

## The Kremlin Disposes of Dubcek

*France:*

***New Revolutionary Organization  
Formed by Supporters of 'Rouge'***

**Glimpses of Soviet Reality**

**Canada and NATO**

GUSTAV HUSAK: Moscow's new man in Prague.

FIRST TIME IN ENGLISH:

**'On the Road to the European Revolution'**

**By Leon Trotsky**



## THE KREMLIN DISPOSES OF ALEXANDER DUBCEK

By Les Evans

The April 17 announcement that the Central Committee of the Communist party of Czechoslovakia had removed Alexander Dubček from the post of first secretary marked the end of the long stalemate that followed the Soviet invasion last August. The appointment of Gustav Husak as new first secretary of the party and the removal of Josef Smrkovsky, one of the best-known reformers, from the party's Presidium completed the transfer of power to the officials most amenable to the dictates of the Kremlin bureaucracy.

Moscow's military intervention, aimed at throttling the burgeoning movement for socialist democracy in Czechoslovakia, proved from the outset to be a major political blunder of the Kremlin. The kidnapping of Dubček and Smrkovsky immediately after the invasion was clearly part of a plan to install a puppet government of old-line Stalinists. This aim was frustrated by the remarkable mobilization and resistance of the Czech people. The result was to unleash a continuing crisis of confidence among the Communist parties that owe allegiance to Moscow and to buy time for the defenders of proletarian democracy in Czechoslovakia.

But from the outset the Dubček leadership adopted a policy of bureaucratic maneuver and compromise rather than struggle at the head of the masses against the Soviet demands. In the name of "realism," the Czech leaders allowed the rights of the workers and the revolutionary students and intellectuals to be whittled away. Dubček and his collaborators, who feared the mass mobilization as much as they did the Soviet troops, found themselves increasingly in conflict with the Czech people and their own party ranks, as they were obliged more and more to act as transmitters of Soviet pressure.

At no time since August 1968 did the Czech people lack determination to resist the occupation. This was evident on countless occasions, from the demonstrations immediately after the invasion to the student strikes in November, to the huge turnout for the funeral of Jan Palach in January, to the most recent demonstrations in March which served as the pretext for the latest Soviet moves against the Dubček leadership.

It was above all the unwillingness of the leadership to organize and lead the resistance that inevitably prepared the way for its removal. This outcome was predicted by the Fourth International as long ago as September 15, 1968, hardly three weeks after the invasion. At that time in an editorial in Quatrième Interna-

nationale, the official magazine of the International Executive Committee of the Fourth International, the world Trotskyist movement declared:

"The Dubček leadership were not intransigent Bolsheviks with a political firmness equal to any test, but men with an essentially bureaucratic training, long steeped in the system which had turned against them....[Because] of their bureaucratic training, they lacked any confidence, basically, in the masses....

"By agreeing to 'negotiate' [with the Kremlin], the Dubček team began sliding down a slope on which it will be difficult, if not impossible, for them to stop. The masses became disoriented, then demobilized; hence a loss in militancy which the occupation is now seeking step by step to turn to its advantage....

"The Soviet leaders will continue this game until they think that they can drop them in favor of opportunists who will relieve them of any need for further worry. The calculation of the Soviet leaders in this matter is based, like the calculation that led them to invade Czechoslovakia, on assumptions concerning the objective reality that are mistaken. But their calculation as to what will happen to the Dubček leadership is correct. This leadership cannot help but disintegrate. The mass movement in Czechoslovakia will rise again and go forward but not under this leadership.\*

As a postscript to this prophetic document, it must be added that at the end, Dubček and Smrkovsky obligingly greased the slope to hasten their own disappearance. Smrkovsky on April 15 humbled himself before the Stalinists by writing in the party newspaper, Rudé Právo, "my judgment was not correct." He recanted his view that the chief danger to Czechoslovakia came from the hard-line Kremlin supporters rather than from the reformers, as Moscow alleged. He even denounced the demonstrations of March 28 for having "damaged the consolidation that was just beginning."

Dubček himself formally asked the Central Committee "to be released from the function of First Secretary." Although he was plainly acting under heavy coercion from Soviet officials, nevertheless he chose to submit rather than to

---

\* The full text of this article is available in the pamphlet The Invasion of Czechoslovakia, Merit Publishers, 873 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10003, 65 cents.

put up a fight, thus weakening and disorienting the popular movement. From the time of the invasion the major trade unions, including the million-member Metal Workers Union, had pledged to call a general strike if the party leadership were deposed. By supinely complying with the Soviet demands, Dubček helped to disarm this potentially powerful opposition force.

Several factors appear to have affected the Kremlin's decision to dump Dubček at this time. One of the most important was the reconsolidation of pro-Moscow elements in the army and secret police. One of the acts of the Czech reformers after January 1968 that most infuriated Brezhnev and Kosygin was the removal of many old-line Stalinists from their posts in the core of the repressive apparatus of the state. This was evidently an important reason for the decision to carry out the military intervention.

In the initial period after August the popular resistance was too strong to reintroduce these discredited men into their old jobs. But one of the "concessions" made by Dubček and company has been to quietly reinstate hundreds of pro-Moscow "conservatives" in the secret police and the army hierarchy. After the completion of this reconquest of power for the Kremlin, Dubček became a superfluous figurehead whose usefulness to the Kremlin had been exhausted.

To be sure, the workers and students have not been pacified or demoralized. The March 28 demonstrations were read by Brezhnev as a sign that he must institute repressive measures if he hoped to disperse this popular opposition before it regrouped around new leaders.

This was the real meaning of the

imposition of Husak. Despite the Slovak leader's nine years of imprisonment, begun in 1951 during the Stalinist purges, he has made it plain that he intends to impose Moscow's diktat and repress any opposition. "One does not get ahead with a popular policy," Husak said in his address to the Central Committee April 17. The calling out of Czech troops in Prague and other cities indicated that he would not shrink from using bullets if necessary to enforce an unpopular course.

Even though the fight for socialist democracy in Czechoslovakia will be more difficult in the future, there are already signs that workers and students have taken up the challenge. Student and trade-union leaders are reportedly circulating a petition calling for a boycott of party leaders responsible for removing Dubček. It declares: "The workers and students reserve the inalienable right to take their own independent stand and adopt the necessary measures." The resolution was said to have received wide support in important factories in Prague, including the CKD truck plant.

The academic council of the Prague School of Economics issued a statement April 19 which said: "In the selection of Dr. Husak we see not merely a personnel change but also a change of political course."

Another not inconsequential consideration on the part of Brezhnev and Kosygin in disposing of Dubček at this time was the conference of world Communist parties scheduled to be held in Moscow June 5. They may have mistakenly expected that the creation of a pro-Moscow regime in Prague would hasten the process of "normalization" and dampen the widespread criticism of Soviet policy among other Communist parties.

This scheme has already backfired. On April 18 the Italian Communist party, the largest CP in Western Europe, denounced the removal of Dubček and called for "full restoration of Czechoslovak sovereignty and an end to all forms of interference." The Finnish CP followed suit in more muted terms.

The elevation of Husak is unquestionably a setback for the forces of socialist democracy in Czechoslovakia. But by still further unmasking the criminal character of the Kremlin bureaucracy it contributes to the world disintegration of the once monolithic Stalinist current. It also increases the likelihood that a new, revolutionary leadership will be born from this ordeal in Czechoslovakia, not drawn from any sector of the bureaucracy. That new leadership will have to carry through the political revolution against bureaucratic misrule that was begun in January 1968.



L'Express

## THE DEMONSTRATIONS IN BATTIPAGLIA AND MILAN

### Rome

APRIL 14 -- The recent demonstrations have considerably heightened the climate of social tension, which has existed in Italy for some months. They have led to sharp clashes with the police in which the demonstrators have not always gotten the worst of it. Two episodes are quite significant -- Battipaglia and Milan.

Battipaglia is a small town [population 26,000] in southern Italy, characterized -- like the rest of the South -- by a low standard of living and a scarcity of employment opportunities. In this context, the news came of the decision to close one of the small factories sustaining the town's precarious economy. The response was immediate. Workers, students, and townspeople organized a protest march April 9 in which large sections of the population took part.

The police quickly sent reinforcements, who assumed a provocative attitude. The police attacked the protest march without warning, trying to break it in two, with the evident intention of isolating the most advanced and militant section from the rest. The reaction was immediate, and clashes with the police began. The demonstrators defended themselves with sticks and stones and managed to put considerable pressure on some groups of police. Some of the policemen in these groups lost their heads and began to fire, killing two persons -- one young worker among the demonstrators and a young schoolteacher who was watching the scene from her window -- and wounding many others.

The crowd, numbering about 5,000 persons, reacted to the shooting with fury. The police were surrounded, assailed, put to flight, disarmed, and finally forced to take refuge in the police station. The demonstrators besieged the police station and called on the police over a megaphone to leave their weapons and come out with their hands up. The police preferred to escape out the back window.

The murder of two persons in Battipaglia aroused the indignation and rage of workers all over Italy. The unions were forced to declare a three-hour national protest strike April 11.

The strike was marked by demonstrations in many cities in which the workers and students confronted the police. The most significant episode was in Milan.

The trade-union leadership in Milan tried to respond to the workers' de-

mands for protests and at the same time avoid creating a favorable situation for the revolutionary groups. Thus they decided to organize a "silent" demonstration of mourning. However, the demonstration did not come off according to their plan.

Workers and students organized by the revolutionary groups converged on the demonstration site, quickly taking the leadership of an important section of the march. When they reached the headquarters of the Milan industrialists' association, they found themselves trapped between two cordons of police. Instead of letting themselves be intimidated, they began to give a clear demonstration of their determination to defend themselves if attacked. Thus the police found themselves facing hundreds of youth armed with sticks and displaying a firm attitude.

The first clashes began in intermittent phases. The demonstrators and police broke up into small groups, which engaged in clashes in a large part of the center city area. This time, too, the balance sheet of the battle was unfavorable to the police: some eighty-eight were injured by sticks, stones, and Molotov cocktails. Thirty demonstrators were injured (or possibly more, since some might have had their wounds treated privately to avoid arrest).

These last battles have created a situation in which, on the one hand, the bourgeois journals are calling for "maintaining law and order" and, on the other, the revolutionary elements are gaining greater experience and moving on from spontaneous demonstrations like the one in Battipaglia to organized confrontations like the one in Milan.

