



INTERNATIONAL

WORKERS OF THE WORLD — UNITE!

THE AMSTERDAM TRIAL

PABLO AND SANTEN SOON FREE!

Editorial : FACING THE BERLIN CRISIS

The Document of the 81 Communist Parties

by LIVIO MAITAN

Panafricanism, Trade Unions and Revolutionary Marxism

by HÉCTOR LUCERO

The Algiers Coup of April 22nd

by PIERRE FRANK

Khrushchev's Third Reform of Soviet Agriculture

by ERNEST GERMAIN

The Cuban Workers' State

by A ORTIZ

***Documents on* : COSMIC FLIGHT; ALGERIA; JOMO KENYATTA; CUBA**

SHERRY MANGAN

NEWS FROM THE WORLD WORKERS' MOVEMENT AND THE INTERNATIONAL

SPRING
SUMMER 1961

13

2 SHILLINGS
35 CENTS

Contents

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Editorial: <i>Facing the Berlin Crisis</i> | 1 |
| <i>Sherry Mangan</i> | 3 |
| <i>The Amsterdam Trial</i> | 4 |
| <i>A Revolutionary Criticism of the Theses of the Moscow Conference</i> , by Livio Maitan | 11 |
| <i>Panafrikanism, Trade Unions and Revolutionary Marxism</i> , by Héctor Lucero | 23 |
| <i>The Algiers Putsch of April 22nd</i> , by Pierre Frank | 36 |
| <i>Khrushchev's Third Reform of Soviet Agriculture</i> , by Ernest Germain | 41 |
| <i>Statement by Parliamentary Group of the Lanka Samasamaja Party</i> | 46 |
| <i>The Cuban Workers' State</i> , by A Ortiz | 47 |
| Documents: Three Declarations and an appeal by the International Secretariat — | |
| I: <i>On the First Cosmic Flight</i> | 59 |
| II: <i>Immediate and Unconditional Independence of Algeria! Algerian Socialist Republic!</i> | 59 |
| III: <i>Free Jomo Kenyatta!</i> | 60 |
| <i>An appeal: Let Us Mobilize in Defence of the Workers' State of Cuba! Against the Imperialist Invasion</i> | 61 |
| Declaration of the Latin American Bureau of the Fourth International — | |
| <i>The Government, the State and the Partido Obrero Revolucionario (Trotskyist Revolutionary Workers Party) in Cuba</i> | 62 |
| News of the International: | |
| Latin America: <i>The Latin American Bureau of the Fourth International Held Its Fourth Conference and Fourth Latin American Cadres School</i> | 64 |

All Correspondence and Subscriptions via:

PIERRE FRANK, 64 rue de Richelieu, Paris 2.

Rates: Single copies: 35 cents; One year (4 issues): \$1.25
 " " 2 shillings (2/5 postpaid); " " (" "): 8 shillings

Please Send all correspondence to PIERRE FRANK (above mentioned address) and not to the Printshop address.

In the Far East, *Fourth International* is available through the Lanka Sama Samaja Party, 49 Drieberg's Avenue, Colombo 10, Ceylon.

In Great Britain, through Jordan's International Bookshop, 4 Dane Street, Nottingham.

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL, the English-language edition of the theoretical organ of the International Executive Committee of the Fourth International, is published four times a year at 59 via della Frezza, Rome, Italy. *Direttore Responsabile:* LIVIO MAITAN. Autorizzazione Tribunale di Roma N° 7763 del 22 Novembre 1960. TI.BA., Via della Frezza, 59, Roma
Printed in Italy

★

FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

ENGLISH - LANGUAGE EDITION OF THE THEORETICAL ORGAN OF THE
INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

Number 13

Spring - Summer 1961

Editorial

FACING THE BERLIN CRISIS

During the last months, the position of imperialism in the world have steadily deteriorated.

In South-East Asia, as it may easily be understood, it is not only the future of Laos which is involved: it is a whole important part of this continent which is again shaken by a crisis. Among other things, the regime of the puppet Diem is completely rotten and nobody could wonder about its eventual collapse, whereas, elsewhere, the military coup in Seoul is only one more brilliant demonstration of the decomposition of the regime in South Korea where the mass movements have undergone a vigorous renewal. In Iran, the Shah is making a last effort through the spectacular turn he was forced to make; but it is obviously a reform from the top, of course insufficient and which will not be able to neutralize the explosive situation in Iran.

Indeed, after the long interval which followed the defeat suffered with the fall of Mossadegh, the masses are again mobilized and shall not be satisfied with the crumbs that the reformer Amini would grant them.

In Africa, while the FLN maintains and even strengthens its positions in the course of the Evian negotiations, the guerrilla has now begun on a very large scale in Angola, and in South Africa we are probably on the eve of a turn in the orientation of the struggle against the abominable regime of Verwoerd, after the new failure of the out-dated methods which were adopted by the present majority organizations. In Latin America the pitiful failure of the aggression against the Cuban Workers' State needs no comment: this is the clearest sign

of an exploding situation which is still more and more clearly developing in a number of countries of this continent.

This evolution of events could not but influence the crisis of the American leadership which, in spite of the "innovators" of the new President, has not been overcome so far. In fact Kennedy has been faced with very heavy problems. Before having even had enough time to put some order in his own house, he has had to determine his plans in other spheres. One must not forget also that he is always facing serious internal difficulties, because he cannot rely on a stable and sufficiently broad majority and needs often to form an alliance with a "Southern" wing which may make him pay a very high price for the support he obtains from them. In a period when the African problems are on the agenda, it is not easy to manoeuvre, even with the local bourgeoisies, if concessions must be granted to people whose ideal is Verwoerd's South Africa.

Long discussions have been held about the reasons which, in the framework of the above situation, have pushed Kennedy on the one hand, and Khrushchev on the other, to agree to meet at Vienna. As for Kennedy, several commentators have spoken about the necessity and of his desire to cut short the manoeuvres of his own apparatus. It also seems probable that he has been willing to take, to a certain extent, an initiative through which he hoped to get out of the blind alley in which he had been visibly forced. But, on the basis of the statements made after the conference it appears that for Kennedy as well as for Khrushchev, the chief aim of obtaining a direct contact was to try to un-

derstand more clearly the aims of the adversary and to fix one's own - brutally, if need be. Given the evolution of the relationship of forces during the last years, it was unavoidable that Khrushchev should take the initiative and that Kennedy should be put on the defensive.

The further evolution of events has confirmed that the meeting at Vienna could not go beyond a confrontation of the respective positions and aims and that considerable changes could not result from it. In fact the international tension has ever-increased since then.

Thus, the talks on Laos are going on and it is most probable that the eventual solution will basically be a formal compromise. The evolution in this country will be more determined by the political and military relationship of forces which has established itself than by agreements which are likely to be made. This, practically means that imperialism will find itself, sooner or later, in front of a dilemma, either to rush into a direct intervention (with all the consequences which can easily be foreseen) or to give up, without a real resistance, another important position in South-East Asia. Concerning the problem of nuclear tests, their suspension seems in danger from now. If there are no important changes within a short period, the United States will resume their tests and the USSR will be obliged to act accordingly. The tension will consequently become greater.

But, despite the seriousness of problems such as that of Laos, or nuclear tests, the question of Berlin seems to be bound to occupy first place during the second half of 1961. Khrushchev's statements were clear: the USSR wants to conclude a peace treaty with East Germany, and if the capitalist nations do not accept it, they will sign a unilateral agreement. That means that the question of Berlin and of Germany will once more be put in an exceptionally acute form.

The explosive nature of the Berlin question needs no demonstration. For the American imperialists, to go backwards on Laos is a bitter pill, but in the last instance, they can stand it. Concerning Berlin, such a possibility does not

exist: indeed a defeat in the fight for this German city would mean for the US a major defeat, of incalculable consequences and precisely in this part of the world where in the last decade they have succeeded in winning rather strong support. If Western Europe was even to quiver, the world prospects of imperialism, already so deeply shaken in other parts of the world, would become catastrophic within a rather short time.

Kennedy and the imperialist leadership risk finding themselves within some months before a decisive choice and the temptation of entering into a series of actions whose final issue could be a world conflict, will be at that time very great. Even though Dulles disappeared some years ago, the world will again be placed, according to a sadly famous expression, "on the brink."

Of course, it is not excluded — and for us it is even probable — that at a certain moment, Khrushchev — whose interest it is, from all points of view, to avoid the outburst of a new World War — will find a way of escape which, while allowing him to make some gains, will not place his adversaries totally against the wall. But the situation stays and will stay serious and nobody could give a priori guarantees that the race to the brink will not end this time without a fatal fall.

Consequently, the world workers' movement, the workers' and peasants' parties of all countries, the trade unions and all the mass organizations have the duty to denounce with the greatest vigour the war plans of the imperialists. The popular masses — who would anyway pay tragically for the costs of an atomic war — must be mobilized against war, more than ever in the past. And to fight against war does not only mean to be mobilized in specific campaigns, but also, above all to fight in order to undermine everywhere, more and more the very bases of the capitalist regime, which is unceasingly impulsed towards war by its very nature, in spite of the formidable blows it has suffered in the last decades.

SHERRY MANGAN

The Fourth International is in mourning. Sherry Mangan, former member of the International Secretariat and member of the International Executive Committee, died on the 24th June, 1961, at the age of 57.

Born of a bourgeois American family, he studied at Harvard University. He won a certain reputation in America literature and demonstrated a real journalistic talent, when, in the years of crisis between the two World Wars, he turned his attention to social problems and the workers' movement. His general temperament and combativity rapidly led him to the American Trotskyist organisation of the Fourth International. Unlike a certain number of intellectuals of his country, he remained loyal until his last breath to the program and organization of the World Socialist Revolution.

In 1940, being in Paris as the correspondent of an American newspaper, he helped the underground activity of the French section of the Fourth International and was therefore expelled from France by the Petain Government. He then used the opportunities offered by his work as a journalist to help the Fourth International ensure liaison during the War, despite the controls and censorship. At the end of the war, he settled in Paris and was elected a member of the European Secretariat, and then of the International Secretariat. He was the main author of the Statutes of the Fourth International adopted at the Second World Congress in 1948.

As he was European correspondent for the American review, "Fortune", he was called before

Macarthy's Un-American Activities Committee. In front of this Committee, he courageously asserted his communist convictions and was therefore deprived of his job.

His health was already bad and he was obliged to interrupt his political activity, though always staying in the closest continual contact with the International.

During the crisis in 1953 in which the S W P International were opposed to each other, and despite the numerous links he had with the S W P, he stood fully by the side of the International, although always putting his utmost efforts into trying to find a way to end this crisis.

Around this period, he remained several years in Bolivia, living with the miners, and writing a remarkable novel on their life, which has not as yet been published.

Although weakened by his illness, he took up again his place and his work in the International Secretariat of the Fourth International at the Fifth World Congress in 1957. He did his share of the activity in defense of the Algerian Revolution and he greatly helped in the issuing of the English language edition of the theoretical organ of the Fourth International. He continued his work up to the last moment, for this issue of the "Fourth International".

The Fourth International will keep alive the memory of his unlimited devotion to the cause of the workers and humanity. When the time comes we will not fail to see that his memory is rightly honoured by the American proletariat.

ACTIVIST MILICIANO

As he felt the wall against his back and against the back of his head, he thought: The glint of sun I see on those rifles is the last glint of sun I shall see on rifles, or on anything else.

The thought seemed to him too personal for this moment, which — with three hundred others coming after

him, the counteroffensive broken, and the loss of four towns, was more than merely individual. But he was no theoretician, had no last words, and even as he heard the snick of the bolts clicking into place, all he could think was: I did the best I could, so it's all right. Still, after a lifetime at it, it's hard not to be here to see how it all came out.

SHERRY MANGAN

THE AMSTERDAM TRIAL

An Important Episode in the History of the Fourth International

PABLO AND SANTEN TO BE RELEASED IN SEPTEMBER NEXT

On July 12, the Court which sat in Amsterdam in judgment on our comrades Pablo and Santen, sentenced them to 15 months in prison. As, at that time, they had already been in "preventive detention" for thirteen months, they will be released in September next.

Big efforts were made by powerful police and governmental circles to launch a provocation against the Fourth International, aimed at discrediting two of its main political leaders, including its Secretary, Michel Raptis (Pablo). These efforts sought to hide the political action of aid to the Algerian revolution by trying to present the case as a common criminal action. The sentence and the trial which preceded it therefore signify a big success for our movement.

It was indeed a big political trial which will range amongst the important trials made by Capitalism against the Workers' Movement. This was due to the efforts made collectively made by our movement and all our friends in the world during the thirteen months of the scandalous preventive detention of Pablo and Santen: the very broad international campaign conducted in their defense, the testimonies made in their favour during the trial by well-known personalities of the European Workers' movement, the quality of the pleadings, the students' demonstrations in the streets of Amsterdam, and last but not least, the exemplary attitude of our two comrades, have all destroyed all of the carefully prepared machinations of the police and of the authorities. A trial prepared by various secret polices of Western Imperialism (including the FBI, as was shown during the trial), against the leadership of the Fourth International, has become a trial of the crimes of Imperialism against the invincible Colonial Revolution, against the victorious march of Socialism throughout the world.

Each day, during the trial, all the Dutch papers published extensive articles on the Affair, giving it the prominence it deserved. Unfortunately the big Press of other European countries remained, on the contrary, very silent, thus giving the measure of its "independence" of Western Imperialism. This barrier of silence gives all the more value to the countless proofs of sympathy and effective solidarity our movement received throughout the world. We wish to thank here the newspapers and organizations of the world Workers' movement who have published or issued articles and declarations in defense of Pablo and Santen. We also thank all the Committees of Aid and Defense which were formed and the various figures of the Left who came forward as witnesses in the trial. Their intervention had major importance in giving the trial all its political content and resonance in favour of the Colonial Revolution and especially the Algerian Revolution, as well as for the ideas of Socialism. They have also strongly contributed in stressing the irreproachable revolutionary character of Pablo and Santen, their human valour and shattering the despicable attempts to show them as common criminals. It is the whole of the Workers' and Socialist movement which shall reap the benefits.

The youth of Amsterdam were in the vanguard of the demonstrations which lasted throughout the whole trial and which demanded the liberation of Pablo and Santen and aid for the war of liberation of the Algerian people. Having begun with the distribution of leaflets and picketing, in which they held big placards with these slogans, the movement culminated on Saturday 24th June in a demonstration during which there were violent clashes with the police when people in the street expressed their sympathy with the demonstrators and joined their ranks. The whole Dutch press printed impressive photos of this demonstration, the like of which had not been seen in Amsterdam for a long time.

During the first day of the trial, immediately after the opening examination, Mr Smeets, Sal Santen's lawyer, asked in a very detailed and juridically strongly based pleading, that the indictment be declared invalid and that Raptis and Santen be immediately released. He demonstrated that the indictment was very vague and full of contradictions. Mr Worst, lawyer for Michel Raptis (Pablo) also supported this demand.

Nevertheless, after two hours' deliberations, the Court rejected it.

Further to Mr Smeets and Mr Worst, the defense of our comrades was effected by Mr Cammelbeeck, a Socialist Senator, who had made a big contribution in Holland to the political campaign for Raptis and Santen.

The interrogation of our two comrades took place on the second day, when they refuted with much vigour many erroneous points and irregularities in the preparatory investigations and the indictment. In reply to several attempts by the President of the Court to obtain from our comrades declarations concerning the Algerian Resistance, Pablo repeatedly exclaimed: "We have nothing to declare concerning the Algerian Resistance, nothing to criticise, to remark, to say thereon. All that is done by the Algerian Resistance is well-done. Glory and Honour to the heroic fighters of the Algerian Revolution!" Also when the President more-or-less reproached him for having had several pseudonyms, he said: "This is a current practice in the revolutionary movement. During my long life as a militant, I had to continually defend myself against the repressions of dictatorial regimes: first, in my own country, then against the Gestapo, Stalin's O G P U, and then the "Red Hand" which is in the service of colonialism".

On the same day, the Court also heard the deposition of the provocateur Hompe, who confirmed entirely his role as an agent of the Dutch Secret Police (BVD), to whom he went regularly each month to deliver his reports, since the 13th January, 1960 (our comrades were arrested on 10th June, 1960).

Then came the first witness for the defense: Professor Laurent Schwartz, world-known mathematician (whom the Court did not afford the possibility of making his declaration orally — this was read by Pablo's lawyer), declared he had known Michel Raptis for a long time and could therefore be witness to his political intelligence, to his polit-

ical morality and of his high ideals. "It is absolutely evident that all his motives were political and were completely disinterested. One cannot blame him for having gone beyond the framework of the laws: in certain circumstances this is unavoidable. I myself, who occupy in France a very respectable position, as Professor of Mathematics at the Faculty of Science (Sorbonne), was persecuted during the War as a Jew and as a member of the Resistance. I could survive only with false identity cards for my wife, my baby and myself. At that time, I myself made such false papers to help friends."

Then came the British Labour Party Member of Parliament, John Baird, to recall the Dutch traditions of struggle for liberty, which were particularly well-demonstrated during the years of the Occupation. He reminded the Court that at that time a great quantity of false papers were made in Great Britain to help the Dutch Resistance and were parachuted into Holland. Three other Labour Members of Parliament, Konni Zilliacus, Stephen Swingle and William Griffiths had asked to be allowed to testify in favour of Pablo and Santen, but the Court refused them permission to speak in the trial, arguing that they did not know our comrades personally. Konni Zilliacus held a press conference in which he declared that Pablo and Santen worked for the good of humanity and for the cause of the independence of Algeria and that is why their case meets with such sympathy in England where the fight of the F.L.N. for the freedom of their country finds very wide sympathy.

Concerning the question of military help to the F.L.N., he also stated: "The world has just seen how a World Power carried out a similar action on a gigantic scale for the Cuban rebels and mercenaries who attacked Cuba; up to now I have not heard any protests against this action either from the Dutch government or from the British government. This action of the American Government was an infraction not only of International Law, but also of half a dozen treaties. After that it is really in bad faith to condemn these two men for having done the same thing on a much smaller scale, for a much more superior cause." Due to the stand taken by the Court the Dutch publicist, Fons Hermans, who actively participated in Holland in the campaign for the Algerian Freedom Fight, and wrote a booklet on it, was also prevented from speaking for Pablo and Santen.

Nevertheless, the quantity and quality of the testimonies were so substantial that the Prosecutor remarked ill-humouredly during his speech: "We knew perfectly well that these two men acted from political and disinterested motives, it was useless having such a large number of personalities come here to say that". He visibly forgot that all the preparations for the trial had been made precisely in order to demonstrate the contrary!

We reproduce after this article, the declaration of our comrade Livio Maitan who, vigorously applauded by the public gallery, ended his declaration with the cry of: "Long live the Algerian Revolution! Long live the Fourth International!"

The third day of the trial was also largely occupied with testimonies: Claude Bourdet, the well-known French journalist, Paris Municipal Councillor and leader of the P.S.U., summarised in a well-argued and documented political declaration, the last conversations he had had in France in 1958 with Michel Pablo. He stressed the political clarity and foresight of Pablo who had long foreseen the development of the contradictions within the French bourgeoisie

itself concerning the evolution of the Algerian Affair and the reactionary, even fascist, attempts which occurred in January 1960 and April 1961. He declared it was in the basic interest of all French democrats and members of the workers' movement to fight against the Fascist threat, together with the Algerians who were fighting against the same fascists for the freedom of Algeria. Then came the historian Isaac Deutscher who praised highly the intellectual and moral qualities of Pablo and his life entirely devoted to the fight for Socialism. He especially stressed the high quality of his political conceptions, quoting his last draft article on the question of the liberation of women, published in the Summer 1960 issue of *FOURTH INTERNATIONAL* immediately after his arrest. The French writer and ethnologist, Michel Leiris, also came to testify to his high appraisal of Pablo and the confidence he has in him.

A French lawyer, Mr Yves Jouffa, was instructed by the French Comité de Soutien, to follow the trial as a juridical observer.

The Belgian lawyer, Marc de Cock, who has for years been defending the Algerians whom French Imperialism prosecutes even in Belgium and kills through the intermediary of the "Red Hand", gave an important explanation concerning the French identity cards which Pablo and Santen were accused of having supplied to the Algerians. He pointedly explained that these identity cards were not compulsory, which made the whole of this part of the indictment (aimed at demonstrating that Pablo and Santen had acted against the French State) completely without foundation. The Belgian Professor Pierre le Greve, of Brussels, who, one year ago, narrowly escaped from a bomb attack made against him by the "Red Hand", (our readers will remember another Belgian professor, the late H Laperche, who was a fatal victim of a similar simultaneous attack in Liege) and who came to demonstrate how French Imperialism organizes on Belgian territory the persecution and murder of Algerian fighters. He brought before the Court a document formally proving this statement, but the Court refused to take cognisance of this document.

After the testimonies made by the Dutch trade union militant, Maurice Ferares, and comrade Pierre Frank (who was interrupted by the Court as he was explaining how it was necessary to fight against Imperialism to support the Algerian revolution, Mrs Sneevlie, widow of the great Dutch revolutionary shot by the Nazis in 1941, ended in a very moving way this exceptional series of testimonies, which were completed by a letter of the French writer Jean Guehenno which was read by Mr Worst.

The President of the Court then announced he would read a letter from comrade Nathalia Trotsky which declared:

"I know personally Michel Raptis and Sal Santen and I wish to tell you at this moment when their trial is taking place, my esteem for these militants, the sincere integrity, their complete devotion to their convictions, who could not for one moment be suspected of obeying personal or self-interested motives. Their long detention in conditions which were those of common criminals, seems to me particularly revolting as would be any sentencing of two true revolutionaries who fight with courage and self-denial for their ideals.

"My health and my age prevents me from going to Amsterdam to testify in person as to my sympathy and

my high esteem for them — which, I pray you, Mr President, will make known to the Court”.

Much comment was made the next day in the Dutch Press on this episode in the trial, in every newspaper. One of them, the “*Algemeen Dagblad*” published an extensive article entitled “*Trotsky Still Speaks*”.

All these testimonies had largely eclipsed the miserable declaration of Joop Zwart, agent of the BVD, boss and author of the actions of the provocateur, Hompe.

After the lengthy speech of the Prosecutor, which lasted about six hours and concluded with a request for a sentence of three years for Raptis and two years for Santen the last day of the trial was devoted to the pleas of the three defense lawyers, who refuted in a most brilliant, serious

and moving manner the indictment and the Prosecutor's concluding address. Mr Cammelbeeck stressed especially the political character of this whole affair from the point-of-view of the help given by Raptis and Santen to the Colonial Revolution as well as from the point-of-view of the counter-revolutionary actions of the secret police of Western Europe and North America.

Lastly our comrades made their final declarations: both of them excellent ones. We can only quote in this issue the conclusion of comrade Pablo's declaration: comrade Santen's having been given in Dutch and now being translated. All these documents will be published in extenso in the booklet which will be issued on this trial, an important episode in the history of the Fourth International and its struggles.

DECLARATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SECRETARIAT

On the trial of Comrades Michel Raptis and Sal Santen (issued on June 1st, 1961)

The trial of Comrades Michel Raptis (Pablo) and Sal Santen, respectively Secretary and member of the Secretariat of the Fourth International, has been fixed for the 21st., 23rd., 26th., and 27th. June, 1961, in Amsterdam.

Our comrades are accused of diverse activities of material support to the Algerian revolution.

The Fourth International assumes full responsibility for the activity of its two imprisoned leaders and proclaims it highly as its own and as absolutely in conformity with the revolutionary principles and conceptions which are its own.

It denies to the imperialist Court the right to judge revolutionary militants for their action in favour of the great cause of liberation from the colonial yoke which moves the greatest part of humanity. The intended trial of the comrades Pablo and Santen is one of the expressions of a regime of oppression and exploitation, which, in the whole world, recoils before the uprising of oppressed peoples and which tries to subsist by repression and terror. All Courts which pretend to judge the activity of revolutionaries acting in accord with their convictions, are only instruments of imperialist and bourgeois justice, which seek to maintain a regime condemned by History.

The French Courts have sentenced thousands of militants of the Algerian revolution and of anti-colonialist Frenchmen and men from other countries who are aiding them; they condemn to death hundreds of Algerian militants who fight for a cause which the French government today has to recognise as legitimate. At the moment in which it must negotiate with these Leaders who these militants have chosen to lead their struggle. These judgements, these sentences will stand before History as crimes committed in defense of Imperialist privilege. These Courts which have sentenced to death men and women who fought for a cause which the power of the Algerian revolution has now made triumphant, will appear as the executioners, the legal covers of imperialist repression.

In the whole world, this imperialist and bourgeois “justice” works to cover up and to justify repression and tyranny: just as the Yankee Courts which for the same faults sentence to death negroes and acquit whites, or

which sentence to death the Porto-Ricans fighting for their independence; just as the Courts of Batista which sentenced Fidel Castro.

In the vast front of international repression, organised against the liberatory revolution of the colonial and oppressed people, Dutch imperialism assumes its tasks of executioner with a base zeal, in defending its privileges, its investments and what remains of its domination.

The “justice” of Dutch imperialism —which continues to be the partner of French imperialism in NATO— had the occasion of exercising itself against the struggle of liberation of the Indonesian people, and it still partakes in present imperialist politics in West Irian and elsewhere.

Our comrades have helped the struggles of the Algerians exposed to arbitrary arrest and persecution, deprived of their elementary rights and submitted to the most cruel treatment, in France as in Algeria. They have helped them to escape that repression. They helped with all their forces the revolutionary efforts of the Algerian masses to expel French imperialism.

For imperialist legality, these are faults and even crimes. This “legality” considers of course as such all attempts to escape its methods of police and fascist repression. It judges “illegal” the armed insurrection of peoples against its domination and exploitation. But it is by insurrection, revolution, by escaping from repression and opposing it with violence and with weapons, that immense sectors of humanity commence to conquer their most elementary rights, to throw off the imperialist yoke, and to open up for themselves the way to a dignified and human life.

The Fourth International for its part has reorganised its activities according to this immense upsurge of the colonial and oppressed peoples which, in the present phase, represent the main sector of the world revolution.

Continuing the revolutionary internationalist traditions of the communist movement of Marx and Engels, the Fourth International does not restrict itself to proclaiming the rights of peoples it militates actively for their insurrection and for the triumph of their revolution. It puts

into practice the principles of the Communist International of Lenin and Trotsky which admitted in its ranks only the parties and organisations which engaged ... "in support not only in words but in deeds for every movement of emancipation in the colonies, and to demand the expulsion of the Metropolitan imperialists from the colonies," as was stated in the 21 Conditions for admission into the Communist International.

Our International in the application of its principles, lives in the same struggle, carries out the same actions and faces the same perils as millions of men and women mobilised for the anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist revolution throughout the whole world.

But the Dutch police does not dare accuse our comrades openly of activity in this respect. Playing skillfully its role of agent of international repression it utilizes against comrades Pablo and Santen, provocations, amalgams, and the most arbitrary methods. It aims at compromising these leaders of the Fourth International by way of false accusations such as that of complicity in an affair of forgery.

Our comrades energetically reject this accusation which has been made up with the complicity of the Dutch, French and German police.

It will not be comrades Raptis (Pablo) and Santen who will be judged in this trial. As in trials held in France, against the Jeanson network and the different "networks" of help to the Algerian revolution, against the Algerian militants, it is criminal imperialism which will be judged. With it will be judged the arbitrary police methods, the secret police, the international police, who are instituting a regime of repression and provocations, to try and halt the internal and external disorderly retreat of the imperialist regimes.

The Court, which will deliver this judgement, will not of course be that which is organised to defend the privileges of imperialism, but that of the colonial peoples, that of the peoples who have overthrown capitalism and built workers states: that of the European workers, and among them the Dutch workers, who knew during the difficult hours of Fascism how to rise against oppression and terror, for the defense of human dignity.

It is our profound confidence in these forces — which are those which are today advancing Humanity and will do so in the future — which gives to comrades Pablo and Santen and which gives to the Fourth International their confidence with the approach of the trial.

This trial, which will be held after seen years of heroic struggle by the Algerian people for their liberation, under the leadership of the F L N, and soon after the heroic Cuban people, organised in their militias, have inflicted a defeat on imperialism, is a part which the Fourth International takes in this vast struggle which is taking place in the world between a regime in collapse and the new society which is pushing its way forward. Our comrades will represent with dignity, the confidence and strength of the world revolution.

The Fourth International salutes Michel Raptis (Pablo) and Sal Santen as the the defenders of its revolutionary flag.

They are going to this trial with the support of a powerful movement of solidarity which has shown itself throughout the world: in Latin America, in the United States, in Europe, in Africa, in Asia, in Australasia. This vast international movement has made heard to the Dutch authorities, the protests and indignation of the revolutionary colonial movements, the socialist and workers movements, the youth and students organisations, the intellectuals' movements who militate against colonialism and take part in the revolutionary struggles of humanity.

This international protest against the arbitrary detention of comrades Raptis (Pablo) and Santen, this call for their immediate release, the Fourth International takes them up again as the trial approaches with all its strength. It launches a new appeal to all the workers' forces, to all the forces of the colonial revolution, to all the socialist and communist forces, to all the youth and intellectuals' organisation, so that they demand the acquittal and liberation of Pablo and Santen from the prisons of Dutch imperialism.

In front of this colonialists trial, the Fourth International reaffirms its unshakable will to continue and increase its struggle for the triumph of the colonial revolution, for the struggle for socialism in the world.

It reaffirms its determination to fight for an independent and socialist Algeria and greets, on this occasion, the F L N, which leads the heroic struggle, heavy with the greatest sacrifices, of the valiant Algerian people. It has confidence in the militants of the F L N to carry the Algerian revolution forward to the Algerian and Mahgreb Socialist Republic.

It reaffirms its complete solidarity with and total support for its leaders Michel Raptis (Pablo) and Sal Santen.

Long live the Algerian and Colonial Revolution!

Long live the world Socialist Revolution!

FROM THE FIRST DECLARATION OF COMRADE PABLO DURING THE TRIAL

... I lived as a militant through the cataclysm of fascism in Germany and in Europe, through the thirties, and also lived as a militant through the cataclysm of the Second World War. I drew from all that the conclusion that a certain quantity of courage, of intelligence and critical spirit is necessary to every citizen so that liberty shall live, so that the horrors of war be avoided, so that society should not fall under the slavery of the bureaucratic privileged minorities. Neither the threat of fascism, nor the

threat of war or of dictatorship are absent from the present world. It can be clearly seen from what is going on in France, in Africa (from Algeria to Angola to South Africa), in Latin America (from Cuba to Chile), or from the East-West relations, from Laos to Berlin.

I shall only say a few words on the Algerian drama, which is at the foundations of the affair you are judging, Mr. President, Messres Judges. I am wondering whether men and women, Christian and civilized people, of Western

Europe, well-established in their relative material comfort, are conscious of what is going, for already seven years in Algeria, and what is going on presently in Angola, or for instance of the drama of the Congolese children, dying in thousands of hunger. Are they conscious to what extent our civilization is still a superficial one, which one has only to scratch to see emerge an incredible potential of cruelty, violence and injustice towards our brothers, the coloured people cruelly oppressed and exploited?

Have people in Western Europe really realized the horrors of the colonial war in Algeria, the fact that there were seven years of massacre and torture, about one million dead on the Algerian side, more than two million poor peasants chased away from their villages, displaced, regrouped in emergency camps, more than 250,000 Algerian refugees in Morocco and Tunisia, most of them being elderly men, women and above all children, war orphans, more than 30,000 Algerian militants in the prisons and concentration camps of France itself? And nevertheless, these figures are quoted in the official press of France, and in the innumerable literary documents and other documents which were issued on this colonial war, the most atrocious in our century.

