

Intercontinental Press

Africa

Asia

Europe

Oceania

the Americas

Vol. 8, No. 38

© 1970 Intercontinental Press

November 16, 1970

50c

Voters Deal Setback to Nixon

George Novack:

Permanent Revolution in Latin America



NIXON: "We're bringing the troops home — you watch us, boy." — Newsweek, Nov. 2.

Save Our Fossil Air

In New York City, which once boasted one of the purest water systems in the world, sales of bottled water are on the rise.

Drawn from uncontaminated springs, the potable liquid is brought into the city by truck and prominently displayed in every grocery store so that it is easily available in all neighborhoods to everyone who can afford it.

Encouraged by this success, antipollutionists in New York are now proposing that fresh countryside air be bottled and trucked into the metropolitan area for sale to the public in a similar way.

Unfortunately they are already behind the times. A Tokyo department store is offering a much better solution—portable oxygen machines.

For \$37.50 you can buy one of the ingenious contrivances. It generates oxygen through the interaction of hydrogen peroxide and crystals. A mouthpiece is attached so that you can get instant air whenever you need it wherever you are.

Free enterprise is to be congratulated on its efforts to find a solution, especially a profitable one, to this growing problem.

Nevertheless government action may yet be required, particularly if the needs of future generations are borne in mind.

One possibility would be to stockpile canisters of fossil air while it still exists in some parts of the world.

This would certainly be more forward-looking than the present preoccupation with stockpiling nuclear weapons.

Moreover, it would most likely not be as costly to the taxpayers; and certainly it would be more likely to be appreciated by mankind when it comes time to put the various stockpiles to use.

Let Them Eat Junk

Colonel Benjamin Adekunle, commandant of Nigeria's ports, told a London press conference October 9 that most of the emergency food supplies donated by Western countries during the civil war was "junk" that had to be thrown away.

In This Issue

		FEATURES
	970	Save Our Fossil Air
George Novack	978	The Permanent Revolution in Latin America
Ernst Koch	985	Franz Jakubowski and the Danzig Trotskyists
Peng Pi-lan	987	Looking Back Over My Years with Peng Shu-tse—III
		U. S. A.
Joseph Hansen	971	Social Tensions in U. S. Strain Two-Party System
		BRAZIL
Gerry Foley	972	5,000 Jailed in Two Weeks of Mass Arrests
	994	Famine in Northeast
		YUGOSLAVIA
	974	Belgrade Students End Their Strike
		MEXICO
	975	Savage Sentences for Political Prisoners
		NETHERLANDS
	976	1,000 Hear Mandel Debate Labor Party Leader
		PARAGUAY
	976	Political Prisoners Stage Hunger Strike
		SPAIN
	977	50,000 Strike in Support of Political Prisoners
		ALGERIA
Henri Dumoulin	983	Behind the Assassination of Belkacem Krim
		GREAT BRITAIN
	984	Churches Oppose Arms to South Africa
	999	Cambridge Students Protest Discipline Code
		INDIA
M. Rashid	989	SWP Runs Revolutionary Campaign in Kerala
		IRELAND
	991	Interview with Tomas Mac Giolla
		REVIEWS
	995	New Interest in the Plague of Fascism
Allen Myers	998	Genocide in the Americas
		DOCUMENTS
	999	Appeal for Imprisoned Yugoslav Student Leaders
	1000	Fourth International Denounces Quebec Repression
		DRAWINGS
Copain	969	Richard Nixon; 971, Spiro Agnew; 975, Gustavo Diaz Ordaz; 977, Francisco Franco

Intercontinental Press, Post Office Box 635, Madison Square Station, N.Y. 10010.

EDITOR: Joseph Hansen.

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS: Pierre Frank, Livio Maitan, Ernest Mandel, George Novack.

MANAGING EDITOR: Les Evans.

EDITORIAL STAFF: Gerry Foley, Allen Myers, George Saunders.

BUSINESS MANAGER: Reba Hansen.

TECHNICAL STAFF: H. Massey, James M. Morgan, Ruth Schein, Steven Warshell, Jack Wood.

Published in New York each Monday except last in December and first in January; biweekly in July, not published in August.

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.

PARIS OFFICE: Pierre Frank, 95 rue du Faubourg Saint-Martin, Paris 10, France.

TO SUBSCRIBE: For one year send \$15 to Intercontinental Press, P.O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station, New York, N.Y. 10010. Write for rates on first class and airmail. Special rates available for subscriptions to colonial and semicolonial countries.

Subscription correspondence should be addressed to Intercontinental Press, P.O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station, New York 10010. Because of the continuing deterioration of the U.S. postal system, please allow five weeks for change of address. Include your old address as well as your new address, and, if possible, an address label from a recent issue.

Copyright ©1970 by Intercontinental Press.

Social Tensions in U.S. Strain Two-Party System

By Joseph Hansen

Nixon's decision to throw the full weight of his administration, financially, organizationally, and propagandistically (including the elocutionary talents of Agnew) into the midterm elections created a widespread impression abroad that the United States was moving decidedly toward the right.

In Europe this was the view not only of the bourgeois press but even of some who ought to have known better. Thus the lead article in the November 2 London *Workers Press*, published by the ultraleft Socialist Labour League, declared:

"Since his car was stoned in San Clemente* on Thursday by an angry crowd of unemployed workers, students and anti-war demonstrators, United States president Nixon has wound up his election campaign with some of the most bellicose anti-working-class speeches ever made.

"They amount to a programme for Bonapartist rule, with a strengthened police force, the suspension of many cherished constitutional rights and an all-round purge directed against 'radical-liberals' who are reluctant to embark on out-and-out repression."

Of course, this misjudgment of political realities in the U.S. was not limited to observers from afar. The *New York Times* itself published a number of articles about the "drift to the right," and commented editorially on it as if a new and rather frightening era had already opened.

The returns in the November 3 election must then present something of a mystery to such analysts. Nixon suffered a setback large enough to seriously impair his chances of reelection in 1972. The "law and order" issue on which Nixon and Agnew concentrated proved to have been a bad choice.

To understand what happened, it is necessary first of all to grasp one of the main contradictions of the Amer-



AGNEW CLEARED. After reviewing the elections with his cabinet November 5, Nixon authorized White House press secretary Ronald I. Ziegler to tell reporters: "We consider this a tremendous success. We are delighted."

ican bourgeois political system. This is the contrast between developments in the social arena and their reflection on the electoral screen.

No one-to-one relation exists at all — far from it, in fact.

First of all, only the capitalist class is represented in the parliamentary arena. No labor party of any kind exists. There are no mass parties, whether petty-bourgeois, Social Democratic, Communist, revolutionary-socialist or what have you. So far as class interests are concerned, "free" America has a one-party system.

Small parties are virtually excluded from the ballot in some of the most populous states and must fight wearing and costly battles in others, often with the likelihood that the machine politicians will exclude them under one pretext or another. In addition, they are effectively denied reaching a wide

audience by the costs involved. In the current election it was reported on the Columbia Broadcasting System that Rockefeller had spent more than \$10,000,000 in his campaign to win reelection as governor of New York.

Yet American society can be highly volatile, so much so that it is notorious for its violence and explosiveness. In the past decade and a half, divisions have appeared that are without parallel in this century.

The main characteristic of this phenomenon has been the radicalization of wide sectors of the populace, beginning with the blacks, traveling to the youth, then to the Puerto Ricans, Chicanos, and other minorities, and now the women. While the main sectors of the working class, particularly those in the trade unions, have not yet begun to move in a massive way, this is clearly impending. The sectors already radicalized can be regarded as harbingers of what is to come.

As against this, there has been a certain gathering of forces toward the right. The attempts to assemble a rightist movement, however, are not nearly so significant as the capitalist propagandists make them out to be. The most reactionary development so far has been the increasing use of the police and the army to put down social protest. But this should not be confused with incipient fascism. They are not the same.

Nevertheless there has been enough strengthening of rightist forces in face of the radicalization to create something of a vacuum in American politics. This is important. It can provide an opening for a demagogue—or, on the opposite side, an independent labor party.

The causes for the widening division in American society stem of course from the efforts of the ruling class to maintain the capitalist status quo in face of revolutionary pressures on a world scale moving inexorably toward socialism.

War, inflation, high taxes, inadequate educational facilities and health services, unemployment, poverty, dis-

* The incident, which seems to have been provoked, if not deliberately staged, actually occurred in San Jose.

crimination, urban decay, intolerable living and working conditions, destruction of the environment, the threat of nuclear annihilation — these are some of the palpable consequences of the policies of the American ruling class that in turn touch off social protest.

With parliamentary politics monopolized by the capitalist class, these issues can be deliberately excluded from debate in an election. A glaring example in the current election was the bipartisan agreement to avoid talking about Vietnam. The formula was that Nixon had "defused" the protest. The reality was that the Democrats have agreed with the Republicans on trying to get a Korea-type settlement.

The November 3 results showed that the voters had not been swept off their feet by the Nixon-Agnew blitzkrieg for "law and order." Thereby the voters also showed that they are very much concerned about the real issues facing the country. But how could they express this with only two capitalist slates facing them in the election booths in most places?

They split their vote, crossing from one slate to the other, seeking differences between individual candidates. Often the "differences" amounted to nothing but nuances and some of these were only fancied.

On a nationwide scale, this added up to some remarkable combinations. In California, for instance, a heavy vote was cast for the Republican Governor Reagan (but not as heavy as the last election), coupled with heavy rejection of his senatorial running mate George Murphy. Even more striking was the victory of Wilson Riles over the incumbent Max Rafferty as State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Riles defeated the Reagan-endorsed ultrarightist to become the first Black to hold statewide office in California.

The meaning of this widespread ticket splitting is plain. Dissatisfaction has reached such a point that the two-party system has become unstable. Were the trade unions to launch their own party, they could put up a powerful challenge in short order to the long-held Democratic-Republican monopoly of the electoral field.

In several areas it was possible for the voters to register their sentiments on one key issue directly. In San Francisco the antiwar movement succeeded in getting the following referendum proposal on the ballot:

"It shall be the policy of the people of the City and County of San Francisco that there be an immediate cease-fire and immediate withdrawal of all

U. S. troops from Vietnam so that the Vietnamese people can settle their own problems."

The vote was 107,785 for and 102,731 against.

In Massachusetts, in a three-way referendum, 558,975 voted for a proposal to "withdraw our armed forces in accordance with a planned schedule"; 347,462 voted to "withdraw all our armed forces immediately"; and 150,984 to "win a military victory."

In Detroit, with 60 percent of the votes counted, 142,541 voted for immediate withdrawal, 82,004 against.

James L. Buckley, senatorial candidate of a right-wing Republican faction that filed as the "Conservative" party, won in New York with a 40 percent plurality. An almost 60 percent vote for "liberalism" was split between the regular Republican and Democratic candidates. Some of the votes for Buckley were undoubtedly not for "conservatism" but in protest against the two-party system.

The Socialist Workers party ran seventy-five candidates in fifteen states. The vote for them — not yet tabulated — was the least concern of the SWP campaign, the purpose of which was to gain publicity for revolutionary socialism. We have scheduled a report on the SWP campaign for our next issue.

Operation 'Training Exercise' in Brazil

5,000 Jailed in Two Weeks of Mass Arrests

By Gerry Foley

About 5,000 persons have been jailed in Brazil in the last two weeks, 1,000 of them being "subversives," according to an Associated Press dispatch of November 6. "The newspapers reported that the roundup would continue," the dispatch noted.

According to the November 4 issue of *Le Monde*, some 4,000 alleged "leftists" were rounded up over the weekend of October 24-25. The Brazilian military dictatorship reportedly mobilized 1,500 military and 5,000 civil police to carry out the arrests. The authorities described the operation as a "training exercise."

Spokesmen for the military regime claimed that the arrests were made to

prevent demonstrations on the anniversary of the death of urban guerrilla leader Carlos Marighela, who was gunned down by police on November 4, 1969, while allegedly "resisting arrest."

The latest wave of arrests came in the wake of the death of the man who succeeded Marighela as head of the ALN (Ação Libertador Nacional — National-Liberation Action), Joaquim Câmara Ferreira, also known as Comrade Toledo.

"According to the police communiqué, Câmara died of 'heart failure' after firing on the officers trying to arrest him," *Le Monde* reported in its October 27 issue. This time, it seems,

the police were doubly innocent of the guerrilla leader's death. He died of "heart failure" while "resisting arrest."

The ambush in which Câmara lost his life Friday, October 23, was organized by Sergio Fleury, the same political police commissioner who directed the operation that resulted in Marighela's death a year before. He is known as one of the most sinister figures in the repressive forces of the Brazilian dictatorship.

"It is astonishing, moreover," *Le Monde* commented, in reporting Câmara's death, "that Fleury was authorized to participate in a repressive action when he is under indictment for being one of the founders and

leaders of the bloodthirsty 'Death Squadron.'"

The Esquadrão da Morte, or Death Squadron, is a secret organization devoted to murdering "undesirable elements" in gangster style, gunning them down on the streets or slaughtering them atrociously in back alleys. Although the Death Squadron has been operating for six years and has murdered an estimated 500 to 1,000 persons, the government first officially admitted its existence on July 24 this year, after two São Paulo judges attacked the vigilante organization from the bench.

The head of the military government, General Emilio Garrastazu Médici, issued a statement which said in part: "The President of the Republic censures and condemns, as he always has, the so-called death squads that commit murder and other barbarous acts under the pretext of eliminating petty offenders."

New York Times correspondent Joseph Novitski commented at the time: "Public knowledge of the squads is not very complete, but it is understood that policemen angered by the slow pace of Brazilian justice were involved in many of the initial summary executions. It has been suggested that other men, attracted by the squads' reported purpose of purging society of its bad elements, have begun acting as executioners."

Seven Dominican priests arrested in the operation against Marighela have accused Fleury of being the chief torturer for the DOPS [Divisão de Ordem Política e Social—Division of Political and Social Order, the São Paulo political police], the October 27 issue of *Le Monde* reported.

Three men who allegedly accompanied Câmara into the ambush were reported to have fled when the police moved in to close the trap.

According to one of *Le Monde's* top Latin-American correspondents, Irénée Guimaraes, Câmara provided the trained commandos who carried out the kidnapping of American Ambassador C. Burke Elbrick in September 1969. The guerrilla leader himself was supposed to have guarded Elbrick while he was in captivity and to have drawn up the list of fifteen political prisoners to be exchanged for him. The selection was representative of the Brazilian revolutionary movement, showing no sectarianism. The spectrum extended from the militant old

Communist Gregorio Bezerra to the student leader Wladimir Palmeira, considered by some left circles in Brazil to be a Trotskyist.

Writing in the November 2 *Rouge*, the weekly newspaper of the Ligue Communiste (Communist League, the French section of the Fourth International), Eduardo Pinheiro gave a résumé of Câmara Ferreira's revolutionary career:

"Comrade Toledo was fifty-seven years old. Like Carlos Marighela he had been a member of the Brazilian Communist party of Luis Carlos Prestes for more than thirty years. He belonged to the generation that long served Stalinism, believing that in this way they were serving the revolution, like Marighela himself; like Jacob Gonder, who is still in prison; and like Apolônio de Carvalho, who was among the forty activists exchanged for the German ambassador. But the bureaucrat did not kill the revolutionist in Ferreira. At a decisive moment, he had the courage to break with Stalinist reformism.

"A former deputy in the Constituent Assembly of 1946, the state of São Paulo was his bailiwick. He played the leading role in the Communist party committee of this state. At the end of 1967 he won a majority in this body for a resolution calling for the dissolution of the party and creation of a political-military organization, the Agrupamento Comunista de São Paulo (São Paulo Communist Group). With Marighela, after the former returned from Cuba where he attended the OLAS conference, Câmara Ferreira formed the ALN.

"Comrade Toledo was an unselfish militant and a courageous fighter; we must pay him homage and recognize his positive role in the process of criticizing and breaking up Stalinist reformism. This is true, even if we cannot share his convictions, which were notably influenced by Debray's formulations.

"In the difficult and painful process of forming a new Latin-American vanguard, Comrade Toledo was not the only one to make mistakes. The experience of his errors will also be useful for generations of revolutionists who will take up the task and carry on his example of devotion."

Following the raids, which, among other things, resulted in the arrest of "every suspected leftist in Rio de Janeiro" (*Le Monde*, November 4), the gov-

ernment announced that it had foiled an international plot to stage a "week of terror."

The plan was supposed to have called for the kidnapping and execution of a number of Brazilian and foreign personalities and the dissemination of revolutionary manifestos in the international press.

The military authorities claimed that the Brazilian revolutionary organizations belonged to a vast international subversive network whose training and propaganda centers were located in Havana, Paris, Rome, and Algiers.

The names of only a few of those arrested in the October 24-25 raids are known. These include Heleno Fragoso, vice-president of the Rio de Janeiro bar association; the composer Erlon Chaves; and Vinicius Caldeira Brandt, former president of the União Nacional dos Estudantes (National Union of Students).

The dictatorship reportedly mobilized 20,000 men in Rio de Janeiro alone to prevent demonstrations on November 4.

The absence of actions to mark the anniversary of Marighela's death will be played up as a victory for the regime, according to *Le Monde* of November 4. But the possibility cannot be excluded that the operation had another purpose.

Legislative elections are scheduled for November 15. Although Institutional Act No. 5 suspends most constitutional rights, some members of the parliamentary opposition have embarrassed the dictatorship by denouncing its crimes.

On July 31 Deputy Oscar Pedroso Horta, the acting whip of the timid "opposition party," presented proofs to the Brazilian congress that a militant young unionist had been murdered by the political police: ". . . Mr. Pedroso Horta displayed autopsy reports on Olavo Hansen, a 30-year-old employee of a chemical company who was arrested in São Paulo last May 1 and died eight days later," *New York Times* correspondent Joseph Novitski wrote August 1. "The official reports, Mr. Pedroso Horta said, indicated that Mr. Hansen had been tied into a crouch and hung from his knees and elbows from a piece of metal or wood. This is a technique that former prisoners call 'the parrot's perch.'