In this situation, another phenomenon is occurring which worries the bourgeoisie. Some sections of the police are beginning to rebel against discipline. The numerous demonstrations are forcing the government to shift police rapidly (the Italian police force is very large, one of the largest in Europe, but it is not large enough to face all the local actions) and to make them take increasingly heavy night duty. As a result, there have been real rebellions. In Milan a month ago a detachment of police demonstrated against heavy duty, marching on the police headquarters to chants of "Ho Chi Minh." Similar cases have occurred in Rome. L'Unità, the Communist party daily, is getting letters from policemen protesting against their working conditions. Thus the situation is very tense -- to the point that it led Le Monde's Italian correspondent to describe it as a "creeping French May."

SUPPORTERS OF "ROUGE" FOUND NEW REVOLUTIONARY ORGANIZATION IN FRANCE

[The following report of the founding congress of the Ligue Communiste (Communist League) in France was published in the April 12 issue of the Belgian revolutionary socialist weekly La Gauche. The introductory note by the editors of La Gauche is also given. The translation is by Intercontinental Press.]

\* \* \*

Over the four-day Easter weekend, a congress was held by the supporters of the communist action journal Rouge, which has served as the rallying point for the young French students and workers who were the vanguard in May 1968. This congress was especially interesting because of the practical way in which it drew up the balance sheet of what has clearly been the most important European event in the last twenty years. It was a perfectly prepared congress whose seriousness and level of consciousness proved that a real leadership was born out of the revolutionary crisis of May.

Documents were carefully prepared, theses were developed, the debate was intense. Decisions were made. The congress divided into a majority of 80 percent and a minority of 20 percent. The minority was divided into two tendencies. One could be characterized as "Maoist-spontaneist," the other as centrist.

Three hundred delegates from every part of France participated in this founding congress. In the following article, one of our collaborators attempts to relate what went on there. It should be noted also that the congress documents are to be published in three pamphlets by Maspéro.

\* \* \*

The present period of the joint crisis of capitalism and Stalinism assigns tasks of prime historical importance to the new vanguard. The discussion that the revolutionists grouped around the journal Rouge have carried out in France over the last weeks is highly significant for the development of this new vanguard.

In order to meet the problems they have been faced with, the "distributors of Rouge" held a congress over the Easter weekend at which they founded the Ligue Communiste [Communist League]. The emergence of this organization constituted a decisive step forward in the advance of the May movement toward the socialist revolution -- because that, in fact, is what is involved.

The Rouge comrades have now under-

taken to change their entire method of operating in accordance with a process of transition to a higher stage which requires an almost total reconversion of their forces, a transformation of their organizational structures, and a reorientation of their tasks.

May 1968 confirmed the strength of the fundamental positions held by the former JCR [Jeunesse Communiste Révolutionnaire -- Revolutionary Communist Youth]\* -- some of whose members are involved in the grouping around Rouge. But at the same time, the May upsurge reveals the limitations and insufficiencies of the old JCR.

These limitations and insufficiencies were the result essentially of the state in which the Stalinists kept the labor movement for forty years. And it is the merit and strength of the Rouge militants that they recognized this. The absence of a mass revolutionary leadership at the time when Stalinism and Nazism mounted a joint repression against the Left Opposition left the working class prey to betrayal and demoralization.

In May, the splinter groups, as has been repeated often enough, played the role of a detonator, that is, by no means the role of a real vanguard. They were only, in the last analysis, a substitute for a vanguard.

Today the lack of correct perspectives for a situation that remains explosive threatens to paralyze the workers movement, to isolate the potential vanguard which is trying to find its way.

In order to be able to respond to the practical demands of the hour, the Rouge militants had to develop a new structure. This, in the last analysis, was the meaning of the Easter congress.

The congress decided to form the Ligue Communiste as the vanguard of the future revolutionary party of the French working class. The new structure is to be a highly centralized organization capable of assuming its historical task when the foreseeable class struggles next break out in the continuing crisis of the French and international bourgeoisie.

The first act of the new Ligue Communiste was to establish a general orientation for its work. It defined three areas of intervention -- the working class, high-school and university youth, and teachers. The workers were given priority because the essential problem now is to construct the

---

\* Banned by the Gaullist regime after the May 1968 upsurge.

revolutionary party.

May, in fact, opened a breach in the wall that the traditional organizations had erected around the workers movement. Workers, and young workers most of all, erupted into the struggle. They raised radical demands. They brought new organizational forms into play and expressed the opposition of a layer of revolutionary elements in the factories. This breach must be broadened by taking advantage of the factory contacts the vanguard developed through the Comités d'Action [or CAs -- Action Committees, the principal organizational forms thrown up by the May movement].

The CAs as well as the CALs [Comités d'Action Lycéens -- High-School Action Committees] and the other united-front organizations proved very inadequate instruments for political education once the struggles subsided. The political tendencies in these organizations fought each other and canceled each other out. Fluctuating according to the circumstances, these bodies did not have the capacities to sustain prolonged action. Thus, in general, the reformists easily regained control of them.

It was necessary, therefore, for the revolutionists to stop burying themselves in these united-front organizations and to create a pole of regroupment for the revolutionary militants. This meant that intensive centralization was to compensate for the immaturity and heterogeneity of the revolutionary organization at that immediate juncture.

Along with the CAs and the CALs, there are to be circles of Rouge supporters. The forms the activity of these circles will take are still to be discussed, but it is understood now that these groups will have to struggle against the political and trade-union leaderships, which are still diverting the workers struggles into harmless channels. It is understood that they will have to combat the fragmentation and isolation of trade-union struggles and conduct educational campaigns around the concepts of workers control and a plan for trade-union unity.

The objective is to prepare the workers vanguard for the struggles to come not only by denouncing the "traitor" leaderships but by proposing practical forms of intervention which would make it possible to mobilize the workers in action going beyond the reformist objectives of the trade-union leaderships -- the election of plant committees, opening the books, workers control of hiring and firing and of wage differentials, etc.

All of the delegates to the congress agreed on the definition of the areas of activity and on the general ori-

entation. But a minority, which had already shown itself during the pre-congress discussion, expressed opposition on two points and raised two questions. The first question was: Must the line of the Ligue Communiste be determined before the organization itself is founded? In other points, would not the development of the league itself make it possible to set the line through the consolidation of broader contacts among the masses? This question dealt, then, with the problem of the relationship between the vanguard and the masses.

"A vanguard organization is one working-class organization among others." What sets it apart from the rest is that it "generates Marxism."

"If there is a link-up between a vanguard organization and the masses, it occurs on a common ground, that of political struggle.

"Conceiving the vanguard organization apart from its relationship with the masses is putting it in the context of a totally formal dialectic, it means appointing one's self a vanguard and engaging in organizational fetishism."

Those were the terms in which the minority delegates put their arguments. They proposed the organization of conferences in which the various vanguards could come together.

The majority delegates replied that it was impossible for militants who differed in their basic approach to problems to join together around a common program. They said it was necessary first to develop the means for action in order to struggle for a regroupment of revolutionists. Moreover, the majority delegates noted, their Marxist positions did not spring full-grown from the brow of Zeus but were the outcome of the whole history of the workers movement and the Fourth International founded in 1938 by Leon Trotsky.

This is why the majority proposed that the Ligue Communiste join the Fourth International on the basis of the sixteen points of the 1963 reunification congress. They proposed this program as the essential basis for the solution of the political problems posed and as the only program still valid for genuinely revolutionary struggle.

The minority expressed reservations on this point. They opposed joining the Fourth International and called instead for the establishment of a fraternal relationship with this organization.

The majority felt that the struggle could not be held up for sterile discussions on this point since there already existed a clear potential basis for a



world revolutionary party and the program of the Fourth International offered a strategy which had stood the test of fire.

The majority delegates held that a mass international was an urgent and permanent necessity for the class struggle in our time. They maintained that the delay in developing such an organization was a misfortune for which humanity is paying a heavy price. The Vietnamese, Indonesians, and Brazilians, they pointed out, have already paid dearly in recent years.

The congress concluded with a vote on the resolutions and on the new statutes of the Ligue Communiste, which recognize the right to form tendencies. A Central Committee was elected, on which the minorities are represented.

Comrades from the JGS [Jeunes Gardes Socialistes -- Socialist Young Guards, the Belgian revolutionary socialist youth organization] attended the congress. Here is the message they brought to their French comrades:

"The Fédération Nationale des Jeunes Gardes Socialistes [National Fed-

eration of Socialist Young Guards] sends its revolutionary greetings to your congress.

"Some years after our leaving the Social Democracy, and in the absence of any revolutionary organization in the workers movement in Belgium, we are in the very first stages of building a vanguard organization among the youth. Thus, your experiences and your gains are a precious help to us.

"Your organization's involvement in the revolutionary progress of May represents an extremely important contribution for all the vanguard youth organizations throughout the world.

"Our own struggles, although they are of a very limited character in this phase, have also clearly shown us that the essential factor for a decisive resolution of the contradictions of capitalist society is the construction of a revolutionary party and a revolutionary international. The orientation you have taken in regard to these questions places you in the forefront of a process in which all of the vanguard youth organizations will have to involve themselves at a certain point."

### THE STUDENT STRIKE IN TURKEY

#### Ankara

APRIL 8 -- The students in most schools of Ankara University and in all the schools of the METU [Middle East Technical University] here boycotted classes last week. As of today the boycott for an indefinite period is still on. The students of the METU are protesting the proposed laws of the governing Justice party: one that proposes to change the present status of Turkish radio and television and one that is designed to curb freedom of the press and speech among other things.

Today the students of the school of architecture of the METU occupied their building. There is a huge painted sign in front of the building saying, "This building has been liberated."

There are pictures of Che hung on the windows. The students are in continuous meetings, which they call seminars. They have a discount bookstore on the ground floor where they are selling the works of Lenin, Mao, and Che and all the radical publications in Turkish.

The situation is critical. The right to decide whether or not to occupy other buildings has been given to a four-man committee.

In the basement of the building, they are making clubs out of wood in case they need them. (They are even using lathes.)

\* \* \*

[Agence France-Presse estimated that more than 40,000 students took part in the strike at twenty colleges and schools. On April 10 the students in the faculty of political science at Ankara University followed the example of the students at the METU by occupying their school.