Can one simply shut his eyes to these facts and lead each one "quietly" his own selfish little life without occupying himself with "the devil of politics"? I do not think so. I firmly believe that politics, that is to say the science of the knowledge, of the organisation, and of the ruling of society, must occupy a primordial place in the life of every free and critical man, in order to avoid disasters and to lead humanity as quickly as possible towards the abolition of oppression, of exploitation, and towards the most complete possible blooming of the individual.

Mr President, Messres Judges,

I have the honour of being for already 32 years, since the beginning of my life as a conscious man, a member of a historical movement created by L. Trotsky, at present known as the Fourth International. It is in the ranks of this movement that I have learnt the real meaning of

the fight for Socialism and the socialist society of tomorrow. This meaning has been temporarily obscured by the features of bureaucratic degeneration and deformation, which were forced upon the Workers' Power in the USSR and elsewhere during the time of Stalin, due to the backward character of Tsarist Russia, and the prolonged international isolation of the October Revolution.

But now we have entered, in an impetuous, irreversible manner into the era of the world expansion of the Socialist Revolution which will restore a victorious vigour to all fundamental ideas, in the field of economy, of democracy and socialist culture, elaborated in the face of storms and tempests over the decades, by L. Trotsky and the Fourth International.

And it is my profound conviction that the era of atomic energy, of sputniks, of the beginning of the conquest of the osmos, will prove to be on the social plane, as the beginning of a new civilization, the first deserving this name in the cruel, thousands of years long, story of Humanity, which it will recognise in the ideas and the programme of the Fourth International, its pioneers, lucid and conscious, the true vanguard of the socialist and communist international movement.

One more word, before ending. I do not as yet know what culpability and what sentence the Court will give to Sal Santen. I declare that I am ardently willing to share both with him. I seize this opportunity, which after all is not so badly chosen, to pay homage to the hard, but so pure and courageous, life of Sal Santen, entirely dedicated to the service of the humble.

I have finished, Mr President, Messres Judges, and my last words will be to pay homage to the Heroic Algerian Revolution which, thanks to the immense sacrifices of its fighters, is now anyway virtually victorious. I have the best hopes for the prompt, total and real independence of Algeria, whose magnificent struggle has during seven years served as an example for all oppressed people in Africa and everywhere and for whom, my organisation and myself have had the honour of making an effort and sacrifices which are after all a minimum compared with the effort and the sacrifices of her own sons. . ."

FROM THE LAST DECLARATION OF COMRADE PABLO DURING THE TRIAL

"... My activity in Denmark and in England was essentially political, for the Algerian revolution. There is in the files seized by the police many letters and documents which show that the aim of my voyage to Denmark was to set under way Committees for Free Algeria and committees for the 30,000 Algerian prisoners in France, that I was there for meetings of students in which the representatives of the FLN came and spoke in Copenhagen, in Sweden, in Norway; that in England, with the collaboration of friends of the Labour Party: Mr John Baird, Mr Michael Foot, Mr Crossman, Miss Lee (the widow of the late Aneurin Bevan). With Mr Griffiths and others, we set under way committees for Free Algeria and we launched a journal, "Free Algeria", for which, as is known, I sent money from Germany.

"Naturally I have nothing against aiding the Algerians

to procure arms for themselves. The Algerians were fighting alone, absolutely alone over many years, exterminated en masse by tens and hundreds of thousands by all the forces of a very powerful imperialism, with the aid of NATO to this imperialism, searching desperately for arms to defend themselves for survival, I consider it as an honour to have aided them, unfortunately very modestly.

"Mr Prosecutor, you wish to sentence me to suffer three years in prison as I have served already thirteen months, thirteen long months, under the regime for the common-law prisoners, in company daily with the common-law prisoners. I say, you condemned me to the regime for the common-law offences and to the regime of obligatory work, compulsory, which is the rule in Dutch prisons. I will say that anyway I protest and will continue to protest against this regime that is not even applied to

Oeldrich in Germany. Certainly, I have no feeling of contempt for my common-law co-detainees, because it is by love of humanity and a great pity for the human condition which I consider to be above all the result of social conditions that I came to Socialism; and prison has done me much good, it has reenforced me in this love of humanity and this immense pity for the human condition, precisely by this daily contact with the weak and the vanquished of this society.

"But this does not prevent, Mr Prosecutor, prison being for me a double pain. I shall undergo it with suffering but with dignity. I would like only to say to you, Mr Prosecutor, that a long imprisonment in the present conditions in which it has to be accomplished today, is a torture with a thousand faces, a very grave pain: the degree of civilization in a society is measured by the way it treats the weak and the vanquished, the mentally-ill, the prisoners. I do not want to formulate here a special criticism of the regime and prisons of Holland or in the capitalist countries it is a general conviction that I have for the prison systems in no matter what country. By profound conviction, reenforced still more by what I now see in the prisons, I have been already for years against the Heath Penalty, against life-imprisonment and even against prolonged detention in the material and moral conditions which reign in prisons today.

Naturally, in my prison I will certainly have as comfort

the powerful voice of active solidarity of men, not only of Free Algeria on the march, but of the whole of Africa, of Free Africa on the march. These men, I am sure, will not forget us, these men of Africa that Christian and civilized Europe has ferociously oppressed and exploited over centuries, selling by the million their sons as slaves, pillaging their natural riches and massacring even today the sons of Africa in atrocious colonial wars, such as the war in Algeria and the war which has broken out in Angola.

Mr Prosecutor, I shall permit myself to make a remark: Holland, the Dutch people have no interest in showing themselves in any way complaisant towards oppressive and repressive Imperialism concerning the men who have fought, however modestly it might be, for the liberation of Africa. Anyway, now, the trial is finished and the curtain falls on an episode after all infinite in relation to the great drama which is played out on the world arena: may our sentencing, our pain, serves as an example to the workers of Europe in order to activate still more their active solidarity with the fight of their colonial brothers, for the interests of all workers are essentially the same and the struggle for socialism is common and indivisible.

(Turning then to the public gallery, comrade Pablo exclaims to them:)

"Ardent and generous youth of Amsterdam, workers of Holland, I send you my fraternal greetings."

The following cable was sent in the beginning of July by Jean-Paul Sartre and Simone de Beauvoir to the Court:

**WE DECLARE OUR HIGH ESTEEM AND
PROFOUND SOLIDARITY FOR RAPTIS
AND SANTEN AND DEMAND STRONGLY
ACQUITTAL OF ACCUSED.**

TESTIMONY OF COMRADE LIVIO MAITAN

I met Michel Raptis for the first time in Spring 1948 during the Second World Congress of the Fourth International. I have known Sal Santen since the same occasion.

I have had uninterrupted relations with them over thirteen years of common activity. I can testify that, during this period, I have not met one person, even among the adversaries of the Fourth International, who has dared to put in doubt the moral integrity of Sal Santen and Michel Raptis.

I will not speak of their activity in general, but limit myself to their action in helping the colonial revolution, more especially to the struggle of the Algerian people. Why have they undertaken this action? Why have they engaged so courageously in this activity?

The answer is clear. Raptis and Santen and the

organisation to which they belong, the Fourth International, believes that the fight of the colonial peoples for their emancipation is a fight of capital historical importance, which has already changed and which will go on changing still more, in the years to come, the very face of the world in which we live. They believe that it is an elementary duty of all communist revolutionaries to aid this struggle by all the methods which are available at a given necessary moment. They think that it is not sufficient to proclaim in words the right of the colonial peoples to self-determination, but it is necessary to join in practice this combat at the side of those who fight for their independence, their liberty, their social emancipation, be they Algerians or South Africans, Cubans or Angolans.

It is necessary to recall that Raptis and Santen

and the organisation in the name of which they have acted, has not waited until the last hour, the period of **certain victory, to range themselves by the side of the Algerians, of the F L N.** They were engaged at the very beginning, at the time when the Algerian revolutionaries had no real allies, and when the traditional workers organisation, who **take unto themselves socialism and even communism, openly played the game of French Imperialism, or looked on without taking a clear attitude.**

It is possible that someone might contest the choice of methods adopted by Santen and Raptis, in their action for the Algerian revolution. Given the nature of **my testimony on this matter** I shall not place myself on the juridical terrain. I can assure the Court that I myself and all the political friends of Raptis and Santen, have full confidence in their line of defense. But it is necessary to add that, in a struggle such as that which Santen and Raptis have undertaken, if one wishes to triumph, one cannot always remain in the framework of bourgeois legality. Those who think that the present social order must be replaced by a **historically superior social and political regime, cannot consider the existing laws as taboos.**

Santen and Raptis are accused of having contributed to the making of false identity cards. It is not my task to establish if this corresponds or not to the truth. But how should one reproach the Algerians, persecuted by the "paras", menaced

by fearful tortures, by a veritable extermination, for utilising false papers to escape their executioners? How can we reproach the courageous men who have furnished them, in this domain also, with **what they need?**

Raptis and Santen have believed that the maximum aid must be given. They have done this. Their friends approve them. They are proud of them.

Mr. President, I must conclude my declaration. I have given this evidence, not in my personal name, but in the name of the Fourth International, the organisation to which Raptis and Santen belong. Our organisation entirely approves the activity of the comrades Santen and Raptis. It is possible that in their actions there were some things which might seem contrary to the law in the eyes of those whose task is to defend a political and social system which still is dominant in part of the world, in Western Europe. But the judgement which counts for Raptis and Santen, for the Fourth International, is the judgement of the workers and peasants masses in all countries, the masses exploited by imperialism, and we are sure that their judgement of us will be entirely favourable.

I terminate by sending once more our fraternal solidarity to our comrades Raptis and Santen and by addressing our warmest greetings to the Algerian revolutionaries.

Long live the Algerian revolution!

Long live the Fourth International!

A REVOLUTIONARY CRITICISM of the Theses of the Moscow Conference

By LIVIO MAITAN

In November 1957 a conference of Communist Parties was called in Moscow for the evident purpose of damming up centrifugal tendencies that had developed after Stalin's death and the XXth Congress, and of proceeding to make a new theoretical systemization to replace that of the Stalinist period. The November 1960 conference had a similar purpose: the 1959-60 polemics, especially between the Soviets and the Chinese, had indeed brought into jeopardy the unity reestablished in 1957.

It is an arduous task to formulate valid generalizations in a period so rich in convulsions, an almost insoluble task for those who, proceeding in an empirical way, run the risk of seeing the constructions they have improvised under the drive of events blown sky-high from one day to the next. But at Moscow a most exceptional effort was made: this conference — by the quantity of the delegations to it, the duration of its labors, the breadth and sharpness of its discussions, and the very tone of its concluding document — went far beyond the 1957 conference. Later comments, especially by certain leaders, have confirmed the fundamental importance attributed to the officially sanctioned document the conference worked up.¹

Just as during the Sino-Soviet polemics in the preceding months, so at Moscow here came out all or nearly all the vital problems of the international workers' movement, or, more generally, the vital problems of the phase of historical transition from capitalism to socialism. The solutions selected, therefore, are to be evaluated not only (or not primarily) as systemizations of the past, but as the prospects for short- or long-term struggle for the various sectors of the international anti-capitalist battle-array.

We apologize to our readers if in the analysis of these problems we roughly follow the outline of a previous article, thus running the risk of repetition, but in this way it will be easier to remain within fixed limits.

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE, WAR, AND REVOLUTION

The analysis of the international situation, summarized especially in the first chapter of the resolution, could obviously not fail to reflect the great events of these last years. Therefore the synthesizing evaluations are more clear-cut than in the 1957 document, even if they are not as much so as certain formulations that were current in the articles and speeches of the Chinese in the preceding months. It is not forgotten, in fact, that, despite all its failures, U S imperialism still has many fearful arrows to fit to its bow.²

On one point the difference of accent compared with 1957 is clear. U S imperialism is presented globally as enemy No. 1 ("the greatest international impoverisher", "the main stronghold of world reaction", "the international gendarme", etc), whereas, three years before, restrictive expressions were preferred ("the aggressive imperialist circles in the United States", "certain aggressive circles in the United States"). Within the limits of the situation created since the failure of the summit conference, there were not too many objections to a certain radicalization of language, demanded especially by the Chinese, for example in the polemics about the role of Eisenhower.

More significant is an assertion whose importance has been particularly stressed by some official commentators:

What is original in this new stage in the general crisis of capitalism consists of the fact that it developed, not out of a world war, but in a period of competition and struggle between the two systems.³

At first glance, this seems to be an all too obvious truth, immediately acceptable. But this step is linked up with another:

The fact that both world wars unleashed by imperialism ended in socialist revolutions does not at all mean that the road to

¹ In his report to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the USSR, Khrushchev spoke of "a notable enrichment of the patrimony of ideas of international Communism. The Resolution [...] is a Marxist-Leninist document of immense international scope."

² Khrushchev insisted on this point in his report to the CC of the USSR: "Imperialism still has great strength at its disposal, still possesses a powerful military machine."

³ This and immediately following quotation are translated from the Italian version appearing in *l'Unità* of 6 December 1960.

the social revolution must pass through a world war, especially in our epoch, in which there exists the mighty world system of socialism. [Chapter 5].

Here, therefore, we have the polemical translation of the previous assertion, i.e., in substance, the rejection of certain arguments put forward by the Chinese. But, though it would be absurd to formulate a "theory" according to which war must constitute the necessary precondition of revolution, it cannot be forgotten, in the first place — as the resolution seems to do in the first of the above quotations (and in contrast to the second!) — that the origins of the present crisis of imperialism lie, in the last analysis, in the convulsions caused by the war, beginning with the revolution in China, the base-element of the world crisis of capitalism in the last 15 years. In the second place, the problem is, not to be satisfied with general proclamations, but rather to analyze concretely whether the present phase does not involve trends of development by which war and revolution are destined to be braided together into a process of war-revolution on an international scale. But, what is more, the assertion of the resolution remains ambiguous, apart from its apparent correctness, because, in the last analysis, it runs the risk of covering up the real revolutionary essence of the historical processes of recent years, marked by abrupt breaks, acute conflicts, almost uninterrupted partial wars, and the ever renewed danger of a general war.

We thus reach the moot point of "coexistence" and of whether war is inevitable or not.

The 1957 conference in substance picked up again the arguments of the XXth Congress. The new resolution faces the problem in a much broader way, not only picking up the general theme again, but trying especially to answer the objections and reservations that emerged during the polemics within the international workers' movement and more particularly the stands taken by the Chinese.

We have already seen how the argument that wars would originate revolutions was refuted. The leitmotiv of so many Chinese speeches and articles — the nature of imperialism has not changed — is taken up again (indeed, how could so elementary a truth be denied?), but with the immediate addition of new elements, whereby, notwithstanding the constant nature of imperialism, war can henceforth be avoided. As is known, the main argument is that the new correlation of forces created in the world permits effectively preventing the imperialists from unleashing the general conflict to which they are driven by the logic of their system.

As the Chinese had not explicitly rejected the thesis that war can be avoided and that of coexistence, they can now put a good face in the matter. But they will not succeed in hiding their retreat because, as we emphasized in an earlier article, the divergence consisted predominantly in stressing certain themes rather than certain others, in using one tone rather than another; there is not the shadow of a doubt that the document of the 81 — especially on this point — represents substantially the Khrushchevian and not the Chinese formulations.

This evaluation is further confirmed by various other elements. Thus, concerning the consequences of a possible nuclear war, the resolution, while once more asserting that "if the imperialist countries unleash a war, the peoples will sweep capitalism away and bury it",⁴ nevertheless insists above all on the catastrophic nature that such a conflict would have and on priority of the struggle to avoid it, and makes no concession to any of the offhand arguments of the Chinese.⁵ Thus also, concerning disarmament, it is substantially the Soviet thesis, that believes in the possibility of bringing it about, which prevails over the Chinese thesis, for which the campaign for disarmament is reduced, in the last analysis, to a propaganda manoeuvre.⁶ And thus, lastly, the assertion according to which, in order to eliminate war, "the complete victory of socialism all over the earth" will not be necessary, includes an implicit refutation of certain Chinese arguments about the irreducibility of the reactionary forces, even if they are confined to isolated citadels.⁷

But the Conference of the 81 was not able to ignore the polemical force of certain basic arguments put forward in the international workers' movement against the theses on coexistence — which were partially reflected in the theorizations of the Chinese — and, as some Communist Parties had already done in resolutions at their own congresses, formulated a whole series of specifications about the content of coexistence, concerned especially with denying its "conciliationist" character.

⁴ This assertion (chapter 3) nevertheless appears abruptly inserted in the context, and takes on the character of a hypothesis that must be made in order to avoid "revisionistic" slips, but without insisting very much on the point.

⁵ Cf the assertions reported in "Problems and Prospects of Our Time in the Mirror of the Sino-Soviet Polemics," by Livio Maitan, in *Fourth International*, Autumn 1960, pp 11-20.

⁶ Cf, e.g., the declarations of 7 June 1960. Khrushchev, in the report quoted, insists on the possibility of bringing about disarmament (op cit, p 12).

⁷ Cf an article in the Chinese C.P. periodical *Red Flag*, April 1960.

The policy of peaceful coexistence is a policy intended to mobilize the masses to engage in positive actions against the enemies of peace. Coexistence among states does not at all imply, as the revisionists assert, renouncing the class struggle. Coexistence among states of different social systems is a form of the class struggle between socialism and capitalism. [...] Coexistence [...] does not involve conciliation between socialist and bourgeois ideologies. It presupposes, rather, an intensification of the struggle of the working class and all the Communist Parties for the triumph of socialist ideas [chapter 3].

To launch formulae which on paper overcome contradictions, reconciling opposed terms, is always possible; but it remains to be seen how things go in reality. Now the idea of coexistence either reduces itself to the assertion of a banal truth or simply to an empty expression which can be filled with any content, or else it has a logic of its own which is concretized in a certain way in political struggle on either the national or international scale.

Let us first of all leave aside the question — one that is idle but constantly raised anew, especially in tendentious polemics against the revolutionary movement⁸ — of the preferibility of the road to socialism via peace rather than via a new general war. In the abstract, nobody would be mad enough to “prefer” the latter to the former term of the alternative; but, let us repeat for the n th time, it is not a question of expressing preferences, but rather of analyzing objective trends, and settling on the most probable prospects. From this viewpoint formulations of the Moscow conference stick to generalizations, sketch out eclectic solutions, permit a certain breadth of interpretations (this was necessary to reach unanimity), and, in the last analysis, they might be called correct in saying both that war will break out and that imperialism will break up without having the strength to bring it about.⁹

But what is lacking is just the concrete analysis on the basis of which to establish — with an approximateness inevitable in all political prognoses — what are the elements destined to prevail in the near future and what is, therefore, the most probable prospect for which the workers’ movement must get prepared. On this point, our movement has also taken its stand much more rigor-

ously in the documents of its last congress, not being satisfied with a hypothetical casuistry: imperialism despite the weakening that it has undergone, and despite its inferiority in certain sectors of nuclear-missile weapons, still has at its disposal the necessary power to launch a general conflict and undergoes a constant pressure to do so from the way the contradictions of its own system become more acute. It is just because the imperialist crisis is irreversible in its general lines that the danger of a conflict is particularly acute, for the U S leaders are well aware that time is working against them, and are not at all disposed to disappear as a ruling class from the stage of history without resorting to even the most desperate measures.

Khrushchev and his followers insists, on the other hand, on the Leninist origin of the theory of coexistence. But, beyond a few quotations, the meaning is forgotten of certain stands of Lenin, which, in substance, as against the oversimplification of certain extremist partisans of revolutionary war under unfavorable conditions, recalled the elementary truth that the struggle between the international bourgeoisie and the first workers’ state could not be steadily conceived in terms of hot war, and that there would be periods of “coexistence” without war, from which the workers’ state would have to derive the greatest possible advantage for itself.

Trotsky shared a similar notion of coexistence.¹⁰

It is immediately obvious that this is not the interpretation of the 81, in whose document coexistence appears, as we have seen, as a general conception of the way to go over from capitalism to socialism. And it is a conception that has its own internal logic and its corresponding practical implications.

One of these implications is that, if war can be avoided even without overthrowing capitalism, the anti-war struggle can be developed on the basis of a much wider front which goes as far as to include even sectors of the bourgeoisie. Here we are confronted by a now traditional contradiction between the policies of the Stalinist and post-Stalinist bureaucratic leaderships and at the same time by one of the greatest differences between both and the revolutionary Marxist movement. It is a contradiction because either the alliance with certain bourgeois sectors is seriously sought — and in this case, it cannot fail to involve serious limitations to the consistent de-

⁸ Cf the polemics against Trotsky and our movement already quoted in *Fourth International*, Autumn 1960 issue, page 18, and footnote 25. Cf also the old-style Stalinist attack in the editorial of Reiman in *Problems of Peace and Socialism*, No. 10 October, 1960.

⁹ Cf the documents published in our Winter 1960-61 issue.

¹⁰ At the 1922 Bolshevik Congress, Trotsky spoke of “a long period of peaceful coexistence and business-like collaboration with bourgeois countries.” (Cf Isaac Deutscher, *The Prophet Unarmed*, p 31).

velopment of the mass struggle (often, especially in certain countries of Western Europe, just this price has been paid) — or else the struggle against war is made into a form of the class struggle — and then the proposed alliance is not acceptable to those aimed at. It is one of the greatest divergences with revolutionary Marxism, because the latter continues to believe that the *conditio sine qua non* really to avoid a new general war is the overthrow of the system, if not necessarily in the entire world, at least in a whole series of decisive countries.

But the most genuine essence of the conception of coexistence is made clear with greater plainness in the report of Khrushchev after the Conference of the 81:

The victory of the USSR in the economic competition with the United States and the victory of the whole socialist system over the capitalist system will signalize a radical turn in history, will exert a still more revolutionary influence on the workers' movement of the entire world. Then it will be clear even to the most indecisive that only socialism provides all that is needed for a happy life for man, and they will make their choice in favor of socialism. To win time in the economic competition with capitalism: that is the essential thing today.¹¹

These things are not new, but perhaps never before have they been said in such explicit form. Naturally Khrushchev is not unaware of the struggle of the colonial peoples and of the proletariat of the advanced capitalist countries; but for him the decisive element in the historical conflict with capitalism that is being developed in these decades consists and will consist of the economic development of the USSR and of surpassing the productive potential of the United States in "peaceful" competition. The logical consequence of this formulation is the search for all possible collaborations with sectors of the international bourgeoisie, the prospect of a long-range collaboration with the national bourgeoisies of the colonial and semi-colonial countries, and the acceptance of the necessity of using certain brakes on revolutionary movement wherever this may be considered useful for the purposes of general strategy.¹²

It was against certain concretizations of this strategy that, in the last analysis, the Chinese

polemics were aimed; but their weakness consisted in the fact that they refused to accept the inevitable implication of a conception which they claimed to share in general.

Revolutionary Marxists neither are unaware of nor underestimate the importance of the economic development of the USSR and the other workers' states as a revolutionary factor in both the objective and subjective sense. But the decisive battles for striking down capitalism on a world scale will be fought before the historically potential superiority of the collectivist system is translated into an overwhelming economic superiority on all levels, and that in any case the example of socialist construction, despite its growing force of attraction, is not yet a sufficient factor. The decisive elements will consist of the anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist revolutionary struggle of the colonial people in so many parts of the world and in the anti-capitalist struggle by the proletarians of the more advanced countries. Only the victory of these last-named, furthermore, to the extent that it is achieved in the best armed citadels of the world bourgeoisie, can provide the real definitive guarantee against the tragic threat of a nuclear catastrophe that is still hanging over those countries in which the revolution has triumphed.

Last but not least, there is another reason for insisting on this prospect and to struggle for its concretization. A development of revolutionary struggles in all sectors of the world would release the unlimited energies of the proletariat and the popular masses and therefore would undercut at its roots any bureaucratic incrustation. There is no doubt that, just for the same reason — considered from the viewpoint of the interests in opposition — the bureaucracy "prefers" and tries to impose the prospect and conception of "coexistence" — a conception which, far from being an "original" form of the class struggle, is in substance only the extreme prolongation, under deeply changed conditions, of the old theory of socialism in a single country. For the same fundamental reasons that the revolutionary Marxists did not accept the latter theory thirty years ago, they reject the former theory today.

THE COLONIAL REVOLUTION AND THE "INDEPENDENT STATE OF NATIONAL DEMOCRACY"

The upsets of these last years, especially in Africa and Latin America, and the Chinese criticism of certain aspects of the Khrushchev line, caused the Conference of the 81 to devote far more attention to the problems of the colonial revolution than the 1957 conference did. While

¹¹ Cf *Problems of Peace and Socialism*, No. 1, January, 1961.

¹² Already in the above mentioned article in the Autumn 1960 *Fourth International*, the essential significance of the Khrushchevian line was synthesized in these terms.

the 1957 resolution contained only rapid synthesizing references, that of this last November includes an entire chapter which not only sketches out an analysis of this situation but also defines prospects for mass struggles and the action of the Communist Parties.¹³

We can naturally agree with a whole series of statements made in this document. Apart from the summary balance-sheet with which the chapter opens, we are not ones to deny that "the collapse of the system of colonial slavery, under the impact of the movement for national liberation, is, next to the formation of the world system of socialism, the second most important phenomenon in its historic scope". In a parallel way, more timely than ever is the condemnation of the neo-colonialism by means of which the old colonial powers and especially Yankee imperialism are trying to keep in their area of exploitation and hegemony the countries of Africa and Asia that have reached independence.¹⁴

But the divergences become clear-cut as soon as the document raises the problem of the motive forces of the colonial revolution at its present stage and the trends and prospects of its development.

Already in the denunciation of neo-colonialism, the assertion that the imperialists are trying to "corrupt a part of the bourgeoisie" is decidedly mistaken. In fact, it is not a matter of a degenerative phenomenon of corruption, but rather of a social phenomenon. Though certain sectors of the colonial bourgeoisie are seeking to guarantee themselves by "positive neutralism", others foresee a new form of alliance with the metropolitan possessing classes as the way to a consolidation, even if only an ephemeral one, of the front against the pressure of the mass movement.

It would be a mistake to think that this can all be brought down to mere impreciseness of language by the drafters of the resolution; in reality, it is already a reflection of the general line of an analysis that assigns a positive function to the national bourgeoisie as a leading force even at this stage.

It is true that the document states that the basis of the National Front must be the alliance of the workers and peasants and explicitly introduces the idea of the dual nature of the national bourgeoisie. But despite these limitations — whose introduction is evidently the result of the very many polemics of the previous months, and

¹³ Cf the 1957 resolution, chapter 1, and chapter 4 of the 1960 resolution.

¹⁴ As in the other parts of the document, the prevalent tone, however, is propagandistic and at times even demagogic.

whose purpose is, once again, to leave the door open to sufficiently broad interpretations and possible future changes en route — approval is given to "the great function of all the patriotic national forces" — among which the bourgeoisie, at least certain of its sectors, is included — and the progressive character that the latter can still have in participating in the struggle against imperialism and feudalism.¹⁵

As for the nature of the revolution going on in the colonial and semi-colonial world, the document speaks of a "national, anti-imperialist, and democratic revolution" and of an "anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution"; and from this the possibility of a still leading function of the bourgeoisie would be derived. But a first crucial point is just this one: given its structure, composition, and economic-social tie-ups, is the national bourgeoisie, or even some sectors of it, able to develop coherently such a revolution, which involves, among other things, as the document itself says, a radical agrarian reform and an "elimination of the economic roots of imperialist domination"? The 81 admit this possibility, even with the attenuations indicated above, while the revolutionary Marxists see it as an abstract diagram that does not correspond to reality. From Nehru's India to Nasser's Egypt, passing through Iraq, if not indeed Brazil or Venezuela, the experiences are by now numerous and significant. Though, in the international context of imperialism's extreme weakness, certain national bourgeoisies have been able to play a front-rank part in the struggle for achieving formal political independence and the imposition of certain important anti-imperialist measures, the revolutionary process has nevertheless stopped half-way (when it has not gone openly backward), precisely because the national bourgeoisie has not been really able to solve the most important tasks, such as agrarian reform, industrialization, and the elimination of the economic bases of imperialism.

The 81 were not able to remain wholly indifferent to the verdict of those experiences and did in fact introduce in the resolution some paragraphs which, in the last analysis, form the major element of novelty in it. They admitted that, after independence is reached, "to the degree that social strife sharpens, the national bourgeoisie is ever more inclined to reach agreements with internal reaction and with imperialism," while "the popular masses become ever more convinced that the best way to emerge

¹⁵ The resolution distinguishes between "colonial and dependent" countries and countries already "freed from the colonial yoke," obviously restricting the possible function of the national bourgeoisie to the second category.

from their age-old backwardness and to improve living conditions is that of a development of a noncapitalist type." But then, toward what economic-social form and under the leadership of what forces should the trend be?

Their answer is that "in the present historical situation, there are being created in many countries internal and international conditions favoring the setting up of a independent state of national democracy," ie, a state that fights coherently against imperialism and its military blocs, against neo-colonialism, and for an agrarian reform, and ensures "broad rights and democratic liberty to the people."

Here, therefore, we are up against a new kind of animal, a politico-social form that "is not of the capitalist type," but is also not — or not yet — of the proletarian-socialist type. As for the forces of leadership, things are even vaguer, for, as we have seen, the bourgeoisie's tendency to backslide is denounced and there is talk of the "extremely important function" (?) of the working class and the peasant masses, but a continuing function of the said bourgeoisie or some sectors thereof is not at all explicitly excluded, nor is the requirement of a proletarian leadership clearly stated. The case of Cuba would serve to demonstrate that an alliance with the bourgeoisie is not at all excluded in the very struggle for the "independent state of national democracy."¹⁶

The dodging of this really essential question would be sufficient to reveal the nature of this "discovery" of the 81. There is not the slightest effort to demonstrate that the possibility for a "national democracy" to emerge results from the objective trends of African or Latin American society;¹⁷ they limit themselves to setting a goal and thinking up a formula, the mistaken nature of which is self-evident. Though there can occur in fact very brief transitional periods — measurable at most in months, if not in weeks and days — during which the social nature of a state is still fluid, there does not exist a development that is no longer capitalist without its becoming collectivist or socialist.¹⁸ A contrary hypothesis would in fact imply a revision of the

¹⁶ We allude, naturally, to the interpretations of Blas Roca and his associates at the Summer 1960 congress.

¹⁷ A fresh proof of the intentionally vague and elusive character of the document is to be found in the fact that the hypothesis of the "independent state of national democracy" is put forward generically for "many countries" without giving any more specific indication, even in the form of an example.

¹⁸ Cf. in the report of Vlahović on the Conference of the 81, the substantially correct criticism made by the Yugoslav "revisionists" of the formula of the "independent state of national democracy." (*One Step Backward*, Jugoslavija publishing house, Belgrade 1961, pp 71-72.) essential criteria of Marxist historical analysis,

and still more, it would irremediably clash with reality.

The fact has already been mentioned that the countries that have already become independent but where a proletarian leadership has not established itself have been unable to solve the problems that are crucial for their emancipation and development and certainly have not set out on a road of a "non-capitalist type." Without returning to the cases of Vietnam and Korea, the recent and burning example of Cuba is a refutation, from the opposite viewpoint, by proof positive, of the fragility of the theorizations of the 81.