"Further, the deputy added, the reports attributed Mr. Hansen's death to kidney paralysis brought on by an

insecticide known commercially as parathion. He suggested that the young man would not have gone out on the first of May holiday with insecticide in his pockets and that it had probably been administered to him."

According to a leaflet distributed by opponents of the Brazilian dictatorship living abroad, "Olavo had been badly tortured. Limbs were broken and his genitals and scalp were marked. In addition, his kidneys showed evidence of a poisonous insecticide . . ."

"According to the police investigator, Olavo must have hidden the insecticide all through the days of prison, of beatings, of search and of interrogation. Furthermore, they say, he had for several years been on their 'subversive list,' accused of having dis-

tributed 'Trotskyist' newspapers and having known people who were arrested for their opposition to the military. As the unhappy writer of the very conservative newspaper *Estado de São Paulo* put it in an article of 15 September (which corroborated many of the details mentioned above), "They almost convince us that Olavo Hansen committed suicide because he couldn't stand being so subversive."

The leaflet noted that Hansen's parents learned of his death when the police told them that they could find their son's body on a garbage heap.

Doctor Brandt Mueller examined the body of the young trade unionist. Finding no traces of insecticide in his mouth, stomach, or esophagus, he concluded that it must have been injected into or near his kidneys.

According to Deputy Horta, Dr. Brandt Mueller was picked up by the police July 13. The doctor has not been seen or heard of since.

After a protest from twenty unions, the government promised to make an inquiry into the Hansen case. A police investigator quickly declared the matter closed.

As a result of persistent reports of torture of political prisoners and atrocities committed by the Brazilian repressive forces, the Inter-American Human Rights Commission, associated with the U.S.-dominated Organization of American States, has asked permission from the regime of General Garrastazu Médici to send a representative to the country. As yet there has been no reply.

Mass Protest Meeting Planned

Belgrade Students End Their Strike

Thousands of Belgrade University students ended a ten-day strike October 31, vowing to continue their fight for the release of one of their imprisoned leaders by other means.

The strike was called to protest the October 20 sentencing of Vladimir ("Vlado") Mijanovic, the president of the student association at the faculty of philosophy, to twenty months in prison for circulating "hostile propaganda."

The strike rapidly spread from the philosophy department to the faculties of philology and theater. At its height, according to the October 24 London *Times*, some 5,000 Belgrade students participated.

"The students challenged both the conduct of the trial and the sentence on the ground that it was illegal to prosecute a person for political activities which, far from being against the law, were merely an expression of a majority view among philosophy students," the *Times* reported.

"The indictment, they said, was political in intent, and the charges related to the activities of the legally elected students' committee of the faculty of philosophy.

"Mr. Mijalovic [Mijanovic] was sentenced for publishing a satirical fac-

ulty newspaper which in fact never went farther than the printers' presses, for protesting against American intervention in Cambodia, for protesting against the suppression of student newspapers, and for helping to organize a hunger strike last summer in solidarity with underpaid Yugoslav coal miners. . . .

"At the end of his trial Mr. Mijalovic told the court that as he regarded the sentence as an act of reprisal he would immediately go on a hunger strike. A delegation of students was sent today [October 23] to see him at a Belgrade prison but failed to do so because the prison rules permit only close relatives to visit a prisoner."

The Communist party organization at Belgrade University condemned the harsh sentence given to Mijanovic, although it did not officially support the student strike. It criticized the strikers as "extremists," and threatened to expel them from the party for violating democratic centralism.

The November 3 Paris daily *Le Monde* reported:

"The decision to end the strike was made Friday night [October 30] at an assembly in the faculty of philosophy. It was reported that M. Mijanovic had ended his eleven-day hunger strike.

He was transferred last Wednesday to the infirmary of the central prison.

"The students of the faculty of philosophy are now seeking to call a general assembly of the student delegates of all the faculties of the University of Belgrade."

A number of other students were indicted at the end of the summer on charges of "publishing false information which could disturb public opinion, with the aim of undermining confidence in the official institutions." Thus far there have been no reports in the Western press of trials for this group.

According to the September 14 issue of *Rouge*, the weekly publication of the Ligue Communiste, the French section of the Fourth International, the accused include:

Slobodan Perunovic, an archeology student and a member of the executive committee of the Student Union of the School of Philosophy [Saveza Studenata Filozofskog Fakulteta—SSFF].

Moma Zivojinovic, philosophy student and member of the executive committee of the SSFF.

Dusan Boskovic, philosophy student

and member of the executive committee of the SSFF.

Vlada Vojvodic, medical student.

Ljilja Jovicic, sociology student and former executive committee member of the SSFF.

Radmila Pavicevic, student of education.

Ilija Moljkovic, literature teacher, journalist, and student at the faculty of philosophy.

Milan Nicolic, sociology student,

former member of the SSFF executive committee.

Sonja Liht, sociology student, former member of the University Student Committee and of the Central Committee of the Youth of Serbia.

In addition, N. Nedeljkovic, a sociology student, and Slobodan Ecvijevic, a history student, were sentenced to a month in prison for distributing leaflets.

Goranko Dapic, secretary of the ex-

ecutive committee of the SSFF, was arrested July 17 and charged with circulating propaganda hostile to the state.

Also during the summer the philosophy student Bozidar Borjan was jailed for publishing a philosophical journal called *Le Rondo*. According to *Rouge*, he was transferred because of bad health to the hospital of Zrenjanin prison in Serbia where he is still being held.

More Than 150 Others Threatened

Savage Sentences for Mexican Political Prisoners

Three Mexican political prisoners were given savage prison sentences October 14. Angel Juan Heredia Espinosa and Antulio Fernández Maldonado, both students, were each sentenced to twelve years in prison and a fine of 65,000 pesos. [12.50 pesos equal US\$1.] Carlos Cabagne López Mendoza, a worker, was given fifteen years in prison and an 85,000-peso fine.

Failure to pay the fines will add six months to the prison sentences.

All three had been held in prison since the 1968 demonstrations of tens of thousands of students in Mexico City. Those demonstrations, demanding the release of political prisoners, were cut short on October 2, 1968, when the troops of President Díaz Ordaz attacked a peaceful protest in Tlatelolco Square, massacring 500 demonstrators.

Heredia, Fernández, and López were charged with criminal destruction of property and convicted even though no evidence was presented to show that a crime had been committed.

In this respect, their case recalls that of the two Guatemalan political exiles, Mario René Solórzano Aldana and Carlos Rolando Segura Medina, who were sentenced to thirty years' imprisonment last April 28. After ten days of torture that left Segura in a coma for a week, the two "confessed" to murdering a soldier in Mexico City.

The soldier was killed on July 4, 1968, the same date on which Solórzano and Segura were granted political asylum in the Mexican embassy in Guatemala City! [See *Intercontinental Press*, June 22, 1970, page 613.]



DIAZ: Political prisoners in Mexico? Not when he finishes with them.

The three prisoners sentenced October 14 had been held more than two years without trial, in violation of the Mexican constitution, which says that all prisoners must be brought to trial within one year of their arrest.

There are still at least 150 other political prisoners in Mexican jails who have been held for a similar length of time. It is now expected that the government of Gustavo Díaz Ordaz may sentence these prisoners—with or without a trial—before Díaz's term as president ends on December 1.

Such a move would be intended to make it possible for Díaz's successor, Luis Echeverría Álvarez, to claim that there are no political prisoners in Mexico.

In view of the sentences given the two Guatemalan exiles and the three prisoners sentenced October 14, the danger to the remaining prisoners is great. Heredia, Fernández, and López were charged with only one offense. Some of the political prisoners still awaiting sentencing are accused of as many as ten crimes.

The prisoners still being held without trial represent the entire political spectrum of the left, as well as persons who belong to no political organization at all.

A campaign in defense of the victims of the repression has recently been launched in Mexico. It was begun at the request of a number of the prisoners, and has since been supported by nearly all of them.

The campaign has set a goal of collecting one million signatures on petitions asking amnesty for all the political prisoners. Groups supporting this effort include the Communist party and the Grupo Comunista Internacionalista [GCI—International Communist Group, the Mexican Trotskyist organization.]

Solidarity actions are necessary in other countries immediately to convince the Mexican government that its actions are being watched by people all over the world. Protests demanding freedom for all the political prisoners should be delivered to Mexican embassies and consulates as soon as possible.

1,000 Hear Mandel Debate Labor Party Leader

Some 1,000 persons, mostly youth, met in Amsterdam October 23 to hear a debate on the subject "Workers Councils or Parliament" between Ernest Mandel, the well-known Belgian Marxist economist who is a contributing editor to *Intercontinental Press*, and J.M. Den Uyl, the leader of the Partij van de Arbeid [Labor party] caucus in the Dutch parliament. The debate was sponsored by the Federation of Socialist Youth Groups, which is associated with the journal *Révolte*.

The Labor party, which is the main Social Democratic party in the Netherlands, holds 22 of the 75 seats in the upper house of parliament and 37 of the 150 seats in the lower house. It is the largest opposition party to the ruling Catholic, Freedom and Democracy, and Anti-Revolutionary party coalition.

The debate was a confrontation between the revolutionary and reformist strategies for the overthrow of capitalism in the Western world, between the concepts of socialist and of bourgeois democracy.

The big turnout made this the largest public meeting to discuss revolutionary Marxism in Amsterdam since the war. Banners calling for workers control and for permanent revolution decorated the meeting hall.

Although there were many supporters of Social Democracy in the audience, the majority clearly sympathized with Mandel's views, and he received a long ovation at the end of his summary speech.

The debate began with the problem of defining socialism and democracy, and of presenting an objective historical balance sheet of what revolutionary and parliamentary politics had achieved for the working-class organizations since the beginning of the century.

The discussion was diverted to the subject of "violence" by Den Uyl. But Mandel was able to point out that those Social Democrats who claim that revolution is impossible without large-scale bloodshed and make this a pretext for opposing revolution in principle have fewer scruples when it comes to accepting imperialist and co-

lonial wars of conquest or reconquest, such as the one Dutch capitalism conducted under a Social Democratic premier against the independent Indonesian republic after World War II.

In the course of the debate it became clear that Den Uyl identified violence with mass action. He called the May 1968 general strike in France an example of "violence," although, as Mandel pointed out, not a single person was killed in all of France as long as the general strike was going on.

Social Democrats fear mass actions because they upset the equilibrium of social forces, which they conceive as

the only arena for their routine activity. But that equilibrium was based upon the preservation of capitalist property and capitalist exploitation of the great majority of the people. Periodic outbursts of revolt against that exploitation are inevitable.

The main task for socialists, Mandel concluded, is to build revolutionary parties that will prepare the vanguard and broader masses in such a way as to enable them to take the lead in mass outbursts of anticapitalist revolt such as the May 1968 events in France, in order to overthrow capitalism and start building a socialist Europe.

Paraguay

Political Prisoners Stage Hunger Strike

A group of about twenty prisoners in the concentration camps and prisons of the Paraguayan dictator Alfredo Stroessner have gone on a hunger strike to protest inhuman conditions, *Le Monde* reported in its October 21 issue. According to exiled members of the ruling Colorado party, some of the participants were already in danger of dying, especially Ambrosio Teresio Canete, Antonio Maidana, Alfredo Alcorta, Julio Rojas, and Captain Vicente Maidana Arias.

The group of strikers reportedly includes imprisoned trade-union leaders like Libio Gonzáles Santander, Lino Aveiro, and Severo Costa Aranda; as well as former members of the Colorado party.

Paraguayan exiles have appealed to the Inter-American Human Rights Commission to intercede on behalf of the prisoners. So far, however, this body, which is associated with the U. S.-dominated Organization of American States, has refused to do anything for the victims of the Stroessner dictatorship.

A telegram supporting the protest of the political prisoners was sent to Stroessner by the International Human Rights Federation. "Numerous

protests are being lodged against a regime accused of torturing and murdering many of its opponents," *Le Monde* reported. "The Paraguayan conference of bishops in a recent bulletin denounced the torture of women jailed for political reasons."

In its October 30 issue, the Uruguayan weekly *Marcha* noted that women prisoners in Paraguay are not even housed in institutions separate from the rest of the prisoners, and are subject to the worst kind of conditions.

Among the female prisoners of the dictatorship are Isabel Ortíz de Casal, who has five children and has been in prison for six years; Idalina Gaona, in prison for four years; Saturnina Almada, in prison for four years; María Rendelli, whose husband was killed by the police and who has been in prison for three years; Alina Rodas de Ramírez, three years; Petrona Yegrós, two years; and Faustina Torres de Quintana, one year.

As a member of the United Nations, Paraguay has signed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. However, the Stroessner regime denies that there are any political prisoners in the country.

50,000 Strike in Support of Political Prisoners

At least 50,000 workers took part in protest strikes throughout Spain November 3, demanding the release of hundreds of political prisoners held by the regime of Generalissimo Francisco Franco. The strikes were called by the illegal Comisiones Obreras [Workers Commissions] and received widespread support from students and intellectuals.

The government-controlled press agency Cifra estimated that in Madrid alone 15,000 workers took part in work stoppages. The November 4 *New York Times* said that other estimates put the total in the city at 25,000.

"The strikes were particularly visible in parts of the city's industrial belt," the *New York Times* reported. "Five thousand workers at the Pegaso truck factory sat down at their machines, while busloads of green-uniformed civil guards ringed the plant. At the Perkins agricultural machinery plant 1,000 workers left their jobs and marched through the street until they were dispersed by the police.

"Stoppages were reported in some factories in Barcelona, Seville and Bilbao. . . .

"The most serious violence of the day was at the University of Madrid, where the police charged into the schools of medicine, economics and political science to break up meetings. Groups of 50 and 100 students raced through the campus afterward, jeering and throwing stones at the police, who responded with baton charges."

Press estimates put the number of political prisoners in Spain at more than 500. These include Marcelino Camacho and Julian Ariza, former union officials at the Perkins machinery plant and leaders of the Comisiones Obreras, who have been imprisoned for more than three years.

The November 3 strike was planned at a clandestine meeting of the Comisiones Obreras held in a Madrid convent last summer, according to the November 3 *Le Monde*. Several leaders of the underground movement were arrested following the meeting but the police were unable to destroy the organization.



FRANCO: From workers to artists, the generalissimo faces rising unrest.

The November 3 strike, in fact, was the first nationwide strike action ever called by the Comisiones Obreras. The leaders of the action announced in advance that they did not expect a universal work stoppage because of the severity of the repression. They hoped to shut down production in a few big factories and to lay the groundwork for a general strike at a later time.

Student demonstrations began at the University of Madrid on November 2, the day before the workers' strike. The November 4 *Le Monde* reported:

"The police intervened Monday at the school of political science and economics in Madrid, in the Somasaguas area, where about 1,000 students were participating in a meeting supporting amnesty for the political prisoners. Several speakers had begun to discuss

the subject of solidarity with the action called for Tuesday by the clandestine Workers Commissions. . . .

"The police, who were armed, gave the students ten minutes to evacuate the auditorium where they were meeting. There were no arrests. But Monday night the art critic José María Moreno Galván, who had participated in the student demonstration, was arrested at his home."

The arrest of Moreno Galván spurred intellectual circles into action. The November 7 *New York Times* reported:

"About 50 of Spain's leading painters began a sit-in at the Prado museum today [November 6] to obtain the release of a jailed art critic. After two and a half hours, the police entered the museum and evicted them peacefully."

Two leading film makers — Juan Antonio Bardem and José Luis Egea — were also arrested November 3 during an amnesty demonstration in Madrid. They were released after a group of film directors staged a sit-in at the government-controlled Entertainment Syndicate November 5.

The supporters of José María Moreno Galván have warned the authorities that the film critic has a heart condition and must have regular medication. The painters who demonstrated in his behalf included Manuel Millares, Alfredo Mompos, Pablo Serrano, Antonio Saura, Lucio Muñoz, and Eusebio Sempere.

The painters drafted a telegram to Pablo Picasso, asking his support. They said they still regarded him as the rightful director of the Prado museum, a position he held under the Republican government during the Spanish Civil War.

According to the *New York Times*, the artists "received informal assurances" from the Franco regime "that steps would be taken as quickly as possible" to release José María Moreno Galván on bail pending his trial.

That'll Teach 'Em

The Propst Machinery Corporation in Morgantown, West Virginia, has installed booby traps to blow the whole place up if a burglar should break in.

The Permanent Revolution in Latin America

By George Novack

[Recently some members of the Grupo Comunista Internacionalista, a Mexican Trotskyist organization, sent George Novack, one of the contributing editors of *Intercontinental Press* and author of a number of books and pamphlets dealing with historical and theoretical problems, a list of questions of special current interest to Latin-American revolutionists.

[The questions fall naturally into three related topics which Novack has taken up in the following reply.]

* * *

*What is the relation between the theory of permanent revolution and the law of uneven and combined development in history? Why have you written that the first theory is founded upon the second?*¹

The law of uneven and combined development is a general law of the whole historical process of which the theory of permanent revolution is a particular expression limited to the period of transition from the capitalist system to socialism.

During the second half of the nineteenth century the idea of evolution flourished in the western world largely in the form of gradualism. In social and political thought it was believed that in the ascent of humanity from savagery through civilization there was a prescribed uniform sequence of stages that every people was obliged to follow. No part of this orderly procession could be mixed up, shifted around, telescoped, or skipped over.