[The students have accused the administration of stalling in the institution of university reforms won last June. The bourgeois political parties have denounced the massive student strike as the work of "a group of leftist provocateurs," but this description hardly explains the widespread participation in the action.

[On April 13, police occupied the METU campus and expelled the students after several sharp clashes. The university administration has decided to close the METU until classes reconvene in October. Several persons were reported to have been injured. More than 100 students were arrested.]

# REVEALING GLIMPSES OF SOVIET REALITY FROM ITS SOCIOLOGISTS

By George Novack

The development of sociology in the United States and the Soviet Union over the past fifty years has proceeded not only on different principles and methods but in opposite directions.

American sociologists have by and large turned away from any universal evolutionary approach to social processes and concentrated upon studying patches of contemporary social phenomena and separate institutions in a narrow and superficial empirical manner. These researches have been conducted with the aid of public opinion polls, sampling, and other statistical techniques. Although some of the younger, less hidebound sociologists of the C. Wright Mills school have expressed dissatisfaction with the absence of any comprehensive and integrated theory of social development and are seeking without much success to overcome the lack, American sociology remains overweighted on the side of microsociological monographs.

Soviet sociology to the contrary has based itself, at least formally, upon the teachings of the general laws of social development expounded by historical materialism. But it has been compelled to keep these on the level of abstract generalization, to parrot the official line of the moment and to refrain from applying its instruments of critical analysis to the facts of Soviet life. Under Stalin the state and party authorities discouraged the concrete study of social phenomena for fear that the results of untrammelled inquiry would lead to conclusions contrary to the sedative mythology of the prevailing political line. Thus the sociology of contemporary life was blighted at the root throughout the era of "the cult of the individual."

In recent years this total suppression of concrete social studies has been somewhat modified not only in the Soviet Union but in Poland and Czechoslovakia, although their revival has been highly tentative and continues to be hedged about by bureaucratic taboos. In July 1964 the Academy of Sciences of the USSR held a conference at the behest of the Central Committee of the CPSU at which academicians P.N. Fedoseyev and Y.P. Frantsev rather mildly observed: "One of the worst consequences of the cult of personality was the lowering of prestige of the social scientists. This was done by placing the scientists working in the areas of social science in those days into a situation which limited to the extreme their creative activity." They might have added that this situation included frame-ups, deportation to Siberian

prison camps, and executions.

At the Twenty-third Congress of the Soviet party in March-April 1966, both Brezhnev and Kosygin spoke about lifting the bans upon the functioning of the social sciences, particularly in the field of sociological research "into the concrete facts of socialist society." Although this promise is very far from realization, Soviet sociologists have recently been able to carry on certain inquiries which cast light upon previously dim areas of Soviet reality.

In a paper read at the Fifth World Congress of Sociology in Washington, D.C., in 1962, G. Osipov and M. Yovchuk of the Institute of Philosophy of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR stated that the new program of concrete sociological research envisaged by the Soviet Sociological Association, headed by Y.P. Frantsev, covered the scientific analysis of five major problems. These were: (1) the alteration of the social structure of society in the process of building communism; (2) modifications in the character of work; (3) the transfer of socialist state functions to public self-governing organizations; (4) Soviet family life and functions in relation to living space and material and social conditions; and (5) the spiritual life of people and the maximum development of personality. Since then several informative reports have been published on some aspects of the first and the fourth of these problems.

Science and Ideology in Soviet Society, edited by George Fischer of the Russian Institute of Columbia University and published in 1968, told about three major social science surveys made in the Soviet Union in the last five years: one at Gorky, a large industrial city on the Volga River; one at Novosibirsk, "the Chicago of Siberia"; and one at Leningrad. Fischer comments that these surveys go counter to the idealized and falsified pictures of life emanating from official quarters and "get much closer to gray and even black shadings of reality now than at any time since the 1920s."

This is confirmed by a report given by Dr. Alex Simirenko at the convention of the American Sociological Association in Boston in August 1968 on a study of vocational plans and occupational mobility conducted by a dozen sociologists at the University of Novosibirsk with the acknowledged support of party officials. Although only partial results of the study are available, the published data disclose glaring inequalities within the younger generation, especially in regard



to educational opportunities, which is no small matter in modern society.

The Novosibirsk survey found that a great disparity existed between the vocational expectations of Russian high-school graduates and their fruition. Eight percent of both boys and girls planned to go to work immediately after graduation. Actually, 26 percent of the boys and 35 percent of the girls did so. Seven percent of the boys and 14 percent of the girls hoped to find jobs that would allow part-time study; but only 2 percent of the boys and 3 percent of the girls managed to find such jobs.

Eighty-five percent of the boys and 78 percent of the girls had planned to continue studying full-time; only 48 percent of the boys and 41 percent of the girls did in fact do so. Most significant is the fact brought out by further analysis of the data that the ability to pursue further studies had a high correlation with the family's social position.

The head of the investigation, Vladimir N. Shubkin, had the following candid and careful comment to make on this point: "While we categorically oppose any broad interpretation of these selective data, we do have grounds for affirming that the paths through life taken by young people from various social groups today show significant divergences. Of every 100 secondary school graduates coming from families of collective farm members and state farm workers, only ten continued to study after completion of secondary school and ninety went to work, while of every 100 graduates coming from the families of urban non-manual persons, eighty-two continued their studies and only fifteen went to work."

Though the sociologist refrains from "broad interpretation," it is fairly evident that the principal reasons for the discrepancy between the individual desire to go on with higher education and the ability to do so lies in the material distinctions among the various sectors of Soviet society. The children of rural and industrial workers have far fewer chances of getting more than a high-school education than the favored offspring of well-to-do and well-placed professional and official families.

These pronounced social gradations are reflected in the values attached to different occupations. The study disclosed that most Russian high-school seniors wanted to escape from the undesirable social positions of their parents. Very few wished to work either in the field of agricultural production or in the service trades. The great majority desired work either in industrial production or the professions because they could earn more and acquire a more honor-

ific status in the social hierarchy.

These standards of social prestige threaten to have serious economic consequences, noted Dr. Simirenko in his ASA paper. "The data...forced the authors to conclude that unless something was done soon to change the social meaning of agricultural and service occupations, Soviet society is likely to be faced with [a] tremendous shortage of workers in these fields. Up to now...service occupations and agricultural production were glorified in the Soviet press without any...objective attempt...to change the lot of people filling these positions. Shubkin and his colleagues maintain that much more than this has to be done to literally save these occupations.

"Youth desires a different way of life and not simply a better remuneration for its services. Young people desire comforts and cultural stimulation now being offered only in cities. At the same time, they also desire occupations which will permit greater creativity and open greater variety of opportunities for their talents..."

Another study begun in 1963 cited by Dr. Simirenko exposes the conditions of discontent among women. This was conducted by the Institute of Public Opinion under the auspices of the official organ of the Young Communist League, Komsomolskaia Pravda, and explored Soviet city-dwellers' use of nonworking hours. It would be misleading to characterize them as "leisure hours" in view of the study's findings on the extent of the burdens imposed on working women by the double duties of household chores and working on the job. These difficulties are compounded by the inefficiencies of the distribution of the necessities of life.

"The category of Soviet population most deprived of free time are the employed women, as well as the housewives whose duties include fixing meals and standing in queues while shopping," summarizes Simirenko. "Time spent on daily routines is also positively related to the size of cities; the larger the city the longer time it takes to perform the various chores....The final practical conclusion and recommendation of the study is that it is more important at this point to shorten the time it takes to care for the necessities of life than to cut the working time of the population. It is estimated that...shopping, cooking and cleaning alone take the time of 100 billion hours of work yearly, equalling one year's life for 12 million people."

These studies show that there are marked and growing differentials in the living and working conditions of the various components of Soviet society today; that the Soviet woman, far from be-

ing free, remains subjected to all the cares and burdens of the family system; that there is an accumulation of privileges at one end of Soviet society and a vast reservoir of deprivation and discontent at the other.

The bureaucratic and professional upper crust and their progeny enjoy far more advantages, all the way from education to the sphere of consumption, than the mass of workers, peasants, and other members of the lower orders. It is impossible to reconcile these facts, disclosed in the studies of the sociologists, with

the official claim that the Soviet Union is already a socialist country on the way to communism. This is a palpable fiction.

What the findings do prove is that the Soviet Union is going through a transition period from capitalism to socialism that bears with it a heavy load of social contradictions. These can be progressively resolved only by the removal of the deceitful, arbitrary, and tyrannical bureaucratic rulers and the establishment of a socialist democracy controlled by the working masses.

## CANADA AND NATO

By Dick Fidler

Toronto

Following an eight-month "review" of Canada's foreign and defense policy, the Liberal government headed by Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau announced on April 3 its decision to maintain Canada's membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the North American Air Defense agreement (NORAD), but to carry out a "phased reduction" of Canadian NATO forces in Europe.

In future, the prime minister's statement suggests, Canada will place more emphasis on "the surveillance of our own territory and coast lines, i.e., the protection of our sovereignty," and "the defense of North America in cooperation with United States forces."

"Abroad, our forces will be capable of playing important roles in collective security and peacekeeping activities," the statement adds.

The decision to remain in NATO indefinitely was immediately welcomed by spokesmen for the U.S. State Department, and by most other NATO allies. West German Foreign Minister Willy Brandt, on a visit to Ottawa a few days later, said he recognized that "the Canada decision is primarily and essentially a decision in favor of NATO and not in favor of disrupting NATO," but expressed the hope that a reduction in Canada's European forces would not encourage other allies to do likewise.

The "official" Conservative party opposition in Canada's House of Commons has attacked the government's decision to reduce its forces overseas as indicating a "drift to isolationism." This interpretation is echoed by the editors of the New York Times, who find it "disturbing" that some influential Canadians regard the Atlantic alliance "not as a

valuable enduring partnership but as a cold war relic....They assume that on the strategic level the United States willy-nilly will defend them if necessary, but insist this no longer obligates Canada to contribute to collective Atlantic defense on the ground in Europe. These attitudes partly reflect the neo-isolationist sentiment so evident in American political campaigns in 1968, as well as the British Labour Party almost a decade ago."