The resolution, naturally, warmly hailed Cuba, but dodged, in a way that was almost grotesque, the problem of the characterization of the Fidelist revolution, defined as "simply popular": really, the Solons of the Communist Parties did not rack their brains much!¹⁹ But, leaving aside propaganda to divert attention, if there is a country which should have been the model of the "independent state of national democracy." that country is precisely Cuba, where the Fidelist leadership "struggled coherently for political and economic independence," carried out the agrarian reform, and extirpated the very roots of imperialist domination. We agree right away that in Cuba we are faced by a development "of a non-capitalist type"; but just what is it? — a historically new form, perhaps, not proletarian-socialist, such as to be able to be fitted into the diagram of the 81? The clear answer formulated by the leadership of our movement immediately upon the decisive measures of last October — and which has by now been given also, with greater or lesser precision and even for differing purposes, by various tendencies in the proletarian movement — is that in Cuba not only imperialist domination but also the hegemony of the dominant classes was overturned, and that relationships of a collectivist type were set up. In other terms, the Cuban revolution transformed itself, without a gap, from an anti-imperialist democratic revolution into a socialist revolution, bringing about the formation of a workers' state that is beginning socialist construction.²⁰

Sufficiently known now are the grotesque subterfuges with which the attempt was made to hide the Cuban reality outright, or the painful

¹⁹ In the report already mentioned, Khrushchev was not much more specific, stating that "the people" attained power (op cit, p 13).

²⁰ Cf the Sixth World Congress resolution on the Cuban state, pp 48-50 of the Winter 1960-61 issue of *Fourth International*, and the article, on pp 00-00 of the present issue.

formulae thought up to save face.²¹ And this is not a matter only of the correctness of a sociological characterization; what is at stake here is a strategic line, a general outlook.

Like all the Communist Parties of Latin America, the Cuban Partido Socialista Popular had repeated ad nauseam that the revolution must be not proletarian-socialist, but "of national and agrarian liberation, patriotic and democratic, anti-imperialist and anti-feudal," and that it was necessary to work with the national bourgeoisie "interested in solving the tasks of the revolution."²² That this line has proved bankrupt no longer needs demonstration: the Fidelist leadership has gone far beyond the objectives of Blas Roca and his comrades, who, fortunately, were not at the head of the revolutionary movement in the Sierra, otherwise Cuba would still have Batista or some "national-bourgeois" substitute therefore, in the best of hypotheses in the style of Frondizi or Betancourt. And even on the theoretical field, Castro, in his *Unità* interview, put the quietus on the thesis of collaboration with the national bourgeoisies in all Latin America.²³

Thus the document of the 81 has developed a diagram already resoundingly shattered by the most original of revolutions in development, neglected to make a concrete analysis of the really special conditions of the African continent in ebullition — from which there may be expected no less original developments than those foreshadowed in Latin America —²³ stuck stubbornly to its old opportunist positions or avoided taking a clear stand on the nature of the forces leading the colonial revolution, and continued to ignore the key-problem for the consistent development of that revolution in the new phase, i e, its transformation into a socialist revolution. But there is a profound logic in all this: it is precisely the logic of the general Khrushchev way of posing

²¹ In Moscow the news of the proclamation of the socialist republic in Cuba was covered up as much as possible. As an example of the a posteriori formulae of justification, cf the lead editorial in *l'Unità* for 3 May and some declarations by Escalante in *l'Unità* later in May.

True enough, Blas Roca spoke since then of building socialism under the leadership of Fidel Castro. It is then probable that a turn of the Communist Parties is now being prepared, with several months delay, in front of events which did not allow any creep-hole.

²² This was the thesis set forth by Blas Roca at the PSP congress the previous summer. Let us recall further that, also last summer, the bureaucrats of the PSP and of the right wing of the 26 July movement attacked as "provocateurs" the delegates of the Latin American sections of the Fourth International to the Havana Youth Conference, "guilty" of having proposed the anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist measures that were carried out by Castro some months later.

²³ Cf *l'Unità*, 1 February 1961.

things, of "coexistence" and the ways of passing over from capitalism to socialism.

If the Khrushchev line — which has been recalled here — is taken as a starting-point, there follows logically therefrom a collaboration with the national bourgeoisies of the colonial and semi-colonial countries, with the Nehrus, Nasers, Sukarnos, & Co — a collaboration which is not limited to the level of relations among states, but is extended to the policy of the various Communist Parties. It is an old line, which in Cuba did not prevent the victory of the revolution because of the insignificant weight of the party of Blas Roca, but caused damages in Iraq and Indonesia, and stood and still stands in the way of the growing maturity of the mass movement in, for example, India and Argentina. It is a line which, despite the rectifications and reservations already mentioned, is at the basis also of the document of the 81, while the only partial novelty — the "independent state of national democracy" — is only a wishful formula which in the best of hypotheses may serve as propaganda, and is, in the last analysis, the equivalent of the "progressive democracy" of the immediate postwar period or of the state which actuates an advanced democracy and controls monopolies, hypothesized by certain Middle-European Communist Parties. At the root of this and the other formulae lies the same conception, the same general outlook.

OLD AND NEW CONTRADICTIONS OF ADVANCED CAPITALISM

In its analysis of the situation in the advanced capitalist countries and in settling on the so-called national paths toward socialism, the document of the 81 does not, compared to that of 1957, introduce outstanding rectifications or additions.

As already at that time, the analysis remains generic, often propagandistic in tone, with the repetition of already too obvious truths which are far from allowing one to grasp the essential concrete elements of certain phenomena. At least some of the parties present at Moscow had in the past years worked up, on the basis of similar arguments, far more thorough-going documents.²⁴

Let us take some examples. In the first chapter, with the intention of painting a completely negative and almost catastrophic picture of the situation of the capitalist world, not only phenomena that really indicate the break-down of the system are emphasized, but expressions like the following are added:

²⁴ It suffices, to think, for example, of certain documents of the Italian CP, which have influenced the preparation of this part of the document.

Although there may be observed, in certain capitalist countries, to a greater or lesser extent a certain increase in production, that does not change the fact that the contradictions of capitalism are worsening on both the national and international plane. [...] The anarchic character of capitalist production is ever deepening.

That the contradictions of capitalism, in the last analysis, are sharpening and that capitalist production is not rationalizable, we have no difficulty in admitting: this conclusion was reached also by the documents of our last congress. But before reaching that point, it is necessary to analyze all the phenomena of these years, especially those relatively new ones that caught even Marxist theoreticians by surprise, and to indicate with precision their specific limits, their specific contradictions. When, in a Western Europe that has been so deeply weakened by the collapse of colonialism and the world crisis of imperialism, there has occurred a stage of productive expansion, often with unprecedented rates of growth, it is too easy to dig oneself out by speaking of "a certain increase," "in certain countries," "to a greater or lesser extent," and hastening to add "that does not change the fact that the contradictions of capitalism are worsening" and that "the anarchic character of capitalist production is ever deepening." Such assertions are reduced to stereotyped enunciations that simply pass over, without any effort at analysis, one of the most "original" and, let us repeat also, most surprising phenomena of this postwar period.

Some other passages refer to the moot problem of the living levels of the masses:

Only by a tenacious struggle has the working class succeeded in obtaining, in a few countries, the satisfaction of its various vital demands, while in many capitalist countries the tenor of life remains always below the prewar level. [...] In the capitalist countries, including the most developed ones, there continue to exist, and even to spread, economically underdeveloped areas, in which the poverty of the masses is particularly notable [chapter 1].

And further on:

The exploitation of the workers and the process of impoverishment of large masses of the peasants are intensified [...].

Here also there is a tendency to stuff everything into the same sack, giving the impression of a prevailing trend toward impoverishment, but without explicitly asserting it, and being careful

not to specify with a few examples in what countries or category of countries the stated phenomena are occurring.²⁵

But the solution thought up, if on the one hand it refers to a way of analysis traditional in Soviet economic documents,²⁶ on the other permits Thorez and the French C G T to continue to hold without contradiction their theses about impoverishment and Togliatti and the Italian C G I L to reject them.

This oversimplified characterization of the situation in the advanced capitalist countries and the uncritical indulgence toward certain formulæ about the impoverishment of the masses have more serious consequences than it might seem at first glance. For the conclusion that may legitimately be drawn is that there does not exist a substantial difference among the various categories of capitalist countries and that even in the most advanced countries the most explosive elements for a break-up continue to be the penury and poverty of the masses. Thus the tendency that has been sketched out in these last years, especially in certain Western European countries (Italy and Belgium, for example), of a resharping of class conflicts, but on a different basis from the past, that is, under the prevailing drive, not of poverty, but of the specific contradictions of the most highly developed capitalism, of "prosperity," of new needs that are constantly being extended (if only in relation with the continued developments of technology), and of the growing aspiration of the toilers to break the chains of alienation by becoming a conscious factor in the process of production — this tendency has been completely ignored by the document. There are certainly things to discuss about the reach of this tendency, which is only now beginning to become concretized, and about the possible rhythms of its development; but a text that just neglects it forms an obstacle rather than an aid to an understanding of the conditions under which a whole decisive part of the workers' movement must operate.

As for the strategic line of the Communist Parties in the advanced capitalist countries, especially in Western Europe, and the roads to power for the working class, the 81 picked up again the themes of 1957. The main stress was on the struggle against monopolies and for a more advanced democracy, which has been worked out in detail by the congresses of the

²⁵ It is not always clear in the document where the allusions are to advanced capitalist countries and where, instead, they are to colonial and semi-colonial countries.

²⁶ The thesis of absolute impoverishment has always had currency in the U S S R. See also the *Manual of Economy* published at the end of 1954.

individual parties and by the European party conference. Despite the advanced crisis of world capitalism, despite the growing contradictions of capitalist society and the growing force of attraction represented by the workers' states -- all elements of which, as has been seen, the document is not unaware -- for the leaders of the C P the task of a revolution of a socialist nature is not yet posed to the working class. The strategic goal remains that of a democracy in which the power of the monopolies is beaten down -- by the nationalization of key-sectors of the economy and their democratization -- but in which the capitalist regime survives. Let us leave to the sagacious tacticians à la Togliatti the arduous task of explaining how it is possible to carry out all this, i e, how to strike the present regime in its vital ganglia without breaking its framework, that is, without the overthrow of the bourgeoisie as a whole and without establishing the proletariat as the class in power.²⁷

We shall not insist on the questions of the forms of passing over to socialism: the resolution textually repeats the theses of 1957, in their turn a faithful echo of those worked out at the XXth Congress, which our movement has already repeatedly criticized. It will suffice for us to recall that here too, when all is said and done, the resolution sticks to generalities, without risking hypotheses or examples, which, however, are necessary to aid the practical guidance of the struggle. The fact that parties operating under such different conditions as, for example, the Italian and the Indian C Ps have adopted for themselves the same conception about the "peaceful" transition to socialism should by itself make one reflect about the real genesis of these positions, as also the most fervent partisans of the parliamentary road must admit that the French experience with Gaullism is not exactly a confirmation of their theses, and would deserve not to be completely passed over in silence.

Evidently, a scientific analysis of so crucial a question would never have ended up in a species of casuistry, but would have given a more precise response to the various hypotheses put forward. The problem, especially as to the aims of the action, is not so much to contemplate the eventuality that the bourgeoisie accept or not accept the play of democracy, as to make a prognosis, based on past experience and objective trends, about the probability that it choose one

²⁷ Such a formulation can make sense, while remaining essentially opportunistic, if it is conceived as a transitional formula in the Leninist manner. Such an interpretation, however, has been explicitly excluded: in the intentions of the formulators of this line, the "progressive democratic" phase is conceived as objectively attainable.

or the other path. For revolutionary Marxism it is beyond discussion that the second is far and away the more probable outlook, on which, therefore, the practical prospects should be based, while the Communist Parties, though not excluding in the abstract the hypothesis of the revolutionary break-up, base their guidance on the variant of the "peaceful," "democratic," and "parliamentary" road, in substance, of a transformation from within, of a use of the old forms for a new content.²⁸

It is hardly necessary to say that on this point the Chinese and the other supporters of their criticism of the parliamentary paths have given way completely; there is, in this part of the document, no echo of last year's polemics.²⁹

The fifth chapter tackles also the problem of trade-union unity and the overcoming of the political split in the workers' ranks. Trade-union unity, especially in certain countries (France, Italy, Belgium), is doubtless a burning question, and proletarian political unity would also mark an evident step forward. But in some typical countries of Western Europe (in the first place, Great Britain and Germany, but also various minor countries) the problem is not so much that of an organizational division -- in reality, the working class in its overwhelming majority, follows a single party -- as that of a persistent predominance of the Social-Democratic leaderships. For what reasons does this continue to occur? by what paths, through what intermediate stages, and by means of what tactical plans will it be possible to overturn the situation so that new Marxist, revolutionary leaderships will be able to get the upper hand? These are the real questions which are raised and to which an answer must be given beyond general, even though abstractly correct, appeals to unity.

But it is an answer that would be sought in vain in the resolution of the 81.

END OF THE GUIDE-STATE AND -PARTY ?

Not even the chapter on "Strengthening and Conquests of the Socialist System" brings new

²⁸ Khrushchev, in the above-mentioned report, spoke of a use of the "parliamentary form to put it at the service of the people and infuse it with a new content [op cit, p 16]." The abandonment of the Leninist conception in *State and Revolution* of the necessity to destroy all the old forms and create new and historically original ones, is all too plain.

²⁹ In his report to the C C of the Italian C P, Longo referred to the reservations of the representatives of certain C Ps about the conception of the peaceful path, attempting to explain these "difficulties in understanding" by the conditions in their own countries, where "there is lacking, for the moment [sic!], any form of democratic life." (Cf *l'Unità*, 19 December 1960.)

elements worthy of interest. It takes up again the current characterizations of the nature of the U S S R and the other workers' states at this stage, the arguments about equality among the workers' states already stated in 1957, and the usual hackneyed indications about the development of the economy. Significant is the reference to "the constant perfecting of the system of the international division of labor," which corresponds to the new stage which relations among the collectivist countries have now entered. In 1957 things were obviously much less advanced, and the formulations used were related to the then reality.

Beyond this, the document contains scarcely perceptible reflections of the most intensely debated and in fact most burning questions that have been raised and are still being raised in the U S S R, China, and the people's democracies in these years. It suffices to think of the problems of agriculture, of the methods and rhythms of collectivization, and of the stimuli to increase in production. There is just a reference — not limited, however, wholly to agriculture — to the "Leninist principles of appeal to material interest" (immediately followed, to avoid any difficulty, by a similar reference to the "maximum spur to moral stimuli") or a brief paragraph on the "voluntary passage of the peasants from small private property to the big socialist coöperative estate" in the popular democracies. Of the conspicuous differences among the various people's democracies and the numerous difficulties and contradictions of the gigantic — and much-discussed — experiment of the Chinese communes, and of the critical situations in the U S S R, revealed only a few weeks later in a resounding way, the resolution does not say a word.

But, more generally, the internal dialectics of the phase of transition from capitalism to socialism — which emerged, even if only in the forms noted, in the denunciations and polemics of 1956-57 — has disappeared almost completely. There are only two or three allusions to the degenerative phenomena of the Stalinist phase, and to the goal of ensuring that they have been eliminated. The "contradictions in the people" seem to have been forgotten.³⁰

More significant are the paragraphs regarding relations inside the anti-capitalist battle-array, among the various workers' states and the various Communist Parties. The importance of the Chinese Revolution is far more emphasized

³⁰ To say, as the text does, that "independently of the forms in which it will be installed, the dictatorship of the proletariat will mean the broadening of democracy" is at least too offhand, especially after the denunciations of 1956.

than in 1957, and a special function is attributed to the development of the colonial revolution. Furthermore, any expression such as to give credence to the thesis of the Guide-State is carefully eliminated, even though the vanguard role of the U S S R and its leading party is recognized.³¹

Khrushchev insisted particularly on this point and on the impossibility of "exerting from any centre the leadership of the socialist countries and the Communist Parties." The bureaucratic leaders thus do not have the intention of returning to organizational forms of the type of the Comintern of the Stalinist phase or the ill-famed Cominform. But the document explicitly expresses a tendency to institutionalize conferences of the CPs as a normal form of consultation and common elaboration and establishes the principle of a discipline binding on all the participants.³²

We are naturally very far from a reconstitution of the International of the Leninist type. What is worse, the experience of the preparatory period, of the development of the conference itself, and of the information distributed after it, gives a clear picture of the methods that it is still intended to put over. Fundamental questions and important divergences are discussed only "on a high level," while the rank and file are not only not consulted but not even honestly informed about the respective positions, and simply asked to accept the conclusions when they are already an accomplished fact.³³ This is strictly already to the most classic bureaucratic traditions.

The violent attack against the Yugoslav Communists and the very form in which it was expressed are, furthermore, another sign in-

³¹ The 1957 resolution was still speaking of the "camp of socialist countries headed by the U S S R" (op cit, p 182), while the more recent resolution — aside from more general expressions ("the strongest bulwark," etc) — states that the CP of the SU "has been and continues to be the universally recognized vanguard of the international Communist movement." The CP SU itself seems to have recommended this rectification, while it is known that, as if paradoxically, it was the Chinese who insisted on the old formula.

³² Cf the closing chapter. Khrushchev particularly emphasized the requirement that "every party conform scrupulously and loyally to the decisions on the conference in all its activity." (Op cit, p 19.)

³³ To a large extent an attempt was made even to deny dissidences as inventions of the bourgeois press, and one of the participants in the conference, the Italian Alicata, polemized sharply against those who might have wanted "scandalous versions" (cf *Rinascita*, No. 12, December 1960, p 932). What was wanted was not scandalous versions, but simply the texts of the documents, the speeches, etc, i e, honest indispensable information. Instead, they carefully refrained from publishing, for example, even the articles of the Chinese Communists.

dicative of the concerns and purposes of the bureaucrats who met in conference. As in the past, well-argued criticisms are not made here, nor are the real positions of the Yugoslav League examined: they limited themselves to sticking on labels and hurling epithets, nor sparing even vaguely threatening phrases. And some of the 81, returned home, hastened to double the dose, scattering downright polemical expedients of the purest Stalinist brand.³⁴

The Fourth International has not concealed the criticisms that it considered should be made of the Yugoslav Communists, both for their theorizations and for their foreign and domestic policies. But the 81 accuse them above all for what is most valid in what they have done: for their tenacious defense of certain experiments with workers' management in the factories and for certain courageous analyses of the conflicts of the stage of transition contained in their most recent program. Precisely because certain arguments of capital importance, in the intentions of the bureaucrats, must remain taboo, they do not wish even to discuss this program, but prefer to deform it in a grotesque way or to bury it under an avalanche of polemical epithets.³⁵

The document contains also a more general criticism of revisionist or dogmatic tendencies. But there is nothing new on this plane. They are the now stereotyped formulæ that are again repeated, and the dosage is such that each leadership will always be able to orchestrate a campaign in one direction or another proclaiming itself to be faithful to the theses of the conference.

PROVISIONAL SOLUTIONS

The Conference of the 81, preceded by the polemics that are well known, was the scene of

sharp and prolonged discussions, as appeared from the reports of some of the participants and from certain admissions of the official texts themselves.³⁶

On almost all the basic themes, diverse positions were expressed, and the "Chinese" line, even if it was clearly in the minority, had nevertheless the support of a certain number of delegations.³⁷

At the end, however, not only was the resolution adopted unanimously, but the attempt was successful to get the various parties in the following months to take much more uniform attitudes, without the sometimes strident differentiations and polemical disclosures of the preceding period. On some points, compromises were obviously achieved, on certain others, the solution consisted of the adoption or repetition of sufficiently elastic formulæ, and on still others the Chinese Communists retreated (or accepted, for the moment, the discipline of the majority.)

In the presentation of the results of the conference and in the application of the line of the document, there were, as we have already mentioned, diverse emphases: the Albanian CP and the Italian CP took their positions at opposite poles, so to speak, the former as the first outpost of Stalinist conservatism, and the latter in the latter in the vanguard of Khrushchevism.³⁸

For their part, the Chinese did not again take up their polemical attitudes of 1959 and 1960, put the accent on the unity that had been reached, especially with the CP of the SU, muted their reservations about coexistence, and avoided any reference to the Guide-State.³⁹ Even the criticisms of the national bourgeoisies of certain colonial countries were diluted in their abundance, if not eliminated outright: indeed, since the agreement about the Chinese in Indo-

³⁴ Compared to the expressions used at the congress of the Albanian CP, the text of the resolution of the 81 is admirably moderate. The Chinese also, both before and after Moscow, violently stepped up the anti-Yugoslav campaign, and doubtless they had an influence in working up this part of the text. It is curious, on the other hand, that Khrushchev in his report did not even mention the Yugoslavs. In his report to the C C of the Italian CP, Longo made a rapid reference, not without reminding that the condemnation does not exclude "convergences, encounters, and joint actions."

³⁵ The Yugoslav reply to the resolution has been given especially in the already mentioned Vlahović report. Certain criticisms go right to the bull's eye: e.g., that on their methods of secret diplomacy in discussing the questions of the workers' movement, that on the dodging of the problems of the development of socialism, that on the nature of the resolution in permitting a variety of interpretations, besides, of course, the denunciation of their attitude toward the Yugoslav League. On international questions — war, coexistence, etc — the well-known Yugoslav viewpoints are repeated; these are radically different from those of our movement.

³⁶ Cf., e.g., the Longo report to the C C of the Italian CP, already mentioned, and various informations given by the leaders of the French CP (who mentioned, among other things, the Chinese and Albanian attacks against the French CP). We note that the December 1st communiqué spoke of "respective opinions and positions," while the final sentence of the resolution indicates "in a greater compactness of the CPs [...] the most important condition for uniting all the forces of the working class" etc.

³⁷ Besides Albania, Australia also supported the Chinese, while the pro-Chinese position of the Indonesians at the Council of the World Federation of Trade Unions at Peking is well known. The Japanese, Indochinese, and Koreans seem also to have been more favorable to the Chinese (as well as certain Central American CPs).

³⁸ In an article in *Rinascita* No. 4th. April 1961, p 361, Togliatti explicitly criticized the methods of the Albanian leadership.

³⁹ The ritual expression, "guided by the USSR" completely disappeared.

nesia, a new idyll with Sukarno is now going on.⁴⁰

But notwithstanding this, the differentiations have not disappeared. Apart from their sectarian reference to the Yugoslav Communists — in this matter the Chinese yield only to the Albanians — there is no doubt that Mao Tse-Tung has a higher opinion than Khrushchev of the contribution of the revolutionary struggle of the masses in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Almost always the difference is one of emphasis rather than of explicit stands, but just the reading of the articles, speeches, and documents is per se revelatory.

Diversity of estimates of the world situation, in this post-conference stage, is more clear-cut. The Chinese express much more optimistic judgments about the international correlation of forces, and naturally the events of this past Spring — from the flight of Gagarin to the inglorious expedition against Cuba — are inducing them to step up the dose.⁴¹ The practical implications of this analysis are clear: according to the Chinese, the U S S R and the other workers' states ought to profit by the more favorable conditions by operating with greater audacity on certain crucial questions.⁴² But it is once again on the

⁴⁰ This confirms the empirical and contingent origin of certain Chinese positions even on this point (the polemics against Nehru, on the other hand, continue).

⁴¹ In an article in its May Day issue, the *People's Daily* spoke of the imperialist camp as "moribund."

⁴² According to leaks appearing in the English press, the characterization of the present stage seems to have formed one of the major motifs of conflict at the conference, the Chinese favoring a definition that would include

characterization of the U S leadership that the divergences became most specific: the Chinese have never taken a relaxed or "waiting" attitude toward Kennedy, whom currently they describe right away as worse than Eisenhower.⁴³

It is not, however, because of the sketching out of these new divergences that the attempt at synthesis made by the 81 is not destined to turn out to be lasting. Partial divergences can sharpen or disappear, according to the conjuncture, and compromise formulæ may favor manoeuvres and propagandistic fictions. What counts more is the fact that the Moscow resolution did not at all provide an answer to the crucial problems of the historical phase we are passing through, in substance dodging them or deforming them. These problems exist in reality, they require an effective solution, and they will constantly raise themselves again and again, no matter what formulæ or tactical subtleties may be excogitated. The synthesis of the 81 will be battered and breached, more or less rapidly, by events, and differentiations and divergences will inevitably reappear.

the notion of a "period of wars and revolutions," the Soviets preferring formulæ of the type of those which prevailed (cf chapter 1 of the resolution). An indirect confirmation of this clash may be drawn from the importance that Khrushchev accorded to a definition of the resolution, rather banal in itself, but which evidently acquires significance in counter-position to a diverse definition (cf op cit, p 3).

⁴³ What is in question here is a declaration by Mao Tse-Tung of 28 April, since then repeated frequently by the Chinese press (cf, e.g., the already mentioned article in the *People's Daily* and another article in the same paper [Tsinhua News Agency despatch of 9 May 1961]).

PANAFRICANISM, TRADE UNIONS and Revolutionary Marxism

By HÉCTOR LUCERO

The Fourth International has summarized its conceptions on the present stage of the African revolution in the document on the colonial revolution adopted by the VIth World Congress. However, it is necessary that the revolutionary marxists constantly bring up-to-date their analyses and that they study more closely situations and trends to be able to elaborate concrete programmes for each country or group countries. We publish in this issue a contribution by comrade H. Lucero on these questions.

Within its present extremely fluid limits, one of the fundamental traits of the African revolution is its unity. Within the framework of an extraordinary revolutionary dynamism such as Africa presents today, this unity is reflected above all in the interinfluence and interdependence of various processes, and the preponderance and spread that are beginning to be acquired by those that express the most progressive and advanced trends in the African revolution at this stage.

It is against this background that it is necessary to situate the evolution of the two fundamental tendencies of the present African national leaderships, such as they have tended to become crystalized in the Monrovia and the Casablanca groups, and of the leaderships in the regions still under direct colonialist domination, as well as the prospects for the workers', trade-union, and revolutionary movement and of the proletarian and revolutionary Marxist left in the African revolution.

THE MONROVIA STATES

The meeting of the 20 states¹ held at Monrovia in May is the most advanced attempt so far to crystalize and give form to a bourgeois or pro-bourgeois current closely associated with European and US imperialism. This current is based on the strata or embryo of a commercial or agrarian bourgeoisie, and even of a national bourgeoisie, which places its hopes of development in an alliance with imperialism, and which is already allied with it to keep the development of the African revolution within capitalist bounds.

The intervention of US imperialism and of French and British imperialism is decisive in this

process. Their economic, technical, military, and diplomatic "aid" is aimed at setting up a bourgeois and land-owning ruling class, tied up with and nurtured by the state apparatus, by the aid of which they can keep their semi-colonial or (as they say in Africa) "neo-colonialist" domination, and confront or counterpose the influence of bourgeois-nationalist tendencies and proletarian-revolutionary tendencies. Another aim of this intervention is to slow down or hold back the evolution toward African unity and consolidate existing frontiers, tied up with the interests of ruling classes in each present state, thus maintaining the "Balkanization" of the continent.

The base for this manoeuvres located in countries like Nigeria, Senegal, or the Ivory Coast, where a bourgeois class of a certain degree of development and tied up with the export of raw materials imposes its mark on the economic and political development of the country.

The resolutions of the Monrovia Conference, extraordinarily well received by the whole European and US capitalist press for their "prudence" and "moderation," clearly define this tendency.

The Monrovia states avoided any attack on imperialism and "neo-colonialism". The resolutions of Algeria, the Congo, and Angola, set the role which this sector of the African bourgeoisie or embryo bourgeoisie intends to play.

In the case of Algeria, the conference took the position of a "mediator", calling on "both sides" to sign peace rapidly, and indirectly giving support to the most conciliatory and pro-imperialist tendencies inside the F L N. In the case of the Congo, it refused to condemn the murder of Lumumba, and distinguished itself from both Tshombé and Gizenga, giving its full support to the intervention of the United Nations and to the Kasavubu government. In the case of Angola, it expressed its support of the nationalists to obtain "autonomy", thus making a nuance between that and independence.

In an even more clear-cut way, the conference

¹ The Cameroons, the Central-African Republic, Chad, the Congo (capital, Brazzaville), Dahomey, Ethiopia, Gabon, Ivory Coast, Liberia, Lybia, Madagascar, Mauritania, the Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Togo, Tunisia, and Upper Volta.

did not utter any condemnation of the French atomic-bomb experiments in the Sahara, limiting itself to deploring "all nuclear tests".

On the level of intra-African relations, the conference rejected the idea of the political integration of the African states, replacing it by that of "coöperation" among equals — whose indispensable counterpart is coöperation with the imperialist powers.

Monrovia established five basic points for this coöperation: recognition of the political equality of all independent African states; non-intervention in the domestic problems of other African states; the right for each state to exist and to refuse any attempt at annexation; the right of each state to join with other states if it considers it advisable; respect for the territorial integrity of each state and prohibition to giving asylum to political opponents of other African states who use the country of asylum to undertake subversive actions against their country of origin.

The Monrovia five points are an attempt to "freeze" or to check the development of the most dynamic forces of the African revolution within the limits of the present states, and to consolidate a capitalist-type evolution within their present borders with the aid of imperialism.

But the very fact that, in order to oppose the Pan-Africanism of the embryonic African national bourgeoisie, they have had to resort to a conference and join forces on a continental basis, also indicates the strength of the feeling of unity on which the other sector is based. For all that, it is none the less certain that imperialism and its African allies, after the Congo crisis that shook up the whole of African developments, have at Monrovia made the most serious attempt to unite their forces on a continental scale and to offer a point of support, of strength, and of centralization to the pro-imperialist bourgeois tendencies or embryos of tendencies in the African states, and also in the regions of East and Central Africa that are on their way to independence.

THE CASABLANCA STATES

Fundamentally, the states of the Casablanca group represent the most conscious nationalist tendency of the African bourgeoisie or embryo of a bourgeoisie — according to the case — which sees its prospects in a development outside the control of imperialism, based on the expansion of the domestic market and not exclusively on the export of raw materials.

They represent also the tendency which has developed the most advanced consciousness — and to a certain extent the domestic forces for

trying to apply it — about the level at which it must act to limit and control the drive of the mass movement in Africa, and which at the same time relies to a limited degree on this movement in order to face imperialism and also relies on the East-West conflict on the world plane to improve its positions in negotiating with imperialism.

The group of the Casablanca Five (Ghana, Guinea, Mali, Morocco, and the United Arab Republic) is the spokesman of Pan-Africanism as a doctrine of the independent and united bourgeois development of Africa. Both Nasser and Nkrumah, spokesmen for this theory, understand that the development of an African bourgeoisie would be stifled within the limits of the present states and requires a unified market.

But above all bourgeois-national Pan-Africanism is an attempt to prevent or check the development of the most advanced sectors of the African revolution toward proletarian positions, by shutting them up within nationalist and "anti-imperialist" limits to keep the support of the African mass movement.

This is the explanation of what the bourgeois press of Western Europe calls the "revolutionary positions" of the Casablanca group, who for that matter, as a group, in no case go beyond the limits of bourgeois or petty-bourgeois nationalism.²

It is a fact that the Casablanca group is not internally homogeneous.

There are, on the one hand, countries like Egypt, Morocco, and Ghana, where a bourgeois class with a certain degree of development actually exists (even with all its limitations, in Ghana, for example), a relatively numerous workers' movement with its own organizations, differentiated to a greater or lesser degree from the nationalist sector in the government, and also a class of landowners whose presence raises the question of agrarian reform and of land as one of those to be solved by the revolution.

² The signators of the Casablanca Charter, adopted on 7th January 1961, assert their fidelity to the principles of Bandung and consider that they have "responsibilities toward the [entire] African continent".

The Casablanca Conference decided on the creation of an "African Consultative Assembly", "as soon as the conditions for it had been fulfilled," and that of three committees (political, economic, and cultural). A liaison bureau and joint military high command are also planned.

They also decided on: unconditional support of the G.P.R.A. in the Algerian affair, withdrawal of African troops from the Congo and unreserved support to the authorities of Stanleyville, approval of "any action taken in Mauritania by Morocco" and a condemnation of "the fictitious state of Mauritania." French nuclear experiments in the Sahara were sharply criticized, and Israel was denounced as "an agent of Western imperialism in Africa."