This sort of neat schematizing even acquired a biological basis. It was known that the early embryonic forms of different animals from the same general group resemble one another much more closely than the adult form of the same species. Evolutionary naturalists like the German Ernst Haeckel elevated these parallels between the embryo and their predecessors into a general law that "ontogeny recapitulated phylogeny." This asserted that during development any embryo passes through a succession of forms which represent its adult ancestors in their evolutionary order. Biologists have since discovered that while this observation does reflect certain features in some species, the supposed law has too many exceptions to be accepted as generally valid.²

The embryology of social formations was interpreted along similar lines by vulgar evolutionists. The apostles of capitalist progress maintained that all forward-moving

peoples would eventually step up from their benighted precapitalist state to the enlightenment of free competition, bourgeois liberalism, parliamentarism, and their attendant institutions in the same order and much the same way as the pioneer capitalist nations had done.

Twentieth century events have shown that there was a fatal flaw in their method of reasoning. They failed to take into account the accumulated effects of the most fundamental and inescapable feature of world capitalist development, its extreme irregularity. This aspect of the workings of the first part of the law of uneven and combined development dictated that the further course of historical progress was not to be so smooth and simple.

Capitalist commerce, banking and industry, capitalist power, capitalist relations and their benefits were for the most part concentrated and developed in classical forms in only one small portion of the planet, Western Europe and the United States, while the majority of mankind either remained stuck fast or were forcibly held in more backward conditions by the overseas exploiters.

This pronounced unevenness of economic, social, political, and cultural growth on a global scale laid the groundwork for a drastic and unexpected upset in the norms of development that had characterized the earlier stages of capitalism. The stifling, stunting, and mangling of the forms of bourgeois life and labor, yoked together with archaic precapitalist relations, prevented the bourgeois strata, which had performed such progressive services in revolutionizing the old order in Western Europe and the United States, from filling a comparable historical role in the colonized areas.

The theory of permanent revolution proceeded from a recognition of the fact that the roles of the social classes were to be vastly different in the declining senior stage of capitalism than they had been in its progressive junior ones. The main tasks of the democratic revolution in the bourgeois era were the achievement of national independence and unification, agrarian reform, secularization, equal rights for women, self-determination for subjugated nationalities, the creation of a democratic state, industrialization and modernization of the economy. These tasks, which had been solved with more or less success by the radical and liberal bourgeoisie in the west, had barely been broached on the continents where the majority of mankind lived.

Because of all the deficiencies arising from the unequal development of capitalist civilization, neither the big nor the little native bourgeoisie in the underdeveloped lands had the capacities for shouldering these tasks and leading the popular masses in a thorough renovation of the old regime along democratic lines. What then was to be done? This has been the paramount problem posed to the revolutionary vanguard in the backward countries ever since the turn of the century.

Through an analysis of the social structure of semifeu-

1. See George Novack, *Uneven and Combined Development in History* (New York, Merit Publishers, 1966).

2. See Url Lanham, *Origins of Modern Biology* (New York, Columbia University Press, 1968), pp. 213-15, for a critical examination of Haeckel's theory of recapitulation that during embryonic development an organism repeats its evolutionary history. "In no instance is an embryo a replica of the mature form of any ancestor," writes the author.

dal, semicapitalist Russia and the dynamics of the class forces disclosed during the defeated 1905 revolution, Trotsky drew the following conclusions: The liberal bourgeoisie had become impotent and politically bankrupt; when the chips were down, it would go over to the counterrevolution. The peasantry and intellectuals could only play auxiliary roles in the revolutionary process. The sole available candidate for revolutionary leadership that could carry the struggle for democracy to its conclusion was the proletariat, the peculiar product of the capitalist industrial revolution.³

The unique alignment of social forces produced by the whole preceding evolution of world capitalism as it entered upon its imperialist phase had prepared the conditions, Trotsky deduced, for a combined development of historical stages in the revolutions of the twentieth century. This correlation had two major aspects. Because the anticapitalist working class was the leading political force in the upheaval, the democratic tasks appropriate to a belated antifeudal revolution inevitably became intertwined with the tasks of the socialist revolution.

The latter tasks included the conquest of power by the proletariat at the head of the insurgent masses, the abolition of capitalist private property, the collectivization of agriculture, the creation of a planned economy and the state monopoly of foreign trade, the development of a socialist democracy. These institutions could promote the most rapid growth of the economy and lead to lifting the levels of consumption and culture, the overcoming of inequalities, the gradual elimination of the differences between mental and manual labor, the city and the countryside, and the uprooting of alienation in social life. The overriding task was the extension of the world revolution through the establishment of workers power in the most advanced industrial countries where the most highly developed productive forces and the seats of imperialist power were located.

Second, both sets of tasks, one belonging to the dawn, the other to the sunset of capitalist society, had to be carried out by a revolutionary alliance of the workers and peasants in mortal combat against the property and power of the native bourgeoisie, the precapitalist proprietors, and the foreign imperialists.

In collaboration with Parvus (A. L. Helphand), Trotsky originated this conception of the revolutionary process and its socialist strategy in the epoch of imperialism as early as 1906, while considering the orientation of the proletarian struggle in Russia. It was adopted in principle by Lenin and the Bolsheviks in April 1917. It guided their policy leading to the October overturn.

The validity of its essential ideas has been positively confirmed since that time by the courses of the Yugoslav, Chinese, Cuban, and Vietnamese revolutions. They have been confirmed in the negative by the inability of those colonial peoples that have not combined their struggle for national independence with a victorious onslaught against capitalist property and power, to achieve either a stable and durable democratic regime or an escape from the yoke of imperialism. Witness the continent of Latin America today from Argentina to Mexico.

In addition to illuminating the road to power and to

liberation from imperialism, the theory of the permanent revolution contains two other theses pertinent to the law of uneven and combined development. It asserts that while the socialist forces can be victorious in a single backward country without waiting for any others, as happened in Russia in 1917 and Cuba much later, the revolution cannot realize its basic aims and full program and be consummated in a socialist order unless workers power has taken over in the most highly industrialized sectors of the globe. This revolutionary internationalist position and perspective is squarely counterposed to the Stalinist national-bureaucratic dogma of building socialism in a single country.

It further stresses that a victorious socialist revolution does not all at once and equally eradicate all the relations and customs of the past but only overthrows those economic, political, and legal institutions at the root of capitalist domination. After the conquest of power, the worker-peasant revolution is obliged to tackle and remove inherited obsolescences as fast as conditions permit.

This historical assignment is especially arduous, onerous, and protracted in those postcapitalist countries that, because of their backwardness, have had to cope simultaneously with the unsolved tasks of the democratic revolution on top of the tasks involved in building socialism. Without a vigilant, firm, and highly conscious political leadership and, above all, without breaking the imperialist encirclement through the extension of proletarian power to the advanced countries, the backward workers states run the risk of suffering retrogression and deformation along bureaucratic lines. The record of the Soviet regime under Stalin and his successors is the most forceful and appalling evidence of this danger.

To conclude, it should be pointed out that the interconnection of the theory of the permanent revolution with the law of uneven and combined development can be seen in the fact that Trotsky himself came to formulate the wider law of historical development only after elaborating the more restricted conception, much as Einstein first presented the restricted and then the general theory of relativity around the same time. Although the seeds of the broader law of uneven and combined development can be discerned in his previous thinking, they did not flower into explicit generalization until after the October revolution when he delved more deeply into the reasons why, contrary to the expectations of Marx, the proletariat could and did take power in one of the less developed countries sooner than in the more developed ones.

Here the results of experience fructified and stimulated a profounder understanding of the dialectics of history. The successive stages in Trotsky's intellectual enlightenment can be studied in his two works, *Results and Perspectives*, written in 1906, and the first chapter of the masterful *History of the Russian Revolution*, written in the early 1930s.

Some authors such as Andre Gunder Frank believe that the formula of uneven and combined development cannot be applied to Latin America since it is nothing but a Trotskyist schema. What do you think of the interpretation of Latin-American development presented in his work which contraposes the Marxist method to the Trotskyist law of uneven and combined development?

3. Leon Trotsky, *The Permanent Revolution and Results and Prospects* (New York, Pathfinder Press, 1970).

The first questions focused upon the passage from a more or less well-developed capitalism to a postcapitalist society. The subject now concerns the earlier period of transition from precapitalist to capitalist formations.

Despite Frank's contention, there is no opposition between the Marxist method of approach and the application of the law of uneven and combined development to the problems involved in this historical process. The two are identical. Indeed, the complexities of the colonial period cannot be unraveled without resort to the law of uneven and combined development.

As capitalism spread from its cradle and center in maritime Europe to create the world market, it encountered and penetrated all sorts of precapitalist formations and relations. These antediluvian forms ranged from primitive food collectors through a gamut of intermediate types of social organization to feudalism.

The forces of capitalism could not and did not immediately wipe out these archaic social relations, especially in the field of production. Quite the contrary. Just as the feudal proprietors of Western Europe made use in their day and way of slavery and peasant households along with the dominant serfdom in the rural regions as well as merchants and guildsmen in the towns, so the original emissaries of capitalist trade and manufacture sought to harness precapitalist institutions and put them to work for their own plundering and profiteering purposes.

In case of need, the mercantile elements went so far as to re-create overseas antiquated modes of production which they had already outgrown at home. The most conspicuous case was the large-scale implanting of chattel slavery in the New World long after it had come to play a marginal role in Europe. This mode of production was exported to the semitropical zones of the New World as the most lucrative and feasible type of labor for growing such staple crops as sugar, tobacco, rice, indigo, etc., and for mining precious metals.

However, the slavery introduced into the Americas was not a mere replica of the classical slavery of antiquity. While it had the same economic form, it acquired very different features and functions owing to the circumstances of its birth, the more advanced epoch in which it grew, and the specific part it played as an agricultural branch of the expanding capitalist world market. From its origins it was a commercialized and bourgeoisified chattel slavery. The slave trade was itself one of the principal forms of commercial enterprise.

This combined type of slavery was perfected in the Cotton Kingdom of the Southern United States during the first half of the nineteenth century, functioning as the main agricultural appendage of industrial capitalism in the international social division of labor. In *The Poverty of Philosophy*, Marx termed it "the pivot of bourgeois industry."

The fusion of capitalist with precapitalist relations gave rise to an assortment of combined economic forms and incongruous social formations in the age of commercial capitalism. In North America the Indian trappers, who traded skins and furs with the French, English, and Dutch trading companies, were thereby annexed to the circuit of capital even though they retained their tribal structure and customs. Marx mentions in the *Introduction to the Critique of Political Economy* that the corporate form which dominates the monopolist stage of capitalism first

appeared in the joint-stock companies that engaged in far-flung colonizing and trading enterprises.

One of the most bizarre was the Carolina Plantations. This joint-stock company sought to set up on the Atlantic seaboard a purely feudal society in line with the blueprint of a constitution drafted by its secretary, the eminent empirical philosopher John Locke. The charter decreed in detail that landlord-serf relations would be enforced in perpetuity among the settlers. This experiment turned out to be more quixotic than empirical. It quickly ran aground of reality because the socioeconomic conditions in the wilderness where labor was sparse and land plentiful militated against the growth of medieval forms of production at that time and place.

Slavery flourished equally well in the Southern English colonies, the Caribbean, and Latin America during the colonial era. Feudal and semifeudal relations of production experienced a more uneven growth. They found the most favorable seedbed in South America. The colonizing process on that continent was the resultant of forces coming from two very disparate levels of development: the Spanish and Portuguese conquerors, who were passing over from feudal to bourgeois conditions, and the indigenous population, which preserved the communal tribal relations of the Stone Age. Their interactions gave rise to a wide variety of intermediate forms. The question is: what was their socioeconomic nature?

According to Andre Gunder Frank, they were essentially capitalist. He writes: "Capitalism began to penetrate, to form, indeed *fully* to characterize Latin American and Chilean society as early as the sixteenth century." (Emphasis added.)⁴ This is the starting point and principal postulate of his analysis of their development.

This sweeping assertion cannot stand up against either the historical facts or the method of Marxism. For the following reasons:

1. In the sixteenth century, capitalism itself was just beginning to take shape in Western Europe. The industrial revolution, which established the specifically capitalist mode of production, did not take off until the nineteenth century. How, then, could backward Latin America have become "fully" capitalist that early?

2. The chief conqueror and colonizer, Spain, had itself barely begun to crawl out of medievalism. The country was still as much feudal as bourgeois. It was ruled by an absolute monarchy attended by an inquisitorial church, and resembled an Asiatic despotism more than the progressive royal regimes of the rest of Western Europe. It rested upon a decadent economy whose relations with the New World did far more to enrich the more advanced powers above the Pyrenees than to revolutionize its own social structure. "As late as the eighteenth century the strength of the higher nobility and the pre-eminence of the grandees rested firmly on their command of land and labor, and four great families reputedly owned one-third of all the land under cultivation in Spain."⁵

The Spanish merchants served as intermediary agents

4. Andre Gunder Frank, *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America* (New York, Monthly Review Press, 1967), p. xii.

5. Cited in: Eugene Genovese, *The World the Slaveholders Made* (New York, Pantheon, 1969), p. 51. His chapter "The Slave Systems and Their European Antecedents" also contains an interesting criticism of Andre Gunder Frank's ideas.

for the French, English, and Dutch producers and powers. How could the Spaniards and Portuguese have instituted forms of economic organization in Latin America superior to their own in Europe between the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries? It is well known that the economic underdevelopment of Spain in relation to the other great maritime mercantile nations of Europe was partly attributable to the overdevelopment of its colonial holdings. This in turn was a considerable contributing factor to producing and perpetuating backwardness in the possessions it ruled and robbed.

3. What did Spain and Portugal in fact do? They created economic forms in the New World that had a combined character. They welded precapitalist relations to exchange relations, thereby subordinating them to the demands and movements of merchant capital.

During the colonial period, diverse forms of forced rather than free labor prevailed in the main areas of production such as mining, ranching, and agricultural enterprises. The subjugated native population toiled under serfdom (the *mita*), outright slavery, peonage or debt servitude, and sharecropping. Wage labor cropped up here and there but was exceptional, marginal, and stunted. The *encomiendas*, which were the principal source of wealth and power, were a feudal, not a bourgeois form of property and method of production, and the landed aristocrats who held them were as feudalized as their counterparts on the Iberian peninsula.

What from the standpoint of Marxism are the sources of Andre Gunder Frank's errors?

1. He fails to see the distinction between the existence of certain capitalist forms of economic activity, such as money-lending and merchant capital, and a matured capitalist system of economic relations. The more primitive and superstructural forms of capital can coexist with precapitalist conditions before capitalist entrepreneurs take command of the processes of production. They did in fact so coexist from ancient times to the industrial revolution.

2. He fixes attention upon the relations prevailing in the sphere of exchange to the exclusion of the relations of production which, for a historical materialist, are decisive and fundamental in determining the nature of an economy and its corresponding social structure. Commodities can be produced under precapitalist as well as capitalist and even postcapitalist conditions. Mercantile capital, viewed in either its domestic or foreign operations, is not identical with the capitalist system of economic relations. This form of capital antedates the creation of capitalist production per se and is a precondition of it. As Marx explained, the capitalist mode of production acquires its adequate and appropriate technical basis only with the advent of large-scale factory industry under the command of industrial capital.

3. He does not understand the role of combined formations in the period of transition from a precapitalist to a well-developed capitalist economy. He thereby misses the very peculiar character—the special form of exploitation—that was the defining trait of the colonial system. This was the exploiting of *precapitalist* conditions of production by the colonial powers for the benefit of the rising *capitalist* system. Capitalist exploitation can thus take place before capitalism takes over the system of production at the base of social life.

When gold, silver, and diamonds were mined by slaves

or enforced laborers other than wage workers and then brought to market, this was a combined economic activity from the standpoint of historical evolution. The precious metals produced by precapitalist methods were converted into commodities, then into money, and eventually into capital, contributing mightily to the prosperity and power of the commercial kingdoms on the way to bourgeoisification. But the weighty role of these commodities in promoting capitalism does not negate the fact that they originated within precapitalist forms. The cotton grown on the Southern slave plantations was produced in a noncapitalist manner even though it was the principal export commodity of the United States before the Civil War and was tied to the capitalist textile industries of both Old and New England.

4. On the level of Marxist theory and method, Frank does not grasp either the highly contradictory character of such transitional formations or the dynamics of their development.⁶ The European civilization that was grafted upon the aboriginal population of Latin America not only produced biological half-breeds like the *mestizo* but sociological hybrids that were as much feudal as bourgeois. The trouble with Frank's theory is that he seeks to rule out hybrids in economics and sociology.

Frank considers it imperative to "elaborate a unitary dialectical theory of the process of capitalist development . . ." Yet he calls into question "the supposed coexistence of feudalism and capitalism."⁷ He insists that the one should have nothing to do with the other when in historical fact these contrary economic categories have not only coexisted but have been fused with one another, above all, in the backward colonial lands.

Frank ignores the dialectical law of the unity or interpenetration of opposites which, in sociohistorical terms, presupposes the possibility of the coexistence, at least for a certain time, of feudal and capitalist relations in the evolutionary course of class societies. In the test case of Chile, they did so coexist in the *encomiendas* and mines where the products of forced labor were sold on the capitalist market. The coexistence of precapitalist with mercantile relations is still clearer in regard to the sugar plantations of Brazil which were cultivated by slave labor. At the end of the colonial period two-fifths of the people in that country were black slaves.

Frank's approach to the socioeconomic development of Latin America is highly oversimplified. It leaves no room for complex historical situations, combined class relations, and contradictory socioeconomic formations.

A scientific investigator cannot work efficiently without the proper tools. Frank could have avoided his one-sided conclusions if he had assimilated and learned how to apply the law of uneven and combined development. This theory is one of the most valuable additions made to scientific socialism in the twentieth century and is indispensable for analyzing transitional periods and forma-

6. See my essay, "The Problem of Transitional Formations," reprinted in *Key Problems of the Transition from Capitalism to Socialism*, three articles by Pierre Frank, George Novack, and Ernest Mandel (New York, Pathfinder Press, 1970).