This view is rejected by a leading Canadian daily, the Toronto Globe and Mail, which like most of the capitalist press, strenuously supports the Trudeau decision:

"In fact, the Canadian enthusiasm for a new approach to foreign policy and defense commitments is based on the very antithesis of isolationism -- a desire on our part to play a more effective role in the international affairs and to make a greater contribution to long-run peace and stability than the limited concepts of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization permit....Some of the future threats to peace and stability may come from Europe but they are much more likely to come from the two-thirds of the world where poverty, ignorance and disease are the principal enemies."

The Trudeau decision is in fact remarkable most of all for the closeness with which it clings to the status quo. The Toronto Star of April 7 noted that "the furor over Canada's decision to reduce its forces in NATO has obscured the fact that the Canadian contingent in Europe already has been steadily and quietly reduced in recent years."

The recent decision, says the Star, "merely accelerates the process."

"The air division in Germany has

been reduced over a four-year period from 12 squadrons of about 200 aircraft to six squadrons of 138 aircraft, and the number of airmen cut from 6,000 to about 4,000.

"The number of Canadian airfields has been reduced from four to two.

"In addition, the strength of the Canadian army brigade in West Germany has been reduced from 6,700 men to just over 5,000 during the past three years.

"Even before last week's decision ...it was intended to reduce the force in NATO by an overall 20 percent."

The prime minister has not revealed the extent of the proposed reduction in troop levels, nor the timetable for its implementation. These decisions apparently will be left to further consultation with Canada's NATO allies at the ministerial meeting in Washington in late April and the policy meeting of the NATO defense planning council in May.



PIERRE ELLIOTT TRUDEAU

The government's announcement is the culmination of a public and private "debate" over foreign and defense policy among the top echelons of the Ottawa bureaucracy and its academic advisers. The debate extended right into the cabinet, with Postmaster General Eric Kierans publicly supporting the view of some prominent civilian authorities that NATO is now "obsolete" and "unnecessary." Kierans, who enjoyed little support in the press, proposed withdrawal from NATO and deployment of Canadian troops for supervisory, counterinsurgency, and "peacekeeping" tasks around the world, including possibly Vietnam.

The House of Commons' external affairs committee, which conducted its own review, came down hard for continued participation in NATO.

The government decision inspires some uneasiness among Canada's allies, especially Washington, mainly because of its possible effect in setting a precedent for similar action by European members of the alliance. The United States, with enormous forces pinned down in Vietnam, has no desire at this time to undertake greater military commitments in Western Europe.

Canada was a prime architect of NATO in 1949, and successive Liberal and Conservative governments have regarded NATO as the keystone of their foreign policy alignment with U.S. imperialism. But in recent years, the old rationale for NATO has lost its force.

None of the capitalist contributors to the current review has challenged Canada's alignment with the United States in the cold war. However, some do question whether Canada's membership in NATO and NORAD is of much use to the alliance -- or to the Canadian capitalist class.

Militarily, European capitalist powers like West Germany have built up powerful forces of their own. Moreover, the Pentagon can now transport thousands of troops anywhere in the world in a matter of hours, as recent exercises in South Korea and West Germany have demonstrated.

The argument that through its membership in NATO and NORAD, Canada gains some special measure of "influence" in Washington has lost all its credibility. For example, Nixon's recent decision to proceed with the antiballistic missile system, which has important military and political implications for Canada, was taken unilaterally without asking the opinion of the Canadian government.

Some bourgeois spokesmen see NATO as an obstacle to further moves toward détente with the Kremlin. Others regard a continuing military presence in Europe

as an important bargaining point in negotiating reciprocal troop reductions with the Warsaw Pact, through NATO. This difference of views was reflected in the varying interpretations of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia. The pro-NATO hardliners pointed to the invasion as "proof" of the aggressive character of the Soviet Union and stressed the importance of NATO as a bulwark against "Communist expansionism" in Europe. Others, more critical of NATO, contended that the Kremlin's intervention against the anti-bureaucratic movement for socialist democracy in Czechoslovakia was not intended as a threat to the capitalist regimes of Western Europe. Kierans, the former president of the Montreal Stock Exchange, said, "the young Czech, Jan Palach, has done more to upset the balance inside the East than the 10 best NATO divisions."

Without doubt, the main factor influencing the outcome of the government's policy "review," however, is the attitude of the U.S. State Department. The clinching argument of all opponents of withdrawal from NATO and NORAD is fear of retaliation by the U.S. government and business interests if Canada were to adopt a policy in any way contrary to their wishes. The proportion of Canada's industry and trade owned or controlled by U.S. interests is higher than the proportion of U.S. interests in any other country. The Canadian capitalist class, thoroughly integrated with U.S. capital, thus has neither the means nor the desire to dissociate itself from Washington's policies.

The main consideration of Canadian policy makers therefore is how Canada can best contribute to the Western alliance, given the virtual elimination of any military importance of its European forces. Both pro-NATO and anti-NATO protagonists agree that the government should place more emphasis in future on Canada's potential as a counterinsurgency troubleshooter for imperialism around the world.

Already the Canadian armed forces, with a total strength of about 90,000, are being converted into a highly mobile force. Special divisions have undergone training in counter guerrilla jungle warfare in such diverse places as Libya, Alaska, Puerto Rico, Australia, Jamaica, and a couple of army camps in Canada. Instructors are training in the U.S. army's counterinsurgency school in Panama and at the Australian Canungra school. Canadians are heavily involved in training neocolonialist armies in Ghana, Tanzania, and Zambia. Canada has already contributed troops for United Nations forces in Korea, the Congo, the Middle East, and Cyprus, and Canadian representatives participate in such truce supervisory operations as the International Control Commission in Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia, as well as

in Kashmir. The government has a standing offer to send troops to Vietnam if requested by the UN or "both sides in the conflict."

Canadian ruling circles still hesitate to make this counterrevolutionary "peacekeeping" function the prime orientation of Canada's defense policy. For one thing, such an orientation, which involves extensive investment in helicopters and expensive supply vehicles, might well require a sizable increase in the defense budget -- already \$1.8 billion, about 10 percent of the federal budget and 3 percent of the gross national product. Moreover, the U.S. experience in Vietnam suggests some obvious dangers in "peacekeeping" involvement when conducted against skilled guerrilla forces enjoying mass popular support.

But the government's likely line of thinking has been spelled out by a close adviser of Trudeau. Writing in the January 1969 issue of Foreign Affairs, Roy Matthews, director of research for the Canadian-American Committee, admits that "it seems likely that the present government review will produce very little in the way of changes in Canada's international or defense policies." However, within five years, he predicts, Canada will have adopted a new role based on an "effective increase in the scope for Canadian peacekeeping -- including conciliation commissions, larger supervisory forces in problem areas and so forth..."

"Such a policy," Matthews observes, "will in no way aim at hurting the interests of the United States. Indeed, I suspect that the U.S. government, which has come to recognize the limitations which its position places on it in certain types of international situations, will increasingly rely upon the sort of special role that a freer agent like Canada can perform."

The government is also strongly hinting it will join the Organization of American States [OAS].

Despite growing public opposition to Canada's traditional foreign policy alignment, a notable nonparticipant in the current policy debate has been the trade union movement. The 1.5-million-member Canadian Labor Congress (CLC), which includes within its ranks the big "international" unions like those in the steel, automobile, and railway industries, has avoided much of the hysterical cold war anti-Communism of the AFL-CIO bureaucracy. But its leaders are long-time supporters of both NATO and NORAD and have urged the Canadian government to join the OAS. The CLC has criticized "both sides" in the Vietnam war. Some affiliates, however, have come out recently in opposition to NATO and NORAD -- notably the Federation of Labor in British Columbia, the heavily industrialized west coast province. Qué-

bec's independent Confédération des Syndicats Nationaux (CSN), with about 200,000 members, has opposed American aggression in Vietnam and the Canadian government's complicity in the war, but has said nothing about NATO and NORAD. Both labor federations have declined to step into the current debate.

The New Democratic party, which is sponsored by the CLC, has confined its intervention in the debate to the parliamentary tribune. NDP leaders have denounced NORAD but endorsed continued membership in NATO. This is contrary to the explicit position of several provincial sections and to the federal party's own policy, which calls for Canada's withdrawal from NATO if the alliance is nuclear-armed, which of course it is.

Both the NDP and the Tory opposition in parliament have criticized the government's failure to inform parliament of its decision before it prorogued the House for the Easter recess. Debate on

the decision will not be held until after the NATO ministerial meeting in Washington.

Yet to be announced is the government's decision on the contentious questions of Canada's nuclear "role" in NATO and NORAD and of possible Canadian participation in the ABM project.

Bomarc missiles in Canada and Canadian army and air force contingents in Europe are armed with nuclear warheads and rockets. Prime Minister Trudeau has suggested that the ABM may be integrated with NORAD. If Canada is to participate in decisions regarding the ABM, he says, "it may be we shall have to become partners in the ABM system."

Whatever the conclusions of the remainder of its policy review, however, it is clear that the Canadian government does not intend to depart from its long-standing slavish loyalty to its mentors and masters in Washington.

## THE YOUTH MOVEMENT AND THE ALIENATION OF SOCIETY

By José Revueltas

[Continued from last issue.]

The Soviet Communist party and state rejected a revolutionary class alliance with the proletarian and popular masses of the world, in particular those of Europe and the United States. As a "penalty" for this they had to ally themselves first with the imperialist German bourgeoisie and later with Anglo-American imperialism against Germany. In this way, the Soviet Union entered into the status quo of class society and was transformed into another "great power."

Its imperialist colleagues no longer have the slightest compunction about talking the same cynical political language with the Soviet Union that they customarily talk among themselves. (The language of Lenin and Trotsky and Brest-Litovsk, and of Chicherin in Geneva, has been consigned to the archives where, like the remnants of ancient scrolls, it is destined to astound and perplex the Homo sovieticus of the new generations educated by the Stalinists.

It is clear that the enormous human sacrifice of the Soviet people in their struggle against Hitler had a decisive weight in tipping the scales in favor of a victory by the Allied powers in their war against the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo "axis."

However, the hundreds of thousands

of "needless" deaths in the inconceivable mass slaughter in Hiroshima and Nagasaki seem to count for less than nothing. It never occurred to anyone that President Truman should have been called before the Nuremberg Tribunal, which judged the most important war criminals in the past conflict. Nor did it occur to the USSR, which was a member of the tribunal at Nuremberg, to call for his appearance there, as far as anyone knows.