There are, on the other hand, Guinea and Mali, where the practical non-existence of a national bourgeois class stresses the Bonapartism of the governing staff between the country's plebeian masses and imperialism. Especially in Guinea, the peculiar character of the planification of the economy, the importance of the nationalized sector, the importance of the farm coöperatives, and the forms in which the population takes part in developments, have till now prevented the definite crystalization of a clearly bourgeois state apparatus, and have maintained the dependence of the leading staff on the mobilization of the country's masses.

The "African socialism" invoked by Guinea and Mali for their plans doubtless has a different meaning from the "socialism" as an ideal stage for an indefinite future invoked by Ghana or Senegal. While the former does not exclude the possibility of an evolution "in the Cuban style", the latter flatly takes the "Indian" road. But even in the case of Guinea, there is no guarantee of a spontaneous and autonomous development toward a non-capitalist state, toward a workers' and peasants' government. And in fact one of the purposes of bringing into existence the Casablanca group in its present form is that of setting bourgeois prospects for this development, by shutting it up within the limits of Pan-African nationalism of the bourgeois type.

The Casablanca group not only approved the principle of "unity of political action", with the resulting measures, but also signed agreements for the unification of Ghana, Guinea, and Mali. But up till now the governing staffs of these countries have not shown that they possess the necessary bases to check centrifugal tendencies and carry much further than mere resolutions these aspirations for unity, which would be one of the first steps toward the unification of first West Africa and later Negro Africa generally.

On the other hand, Pan-Africanism, as the ideology of the embryonic African bourgeoisie, was particularly expressed at the Third Pan-African Conference that met in March 1961 in Cairo, the resolutions of which were politically oriented along the lines of the Casablanca group, even if many of them were considerably more to the left.³

³ It is obvious that the other line of division cutting through the Casablanca group, the Monrovia group, and the Cairo conference, is that between the Arab and African-Negro countries — which is connected in particular with the role that the different sectors of the Arab bourgeoisie intends to play in Africa. But this is a problem that lies outside the scope of this article.

THE CAIRO CONFERENCE

The above-mentioned Pan-African Conference, following on those at Accra and Tunis, was attended by more than 50 organizations from almost all the African countries.

The key note, the opposite of that at the Monrovia meeting, was the attack on "neo-colonialism". The conference declared that "it approves resorting to force to liquidate imperialism" and pointed to the United States, West Germany, Great Britain, Belgium, France, Holland, Israel, and South Africa as the greatest "neo-colonialists". It denounced as active agencies of "neo-colonialism" "the embassies of the colonialist countries, the personnel of technical aid abroad and the personnel of the United Nations, the representatives of the imperialist countries, the tendentious propaganda of the colonialist countries, and the puppet governments used for the development of neo-colonialism".

The conference called on the independent African states to suppress any military base on their territories and to withdraw from any "community" under the patronage of the colonial powers. It made an appeal to speed up the common economic development of the continent and to fight for African unity.

Concerning the Congo, it denounced "the machinations of the UN", gave full support to the Gizenga government, declared Lumumba an African hero, and asked for the punishment of his murderers, beginning with Tshombé and Kasavubu. Concerning Algeria, it gave unconditional support to the G P R A and censured any attempt to refuse recognition of Algerian sovereignty over the Sahara. Concerning the Cameroons, it lined up in general with the positions of the rebels of the UPC (Union of the Peoples of the Cameroons) who are keeping up their guerrillas in the Bamileke country. Concerning the Central African Federation, it asked the African states to boycott its economy and to prohibit the use of their respective air spaces for this country's planes. Concerning South Africa, it recommended economic boycott and breaking off of relations and called for the cessation of South African domination over South-West Africa. It supported the liberation movements in the Portuguese colonies, and especially those in Angola. As for the UN, it denounced its "transformation into a tool of neo-colonialism", and called for the reorganization of the secretariat. It demanded the immediate release of Jomo Kenyatta and independence for Kenya in 1961.

Concerning African unity, it approved the following resolutions: the setting up of an "African Freedom Fund", aimed at giving financial help

to the liberation movements in the African continent, whose loans would be repaid by the independent African countries; creation of a Free Africa Radio in a central region of the continent; creation of an African press agency and an African information centre; setting up of an African Experts Committee, to determine a common economic policy for all Africa, a first step toward the economic unity of the continent; establishment of a Committee of African Military Chiefs, to set up plans for joint defense; creation of an intra-African transport enterprise; establishment of an African Consultative Council, formed by the representatives of the parliaments, with a permanent secretary, to establish a "common policy" for all Africa.

The conference asked the "anti-imperialist bloc" to contribute to the economic development of the African countries, "respecting national sovereignty and without political or military conditions", granting long-term credits at low interest rates, repayable in national currency and not in hard currencies, and putting Africans in all the principal posts in the development projects.

One of the main resolutions was in support of setting up an All-African Federation of Trade Unions, for the entire continent.

In economic matters, the conference took a stand for "the liquidation of the economic bases of colonialism and neo-colonialism and the creation of a national economy".⁴

The resolutions of the Cairo conference constitute one of the most advanced frameworks accepted by the Pan-Africanism that desires a capitalist development for Africa. But it is plain that it does not go beyond those limits, although it approaches them in some resolutions.

These resolutions, at the same time that they reflect the pressure of the Africa mass movement, with its hopes for African unification, including

⁴ In the April 1961 *Colonial Freedom News*, John Eber, representative of the Movement for Colonial Freedom at the conference, gives the following summary of the measures for economic development approved in the resolutions at Cairo:

- 1) Nationalization of the main foreign-owned estates, banks, transport, insurance and industrial concerns; land reform — land to those who cultivate it; credit and technical assistance by the state; encouragement of mutual aid in agriculture, leading to agricultural producers' coöperatives; 3) control of currency to prevent the exit of capital and profits, and ensure their investment in the country; and 4) state plans for development, with emphasis on full employment and a high rate of investment from internal sources by "austerity" policies; trade with all countries, with a warning that trade with imperialist countries had the danger of neo-colonialist penetration; emphasis on imports of capital goods and the creation of heavy industry.

in a certain way its socialist aspirations, express the need, for the present leaderships that have a bourgeois or petty-bourgeois base or hope for a bourgeois development, to limit and channel this movement by a "Jacobin" ideology. They are situated, furthermore, in the present international context of the advance of the colonial revolution, the resounding successes of the economy and the technology of the workers' states, and the strengthening of the de facto alliance between the workers' states and the colonial revolution — a context in which these African leading staffs and sectors have to move and act.

The relative weakness of these pro-bourgeois staffs in face of the masses, their need to keep the masses' support in order to stand up to imperialism, the impossibility of planning African development within the framework of "classic capitalism", and at the same time the profound revolutionary dynamism of the situation and the heterogeneity and radicalization of the organizations present — all these were expressed in the Cairo resolutions. Many of them may be considered as part of the program of an anti-imperialist united front, and supported by the proletarian left of the African revolution.

But this left cannot just merge into the Cairo program, become integrated in it without differentiation, and stop setting its own socialist goals, for the revolution and for the building of the workers' and revolutionary organization of the African masses. The Cairo program as a whole does not open up the road to a socialist development; it is not socialist, despite some declarations. It does not propose nationalization without indemnization of the enterprises, expropriation without indemnization of the land, monopoly of foreign trade under workers' control, workers' and people's organs of power, arming of the population in workers' and peasants' militia, etc. It is a program for building a "national economy", not an economy of a socialist, nationalized, and planned type.

The dilemma between an anti-imperialist bourgeois or petty-bourgeois program and an anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist workers' program is raised again in the application of one of the basic resolutions approved at Cairo, the meeting of a constituent congress of the All-African Federation of Trade Unions.⁵

⁵ The congress met on May 25th at Casablanca, under the patronage of eight founding organizations — the Union Marocaine du Travail, the Union Générale des Travailleurs Algériens, the Trades Union Congress of Ghana, the Egyptian Confederation of Labour, the Union des Travailleurs of Mali, the Union Générale des Travailleurs d'Afrique Noire, the Confédération National des Travailleurs of Guinea, and the Union Générale des

THE MASS MOVEMENT AND THE AFRICAN TRADE UNIONS

The pro-bourgeois leaderships of various types who are generally channeling and indeed controlling the African mass movement at the present stage depend largely on its pressure and its special and tumultuous forms of expansion in all Negro Africa.

If, in the period preceding independence, the African nationalist parties that are fighting for it and unifying the population behind this struggle are the most widespread form for this control, in the period just before and after independence it becomes more and more important for the nationalist tendencies to control the leaderships of the masses' trade-union movement.

The trade-union movement was born in the African — including the Arab — countries as part of the national movement, including being formally, as in the case of Ghana, one of the branches of the government party.

The slogan of "trade-union independence," which the European trade-union leaderships tried to transfer mechanically to Africa, was felt by the African masses first of all as "independence" from the European trade-union federations, and not as "independence" from the national movement, especially when the slogan came from the trade-union movement of the imperialist metropolis which had not differentiated themselves clearly from the imperialist policy of those countries.

The development of the trade-union movement nevertheless leads it to differentiate itself from the nationalist leaderships — even if it continues to support them — to emphasize more and more the masses' own independent interests, and to call for — as a negotiating mean, also — its own role as the leadership of the organized and most dynamic sector of the African masses.

Trade-unionism in Africa, as in all colonial and semi-colonial countries, tends to play a political role of its own. In the absence of mass workers' parties, it is the trade unions which in a series of countries tend to carry their representation of the proletariat and the masses over into the political

Travailleurs Tunisiens — and with the attendance of delegates from 45 trade-union organizations from 38 African countries.

The federation's charter, adopted on 30th May, says that members of the federation can not be affiliated to international trade-union organisations. It gives members with such affiliations ten months in which to disaffiliate from the international bodies. The charter calls for "positive neutralism" and non-alignment between blocs. It also says that there must be no interference by governments and political parties in trade-union affairs and no interference by international organisations in the running of African trade unions.

field. The trade-union leaders are obliged to be more and more aware of this pressure. The trade-union, as it gradually reaches a certain development, tends to be transformed into the centre concentrating the concerns, problems, and interventions of the masses on all levels. The natural trend is towards a trade-unionism that embraces all categories of the laboring population.

In almost all the African countries where the trade unions have attained a certain degree of development, the most radical wing of the national movement finds its support or bases itself directly or indirectly upon them. Despite their having few members, owing to the continent's lack of industrialization, the African trade unions already form a political centre of the masses, the influence of which may extend much farther than the categories grouped in their ranks.

The slogan of "trade-union independence" takes on new meaning to the degree that it begins to arise from the vanguard sectors of the masses themselves as against the apparatus of the bourgeois or pro-bourgeois party or state. Among the trade-union staffs and cadres which are appearing as the radical and leftist wing of the national movement, socialist ideas begin to find an echo and development, and especially ideas that imply a participation by the masses, through their organizations, in the leadership of the African revolution.

While the African nationalist leaderships are trying to control and domesticate these tendencies for their own use, the pro-imperialist leaderships ally themselves with the intervention of the agents of European and US imperialism in the African trade-union movement.

The old struggle of imperialism was aimed at preventing and condemning the political role of the African trade-union movement. In this it could count on the support of the leaders of the European and US trade-union movement, and also on that of the Stalinist-controlled World Federation of Trade Unions, both of whom for a long time condemned the "nationalist" deviations of the African trade unions⁶ and kept up a paternalistic and limiting attitude toward trade-unionism in the colonies.

At present, the AFL-CIO wing of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) is trying to control and channel this political role in its own favor, to facilitate the penetration of Yankee imperialism, and to check the independent development of the African masses by means of the control and bribing of the trade-union leaderships, while

⁶ A well-documented summary of this policy was made by Georges Fischer, "Syndicats et décolonisation," in *Présence Africaine*, October 1960-January 1961.

appearing at the same time opposed to the old "colonialism." Its agent for the African movement, Irving Brown, openly and handsomely subsidizes many African trade-union leaders. The leadership of the German DGB supports this policy. The AFL-CIO is in favor of granting regional autonomy inside the ICFTU to a regional organization of the African trade unions, thus reconciling the Pan-African tendency with control by the ICFTU.

The British Trade Unions Congress, on the other hand, has used the method of sending out trade-union organizers from the former mother-country. It is opposed to the trade unions' intervening in politics, asserting that this means opening the door to communism, even when it is done while waving the national flag. It accuses the US unions of trying to build a trade-union movement by controlling and bribing its leaders, while the Americans in their turn accuse the TUC of trying to impose their control by getting the African union movement under way in the mould of British trade-unionism.

Inside the ICFTU there is thus a clash between two methods of pro-imperialist control of trade-unionism in these countries, corresponding to the old European paternalistic method and the Yankee method of alliance with a sector of the local bourgeoisie. If the latter method is better adapted to the dynamism of the African situation, it is also certain that its prospects are limited in regard to the nationalist tendency supported by the mass movement, on the one hand, and, on the other, the revolutionary tendencies that escape from the control of that nationalist wing.

It is for this reason that the ICFTU and its agents have concentrated, in one form or another, their fire against the creation of an independent African federation, and surely they will not accept with resignation the resolutions of the Casablanca congress, to the calling of which they were opposed for at least two years before. This is one of the fundamental battles for the control and development of the African mass movements in the next years.⁷

Quite apart from the intentions of the pro-bourgeois nationalist leaders, the creation of a Pan-African Trade-Union Federation reflects a deep impulse of the mass movement, and is a profoundly progressive step that shows the weight that the movement in Africa is acquiring

⁷ As is indicated above, countries such as Ghana, Morocco, and the UAR, whose governments most clearly represent the bourgeois nationalist tendency, are those with the greatest internal weight inside the trade-union movement: 650,000 members in the UMT and the Moroccan unions, 350,000 in the Ghana TUC, and 300,000 in the Egyptian trade unions.

as a means of centralizing the economic and political struggles of the proletariat and the masses. The trade unions take political positions, and appear as an instrument for bringing an independent policy to maturity. They open up the possibility of developing from that starting-point, as in other semi-colonial countries, as embryo organisms of power of the masses.

In all Africa, the development toward a modern economy imposes the objective need of planning. The participation of the trade unions is fundamental for the drive and direction that this planning will develop. The growth of the Pan-African Trade-Union Federation will be a major spur to unification on socialist foundations of the nationalized and planned economy, directed by the toilers themselves, to be introduced as a new progressive factor in the correlation of forces of the revolution.

For this, the trade unions need to demand an independent political role for themselves. Even when they support the national and anti-imperialist movement, they do not identify themselves with it. They are the base of its socialist wing. They are the organization for the wider regrouping of the toilers in this period to impose planning on socialist bases, to struggle for the transformation of the revolution of national liberation into the socialist revolution.

Nasser, as representative of the national bourgeoisie, contends that the stage following that of political independence is that of economic independence, the "national economy" directed by the local bourgeoisie or embryo bourgeoisie. The African trade unions must be a centre for the preparation of a program, for centralization, and leadership of the struggle for social liberation, for replacement of colonialist society by a workers' and peasants' government in each country and in all Africa, based on the trade unions and workers', peasants', and people's organisms, which would manage a nationalized and planned economy.

THE POWDER-MAGAZINE IN COLONIAL AREAS.

Not only is the independent development of the trade-union movement an element that undermines the attempts at crystallization on pro-imperialist positions at Monrovia or on national-bourgeois positions at Casablanca, where today the concerns of the leading sectors of the new African states are concentrated; but the situation in all regions where white colonial domination is still being maintained forms a powder-magazine that threatens to blow sky-high all the stabilizing schemes for the African situation and even opens the doors to the

beginning of the second revolution all over Africa.

From Angola to Mozambique, from Kenya to South Africa, armed rebellion is smoldering or has already begun. The whole Portuguese colonial system, white domination in South Africa, in South-West Africa, and in the Rhodesias, and colonial domination in Kenya and Uganda, are exposed to a chain reaction of African insurrection.

The internal explosion in the Congo, provoked by the intervention of Belgian imperialism with the solidarity of world imperialism through the UN, had as one of its goals the "neutralizing" of the revolutionary forces and the setting up of a barrier between independent West Africa and the southern, central, and eastern areas of the continent under white colonial domination. Ethiopia and the Sudan complete the circle in this case.

Nevertheless, the revolution is blossoming out in new forms — which in their turn will stimulate new future revolutionary developments in the Congo. In Angola real guerrilla warfare is developing. In South Africa, there are guerrilla activities in Pondoland, and the entire situation is reaching a point of tension close to a general explosion, despite the desperate efforts of the traditional leaderships to limit and channel the struggle by "peaceful" and "non-violent" means. In South-West Africa, the pressure of the Angola revolution is spreading.

In the regions under British colonial domination, the resistance of the white settlers threatens to jettison all the plans of the Colonial Office to carry out a more or less "peaceful" transition towards an alliance with a new African ruling sector, an example of which would be the present evolution of Tanganyika with Julius Nyerere. Particularly in Southern Rhodesia and the Central African Federation, the racist white settler are opposing a furious resistance and are thereby preparing (and preparing themselves for) a real armed struggle, being disposed to resist with their backs to the wall, like their twins in South Africa.

In this whole area the settlers and the mining companies, who exploit Negro labor on a vast scale, are the heart of the white resistance. This locates the problem at the same time on immensely revolutionary bases: the African insurrection is aimed, not only against white colonial domination, but simultaneously against capitalist and landowner exploitation personified by the heads of the enterprises and the white settlers and kept up by racism and discrimination in its most inhuman and brutal forms.

In all eastern, central, and southern Africa,

and especially in countries such as Kenya or Rhodesia, the problem of the land is at the centre of the revolution. The expulsion of the white settlers and the restoration of the lands seized from the Africans is the first slogan of the revolution in Kenya. If imperialism is resistant about freeigg Jomo Kenyatta, it is because it knows that his release risks being considered by the African population of Kenya as the signal for settling accounts about the land question and as the final blow against imperialist domination in all of eastern Africa.

The revolution against white colonialist domination in this area takes on the clearest form of peasant revolution. The guerrillas of Angola, like those of Pondoland in South Africa, like those of the Cameroons farther north, like (a few years ago) those in the Mau-Mau rebellion, are the forerunners of the spread of the African peasant revolution, which is aimed directly — even though not consciously — against any attempt at setting up in these countries a "comprador" bourgeoisie or a regime of a feudo-capitalist type allied to imperialism.

The guerrilla activities are centralizing the struggle of the peasant masses and form a centre of reference and of stimulation for the detribalized masses in the cities, particularly in South Africa. The African peasant mobilization cannot stop at the reconquest of the lands. Its radical character arises from the fact that white domination is closely identified with capitalist exploitation. The solution of the land problem by revolutionary means requires the destruction of the whole apparatus of white domination. In South Africa it raises the question of the ownership and administration of the mines and factories, of the whole economic apparatus. The reseizure of the lands means simultaneously the seizure of the mines and factories by the Africans, and raises the question of the nature of the new power.

In South Africa especially, the smashing failure of reformist and peaceful methods for decades, together with the development of the revolution in the rest of the continent, helps radicalize the whole situation. Despite their preponderance in the traditional African leaderships, influenced by Ghandi-ism and white liberals, the conciliatory tendencies in the African movement, such as the African National Congress and its allies, are in retreat in the consciousness of the masses.

The tendencies that favor armed action, together with the class mobilization of the African proletarians in South Africa are winning authority among the African masses of the country and are leading considerable sectors of them. In the new stage of the South African revolution now

beginning, the weight and preponderance of these tendencies, which already take their stand on general socialist bases, will increase.

From now on and in the course of the struggle, these tendencies must work up and make definite a concrete workers' and socialist program, to centralize the various non-European class forces, — workers' and peasants' — on a national rather than merely regional or tribal scale, with the prospect of a workers' and peasants' government that administers a nationalized and planned economy.

This development will put the whole African revolution on new bases, will incorporate the most dynamic and powerful proletarian force in all Africa — the South African proletariat — on a socialist program, and will contribute to giving a proletarian centre to the whole African mass movement.

At the other end of Africa, the future of the Algerian Republic will have a decisive weight in the evolution of the African revolution, both in the forms that it takes on organizationally, and in the inevitable differentiation that will be set up between the pro-bourgeois tendencies who favor association with imperialism, and the proletarian and plebeian tendencies, centred in the U G T A which proclaim themselves "anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist."

THE PRESENT PREMISES OF THE AFRICAN REVOLUTION

To the question "capitalist road or socialist road?" in Africa, the answer "socialist road" appears in a more and more exclusive form. Even the pro-bourgeois and pro-capitalist tendencies are forced to reject the classic diagrams and to adopt the "socialist" label.

But it is as far a cry from Nkrumah's "socialism" to the socialism of the African masses as from his "Pan-Africanism" to theirs.

The fundamental problems of African development — industrialization, living standards, the land question, increase in production, unification of the African-Negro nation — cannot even begin to be tackled with the methods of "classic" capitalism. Even for the right wing of the African national movement it is out of the question for Africa to be able to repeat the pattern of capitalist development of the Western industrial countries.

In Africa there is a kind of shifting of positions. While the representatives of the "comprador" bourgeoisie and landowner and bourgeois sectors allied to imperialism, whose position was expressed at Monrovia, tend to imitate the parliamentary and state institutions of the Western bourgeoisie, the representatives of the African

nationalist bourgeoisie are playing the "neutral" card for all it is worth and are using a "socialist" vocabulary. What is more, they are adopting a pattern of development similar to that of the "revolution by stages," theorized first by Russian Menshevism, then by Stalinism: i e, first a stage of industrial capitalist development of the country, then — in an indefinite future — a stage of development toward socialism. Such is Nkrumah's "socialism."

But the need to construct a modern society in Africa does not permit of any capitalist stage. A modern state cannot be a capitalist state, the industrial development of a backward country is not possible by the methods of private ownership of industrial enterprises, market anarchy, commercial and industrial domination of foreign capital, agrarian backwardness, while leaving "anti-capitalism" for an unspecified future.

The development of a native feudo-bourgeois or bourgeois class, based on the ownership of the land of industry, on the control of trade and the administration of the state apparatus, i e, in the manner of Houphouët-Boigny on the Ivory Coast or Nkrumah in Ghana, slows down the essential dynamism of the African revolution and increases dependence on outside "aid" and the direct investment of imperialist capital.

Planning is an objective necessity for the development of the economy of the African countries. It runs up against serious obstacles, among them the lack of capital, technical cadres, an adequate substructure⁸, etc.

This renders even more necessary the direct intervention and participation of the African masses, who, as against the weak and embryonic native bourgeoisie, are the essential motor of the revolution.

But the precondition required to make it possible to carry out this planning and participation is above all the existence of a decisive nucleus of nationalized economy in the nascent industrial sector, the organization of farm exploitation by means of coöperatives or communes which assimilate the traditional structures of African agrarian society and permit the expansion of production; and, above all, a political precondition: the intervention of the masses by means of their own organizations — neighborhood and town committees, trade unions, etc — in the planning and managing of economic development.

Any attempt to build and strengthen a bourgeois state apparatus and a privileged owning class, i e, to impose a capitalist frame, goes

⁸ Charles Bettelheim refers to these obstacles in his article "Planification économique en Afrique Noire", in "Cahiers Internationaux", January-February 1961.

against this intervention of the masses, checks the force that is essential for economic development, and raises new barriers and obstacles.

As much as or more than that of the people's committees, the intervention of the trade unions is fundamental in this planning, as well as in the management of nationalized industry. The trade unions — even with their limited present development — represent the sector most connected with a socialist development of the economy, the basis for a proletarian, non-capitalist leadership. They further represent the sector that is not tied down by the special interests of the present and artificial borders frontiers, unlike not only the local possessing classes but also the staff linked with the state apparatus. The trade unions are the most homogeneous and unconditionally Pan-Africa sector, most tied up with the outlook for a united African development on workers' and socialist bases.

It is only this basis that it is possible to raise, concretely and not abstractly, the question whether the African masses are "mature" enough to begin the construction of socialism. In spite of their illiteracy, in spite of the conservative weight of traditional African agrarian cultures, the readiness to accept and the acceptance of socialism by the African masses appears to be a quite natural thing. In a certain sense, the old cultures that are falling apart together with tribal society offer less resistance than the respect for or belief in the effectiveness of the capitalist state apparatus introduced by the reformist leaderships among vast sectors of the toilers in highly industrialized countries.

In all Africa without exception, not only the social structures but the consciousness of the masses is living through a process of transformation of an inexhaustible dynamism. The experiences since independence, of the alliance of the local pro-bourgeois sectors with "neo-colonialism," of the imperialist manoeuvres of Belgium and the UN in the Congo, of the assassination of Lumumba, have been lived through, discussed, and assimilated in every corner of the continent, no matter how cut-off or illiterate its inhabitants may seem, with much greater rapidity and understanding than by large sectors of the Western proletariat. The impact of the first Sputnik, like that of the "Lunik," and that of the first cosmic flight brought off by the U S S R, has reached the very depths of the African continent in revolution, as the Chinese experience or the triumph of the Cuban revolution have reached there too.

That experience and that assimilation is still disorderly, and still lack a centre. But in this disorder, which is also the disorder of the

economy, the transport, the administration, and of the peasant masses' uncontrolled detribalization and urbanization, revolutionary consciousness is also ripening.

Capitalism is totally incapable of imposing order on this process, of setting up a functioning bourgeois state that impresses or even wins a certain respect in the eyes of the masses. It is incapable of replacing the collapsed order of the old tribal structures, on the one hand, and of colonial domination on the other, by order of a capitalist type.

Only the autonomous participation and organization of the masses can bring order into this development, into the transformation and disappearance of tribal and colonial society. In a whole series of countries, the most concentrated nucleus of this autonomous intervention at present is the trade unions, and then its alliance with the left wing of the national movement on a workers' and socialist program.

The African cadres are being formed by jumping over stages, in great leaps, in a process of permanent revolution that tackles not only objective realities but also subjective consciousness and development. A number of those cadres are getting incorporated in modern organization, *organizing* the socialist revolution.

This explains the dynamism, daring, capacity for quick understanding, inventiveness, and spirit of initiative, decisiveness, and resourcefulness, that many of these cadres, recently incorporated in the revolutionary movement, are showing in the most varied circumstances. These cadres are growing mature for the permanent revolution, not on the basis of old polemics, but from their own living daily experience and from the requirements and the dynamism of African revolution, on the basis of a movement of millions and millions whose violent desire for human dignity — as deep as or deeper than that shown in the greatest mass movements in history, since it was formed by centuries of slavery in the modern world — cannot be pacified by reformist solutions that capitalism is incapable of giving in Africa. There is the real root of socialism in Africa and also the possibility of beginning right now to build it.

THE SOCIALIST PROGRAM AND THE FORCES OF THE SECOND AFRICAN REVOLUTION

The "Monrovia Charter" and the "Casablanca Charter" are to advance the intentions of the present African nationalist leaderships to build a dyke — even though at different levels — for the African revolution. Both attempts have their men and their forces in the trade-union

leaderships, with the support either of the ICFTU, the AFL-CIO, the British TUC, or the German DGB, or of the national state apparatuses or their agents or ideologists in the African labor movement.

French imperialism with its policy of "association," British imperialism with its policy of "independence by stages" (setting up first a dominant native sector allied with its own interest), US imperialism with its intervention by trade-union agents (Irving Brown), its diplomatic envoys, its investments and "aid" plans, and its men in the African state apparatuses — also do not disdain, to the degree that they have to retreat on other fields, to deal with the most direct representatives of the nationalist bourgeoisie, such as Nkrumah, as has already been seen in the past.

The crystalization of the old African leaderships of countries that have reached independence or are on the road to it by agreement with imperialism, on positions of resistance to the further development of the revolution, creates the conditions for the differentiation and growth of proletarian socialist ideas, and of socialist forces, in the national movement. These ideas and forces tend to differentiate themselves within the "national front," whether in the left or the youth of the nationalist parties, or in the trade unions.

But to the degree that these forces remain within the national program, within the leadership of the nationalist movements, only as their left wing, their role tends to be the following: to express the discontent of the rank and file and its desire to go forward with a socialist outlook, but at the same time to form a safety valve for this pressure without breaking with the national reformist leadership. It is completely certain that this break cannot be artificial or made by limited sectors which would condemn themselves to isolation. But neither can they accept indefinitely and passively a prospect which would be, as these left forces grow and become preponderant, a "unity blackmail" by the reformist national leadership.

In a certain way, the Cairo resolutions reflect this dual aspect. But only by escaping from this subjection can the organizations of the African masses have the possibility of fighting for the most positive and anti-imperialist aspects of the resolutions, without remaining prisoners of the pro-bourgeois nationalist ideology.

The independent development of the trade unions and the trade-union federations, on the one hand, and the development of guerrilla fighting and the concentration of the peasant revolution on armed struggle, on the other, are the main forces that from now on will tend to break

these patterns, to burst through the dykes of the pro-imperialist or reformist-national leaderships, and to open up a revolutionary and socialist channel to the always tumultuous wave of the African revolution.

It is fundamentally on the development of these forces that depends the fate of a staff like that of Sekou Touré and the Guinea experiment, which the most conscious bourgeois or pro-bourgeois sectors of the Casablanca group are seeking to hem in within their own limits, preventing it from joining up with new centres of revolutionary development. Both tendencies are represented in the Guinean staff.

These forces will also be decisive for a new rising stage of the revolution in the Congo, where the concentrated action of world imperialism has not been able to destroy the endurance of the centralizing forces, despite their lacking adequate means and parties for their expression and development.

In the face of Monrovia and Casablanca, in the face of imperialist manoeuvres in East Africa, the problem that is raised is the program to centralize and unify the socialist forces of the revolution on an African scale. And program signifies means, methods, and forces to carry them forward.

The program is inevitably based on the prospect of the Socialist United States of Negro Africa, as the Sixth World Congress of the Fourth International presented it.⁹

The basis for development must be a fundamental nucleus of nationalized economy, through the nationalization without indemnification of the great colonial imperialist enterprises, and the development of nationalized industries under workers' administration. The payment of indemnifications to the expropriated enterprises, far from being a "tactical" measure to calm down imperialism, as it is presented by some reformist leaderships, only serves to load a heavy mortgage on the future success of nationalization and on the weak economy of the country, and to maintain the ties of dependence and the sabotaging interference of imperialism in the economy. Foreign industries may be set up within the framework of the plan, always provided that the margin of profit remain reasonable and limited, and that most of it be reinvested within the country, integrating the industry in the national economy under workers' control.

The monopoly of foreign trade under workers' control is indispensable for any development plan

⁹ See the entire section on Negro Africa in the resolution, "The Colonial Revolution: Its Balance-Sheet, Its Problems, and Its Prospects," *FOURTH INTERNATIONAL* n° 12, Winter 1960-61, pp 41-43.

in countries like these, where this trade is of a disproportionate weight in the economy. That, together with the nationalization of banking and credit under workers' control, is the basis for investment and planning of resources by the state.

Even when the peculiarities of each country are taken into account, farm coöperatives or communes are the general framework for the development of agricultural production, integrating and surpassing the old African agrarian structures. But a fundamental role is also played by state aid of every sort to the peasant coöperatives or communes, as well as to the small peasantry, and state centralization and marketing of farm products, with the collaboration of the peasant organizations: "Investment in labor," the mobilization of all the human resources which today are underemployed or not employed at all, will to a large extent replace, as experience has shown, the lack of big capital for agricultural development in the first stage.

But this "investment" and mobilization are impossible without the direct and leading participation of the urban and rural masses in the revolution, in the management of the state and the economy. In the very last instance, it is on the *political* level that the whole problem of economic development is to be solved at the present stage of the revolution in Africa.

It is by the participation of these masses that it will be possible to work up the *economic plan*, beginning with a census of the people's needs, with an order of priorities, in order to set up a plan that harmonizes the needs of development and accumulation with the most urgent needs of the population, and the utilizable resources.