7. Andre Gunder Frank, *op. cit.*, p. 268.

tions in general, and especially those characterizing the colonial world.

Andre Gunder Frank, in our opinion, correctly states that the historical development of Latin America is complex and cannot be explained by blueprints. Nonetheless, in his polemic with the Stalinists, he has maintained that the conquest of America by the European powers was capitalist in its essence. This view is shared by Luis Vitale in Chile, Alonso Aguilar in Mexico, and other Marxists. What is your position in this controversy?

The viewpoint represented by Frank and the others mentioned is prompted by revolutionary motives and directed against far more erroneous and dangerous positions.

The myth of a *purely* feudal past is put forward by liberal and proimperialist U. S. scholars in order to defend the path of capitalist development as a dynamic "democratic alternative" to Latin-American stagnation and its traditional institutions. It is likewise championed by ideological followers of the Moscow-oriented Communists to bolster their opportunist conception of a two-stage revolution in colonial countries in which priority over the mass struggle for socialism is assigned to a separate and independent democratic revolution. (Many Maoists likewise share this conception, which is derived from Menshevism, not Bolshevism.)

This false and pernicious schema enables the reformists and Stalinists to justify supporting the allegedly "progressive" and "anti-imperialist" wings of the native bourgeoisie as against the reactionary landed interests. In practice, the policy comes down to subordinating and sacrificing the revolutionary class struggle for workers power.

However, praiseworthy political intentions do not excuse crude sociological analysis and superficial historical insight. One can hardly refute the reformists and Stalinists by matching their erroneous conception of a purely feudal society with the mistaken view of a purely capitalist one in defiance of the historical realities. These are equally one-sided mirror images.⁸

Both can be avoided if the law of uneven and combined development is properly used to clarify the actual

8. It is instructive to observe that for the past decade or so a comparable controversy has been going on in the United States about the nature of the Southern slave civilization among scholars specializing in this subject.

One school argues that the slave society must be regarded as predominantly capitalist, despite all its other peculiar features, because of the commodity relations that surrounded and permeated it. The contrary tendency asserts that, despite its commercial characteristics, the plantation-based society had an independent foundation and the planters constituted a pure slaveholding class with a clearly distinctive way of life.

Both views are one-sided, failing to take into account the totality and duality of the Southern slave system. As I have written elsewhere in an extended analysis of the dynamics of its development during the nineteenth century: "The slave economy of the South had a peculiarly *combined* character. It was fundamentally an archaic precapitalist mode of production which had become impregnated with the substance and spirit of bourgeois civilization by its subordination to the system of industrial capitalism." *The Rise and Fall of the Cotton Kingdom*: "The Ultimate Stage of Chattel Slavery in the South." In *Studies in Afro-American History* (New York, National Education Department of the Socialist Workers Party, 1968).

course of Latin-American socioeconomic development in its intrinsic duality.

More than a theoretical or academic question is at issue. Since the answer involves serious political and strategical consequences for the revolutionary vanguard throughout Latin America today, a correct and comprehensive approach to the problems is essential.

The theory of permanent revolution explains both why the belated Latin-American bourgeoisie has been unable to carry through the basic tasks of the democratic revolution and why the proletariat is the sole social and political force that can lead the way to solving these tasks as part of the anticapitalist struggle.

The two most important democratic tasks facing the Latin-American peoples are the achievement of genuine liberation from imperialism and agrarian reform. But it will take a socialist revolution to realize these aims.

Frank's line of theorizing cannot explain why the agrarian question, which is one of the vestiges of feudalism or the slave system, plays so central a role in the contemporary revolutionary process.

How is it that this requirement of the democratic revolution, which was taken care of by the bourgeoisie of the United States in its two revolutions, weighs down so heavily upon Latin America? And how is it to be solved? The theory of the permanent revolution provides the clearest explanation, and also the most realistic approach to its solution from the revolutionary Marxist point of view.

In confronting the Stalinists, one ought to examine their position in accordance with the Marxist method. This requires, among other things, studying its origin. Not much effort is needed to uncover the fact that the Stalinist theory of "revolution in two stages" and the possibility of the capitalist class or a sector of it playing a "progressive role" in such a revolution, did not originate in Latin America. It is a mere application in Latin America and elsewhere of a theory advanced by Stalin after the bureaucratic caste usurped power in the Soviet Union.

A little further research will reveal, not unexpectedly, that Stalin only revived a theory that came under the most thorough discussion in the Marxist movement in Russia in the early part of the century and before. This was the theory of the Mensheviks, holding that the revolution in Russia would come in two stages, in the first of which the Russian bourgeoisie would play a leading role.

The debate of the Russian Marxists over this question is highly pertinent to the current discussion, inasmuch as they were confronted with the problem of making a revolution in a land where very palpable vestiges of feudalism existed. It is hardly worthwhile to reexamine that debate from the vantage point of Frank's theory, but the following would seem obvious.

Trotsky's contribution of the theory of permanent revolution would, of course, be rejected out of hand. So would the basic position of Russian Marxism, including that of Plekhanov and Lenin, since all of the Russian Marxists, whatever their differences on other questions, agreed in common that the tasks historically belonging to the bourgeois democratic revolution had not yet been achieved in Russia.⁹ Against the Marxists, a Russian revolutionary

9. A good account of how the Russian Marxists wrestled with this question and came to divergent political positions that in

committed to the equivalent of Frank's theory would have said that the country was already capitalist and that the question of feudal vestiges was only diversionary. What was imperative was to discard "the received dualist view" of "the supposed coexistence of feudalism and capitalism" and "to elaborate a unitary dialectical theory of the process of capitalist development."

The Russian prototype of Frank would also be hard put to explain the origin of the agrarian question, why a thoroughgoing agrarian reform was of paramount importance, and why Lenin insisted on working out a correct program on this so as to assure leadership of the revolution to the proletariat.

Andre Gunder Frank can argue that this is absurd. Naturally, in the case of Russia he agrees that the Marxists of those days were correct in holding to a "dualist view," and correct in viewing agrarian reform as a bourgeois-democratic task that had fallen to the workers to carry out. However, that ought to lead him logically to admit the following possibility:

If feudal vestiges do exist in Latin America today, this does not stand in the way of making a successful revolution. In fact, from the standpoint of both theory and

some instances led to individual disaster and in others to leadership of a successful revolution is to be found in Samuel H. Baron, *Plekhanov: The Father of Russian Marxism* (Stanford, Calif., Stanford University Press, 1966). Baron, it should be noted, does not himself share a Leninist or Trotskyist position.

practice, it can facilitate the revolutionary process. The example of the Russian revolution proves it.

The reality is that this *is* the situation. The semifeudal, semibourgeois nature of Latin-American development has created a contradictory state of affairs in the amalgamation of feudal with capitalist relations that only the conquest of power by the revolutionary working class, leading all sections of the oppressed, including the landless and impoverished peasantry, can resolve. Just as the structure of Latin-American society intermingles precapitalist with capitalist elements in an indissoluble unity, so the solution of its inherited democratic tasks are inseparably interlinked with the socialist tasks of the coming revolution. This is the gist of the teaching of the permanent revolution. It is no less Marxist than Trotskyist.

The law of uneven and combined development is no less indispensable for understanding the development of Latin America over the past four centuries. It can illuminate both the earliest stage when precapitalist relations were intermeshed with capitalist ones and the present stage when the tasks of democratization, belonging historically to the bourgeois epoch, have become an integral part of the proletarian revolution of the twentieth century.

That is also why Frank's attempt to divide Marxism from Trotskyism and contrapose one to the other does not hold water. The theoretical formulations of the Trotskyist movement are not only solidly rooted in scientific socialism but are the most penetrating and ripened expressions of Marxist thought available today.

November 1, 1970.

Algeria

Behind the Assassination of Belkacem Krim

By Henri Dumoulin

[During the night of October 15-16, Belkacem Krim, a former leader in the Algerian struggle for freedom from imperialist France, was strangled by four unidentified assailants who had registered at the hotel where he was staying in Frankfurt, Germany. Three of them appear to have had false Moroccan passports.

[The crime created an international sensation, for the finger of suspicion pointed at the Boumédienne regime in Algeria.

[The following article about the assassination was published in the October 30 issue of the Belgian revolutionary-socialist weekly *La Gauche*. The translation is by *Intercontinental Press*.]

* * *

The murder of Belkacem Krim has

baffled the bourgeois press, which is spinning fantastic tales about buried treasure. The money fetish has grown to such proportions in our capitalist society that those who no longer think in any terms but greenbacks come to believe that revolutions, too, hinge on bank accounts.

But these journalistic amateur detectives are incapable of the slightest serious political analysis.

In reality, this revolting murder of one of the historic leaders who launched the Algerian war of liberation on November 1, 1954, is a new episode in a long fratricidal struggle. This battle has been going on since 1956 between the guerrilla fighters inside Algeria and the leadership established outside the country that built up the border army stationed in Morocco and Tunisia. Boumédienne became the chief of staff of this army.

It should be recalled that the mysterious death of Abane Ramdane in Morocco in December 1957 has never been cleared up. Many Algerian militants waited in vain for the National Liberation Front congress in the spring of 1963, the congress that adopted the Charter of Algiers, for full light to be shed on this episode and many others of the same type. But Boumédienne's representatives on the preparatory commission of the congress did not allow it.

Abane Ramdane was unquestionably one of the most political among the leaders of the ALN [Armée de Libération Nationale—National Liberation Army] inside Algeria. He wanted to give the guerrilla *djoundis* political and not just military training.

Belkacem Krim was of peasant origin. Along with Rabah Bitat, M. Boudiaf, Didouche Mourad (killed in

1955), M. Ben Boulaïd (killed in 1956), and Larbi Ben M'Hidi (hanged by the parachutists in 1957), Krim was a member of the CRUA (Comité Révolutionnaire d'Unité et d'Action—Revolutionary Unity and Action Committee), which launched the insurrection.

Krim was the first commander of *Wilaya* III—the Kabylia, or Berber, military zone—and demonstrated notable abilities in the military field.

Mahomed Lebjaoui, former leader of the Fédération de France du Front de Libération National [Federation of the National Liberation Front in France], tells how he carried out "Operation Blue Bird" in his book *Vérités sur la Révolution algérienne* [Gallimard]. For several months, ALN groups under the direct authority of the *Wilaya* command were supplied with arms, ammunition, and money by the French army, which thought it was dealing with Algerian fighters supporting France.

After going abroad, Krim became the minister of the army and later minister of foreign affairs in the GPRA (Gouvernement Provisoire de la République Algérienne — Provisional Government of the Algerian Revolution). Within this government he was part of a triumvirate along with Bousouf and Ben Tobbal.

At Evian, Krim was one of the negotiators. In the crisis that came with independence in July 1962, when Ben Keddou's GPRA was breaking up, he was one of the Tizi-Ouzou group, including M. Boudiaf and Ould Hadj. This group opposed the Tlemcen group made up of Ben Bella, M. Khider, and Boumédiène's border army.

As we know, the confrontation between the two groups was bloody and the guerrillas of the interior bowed to the superior logistical force of Boumédiène's tanks, while the people came into the streets shouting, "Seven years is enough!"

From this period dates the fratricidal hatred between Belkacem Krim and Kaïd Ahmed (Commander Slimane). Ahmed was the secret envoy of the political bureau (the Tlemcen group) sent to infiltrate the *wilayas* and get them to rally behind the army of the frontiers.

A better soldier than politician, Krim resigned his post as a deputy in November 1964 and took refuge in Gene-

va. After the coup d'état of June 19, 1965, he returned to Algiers and became a jeweler. In 1967 he went to Paris, where he founded the Mouvement Démocratique du Renouveau Algérien [Algerian Democratic Renewal Movement], a bourgeois opposition to the Boumédiène government.

Krim was accused by the Algerian government of setting up a network of killers charged with assassinating Kaïd Ahmed, who has now succeeded Sharif Belkacem as head of the FLN [Front de Libération National—National Liberation Front]. He was sentenced in absentia to death by a special revolutionary tribunal that sat in Oran in December 1968. The members of the alleged network who were arrested were sentenced to death, or to long prison sentences. To this day it does not seem that any have been executed.

Two hours after Belkacem Krim's death, before the body was officially identified, Radio Algiers was already announcing his assassination. Responsibility for the act has thus been acknowledged.

This murder was a settling of old

scores between two wings of the "national" bourgeoisie.

Such odious machinations by bourgeois politicians acting on their own and in the shadow world of political gangsterism do not concern the workers movement. Only the desire to reestablish the historical truth and answer all the stupidities spun out on the case led me to pick up my pen.

The crime is a reminder of the police-state aspects of the regime that rules in Algiers and of the gangster methods it often does not hesitate to employ.

At the present time, genuine revolutionary nationalist militants are still languishing in Boumédiène's jails, in particular the peasant nationalist leader Ahmed Ben Bella.

Today the Palestinian revolution is capable of freeing two Algerian "brothers" from the Zionist prisons. It is possible, in the wake of the demand of the Democratic Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine to release the political prisoners in Algeria, that the radicalization of the Arab revolution in the Near East will create more favorable conditions for ending such victimization.

Churches Oppose Arms to South Africa

Church officials in Britain have protested the plans of Prime Minister Edward Heath to sell arms to South Africa.

Basil Gingell reported in the October 26 London *Times* that the Archbishop of Canterbury had written to Heath on behalf of 100 of the 112 Anglican bishops. The letter expressed "deep disquiet at the possibility of the resumption of the sale of arms to South Africa."

The British Council of Churches, meeting at Swansea October 27, sent Heath a telegram urging him not to lift the restrictions on arms sales.

The meeting also debated the recent decision of the executive committee of the World Council of Churches to give financial aid to some African liberation organizations. The British Council voted to give "its general support to this action."

A working group of the council has prepared a report entitled "Violence in Southern Africa," which goes be-

yond any previous position of the council.

It points out that nonviolence has failed to bring liberation to Africans and adds that "it is impossible for a group of Christians in Britain to recommend sacrificial non-violence without being hypocritical. A body such as the British Council of Churches could not with consistency counsel others to non-violence while remaining ready to acknowledge the possibility of a 'just war' to defend Britain. If such a war can be just . . . then there can surely be no doubt about the justice of the revolutionary violence advocated as a last resort by the freedom fighters of southern Africa."

Czechoslovak CP Loses Workers

In 1946, 57.7 percent of the members of the Czechoslovak Communist party were workers. Today, workers total only 22.8 percent, and in Prague the figure is 16.8 percent.

Approximately one-third of party members are over 55 years old.

Franz Jakubowski and the Danzig Trotskyists

By Ernst Koch

[We have translated the article below from Vol. III, No. 2 (1970), of *Die Internationale*, the magazine of the Gruppe Internationale Marxisten (GIM—International Marxist Group, the German section of the Fourth International), where it was printed as an introduction to "The Trial of the Danzig Trotskyists" by Leon Trotsky.

[Trotsky's article was originally published April 29, 1937, following the trial of ten revolutionary socialists of the Spartakusbund (Spartacus League) by a Nazi court in Danzig on charges of maligning Hitler's government, disturbing the peace, circulating false information, violating the press laws, and illegal possession of weapons.

[The chief defendant was Dr. Franz Jakubowski, who had become a Trotskyist in 1935.

[In his article, Trotsky pointed out that the Danzig trial completely exposed Stalin's frame-ups in the notorious Moscow trials. While Stalin presented Trotsky's political opponents as "Trotskyists" and asserted that they were agents of the Gestapo, the real Trotskyists in Danzig were prosecuted by the Nazis for their defense of the Soviet Union.

"What is the attitude of the Danzig Trotskyists," Trotsky wrote, "to the defense of the U. S. S. R.? 'Hitler offers himself as a super-Wrangel'—writes the organ of the Spartakusbund—'for the imperialist crusade against the Soviet Union. . . . Stalin and his bureaucracy constitute the greatest danger to the existence of the Soviet power. In their home policy they have supplanted the rule of the proletariat with the rule of the bureaucracy; in foreign policy they have given preference to an alliance with the bourgeoisie as against the support of the proletariat. But they haven't as yet succeeded in destroying the most important social conquests of the October revolution. Therefore the defense of the U. S. S. R. remains the unconditional duty of the proletariat.' Let us not forget that this was written on Hitler's own territory."

[The complete text of Trotsky's ar-

ticle is contained in *Writings of Leon Trotsky* (1937-38), Pathfinder Press, New York, N. Y. 184 pp. \$2.95. 1970.]

* * *

Two years ago, the Frankfurt SDS [Sozialistischer Deutscher Studentebund—German Socialist Students League] publishers, *Neue Kritik*, reprinted Franz Jakubowski's dissertation, which he wrote in Basel in 1935 under Professor Salin. (It appears as Volume 9 of *Neue Kritik's* series "Archiv sozialistischer Literatur" [Archives of Socialist Literature]. This series includes works of Trotsky, Luxemburg, and Bukharin, among others.)

The dissertation was originally published in Danzig under the title "Der ideologische Uberbau in der materialistischen Geschichtsauffassung" [The Ideological Superstructure in the Materialist Conception of History].

As is customary with doctoral works, a short biography of the author was appended to the text. This listed the candidate's course of studies, but naturally did not disclose whether interests other than scientific had motivated Jakubowski—the son of a medical doctor—to concern himself with historical materialism.

Neue Kritik and the author of their introduction, Arnhelm Neusüss—who is known for his studies of Karl Mannheim's sociology of knowledge and his studies of the utopia concept—either did not concern themselves with this question or did not make use of information available to them. Insofar as possible, I will attempt to fill in this gap.

Neusüss characterizes Jakubowski—against the background of the Social Democratic and Stalinist dogmatization of Marxism—as a "solitary giant in the correct understanding of Marx."

The level of Jakubowski's interpretation of Marxist methodology has since been surpassed—especially by the interpretations of the "Frankfurt school" (Horkheimer, Marcuse, Adorno, Schmidt, Habermas). His weak-

ness in philosophical argumentation, his skipping over of problems in the theory of knowledge, is apparent. Therefore Neusüss is right when he sees the importance of Jakubowski's study in its pedagogical value.