Of course, it is fully apparent today why the atom bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki -- which were as heinous and horrifying as the liquidation of the Jews in the gas chambers -- were not then considered war crimes. The nonnuclear states reserved the right to produce their own bombs and slaughter other peoples in the near future in accordance with the alternatives offered. It was at this point that the USSR entered fully into the "atomic complex" which is alienating the social consciousness of our time.

Let us see what this "atomic complex" consists of, understanding that it has nothing to do with historical psychoanalysis or anything like it. I might say that deformation of the lines of historical development follows its own dialectic; that is, the dialectic as a universal law does not and cannot fail to manifest itself in every area of nature and society. Thus, the dialectic also operates in the conservative, retrogressive, and reactionary processes of history and does not always move "onward"

or "upward" as the dogmatic vulgarizations by the authors of the philosophic compendia [of the USSR] would have it.

Distortion of a given course, or at least one of its aspects, always results when the subjective forces that want to change history fail to resolve the contradiction between the immediate concrete reality and the underlying process of change contained within it, when they end by accepting this concrete reality as permanent and accommodate to it. This is always the result when the subjective factors -- men, leaders, parties -- that are outside or opposed to the dominant historical tendency of the moment fail to overcome the contradiction between the immediate material reality and its content mediated between the concrete and the abstract -- between sense perception and the category of knowledge; when these subjective factors judge themselves by this objective reality and accept it as a closed and self-sufficient context defying negation.

Distortion always results when the subjective forces accommodate to this concrete context instead of identifying themselves with the negative tendencies within it. In that case, practice tends to prolong the existence of the conservative side of dialectical education at the expense of its revolutionary side, and this practice tends automatically to change from conservative to reactionary.

I repeat, psychology does not enter into these problems in any way. Nor, despite Lombardo Toledano's claim and the pretensions also of the quack purveyors of social psychoanalysis, does the Freudian branch of psychology. Neither fear, anxiety, insecurity, nor the destructive psychosis form part of the "atomic complex."

In the last analysis, this "complex" represents a phenomenon larger and of more catastrophic proportions than any other type of social disorder or crisis of civilization. What is involved is a state alienated from itself, from its historical nature, and from its own dominant class. It has become a superstate which represents organized violence but only out of and for the sake of violence itself, without any objective but its own preservation and perpetuation. It is an alienated state which alienates itself, a reifying state which is becoming reified. (Of course, anyone who tried to express this in absolute, nondialectical terms would not have understood anything of the problem.)

The industrial revolution of the eighteenth century has its opposite in the atomic counterrevolution of the twentieth century. Humanity, in fact, has traveled a surprisingly short road

-- barely two centuries -- from the beginning of the maximum development of its productive forces to maximum development of its destructive forces.

The result is that the economic basis of society determines all other aspects of social existence much more directly than in the past. In the most recent past what made up the economic base -- the whole complex of production relations -- conditioned all other social, political, and ideological relationships in the last analysis, as Engels said. Today, the productive relationships have become destructive relationships which immediately condition all other human relationships in contemporary society.

The bourgeois states, which were at once the forerunners and product of the industrial revolution, have not been replaced in the twentieth century by workers states (that is, by forms representing the direct exercise of power by the workers themselves). They have been replaced by nuclear superstates. Achieving the objective of revolution by means of an atomic war (as the policy of People's China might seem to propose) is completely excluded.

Therefore, the "atomic complex" heralds nothing but a complicated interweaving of new contradictions and the turning upside down of those formerly contained in reality. Above and beyond the classes they represent, the contemporary states have ended by being alienated through the immediacy of nuclear power.

In view of this sinister panorama, the real context in which the socialist countries move becomes much more clearly defined -- from the division of the world into "spheres of influence" between the USSR and American imperialism to the hostile, "cold war" relations between the Soviet Union and People's China and the cynical, flagrant, and outrageous invasion of Czechoslovakia by the Warsaw Pact countries.

This division of the world into "spheres of influence" among the powers that emerged victorious from the second world war enabled English imperialism to crush the Greek people and the Greek revolution, while the USSR benevolently and criminally turned its back. From that time on the Communist parties could have realized -- if their bureaucratic leaderships had not prevented them -- that the Soviet Union's foreign policy had completely broken from proletarian internationalism.

They could have known that if the Soviet Union dared abandon a people struggling arms in hand to make its revolution, it would be less than a step from that to abandoning or even fighting against any people which had taken power and whose



international policy became an obstacle in the path of the needs or geopolitical aspirations of the Soviet Union. Subsequent events have proved this.

Today we find ourselves in a situation of open "cold war" between the Soviet Union and People's China. And in this situation it seems, according to every indication, that each of the opposing socialist powers is trying to establish an "entente cordiale" with the "other enemy" -- American imperialism. The third world war -- which is already in progress insofar as its logistic development and the taking of strategic positions on land and in space go -- might start with an intersocialist war in which the opposing blocs would rely on the goodwill, aid, or participation of American imperialism or some other imperialist power.

It is within this complex of problems, then, that the world youth rebellion is incubating and developing, and it is this context that defines it. And this is the same youth rebellion we see in Mexico, though, naturally, the stupid, provincial bourgeoisie that rules our country is absolutely incapable of understanding this. It is an indisputable fact that there is on the order of the day in the world a New Revolution, which is destined to overcome and eliminate a hopeless situation. And it is an indisputable fact also that neither the governments nor the ruling classes can stamp out this revolution.

In his farewell performance, his swan song, Lombardo Toledano did nothing but perform feats of stage magic, tricks of all sorts. He pulled rabbits out of hats, he hid cards up his sleeve, he changed water to confetti -- and transformed real Marxism into a bogus existentialism. In short it was pure legerdemain. And the saddest part was that the whole show had the petty, miserable, and inglorious objective of aiding the Mexican bourgeoisie -- one of the most wretched ruling classes in the world and the one most abounding in fools -- out of an awkward situation. Lombardo was trying to cover up for the bourgeoisie's murderous repression of the students. He himself considered the massacre of the students a mere false step, "an excess." But what it actually represented was the onset of the historical bankruptcy of an absurd regime which has already fallen into a process of mortal decay.

Let us examine how Vicente Lombardo tackled such a thankless task. Today's youth was born in the wake of the last war and is gripped by great fear for the destiny and future of humanity "because of the great dangers that cast their shadow over it." (This means the dangers that threaten the youth because it is

they who will have to bear arms in a future conflict.) In telling us this, Lombardo did no more than note an obvious and simple fact of which we are all aware.

But this youth, Lombardo continued, is well aware that in a few years it will lead the government and hold the posts of command in the companies, production centers, and service establishments. But in the meantime it is unsure about the world's prospects. This is where the rabbit's ears start to peek out of Lombardo's hat.

He claimed that the long-term perspectives of the youth were secure because tomorrow they would occupy the command posts in the state and society. But at the same time, he claimed that their immediate future was insecure because their rosy perspectives were spoiled by the uncertainty of the world situation and the threatened outbreak of a new armed conflict among the great powers.

That is, Lombardo presented it as a repellent, unquestionable fact that the unease, impatience, and rebelliousness of the youth, who are conscious of their destiny to command the economy and political life of the society and state (capitalist? socialist? it doesn't matter), were produced by their fear that the blissful prospect of their joining the ruling class might be shattered by the outbreak of war in our time. Why did Vicente Lombardo Toledano raise this question at such a time?

His intent might not be noticed at first glance. A slow, calculated beginning was one of the basic devices of his polemical style. Further on he would present the characterization that he wanted to emerge from this line of reasoning and toward which his argument was leading. What he wanted to tell us through these first remarks was that the student youth could have only bourgeois aspirations since the great majority of them came from the wealthy classes.

Thus the youths who have come out on the streets in Paris, Rio de Janeiro, or Berlin to demonstrate against the Vietnam war, and those who faced the murderous bullets of the army in Tlatelolco, presumably have done so only to eliminate the dangers imperiling their futures as big social magnates in a society whose content and structure promised them a carefree life.

Lombardo added further on, without any apparent connection to what went before, that the "impetuous development of science and technology has left the universities behind" and that therefore it was urgent to promote some educational reform because "the youth is also impa-

tient on this account and is demanding radical changes in the structure of the educational institutions and the methods of teaching."

See how carefully he attempted to conceal the real aspirations of the youth and the historical causes motivating the youth confrontation. For Lombardo the youth today were not rebelling against society as a whole and the structures of this society (since the youth were supposed to be as bourgeois as their opponents), nor were they trying to abolish this society root and branch. According to him, they restricted themselves to raising questions that could be solved through the type of educational reform "every country will have to carry out in order to stay in the vanguard of progress" -- or such a reform would at least take the militancy out of the student movement.

Here Lombardo distorted the interrelations among, and the consequences of, the component forces in the youth rebellion for the purpose of giving a falsified characterization of the problems of youth -- which are the same as those of the contemporary world. And he sought as well to falsify the ideological context of these problems, as can be seen further on.

But let us return to the elements Lombardo Toledano takes as his point of departure, which are the following: (a) an impetuous development of science and technology contrasting with the backwardness of the universities and centers of higher education "in the capitalist countries"; (b) the urgency of promoting, therefore, an educational reform that would satisfy the needs of the youth, because this backwardness of the educational system is the source of at least part of their impatience; and (c) the specific character of this educational reform (remember, it is supposed to be needed because the universities are lagging behind the development of science and technology).

The question of this educational reform set the stage for the following passage, which refers to a previous comment on the Soviets' launching of the first artificial satellite and the unevenness of technological development this showed among the various countries. Lombardo Toledano said: "In the United States the problem was posed of catching up with and surpassing the Russians. When Wernher von Braun, the chief of atomic arms development and construction, was asked about this, he answered that in his opinion it was necessary to reorganize the entire American educational system from the primary schools up to the universities and technological institutes."

Let us analyze both the inferred and literal meanings Lombardo gave to

these elements in his attempt to distort the character of the youth rebellion of our time. Obviously, there is a disparity between the level of scientific and technological development and the level of higher education. But is the problem to even out these levels? And if so, in what sense and with what purpose? Are scientific and technological development and higher education to complement each other, or is higher education to conform to science and technology? What sort of a relationship is there to be between them? These are the questions raised by Lombardo's skeletal formulation. Certain premises of the educational reform he proposed would depend on the answers. But it is clear that neither for him nor for us is this a matter of settling an academic question.