The raising of the standard of living, not only by the fight against illiteracy and the development of education, but in all ways — wages, housing, full employment, medical attention, communications, etc — cannot occupy a merely secondary place in the priorities, as it does in the "austerity" projects of various African governments, an "austerity" that certainly does not reach as far as the stratum of state functionaries, and, linked up with them, the tradesmen and private beneficiaries of state credit, et al.

There is need of a raw-materials pool among the African states, so as to negotiate under the best possible conditions about the price of their products on the world market, as well as other measures aimed at pooling technicians and other resources needed for development.

An economy of this type will permit a thorough use of the aid coming from the workers' states in the form of money, machines, technicians, etc.

In each country it is necessary to work up on this basis a *transitional program*, which studies

the particular aspects and problems which worry and stir up the masses, from question of wages and working conditions to the problems of the emancipation of women, the overcoming and assimilation of tribal peculiarities and rivalries, etc. The backward state of the economy, measures that check the revolution and the centralized mobilization of the masses, contribute to giving nutriment to regional and tribal disputes. The forces that are being uselessly wasted in these can be reabsorbed and used only through the centralization of the revolutionary forces with this program and these methods.

One of the bases for the support and growth of the embryonic African bourgeoisie, and of its class ideologies and cadres, is the development of an army and a staff of privileged officers. This is a force constructed and aimed directly against the masses and their organizations. It is necessary everywhere to bring up the question of dissolving the army and replacing it by the people in arms, the arming of the toilers of town and country, organized in workers', peasants', and people's militia, who elect their own officers, as was done in the Cuban revolution.

All these economic and political measures require the direct intervention of the masses through their own organizations: trade unions, urban and rural committees, etc. In Africa, as everywhere and even more than elsewhere, there is no social force or organizational artifice that can replace this.

THE TRADE UNIONS, THE MASS WORKERS' PARTY, AND THE REVOLUTIONARY MARXIST PARTY.

The centre for the development of this program, for the regrouping of those forces inclined to carry forward a socialist program, is formed today by the peasant guerrilla movements where these exist or are being prepared, and, more generally, the trade unions. These, though still controlled by leaderships favorable to the nationalist tendencies, tend to intervene politically, reflecting the pressure and positions of the masses.

This intervention must be stimulated. It must be extended — everywhere that the trade-union movement has attained a certain level of development — not only to its independence from the state and from the nationalist parties, but to its own political expression, the formation of workers' or labor parties based on the trade-union movement, with union support, with a workers' and socialist program for the revolution. The labor party based on the trade unions would be the conscious expression of the political tendency of the trade-union organizations, and it can be the political instrument for the alliance between

the urban and rural masses, beyond the control of the bourgeois or pro-bourgeois tendencies. It is the means for developing and expending the political maturity of the masses, and of the socialist forces.

At present the leadership of the forces that can form anti-imperialist united-front alliances is in the hands of pro-bourgeois sectors, as the Cairo meeting, among others, has shown.

The autonomous development of the workers' movement, through trade-union independence, the Pan-African trade-union federation, and the formation of labor parties based on the trade unions, and its alliance with the peasants and the peasant guerrillas, will permit the socialist forces to be independent in every anti-imperialist united front, will give them the means to prevent the worker, peasant, and plebeian forces from being subjected to the interests and leadership of the bourgeois and pro-bourgeois sectors.

It will also provide the means for the development of organisms for popular action and intervention in the leadership of the revolution and of the state (committees of every sort at different levels), against attempts to "freeze" the intervention of the masses in the African revolution and to consolidate state apparatuses separated from the masses and incapable of organizing, planning, and spurring on African development.

The position of Stalinism and Moscow, up till this last period, had been to support the African nationalist leaderships and to subordinate to them the independent movement of the masses. Only in the very last stage have they begun to raise the question of the need for the independent organization of Communist Parties,¹⁰ with the program, however, of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, by stages, and a front with the national bourgeoisie and its agents during the whole of what they consider the "bourgeois democratic stage" of the revolution.

This is tantamount to subjecting the independent movement of the masses to the present leadership of the Nkrumah sort, in the best or cases to assigning it a simple role of "bringing" pressure on the national bourgeoisie, to preparing new catastrophes like that the C P suffered in Egypt, to cite just one example.

The socialist forces of the African revolution need to organize there a revolutionary Marxist party on the basis of each country and furthermore on a Pan-African scale.

The independent political expression of the trade unions can be ensured by their own labor

party, based on the unions, in those countries where the unions bases for this exist. Such a party should comprise all the workers' tendencies — including the revolutionary Marxist, Trotskyist tendency — of the workers' movement.

But the political expression and action of the African revolutionary Marxist vanguard can be ensured only the organization *everywhere* of the revolutionary Marxist party, the Bolshevik political organization of the vanguard, which develops the whole revolutionary Marxist program of the African revolution, which builds the staff of African Bolshevik cadres, which intervenes to stimulate or lead, where that is possible, all revolutionary processes, educating the vanguard of the masses in the ideas and the complete internationalist program of Trotskyism, of the permanent revolution, of the Fourth International.

Without isolating itself from the living forces of the revolution in the channels through which they are moving, developing, where necessary and possible, the left tendencies in the nationalist movement, getting integrated in the organizations of the peasant guerrillas, spurring on the development of mass labor parties based on the unions and possibly entering them with at least part of its forces — the revolutionary Marxist party must nevertheless be the centre of incentive, initiative, and conscious Marxist leadership of the vanguard forces of the revolution. One of its tasks is to work for the regroupment on an African scale of the forces and organizations in each country that claim to be proletarian socialist and internationalist, differentiated or on the way to becoming differentiated from the so-called "socialism" of the African bourgeoisie.

The most enormous pressures — of world imperialism, of African nationalism, of Stalinism, of Moscow or Peking — are turned on Africa. There is direct or indirect pressure on the revolutionary movement and on the revolutionary vanguard, on the trade unions, and on the mass movement.

The development of the trade unions and their centralization on an All-African or partial scale, the development of guerrilla activity, push the revolution up to higher levels, but at the same time increase these pressures.

This renders more necessary than ever the task of developing and organizing the revolutionary Marxist forces, to spur on the alliance of the trade unions and the left wing of the national movement in the independent states with the peasant war of liberation that is smoldering in in South Africa, that has burst out in Angola, that is threatening to burst out in Kenya, which will upset all the plans for stabilizing the African situation.

¹⁰ See Walter Markov (professor at Leipzig University), "Mouvement national et classes sociales dans le Tiers-Monde," in *Cahiers Internationaux*, March-April 1961. May 1960

These forces must provide the program and build and unify on the African scale the cadres for this struggle, for this alliance, and for this next stage of the revolution in Africa. They must be the pole of attraction and the initiators of regroupment of the whole most revolutionary sector of African society in movement. They must help to demonstrate the program in practice, in deeds, encouraging from below all sorts of initiatives and actions of solidarity with the other African movements: strikes, demonstrations, the organization and sending of militia to support the guerrillas, the shipment of all sort of aid, etc.

The rich complexity of the whole process now going on in Africa creates the conditions whereby a relatively small group of revolutionary Marxist cadres, organized in a party, may have a very great, and indeed decisive, weight in the process itself.

Stalinism and a whole sector of the nationalist left have practically abandoned this task, and lack the program and outlook to carry it forward.

The program and organization of the Fourth International are the instrument, that must be immensely developed, beginning from the present level, to carry forward these tasks in the next stage of the African revolution, to give drive to the regroupment of the socialist, workers', and revolutionary forces, to unify the African revolutionary Marxist movement with the experience and the organized forces of revolutionary Marxism in the world, and particularly in the centres of the colonial revolution, so that these forces can make their weight felt in the whole process now going on in Africa.

May 1961.

THE ALGIERS PUTSCH OF APRIL 22nd

By PIERRE FRANK

The recent putsch in Algiers attempted by a few Generals and Colonels followed a number of attempted armed coups which, since 1956, have aimed to modify the policy and regime in France. From February 6th 1956 to May 13th 1958 these armed coups have succeeded in imposing the policy of so-called "French-Algeria", and the elimination of Parliamentary democracy.

Since May 13th 1958 these armed coups have neither reversed the regime of the Fifth Republic, nor reversed the march of Algeria towards self-determination — towards independence.

Until May 13th 1959 these coups succeeded, thanks to the union of the European-Algerians and the army, combined with the wearing down of the democratic regime and the needs of Big Capital for a power "independent" of French society. Once de Gaulle was installed in power this combination was not maintained. We will come later to the attitude of the bourgeoisie in France. For, whatever they did in Algiers, the army (the professionals of course) wanted to maintain an Algeria indissolubly tied to France and did not want to serve the *particular* reactionary interests of the European-Algerians. It is this which explains both their attitude of wait and see in January 1960, when Lagaillard and Ortiz attempted the "coup des barricades" in Algiers and their recent attempted putsch, prepared entirely in the backroom, truly as a "Kriegspiel", outside any ties with the political formations of the "ultras" of France and Algeria, and of all preparations of a political order — unless one calls a few plastic bombs preparation of a political order. . .

We see once again, as in the whole post-war period, that fascism has been revealed to be extremely feeble. In France itself it reached its height as a movement with Poujadism, which grouped the generally old and small merchants ousted by the capitalist concentration in certain underdeveloped regions, but who never dared attack the workers' organisations. In Algeria it was more important; it was founded on the desperate resistance of the Europeans to the rising colonial revolution.

But there also without the support of the army it would not have been very important. Fascism has not known a serious development in the post-war period except in the very particular form of the transformation of an important part of the professional army into a political faction, seeing

in the "subversive war" and the "psychological war" the means of bringing an end to communism and the colonial war.

BONAPARTE AND HIS SWORD.

De Gaulle was brought to power following the coup of May 13th 1958, but as we said at the time he was not at all a political representative of the forces which made the operation.¹ He came to power pushed by a small but dynamic wing of Big Capital which has modernised the basic industries in France but which, in order to carry out its work, must accelerate the process of concentration in light industry, in distribution and in the countryside, and which finds the parliamentary regime a big obstacle on this road. De Gaulle was installed following an old political tradition — that of bonapartism — as an arbiter above society. The bonapartism of de Gaulle uses well the philosophy of the "Grandeur" of France but he does not hold the sword — that is to say the army — firmly in his hand. On the one side there is no lack of officers of the old school still imbued with Petainism and who have not forgotten that in June 1940 de Gaulle gave a dangerous example of disobedience. On the other side, there is the young neo-fascist school of "expeditious and limited savoir-faire" who reproach de Gaulle with selling out the Empire in the manner of Mendes-France.

From May 13th de Gaulle sought by all sorts of manoeuvres, tricks and corruption (promotions, dismissals . . .) to take the army in hand and make it an instrument of his "strong State".

He did not fail as well to give a new reason for its existence. If, with the march of events, France must let go the ballast of the Colonies, he, de Gaulle, will keep it in the ranks of a Great Power, creating that which at present is the mark of a Great Power, that is, atomic weapons and not colonies. Amongst other things the "striking force" serves to regroup around de Gaulle the most technical part of the army far removed from the memories of Dien-Bien-Phu. But, this attempt to take over control of the army by these means will prove in vain. If it is true that the adventure of Challe, Salan, et

¹ See various articles in the "Fourth International" and also our introduction to the new French edition of "Whither France" by L. Trotsky.

al. failed quickly and miserably, it is no less true that the plot was widespread in the army and that only the course of circumstances prevented the participation of a larger number of officers implicated in the plot.

Also, this time, under the cover of a few arrests and of a certain number of sanctions, de Gaulle proceeds with a much more serious plan. He is obliged to dissolve the units which constitutes the spear-head of the French army — the four day putsch itself contributed to the breaking up of the army. De Gaulle clearly felt the danger of the putsch and he did not hesitate to appeal to the troops to refuse to obey all rebel officers, *even when they were involved in operations against the F.L.N.*, to crush the military plot if necessary with arms. Never have the “democrats” and the workers’ parties dared go so far, not even on May 13th 1958.

The greatest obstacle the “putschists” encountered in Algeria were the conscripts. They did not act as a malleable mass, who would be sympathetic to the sentiments of the European-Algerians, and would not oppose the plot. From the beginning the conscripts were hostile to the armed coup. The resistance first of all manifested itself as inertia, passivity, in front of the orders of the rebels and here and there an active resistance. The appeal of de Gaulle gave to all soldiers who wanted to act against their officers a point of support.

The remaining rebels rapidly retreated with the regiment’s professional soldiers whom they used to commence the operation. One sees now in the army a number of signs of distrust, of refusal to serve under the orders of those officers who have been dilatory in the course of the putsch. In short to the growing distrust between the officers and de Gaulle, is now added a distrust between the troops and the officers.

THE “STRONG STATE”.

The same dubious attitude of the military cadres is rife in the other armed forces of the State (police . . .) and this explains why on the evening of Sunday 23rd April panic reigned in the high apparatus of the State, and why, after de Gaulle’s “aidez-moi” appeal to the French people, Debré appealed to the people to oppose the Parachutists whom, he thought, threatened to land within a few hours. This is why the ministers such as Malraux and Frey were forced to form a militia of odds and ends, and why the “government” closed its eyes, more or less, to the possibility of the formation of workers’ militias. The attitude of the manager of Renault in his relations with the trade union organisations, more particularly with the C G T, was at least ambiguous on this point for

some hours. It is hardly necessary to say that, once the danger became remote, the government recovered itself and even swaggered, attributing to itself all the merits of success. In fact, within a few hours, all the mystique of the “Strong State”, spread abundantly for nearly three years, had collapsed.

THE BOURGEOISIE AND DE GAULLE

In the course of this operation, amongst other things was shown the isolation of the regime even with regard to large layers of the bourgeoisie, both middle and big. Incontestably these layers were not favourable to a coup d’Etat. Business goes well — why upset the market? But at the same time these layers did not show any solidarity towards de Gaulle. The Conseil National du Patronat Français (National Council of French Employers) only made a declaration against all disturbances of order three days after the collapse of the putsch. The Confédération des Petites et Moyennes Entreprises (Confederation of Small and Medium Enterprises) made no declaration. The Confédération Générale des Cadres (General Confederation of Managerial Staff) was not associated with the strike of April 24th, refusing, they said, to participate in a political movement. The organisation par excellence of people of influence, the Indépendants et Paysans, made no declaration, and its General Secretary, Duchet, refused as Mayor of his commune to send a pro-de Gaulle declaration. He has since left his post as General Secretary but this does not cancel out the fact that he expressed the sentiments of large layers of the well-established bourgeoisie, who accept de Gaulle as a last resort. The political editor of “Le Monde”, Jacques Fauvet, who conveys with a slight Leftish touch the positions of the intelligently conservative bourgeois strata, in a conversation with some journalists, replied as follows to the question: “If de Gaulle was to disappear what would remain of this regime?”

“Nothing! For the time being, nothing!... I believe that de Gaulle has been necessary to set the affairs of Algeria in order. The suspension of certain democratic forms was also a necessity... But we shall not be committed much longer to this road and wait first for Algerian affairs to be solved, and second for de Gaulle to go. Afterwards we shall see!”

How much is expressed in these few words! The cynicism of a bourgeoisie rich in political experience lends support to the impression that de Gaulle will go once the affair of Algeria is settled.

THE ATTITUDE OF THE WORKING CLASS AND ITS ORGANISATIONS TO THE PUTSCH.

Faced with the rising of the army the "Strong Government" turned towards the working class. Their reply was rapid and firm. Not only was the strike of April 24th general, the demonstrations large, but the slogans launched by the CGT and the FCP for arms and militias were accepted without difficulty, even though the same organisations in the past and again on May 13th 1958, denounced as "provocateurs" those who advanced such a policy.²

It is not sufficient to say that the working class reacted immediately against the fascist putsch, it is necessary to analyse their feelings and reactions more fully. Generally, though there is much resolution among the workers and though one does not doubt they would have faced this show of force without weakening, nevertheless, at the same time, they have been deprived of any of the enthusiasm which is normally associated with combat, and they have been very preoccupied with making clear that their action cannot be considered as political support for de Gaulle. It is true that the FCP and CGT and, in the same way, the PSU have denounced the Gaullist regime which has placed the leaders of the putsch in the highest positions, whereas the leaders of the SFIO, FO, CFTC have lined themselves up behind de Gaulle. But this anti-de Gaulle feeling has developed over the years just gone and this explains largely the lack of enthusiasm which marked the workers' intervention.

At the same time as denouncing the responsibilities of de Gaulle, these organisations did not develop the least perspective for the workers.

² The recourse to the slogans of arms and of militias does not signify any change in the conceptions of the leadership of the FCP on the "parliamentary and pacifist road" to Socialism, as one could verify a few days later at the 16th Congress of FCP. These slogans were launched under pressure of these very same events which led the government, faced with the possible landing of the Parachutists, to add to its appeal to resist, the necessity not to do this with empty hands. Moreover the leaders of the FCP and the CGT launched these slogans in a very legalistic manner, demanding arms from the Government, and leaving it at that. At no time was this step intended as a manoeuvre to make better understood these slogans in the way Lenin so powerfully expressed it: "Arm the workers with the desire to arm themselves."

All this being stated it is nevertheless clear that the use of these slogans even in the way it has been done can lead much further than is the wish of leaders who, in their past career have gone no further than to call the masses to insurrection to replace Marshal Petain with General de Gaulle. More than one militant thinks that an opportunity was lost once in 1945, and that that was already too much.

To them it is obviously necessary to bar the way to a military dictatorship. But, this done, one comes up again against de Gaulle. And afterwards? In actual fact the FCP, CGT, and PSU have all brought forward the "Defense of the Republic", the watchword of the socialists, the Gaullists, the MRP and all the other opponents of the putsch. The FCP have forgotten to propagate their "renewed democracy" and the PSU the "socialist front." These organisations forgot, at this crucial time, the pivot of their policies; this alone suffices to show their feebleness. Let us add that the right wing of the PSU has gone further, it joined the "left Gaullists" in their effort towards the Minister of the Interior to get arms.

Finally these organisations in Paris bowed to the decisions of a government whose powerlessness was evident, they did not ignore a government ban on street demonstrations at a time when millions of workers left their work and would have responded in very great numbers to an appeal for street demonstrations. Only the students ignored the government ban and once again in this period showed themselves acting as the advance guard, leaving behind the traditional leaders.

The suspicion of the workers towards the government was expressed as early as the day after the collapse of the putsch by a stepping up of the wages drive. There had been, a short time before the putsch, many demonstrations over wage demands. Halted during the four days which it lasted, they were taken up immediately it came to an end. But, at this moment, the reformist top TU leadership of the FO and of the CFTC in order to be forgiven for making a certain rapprochement with the CGT and the communists, wished give a breathing space to the government and the bosses. The workers would not listen to this. This was very clear in the Paris transport undertakings. Though the workers in this industry are very divided from a trade union point-of-view (twenty-odd unions) which meant that in the past these movements did not happen except when a limited unity of action was realised by the principal unions, this time the appeal of a single union, the CGT, produced *twice* the number of strikers. The same day the railway workers, encouraged by the CGT and the CFTC largely brought the traffic in the whole country to a halt. In the factories numerous demonstrations sprang up, initially for better wages.

However important this surge of wage claims might be, however promising it could be for the cohesion of the working classes and for their future struggles, one must not mistake its limits,

it must be placed in the framework of the regime. It is from de Gaulle they are demanding an increase. It is not, but must become, a battle against the regime.

ONCE MORE IN SEARCH OF THE "STRONG STATE"

The general effect of this situation; the feebleness of fascism, the indifference of the bourgeoisie, the working class affected politically by the disillusionment of the post-war period, the defeat of the 13th May, and the flabbiness of the traditional leaderships, gives to French political life a rarified atmosphere in which the personality of de Gaulle takes on a particular importance, and which also gives him, in spite of the narrowness of his support in the country, a significant amount of room to manoeuvre in internal policies. The putsch has much enfeebled French imperialism by dislocating its army, but present day political conditions in France mean that in the immediate future in internal affairs it will be de Gaulle who will hold the political initiative and derive an advantage from the operation. Realising at the same time his strengths and his weaknesses de Gaulle has brought into play article 16 of the Constitution, which consists precisely of suppressing all legal or judicial rule and of giving all power to de Gaulle, of installing in French society completely arbitrary government.

The pretext is that it is very convenient for the suppression of the instigators of the putsch. But nobody doubts that it will translate itself into some measures, probably quite stringent, but extremely limited, against the fascist Right, and into play article 16 of the Constitution, which of the political revolutionary vanguard of the working class and the intelligentsia.

Has de Gaulle succeeded in building his "Strong State"? If he has only the traditional leaderships he will be able to achieve this. But there are, throughout the world, problems much less easy to deal with than these leaders. In the first place, there is Algeria. It was seen in what an unpredictable way the Evian encounter was prepared. The downfall of the would-be fascists of 1960 and 1961 has not advanced things more than in a very limited fashion. On the one hand de Gaulle has not renounced the attempt to conserve the serious holdings of French capitalism in Algeria; he still has remote hopes of what the men of the G P R A will sign and accept, even if, under the pressures exerted on them from all sides, they show themselves unwilling to make extended concessions. For there are the Algerian people whose aspirations are grow-

ing more and more radical. In spite of the chatter of a sycophant press de Gaulle approaches the negotiations in an aura of enfeebled power, for he has had to strike at the unity of the army which throughout the past years has to de Gaulle and the fact that French Imperialism has accepted its defeat in Algeria.

We must therefore expect long negotiations before agreement can be reached. During this period one could think that the political re-awakening witnessed on the Left in France would grow, nourishing itself precisely on the resistance to de Gaulle and the fact that French Imperialism has accepted its defeat in Algeria.

MORE LONG-TERM PERSPECTIVES

Political re-awakening, let us say, but without having illusions with regard to its extension and rhythm in the most immediate period, all the more that the good economic conjuncture contributes to maintaining a settled situation.

Nevertheless many elements are preparing for a more active political future, as much on the Right as on the Left.

On the Right we have seen a series of defeats of a particular form of fascism. It is possible that the putsch of the 22nd April is the last important political action — exclusive of some "plastic" bombs. But fascism will find itself new forms later on when the independence of Algeria is recognised. Ex-officers returned to civil life, European-Algerians who have left Algeria, petty-bourgeois nursing the humiliation of the "selling out" of the Empire, others displaced by the growing concentration of capitalism, will furnish a clientele for the fascist politicians. The danger of a conquest of power by the fascists in the longer run seems to us very limited, but one must expect intense fascist political activity, so much the more acceptable to capitalism because they would wish to counterbalance a resumption of political activity of the working class.

On this side, from now on, the re-awakening of which we have spoken, although it seems feeble, manifests itself above all on the level of a critical approach, in two groups of great importance for the future: the militant workers and the youth, student youth more particularly.

Although Mollet and Thorez continue to boast, each in his own party, the crisis of the lack of confidence grows and deepens. As far as the F C P is concerned the unanimity of the Congress no longer succeeds in disguising the misgivings of the great majority, the irreducible disagreements of a minority.

Although cut short, the Casanova - Servin affair reflected this state of things in the party apparatus. The perspective of "renewed democracy", the question of the "roads to socialism" are problems which pose themselves to a growing number of militant communists.

It is amongst the youth that one feels a growing political interest which is not at all conformist either towards the government or towards the old leaderships. Instinctively it is towards revolutionary solutions that a vanguard turns, disgusted with the policies pursued by these leaders. One remembers the affair of the 121 intellectuals recognising the right of "insoumission" (i.e., refusal to be conscripted into the army.) The role played by the conscripts in the debacle of the recent putsch allowed those who, inside the workers' movement had denounced this demonstration, namely the leaders of the F.C.P. to say: "We advised you, you should not have deserted, you should have done work inside the army!". This "argument" does not take into account a certain number of facts: First, the position of the 121 could not be a call for a mass action, it was a demonstration of opposition towards war in Algeria aimed at an awakening of the public opinion which no political leadership with a mass influence called upon for action; second, the "insoumis" and deserters were the result of this inefficient leadership and treason after six years of war! third, as for the work of these organisations inside the army, it never existed; the conscripts reacted spontaneously, under the pressure of weariness towards war in Algeria, which is felt by most French people, and of the desire not to help

people whom they know pretty well ("paras", "légionnaires" and also the European-Algerians) and whom they hate.

But if the organised workers' movement has no direct responsibility in the attitude of the conscripts during the putsch, one may say, without fear to contradiction, that the young men who have made such an experiment in Algeria, however short this experiment may have been, will certainly stay profoundly influenced thereby and that later there will be repercussions inside the workers' movement. The attack against Order in its most oppressive form, the military hierarchy, cannot but lead to a capacity to stand against disfigured forms of the bourgeois order as are the apparatus of the organizations established in this society.

New generations are arising to political life, in a climate of oppression and stifling of political thought both by the regime and the old leaderships. They reach political life with much confusion resulting from the whole policy and teaching of the old leaderships. But at the same time they are rebelling against these policies, these teachings.

The putsch which recently failed, struck a big blow against French imperialism, obliging it to chop off a part of its armed forces. It will have contributed also in allowing thousands and tens of thousands of young people to have an unforgettable experience which will stimulate in them the spirit of criticism and rebellion. It was not bad that Reaction should have made a faux pas. Unfortunately benefits will not be immediate, except for de Gaulle, but they will nevertheless exist in the future.

15 May, 1961.

KHRUSHCHEV'S THIRD REFORM OF SOVIET AGRICULTURE

By ERNEST GERMAIN

For the fourth time since Stalin's death, the leaders of the Soviet bureaucracy have modified their agricultural policy. The first reform — that of Malenkov — was proclaimed at the meeting of the C C of the CPSU of September, 1953; the second (Khrushchev's first reform) was decided on in 1955; the third resulted from the speech which Khrushchev made at Minsk on 22nd January, 1958; the latest and fourth reform is the result of the debates of the Central Committee during January 10th to 18th, 1961.

Why this new reform? It is because Soviet agriculture is not developing at a sufficient rate, in spite of the partial successes of the earlier reforms. The targets fixed by the sixth five-year plan (which could not have been reached in any have not been attained, as the following figures show:

| | Targets for the 6th five- year plan fix- ed in 1955 for 1960 | Actual pro- duction rea- ched in 1960 |
|-------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| Cereals harvested | 180,000,000 tons | 133,000,000 tons |
| Livestock | 13,000,000 » | 8,700,000 » |
| Wool | 465,000 » | 355,000 » |
| Eggs | 45,800,000,000 units | 26,400,000,000 units |

The gap is therefore considerable; on average, the agricultural production was 25% below the expectations of the planners in 1955, and 15% below the targets set in 1959 for 1960. As the requirements of the population have increased to a greater extent than the planners had foreseen, especially with regard to the basic agricultural products — meat, butter, milk, cereals, vegetables — the tardy development of Soviet agriculture constitutes a permanent source of social friction and of political tension in the country.

The tremendous success of Soviet science and technology — as witness the sputniks and Gagarin's exploit — have not in any way lessened the tension, even if they have undoubtedly strengthened the subjective foundations of Soviet society (i.e. the refusal to make any change in the social regime). On the contrary, compared to these achievements, the shortages and interruptions in the food supply of the people and in other agricultural products more and more assume the aspect of a permanent scandal. Against this scandal various sectors of Soviet society are

raising an outcry. Under Stalin, the savage police dictatorship made it possible for this weakness in agricultural policy to persist for a long time. Under Khrushchev, the change in the relation of forces between the masses and the bureaucracy obliges the government constantly to modify their agricultural policy when it appears that the targets set are not likely to be reached.

The president of the Council of Ministers of the Federal Russian Republic (the largest Republic in the Soviet Union), DS Polianski, has admitted that "some irregularities in the food supplies of the people (meat, milk, butter) are found in many towns and cities." (*Pravda*, 12th January, 1961).

In a speech on 17th January, 1961, at the C C of the CPSU, Khrushchev himself admitted the inadequacy of the development of agriculture in relation to the increased needs of the population: "As I have already stated, the agriculture of our country has achieved much success, but it must be admitted that it is not developing as rapidly as industry, and that it does not follow, so to say, the rapid increase in our industry and in the requirements of our people. . . Although we can state that in the past year or so a definite increase in our agricultural production has taken place, this fact does not give us satisfaction because it *does not correspond to the increased need of the people.*" (*Pravda*, 21st January, 1961.)

Khrushchev affirms that in 1960, income of salaried persons in the Soviet (including superannuation) increased by 242 milliards old roubles in comparison with that of 1955. At the same time per capita consumption has increased, between 1953 and 1959, by 42% for meat, by 35% for butter and by 74% for milk and dairy products. On the basis of these figures, per capita consumption of meat in the USSR falls below that in the USA by 50%. The prospect of reaching and overtaking the American pro capita consumption of meat therefore remains distant, as it also does for agricultural products of high quality.

THE KOLKHOZES DELIVER LESS AND LESS GRAIN TO THE TOWN

The first agricultural reform since Stalin, launched by Malenkov, saw an increase in the production of the kolkhozes, due to the increase

in the incomes obtained by them for products supplied to the State. The second reform — the first to be initiated under the direct responsibility of Khrushchev — envisaged the exploitation of virgin areas on a large scale. As we explained in a previous issue, these virgin lands came to be exploited exclusively by the sovkhozes (state farms). The scheme had as its aim the provision of foodstuff to the towns to some extent independent of the production of the kolkhozes (peasant collectives) i.e. of by-passing the peasant and at the same time of winning him over.

The third reform consisted in the sale to the kolkhozes of agricultural machinery, tractors, and other forms of state property, with the object of stimulating production of the kolkhozes, as production of the sovkhozes established in the virgin lands was found to fluctuate too much to afford a firm foundation for supplying the towns.

What is the nature of the fourth reform, as evolved by the "Agricultural Plenum" of the C C in 1961? Contrary to the three earlier reforms, the fourth cannot easily be summed up. The essential measures make provision for especially:

- 1) an improvement in the supply to the kolkhozes of agricultural machinery and spares through the creation of a "Union for the Sale and Maintenance of Agricultural Machinery" with powers to register and regulate the demand for and supply of such machinery, as well as being responsible for the production, re-allocation and despatch of such machinery throughout the U S S R;
- 2) a reorganisation of the methods of purchase of the products of the collective farms by the State by means of contracts entered into by the kolkhozes on the one hand and itinerant inspectors on the other;
- 3) an attempt to stifle the growth of private peasant markets, by instructing the state co-operatives to buy not only the surplus production of the kolkhozes, but above all their surplus private production;
- 4) more energetic measures to suppress forgery, theft and misappropriation of kolkhoz property by the kolkhoz bureaucracy or by individual peasants.

Does this reform contain a fifth element, extremely important to note, i.e., the attitude of the State towards commercial and industrial enterprises created by the rich kolkhozes, this latter implying private exploitation of the peasants? The report of the C C debates provides no answer to this question, although some divergency of opinion seems to have provoked discussions which were kept secret. However, some decision or other

can be expected in the course of the next few months.

To understand the reasons for this new reform, the balance sheet presented at the Plenum of the C C of January, 1961 must be examined more closely. It is evident that the two major weaknesses of the system continue despite the measures taken in 1958. Kolkhoz production stagnates, and production from the "virgin lands" fluctuates greatly from year to year, according to weather conditions in Central Asia.