Jakubowski's short work gives an adequate introductory explanation of what is meant by "historical materialism," and it is an aid in reading the 1923 writings of Karl Korsch and Georg Lukács (*Marxismus und Philosophie* [Marxism and Philosophy] and *Geschichte und Klassenbewusstsein* [History and Class Consciousness])—works upon which Jakubowski bases himself. He summarizes the results of the "restoration of original Marxism" undertaken by Korsch and Lukács and uses them to arm theoretically a new generation of fighters who had transcended Social Democracy and Stalinism.

The problem with presenting the materialist theory of society—which is intended to be only "the universal expression of a movement unfolding spontaneously before our eyes" (Marx)—in the form of "guidelines" is described by Neusüss with the formulation: "Guidelines of historical materialism are able to 'solve' only those problems they choose to take up." Therefore they fail. Jakubowski's "guidelines" are characterized, according to Neusüss, by the fact that "Jakubowski corrects himself over and over again without noticing it."

So far, so good. But beyond this, Neusüss traces the contradictions in which this textbook presentation of revolutionary theory gets entangled back to "Jakubowski's predicament, his situation in a time when a deep gulf had opened between Marxist theory and proletarian practice."

Here Neusüss is picking up Karl Korsch's idea that the insight into the amalgamation of theory and practice in working-class action—an insight achieved when the class struggle comes to a peak—is either lost, or retained only in an inadequate, stereotyped way during the periods of ebb, of stagnation, of the "integra-

tion" of the revolutionary class into the status quo.

This concept is the basis of Korsch's explanation of the Kautskyist ideology and of "Soviet Marxism": He sometimes remarked that the "true ring"* (the "authentic" Marxism) which Marx's heirs contended for, did not exist because it had been irretrievably lost. In his view, the attempt to place new forms of proletarian "praxis" under the categories of inherited revolutionary theory was always a falsification of the new forms of action, was dogmatism. Therefore, the revolutionary class always had to start anew from nothing, even in the theoretical realm.

Neusüss projects upon Jakubowski, whose understanding of Marxism was very similar to that of Max Horkheimer in his works *Materialismus* [Materialism] and *Kritische Theorie* [Critical Theory], which were written at the same time, the hopelessness, remoteness from politics, and fatalistic waiting for "action" that were so characteristic of the theoreticians of the "Frankfurt school."

Behind Neusüss' argument clearly lies a highly unrealistic, even mythologized concept of action. For him the only kinds of action worthy of the name are the historically exceptional instances of thousands and millions of workers acting as an independent political force.

In the everyday world of capitalist society, there are only two conceivable alternatives. You can "wait for proletarian praxis," which alone will permit an adequate formation of revolutionary theory, at the same time as it makes "guidelines" superfluous. Or you can base yourself on "non-proletarian praxis," nonproletarian forms of activity. But Neusüss rejects nonworking-class activities as substitutionalism (you can't do anything without the workers . . .). Action, as Neusüss sees it, is an automatic function of objective social development: No plant grows out of season.

In contrast to this, revolutionary Marxists bow neither to a myth of the "final conflict" nor to the opposite side of the coin: resigned quietism during the ebb tides of the class struggle. Thrown back to the status of an "international propaganda society," they work to stimulate the present

"praxis" of the proletariat so that out of it will arise the world-changing action of tomorrow—so that out of the contradictory consciousness of workers today will arise the class consciousness of tomorrow.

Revolutionary organizations, both in their incipient forms (the Communist Leagues, Spartacus Leagues, Zimmerwald movements), as well as in their developed forms (revolutionary mass parties as sections of the International), are the *memory of the class*. They prevent the working class from having always to start over again from the beginning, as though they had no history. These organizations preserve the experience of the workers' great victories and defeats, carry on propaganda; and, as soon as they are able to do so, lead new generations of workers into battle against the capitalist system. On this "long march," forms of "nonproletarian praxis"—such as the student revolts in the neocapitalist and neo-Stalinist societies—can serve as icebreakers creating the preconditions for a revival of the forgotten forms of class-conscious action.

Revolutionary theory can be independent of the tides of the class struggle only on one condition: It must be coupled with tireless political work to match the demands of the revolutionary program with the actual level of consciousness of the class. "Correct consciousness," then, belongs to those who firmly retain the memory of the level of theory and practice once reached, while developing an understanding of the reasons for the ebb that is free from illusions, so that, in different conditions, they can lead the struggle to transform the new social reality.

This was the road Franz Jakubowski took. He was not only a doctoral candidate in Basel, but also a member of the KPD [Kommunistische Partei Deutschlands—Communist party of Germany], later of the Fourth International, and organizer of the Danzig "Spartakusbund."

A political trial was directed against this organization January 11, 1937, culminating in a total sentence of thirteen years for the ten defendants (of sixty arrested).

As is clear from the trial reports, the members of the Spartakusbund, besides the 25-year-old Jakubowski, were chiefly workers. Named in the indictment were: Otto Treppner, 32

years old; Eduard Krajewski, 41; Stefan Körner, 37; Bruno Briese, 31; Max Fischer, 23; Artur Ellwart, 35; Auguste Treppner, 57; Helene Schumann, 31; and Lucie Etowski, 33.

The trial coverage in the fascist press showed that the Danzig "Spartakusbund" had risen to the political tasks of the period. Its practical and propaganda work was directed toward constructing a new Communist party as part of the Fourth International.

It carried out the struggle against fascism in Danzig and in the *Reich*. Along with agitation against Stalin's show trials, it issued strike calls to the Danzig longshoremen to block the arms shipments to Franco's fascists . . .

Trotsky learned of the existence of the Danzig group only shortly before Soviet pressure resulted in his being interned in Norway (because of his campaign against the first great show trial of Zinoviev, Kamenev, and others in August 1936). In "The Trial of the Danzig Trotskyists," which he wrote in Mexico, Trotsky left a monument to the group. His comparison of the Danzig case with the simultaneous proceedings in the second Moscow anti-"Trotskyist" trial leads to the conclusion:

"The Danzig indictment in all its essential aspects was genuine . . . In the prisoners' dock in Danzig there sat my real co-thinkers and not enemies of mine who assumed a mask of friendship by command of the police."

We do not know what became of Jakubowski's comrades. He himself was able to emigrate shortly before the complete "unification" [with Germany] of the Danzig "Free State." His path led him through Copenhagen and Paris to England, and then to the USA. There all trace of him disappears after the end of the second world war. It is our task to preserve the memory of these German pioneers of the Fourth International.

June 1, 1970.

George Brown Becomes George-Brown

George Brown, former British Foreign Secretary in the Labour party government, has changed his name to George George-Brown. The change permits him to be called Lord George-Brown when he enters the House of Lords. The College of Heralds has objected to the name on the ground that it could cause him to be mistaken for the younger son of a duke or marquess.

* The reference seems to be to the Ring of the Nibelungen, which had the power to breed gold.—IP

Looking Back Over My Years with Peng Shu-tse

By Peng Pi-lan

III

[Continued from last week.]

The big press reported the arrest of Ch'en Tu-hsiu and Peng Shu-tse, especially the fact that they had been transferred from Shanghai to Nanking where they were to be tried by a military court. Fearing that the two revolutionary leaders would be condemned to death, many eminent figures sent telegrams to Chiang Kai-shek and his government, calling for their case to be transferred to a civil court. These included Tsai Yuen-pei, the former chancellor of Peking National University, Soong Ching-ling, the widow of Dr. Sun Yat-sen, who is a vice-president of the People's Republic of China today, and a number of well-known professors. Because of these appeals, the two were finally transferred to a civil court in Nanking. The proceedings, which were made public, lasted two years, and were closely followed by the press throughout the country.

The Kuomintang government charged Ch'en Tu-hsiu and Peng Shu-tse with violating the "Emergency Law Governing Treason." Both of them wrote statements defending themselves and chose several lawyers to represent them in court. Peng, in addition to answering the charges in his statement, denounced as treason the Kuomintang's policy of offering no resistance to Japanese imperialism, abolishing civil liberties and democratic rights, and stated that in his opinion only communism could save China from disaster.

On the day of their open trial (the one and only time in the history of the Kuomintang government that communists were granted an open trial), the courtroom was crowded. Chen Li-fu and his entourage, the bosses of the Kuomintang, even followed the trial, although hidden from view behind screens.

In his speech of defense, Peng boldly attacked the foreign and domestic policies of the Kuomintang, and affirmed his belief in the goals of communism. Chen Li-fu and his companions were particularly outraged at this.

Ch'en and Peng were each sentenced to thirteen years and the other comrades to five years. The thirteen-year sentences, upon being appealed to a higher court, were later reduced to eight years.

Actually, Peng spent five years in the Nanking Model Prison, not being released until the prison was destroyed by Japanese bombers at the opening of the Sino-Japanese war in 1937.

During the years in prison, Peng converted his cell into a "study." His reading ranged from the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Trotsky to the history of China and the Western world, philosophy, the natural sciences, and literature. He read every good book he could lay his hands on, broadening his knowledge as much as possible,

including even the origins and social content of the Christian and Buddhist religions.

Unfortunately, during their second year in prison, differences arose between Peng Shu-tse and Ch'en Tu-hsiu over problems involving the Soviet Union, proletarian dictatorship, and democracy. These were the outcome of a few articles Peng wrote on these subjects. They found it impossible to reconcile their differing points of view and their friendship finally came to an end. During the same year, Peng's younger brother, Peng Tao-tse, one of the best cadres, who was also being held in the same prison, died of an illness left untreated for want of money. These two misfortunes greatly affected Peng, as I could tell from his letters. Yet his fortitude, his patience, and his inner balance enabled him to take these blows and recover.

Over the long five years Shu-tse was in prison, I suffered greatly, personally, from the disruption of our family life, meeting with much hardship. I had to support our two children, yet be wary of the offers of help that came from many sides. Most painful of all, I had to face political isolation.

Whenever I participated in meetings of left groups or engaged in political discussions, almost inevitably I encountered Stalinists and their sympathizers, very seldom Trotskyists. At first the Stalinists displayed sympathy and friendliness. They even went so far as to find work for me, thus hoping to win me to their ranks. However, once I had openly rejected their advances, making clear my political views, they cut me off from all their various activities.

On August 13, 1937, a few days after the Nanking Model Prison was bombed, Peng, Ch'en, and the other comrades were released. Peng was the last to be freed. Had it not been for the strong objections of the chief jailer, the Kuomintang hierarchy might still have kept Peng locked up because of his strong attack against their regime at the time of his trial.

When Peng Shu-tse returned to Shanghai, the nationwide anti-Japanese campaign was at its height. However, there were only a dozen or so Trotskyists left in Shanghai. On top of this, although a nominal central organization existed, contacts with other local groups had not been reestablished.

To begin swimming in the current of the anti-imperialist struggle, Peng called a provisional conference of all the remaining comrades, including those newly released from prison. A resolution was passed at the conference supporting the armed struggle being waged by the Kuomintang government against Japanese imperialism. Accompanying this was a criticism from the political point of view of the government's reactionary policies.

A provisional central committee was elected and authorization given to publish a clandestine party journal,

The Struggle. Shortly after this meeting, a number of small regional groups were again established. Owing to the favorable objective situation, the Trotskyist organization was soon expanding in areas such as Shanghai, Peking, Canton, Hong Kong, and the provinces of Kwangsi and Chekiang.

No sooner had our movement found its feet than two important events occurred.

The first was a rumor cooked up by the Stalinists and published in their press alleging that Ch'en Tu-hsiu and Peng Shu-tse had accepted funds from the Japanese imperialists and had pledged to enter into their service. The tag they used for this was "Trotskyite Traitors." The Stalinist newspapers in Shanghai followed this up with the slander that Li Kuo-chieh, a traitor who had just been assassinated by Kuomintang agents, and Peng Shu-tse were good friends. The purpose of this was to provoke an agent of the Kuomintang into assassinating Peng, or to provide a cover for one of their own agents to kill Peng. They retracted the slander only after Peng filed a lawsuit.

The second event involved Ch'en Tu-hsiu. He proposed to offer all-out support to the War of Resistance as led by Chiang Kai-shek. He objected to the political criticism of the Kuomintang published in our journal. His attitude gave rise to a severe dispute within our organization. Peng Shu-tse, trying to overcome the confusion that had been created, had no choice but to criticize Chen Tu-hsiu's viewpoint. This ruined their relationship conclusively. For the Chinese Trotskyist movement, the loss was a great one.

Yet, as Peng Shu-tse, Liu Chia-liang, Wang Fan-si, and other cadres released from prison collaborated with the few comrades who had remained firm in Shanghai, the movement progressed steadily despite the rumors circulated by the Stalinists and despite the difficulties caused by Chen Tu-hsiu's erroneous position. In fact, after the publication in August 1939 of an open periodical, *Moving Onward*, its influence was quite considerable. The periodical carried criticisms of the Kuomintang's passivity in the War of Resistance and of Stalin's signing the infamous German-Soviet pact.

In this same period, various sympathizers gave Peng substantial financial aid, enabling us to publish two books and a pamphlet by Trotsky, *The History of the Russian Revolution*, *The Revolution Betrayed*, and *The Moscow Trials*. We also published three pamphlets by Peng, *The War Against the Japanese Imperialists*, *The Lesson of the Defeat of the Spanish Revolution*, and *The Defeat of the Austrian Revolution*. These received quite a wide response from workers and intellectuals. Once again our movement was moving forward.

At the outbreak of World War II, just prior to the attack on Pearl Harbor, a very serious internal struggle took place within the Chinese Trotskyist movement.

One tendency, headed by Ch'en Tu-hsiu, viewed the war as a struggle between democratic countries and the fascist Axis. He therefore argued for abandoning the policy of "defeatism" in democratic countries like England and France. In addition, in view of the tragedy of the Moscow trials and the Hitler-Stalin pact, he reached the conclusion that the Soviet Union was no longer a workers state and consequently should not be supported.

Another tendency, headed by Wang Fan-si, held that if

war broke out between Japan and the USA, China would become involved in an imperialist war. A consequence of this would be the conversion of the national war of resistance into an imperialist war. Thus he held that we should adopt a policy of "defeatism" towards the War of Resistance led by the Kuomintang.

These two tendencies, especially the ultraleft one, caused great confusion among the rank and file.

To combat this, Peng Shu-tse wrote a long article, "On the Struggle Against Two Deviationist Lines," explaining the dangers inherent in Ch'en's opportunism and Wang's ultraleft sectarianism. Peng defended Trotsky's fundamental position on the second world war and the Sino-Japanese war, including the possibility of war breaking out between Japan and the U. S.

The discussion in the membership ended at the National Convention of the Communist League of China in August 1941. Peng's resolution was adopted by an overwhelming majority. No one supported Ch'en's position, and Wang's position was backed by only a few members.

After the convention, Ch'en Tu-hsiu broke with Trotskyism. He died in June, 1942, in Szechwan province.

The minority group led by Wang continued to maintain its position but then violated the principles of democratic centralism by publishing an open periodical of its own. Not long after the outbreak of the war between the United States and Japan, Wang and his small group of followers left the Communist League of China.

After the attack on Pearl Harbor December 7, 1941, Japanese troops occupied the foreign settlement in Shanghai. This dealt a heavy blow to our movement. Communications between our central headquarters and the local organizations were disrupted. More importantly, a number of cadres were arrested. Peng Shu-tse barely escaped.

The repression caused a number of activists to leave Shanghai. Once again our link with the masses was severed. A period of extreme terror opened under the Japanese imperialist occupation.

Despite the perilous situation, Peng managed to bring together a group of young comrades. Using a pseudonym, he gained an appointment as a professor of Chinese history, Western history, and philosophy in two universities. In his classes, of course, he could not use Marxist terminology. Nevertheless, he oriented his lectures along Marxist lines and influenced a number of leftist students. Some of them wanted to meet him after his lectures and thus we welcomed a group of young people to our home, regardless of their political backgrounds.

We discussed various problems with these students, later converting even those who had come under Stalinist influence to our positions. These youths were to become the foundation of our movement in the postwar period.

We also became acquainted with several businessmen of leftist inclinations. They later became good friends of ours. After the war they helped the movement financially in an energetic way, especially in the publication of periodicals.

With the surrender of Japan, Chiang Kai-shek's government came under mounting pressure from the people to grant democratic concessions. This eased the political situation somewhat. Taking advantage of the opening, our organization once more moved actively forward. Our first task was to publish an open journal to stir up the masses.

On May 1, 1946, two open monthly magazines came off

the press. *Seeking the Truth* was a theoretical and political magazine edited by Peng Shu-tse. It was the most attractive magazine of the postwar period, openly propagating Trotskyist ideas. The second magazine, *Youth and Women*, which I edited, was later renamed *New Voice*. It became the organ of the Trotskyist movement.

The two periodicals had a nationwide circulation, reaching all the important cities until they ceased publication in 1948 upon our leaving Shanghai. Their influence was considerable among the intellectuals, students, and young workers. In addition they made it possible for branches of our movement, disrupted by the war, to renew contacts and to reach out to individuals who had become isolated.

The Communist League of China not only recovered its lost forces, it began to grow at a rapid rate. It reconstituted a number of cells among industrial workers and university students in Shanghai, Canton, Hong Kong, and other cities.

We devoted our most intensive efforts to educating young cadres. In addition to regular cadre schools, we held a seminar each week that was regularly attended by more than one hundred comrades and sympathizers. This weekly gathering continued for two and a half years, becoming a pole of attraction that recruited many youths and intellectuals into our movement.

Peng Shu-tse was one of the principal speakers and organizers of these meetings as well as of the cadre schools. Despite sleepless nights, which he spent in writing articles for our publications, he participated in all these meetings with rare and unflagging energy.