The real and objective question is not, in the circumstances of our time, whether the development of science and technology has "left the universities behind." What is happening -- and this is the crucial element in the alienation of contemporary society -- is that science and technology are not developing in conjunction but separately and that their separate courses of development have come into conflict to an extreme that is catastrophic for the development of the human race itself. Let me explain myself, starting from the most elementary concepts.

Technology consists in the way of making a thing; science, in knowing why the thing is made. Such a simple statement, however, contains the principle of the dialectical contradiction between technology and science. Technology follows formal logic and pragmatism; science is dialectics and cognitive knowledge, reasoning and history. The lever, for example, originated as pure practice, as a lesson learned by apprenticeship. After its practical use it reproduced itself, with Archimedes, as knowledge.

The equilibrium which should exist between the functions of science and technology has been broken in the contemporary societies -- both the socialist and capitalist societies. This is because the principle of production is based exclusively or preponderantly on exchange values, which are reifying in themselves and also reifying indirectly because man also becomes another exchange value. Technology goes out of control and is dehumanized. It becomes ever more irrational.

This development naturally projects itself onto culture and education; it narrows and reduces them as much as possible in order to transfer them to a mere apprentice status, in conformity with the needs of technological society. The contradiction, then, is not between science and technology lumped into one category and the universities and higher education lagging behind them. Rather the contradiction

lies in the ever more acute incompatibility between the direction of technological development and the essentially human content of higher culture and education.

Any educational reform must, therefore, be put in terms of a reform of society, or more correctly, of a social revolution. In the light of these facts it is very significant what academic authority Lombardo Toledano quoted, i.e., Wernher von Braun, who is supposedly in charge of atomic arms development and construction in some U.S. institution which Lombardo did not mention. Concerned by Soviet progress in launching space vehicles, von Braun considered the most important thing to be a reorganization of the entire American educational system, "from the primary schools to the universities."

Was Lombardo Toledano proposing the same sort of educational reform von Braun advocated? One would think so from his simplistic reduction of the problem solely to its immediate, apparent, and superficial aspect, i.e., the universities "lagging" behind technical progress -- as if precisely the universities should have no other task than to transform themselves into storehouses of specialists intended to satisfy the needs of an industrial society. But that is what the youth have taken a radical and determined position against.

In counterposing educational reform to reform of society -- that is, to revolution -- Lombardo's sole aim was to deny the scope, profundity and historical content of the world youth movement in order better to lock it into the old categories. In this schematic framework, the youth movement would appear as a disoriented "petty-bourgeois impulse" outside reality, which neither heeded nor based itself on the objective laws of development. But Lombardo did not stop there.

Lombardo conceded that the youth had definite worries and that they struggled in defense of weak nations, against imperialist aggressions, and wars like the Vietnam war. But, he said, there were also specific, national demands and aspirations that the youth of each country fought for that did not interest all the students in the world equally. This is so evident that no one would challenge it in any respect. No one would pretend that the demand raised by the Mexican students for the removal of a mediocre police chief could be regarded as a universal aspiration. But Lombardo was deceitfully weaving his political web here, perhaps intending his operation to go unnoticed.

The snare is the following: Since there is an objective law of the uneven historical development of different countries, said Lombardo, with some barely in a tribal state, others underdeveloped,

others at a highly developed stage of capitalism and the rest socialist, it follows that there is a specific tactic of struggle suited to each country. To use tactics proper to a country of great industrial development in a country where capitalist productive relationships are just beginning "is a tactical error destined to result in defeat."

This observation by Lombardo is incontestable. But what example might he have cited of a country where the students failed to observe this elementary principle? In what country could a mass youth movement have developed on the basis of abstract and doctrinaire demands which had nothing to say to the youth about their own national reality? Lombardo claimed that this had happened in every country! And in Mexico above all.

Then he cited about fifteen ideologists representing every current and tendency (Marcuse lumped together with Gorz; C. Wright Mills, with Lefebvre) and attempted to reduce them to a common denominator because "all of them share the same postulates and come to similar conclusions. Out of this amalgam, he concocted an absurd ideological gobbledygook which the youth throughout the world were supposed to have taken as their international banner.

Thus, Lombardo Toledano made two incoherent and slanderous charges against the youth. The first was that they applied tactics to their own countries that were suited only to foreign countries. The second was that they had allowed themselves to be seduced by the eclecticism of the ideologues of a so-called New Revolution. According to him, these ideologues had blended Trotskyism, Freudianism, and existentialism into a "curious mixture" meant to substitute for the old philosophical and social doctrines. And chief among these doctrines was Marxism, which the modern youth were supposed to regard as obsolete.

What did Lombardo propose to establish with these accusations? The "curious mixture" of contradictory factors and situations, all disparate in space and time, and of confused terms, was his own creation. He chose to attribute it to the youth as if it were a common ideological substratum out of which their tactics and strategy developed. Therefore we must deduce from this same "curious mixture" the curious conclusion to which Lombardo wanted to lead the audience of his swan song and now, after everything, his readers.

Lombardo was trying on the one hand to get across the idea that the youth movement did not develop in response to international historical causes and reasons. On the other, he was trying to introduce the notion that the student movements are not

governed by national causes but are inspired by an international ideological sophistry which has attracted the youth by the pure seductiveness of its ideas and the brilliant form in which they have been presented by "talented exponents," as in the case of Jean-Paul Sartre.

Lombardo's position is untenable; it will not withstand the most elementary logical examination. But his argument had a real, concrete, and opportunistic motivation. Lombardo made this speech in Mexico at a time when the entire country was shaken, excited, and aroused by a student movement of a new type, a movement with its own original characteristics, unlike any that ever appeared before in other youth movements. Therefore, Lombardo's words were intended to misrepresent, distort, and falsify the character of the Mexican youth movement.

His purpose was to provide the government and the president of the republic in particular with the theoretical weapons to combat the confrontationist and rebel

student movement. Lombardo's whole ideological barrage did nothing but reinforce the Mexican government's official interpretation of the student movement as a movement inspired by "foreign forces" and "exotic ideologies," which espoused no concrete "constructive plan" capable of solving the problems of the youth.

Of course. The July 26 student and people's movement will never submit to the norms of the social and political status quo that prevails in Mexico, as the government and the bourgeois-democratic ideology would have it do. The revolutionary youth of this country have taken up the banner of struggle going all the way to a radical transformation of Mexican society. This is a fact that no power can nullify, just as no one can divest the nation of its destiny.

Mexico City Preventive Jail  
November 1968

[The end.]

#### BERNADETTE DEVLIN ELECTED TO PARLIAMENT FROM MID-ULSTER

The election of twenty-one-year-old civil-rights fighter Bernadette Devlin to the mid-Ulster seat in the British

parliament on April 17 testified to the rapid and deepgoing changes that have been occurring in Northern Irish political life over the past half year.

The mid-Ulster constituency has a Catholic and nationalist majority of 3,000. But Miss Devlin won by an edge of 4,211 votes over her pro-English Unionist opponent, almost half again as large as the Catholic majority in the district. Moreover, Miss Devlin, a member of the student group, People's Democracy, which has been the radical driving force of the Northern Irish civil-rights movement, waged a campaign hardly calculated to appeal to any sectarian feelings on the part of the Catholic population. Her slogan of a united socialist Ireland expressed an antagonism to the nationalist Catholic bourgeoisie as well as to the pro-English Protestant bourgeoisie and landed officer caste surviving in British-ruled Northern Ireland.

The liberal English weekly Observer described Miss Devlin's campaign this way: "She talks with a soft urgency...evoking a vision of great wrongs to be righted. She talks of 'oppression' and 'exploitation' and 'getting up off our knees' and again and again of 'the people!'"

Immediately after Miss Devlin's election, ultrarightist Unionists began mounting provocations. Six thousand followers of Ian Paisley, the fanatically reactionary Protestant preacher, staged a threatening march through Miss Devlin's hometown.



BERNADETTE DEVLIN

ON THE ROAD TO THE EUROPEAN REVOLUTION

By Leon Trotsky

[With the new rise in the European revolution after the May 1968 events in France, it is especially appropriate to publish, for the first time in English, a speech by Trotsky on the question of the European revolution. Although it dates from nearly half a century ago -- April 11, 1924 -- it naturally has far more than just historical interest.

[Trotsky's method of analyzing the dynamics and the interrelations of the differing national situations in Europe is, as ever, the work of a master. Above all, his comments on the necessary components for victorious socialist revolution, especially the crucial role of the party, have the same force today as then.

[Trotsky, who was then still commissar of war and a member of the Politburo, gave the speech in Tiflis, capital of the Georgian Soviet republic, at a special session of the city soviet. The correspondents of Pravda and Izvestia, which ran stories paraphrasing parts of the speech but did not print it, described enthusiastic, overflow crowds for this, Trotsky's first visit to the Georgian capital. Of the lengthy ovation with which the crowd greeted the appearance of the Bolshevik leader, the Izvestia correspondent wrote: "This is the first time that Tiflis has seen such a welcome."

[This was a time when a speech of this kind could still be made by a leader of the party and government, and still draw such a response.

[The speech was made shortly after two major blows to the international revolution -- the defeat of the 1923 German revolution and the death of Lenin. Trotsky here openly proclaims the German failure a defeat, at a time when Stalin, Zinoviev, and Company were still orienting the Communist International toward "imminent revolution" in Germany.

[At that time, the self-seeking intrigues of the bureaucratic apparatus in the party and government -- headed by Stalin -- were already far advanced, and further freed of restraints by Lenin's death. A campaign against Trotsky and the 1923 Left Opposition, who were defending concepts of workers democracy, had already brought about their condemnation by official bodies of the party and International.

[But the struggle with Stalinism was still at an early stage. The theory of "socialism in one country" had yet to be accepted by the party; and the campaign against "Trotskyism," as the revo-

lutionary internationalism represented by this speech soon came to be called, was mild by comparison with the virulent slander yet to come.

[Trotsky was in the Caucasus area in the months after Lenin's death -- primarily at a sanatorium in Sukhum in Abkhazia -- recovering from a debilitating case of influenza. During his absence from the center, the party apparatus under Stalin, Zinoviev, and Kamenev carried out the "Lenin levy," bringing 240,000 workers into the party at one stroke.