Certain figures, quoted in the course of the C C debate of January, 1961, regarding kolkhoz production, are extremely alarming. Thus, Khrushchev's closing speech, as well as his speech on the resolution, shows that between 1953 and 1960, the quantity of grain sold to the state increased from 31 to 46.5 million tons. But, in speech previously quoted, Polianski indicates that the "virgin lands of the R S F S R alone have sold more than 16.3 million tons of grain to the State in 1960." (*Pravda*, 12th January, 1961). It follows therefore that the supply of grain from the kolkhozes to the State in 1960 was *at a lower level than during the crisis of 1953*. Khrushchev prefers not to quote all the facts, but he does quote sufficient figures for this conclusion to be drawn. Out of 15 Soviet Republics, 13 supplied less grain to the State in 1960 than in 1953, while for the fourteenth, the R S F S R, the districts in which no "virgin lands" are available find themselves in exactly the same position. Of these 13 republics, no fewer than 7 (Georgia, Lithuania, Latvia, Tadzhikistan, Armenia, Turkmenia and Esthonia) supply not a single kilogram of wheat to the State, whereas in 1953 they supplied almost a half-million tons.

In the Ukraine, which in 1953 supplied almost a third of the wheat sold to the urban population of the entire U S S R, the sale of grain to the State has fallen from 9 million tons in 1953 to 5.8 million tons in 1960; the one-time granary of the Soviet Union cannot supply more than 15% of the needs of the Soviet citizens. For the White Russian Republic, the fall in supplies to the State was 50% if based on the 1953 level, and 65% on that of 1950. As for the R S F S R, if one excludes the production of the "virgin lands", sales to the State have fallen to the same extent by 1.5 million tons between 1953 and 1960.

As Khrushchev elsewhere confirms that production of the "virgin lands" contribute more than 40% of the grain supplies at the disposal of the State, it can be estimated that other agricultural areas have reduced their grain supplies to the State by almost 6 million tons, in comparison with 1953.

Certain figures quoted by Khrushchev suggest

that a *general tendency* is manifesting itself. Sales of grain by the Ukraine to the State were as follows: 1948, 10 million tons; 1949, 8.7 millions tons; 1953, 9 million tons; 1958, 9 million tons; 1959, 7.4 million tons; 1960, 5.8 million tons.

In certain regions, especially in White Russia and in the region west of the R S F S R, a large *deficit in grain* is apparent, that is to say, the State had to supply to these areas a much greater quantity of cereals than it obtained from them. In 1960, this deficit reached nearly 300,000 tons for the White Russian Republic alone, and almost 600,000 tons in some districts to the west of the R S F S R.

THE "VIRGIN LANDS" EXPERIMENT REMAINS HYPOTHETICAL

Even if Khrushchev and other speakers at the "Agricultural Plenum" had not stopped boasting about the results obtained from the clearing of "virgin lands" in Siberia and Kazakstan, some facts given incidentally still show that the experiment has not yet proved itself. Khrushchev himself recognises that it is impossible to maintain seriously that this clearing of "virgin lands" is the final solution to the agricultural problems of the U S S R. In his closing speech to the C C of January, 1961, he included a rough estimate. During the seven years 1954-1960, the State has invested 440 milliards of old roubles in these areas, and the entire grain production during these seven years amounted to 760 milliards. This gives a nett profit (these are the exact words of the first secretary!) of 320 milliards.

But Khrushchev should take pains to make a more profound and serious analysis. He fails to answer this question: if these 440 milliards had been invested in the development of grazing lands for fattening stock and the production of additional agricultural machinery, would this not have yielded more than 760 milliards of roubles worth of cereals in the U S S R?

He does not include in his costing the terrible sufferings and great sacrifices made by hundreds of thousands of young Komsomols and workers, sent to clear these lands and having to live under absolutely inhuman conditions. He does not include damage caused by erosion as a result of the extensive cultivation of the "virgin lands". The First Secretary of the C P of the Ukraine, Podgorny has spoken of the terrible "black tempests" which are sweeping right to the borders of this Republic (the dust from the distant Siberian fields!), not to mention the future havoc. An immense "dust-bowl" like that of Oklahoma, tragically famous during the 30's, is today being formed in the U S S R. A gigantic irrigation project will be needed to solve this problem. The

First Secretary of Kazakstan has admitted to the C C that of the 7,300 acres ordered to be put under irrigation, *not a single acre* has been successfully irrigated during the present year. (*Pravda*, 12th January, 1961).

The figures quoted for the cleared "virgin lands" are equally eloquent. The average grain yield in the U S S R is just over 10 cwt. per acre, which is extremely low even for extensive agriculture. But in Kazakstan, this *average* fell to 8.4 cwt., and this figure includes the yield from irrigated areas. Polianski's figures suggest that a similar return from the "virgin lands" of Siberia is likely. This is lower, by more than 20%, than the average yield from the cultivated areas in other parts of the U S S R.

Khrushchev's closing speech does not directly touch on the problem of the discontent of the young workers sent to the "virgin lands". It is known that this discontent has given rise to open and above all violent strikes, that is to say, of wide-spread desertions, thus endangering the harvest in many regions, especially Kazakstan. Various books and articles have recently reflected the agitation of public opinion on this matter. But the leader of the Soviet bureaucracy makes only an indirect reference to this when he states that it preferable "to create local enterprises founded on seasonal production which can be halted during the harvest in order that the workers can be sent to the kolkhozes and sovkhoses".

This will be more effective than sending to harvest people who are not accustomed to working on the land. Is this an indication that a stop will be put to sending Komsomols to the "virgin lands"?

THE BUREAUCRACY AS BRAKE ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PRODUCTIVE FORCES

Among the significant aspect of the "Agricultural Plenum" debates were the violent attacks made by Khrushchev on State and Party leaders as well as on certain leaders of minor bodies. These leaders were accused of a series of crimes: falsifying statistics and accounts; criminal practices to justify the falsifications; "bulletins of victory", especially with reference to the slaughter of *calves and of heifers*, to "reach" the target set for the supply of meat; purchases of butter or milk on the open market to "reach" the target for milk production, etc.; clear-cut cases of theft. These debates took place in the presence of numerous "experts" — agronomists and the presidents of kolkhozes. More and more, the Plenum of the C C of the C P of the U S S R thus transforms itself into a veritable little parliament of the bureaucracy, an extension of the basis of power even at the heart of the bureaucracy, which we fore-

cast ever since the day following the death of Stalin in 1953.

Certain interruptions by Khrushchev, certain dialogues and revelations, take on a tragi-comic aspect. Here are some examples: *Khrushchev* (interrupting G. I. Tkatchouk, president of the Ukrainian kolkhoz): And why do the Ukrainians not promulgate a law against the thieves (sic)? Is that possible? (applause).

K. I. Tkatchouk: That is certainly possible.

Khrushchev: As well as against the private distillers and the drunkards? (Commotion in the hall).

G. I. Tkatchouk: Certainly. Whoever drinks too much ought to be punished in the same way. (sic). *Pravda*, 14th January, 1961. Again:

I. R. Rassakov: (First Secretary of the C P of the R S S of Kirghiz): In the theses on his report, Comrade Khrushchev has criticised the C C of the C P of Kirghiz in a severe but fully-justified manner... In effect, the ex-First Secretary of the regional committee of the Party of Tsian Chan, Issaiev, has committed a crime in calling on the presidents of the regions and of the kolkhozes to buy butter in the shops and to supply this butter to the State, pretending thereby to have realised the target for the production of milk. The C C of the C P of Kirghiz has dismissed him from the party for anti-party conduct, and deprived him of his office of Minister of the Interior.

Khrushchev: When did you do this? After you received my Open Letter?

I. R. Rassakov: Yes, after the Letter.

Khrushchev: Did you learn the facts only from the Letter?

I. R. Rassakov: Some party members had posed this question at the conference.

Khrushchev: And previously, you did not know it?

I. R. Rassakov: We knew it but we did not deal with him too severely.

Khrushchev: And you afterwards appointed him as Minister? You go so far as to consider that the best punishment for a man who has committed a crime is to appoint him as Minister? (Commotion and laughter in the hall).

I. R. Rassakov: There we committed a grave error. We appointed him Minister of the Interior. (sic!) (*Pravda*, 14th January, 1961.)

But in his closing speech Khrushchev bitterly attacked the Prime Minister of the Ukraine, Kaltchenko, who by urging a premature harvest of maize and sunflowers under the pretext that the crops were being scorched had caused serious damage... "and today he is a deputy member of the Council of Ministers of one of the largest Republics, the Ukraine, and its like water on a duck's back to him — he is unconcerned over his mistake." (*Pravda*, 21st June, 1961.)

Epilogue: Kaltchenko was relieved of his post in February, 1961, but shortly afterwards was appointed vice-president of the Council of Ministers of the Ukrainian Republic!

These attacks, crude at times, but often shrewd, against the conduct of individual bureaucrats, are, nevertheless, not a new phenomena in the history of the Soviet bureaucracy. Under Stalin they were common enough; and they have occurred more than once since his death. What distinguishes Khrushchev's attack from the preceding ones is, on the one hand, their extent (see note ¹) and on the other, the fact that they are not followed by disciplinary measures. It is clearly a classic case of finding a scapegoat. Moreover, some of Khrushchev's attacks under the guise of an attack on the bureaucracy are in reality directed against the peasants. Thus the most sensational outburst from Khrushchev was when he was ostensibly visiting the chief secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party, N. V. Podgorny.

Khrushchev: I am convinced, Comrade Podgorny, that the figures quoted by you in connection with the maize output do not represent half the harvest. The remaining half has been stolen from the land while it was ripening.

N. V. Podgorny: That is true, Nikita Sergei-vitch.

Khrushchev: Can you then say that the loss was due to the bad weather? The harvest has been stolen yet you say that the poor harvest was due to the bad weather. Is that so?

N. V. Podgorny: Yes, that is correct. (*Pravda*, 12th January, 1961.)

It is necessary to emphasise that following his explanation, Podgorny tried to minimise the effect of Khrushchev's accusation by declaring that the facts revealed by Khrushchev have had "a certain influence" on the work and, "to some extent" complicated it. But the incredible accusation from Khrushchev that "... half the harvest from several millions of acres of wheat-fields has been stolen" leaves no doubt as to the guilty ones — the peasant masses themselves. In fact, it would be difficult to believe that the bureaucrats had "stolen" and transported to the Kolkhoz the contents of thousands and thousands of railway trucks or a veritable fleet of tens of thousands of lorries. Only the peasants could have committed such a large-scale theft. Moreover, the decrees recently promulgated in connection with the penalties against economic crimes leave no room for doubt

¹ As one can expect, the range of these attacks has had some effect... in industry; the workers know very well that the methods of the State bureaucrats are in every way as dishonest as those of the bureaucrats in agriculture. Recently *Pravda* published an article declaring that it had received thousands of letters a day (sic) denouncing in exact detail false statistics of the factories.

in this matter: they deal mainly with the offences of the peasants and other "private entrepreneurs" rather than with the crimes of the bureaucrats.

BETWEEN SCARCITY AND PRIMITIVE ACCUMULATION

In his closing speech to the Central Committee in January, 1961, Khrushchev relates that last year while on holiday in the Ukraine, he met a happy group of men and women who had brought some apples from Saporoshe, about 800 kilometres distant and almost in White Russia! He adds that some people even transport apples by plane from as far away as Chabarovsk in the Far East.

The decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U S S R of the 4th. May, 1961, refers to similar cases. A letter published in the journal *Sovietskaiia Rossia* and reproduced in *Le Monde* of 4th May mentions the "rich harvest" which can be reaped by enterprising individuals in selling a product privately at speculative prices and at the right moment. If one were to view this not only from the moral angle but also from its economic origins, one will easily grasp that it is a question of a permanent revival of the small retailer due to the shortage of food supplies.

As in Stalin's time, the agricultural policy of the Soviet bureaucracy vacillates between two extremes on this question: whether at all costs to encourage the growth of production and the productive efforts of the peasants including on their private plots — and thus inevitably bring to the fore the tendencies resulting in primitive accumulation; or whether to wage war on the small retailer by means of restrictions and legislation — thus provoking an inevitable reduction in the output of the peasant, and a growing scarcity in consumer goods for the urban population.

Between 1953 and 1959, the initiative and the profits of the kolkhozians were encouraged in every way, above all by the policy of prices. As a result, an extensive accumulation of liquid capital occurred. This capital was used, primarily, in the purchase of agricultural machinery especially tractors, and in the purchase of the means of industrial production and the means of exchange. Some Kolkhozian factories were erected (particularly in the food and building industries) which were thus actually competing with the State industries. Some Kolkhoz shops appeared in the farms cheek by jowl with the State shops and the co-operative shops.

Parallel with this development, a section of the private peasantry has discovered how to accumulate equally extensive properties, thanks to the proceeds from private sales on the "Kolkhozian market" which are once more tolerated and even encouraged by the authorities.

It seems that in 1959, a reaction against these tendencies began to show itself. Already at the Plenum of the C C in January, 1960, the tendency to reduce private plots and to force the peasants to sell their private cows, makes its appearance (see Note 2.) We stated at the time that the reaction of the peasants to those measures would be a reduction in output. The production figures for 1960 have confirmed this forecast.

The protests of the "poor Kolkhoz" against the difficulties which we have fully dealt with — (see our article in *Fourth International* of April, 1958) added to the increasingly bolder activities of the Kolkhoz in the industrial and commercial fields, are forcing the authorities to put on the brake. Throughout the year 1960, a debate raged in the leading spheres of the Party, the substance of which we can infer from the organisational measures taken afterwards at the Agricultural Plenum of the C C in January, 1961.

At the end of February, 1961, there appeared a decree of the Council of Ministers of the U S S R which authorised the co-operatives to repurchase the surplus production of the Kolkhoz and of the private peasants at prices higher than fixed for deliveries stipulated and "fixed by agreement" by the consumer co-operatives and the Kolkhozes (or Kolkhozians). *Pravda*, 18th March, 1961, mentions that at Krasnodar there is in operation the first "co-operative market" which will thus replace the old "Kolkhozian market" to advantage. The same journal also mentions that the food supply is once again "insufficient".

Parallel with this, another decree of the Council of Ministers of the U S S R insists on the obligation of the kolkhoz to enter into contracts for the deliveries to the State, contracts which would be negotiated by "itinerant buying commissioners."

The two measures seem to have the same object: to reinforce the control — previously decentralised — of the State on agricultural production by means of the new apparatus of bureaucratic intermediaries. But in the situation of scarcity which exists, the law of supply and demand cannot be ignored by the bureaucracy with impunity if production and the consumers are not to suffer severely!

One gets the impression, moreover, that a compromise will be struck in this matter and that the discussion will be continued at higher levels in the bureaucracy. For, in addition to the above mentioned measures which the peasants will undoubtedly consider vexatious the government has decided to lower the prices of spare parts for

2 Podgorny declared at the C C of January, 1961, that in 1960 livestock had diminished by 1.7 million cattle and by 400,000 pigs in the Ukraine.

agricultural machinery and to facilitate the supply of tools to the kolkhoz by the institution of the "Union for the Sale and Maintenance of Agricultural Machinery" ("Soiusselchostehnika"). The bureaucracy has meanwhile taken measures against the direct sale of agricultural machinery. This is an additional and disquieting proof of the decentralisation and primitive accumulation introduced into the economic life of the Soviet Union by the increasing initiative of the Kolkhoz in industry and commerce.

Thus, oscillating between two extremes and definitely seeking its salvation in a succession of spectacular measures, the Soviet bureaucracy is far from a solution of agricultural problems in the U S S R. And while it delays the solution, the causes of discontent are growing in various sectors of the Soviet population, undermining Khrushchev's popularity and the relative and temporary stability which the bureaucratic regime has enjoyed since 1957.

5th June, 1961.

STATEMENT BY PARLIAMENTARY GROUP OF THE LANKA SAMASAMAJA PARTY (CEYLONESE SECTION OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL) ON THE LANGUAGE QUESTION

We are publishing here a declaration by the C C of the L S S P on the problem of languages. The IS wishes to recall that the Sixth World Congress disapproved of "the political line adopted by the Lanka Sama Samaja Party following on the election defeat of March 1960" that is the parliamentary support of the Bandaranaike government, which still remain the general policy of the L S S P.

"The L S S P opposes the installation of a Governor-General's Government in Ceylon, and reminds the people of this country that all previous experience has proved that the imposition of a Governor-General's regime destroys the democratic processes and, by placing the police and the military in power over the people leads to every kind of excesses.

There is no truth in the announcement of the existence of a state of Public Emergency in Ceylon and there is no justification whatsoever for bringing the Public Security Ordinance into operation throughout Ceylon. The L S S P therefore opposes the Government's action.

Furthermore, the L S S P points out that it is the Government's own wrong policies and unwise acts which have brought about the present situation and, in the light of these facts, the L S S P cannot have any doubt that the Emergency powers will be used by Government not only as stated in the Proclamation to restore a disrupted administration in certain areas but also to suppress and crush the movement of the Tamils for their just Language Rights. The L S S P cannot in any manner support such suppression and repeats that the only way in which the Tamil question can be resolved is by the Government itself taking the necessary legislative and administrative steps to satisfy

the just Language claims of the Tamil-speaking people. Such steps must include immediate action to introduce suitable amendments of the Language of the Courts Act and the redrafting of the regulations under the Use of the Tamil Language (Special Provisions) Act.

The L S S P takes this opportunity to point out that the Federal Party has acted completely wrongly in endeavouring to set up a Government in certain areas. The Federal Party had no mandate from the people of these areas for such separatist action. The L S S P remains completely convinced that the demand of the Tamil minority is not for separation but only for their just rights as a minority in a united Ceylon.

Finally, the L S S P, has to stress that present developments once again illustrate how the democratic rights of the people as a whole are imperilled by the failure to bring the language question to a just settlement. The present policies of the Government in this field only raise the prospect of ever more frequent and prolonged emergencies in the context of a deteriorating economy, a rising cost of living and the increase in unemployment. It is necessary in the interests of the entire people and the future of the nation as a whole to find the quickest way out of the present impasse."

(Ratified by C C meeting of L S S P on 19th April, 1961.)

THE CUBAN WORKERS' STATE

Socialism and the Strength of the Colonial Revolution - Proletarian Democracy

By A ORTIZ

The problems analysed on chapters IV and V of the present article are a contribution of comrade A ORTIZ for the discussion on these problems in the International.

The decisive defeat of the counter-revolutionary invasion by the militia and the Cuban Rebel Army, the proclamation on May 1st of the first Socialist Republic of Latin America and the announcement of a four-year plan for the Cuban economy are expressions of the formidable dynamism and vigour of this revolution and of this triumphant workers' state which has come into being in the very heart of the "free world", of the imperialist system.

"The existence of the Cuban workers' State, firmly based on the worker and peasant masses of Cuba is the main centre for the weakening and disorganisation of Yankee Imperialism, and the main stimulus for the anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist struggles of the Latin American masses".¹

This revolution, which was declared by its authors to be neither capitalist nor socialist, but *humanist*, which was proclaimed *democratic* by the Stalinism, which Sartre defined as a revolution *without ideology*, and which Wright Mills called a revolution of the *intellectuals* and the *youth* beyond the bounds of social classes, this same revolution now defines itself as a *Socialist revolution*, its regime as that of a *Socialist Republic*, and its government proclaims itself a *workers and peasants government*.

I — THE PECULIAR WORKERS' STATE OF CUBA

The nationalisation of the means of production, of transport and the banks, foreign trade monopoly, expropriation of the large landed estates and the establishment of direct state ownership of a large part of the land, the formation of co-operatives and the distribution of land to the small peasants, have established new property relations in Cuba in place of capitalist private property.

Although the forms taken by the state in January 1959 at the victory of the forces led by Fidel Castro maintained some of the forms of the old state, and the subsequent changes and purges have maintained many of these forms, the state is organised today for the defence of these conquests and new forms of ownership. The state is based directly on the mobilisation of the masses, on the armed militia, which, as shown during the last invasion, defends it against external aggression, internal counter-revolution and any disorganisation and chaos in the apparatus of production, through a great combined military and productive collective effort and through an attempt at planning.

It is these new forms of ownership, won and defended by the revolutionary mobilisation of the Cuban masses, which constitute the basis of the society and which characterise Cuba as a workers' state.

The state apparatus is not working class in composition or structure. There is no form of Soviet power, of workers' and peasants' councils, in Cuba. It is not a normal wor-

It is not only the capitalist system which suffers from the impact of the Cuban revolution, from the birth of the new workers' state, but also the official conceptions of the Left, of the reformist and Stalinist movement, the conception of the "peaceful road" and "peaceful co-existence" and the alliance with the "progressive sectors" of the bourgeoisie. These conceptions are suffering from the impact of this developing revolutionary process. The very role of the Stalinist party is at stake. The *Socialist Republic* proclaimed in Havana is not mentioned in Moscow. Anibal Escalante, Executive Secretary of the PSP,² says that it cannot be considered "that Cuba is already a Socialist country".³

Such attitudes do not arise from a desire for theoretical clarity, but from a resistance to an acceptance of a major political defeat for Stalinism.

Cuba is no more a "socialist country" than any other of the existing workers' states. Cuba is a workers' State of a special kind, a regime of transition to socialism. How it has come into existence, what are its fundamental characteristics, what is its most probable evolution — these are themes which need to be clarified by the world revolutionary movement which is today supporting the new Cuba and which is now learning from its experience.

workers' states, any more than is any of the already existing workers' states, but a deformed one. It is for this reason that it cannot be classed simply as a workers' state without drawing attention to its peculiar character.

The determining factor is the function of this apparatus, the property and social relations on which it is based. We shall attempt to define them more clearly.

THE SOCIAL FORCES OF THE REVOLUTION

The depth and the daring of the Cuban revolution have been explained by various authors as arising from an "enlightened" petty bourgeoisie, from the personal characteristics of Fidel Castro and his team, from the reaction to the pressure of Yankee imperialism, from the youth of the leaders, etc. All these factors have some weight.

But the Cuban revolution is an expression of precise social causes, of the intervention of the exploited classes and especially the proletariat, supported and helped forward by a new world factor — the existence of the workers' states, forming a system opposed to the capitalist system.

The initial nucleus of the revolution is of petty bourgeois origin. The curb placed upon the working class for years by the Partido Socialista Popular, helped the Batista dictatorship consolidate itself by means of a powerful bureaucratic trade-union apparatus and permanent repression, and relegated political agitation for a whole period to the student sectors. During the latter years the centre of political activity was among University circles. The group headed by Fidel Castro strove to develop for a

¹ Latin American Bureau of the Fourth International, "Voz Proletaria", Buenos Aires, second half of April 1961.

² Partido Socialista Popular, Cuban Stalinist party.

³ Television speech of May 7th, quoted by "L'Humanité".

time through these circles to influence the petty-bourgeoisie. But the group only succeeded in achieving isolated actions of a "putsch" character such as the assault on Moncada, and did not develop a political insurrectional force capable of overthrowing the dictatorship.

This group was only able to form a basis favourable for insurrection when it left its own circle and class in order to seek this basis among the peasants in the Sierra. It is incorrect, then, to generalise about the Fidel Castro uprising as a political expression of the middle class. We can consider it as the fusion of a radical and small minority section of that class which sought a revolutionary way outside the urban petty-bourgeoisie.

The Fidel Castro movement continued to make individual recruits from university and petty-bourgeois circles, but it obtained its development and its main support through its action in the Sierra and among the agricultural workers' in the areas where it operated.⁴

But from this arises another erroneous conception — that of the role of the small peasantry in the insurrection. It would be inexplicable, in a country in which the small peasantry comprises a third of the rural population and accounts for a very much smaller percentage of agrarian production, that this sector, some elements of which participated directly in the revolutionary struggle, could provide such a cohesive force, bring into being a new regime for the whole of Cuba and maintain it throughout all the first period, particularly when one considers the breadth of vision and perspective of this regime.

In reality, there is another social situation in the Cuban countryside. There were more than half a million agricultural workers and labourers directly dependent upon the large foreign concerns, producing for the market. The greater part of these workers were employed for only three months in the year, and there were several hundred thousand others completely unemployed.

These were social sectors which gave the Cuban countryside its social instability,⁵ and was among these sectors on which the revolution headed by Fidel Castro was based. The need for a change was felt, not only by the petty-bourgeoisie and the small peasantry, but also by this agricultural proletariat and the mass of unemployed who were the objective and potentially subjective base for the overthrow of the capitalist structure and the rural latifundia.

Youth who attained working age could find no employment. If the youthful character of the Castro movement is seen as the expression of its idealistic character beyond class divisions, we can say that the tremendous spirit of sacrifice, generosity and intrepidity of the young Cuban revolutionaries finds its material basis in a youth which was deprived by the capitalist regime in Cuba of any prospect of a worth-while life, and this youth was the permanent source of cadres, and fighting spirit for the Castro movement in the towns and countryside. The members of the Fidel Castro movement were recruited from among young people often under twenty, who left

the sugar plantations and mills and the inland towns to go to the Sierra — sons of workers of the sugar industry, of railwaymen, of employees of the Guantanamo naval base and of poorest sections of the petty-bourgeoisie who were most closely in contact with these workers, facing their same problems, and of the small peasantry.

The fact that the revolution was to pass so rapidly through the stage of small property to co-operatives under state direction and People's Farms, maintaining and developing all the popular support and enthusiasm, shows the social, ideological and even political weakness of the small peasantry within the forces of the revolution.

On the other hand, the strength of the workers and the wholly and partially unemployed, the demands of a youth which was unemployed or employed in miserable occupations, call for solutions which will not tend to keep the workers in a static position, but which bring about a profound transformation of the economy, which finds a new equilibrium in full employment and expansion of the productive forces.

The Cuban revolution could not be carried through under the slogan of the land for those who work it. In Cuba the land had been developed by capitalism, with production for the market, with an enormous proportion of unemployed for a country with such a relatively small population as Cuba — a proportion of one seventh of the population.

This development of the economy could only be achieved by taking great leaps forward, and had to be attained by having recourse to the whole of Cuba's resources — resources which were not in the hands of the people. The role of the working class has been decisive, not merely in the programme of expropriation, but in carrying through the plan. The wide mobilisation of the masses, the demands for a radical change which would not permit a return to the old situation of degradation of the masses and the youth could not be achieved within a capitalist regime.

From the beginning, Trotskyism stated that the Cuban revolution raised problems and was taking paths and measures which went beyond the capitalist system, not because the forces engaged were in themselves incompatible with capitalism in general, like the first Agrarian Reform, but because capitalism, with its rigidity and its crises, was incapable of absorbing even the slightest of these measures, and would be compelled to act against them.

However, how was it possible for a leadership which was petty-bourgeois in its origins and with a democratic programme, to lead this revolutionary process which has resulted in the taking of power, the setting up of a Workers' State and a socialist programme?⁶

⁶ This eventuality had been foreseen in 1938 in the Foundation programme of the Fourth International, in the following way: "Nevertheless, it is impossible to deny categorically in advance the theoretical possibility that, under the influence of a completely exceptional combination of circumstances (war, defeat, financial collapse, revolutionary offensive of the masses, etc), petty-bourgeois parties, including the Stalinists, may proceed farther than they themselves wish on the road to a break with the bourgeoisie. In any case, one thing is certain: if this unlikely event should occur, and that a « worker and peasant government » in the sense mentioned above comes into being, it would represent no more than a short episode on the road to the real dictatorship of the proletariat".

⁴ According to Paul Baran, the middle class looked with favour on the downfall of Batista, gave "logistic" help to terrorism and financial help to guerrillas, but was "neutralised". — "Cuba, a Revolution on the Road to Socialism", *Cahiers Internationaux*, January-February 1961.

⁵ Which led to the organisation of soviets on several sugar plantations during the general strike of 1933 which overthrew the Machado dictatorship.

The crisis of the capitalist regime in Cuba drove a nucleus of the petty-bourgeoisie into insurrectional struggle, in which they became linked with the most exploited sectors of the population, for whom the crisis of the regime did not mean merely a change of government and methods of administration. The extraordinary upsurge of the colonial revolution, particularly the Latin American revolution, has sustained this development, which is confronted by the crisis of the imperialist system, and, on the other hand, finds support in the existence of the workers' states.

THE ROLE OF THE EXISTING WORKERS' STATES

The workers' states are no more simply isolated states which can affect by their example. They act objectively and as a system on the world economy, with an economic policy which they carry on in their own defence and which links them to the process of revolution in various parts of the world.

The new proletarian economic forms, in spite of the policy of "socialism in one country", "peaceful co-existence", etc. go beyond the bounds of a single country. They constitute a considerable sector of the world economy and provide an objective basis for the workers' Power in the world.

"The strength of socialism in the world is cumulative".⁷
The colonial revolution, the Cuban revolution, driven

forward by tremendous subjective forces, by a will for change and improvement, mobilising the creative forces of millions of men, is smashing the sclerotic structures of capitalism, is entering into a war with imperialism, undeclared or open, is breaking the bounds of the capitalist system and finds an objective social basis already in existence in the workers' states, while by its existence and its active intervention in the world economy it is stimulating the revolutionary process and enabling this process to find the only other equilibrium open to it free from imperialist exploitation.

Cuban economy, breaking with the world capitalist market, objectively had to seek a new solution. But this was not only a commercial solution, but a solution to its own internal struggle, to the civil war which was taking place against the remnants of capitalist power, of the capitalist organisation within Cuba.

The needs of the Cuban proletariat, unemployed or employed for only a third of the year, or suffering as a whole from the results of this situation, found their expression, not in the programme of the Partido Socialista Popular de Cuba, which counselled conciliation and moderation, but in the objective existence of the workers' states in world political and economic life and their tendency to international expansion as a system.⁸ This has been the objective basis for the subjective development of the Cuban revolution.

II — THE DYNAMISM OF THE CUBAN WORKERS' STATE

At the present time, not even China, with all the power of its development, has the internal dynamism nor generates the external dynamism of the Cuban revolution. The forms which Cuban economy is taking, the forces which are organising it and the forces which form the basis of the new state are in a continuous process of development and change.

To analyse Cuba is not to analyse a crystallised and fixed phenomenon. New forces and factors of the economy are continually developing from the popular mobilisation and the state organisation, which advance beyond and reabsorb the previous steps, the organisational forms taken by the development of the revolution and the workers' state.

AGRICULTURE

The organisation of agriculture is one of the aspects in which this dynamism and transformation are most clearly expressed. The Agrarian Reform Law of March 1959, maintaining capitalist ownership, organising peasant co-operatives on the land expropriated from the large companies, was rapidly superseded by its own application.

⁷ Paul Baran, op cit.

⁸ Che Guevara said recently: "It is not surprising that we seek our models in the East. I am not in the slightest interested in what a French Communist may tell us, since the French Communists are not even capable of stopping the war in Algeria. But I think that in order to learn to rule a country, to plan its economy and to build socialism in it, our youth need to read the books of the Socialist countries which have trodden this road before us." What he says about the French C P can be said of the Cuban P SP. The Stalinist parties have degenerated and are adapting themselves to and capitulating before their own bourgeoisie, but the workers' states, as a social system, are tending to integrate themselves into an international system which is an objective support for workers' power.

"The moderation of the law soon contrasted with the rapidity of its execution."

In October 1960, sugar mills and estates were placed in the hands of the state by the expropriation of the capitalists. But state ownership of the sugar industry and the placing of the canefields in the hands of co-operatives did not solve the problems posed to the Cuban revolution. If unemployment and seasonal work raised social problems which had to be solved by the development of sources of employment, the economic blockade of imperialism involved the necessity of developing the production of foodstuffs and raw materials which had previously been imported.

Based on various kinds of experiences, Cuban agriculture has taken on a different and completely daring aspect: the formation of the People's Farms (Granjas del Pueblo). These farms are owned and administered by the state, and they are developing all aspects of production with the exception of sugar. They occupy large areas of both fertile and virgin land (up to 40 hectares), and are starting to produce all kinds of crops, are employing several hundred and thousands of workers (some of them have more than 5,000 workers) and are absorbing some of the former co-operatives.¹⁰

⁹ René Dumont, "Esprit", No 4, 1961, page 596.