In August 1948, when the Third National Convention of the Communist League of China opened, our membership stood at 350. This was a good gauge of our fast rate of growth. A new political platform was adopted at the convention, and it was decided to change the name of the organization to the Chinese Revolutionary Communist Party.

As our movement made these strides forward, a decisive change took place in the objective situation. The military counteroffensive opened by the Chinese Communist party against Chiang Kai-shek gained victory after victory. The People's Liberation Army stood at the north bank of the Yangtze and was poised to take Nanking and Shanghai.

Under these circumstances, the Chinese Revolutionary Communist Party held an emergency conference at which measures were adopted in the light of the experiences and lessons learned from the treatment of Trotskyists by the Stalin regime in the Soviet Union.

All the members of the Executive Committee were present. They voted for a resolution recommending that the Political Bureau be transferred to Hong Kong and that a Provisional Committee be set up in Shanghai, charged with the responsibility of keeping in touch with the regional groups and giving directives as necessary.

It was also decided that all our party members and the members of the youth movement should do everything possible to integrate themselves into the Chinese Communist party, the Communist Youth League, and the mass organizations of workers and peasants of various kinds in order to better support all progressive measures undertaken by the CCP.

The cadres who were too well known to the Stalinists were instructed to leave Shanghai for other provinces. Exchanges of cadres between different areas were also decided upon. Of the five comrades on the Political Bureau, Kin was already in Hong Kong; Yun Kuan, who was not willing to leave Shanghai, was soon arrested by the CCP regime along with many other comrades none of whom have been heard from since; Peng Shu-tse, Liu Chia-liang, and I set out for Hong Kong, where we arrived at the end of 1948.

[To be continued.]

While 'Communists' Prefer Gandhi to Marx

SWP Runs Revolutionary Campaign in Kerala

By M. Rashid

Chalakkudi, Kerala
"Money was flowing in the [September 17] election like water," according to political observers in Kerala. All the candidates and parties—with one exception—spent large sums of money.

The exception was M. A. Rappai, the Socialist Workers party [SWP—Indian section of the Fourth International] candidate from Chalakkudi. Because of lack of funds, the SWP candidate could not hire a single taxi to take him and his campaign workers to the voters. (Even the small Communist Revolutionary party [CRP], a

Maoist group led by K. P. R. Gopalan, had many taxies and jeeps for its campaign.)

But the SWP was the only party that used the campaign to spread revolutionary propaganda. The party issued an "Election Special" of *Chenkathir*, the Malayalam organ of the SWP, containing the election manifesto and the central committee's resolution on the current political situation and tasks. This was also published as a separate pamphlet.

Rappai and seven other SWP members conducted a *jatha* (walking tour) of the entire constituency. The *jatha*

covered 360 miles. While the other participants were replaced along the way, Rappai walked the entire distance.

Wherever they went, the members of the *jatha* chanted: "Neither left nor right CPI [Communist party of India], nor any of the Naxalite [Maoist] groups; we are spreading the revolutionary message of Trotsky in the villages." They addressed innumerable street-corner meetings, sold many copies of Trotskyist literature, and collected contributions.

The *jatha* could not reach the Malappara Tea Estate area—which is

sixty miles from Chalakudi on the border of Madras state but is included in the Chalakudi constituency—until the day before the election. Nevertheless, the SWP candidate obtained some votes from that area.

In public meetings and private talks, Rappai was not concerned with asking for votes. He explained the SWP political programme and bluntly told the voters that none of the burning economic and political problems facing the masses could be solved by elections in a capitalist parliamentary system.

The other left parties propagated the view that the elections would settle important questions of political power. Both the "National Democratic Front" [NDF] led by the CPI [the pro-Moscow CP] and the "Peoples Democratic Front" [PDF] led by the CPI(M) [Communist party of India (Marxist)] held out numerous promises to the electorate.

Both fronts represented unprincipled alliances aimed only at securing seats in the assembly.

One of the main results of these electoral deals was the comeback staged by the Congress (Ruling) [Congress (R)] party of Indira Gandhi. It is now re-established in Kerala as a leading political party of the bourgeoisie.

In the 1967 election, the Congress—then still united—was almost wiped from the political map in Kerala, being reduced to 9 seats in the 133-seat assembly. This time, with the open support of the CPI, RSP [Revolutionary Socialist party], and PSP [Praja Socialist party], the Congress (R) won 32 seats.

Other bourgeois parties also benefited from the aid of the reformist left. With the indirect support of the CPI(M), the two other wings of the Congress, the Syndicate and the Kerala Congress, secured a total of 16 seats.

The CPI(M) was in open partnership with the reactionary Krishaka Thozilali party [KTP]—formerly an anticommunist front led by Father Vadakkan, a Catholic priest—which won two seats.

The reactionary Muslim League is a partner in the new NDF cabinet, which also includes the CPI, RSP, and PSP.

Before nominations were filed, the RSP loudly proclaimed that it would have nothing to do with the Congress

(R) party; but after the filing, no other party allied itself so closely with the latter. In Quilon and Trivandrum, districts where the RSP has some mass base, it worked with the Congress (R) as though the two belonged to one party. In Kundara and Kottarakara, other areas where it has some mass following, the RSP worked for the Congress (R) candidates and helped them win election. The RSP had an "advantage" over the CPI in relations with the Congress (R). The latter consider the RSP a "national" party while they look upon the CPI as "Moscow-inspired."

What the RSP gained from its alliance with the Congress (R) was several seats that it would otherwise have lost.

For its part, the CPI(M) donated seats to the Syndicate Congress in Calicut II, Cannanor, and Mattanchery, all predominantly working-class constituencies with a tradition of thirty-five years of militant class struggles under communist leadership.

In doing this, the CPI(M) leadership ditched their own party's candidates, P. C. Raghavan Nair and P. Gangadharan. The two are veterans of the Communist movement in Kerala and are among the few CPI(M) leaders still retaining their old idealism and dedication. They were sacrificed to reactionary elements who ran as independents.

Both CPI(M) candidates were incumbents in the dissolved assembly. Raghavan Nair's seat in Calicut I was allotted to a self-proclaimed "Gandhian" who denounced Marxism as an "outdated theory." Gangadharan's safe seat was offered to Wellington, a KTP leader and ex-minister against whom charges of corruption were levelled when he was in the CPI(M)-led cabinet headed by E. M. S. Namboodiripad.

In Calicut II, a CPI(M) trade-union leader had filed his nomination and started the campaign. One week before the polling date, he was compelled to withdraw in favour of a Syndicate Congress leader (the mayor of Calicut City) whom the CPI(M) supported as an "independent." This "independent" is now deputy leader of the Syndicate Congress group in the assembly.

The reformist left, which was so anxious to help the bourgeois parties, went out of its way to attack the SWP.

The CPI(M) supported an "independ-

ent" running against Rappai, while spreading the slander that Rappai's campaign was being financed by the Congress (R) in order to split the left vote. (The Congress [R], meanwhile, was conducting a whispering campaign among the district's Catholics, urging them not to vote for an atheist.)

Two factories in Chalakudi, where Rappai is a union leader, have been closed by the owners. Instead of attacking the owners for this, the CPI and CPI(M) attacked Rappai!

The bourgeois press, of course, did its best to black out news of the Trotskyist campaign, although the SWP was able to get some coverage. But *Deshabimani*, the organ of the Stalinist CPI(M), never once printed the name of the SWP. For *Deshabimani*, Rappai was an "independent" candidate without any political affiliations. Despite the lack of publicity, the SWP got 362 votes in Chalakudi.

By using the election campaign for revolutionary purposes, the SWP was able to project the programme of Trotskyism and the Fourth International on a state-wide basis.

This activity did not end with the election. On September 18, when the election results were announced, the SWP held a public meeting in Chalakudi. Rappai, P. Natarajan, A. K. Madhavan, and A. Narayankutty spoke about the future activities of the SWP. The defeated candidates of the CPI(M) and the CRP, on the other hand, were not even seen in the town for many days.

Correction

A misreading of the author's manuscript caused an error to appear in Ranjan Roy's article "Police Mobilized Against Rebel Peasant Movement" on page 899 of our October 26 issue.

The police attack mentioned in the third paragraph from the end of the article did not occur at Kalna, but at Bankura, a town in Bankura district. News of the attack was received at Kalna, where the Socialist Workers party West Bengal unit was meeting.

Is Nothing Sacred?

The November 1 London *Sunday Times* claimed to have evidence that Jack the Ripper was really Edward, Duke of Clarence, Queen Victoria's grandson and one-time heir to the British throne.

Sinn Fein President Discusses Revolution in Ireland

[The following interview was granted to Gerry Foley July 29 in Dublin by Tomás Mac Giolla, the president of Sinn Féin, the political arm of the Irish republican movement. Mr. Mac Giolla has not corrected the text, which we have shortened for reasons of space.]

* * *

Question. What strategy does the republican movement have for overcoming the sectarian divisions in Northern Ireland?

Answer. We continually emphasize the fact that there are three basic elements of republicanism: It's separatist. It's socialist. And it's nonsectarian.

The nonsectarianism of the republican philosophy is essential to its progress and essential to the success of the republican cause in Ireland.

The primary enemy is Britain—British imperialism in Ireland. Before the twelfth of July parades, held this year on the thirteenth, there was built up through the news media, etc., tensions and the feeling there was going to be great strife between Catholic and Protestant. We took special measures to be sure there wouldn't.

I myself paid a visit to Belfast on Friday, the tenth of July, and remained there until Sunday evening. During the time I was there we had a meeting of the Republican Clubs at which we discussed the whole question and the necessity for ensuring that there wouldn't be any strife and for talking to people and explaining to them that fighting between Catholic and Protestant would only aid the British cause.

Q. Do you have any evidence that the point is getting across to the Protestant population, that some of them are beginning to understand what the actual problem is, and that you're beginning to win some support among the Protestants?

A. This has come true in the two areas that have had the most strife in the past year. At a press confer-

ence in Belfast July 11, it was pointed out by the local Republican Clubs that the Housing Action Committee in the Falls area, which is spearheaded by the republicans, had been in correspondence with the Shankill Development Association.

The answer from the Shankill people was quite courteous. It pointed out the difficulties at the present time of establishing such cooperation but certainly not ruling it out. This was most helpful and gave indication that there were strong possibilities of the Catholic and Protestant people of the Falls and the Shankill cooperating together on questions of mutual advantage and benefit, such as housing in particular.

Now in Derry you have precisely the same thing, where the equivalent of the Shankill would be the Fountain Street area, which is a Protestant area and has been built up by the mass media as being the home of absolute out-and-out Paisleyism ready to attack the people in the Bogside.

The James Connolly Republican Club in the Bogside went up in the Fountain Street area advising and helping Protestant families there on the housing question. They were told by the people of Fountain Street that they had written to everybody—they showed them letters to Chichester-Clarke, the local MP, Albert Anderson, Falkner, and various others, and the replies they got, which were all negative. They were ready to get the help of the Housing Action Committee which had been set up by the James Connolly Republican Club and together they started an agitation.

They held a picket at the guild hall, invited the press to take pictures of the Protestant families and republican people together fighting for justice in housing. So there's no doubt whatever about it that the Catholics and Protestants can get on together quite well.

Q. Can you define the immediate objectives of the republican movement in the North?

A. The immediate objectives are

manifold. Just twelve months ago the immediate objective was the implementation of the reforms for which the civil-rights movement had been fighting.

The month of August of last year changed the whole aspect of things and the immediate objective was the defense of the people. Following what happened in Derry and Belfast, people in many other towns throughout the North felt very insecure, and defense committees were established right across the Six Counties.

The issue of defense remained paramount throughout the winter. Republicans recognized that civil rights was an important aspect of the fights against British imperialism, but it was only a step on the way. They were also aware that the issue of defense of the people was again not a final objective in itself.

There are many people on the defense committees who are there merely to defend their own homes, their own areas, and have no immediate interest outside of that.

But the events of the past couple of months in Belfast, and particularly the events in the Falls on the night of July 3, have brought the issue much clearer to people's minds that the enemy is the British occupation. This is seen now by the ordinary people in the North and the issue of just local defense is not now as much in the forefront of their minds as the issue of constitutional change.

In other words, people have come to the stage of saying that the setup between Ireland and Britain cannot last. It must be changed, so what kind of change is there going to be?

The old partition solution no longer works. The new solution that Britain is looking for is one that will maintain her interest and control. We are therefore pointing out that the only change that can benefit the Irish people is to take into their own hands control over all the resources of the country, all the wealth and wealth-producing processes.

We have been pointing out in recent issues of our newspaper the *United Irishman*, in statements, etc., that the

great danger at the moment is a federal solution to the Irish problem, that partition would end in the sense that the border would be done away with but the whole country would be more under the political domination of Britain than previously, the Twenty Six Counties as well as the Six Counties.

Q. When you say that one of the major questions is the constitutional question and what's involved with that is a union of one part of Ireland with Britain, then that would mean in your view the struggle that's going on now is essentially a national struggle. That would be the next higher stage presumably beyond the civil-rights struggle.

A. That is true. The objective of the republican movement is national liberation and the establishment of a democratic socialist republic for the whole country.

Our contention has always been that the Twenty Six County government was just as satisfied with the partition solution as was the Six County government. They had their own little bailiwick which they controlled down here—the Fianna Fáil government—and the Stormont Unionist government had its area over which it maintained control.

Now all has changed and therefore we are emphasizing our policy just as much in the Twenty Six Counties as in the Six Counties, that the objective must be to break the grip of economic domination by Britain on Twenty Six County affairs and to end her direct control over Six County affairs and establish a united democratic socialist republic.

We are convinced that the struggle for national independence and the struggle for a socialist form of society must continue side by side. We are totally opposed to the idea which republicans have had in the past that we take the struggle for national independence first on the basis that if we leave out all ideologies, we can unite all the people behind the struggle for national independence and then, national independence having been achieved, we can decide what form of government or type of society we want.

This had been the main strategy of the republican movement in the

forties and again in the fifties when they carried out the campaign against the British forces in the North. But both were failures.

The basic reason for the failures was that the people weren't behind the struggle. They were enthusiastic for it all right and supported it at a distance but weren't part of it and left the struggle completely to the republican movement, to the IRA [Irish Republican Army, the military wing of the Republican movement] and to Sinn Féin.

The reason the people weren't part of it was that they didn't see it as being their struggle—for basic social justice, for jobs, for houses, for improved standards of living, for an end to emigration, for full employment.

We decided in a reassessment of our position following the end of the campaign in 1962, during the years 1963-65, that the struggle must be a revolutionary struggle of the Irish people, not just against the physical presence of British armed forces in the Six Counties, but against all the manifestations of Britain's control of the country. In other words against British economic interests, against British control of industry, the commercial life of the country, landed estates, fisheries, the property development companies—London-based—which were knocking down sound houses and building office blocks, evicting people from houses.

So we carried out a fight on all these issues, and adopted a socialist ideology based essentially on the teachings of Theobald Wolfe Tone and James Connolly and also Finton Lalor who was a rural socialist of the 1840s.

Q. Does the republican movement have a policy of trying to win leadership in the trade unions?

A. No, we haven't a policy of winning control of the trade unions, but we have come to the realization that republicans and militants in the trade-union sense must achieve a position of greater influence.

We have established republican trade-union groups in Dublin, Cork, and Belfast. They're particularly strong in Dublin. The republican trade unionists in Dublin have been particularly active on factory closures. A number of factories have closed down

as a result of the operation of the Free Trade Area agreement with Britain. The republican trade-union group has in the past organized workers' protests at these closures. They haven't had any great success except in highlighting the fact that industries have closed down on the decision of the management without any consideration for the rights of the workers.

Our attitude toward trade unions is of course that they are selling out the workers and have been for a number of years and are not in any sense the trade-union movement that Connolly and Jim Larkin fought so hard to build.

Connolly fought for One Big Union of workers and he saw this as being the political arm of the working class to fight not just for such things as better pay and better working conditions but to fight for ownership of the wealth of the country for the working people.

The trade-union movement has confined itself completely to haggling with employers over a few shillings a week extra and has carefully refrained from having any political influence on the affairs in either North or South. This is changing, and this is why I say it's a wonderful thing that the trade-union congress has condemned entrance into the EEC [European Economic Community—the Common Market] because this is a political act and they will have to fight a political campaign if they are going to live up to their resolution.

One fight we feel the trade-union movement could be brought into is the housing issue, particularly here in Dublin; it could also be done in Belfast. It is essentially the working class who are suffering the lack of housing, who are living with in-laws, living in one room, living in caravans, living in very poor conditions—broken down houses with no toilet facilities, leaking roofs, etc.

One issue leads to another and we believe that eventually the workers in the trade-union movement will get back to the position they were in from 1913 to 1916, when they saw themselves as the political arm of the working class and when they saw that the first enemy of the workers in Ireland is British imperialism, when they were prepared to unite against it and form a citizen army to fight against

it. This would probably be a slow development.

Q. Does the republican movement consider itself part of an international movement and if so, what movement and what is its place in it?

A. Yes, we would. We believe that the fight against imperialism, neocolonialism—this is economic imperialism—is international. We are convinced that our main contribution to the fight against imperialism is against the imperialism that is affecting us, British imperialism. But we have been very prominent in protests or marches of solidarity with the Vietnamese and with other nations who are opposed to imperialism.

We also oppose the imperialism of Russia when she invades Czechoslovakia. We have continually reiterated this. Our international policy would be one of nonalignment in the sense that the smaller nations must not be aligned with the larger imperial powers, one or the other, that there must be solidarity between the small nations just as much as there must be solidarity between the men of no property, the small man in the nation, the workers.

Q. Is it your belief that what you call Soviet "imperialism" is comparable to the imperialism of the advanced capitalist countries; for example, to American imperialism?