[In the latter part of the speech there is a favorable reference to this development, which actually was a maneuver by the apparatus to tighten its bureaucratic hold over the party. Whatever hesitations Trotsky felt about this move, he was bound by discipline as a Politburo member not to oppose it publicly -- and Stalin used the temporary geographical isolation of his chief opponent to carry out slippery maneuvers whose full meaning was not always immediately apparent.

[In later years, when the perspective of fighting from within to correct the course of the party and preserve its program had to be replaced by the struggle for a new international, Trotsky exposed the essence of the "Lenin levy":

["The gates of the party, always carefully guarded, were now thrown wide open," he wrote in Revolution Betrayed. "Workers, clerks, petty officials, flocked through in crowds. The political aim of this maneuver was to dissolve the revolutionary vanguard in raw human material, without experience, without independence, and yet with the old habit of submitting to the authorities."

[The translation for Intercontinental Press is by George Saunders. It is taken from a text of the speech published in pamphlet form by the Krasnaya Nov' Publishing House, Moscow, 1924.]

\* \* \*

I confess that I am giving my report today under certain handicaps. For two months now I have been in this beautiful land of the Caucasus, which I never before had the chance to visit. I have passed this time in one of the most favored, but at the same time most isolated, corners of the Upper Caucasus, namely, Abkhazia. You know, comrades, Abkhazia is a beautiful country and has fine comrades, but unfortunately this country lags far behind, so far as mail and telegraph services go.

Cut off from the center of our Union, Moscow, I have not had access to anything like complete information, what with the long delay in receiving the papers.

Therefore, when some journalist comrades approached me and, according to their unpleasant custom -- I may speak frankly, being a journalist myself -- asked me for an interview -- such is the sorry parliamentary-and-press custom that we have adopted -- I actually should have gotten them to inform me of the latest news and reports, rather than enlighten them as interviewers. Allow me then to keep my report in the nature of a general review, summing up certain lessons of the recent past. I will dwell primarily on our international position, which is, however, inseparably linked with the destinies and course of the world revolution and with our internal work, our internal successes.

Comrades, if we take an overall look at the past period, we must say first of all that together with our current successes and failures, we have had one great misfortune, which weighs very heavily in the balance of world forces. That misfortune is the loss of our leader, a loss which is taken into account by our enemies as well as our friends: by our friends as an irreparable loss and by our enemies with malicious glee and high hopes.

All, or nearly all, that could be said on that subject has been said: all measures that, through collective effort, could compensate even in part for this loss, we have taken, are taking, and will take. If the sorrow of our friends, the sorrow felt everywhere in the world as well as here, among ourselves, cannot be mitigated, at least we will do everything to assure that the malicious hopes of our enemies will not be justified. (Stormy applause.)

The world situation from the viewpoint of our Soviet Union and the world revolution remains, as it was before, complex, contradictory, changeable, but generally and on the whole, changing in our favor.

### The Bessarabian Question

The international situation can be approached of course from various angles. Let me approach it from the angle of a newspaper, today's issue of your paper, *Zarya Vostoka*, one of the best papers of the Soviet Union. Anyone interested may learn from today's issue some of my opinions on international questions. I should say at this point that these opinions are recorded with extreme inaccuracy. This I say with all friendliness toward the correspondent of our paper. I am obliged to

speak of this, comrades, both in order to present my views more clearly and precisely, and in order not to cause our friend Chicherin\* extra difficulties. On the question of Bessarabia, matters are presented in the interview as though I considered war with Rumania likely. This is not so, absolutely not so. The problem is very sharp and important, and ambiguity cannot be permitted here. At issue is not how our complicated relations with Rumania will turn out in general, but to what the breaking off of negotiations, done at Rumania's initiative, will immediately lead. Rumania would not accept the proposals of our government for arranging a plebiscite in Bessarabia. A plebiscite would be the most democratic step to take in this case. On this point the international Mensheviks should come to our support. We propose to poll the population of Bessarabia and to that end to have troops withdrawn and to have the most democratic conditions created for the balloting. It is necessary to state -- as we have in vain dinned into the skulls of the representatives of the Second International -- that we by no means reject democracy totally and for all situations. No. By comparison with the autocracy, with czarism, democracy was a positive factor. By comparison with the unrestrained, unmitigated reactionary rule of the Black Hundred Rumanian nobility, democracy is of course a plus factor. And it would clearly be a step forward if we created even a temporary democratic regime for polling the population on which country they wish to belong to.

But that was rejected. And so, to the question whether this would mean war, I gave the following answer: We cannot of course take it upon ourselves to guarantee that whatever the circumstances, there will not be war between ourselves and Rumania. Rumania has an army and so do we. Rumania has an army for some reason. We, too, have one for a reason. (Applause.) Comrades, your applause may be taken in Bucharest as a sign that you want to put the army into action... (Laughter.)

What does the breaking off of negotiations mean? Let me cite a French proverb that says, "Doors can be either opened or closed." In this case to close the door would mean to recognize de jure, that is, to legalize, the seizure of Bessarabia by Rumania. What would it mean to open the door? Under these conditions it would mean to break it open, but on the international scale what serves for breaking things open is -- infantry, cavalry, and artillery. How shall we

---

\*Georgii Vasilyevich Chicherin, people's commissar for foreign affairs from May 1918 to July 1930.



proceed -- shall we open the door or close it? No, we shall leave it half open. What does this mean?

We will not recognize the seizure and will openly so declare to the workers of the world and, above all, to the workers of Bessarabia and Rumania. That is the first thing. Then we will wait. Conditions are changing, and many countries that were under feudal landlords or Mensheviks have become good Soviet countries. This may, and should, also be Bessarabia's fate and, thereafter, Rumania's as well. Thus, we have, let us say, an expectant policy, not quite a neutral one, and at any rate not a very "cordial" one.

#### French Policy

But Rumania's policy, comrades, is not an independent policy. Behind Rumania stands France, which also stands behind Poland and China, and aims to do the same with Turkey. Right now, when the moment of our détente with France has seemingly come very near -- at least the most prominent publicists in the leading organs of the French bourgeoisie have been writing unceasingly to this effect, with Poincaré himself exchanging remarks with Chicherin in a very polite tone -- this same France has intensified the hostile character of its policies toward us tenfold. In their parliament they have "ratified" the incorporation of Bessarabia into Rumania; as you know, there are some quite complicated words for stealing, thieving, and taking by force, such as annexation, de jure, ratification, and so on.

Simultaneously, France has started a campaign against us in Poland. It has been a long time since the Polish press spoke of us in such hostile terms as it does today. There are also rather serious reports that France is bending its efforts toward worsening our relations with Turkey. Certain organs of the Turkish press that earlier had conducted themselves in a rather amicable fashion toward the Soviet Union have begun to speak a different language. Although the value of the franc has fallen drastically, it nevertheless continues to have a pleasant ring, apparently, in the ears of certain journalists of the Turkish press.

France is also supporting the Little Entente, giving it hundreds of millions for armaments and building it up against us. And at the same time, at home, ruling-class France, in its parliament and press, declares that it has no conflict of interests with the Soviet Union and that a détente with us is entirely possible.

What is the reason for this policy? This is a consummate and graphic expression of the policy of speculators' black-

mail. Poincaré wants to show us that without France we will have difficulties here, there, and everywhere: the Little Entente is against us; Rumania is against us; in Poland, supposedly, there is a wave of indignation against us; and even in Turkey, it seems, the wheel is turning against us. And France tells us: Just pay what we ask, and all the petty pretensions of the small powers will disappear.

The idea is that France will betray Poland, Rumania, and Turkey as soon as we agree to pay a percentage on all loans and, in general, to bow down before Poincaré. And until then, we will have blackmail, a policy of pinpricks. Out of the wolf's coat sticks the tail of a fox: the assurances by the leading organs of France that we have no contradictions with her. It is plain that Poincaré miscalculated with this policy. His predecessor on this path was Clemenceau. A more solid and powerful figure. Clemenceau's hatred for us was 24-carat hatred. He surrounded us with barbed wire and tried to strangle us with a blockade. We broke through that barbed wire and we say now: If Clemenceau failed to destroy us with a barbed-wire blockade, then Poincaré doesn't frighten us with his policy of pinpricks.

As everyone knows, France is one of the countries that have not recognized us, and nonrecognition is one of France's extortionist methods in relation to us. Current French policy is entirely founded on extortion: a Platonic and hopeless extortion in regard to us and a real, material extortion in regard to Germany.

That is the difference between the situation of the Soviet Republic and that of the bourgeois German republic. The Menshevik social democracy has ruled there for several years, in that arch-democratic republic. And what of it? In international relations this democracy has turned out to be a rug on which General Poincaré wipes his boots. But the republic that is crowned by the dictatorship of the proletariat has turned out to be a rock on which the imperialists of the whole world have broken their teeth. There you have a splendid lesson for the working class and for those Mensheviks still capable of learning something.

#### The German Revolution

We lived through the past year under the sign of impending revolution in Germany. During the second half of the year the German revolution grew closer day by day. We saw this as the key factor of world development. If the German revolution had been victorious, this would have radically changed the world relationship of forces. The Soviet Union, with its population of 130 million and its innumerable natural riches, on the one hand,

and Germany with its technology, its culture, and its working class, on the other -- this bloc, this mighty alliance, would have cut directly across the line of development in Europe and the world. The building of socialism would have acquired an altogether different tempo.

However, contrary to our expectations, the revolution in Germany has not been victorious thus far. Why? It is necessary to think about this question because it can teach us something not only of use to Germany but to ourselves as well.

Under what conditions is a victorious proletarian revolution possible? A certain development of the productive forces is necessary. The proletariat and those intermediate classes of the population that support and follow it must constitute the majority of the population. The vanguard must clearly understand the tasks and methods of proletarian revolution and have the resoluteness to bring it about. And it must lead the majority of the laboring masses with it into decisive battle.

On the other hand, it is necessary that the ruling class, that is, the bourgeoisie, be disorganized and frightened by the whole international and internal situation, that its will be undermined and broken. These are the material, political, and psychological prerequisites for revolution. These are the conditions for the victory of the proletariat. And if we are to ask, Were these conditions present in Germany? -- I think we would have to answer with absolute clarity and firmness, Yes, all but one. You recall the period after the middle of last year, the lack of success and the collapse of the passive resistance of bourgeois Germany to the occupation of the Ruhr. This period was characterized by the thorough shaking up of German society. The mark plummeted downward at such a mad pace that our quiet Soviet ruble might have had cause for envy. Prices of basic necessities rose wildly. The dissatisfaction of the working masses was expressed in open clashes with the state. The German bourgeoisie was discouraged and incapable of action.