¹⁰ An article in the revue "Bohemia" of February 19th, 1961, entitled "Cuba changes its Profile" describes the "Granma" People's Farm in Oriente Province, which has an area of 4,000 caballerias (caballeria is a Cuban unit of land measurement equal to 33 acres — Editor) and employs 5,000 workers: "Co-operatives of sugar cane workers, charcoal burners, fishermen and timber-workers operate within the "Granma" Farm. There are 28 clothing workshops with 52 teachers and 1,500 women students, which will serve as a basis for a ready-made clothing factory which is being planned. The overall budget of the farm for the year 1961

The Peoples' Farms which have been formed from the taking-over of the large cattle ranches, have succeeded in increasing production¹¹ and absorbing part of the unemployed labor force,¹² and have abolished in some parts of Cuba some of the "dead time" from which the workers suffered during a large part of the year.

The Cuban countryside comprises four main economic sectors:

1. According to official statistics,¹³ 59% of the 7½ million hectares of cultivated land is held by *small peasants*, who, constitute approximately a third of the agrarian population, but account for a much smaller proportion of production. The policy of the government is to guarantee their right to land ownership, to raise their standard of living, but not to base its agricultural development plans on them.¹⁴

2. 11.8% of the cultivated land is held by 622 *co-operatives* comprising 122,448 co-operators¹⁵ this land being in the main taken over from the large sugar estates.

In fact, the production plans of the co-operatives are organised and directed by INRA.¹⁶ Their members

is \$9,219,167.91 spread over 25 different crops. There are further budgets for basic projects such as the building of 20 villages of 120 houses each, with schools and health centres, people's shops and all the benefits of civilisation, the building and maintenance of various factories, some of which will come into operation immediately such as the cotton-burling factory, the furniture and box factory and the clothing factory, and others, such as the canning factory and the oil-press, which will come into operation in a few months. Besides these, building is going ahead on the construction of poultry farms which will produce 200,000 chickens a month to supply the region of the Golfo de Guacanayabo and the surrounding area, together with pig-farms for more than 4,000 pigs, and cattle farms with more than 3,000 head of cattle of well-established breeds."

¹¹ A recent announcement states that the production of tobacco has been increased to a total of 90 million pesos (one Cuban peso is roughly worth a dollar), and of coffee to a crop of 850,000 quintals in the latest harvest, which have enabled exports to be increased. The cocoa harvest has been increased (45,000 quintals was the latest harvest), and the country now produces sufficient vegetables and fruit for its own needs and almost sufficient rice (6,000 tons been imported from the United Arab Republic). (Report of Captain Nuñez Jimenez, Director of INRA, on the occasion of the 2nd Anniversary of the signing of the Agrarian Reform Law.) (N.B. INRA: National Institute of the Agrarian Reform.)

¹² According to official statistics, about 300,000 unemployed from the town and countryside have been absorbed into production.

¹³ Nuñez Jimenez, above quoted report.

¹⁴ Some European agricultural experts had recommended a greater degree of help to the small peasants as a means of increasing the production of foodstuffs, but the plans have been based mainly on the People's Farms, and partly on the co-operatives. Fidel Castro, in a speech he made on May 17th., said: "The revolution proclaims and guarantees the rights of the small peasants to land, and has at its disposal large landed estates for the development of its plans." (*Our italics*).

In the two years since the proclamation of the Agrarian Reform Law, 31,425 title-deeds to land have been issued.

¹⁵ Nuñez Jimenez, above quoted report.

¹⁶ In this connection, René Dumont, in the article previously quoted, says: "The large holding, called a co-operative, is really a People's Farm directed by an administrator appointed by INIA. The management is

receive a wage, and the surplus is invested in collective works and the development of production."¹⁷

The rice, cotton, fishing, timber getting and vegetable co-operatives are being absorbed and incorporated into the People's Farms. The sugar co-operatives, which are the great majority, are not the most dynamic sector of Cuban economic development, nor are the small peasants. There is no immediate prospect of an increase in the market for sugar, and the industry can increase its production to cope with present necessities without, great effort or capital investment.¹⁸

3. There are 263 *People's Farms*, accounting for 29.1% of the cultivated land (formerly cattle ranches), and employing 96,000 agricultural workers. This is the state sector, of the countryside,¹⁹ and that in which the efforts of the state are concentrated on the development of agricultural production, on industrial development in the countryside and on the absorption of unemployed labour.²⁰

4. The Sugar Enterprises are owned by the state, together with the sugar mills for pressing the cane, the railways engaged in the transport side of the industry, etc. During the periods of full activity, this industry employs several hundred thousand workers, and the plantations form the basis for the industrialisation of the main export product, and the entire productions of the sugar co-operatives are really subordinated to them.

Through its ownership of the People's Farms and the sugar plantations, together with its administration of the co-operatives, the state controls 80% of agricultural production. Official figures give the amount of investment during the two years since the Agrarian Reform Law as 400 million pesos.

These forms of agricultural organisation, daring in their methods of preventing fixed social forces in the countryside, of rapidly liquidating the effects of private ownership and eliminating the possibility of enrichment and differentiation in the countryside, express a dynamism which will continue to be reflected in the revolutionary process and which must rapidly lead to an effective industrial development.

INDUSTRIALISATION

The development of the Cuban Workers' State towards a socialist economy will have to be based on a vigorous

thus entirely controlled from above and organised by branches of the apparatus of production."

¹⁷ Dumont says: "Che Guevara... reproached me for emphasising in my report the feeling of *joint-ownership* which I considered useful to apply to the co-operators. This did not appear to be orthodox to him, and he preferred to develop the feeling of *responsability*, « especially as many of them are called upon to be displaced »" (op cit).

¹⁸ The present scale of production is 6 million tons, and can be increased to the record figure of 7 million.

¹⁹ Nuñez Jimenez, above quoted article.

²⁰ The Peoples' Farms have solved another problem. The abolition of rent by the agrarian reform opened up the possibility of the profitable utilization of the differential rent on the richest land of the cattle ranches in the same way as it occurred in the Sugar Enterprises. The Peoples' Farms and the state ownership of these enterprise puts directly in the hands of the state these resource which are an important source of accumulation.

process of industrialisation. This is the most difficult problem for Cuba, where practically no industries existed, where there was not a single large factory, and which even used to import from the United States fruit juices produced from fruit grown in Cuba itself. The development of industry raises several problems:

1. *The maintenance of the existing machines*, in the sugar-mills, electrical powers generators and distributors, telephones, railways, motor transport, agricultural machinery, petrol refineries, commercial and military aircraft, etc. As the machines are of United States manufacture, the economic blockade is felt very keenly. For a time, spare parts were bought from other countries (Mexico, Canada, etc.) but a start has been made on creating factories for spare parts with the help of the workers' states of Europe and Asia. A central problem has been that of petrol, as the lack of large rivers means that Cuban electrical power relies on petrol for its generation. An agreement valid for several years has been signed with the Soviet Union.

2. *Better utilization of the existing industrial capacity*. The regrouping of branches of state industries has been practically achieved in electricity and telephones, and can be achieved without great difficulty in sugar, railways, petrol and buses. *Consolidated industrial units have been formed to regroup small enterprises and factories in various branches: textile, metallurgical, chemical, etc.* It has thus been possible in some cases to undertake immediately a complementary development. It is planned to increase the amount of electrical power generated by 60% in a short period, and to increase output by 100% during the next five years on the basis of equipment provided by the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia.

3. *Aid from the other workers' states*. Cuba depends upon outside help for any real industrial development, in fact, from the workers states of Europe and Asia. This aid has received practical form in the availability of credits for industrial equipment for the Cuban workers' state.

Some 300 million dollars will be used for the development of the steel industry, electrical power, petrol refineries, shipyards, tractor, car and lorry factories, textile factories, abattoirs, factories for spare-parts and tools, chemical products, dynamite, mining machinery, etc. At the same time, students are being trained for various technical careers and technical workers are being trained, and technicians are being sent to Cuba. 21

21 Prospecting for oil and all kinds of minerals is being carried out by technicians from the Soviet Union and other workers' states. A credit of 100 million dollars granted by the Soviet Union is being used mainly for the installation of a complete steel plant capable of producing half a million tons by 1964, a complete petrol refinery, together with the plans for electrical power already mentioned. A credit of 40 millions from Czechoslovakia is being used for the installation of a factory for the manufacture of tractors, lorries and motor-cycles, to be expanded later to include buses and cars.

Two complete textile factories have been purchased in China and East Germany, to be installed at once. A number of complete factories has been bought from Poland, including a shipyard which will build ships of 3,000 tons in the first instance, and later ships of 10,000 tons.

Contracts have been signed for the installation of more than 100 enterprises during the period 1961-65, and an equal number are under discussion, to be installed during the

The figures and plans are modest in relation to those of large producer countries, but for Cuba they mean the creation of a basic industrial structure and the training of a specialised working class, together with a number of basic industrial enterprises on which can be developed a large-scale heavy industry. Throughout an entire historical period, the basis of Cuban heavy industry is and will be in the other workers' states.

4. *Foreign Trade*. Cuba is subjected to the economic aggression of United States imperialism, together with that of the other imperialist countries and the bourgeois governments of Latin America. The Kennedy government has continued the embargo on any Cuban purchases, and now prohibits any kind of sale, putting pressure on other countries to the same end. Because of Cuba's geographical situation and its traditional trade, this economic encirclement is of tremendous importance for Cuban economy. In order to break free, Cuban economy must be fundamentally based on the monopoly of foreign trade which has been established, and on this trade being carried on with the workers states.

One of the immediate problems which has to be faced is that of the price of sugar, which forms the bulk of Cuba's exports and which is the basis of its purchasing power. 22 Cuba can maintain its volume of sugar exports but receives less for them. In any event, the trade with the workers' states, especially as it is carried on through long-term credits, interest free or at very low rates of interest, and the prices of some of the goods imported, 23 together with the increase in Cuba's production of food-stuffs, reduces costs and allows for a certain amount of

same period. Spare parts and tool factories have been bought in the USSR, and a large number of smaller workshops have been bought in Czechoslovakia, the installation of some of which has already begun. A number of industrial units have been bought in East Germany. Several score of factories for the production of spare parts, tools, accessories, chemical products, textiles and dynamite have been bought in China, and in North Korea and other countries, various types of mining machinery, lathes and tools of many kinds.

These purchases are being obtained in the main by means of long-term credits. Interest-free credits of 60 million dollars have been opened in People's China, of be repaid over a period of 15 years. 785 students of various branches of engineering, 855 students of different branches of science and 1,680 technical workers have been sent to these workers' states.

Plans have also been developed for the utilization of the hydrocarbons of sugar cane for a series of important chemical products in order to reduce the cost of sugar production while making use of the by-products. (Report of Che Guevara on his return from a tour of the workers' states of Europe and Asia, in the review "Obra Revolucionaria", 6th January, 1961.)

22 The United States used to buy 3 million tons of sugar (60% of Cuba's production) at a price of 5.25 cents a pound, while the world price was 3.25 cents or less. The trade agreements made at the end of last year with the workers' states allow of the sale of sugar to them at 4 cts. The Soviet Union has agreed to buy 2,700,000 tons, China 1 million tons, and the other workers' states 326 thousand tons.

23 According to the economists (Sweezy and Huberman, *Cuba - Anatomia di una rivoluzione* Finaudi, 1961, page 217), the prices to be paid to the workers' states for goods supplied are lower, and this makes up for the lower prices received for sugar.

financial equilibrium to assist in the development plans. The credits are, in any case, a fundamental point of support for the initial stages of the industrialization process.

But there is another very serious problem for the Cuban economy. Together with the economic blockade, there is a military blockade, with aggression such as the last invasion, the counter-revolutionary guerrillas, sabotage and frequent arson.²⁴ The internal military mobilisation of the masses is kept in being together with the production effort by the tremendous revolutionary spirit and the development of the initiative and the energy of the Cuban working masses, but a permanent economic effort is required to maintain an efficient and large scale armament and a mobilisation for the entire militia. At the same time, the Cuban workers' state is subjected to a series of restrictions in the supply of various materials. Without having to resort to the "War Communism" of the early years of the Soviet Union, collective efforts have to be made to persuade the people to accept a tendency to the levelling of consumption and to rationing where necessary, especially for the sections of the petty-bourgeoisie and the more privileged sections of state employees who have been accustomed to a higher standard of living.

5. *Planning.* The economy of the Cuban workers' state can only overcome its backwardness and take advantage of the openings in the world market placed at its disposal by the workers' states, and make use of its internal resources and the creative energy of the masses, by a planning of the whole economy.

The existing chaos in industry has been largely due to the lack of any concrete idea of what to do in this field, but the material basis for this chaos was the complete inefficiency of industry for a country which broke from an age-old economic structure without having developed the minimum bases of the new structure, and which soon found itself subjected to an economic blockade which severed it from its normal sources of supply of industrial products.

The consolidated industrial units, in some cases, such as the textile, metallurgical and chemical industries, comprising the small state or expropriated enterprises, do not provide the possibilities for a real change or the attainment of the minimum needs of the new economy.

III — THE MASSES, THE NEW ECONOMY AND THE WORKERS' STATE

THE CHANGES IN LIVING CONDITIONS

The considerable economic measures taken in town and country have been accompanied by small but noticeable improvements in the lot of most exploited sectors of the old society. Immediate measures taken by the revolution *cut rents in half* and *reduced telephone and electricity charges*. The INAV (Instituto Nacional de Ahorros y Viviendas - National Savings and Housing Institute) was immediately set up, and embarked on the relatively important task of *building blocks of modern popular dwellings*.

Later, *Urban Reform* developed the conception of the social function of housing, abolishing the large-scale ownership of urban housing²⁵ and giving the occupants

Nevertheless, the expropriation of these small enterprises (which has been criticized) place in the hands of the state the minimum elements of private accumulation, and lays a healthy basis on which the development of the industrial apparatus can be built through the help of the other workers' states.

The Ministry of Industrialization, headed by Guevara, and the four-year plan which he announced on May 1st., provide a new basis following the first attempts.

It is based on expropriation, on the consolidated units, the General Administrations (of tobacco, coffee and cocoa) and on the agreements with the other workers' states, which form a starting point for a rational equipment for the Cuban industrial development.

In this direction, the basis has been laid for the beginning of a plan for industry and for the planning of the whole economy supported by the dynamism of agricultural production, by the real increase in the production of food-stuffs, and by the real improvement of the living standards of the Cuban workers food, housing, work and education.

In any event, this economic development and this planning is at an anarchic and explosive stage, with great possibilities, and developments, and with many bottlenecks, because it is under the fire of the need, the impulse, the fever and the demands of the various sections of the working class, subject to the solution of great economic problems and the lack of a coherent and homogeneous class, which could only be provided by the working class in Cuba, which has arrived at a homogeneity of programme, policy and objectives to lead this process and to solve in a harmonious way the problems of planning.

These beginnings of planning are led by sectors of a team which is continuing to adopt the Socialist point of view, which is basing itself on the experience and help of the Stalinist leaderships of the workers' states and the technical advice of elements of the international Left, a team which is acting under the lively and healthy pressure and demands of the Cuban working masses, but which has not yet succeeded in constructing a programme, a doctrine or a political force which fully expresses the content and the proletarian leadership of the Cuban revolution and the working class leadership of the Cuban workers' state.

of all houses the opportunity of owning their houses by payment of rent over a period of time.²⁶

One of the boldest programmes is that dealing with *housing for the peasants and agricultural workers*. This envisaged an individual dwelling in place of the old one, in line with the first conception of the agrarian reform. But now, through the People's Farms, the building of *population centres* which concentrate the population is being undertaken. These are being specially built to provide *sanitary facilities, electrical wiring, schools for children and for eradicating adult illiteracy, health centres, people's shops, entertainment centres* and various other social services.

The People's Shops, begun in 1959, provide a form of distribution of various consumers' goods which were not

²⁴ Some of the large shops in Havana have been burnt in recent months, including "El Encanto" and "La Epoca".

²⁵ There were proprietors of more than 5,000 dwellings.

²⁶ Those property owners who lived on the rents of a small number of dwellings were granted by the State a pension equal to the rents they had been receiving up to a maximum of 600 pesos.

previously available to country-dwellers, thus making possible an increase in the interchange and variety of their food supplies and general consumption. At the same time, the shops eliminated the middlemen and brought a real reduction in retail prices, which cover only administration costs. According to Professor Dumont, these prices were reduced by 20 to 30%, bringing that amount of increase in rural consumption.

Professor Dumont makes the following comments in this connection:

"The traditional communist State would have taken the difference in prices, or the major part of it, for use as investment. When I proposed to the president of the National Bank, the famous Comandante Che Guevara, that a half of the reduction in retail prices should be devoted to that purpose, he told me that he would supply that investment fund by re-selling at the old prices the watches and radio sets which the USSR would supply to them very cheaply. A watch bought for 9 pesos could be re-sold at 40 pesos. But these «durable» purchases constitute only a small part of the purchases and a general tax on all purchases would bring in much more." 27

Despite the desertion of some doctors, enticed, together with that of some other technicians, by imperialism and reaction, medical attention has been improved, mainly by carrying out a better distribution of doctors and medical personnel throughout the country, whereas they were previously concentrated in the urban centres and among sectors who were better able to pay for services; by creating new health centres in the Sierra and expanding the services of the skilled medical workers, but above all by linking this development with the new People's Farms and the population centres attached to them, and with the sugar enterprises and co-operatives, etc.

But the new regime is concentrating its energies particularly in the fight for education and against illiteracy. 28 Apart from the establishment of large schools, particularly in the buildings used formerly as military barracks by the Batista dictatorship, the main effort has now been directed to combatting illiteracy among adults, mainly in the countryside, with the creation of corps of voluntary teachers for which an appeal was made to the finest spirit of sacrifice and generosity of young Cubans. Clearly this effort has met with the open opposition of some of the old layers which monopolized education when it was imbued with a strict class sense, and it has encountered considerable resistance from the Church, including a strike by some private colleges against the state monopoly of education, representing the resistance offered by the old caste-spirit of Cuban education. Now all former private schools, and the universities have been taken over by the State.

Here, as in other aspects, the desertions added to the already existing shortage of technicians and specialist personnel, even more acute in view of the tasks which have to be accomplished, represent a great handicap to the workers' state, but this also provides a stimulus to the development of its own team and its own apparatus,

27 Quoted article, p. 591. For example, after the installation of the Peoples' Shops, the Sabatés an American factory making soap and other toilet requisites—and now expropriated—incorporated in its own distribution chain entire zones where it did not exist before.

28 The year 1961 has been named "the Year of Education".

calling upon the creative energy and the capacity of the people for development. At the same time, as we have seen, the workers' states give support by the training of technicians, which Cuban education is not yet able to undertake, and numerous volunteer technicians from other Latin American countries are helping the Cuban workers' state during this difficult transition period.

If we add to these measures the progress made in overcoming unemployment and seasonal working, we can see that there have been real improvements in the condition of the masses, even though some more privileged sections of the workers (privileged comparatively with the extreme exploitation of the Cuban masses), like the petty-bourgeoisie, have seen a reduction in their income.

This difference which Professor Dumont notes between Cuba and the "traditional Communist state" is a very real one, if we consider, not the traditional Communist state, but the Stalinist conception of the state and its relation with the masses. In the other workers' states, Stalinism has imposed as a source of accumulation, a superexploitation of the masses, at the same time justifying political oppression and the lack of workers' democracy, by the need to impose upon the masses for a whole historic period a regime capable of ensuring the maximum productivity by imposing a very low level of consumption. In reality, instead of equal sacrifice, a privileged stratum of administrators, managers and officials has been built upon this low level of consumption.

While the Cuban Revolution bases its development on the other workers' states, it differs from Stalinism, among other things, by developing a real material bond with the Cuban people through a real, though small, improvement in their lives and through a participation which is measured materially in the transformations effected by the revolution. And this is being done under the pressure of the imperialist blockade, of the invasions, and of internal counter revolution.

THE STRUCTURE AND COMPOSITION OF THE STATE APPARATUS

This greater share of the masses in the national income has not eliminated the differences in income of the various sectors. Though Cuba is a workers' state in the production relations on which it is based and which it defends, the distribution norms are bourgeois in character. Surplus value is maintained, together with higher incomes for certain social layers (technicians, teachers, administrators, members of the government, trade union leaders and army officers) in relation to the large masses. 29

These differences are not very marked at the present stage of revolutionary mobilization, and the danger is more potential than actual because of the actual structure and composition of the state apparatus. This apparatus has been in the process of renewal since January 1959 as a result of crises and purges but it still maintains some forms of the old state. It is in a permanent state of change, has no coherence or homogeneity, and does not represent a class exercising power through its constituted organs.

It is difficult to lead from a centralized control these developing forces, this permanent mobilization throughout Cuba against imperialism and internal counter-revolution,

29 The differences in income are expressed not only in salaries, but also in the possibility of the use of property expropriated from the old administration (houses, cars, etc.)

this economy which is evolving daily, this revolutionary process which places in the hands of the state human and economic resources of tremendous dynamism and potentialities.

In fact, these forces cannot be centralized and planned without affecting their permanent expansion, without operating a very great change in the structure and composition of the state apparatus. The structure of this apparatus must arise from the very classes which maintain all the revolutionary dynamism and interest in the development of the economy. Only the working class, supported by the peasantry, through its organs of power, its workers' councils, its soviets, can provide the structure capable of centralizing the state, of planning the economy, maintaining and intensifying its dynamism and creative force.

In general, the road taken is a contrary one. It is that of developing the administrative centralization, a disciplined state, economic, trade union and political apparatus which is being imposed from above. The factories, People's Farms and co-operatives³⁰ are directly administered by the State, by the INRA. A Stalinist leadership is being imposed from above on the trade unions. The desire to impose a centralized leadership has meant that, instead of developing the power of the working class through its organs, there is the development of the power of an apparatus of hybrid composition.

The consolidation of such an apparatus can only be achieved at the expense of the initiative of the masses and of the dynamism of development.

To the extent that this State apparatus has not a structure controlled by the workers, that it is not working class in composition, and that it is not basing itself on the development of industry, on the People's Farms and the army, will the dangers of these weak bourgeois distribution relations grow, and introduce differences tending to crystallise into serious bureaucratic distortions. That is to say, these distribution relations can imperil in the long run the property relations characterized by the state ownership of the means of production.

The danger which exists is not so much that bourgeois norms of distribution are in existence, but that there may be created around this structure a social grouping within the workers' state which seeks to maintain and consolidate them with the backing of an uncontrolled state apparatus.

The role of the state is fundamental, because, as Trotsky has posed it, while the productive forces work automatically in a capitalist regime, the property relations established by the revolution in the workers' state "are indissolubly linked with the State which gives them birth".

It is necessary that the State apparatus and its policy should be completely on the side of the proletariat and be socialist in tendency. That is, that the whole weight of political power should be directed to the maintenance of socialist tendencies. This is decisive for the true socialist development of Cuban society.

WORKERS' POWER AND THE MILITIA

But also here the process is many-sided, contradictory and far from having crystallised.

For a whole period, the source of Fidel Castro's power

was the support of the masses, but this power is exercised concretely on the basis of the Rebel Army, an organ whose principal cadres were in general recruited among petty-bourgeois circles, but whose rank and file comprise agricultural workers', peasants and the sons of workers, and whose social medium was the Cuban countryside with all its explosive contradictions.³¹

But there has been a rapid development in the militia, with the influx mainly of the urban and rural working class, the peasants and the poor sectors of the urban petty-bourgeoisie. The fight against the counter-revolutionary guerrillas was carried on directly by the peasants in the Sierra del Escambray or the Sierras de Oriente, and it was they who eliminated them. The vigilance in the centres of work against sabotage and against terrorism has called for a permanent mobilization of the workers rather than a regular army or an independently mobilized police force. This has given a greater participation and importance to the militia in the defence of the revolution, increasing its initiative and independent action in association with the factories and work centres, the sugar plantations, the People's Farms and the mills, and territorial control of the militia has developed in practice in the peasant areas.

The very danger of invasion has contributed to raising the importance of the militia in relation to the regular army. What is needed to counter an invasion from the United States — like that of April last — is not a matching of army against army, but, above all, the mass mobilization of the entire Cuban people, house by house fighting, as Fidel Castro has said, guerrilla warfare, the infinite harassment throughout Cuba by the armed people.

This is the type of warfare which the Cuban workers' state can carry on against an armed invasion by the forces of imperialism, a type of fighting which cannot be defeated and which also places in the forefront the militia and its initiative and relegates the role of the regular army to second place.

In fact, the militia has now superseded the army in importance. It was the militia which carried out the actions and was the vanguard in the defeat of the recent imperialist invasion, and is the most highly organised expression of the mobilisation of the Cuban working masses in defence of the workers' state.

It is here that new forms of power have developed in Cuba in recent months, though this power is not expressed in an organized form, nor canalized in the leadership of the State.

More than half a million armed militiamen, more than a million men mobilized in the fighting services and auxiliaries, supported actively by the greater part of the Cuban population — these are figures which give the Cuban workers' state special characteristics which bear no relation to any other workers' state at the present time, and which explain the dynamism, the daring and the permanent process of amazing development of the Cuban workers' state.

This is another of the great obstacles to the development of a bureaucratic, Stalinist regime — this State which must base itself on the stimulus of the creative spirit and the initiative of the masses and in full accord with them in every part of Cuba.

³⁰ The co-operatives elect their leader, but the actual administration, is in the hands of the coordinator and the administrator designated by the INRA.

³¹ See Sweezy and Huberman, *op cit*, p. 224.

THE COUNCILS OF TECHNICAL ASSESSORS AND THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE ECONOMY

The formation of the Councils of Technical Assessors (CTA) is a step on the road to the intervention of the working class movement in the control and administration of the economy.

The CTA has been conceived partly as a means of associating the workers of the various enterprises with the production drive, giving them participation in its leadership. The law setting up these Councils calls for them to be set up in all state enterprises, whether directly or partly controlled, as *consultative bodies* which participate "in everything concerning the development and improvement of production, the fixing of rates, discussions with the workers on output and other working conditions, together with the drawing up of long-term and short-term plans." According to the law, the Councils are also empowered to propose to the managements "the adoption of whatever measures they feel may be necessary for the technical improvement of production, both in relation to productivity and to the quality of the articles being manufactured".³²

These councils are not directly elected by the workers. Full sectional or departmental meetings of the workers elect a list of three delegates. These lists are taken to the management, which selects from each list of three a delegate to represent each department or section.³³

On his return from his tour of the workers' states, Guevara explained that the CTA "constitute something which has been one of our main aims, which is to link the working class even more closely with the leadership of production, to interest the workers in production, to reveal the problems of each factory and to solve the very difficult problems which face us at this time, when we have had to absorb the great majority of Cuban enterprises with practically no administrative apparatus", and he stressed the role of the CTA as that of "ensuring the maximum production capacity of the factory, and also improving the living standards of their workmates", adding in conclusion that "we shall be able to integrate

ourselves much more or integrate the working class in the leadership of the factories. For it is a fact that the administrative work is separated from the masses. That is a fact. Bureaucracy does exist".³⁴

At the February Convention of the CTA, Fidel Castro said: "This is a meeting of the workers as participants in the management of the enterprises". And Guevara said: "It is in no way possible to make an all-embracing economic plan unless we have the agreement and the interest of the people and the participation of the masses in all the planning work of the national economy".

These statements, reflecting both a certain understanding of, and a certain lack of confidence in the working class, reveal the role of the CTA. The CTA represent a revolutionary step in the participation of the workers in the control of the factories. They also represent an as yet paternalist form of leadership, lacking confidence in the workers, which hinders full intervention and resists the full development of workers' democracy, preventing the workers as a class from taking over the leadership of the state economy through its organs of power and absorbing the administrative apparatus into the control and leadership of these organs. This apparatus still maintains its independence and its capacity for taking decisions over and above the working class.

But this development must be seen in the framework of a dynamic process of permanent incorporation of the working class, of the development of its experience and participation. Like all the other organs of the revolution, the CTA is a organ of transition, whose content will not be decided by the law nor the will of the leaders, but by the masses themselves and by the role which the masses assign to them in their own process of development, of political understanding and of dynamic intervention. The CTA answer the objective need for the intervention of the workers in the planning and leadership of the economy, and for the political development of the working class itself. They represent the beginning of a new stage in the development of the organised intervention of the working class.

IV — PARTIES AND TRADE UNIONS

The rapid evolution to socialism, the measures which have transformed Cuba into a workers' state, the building of a state apparatus and the mobilization of the masses, which reflect such strength, are not being achieved without very great internal contradictions. And these contradictions are being reflected principally where the organized life of the masses takes place, or should take place — in political organization and in the trade unions. There resides the crisis of the growth of the revolution and of the workers' state, where the struggle is engaged between the groups which are attempting to control and crystallize the forces of the revolution at a level which will permit them to dominate these forces, and where the main part of the battle will take place for the full expression of the power of the masses.

³² ("The Workers, the Trade Unions and Production", FNFC, Havana, p. 29).

³³ A meeting of the delegates of each enterprise or work centre forms the CTA, which elects the delegates for the corresponding *Consolidated Unit* CTA.

³⁴ "Obra Revolucionaria", Havana, 6th January 1961.

THE SOCIAL ROOTS OF STALINISM IN CUBA

Who is interested in controlling and crystallizing the forces of the revolution? The PSP has worked throughout all this period to gain controlling positions in the trade unions, in the political apparatus on which the government is based, and in the state. But this is not only the product of the subjective desire of the Cuban stalinists, but the political expression of the social forces which act within and on the Cuban workers' state.

Some petty-bourgeois sectors of the old trade union bureaucracy, driven by the impulse of the insurrection, took part in the first stage of the revolution and formed themselves into the 26th of July Movement, which was later left completely behind by the direct mobilization of the masses. These sectors form part of the cadres of the state apparatus, and particularly of some organs such as the police, INRA, sectors of the CTC and the trade union leadership, but which tend to lag behind the continuous development of the forces of the revolution and the intervention of new forces. They rather trail behind the revolutionary process, without any pol-

itical initiative. They have bureaucratic ideas, resist and distrust the full revolutionary expansion of the working class, and oppose the development of the organs of workers' and peasants' power in Cuba.

This layer is not consolidated or cohesive, and has no very defined interests as a social grouping. The influence which gives it a certain centre of cohesion and political force is an external one — the influence of Soviet bureaucracy.

While the Cuba workers' state relies on the support of the system of workers states, the bureaucratic deformations of those states also affect the Cuban workers' state, just as the bureaucratic degeneration of the Soviet Union affected the other workers' states during their formative process.

Though the Soviet bureaucracy objectively supports the Cuban workers' state, it tends to prevent any ideological and political development, and especially any development of workers' power and of soviet democracy in Cuba, which would profoundly influence, not merely the Communist Parties, but the workers' states themselves, shaken as they are by an ideological crisis and a development of new forces seeking to return to the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism.

This bureaucracy, which has not hesitated to break with and combat the Yugoslav workers' state, or smash by force of arms the development of workers councils in Hungary, or fight the Polish revolution and the revolutionary ideas of the Chinese, is clearly not simply playing the role of a disinterested benefactor in Cuba. Although the Soviet bureaucracy has not subjectively inspired the Cuban workers' state through its Stalinist forces inside Cuba, it is, through its objective connection with it, clearly trying to control an evolution which might prove dangerous to its own system in the workers' states. This Cuban example, based on a soviet-type democracy would be a tremendous stimulus to the revolutionary movements of Latin America and Africa, its influence even being capable of extension to the workers' states through the most sensitive sectors such as China.