A. No, not at all. It's completely different. Perhaps imperialism isn't the right word although I believe that any big nation which tries to dominate and control a smaller nation is acting in an imperialist way. But the imperialism of Russia is obviously different in many ways to the imperialism of the USA or Britain, because it's not based on monopoly capitalism, large international cartels dominated by huge industrial complexes or anything of that nature, which are the bases of the imperialism of the USA or Britain. What we oppose is one nation imposing its ideas and its system on another nation.

Q. What kind of political support would you hope to receive from left-wing organizations in other parts of the world?

A. Well, internationally at the mo-

ment we hope that socialists and progressive groups in other countries will give their full support to the demands of the civil-rights movement and to the call for the withdrawal of British forces from this country. In the long term we expect that this country will be engaged in the struggle against British imperialism in Ireland, that the people will have to engage Britain if she doesn't herself withdraw her forces from our country. If this happens, there is a grave danger that the Washington government would be in support of the London government in view of the close ties between America and Britain.

We would therefore hope that the American people would ensure that their government would not stand behind Britain or back Britain in her struggle for the domination of the Irish people. We would hope that the links of the Irish people and the strength of the Irish tradition in America would be strong enough to overcome the British influence in Washington.

Q. Unfortunately the national identifications of people of Irish descent and origin in the United States have considerably weakened since the last full-scale struggle in Ireland. Are there other forces in America you feel you can look to for support?

A. In our association with the Irish Voice on Vietnam we have held demonstrations to show our solidarity with the Vietnamese people. In this campaign we became very much aware of the tremendous growth of the antiwar movement in America and the influence which it has in restraining the imperialist designs of the Washington government. We are convinced that this movement can be most helpful to a small nation like Ireland if it were engaged in a struggle for its national liberation such as the Vietnamese people are engaged in at the moment.

Q. Can you outline the reasons for the split in the republican movement early this year?

A. Well, in the split in the movement which occurred in January last, three basic charges were made against us: One, that we were abandoning the abstentionist policy and therefore were

becoming Free Staters just like Fianna Fáil and Clann na Poblachta previously. Two, that we were dominated by international communism because we were promoting socialist policies. And three, that we had failed to defend the people of the Falls and of the Bogside when they were attacked by the UVF [Ulster Volunteer Force] and the RUC [Royal Ulster Constabulary].

On the first issue, it's true that the split occurred on a proposal that we adopt a policy of political participation for the promotion of our policies. But I think the events since the split have proved that we who were prepared to make amendments in this abstentionist policy, to allow political participation in the Leinster House parliament were more opposed to the Free State, to the Fianna Fáil and Fine Gael clique than those who broke away.

In fact, the Provisionals have deliberately and carefully refrained from any political activity which would embarrass the Dublin government ever since the split occurred in January. We on the other hand have intensified our campaigns of political action on economic issues, on the issue of the collaboration between the Dublin and London governments in the sentencing of a number of men in England to eight years and seven years penal servitude.

We have participated in sit-ins and take-overs of British offices and property, including the passport office. And we have intensified our campaign of fish-ins for claiming the ownership of the river fisheries for the Irish people.

We have also declared our opposition to the policies of Blaney and Boland, which are based on the extension of free Statism, the extension of the Twenty Six County political setup to the thirty-two counties, to which we are completely opposed and the Protestant people of the North would be entirely opposed.

The Provisionals have been put into the position now where many of them, wittingly or unwittingly, find themselves in association with Neil Blaney and Boland and their policies in the North in both Belfast and Derry, which of course has seriously embarrassed very many of the Provisionals who are sincere republicans totally opposed to Fianna Fáil or any type of Free Statism.

Their argument in regard to the socialist policies, which is the one that

they have used ever since the split to try to prove that we were reds, I think is falling on deaf ears, because it's so obvious that we are promoting the policies of Tone, Connolly and James Fintan Lalor and Pearse on questions such as the ownership of property, ownership of the wealth and resources of the nation in our opposition to British imperial control of the country.

The issue of defense of people of the Falls: it is quite true that the IRA in August last hadn't got sufficient arms to defend the Falls. I doubt if the IRA in any previous period either would have had sufficient arms to meet the onslaught that occurred on August 14 and 15 last year.

Furthermore, the Provisionals who make these charges were in a position of leadership and in a position to have remedied these defects if they were able or willing to do so, so that they were just as much to blame for any lack of equipment as the official IRA.

A few weeks ago in Belfast the regular IRA and the local populace held off a fully armored British division for a period of eight hours, until five o'clock in the morning.

It is now the officials who have the greatest military discipline and strength and were able to put up the best fight in Belfast.

We are still prepared to work with the Provisionals on such issues as opposition to entrance to the EEC, local issues such as housing, or anything that would be to the benefit of the Irish nation. We hope that this can be achieved at some future date.

Q. Will the revolution you propose involve transforming the existing state structures in Ireland?

A. Well, our objection as far as the two states in Ireland are concerned is that both states and both state structures must be destroyed, and a new state structure established for the whole country, taking into consideration the different traditions of North and South and the different outlooks and philosophies of the Protestant and Catholic peoples. Also the rights of the working class whose power shall be supreme.

You could not establish a socialist form of society and maintain the existing state structure in either the North or the South because both are basically reactionary and both are de-

signed to maintain British interests here.

Q. Do you believe that it is possible to establish the people of Ireland in the ownership of Ireland by peaceful means?

A. We've adopted a completely flexible approach to this question. We're convinced that there must be a revolution of all the people of Ireland. No revolution is necessarily a bloody revolution, but it must be a revolution of the people, who must understand that they want change in society. They must be given this understanding by a revolutionary movement such as ours.

The manner in which the people through a revolutionary movement take power could be either through a popular demonstration and unrest; it could be through the ballot box, by the people electing revolutionaries for a revolutionary purpose; or it could be by armed revolt.

And as I say, we have a completely flexible outlook on this. Our objective in our strategy has been over the last five years a policy of economic resistance, number one. This is the people in their local area resisting economic domination either by foreign British interests or by native gombeen men, native capitalist interests.

Secondly, political action, either in the streets, in public protests, in sit-ins, take-overs, in civil-rights demonstrations, etc. This phase of the struggle could reach finality on these methods but if not, we're quite prepared to follow up with military action.

We are completely aware that even in the event of gaining the support of the majority of the people in a democratic election that right-wing forces in this country either in the North or in the South would endeavor to ensure that we would never take power. This is one of the primary reasons why we are convinced that a political movement on its own would end in failure. It must be backed by military force of the people for such an eventuality.

We are explaining to the people precisely what the philosophy of freedom is, an idea of what ownership of the country will mean to them in practical terms.

We are particularly concerned with ensuring that the political structure will not be totalitarian, will not be

bureaucratic in any way. In other words, that power must come from below upwards, not from the top downwards. James Connolly devoted some attention to this, and he stated quite clearly that state socialism is nought but state capitalism.

His objective which we would completely support is that the ownership of the wealth-producing processes, the means of production, distribution and exchange, must be in the hands of the state but the control must be in the hands of the people, must be in the hands of the workers through cooperatives, etc.

In other words, it's state ownership and cooperative control by the workers. In this way we would avoid the bureaucratic state ownership and state control of all aspects of the economy and have the power really in the hands of the workers whose cooperatives and other regional groupings would elect the representatives to the state assembly, thus maintaining the power from the production unit right up through a regional system of government to the top.

Famine in Northeast Brazil

More than 1,500 starving Brazilian peasants looted food stores of Quierambim city in the northeastern state of Ceara, Leonard Greenwood reported from Rio de Janeiro in the October 9 *Los Angeles Times*. He wrote that the city is in "a virtual state of siege" because the peasants have threatened to return.

One government agency estimates that 2,500,000 persons in the northeast are now suffering famine, a figure that is "extremely conservative," according to Greenwood.

The London *Times* of October 14 reported that a Roman Catholic bishop from the neighboring state of Pernambuco has charged that wages of peasants given emergency jobs in government work camps are not sufficient to feed them. Wages are less than forty-four cents a day.

When the bishop complained to government agencies about the conditions in the camps, he was told that the peasants "are accustomed to misery."

Punishment First, Trial Later

"More than half the people refused bail by magistrates' courts and remanded in custody [in Britain] do not eventually receive a prison sentence.

"A defendant, who by English law is presumed innocent until found guilty, may . . . spend months locked in a cell 23 hours a day awaiting trial. In 1968 (the latest figures available), of 40,278 prisoners remanded in custody, 21,135 were ultimately given non-custodial sentences." — October 11 London *Observer*.

New Interest in the Plague of Fascism

[The following review by Igor Cornelissen of recent books on the phenomenon of fascism was published in the October 24 issue of the Amsterdam weekly *Vrij Nederland*. Our translation is slightly abridged for reasons of space.]

* * *

The Nature of Fascism, edited by S.J. Woolf, Vintage 1969, \$1.95.

Geschichte der Weimarer Republik, by Arthur Rosenberg, Europäische Verlagsanstalt, 11, unveränderte Auflage 1970. DM16 [about US\$4].

Revolution und Räterepublik in Bremen. Herausgegeben von Peter Kuckuk, Suhrkamp Verlag, 1969, DM5 [about US\$1.25].

Die deutsche Revolution 1918-1919. Herausgegeben von Gerhard A. Ritter und Susanne Miller, Fischer Bücherei 1968, DM5.25 [about US\$1.30].

Ernst Hanfstaengl: *Zwischen Weissem und Braunem Haus*, Piper-Verlag 1970.

Over het Fascisme, 2 vols. Uitgave van de SVB, 1970, deel I, G3.90 [about US\$1]; deel II, G4.90 [about US\$1.30]. Available from the ASVA, Weesperstraat, Amsterdam. Volume I includes articles by Vilmar, Abendroth, Guérin, Sering, Romein, Grosser, and De Jonge. Volume 2 by Haug, Czeskleba, Blanke, Thalheimer, Reiche, Marcuse, and Burke.

Daniel Guérin: *Fascisme et grand capital*, Maspéro 1965, FR18.80 [about US\$5.80]. This is a supplemented edition. The same publisher also put out a small book by Guérin, *La Peste brune* [The Brown Plague], reports of trips by the author shortly before and after the fascist seizure of power in Germany. FR6.15 [about US\$1.50].

European Fascism, edited by S.J. Woolf, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, second impression June 1970, 63 shillings [US\$7.56].

Where does the German question begin? Where does the history of National Socialism begin? Can we limit ourselves to the period 1933-1945? The biographers of Hitler and other Nazi luminaries have had a relatively easy time, because they could begin with the birth of their subjects and roll on automatically through the rise, apogee, and decline of the Third Reich.

The most important historical facts are now well known, although there must still be a lot in the archives worth publishing. It is more difficult, it seems, to interpret the facts, or define the standard concepts used in describing Germany before and after 1933.

What is fascism exactly? Hitler based himself (electorally) on an important part of the intermediate layers and middle classes. So far so good, but what did the middle classes want? And didn't hundreds of thousands of Social Democrats and Communists go over to the NSDAP [Nazionalsozialistische Deutsche Arbeiter-Partei—National Socialist German Workers party]? What were their expectations?

Big industrialists supported Hitler financially. But were their—perhaps unspoken—demands fulfilled?

The differences in approach and conclusions appear very clearly from the reports and discussions of the conference organized in 1967 by the Reading Graduate School, which have been published in *The Nature of Fascism*—a fascinating but specialized book. Two questions are central for the period that lies well behind us but unfortunately has not been definitively closed. The first is the one already noted above—who supported the National Socialists; most of all, who gave them financial support, and with what aim and what result? Secondly, could Hitler's seizure of power have been prevented, and by whom?

The only movement that could have kept Hitler from taking power—almost all historians agree on this—was the German workers movement. It was sharply divided into contending factions; but in the last elections (November 1932) it was still altogether stronger than the NSDAP.

But in order to understand why the SPD [Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands—Social Democratic party of Germany] and the KPD [Komunistische Partei Deutschlands—Communist party of Germany] could not get together in an antifascist united front, you have to know the earlier history of the parties. Especially, you have to know their history in the period when these parties, divided since the first world war, missed the chance for a socialist Germany.

The SPD and its related trade-union organization failed because they were stuck in a morass of legality; the KPD because it suffered from a dangerous inclination to putschism combined with an incapacity for correctly analyzing the historical situation.

The Nature of Fascism is concerned primarily with the period 1918-33. In these years the left parties demonstrated their incapacity time after time. As a government party, the SPD followed a policy of far-reaching compromises. In this period also the National Socialists were able to conduct a campaign that made them into a mass party, even before the "real" crisis broke out.

The trail seems to lead back endlessly. The SPD of the Weimar years was a continuation and heir of the mighty party of Bebel and Kautsky, the proud model party of the Second International before the first world war. It had a press with a circulation in the millions, extensive parallel organizations, and brilliant parliamentary leaders. In 1914 the whole business split in two when the SPD—Lenin refused to believe it at first—lined up behind the German national cause. A couple of years later, the faction against the war and for internationalism painfully got under way.

Now we have reached a beginning and a culminating point. The SPD of the Weimar Republic exhibited all the bad qualities of the pre-1914 SPD and in the early

years there were only a few who had the nerve to oppose Kautsky, the almost unchallenged trustee of Marx's spiritual heritage. Rosa Luxemburg did so, and as Peter Nettl's extensive biography of the Polish-German revolutionist shows, she was able also to measure the extent of the earlier SPD's revolutionary conviction.

Already before his book on Rosa Luxemburg appeared, Nettl demonstrated in a detailed article that the SPD in fact had long since become a revisionist party which paid a lot of lip service to Marx but kept strict silence about subjects such as the postrevolutionary period, the revolution itself, and the war question. The SPD was a party of everyday routine. Or, as Parvus so well put it: "From Marx's good old dough, Kautsky has made matzos." (Peter Nettl: "The German Social Democratic Party 1890-1914 as a political model," in *Past & Present*, April 1965.)

The thread of this lamentable incapacity of the left runs life-size through Arthur Rosenberg's classic *Geschichte der Weimarer Republik*. First published in 1935, this book is fortunately once again available. Rosenberg (who must not be confused with the well-known Nazi ideologue Alfred Rosenberg) was a professor of ancient history in Berlin, a member of the Communist fraction in the Reichstag from 1924 to 1926, and later a supporter of the SPD, but as his book makes clear, a very critical supporter.

Arthur Rosenberg, who fled to England in 1933 and later turned up in the U. S., is merciless in his judgment of the SPD. But he is honest and does not spare the Communists (he blames them somewhat for continuing "utopianism"). From the beginning he shows the forces rising up almost unimpeded—the army (in the broad sense, including everything connected with the military), the nationalists (with or without an anti-Semitic sauce), and the industrialists.

The revolution of 1918 held great possibilities. Millions of workers and soldiers supported it and the councils which arose spontaneously (on the Russian model) had great influence. But the majority faction of the socialists—the SPD—wanted them out of the way as soon as possible. After all, these councils were the product of revolutionary disorder and the SPD wanted to get back quickly to the parliamentary arena: "Social reforms and voting rights were and remained the chief objectives of Social Democratic policy and what lies outside this was often ignored or approached in a diffident and inadequate way."

It is hard to explain why Rosenberg wrote such a fascinating and indispensable book. He is not a brilliant stylist. Every page is heavy with information. But the remarkable thing is that this does not bother the reader. You come to the conclusion that Rosenberg has not included any petty details, that *everything* he puts down is essential. He does not stop at exposing the actions of the most notorious figures like Noske, Ebert, and Scheidemann; he explains why nothing more could be expected from leaders with their tradition.

But Rosenberg also lays bare—and that is still more important—how every maneuver of this SPD leadership was followed by a further encroachment of the bourgeoisie, which in turn signified a still further departure from the ideals of the revolution and loss of the social and political conquests previously won.

In January 1919, when the Spartacus revolt was smashed by government troops, it was *apparently* the right-wing Social Democrats who profited. In reality, Rosenberg writes, it was the officers and through them the bourgeoisie.

What was fatal to the German republic was not that Noske used violence but that he used primarily counter-revolutionary army units for this purpose. Noske wanted to be a hangman; his slogan was: *For law and order, and against Spartacus*. In this period also began the "Erschiessungen auf der Flucht," [cases of persons "shot while attempting to escape"].

What took place on a large scale throughout Germany in those years, the undoing of the November revolution, was begun under the leadership of Noske himself in Bremen, a city with a strong left tradition. The little book *Revolution und Räterepublik in Bremen*, published last year, gives a penetrating survey, complete with documents, protocols, and eyewitness reports, of this short-lived experiment. As a further supplement to Rosenberg, *Die deutsche Revolution 1918-1919*, which also consists almost entirely of documents, is indispensable.

In Rosenberg (pages 82-89), where he analyzes Germany's foreign policy in connection with the Versailles Treaty, we also find highlighted two aspects which long outlived Weimar. The first tendency was the "Anglo-Saxon illusion" which originated as far back as the Bethmann-Hollweg period, based on the consideration that, "when worse comes to worst," England would not fight against Germany.

This hope still existed even after 1918 and Prince Max of Baden accepted President Wilson's conditions, on the basis that German troops could remain in the east to defend European civilization against Bolshevism. Hess's flight to England in 1941 (the background of which is still not clear) and certain political conceptions of the participants in the July 20, 1944, plot show that the "Anglo-Saxon illusion" was persistent—and not entirely without reason.

Also bound up with this illusion was the Baltic policy of the new German government. The big landowners of German descent in Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania had welcomed the German invasion. After the November revolution they exhibited an understandable anxiety about Bolshevism. Besides these aristocrats and the supporters of the Soviet Union, there was another grouping, the native farmers and middle classes who aspired to a bourgeois-democratic national state and had the support of the Entente.

The farmers and the German nobility cemented an alliance against Bolshevism, and the choice of the army leadership still in these regions was clear. One after another, fresh forces of German volunteers—with the backing of the Entente—came to help the anti-Bolshevik fighters.