Ministries rose and fell. French troops stood on the German side of the Rhine. Stresemann, premier of the great coalition, declared: "We are the last bourgeois parliamentary government. After us come either the Communists or the fascists." And the fascists said: "Let the Communists take over; our turn will be next." All this signified the last stage of the crumbling of the foundations of bourgeois society. The workers poured into the Communist party day after day. To be sure, fairly broad masses were still marking time in the ranks of the

Menshevik party. But you remember, when we took power in Petrograd in October, we found Mensheviks still at the head of the unions, because the Petrograd workers, led by our party, had moved forward to the conquest of power so rapidly that they never got around to shaking off the old dust in the trade unions.

Why then in Germany has there been no victory thus far? I think there can be only one answer: because Germany did not have a Bolshevik party, nor did it have a leader such as we had in October. We have here for the first time a tremendous body of historical experience for comparison. Of course, one may say that in Germany, victory is more difficult. The German bourgeoisie is stronger and more clever than ours. But the working class cannot pick and choose its enemies. You comrades here in Georgia fought the Menshevik government that fate had brought you. The German working class is obliged to fight the German bourgeoisie. And one can say with full assurance that history will hardly create objective conditions any more favorable to the German proletariat than those of the latter half of the past year. What was lacking? A party with the tempering that our party has. (A voice: Right!) This, comrades, is the central question, and all the European parties must learn from this experience, and you and we must learn to understand and value more clearly and profoundly the character, nature, and significance of our own party, which secured victory for the proletariat in October and a whole series of victories since October.

Comrades, I would not want my remarks to be taken in some sort of pessimistic vein -- as though, for example, I considered the victory of the proletariat to have been postponed for many years. Not at all. The future favors us. But the past must be analyzed correctly. The turnabout this past year, in October-November, when German fascism and the big bourgeoisie came to the fore, was an enormous defeat. We must record it, evaluate it, and fix it in our memories that way, in order to learn from it. It is an enormous defeat. But from this defeat the German party will learn, become tempered, and grow. And the situation remains, as before, a revolutionary one. But I will return to that point.

On the world scale there have been three occasions when the proletarian revolution reached the point where it required a surgeon's knife. These were October 1917 here; September 1919 in Italy; and the latter half of the past year (July-November) in Germany.

In our country we had a victorious proletarian revolution -- begun, carried through, and completed for the first time in history. In Italy there was a sabotaged

revolution. The proletariat hurled itself with all its weight against the bourgeoisie, seizing factories, mines, and mills, but the Socialist party, frightened by the proletariat's pressure on the bourgeoisie, stabbed it in the back, disorganized it, paralyzed its efforts, and handed it over to fascism.

Finally, there is the experience of Germany, where there is a good Communist party, devoted to the cause of revolution, but lacking as yet in the necessary qualities: a sense of proportion, resoluteness, tempering. And this party at a certain moment let the revolution slip through its fingers.

Our entire international and each individual worker should constantly keep these three models in mind, three historical experiences -- the October revolution here, a revolution prepared by history, begun, carried through, and completed by us; the revolution in Italy, prepared by history, lifted up on their backs by the workers, but sabotaged, exploded, by the Socialist party; and the revolution in Germany, a revolution prepared by history, which the working class was ready to lift onto its back, but which an honest Communist party lacking the necessary tempering and leadership could not master.

History does not work in such a way that, first, the foundation is laid, then the productive forces grow, the necessary relations between class forces develop, the proletariat becomes revolutionary, then all this is kept in an icebox and preserved while the training of a Communist party proceeds so that it can get itself ready while "conditions" wait and wait; then when it's ready, it can roll up its sleeves and start fighting. No, history doesn't work that way. For a revolution the coinciding of necessary conditions is required.

The fact is that if in Germany in the second half of last year our Bolshevik party had been on the scene, with the will that it has now, had before, and will continue to have, with the will that shows itself in action, with a tactical skill that the working class senses, so that it says to itself, "We can trust our fate to this party"; if such a party had been on the scene, it would have carried with it in action and through action the overwhelming majority of the working class.

What do we conclude from all this? The conclusion for our German party is, of course, that a further solidifying of the ranks and closer ties with the masses is necessary, that a careful selection of militant revolutionists and a tempering of the party's will must be accomplished.

But now we must ask: Will the objective conditions for revolution be maintained? This is a very important question for the evaluation of the international situation in general and of that in Germany in particular. During the last few months the situation in Germany has changed sharply. A certain stabilization of the mark, the German monetary unit, has been achieved. Prices in Germany have stopped climbing so rapidly. Industry is now developing there; the economic situation is better than it was last year; unemployment is somewhat less; the situation of the working class has improved a little. These are indisputable facts.

The severity of the situation, then, has somewhat abated. What next? The answer to that question can only be given in its most general outlines now, but this answer will be sufficient nevertheless for an evaluation of the prospects before us.

The development in Europe in the coming period can go along either of two paths, depending on whether the Entente gives Germany a chance to breathe or not. After the experience of last year in Germany, when the red specter of communism barely stopped short of becoming flesh and blood, the bourgeoisie of France, England and the United States can try to ease Germany's situation a little, grant her some credits and offer such postponements in the payment of reparations as would make economic life in Germany possible.

This would inevitably result in a certain upturn for German industry and a corresponding growth in German exports. German industry is currently working at approximately 50 percent of capacity, and if the economic and financial situation of Germany were slightly eased, there could be a rapid growth of German export. The capacity of the European market, however, is very small, and as a result of German exports we might in a year or less see a catastrophic crisis of English or French industry. The smallest easing of the burden on Germany inevitably increases the crisis in England, where even now there are about a million unemployed.

It is absolutely clear that this would give a mighty impulse to the struggle of the English proletariat. MacDonald, the present English prime minister, about whom we shall have some warm words later on, understands of course that in the present conditions aid to German industry can deal a blow to English industry. Having decided this, he may wash his hands of the matter. He has already refused, after all, to reconsider the Versailles treaty.

Supposing the United States does

not come to Germany's assistance and that Poincaré continues his policy of stifling Germany. Under such conditions the German mark after a few weeks would begin to fall at a still more frenzied pace than it had before; prices would rise no less frantically; industry would fall off, unemployment increase again, and revolution would develop at a tempo even swifter than that of last year. But the German Communist party will no longer be the party it was last year. It has already become more experienced, more tempered for the new tests to come, and that increases the chances of victory enormously. There are, then, two perspectives before us:

either a temporary easing of the revolutionary situation in Germany at the cost of an inevitable sharpening of revolutionary attitudes in all of Europe, or a postponement of the crisis in England and France at the expense of a furious sharpening of the class relations in Germany. In either case Europe will be traveling the road of great revolutionary upheavals. This, in general and on the whole, is how I evaluate the situation in connection with the course of development in Germany.

[To be continued.]

# ANTIWAR DEMONSTRATIONS HELD IN CANADA AND NEW ZEALAND

## Toronto

More than 15,000 Canadians marched in cities all across Canada April 6 in the largest round of demonstrations against the Vietnam war since October 21, 1967. In some cities, the demonstrations were the largest ever. The cross-Canada themes were "Solidarity With the Antiwar GIs," "Withdraw U.S. Troops Now," "Vietnam for the Vietnamese," and "End Canada's Complicity." An important new theme was "No Phoney Canadian Peace-keeping Troops to Vietnam." All the demonstrations were characterized by their youthfulness and militancy. Significant support came from Canada's labor party, the New Democratic party [NDP]. The League for Socialist Action, the Canadian Trotskyists, intervened with the slogan "NATO,

NORAD [North American Air Defense], and ICC [International Control Commission], End Canada's Complicity."

In Toronto, the march was variously estimated at 20,000 by one city official and 10,000 by the police. The marches in Vancouver and Montréal were each estimated at about 3,000. The march in Vancouver was backed by the Vancouver Labour Council and the NDP of the province of British Columbia, in which Vancouver is located.

April demonstrations were also held in New Zealand. Marches of several hundred were reported in Auckland and Christchurch. There were two demonstrations in Christchurch, one on April 3 and another on April 6.

## In this issue

DRAWING: Gustav Husak .....	401
The Kremlin Disposes of Alexander Dubček -- by Les Evans .....	402
The Demonstrations in Battipaglia and Milan .....	404
Supporters of "Rouge" Found New Revolutionary Organization in France .....	405
The Student Strike in Turkey .....	407
Revealing Glimpses of Soviet Reality from Its Sociologists -- by George Novack .....	408
Canada and NATO -- by Dick Fidler .....	410
DRAWING: Pierre Elliott Trudeau .....	411
The Youth Movement and the Alienation of Society -- by José Revueltas .....	413
Bernadette Devlin Elected to Parliament from Mid-Ulster .....	418
DRAWING: Bernadette Devlin .....	418
On the Road to the European Revolution -- by Leon Trotsky .....	419
Antiwar Demonstrations Held in Canada and New Zealand .....	424

INTERCONTINENTAL PRESS

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

New York, N. Y. 10010



**EDITOR:** Joseph Hansen. **CONTRIBUTING EDITORS:** Pierre Frank, Livio Maitan, George Novack. **TRANSLATIONS:** Gerry Foley, George Saunders. **BUSINESS MANAGER:** Reba Hansen. Published each Monday except last in December and first in January; biweekly in July; not published in August. **TO SUBSCRIBE:** For 26 issues send \$7.50 to Intercontinental Press, P. O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station, New York, N. Y. 10010. Write for rates on airmail. **PARIS OFFICE:** Pierre Frank, 95 rue du Faubourg Saint-

Martin, Paris 10, France. **INTERCONTINENTAL PRESS** specializes in political analysis and interpretation of events of particular interest to the labor, socialist, colonial independence, and black liberation movements. Signed articles represent the views of the authors, which may not necessarily coincide with those of *Intercontinental Press*. Insofar as it reflects editorial opinion, unsigned material expresses the standpoint of revolutionary Marxism. Copyright © 1969 by Intercontinental Press.