Oppositionist SPDers, the USPD [Unabhängige Sozialdemokratische Partei Deutschlands—Independent Social Democratic party of Germany, a centrist party that later split between the SPD and the KPD], and the Communists sharply criticized the government's eastern policy. The government, in fact, declared that it wanted no war with Russia and had no intention of interfering in the internal affairs of Estonia and Latvia; it also gave as-

surances that German troops still in the Baltic would be withdrawn as quickly as possible.

However, "powerful circles in the German army and the German diplomatic corps thought differently on the Baltic question. They hoped on this occasion to be able to retain at least part of the German conquests in the East and that they could achieve an agreement with England on the basis of a common struggle against Bolshevism, and thus change Germany's entire international position." (Rosenberg.)

Although the German troops "continually" received matériel, provisions, money, and reinforcements, the whole Baltic adventure ended in failure. The alliance with England did not materialize. But the soldiers who arrived in Berlin from Riga formed "the real shocktroops of the counterrevolution," and the German republican government, Rosenberg writes, could not rid itself of the ghosts it itself had conjured up.

According to the Versailles Treaty, the German army could not number more than 100,000 men. The Reichswehr, which was later to form clearly a state within a state, was not ready for adventurism (a putsch) in the first years after the aborted revolution, although at that time also it was antidemocratic and antirepublican through and through. The emperor was gone, but the generals had remained, in the words of the novelist Plievier, who experienced all of this.

And the generals did not permit the bourgeois politicians to stick their noses into military affairs. In reality, Rosenberg writes, the *military estate* was outside the control of the Reichstag. "*In den vielen geheimen Fonds des Reichswehrministeriums fand kein Abgeordneter sich zurecht.*" [No deputy could make head nor tail of the many secret funds of the Ministry of Defense.] Sums of this money went directly to meet the needs of National Socialist groupings, like the one led by Hitler.

There were also private bourgeois individuals who supported the NSDAP at an early stage. In his well-known book *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*, Shirer wondered how the semiweekly anti-Semitic sheet *Völkischer Beobachter* became the property of the NSDAP, which made it into a daily. He also thought of the army secret funds.

Some of the financial angels are known, like Ernst Hanfstaengl, the scion of a prominent family of Munich art dealers who had studied at Harvard. Hanfstaengl fell under Hitler's charm and served him for many years, first as an adviser and later as the director of the foreign press department of the party, until he was forced to flee abroad in 1937.

Hanfstaengl (Putzi to his friends) came directly to the United States and there became one of Roosevelt's advisers. In his recently published memoirs, *Zwischen Weissem und Braunem Haus* [Between the White House and the Brown House], he writes buoyantly of these years. . . .

Although much of what Hanfstaengl says cannot be checked (he quotes conversations at the time), he gives a pleasant impression (very cheery) of the early years of the NSDAP. The party was very much in Putzi's debt. He donated \$1,000 to it, which was a fabulous sum in 1923, as Shirer noted in the introduction to the English edition of these memoirs (*Hitler: The Missing Years*; Lon-

don 1957), when you consider the inflation that prevailed then.

Shirer called Putzi a superficial type, and you also get this impression reading his memoirs. He still seems to find it amusing that he diverted the Nazi bigwigs with his virtuosity on the piano. He even composed some of their marches himself. But Putzi, with his \$1,000, was not alone. Hitler was also an honored guest at the home of the Bechstein family, who played another kind of music; as well as at the home of Frau Gertrud von Seidlitz, who had interests in the Finnish paper industry.

In *The Nature of Fascism* many aspects of the subject are discussed, including the relation between German and Italian fascism and the intellectuals. Considerable attention is paid to the influence of economic factors on fascism and vice versa. The most important article, the one by T.W. Mason, is also included in the first volume of the SVB-Cahiers *Over het fascisme* [On Fascism]. In translating and publishing very significant historical and theoretical studies on fascism, the SVB has performed a valuable service. But Mason, to come back to him, by no means disputes the fact that big industry cooperated with Hitler in the early period. This cooperation did not, however, he writes, result from any economic plan of the National Socialists. Hitler had hardly any interest in economic problems. Building up an arms industry was the most important thing for him.

After 1936, according to Mason, when the German economy underwent great structural change (lack of imported raw materials and labor), the framework of economic activity in Germany was determined by the political leadership and not the other way around. The fact that the big companies "took advantage" of this framework in a barbaric way does not change anything. They had "identified with National Socialism in order to be able to further their economic development."

The primacy of politics, supposedly, was reestablished in 1933 and maintained. Mason points to various self-destructive measures of the National Socialists, such as the rooting out of thousands of skilled Polish metalworkers from the arms industry at the turning point in the campaign against the Soviet Union, which presumably can only be explained on the basis of a dominance of politics over economics.

Grosser, also, in his articles on the National Socialist economy included in the SVB-Cahier, writes that the rise of Göring, who replaced Schacht in 1936, meant a lessening of the influence of the industrialists on economical and political decisions. But while there seemed to be resistance in the army in 1938 on the part of some officers against the increasingly obvious plans for war, "there is not a single indication of fundamental opposition among the leading industrialists."

Dr. Jan Romein, whose pamphlet written for the Comité van Waakzaamheid [Vigilance Committee] is included in the volume, was one of the few before the war who made an effort to shed light on the economic roots of fascism. As he indicated in a footnote, he made extensive use of Daniel Guérin's book *Fascisme et grand capital* [Fascism and Big Business], which was published in 1936.

Guérin gave a Marxist explanation of the fact that Hitler got support from big industry (Stinnes, Thyssen), while light industry (*Fertigindustrie*)—oriented primarily toward direct consumption—remained firmly attached to

parliamentarianism and had no desire for National Socialism. Guérin saw a representative of this latter capitalist group in Rathenau.

But Guérin did much more than offer a theoretical dissertation (which is too complex to summarize here). By means of speeches and newspaper reports from the years in question, he traced the development of the relationship of forces between the fascists and antifascists. And, although in a different way than Rosenberg, he demonstrated the bankruptcy both of the Social Democracy and Stalinism.

The German proletariat was weakened and demoralized before Hitler came to power, Guérin writes. It was debilitated not only by mass unemployment, not only by the clashes with fascist street gangs, "but above all because the unions did not manage to hang on to the advantages won by the workers."

What I have done thus far is not much more than cite some new publications and, at best, extract a few points from them.

From what has been said above, however, it might seem that the works discussed treat only the directly political or economic sides of fascism. That is by no means the case. In *The Nature of Fascism* (which gives equal attention to the Italian and German systems, as Guérin does also) there are sociological studies. Some of the

contributions to the SVB-Cahiers are also sociological. Furthermore, most of the books and articles contain many references to other literature. It is understandable that in most publications the stress is on Germany and Italy, but this involves a danger that the younger generation may get the impression that fascism was a local phenomenon, which came to power in these countries as a result of "accidents."

In *European Fascism*, a number of specialists offer short treatments of fascism in Italy and Germany but also in Austria, Hungary, Rumania, Poland, Finland, Norway, England, France, Spain, and Portugal. Furthermore, this book includes a bibliography on various countries. The compilation is useful above all for those countries (e.g., England, Norway, Hungary, and Rumania) about whose fascist movements little is known.

The striking thing in the articles on Norway and England is that they likewise constitute biographies of Quisling and Mosley. Mosley also began his political career in the Socialist movement and he also won extensive support from rich industrialists. In 1963 Mosley (who has also published his memoirs) ascribed Hitler's success to the mass unemployment that followed the economic crisis. When he was asked a year later what his chances were, he answered, "None until the crisis breaks out."

Why It Happened

Genocide in the Americas

By Allen Myers

Genocide Against the Indians by George Novack. Pathfinder Press, New York, N. Y. 31 pp. \$.50. 1970.

In his introduction to this pamphlet, George Novack writes that his intention is "not so much to tell what happened (there are plenty of such narratives of varying merit on the library shelves) but *why*. . . I have used the Marxist method of historical materialism to answer this key question."

In a series of three essays, Novack explains the conflict between white man and red man as a conflict between social systems: the developing bourgeois society of the European immigrants and the primitive communism of the Indians.

This conflict centered primarily around the question of land. Living in a hunting society, the indigenous Americans could not even conceive of private land ownership: "The very idea that ancestral lands from which they drew their sustenance could be taken from the people, become an ar-

title of commerce, and be bought and sold was inconceivable, fantastic and abhorrent to the Indian."

For the European settlers, on the other hand, "it was natural to convert everything into private property and thereby exclude the rest of humanity from its use and enjoyment."

The outcome of the struggle was predetermined by the greater technology, organization, and numbers of the immigrants—by the fact that capitalism is a higher form of social development than primitive communism. Novack points out, however, that humanity has paid a high price for the attainment of this higher economic level: not only in the slaughter of millions of the original inhabitants of the Americas but also in the less well-known loss of the Indian social practices of equality, democracy, and concern for one's fellowman.

These ideals will become a reality in human society once again, Novack concludes. This will be accomplished not by a return to the outmoded eco-

nomic conditions of primitive communism, but by human society taking the next step in its evolution, abolishing capitalism and constructing a socialist order.

It is appropriate that a leading role in this transformation will be played by "the descendants of the red, black and brown peoples which were subjugated by the bourgeois property owners on their way to supreme power."

Racist Bosses in Britain

An English employment agency that tries to find jobs for Asians, Africans, and West Indians is meeting with very little success, the London *Times* reported October 19.

The agency, International Personnel, explained its goals: "Our main purpose is not to chase employers who discriminate but to offer a service to employers who want to operate a positive race relations policy."

"The agency," said the *Times*, "has so far found only a handful of jobs, and admits to disappointment at its lack of success."

Appeal for Imprisoned Yugoslav Student Leaders

[The following appeal on behalf of imprisoned Yugoslav student leaders is being circulated in Europe and America. We are including the initial group of signers.]

* * *

We, the undersigned, supporting socialism and the realization of self-management,* ready to defend them against attack of any kind, have been informed of the following cases of repression against the left Yugoslav student movement:

- Two students, *Vlado Mijanovic* and *Bozidar Borjan*, have been arrested. They have been accused mainly because of their involvement in student actions and their efforts to inform Yugoslav public opinion about them: for example, a student hunger strike in support of striking Bosnian miners.

- Yugoslav student and youth journals with a critical orientation are prohibited and immobilized in every way.

- Fourteen students have been accused of slandering Yugoslav society and "disturbing public opinion." Two students, one of whom is in prison, have been accused of subversive activity against the socialist state and people. Three students have been indicted for printing satirical papers. Seven students and one assistant professor have had their passports recalled. Two students have been imprisoned for two months.

The mass media are monopolized by people who level charges at the students, and the latter have no opportunity to answer these attacks.

We are worried about the increasing repression directed at the progressive forces in Yugoslavia and about the future evolution of political life in that country. The situation today reminds us of methods that have been condemned in Yugoslavia itself. Our fear increased when we heard of the drafting of the so-called quarantine law.

* Those who disagree with the general concept of self-management are indicated by an asterisk.

If this draft should become law a dangerous process of repression would begin.

We do not necessarily agree with all the opinions expressed by the Yugoslav comrades. But we think that their criticism was made from a socialist point of view and therefore we demand:

- The immediate release of the Yugoslav students *Vlado Mijanovic* and *Bozidar Borjan*.

- The end of all persecutions of the left Yugoslav student organizations.

- The end of repressive measures against the left Yugoslav student movement.

We support the left Yugoslav students in their right to express their opinions orally or in print.

Signed:

Ernst Bloch, philosopher, Tübingen; Jean-Paul Sartre, philosopher, Paris; Lawrence Daly, general secretary, National Union of Mine Workers, England; Ernie Roberts, assistant general secretary, Amalgamated Union of Engineering and Foundry Workers, England; Professor Noam Chomsky, Cambridge, USA;

Elmar Altvater, Free University, Berlin; H.-D. Bahr, Free University, Berlin; Heinz Brandt, I.G. Metall [Metal Workers Union], Frankfurt; M.J. Broekmeyer, University of Amsterdam; Pierre Broué,* University of Grenoble; Chris Farley, director,

Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation, London; Michael Fengler, film director, Munich; Helmut Fleischer, Free University, Berlin; Guido Furxhi, University of Turin; Lucien Goldmann, Sorbonne, Paris [the internationally known sociologist died October 3 shortly after signing this appeal — *IP*]; André Gorz, *Nouvel Observateur*, Paris; Ken Coates, Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation, West Brighton, England; Ken Fleet, Institute for Workers Control, England;

Alain Krivine, Ligue Communiste, Paris; Ernest Mandel, editor, *La Gauche*, Brussels; David Mercer, playwright, England; Bertram Michel, University of Giessen, West Germany; Ernst Theodor Mohl, University of Frankfurt; Oskar Negt, University of Frankfurt; Christel Neusüss, University of Erlangen; Stan Newens, chairman, Movement for Colonial Freedom, England; Gerd Oesterwind, University of Frankfurt; Lothar Pinkal, Europäische Verlagsanstalt [publishers], Frankfurt; Jean Pronteau, editor, *L'Homme et la Société*, Paris; Reimut Reiche, *Neue Kritik*, Frankfurt; Helmut Schauer, *Neue Kritik*, Frankfurt; Alfred Schmidt, University of Frankfurt; Professor J. Schunmacher, Woodbury, Connecticut; Laurent Schwartz, Secours Rouge [Red Help], Paris; Mario Spinella, *Renascita*, Communist party weekly, Milan; Tony Topham, Institute for Workers Control, England.

Cambridge Students Protest Discipline Code

More than 600 students peacefully picketed outside a meeting of the Cambridge University Council of the Senate October 26. The council is in effect the university governing body.

About 300 of the students conducted an hour-long sit-in in the yard outside the meeting.

The demonstration was called to protest the university's refusal to abolish proctors—disciplinary officers selected without any consultation with the students.

The students are demanding a new

disciplinary code for the university, to be worked out in joint consultation between students and the university staff. They want student representation on the council of the senate.

The demonstration and an earlier protest on October 17 were called by the Cambridge Students' Union. Following the October 26 action, the university vice-chancellor and three members of the senate council agreed to negotiate with five elected student representatives, including the president of the students' union.

Fourth International Denounces Quebec Repression

[The following statement was issued October 25 by the United Secretariat of the Fourth International, the World Party of Socialist Revolution founded by Leon Trotsky in 1938.]

* * *

Under cover of the War Measures Act, the Canadian government headed by Liberal leader Trudeau has unleashed a wave of repression against the people of Québec and Canada. Thousands of troops have occupied Montréal, turning it into an armed camp.

Hundreds of people—including trade-union leaders, professors, lawyers, students, and journalists—have been arrested, interrogated and jailed without charges being laid against them. Books, magazines, and pamphlets by the ton have been confiscated. Lawyers' files have been seized. The Québec police have interpreted the act as a license to ban the distribution of political literature. They have been given the green light by the Tories and Liberals in Ottawa to arrest "anyone in possession of posters, stickers, or pamphlets of a political nature" (Toronto Star, October 16). [Emphasis added.] The act in effect suspends civil liberties won by Canadians over decades of struggle.

The emergency powers are not just aimed at the Front de Libération du Québec [FLQ] which is claiming responsibility for the kidnapping of British diplomat James Cross and the kidnapping and killing of Labor Minister Laporte. Leading members of the Trotskyist organization Ligue Socialiste Ouvrière have been arrested and held incommunicado, including Arthur Young and Penny Simpson, respectively the publicity agent and campaign treasurer of Manon Léger, the candidate of the LSO and the Ligue des Jeunes Socialistes for the Montréal mayoralty.

At least two candidates of the Political Action Front [FRAP], the trade-union-backed party, which participated in the Montréal civic elections, have been arrested. According to Trudeau and company, it is now a crime pun-

ishable by imprisonment for radicals to contest bourgeois elections! The wide-ranging provisions of the act could include the banning of "any organization which any policeman judges guilty of planning revolutionary change" (Toronto Star, October 16).

The Fourth International calls for the immediate repeal of this act and all similar repressive legislation. All political prisoners must be released. All victimization and persecution must stop. Demonstrations for the repeal of the act and in solidarity with all political prisoners should be organized in as many countries as possible.

While sympathizing with the nationalist and anticapitalist sentiments of the FLQ, revolutionary socialists do not think that in the present context of Canada, such actions are the correct means to bring about a mass struggle for an independent socialist Québec.

The Canadian government, no doubt with the advice and guidance of the U.S. State Department, has seized the opportunity to exploit the situation for their own reactionary aims. Trudeau claims that the FLQ is responsible for the violence that exists in Québec. He conveniently ignores the real reasons for the violent reactions of the FLQ—namely, the vi-

olent oppression of the Québec people by the capitalist governments in Montréal and Ottawa in the form of unemployment, poverty, the violation of the most elementary democratic rights including the right to work in and use one's own language.

The mass violence is used by the present rulers of Ottawa and Québec to try and hold back the legitimate movement for the national rights of the Québécois. Attempting to repress the growing mass movement, they have legislated severe restrictions on civil liberties, including bans on demonstrations, laws permitting arrest without warrant, etc.

The same politicians who grieve over the death of Pierre Laporte have nothing to say about the mass killings of the Vietnamese people perpetrated by the American government. They remain silent about the mass murder of the Palestinian refugees in Jordan. They have nothing to say on these questions because they support and are part and parcel of the system of organized violence that is responsible for these atrocities. The attempts by the Canadian government to push back the developing nationalist and socialist movement in Canada through the War Measures Act will not succeed.

The fact that they have to resort to such measures is a sign of their own political bankruptcy.

MEMO **to:** Intercontinental Press
P.O. Box 635, Madison Sq. Station
New York, N.Y., 10010

from:

Name

Street

City State Zip

Country

\$15 enclosed for a one-year subscription.
 \$7.50 enclosed for a six-month subscription.
 Send information about first-class and airmail rates.