Stalinism in Cuba, tends in fact to be the political expression of this internal semi-bureaucratic sector, supported by external bureaucratic interests. This sector is not directly organised in the PSP. It forms its political grouping in the 26th of July Movement, the latter which, though it has not disappeared, has ceased to be a centre of political initiative and political grouping. Without party lines, it acts as a confused political medium through a de facto Front established with other organisations of the same political characteristics, such as the Revolutionary Directorate, the Young Rebels, etc, in which the PSP is the cohesive force. These sectors are not going to the PSP and have not hardened into bureaucratic positions. They are linked with the PSP, which has an influence and fulfils a role in these circles far more weighty than it has in the development of the revolution.

In fact, the PSP is today the organizing element of the resistance which is barring the proletariat from full expression and control of the workers' state.

This has been expressed in the fight against the full expansion of the working class movement, its ideas and organization, which must logically be the basis of support, the constituent cells of the new state organism. This fight has shown itself in the attempt to place the trade unions under the direct control of the Ministry of Labour,

and to force them to accept leaders generally linked to Stalinism. This acts as a brake upon the independent fighting spirit of the working class and makes use of working class support for the Revolutionary Government in order to subordinate its organs, robbed of their own political content, to the hybrid state apparatus which we have seen.

We would say that the most symbolic expression of this fight has been the attempt to reimpose the trade union leadership of Lázaro Peña and the old leaders who have been discredited by their former conciliation and subordination to bourgeois governments — to prevent the election of a new leadership from among the working class vanguard which has arisen during the revolution and during the process which culminated in the establishment of the workers' state.

Of all the forces of the revolution, it is in the trade unions that the greatest struggles and crises have taken place. The so-called purges of elements who collaborated with the old regime have been used as a means of liquidating opposition and imposing a certain political terrorism. Of course, a considerable part of the opposition to Stalinism came from elements which resisted some of the measures of the revolution. But there has been resistance by the working class vanguard and rank-and-file to these bureaucratic methods, and unions with several thousand members have elected their leadership at meetings attended by only a few score workers. This is not a sign of indifference or lack of interest, since these same workers who fail to attend their trade union meetings are the same who rally to the great public demonstrations, who form the militia and stand on guard against the counter-revolution, and who are the driving force of production. But for the time being, it is in these channels that the revolutionary energy of the workers finds expression, and the measures taken by the government, the advances it has made and its fighting determination overshadow the complaints and disagreements which may exist in other directions.

But, as the leaders of the government are themselves discovering, the development of production and planning demands and will demand greater participation by the workers. In the organization of agriculture, industry, education, the militia, the building of houses, health centres and factories, the state has to rely on the forces of the people, to nourish itself on the working classes which support the revolution, to stand fast on each one of these tendencies in the life-and-death struggle against the former owning class, the technicians of the old regime, the Church, the privileged sectors, the active and passive resistance of the capitalist regime in all its forms, the sabotage and the economic blockade. This is where the elements of the new state are being developed. The contradiction between this method of appealing continually to the initiative of the popular forces, to their creative and revolutionary spirit, to their maximum effort in production or in military defence and the attempts to control or crystallize the organs of the workers in a bureaucratic form, will become increasingly sharp.

THE SINGLE PARTY

The Church is attempting to regroup within Cuba the most privileged sectors of the petty-bourgeoisie, and to make them act by forms of pressure and action against the State in conjunction with the external aggression and

pressure. The strike of students of private (that is, religious) schools was the most serious attempt at this stage. But the recent invasion has shown the weakness of this attempt and the division of these forces, which were not able to react or to take any initiative in favour of the invading forces.

The various political forces whose cadres were built up before the insurrection (the "Organizacion Autentica", the "Ortodoxos") have been swept away, together with the wing led by Manuel Ray, which split from "Accion y Sabotaje" and went over to the counter-revolution. The Revolutionary Directorate and the 26th of July Movement, whose cadres were created during the insurrection, are incorporated in the administrative apparatus, in a groupment whose ideology and initiative is provided fundamentally by the PSP, subordinate, of course, to the policy of Fidel Castro. Some of the old trade union sectors have been smashed (Fraginals, of the Electrical Workers), others pushed aside (Antonio Torres, of the Railwaymen), others have submitted to the apparatus and to collaboration with the PSP (such as Cabrera), particularly since the PSP represents politically certain social interests of this layer.

This is really an aspect of the struggle for the formation and development of the Party which will lead the Cuban workers' state.

There is an urgent need for a party, since the old forces which took part in the insurrection are outdated. Here two interests collide: those of the governmental, state, economic and trade union apparatus, and those deriving from the maturity, expansion and centralized intervention of the proletariat and the working masses in the administration of the state and the economy.

The idea of a Single Party has been circulating in leading circles for the past year and a half. It has been the subject of internal discussions, but decisions have been postponed.³⁵ One of the strongest points of the present leadership has been its resistance to crystallizing into laws, fixed juridical forms and organs any of the transitory stages and movements. Nevertheless, there has been a process of developing maturity, and the government is now working towards this Single Party, based on the apparatus and relying on the prestige of the present leadership of the revolution.

The Single Party is not being built on the plan of development and intervention of the masses, but on the constitution of a state political force, a force of the apparatus, based perhaps on the militia, the trade union apparatus, the corps of volunteer teachers and the "Young Rebels", similar to and in the image of the present hybrid apparatus. Within this, Stalinism, would represent the pressure of the bureaucracy of the Soviet Union and the other workers' states. It would be a force which would reflect all the contradictions, but with a tendency to solve them from above, consolidating the apparatus and submitting the forces to it.

Stalinism cannot openly predominate with its cadres and ideology. There has been no retreat of the revolution to allow of that. The Single Party sponsored by bureaucratic circles and accepted in principle by the

government, is the form of a regrouping of the apparatus with a Stalinist-Khrushchevist predominance.

But a very big resistance to Stalinism exist among the workers, the cadres of the Rebel Army and in the government itself. From its beginning, the Single Party will be faced with an internal struggle in its own apparatus. Through Fidelism the masses seek their own power, and this will be an element of differentiation with the bureaucratic tendencies.

The PSP itself, shaken by the differences existing between China and the Soviet Union, by the disagreements introduced among its youth by the comparison of the Cuban Revolution itself and its methods with Stalinist reformism, is not a force capable of establishing complete domination. The different tendencies maintain agreement publicly, but they are themselves rent by internal struggle. The whole weight of international Stalinism is needed to maintain its cohesion. But the determining factors are the relationship of forces within the revolution and the advancement and development of the workers' states. These contradictions will blow up.

THE REVOLUTIONARY MARXIST PARTY

The alternative to the Single Party is the achievement of political cohesion in the working class and the formation of its own party, of a revolutionary Marxist leadership which would not be swallowed up by the state apparatus, but would impose its will on that apparatus. There is a political force in Cuba which expresses that alternative, the Partido Obrero Revolucionario (Revolutionary Workers' Party), the Trotskyist Party of Cuba. The fate of this party is linked with the struggle for the intervention and control by the workers, worker and peasant, democratic and soviet leadership of the Cuban workers' state.

The fight for the political organization of the Cuban workers' state, has to be waged through the formation of a party which brings together the socially diffuse forces in the apparatus, which organize to affirm their leadership and privileges, though, at the same time, having to unite themselves with authentic revolutionary forces — or through the coherent political development of the revolutionary forces capable of imposing their leadership on society and on the Cuban workers' state.

The reorganization and development of Trotskyism in Cuba today is the conscious expression of the need of the working class as the leader of the revolution, of its expansion, of the political hegemony of the proletariat. The role of the POR is to promote, develop and organize the workers' forces politically in revolutionary Marxism.

The struggle which has been strangled by police means in the Soviet Union, and stifled in each workers' state with the triumph of bureaucracy, of the apparatus over the masses, opens up again in Cuba. The social and political conditions make it difficult for Stalinism to smash it by police methods there also, as it is supported by the developing proletarian forces. This struggle raises the problem of the leadership and political organization of workers' power.

The revolutionary Marxist Party will grow in the struggle for the development of the organs of mass power, of the workers' Councils (soviets), of the trade unions, militia and peasant and youth organisations. *A congress of these bodies, with delegates elected democratically by*

³⁵ Since this article was written, Che Guevara, in a speech delivered to student on June 5th 1961, stated that as a real unity of the revolutionary organisations exists in Cuba, "nothing more remains than to form a single party whose general secretary would be Fidel Castro".

direct vote of the workers at meetings, must organize the new state apparatus.

The fight of Trotskyism against the Cuban political expression of conservative bureaucracy of the workers' states is taking place in conditions of advance, and not of retreat and isolation. The very political basis of Stalinism, the control of the first workers' state is being seriously jeopardized by the development of new forces. The methods which permitted the triumph of Stalinism have had to be condemned in the Soviet Union itself. The Chinese C.P., just as the Yugoslav, Polish and Hungarian revolutions before, raises as a matter of discussion the monolithic character and the fundamental conceptions of Stalinism, and Cuban Stalinism — at the same time that it is tending to secure control — is shaken by this international crisis and is splitting into wings. To the extent to which it links itself with the workers' state, it becomes exposed to the fire of a permanent revolution, is shaken by the crisis, Leftist tendencies, "Chinese" tendencies appear,

V — THE REVOLUTIONARY DEFENCE OF THE CUBAN WORKERS' STATE

This struggle must be based fundamentally on the same forces which are today defending the Cuban revolution, on the Latin American revolutionary movement, on the development of new workers' states in Latin America and the colonial world.

The Cuban revolution will have to assert itself by a permanent revolutionary process, not only internal, but also through its external extension as a vital necessity for its very existence. It must extend itself on a continental scale through the development of new workers' states, in an extension of the system of the United Soviet Socialist States of Latin America.

The great subjective and objective support for the Cuban revolution is to be found in the Latin American revolution, as part of the colonial revolution, just as the objective support for its economic victories lies in workers' states.

Today the struggle for the maintenance of the Cuban workers' state is not only the affair of the Cuban masses. The pressure of the colonial revolution will increase the intervention of the Soviet Union and the other workers' states. The colonial masses measure the sincerity of the help which the Soviet government proclaims for them in Asia, Africa and Latin America, by its attitude towards Cuba. The Cuban government is aware of this. "All peoples now know that their sovereignty can be guaranteed by the Soviet Union", said Guevara on May 8th, speaking to electrical workers in Havana, adding: "I consider that the solidarity of the Socialist countries has

as well as other tendencies which will in the coming period come to be called "Cuban tendencies".

As we have seen, Fidel Castro himself is departing from Stalinist patterns and Stalinist political conceptions in his leadership of the state and the revolution, and today he constitutes the Left within the leadership of the workers' states.

Trotskyism bases itself today on a dynamic of the revolution which, despite its errors and deviations, is a revolutionary Marxist dynamic, a Trotskyist dynamic. The building of a mass revolutionary Marxist Party, the establishment of a real workers', soviet rule of the Cuban workers' state, must be conquered in an implacable struggle against all attempts, repression, deviations and obstacles — a struggle against the pressure that is still capable of being put on the revolution by the bureaucracy installed in the system of workers' states, to which in one way or another the Cuban workers' state is subordinated by objective necessities.

prevented Cuba from becoming a pawn in future transactions on a world scale".

The defence of the Cuban workers' state will be based on the support of mobilizations like those which took place in Latin America and in other parts of the world, but its long-term support must be based on the revolutionary struggles of the Latin American and colonial masses. The defence of Cuba will extend the revolutionary movement in all countries, "making the Andes into a Sierra Maestra," transforming the imperialist war against the Cuban workers' state into a war for the expulsion of imperialism and the ending of capitalism in Latin America. "Our revolution is not only an example for Latin America but also a catalytic", as Guevara said to the electricity workers.

The revolutionary defence of the Cuban Workers' State is an integral part of the fight for the social revolution in Latin America. This defence will put an end to the policies of alliances with "progressive bourgeoisies", the policy of conciliation, and, as is now happening, revolutionary forces and tendencies in the old parties and in the workers' movement will develop together with the Trotskyist parties. The revolutionary defence of the Cuban workers' state will develop together with the development of the revolutionary Marxist parties, with the parties of the Fourth International in Latin America, the parties which hold to the programme of the Proletarian Revolution.

30 May, 1961

Three Declarations and an appeal of the International Secretariat of the Fourth International

I

ON THE FIRST COSMIC FLIGHT

The Fourth International enthusiastically hails the first flight of man in cosmic space, accomplished by a Soviet astronaut.

This magnificent undertaking has once more demonstrated the scientific and technical advance of the workers' states over capitalism, and the immense possibilities opened up to humanity by the nationalized and planned economy.

The first cosmic flight is not only a great victory of Soviet science and technics; it is also a new blow struck at imperialism throughout the world, at its self-confidence and prestige. It is a new and powerful encouragement to the world's masses, whose imagination, initiative, and determination to win have been strongly stimulated. It is a new spur to the alliance between the workers' states and the colonial masses in revolt, who see in these dazzling conquests of Soviet science a picture of the immense possibilities that the socialist future offers to humanity. It is a new encouragement to the struggles, self-confidence, and

hopes of the masses of the Soviet Union and the other workers' states to re-establish a socialist democracy.

The conquest of space by man, begun by the first victorious workers' state in history, while imperialism in decomposition still threatens a nuclear hecatomb, strengthens the determination of the masses who are fighting everywhere on the planet for the destruction of capitalism and imperialism, to reassert and guarantee the dignity of human beings, their possibilities of unlimited expansion and their happiness, and to prevent imperialism's suicidal war by the only sure means: the overthrow of capitalism everywhere.

The Fourth International hails, in the first cosmic flight of man, the unlimited possibilities which will be opened up to humanity by the triumph of the Socialist revolution on the planet.

12 April 1961.

II

IMMEDIATE AND UNCONDITIONAL INDEPENDENCE OF ALGERIA! ALGERIAN SOCIALIST REPUBLIC!

The independence of Algeria is an irreversible fact. French imperialism, defeated in seven years of military struggles in North Africa, is now trying to limit and control this independence by means of negotiations. It wants to keep control over the country's principal sources of wealth, and at the same time to impose conditions about its future form of government, and its national and international policies. By means of a possible alliance or understanding with the revolution's right wing, French imperialism wants to ensure that it can stay in North Africa, check the drive of the Algerian fighting masses toward a socialist reorganization of the country, and maintain there a key control post over the development of the new African states as a whole.

The Tunisian and Moroccan bourgeoisies, even when their interests do not coincide with those of imperialism, are at present interested in the success of the operation to limit the influence of an independent and revolutionary Algeria on the North African masses as a whole.

US imperialism, while manoeuvring to replace France in the alliance with the African colonial bourgeoisies, is not, however, backing unrestricted independence for Algeria, which would leave its destiny largely in the hands of the peasant and urban forces which made the revolution and kept up the long war.

Both world imperialism and its bourgeois or pro-bourgeois allies in Africa are aware that Algerian indepen-

dence raises the question of the country's government and social organization, and that the revolution has developed powerful peasant, worker, trade-union, youth, anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist forces, for whom the revolution against imperialism is a synonym for the socialist revolution in Algeria. Those imperialist and capitalist forces, just as heretofore they tried to block or delay Algerian independence, are now proposing to prevent the masses of Algeria from deciding the destiny of their own country.

This is the essential basis for the manoeuvres, delays, and indefinite dragging-out of the negotiations, aimed at discouraging the determination of the masses and at giving greater weight within the Algerian forces, not to such ghosts as the MNA, but to the more conciliatory and pro-bourgeois wing of the FLN itself, to the sector most inclined to make concessions to French imperialism for the principal purpose of checking its own masses.

The organizations of the African masses, of the colonial and semi-colonial masses of the entire world, of the French, European and North American workers, and of the workers' states, must intervene and help the Algerian revolution to defeat imperialism's manoeuvres and pressures, demanding more forcefully than ever an immediate end to French military intervention in Algeria, and *immediate and unconditional Algerian independence*.

The independence of Algeria, peace in Algeria, mean:

The withdrawal of all French troops from Algerian territory, and the concession of no military base — such as that of Mers El Kebir — from which pressure on or control over the Algerian Republic could be exercised.

The post-independence solution of the problems raised about the rights of minorities, to be discussed by the Algerians themselves within the framework of the independent Algerian state. The first of all is the right of the Algerian majority to be independent and to govern its own territory.

The rejection of any attempt to impose economic conditions (French control of the Sahara, French rights to petroleum and natural gas, guarantees to the French settlers against the agrarian reform, etc). All "rights" arising from the French occupation must be considered null-and-void. The Algerian people are the only ones to decide, according to their needs and advantage.

The rejection of any attempt to impose political conditions (independent Algeria's form of government, joining the Western bloc, etc).

The organization of the Algerian Republic on the basis of the worker, rural and urban masses who have kept up the war of liberation and who controlled the cities in the historic demonstrations from the 11th to the 14th of December. The Algerian Republic must be a socialist republic, based on people's committees, on the trade unions, on the plebeian forces of the Army of Liberation, on the people in arms, which will, immediately after independence, get the reconstruction of Algeria going on the basis of a nationalized and planned economy, with an orientation towards a Socialist Federation of the Maghreb, and a Federation of Arab Socialist Republics.

The Fourth International, which has unconditionally supported and continues to support the struggle of the Algerian masses, led by the FLN, for their national and social liberation, which has turned its forces in all coun-

tries to the support of the Algerian revolution, which has undergone, as a result of this struggle, bourgeois and imperialist repression whose plainest example is the jailing of Michel Pablo, its general secretary, and Sal Santen, member of the International Secretariat, imprisoned for nearly a year for their labor of help and support to the Algerian revolution, calls on the colonial and semi-colonial masses of Asia, Africa, Latin America, on the French, European and U S workers, on the masses of the workers' states, to mobilize to demand the independence of Algeria and the unrestricted right of the Algerian masses to decide the destiny, the government, and the organization of their country.

Trade unions, workers' parties, labor and anti-imperialist organizations, student's and people's organizations, must hold meetings, demonstrations, and mass-meetings, where the whole weight and force of the collective resolution is turned on support to the immediate and unconditional independence of Algeria. They must send their resolutions to the French embassies, to the French government, to the GPRA (Provisional Government of the Algerian Republic) and the FLN, and to the Algerian, Tunisian and Moroccan trade unions. In the African states of the ex-"Communauté", they must impose on their governments a break of any link with or dependence on French imperialism, which is relying on them to maintain its influence in Africa and counter the influence of the Algerian and African revolution.

Against the manoeuvres of imperialism to postpone or pose conditions in the peace negotiations with the G P R A!

For the immediate and unconditional independence of Algeria!

For an Algerian socialist republic!

THE INTERNATIONAL SECRETARIAT
OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

12 April 1961.

III

FREE JOMO KENYATTA!

The elections which British Imperialism was obliged to concede in Kenya notwithstanding their complicated mechanism, aimed at maintaining colonial domination, and at benefitting the most conciliatory African leaders, have shown one fact:

Unanimously, the African masses, the smashing majority of the country, have repeated once again, in the electoral campaign and in the election itself, its demand: Freedom for Jomo Kenyatta! All the parties, even those which represent the European colonialists, recognised Kenyatta as the present undisputed leader of the masses of Kenya.

Nevertheless, British Imperialism keeps Kenyatta confined, and attempts to organise collaboration with the most conciliatory of the African leaders. British Imperialism fears the impulse that Kenyatta's liberation will give to the revolution in Kenya and all East Africa.

The popular pressure for Kenyatta's liberation and for the full right of self-determination and independence for Kenya has obliged the African leaders to interrupt discussions with the representatives of the British Government, till the moment Jomo Kenyatta is liberated.

The Fourth International supports without reservation the unanimous demand of the masses of Kenya and all East Africa:

Freedom for Jomo Kenyatta! Unconditional freedom

for Kenyatta and all the African leaders and organisations of Kenya. Full self-determination and independence for the peoples of Kenya. British Imperialism must get out of all Africa!

Kenyatta's liberation will be the signal for a new and big step forward of the revolution in Kenya and all East Africa. It will be the conquest of one of the deepest-felt demands of the Kenyan people, who up to this moment have been the victims of an atrocious history of repression, tortures, spoliation and sacking by British Imperialism. It will be a blow to the conciliatory and pro-Western Africa leaderships who are trying to put a brake on the revolutionary process.

The Fourth International calls on the African masses, on all the workers of the colonial and semi-colonial countries, on their trade-unions, on anti-imperialist and popular organisations, on the anti-imperialist and workers parties of Africa, Asia, Latin America and the rest of the world to support the struggles of the people of Kenya by declarations of support, demonstrations, mobilizations and concrete actions, and to demand:

Free Jomo Kenyatta!

Kick out Imperialism from Kenya and all Africa!

THE INTERNATIONAL SECRETARIAT
OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

March, 1961.

AN APPEAL

Let Us Mobilize in Defense of the Workers' State of Cuba! Against the Imperialist Invasion!

Yankee imperialism has finally launched its armed attack against the Cuban Revolution. It has done so through its lackeys, armed to the teeth with the most modern weapons. The imperialist invaders set out from bases in the United States and in Guatemala, with all the aid, collaboration and protection of the US armed forces.

This brutal and direct imperialist aggression was set up and organized from Washington and the Pentagon. They are the same ones who assassinated Lumumba and are trying to check and strangle the African revolution. They are the same ones who are committing provocations against China, arming the counter-revolution in Laos and in Vietnam, and organizing a counter-revolutionary world war against the USSR, the other workers' states, and the colonial revolution.

Cuba has been attacked by imperialism for having courageously carried forward its revolution, expropriating the imperialist exploiters who for half a century have supported and financed sanguinary dictatorships in Cuba. Cuba has been attacked for having established the *first workers' state* in Latin America, overthrowing capitalism and imperialism. Castro has just confirmed this by declaring: "What the North Americans cannot forgive us is our having made a *socialist revolution* right under their noses."

The whole Cuban people is on a war footing and determined to exterminate the invaders. A worldwide mobilization is immediately necessary in support of the Cuban workers' state, in defense of revolutionary Cuba, to support by every means the Cuban masses' fight against the imperialist invaders. It is necessary to organize and channel the mighty wave of indignation that is surging up from the masses of the world in face of this criminal imperialist aggression.

The Fourth International calls on all workers' peoples', and anti-imperialist organizations, on workers' and anti-imperialist parties, on workers' and peasants' federations and unions in Latin America, Africa, Asia, in the workers' states, in Europe, and in the United States itself, to organize this mass protest. Just as the Cuban Labor Federation made an appeal at the time of Lumumba's assassination, it is necessary to organize on a world scale strikes of protest and in defense of invaded Cuba. Let the toilers of all countries show by strike action their determination and decision to paralyze and defeat imperialist aggression!

Great demonstrations by all the workers' and anti-imperialist organizations must be organized, which include the whole exploited population, to demonstrate in front of the embassies of Yankee imperialism, and to demand that the governments of all countries break off relations

with the United States if the aggression against Cuba is not immediately stopped!

The sending of aid of every sort — weapons, supplies, etc. — to the Cuban workers' state must be organized. The demand must be raised that the governments of all countries struggling against imperialism offer to the Cuban government to send troops to defend the Cuban state! No dependence can be placed on the U.N. agency of imperialism, which has fully shown in the Congo what its role really is. Troops and arms must be sent directly!

Workers' and anti-imperialist organization and parties must immediately organize brigades, open recruiting for volunteers to defend the Cuban Workers state!

The Fourth International calls on them to go out into the streets in all the cities of the world in defense of Cuba. Labor organizations must set a boycott on US ships, US labor organizations must prevent the sending of arms and supplies to the counter-revolutionary forces in Cuba.

It is necessary to connect up the mobilization for Cuba with the mass struggles in each country. In all Latin America, in the colonial and semi-colonial countries, support for the Cuban workers' state must take the form of following Cuba's example: organizing the expropriation and distribution of the land to the peasants, occupying and expropriating the imperialist enterprises, and expelling imperialism.

The Cuban masses have mobilized to crush the invaders. The active support of the world's masses will transform the aggression into a thorough defeat for imperialism, and will spur, all over the world, the advance of the forces of the socialist revolution.

For immediate and active support in every form for the Cuban workers' state against imperialist aggression!

*For the crushing of the counter-revolutionary invasion!
Long live the solidarity of the world's masses with revolutionary Cuba!*

THE INTERNATIONAL SECRETARIAT
OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

17 April 1961.

Text of cable filed 17 April by the International Secretariat
FIDEL CASTRO - PREMIERATO - LA HABANA - CUBA

Fourth International expresses complete and active solidarity with Cuban workers' state against imperialist aggression.

FOR THE INTERNATIONAL SECRETARIAT
LIVIO MAITAN

Declaration of the Latin-American Bureau of the Fourth International

THE GOVERNMENT, THE STATE AND THE PARTIDO OBRERO REVOLUCIONARIO (TROTSKYIST REVOLUTIONARY, WORKERS PARTY) IN CUBA

The Latin American Bureau of the Fourth International publishes this first declaration after the reception of a communique from the Partido Obrero Revolucionario (trotskyist) of Cuba, denouncing the fact that the police have seized the print-shop where "Voz Proletaria", paper of our Cuban Trotskyist comrades, is printed, and that the latest issue has been destroyed. An edition of "Revolution Betrayed", by Trotsky, was also in preparation, and the print has been destroyed. The print-shop has been seized and the May 1961 issue of "Voz Proletaria" has been banned. The Partido Obrero Revolucionario Trotskista presented its protest to the government of Fidel Castro.

We have no news yet of this answer. No comrade of our Cuban Party has been imprisoned. The seizure of the printing-shop has been done by an official of the Labor Ministry, who said that he was acting on behalf of the Ministry. Up to May 27th (the last day of which we have news), the Labor Ministry had refused a request to have a meeting with our comrades.

The officials who seized the print-shop and destroyed the issue of "Voz Proletaria" and the print of "Revolution Betrayed" are members of the Cuban Communist Party (PSP).

We do not know specifically yet what were and what are the scope and the intentions of the Cuban government in taking these measures. We do not know if it is part of a plan of repression against Trotskyist ideas, or a measure by Stalinist governmental officials who profit from their position to take repressive measures against the Trotskyist Press.

Later we shall amplify our analyses and opinions, meanwhile we wait for other news and communiques from Cuba.

* * *

"We address ourselves to the Cuban government demanding the right of the Cuban Partido Obrero Revolucionario (Trotskista) to publish its papers and books and to fully use the revolutionary democracy. One of the basic reasons why the Cuban revolution receives the support of the exploited masses of the whole world is that these masses desire and wait for the right to speak, to discuss, to express their ideas without any obstacles being placed in their way, and without fear of repression. It is because they hope and want to push forward the revolution, that they hope, and that they want, to feel themselves the owners of the revolution and a part of the revolution. The Cuban revolution is anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist. The Cuban Trotskyists have developed and do develop

their activities and their publications, as do the Trotskyists all over the world, in unconditional defense of the Cuban revolution, and for an intransigent fight against imperialism and capitalism.

They are the ones who throughout the world started the campaign for the defense and the support of the Cuban revolution, at the same time as the Communist Party was opposed to Fidel Castro's movement, saying that it was an adventure. The Trotskyists have been and are proposing and fighting for revolutionary measures to drive out imperialism and capitalism from Cuba and who are calling on all the Latin-American masses to drive out imperialism and to overthrow capitalism, just as the Cuban masses have done.

They are those who inside and outside Cuba, have proposed a whole series of social, political and financial measures against imperialism and capitalism and for the advancement of the revolution, measures that have since been taken partially or fully by the Cuban government and the Cuban revolution.

The Trotskyists were the first ones, and the only ones up to May Day, who have claimed that Cuba is a workers' state and who have called for its defense as a workers' state. Meanwhile, the Communist Parties are still trying to present the Cuban state and the Cuban revolution as though it were only a patriotic revolution, a revolutionary capitalist front.

The Cuban and world Trotskyists understand and feel the enormous difficulties through which the Cuban revolution government and workers' state go and will have to go. To go through them, to overcome them, the Trotskyists think — and they have often repeated it in the past — will only be possible through the pushing forward of the revolution.

For the revolution to go forward at this stage, the main way is the soviet form of organisation: the soviet organisational way through workers', soldiers' and peasants' councils, and the full enjoyment by the masses of their democratic rights to defend the revolution, to support it as the prime necessity in their lives and also to obtain and impose the right of their free expression of ideas, of tendencies and of political positions. This is the way in which the masses will express their ideas, their initiatives, and in which they will participate actively in the leadership of the revolution, making it unconquerable.

We call on the Cuban government and revolution to lift the measures taken against the paper of the Cuban Partido Obrero Revolucionario Trotskista. We call on all the masses of Latin-America to protest against the

repressive measures taken against the revolutionary democratic rights of the Cuban POR (T), to demand of the Cuban Workers' State government the stopping of these measures and the punishment of the functionaries who adopted them, and to ask for the revolutionary democratic rights of the revolutionary anti-capitalist and anti-imperialist tendencies which defend unconditionally the Cuban workers' state.

The Cuban revolution will enter a new phase full of dangers. Imperialism is studying and preparing with Latin American governments and bourgeoisies, a new assault against the Cuban revolution and the Cuban workers' state. It can take the form of new invasions, sabotage, economic sanctions, or combining invasion and blockade of Cuba, whilst they look for conciliatory tendencies towards Imperialism inside the Cuban state and government itself. Stevenson's trip is a part of these preparations. The mass struggles in order to form militias in defense of the Cuban revolution, campaigns, mobilizations, agitation, continual meetings in defense of Cuba, are all part of the struggles of the masses of Latin America and of the world — especially of the masses of the colonial and semi-colonial countries — for the defense of the Cuban revolution and workers' state.

The alliance with and the unconditional support for Cuba by the Workers' States against Imperialism and Capitalism, is also a part of this struggle. But the main basis for the defense of the Cuban revolution is the advance in every country of the struggles of the masses for the driving out of imperialism and capitalism and for the establishment by the masses of their own governments and their own workers' states. The Cuban revolution

advances unceasingly. In a contradictory and partial way, it reflects its own strengths and its own weaknesses. The Cuban masses feel profoundly for their revolution and they defend and will defend it as they have already done, defeating the counter-revolutionary invasion organised and led by imperialism.

This attack against the revolutionary democratic rights of the Partido Obrero Revolucionario Trotskista is a part of and an expression of the contradictions through which the Cuban revolution and workers' state goes forward. While we call on the masses to support and defend with their own lives the revolution, and the Cuban Workers' State, so we also call on them to demand full revolutionary democratic rights for the Trotskyists and their press in Cuba. Without the publication of their press, there cannot be full revolutionary democratic rights for the Trotskyists in Cuba.

For the Workers' and Peasants' Trade Union Federation of Latin America

For the Anti-Imperialist and Anti-Capitalist United Front For the Anti-Imperialist and Anti-Capitalist fight in each country

For the unconditional defense of the Cuban revolution and workers' state

For the driving out and the defeat of capitalism and the establishment of workers' states in each Latin-American country and for their unification into the Federation of Soviet Socialist Republics of Latin America."

LATIN AMERICAN BUREAU
OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

14 June, 1961

News of the International

Latin America

THE LATIN AMERICAN BUREAU OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL HELD ITS FOURTH CONFERENCE AND FOURTH LATIN AMERICAN CADRES SCHOOL

Between the 5th and 27th March, in a Latin-American country, the Fourth Conference of the Latin-American Bureau of the Fourth International was held.

All the Latin-American Sections of the Fourth International were represented at the Conference.

The Conference discussed the agenda and adopted resolutions on each of the points.

The Conference began with a minute's silence in memory of Leon Trotsky. A Presidium of honour was designated comprising Comrade Natalie Trotsky, and comrades Michel Pablo and Sal Santen, who have been in prison in Holland for ten months without trial, for the activity they carried out in support for the revolution and fight of the Algerian people, for the expulsion of French imperialism and for the national and social liberation of Algeria. It was decided to send a letter of fraternal greetings to both comrades.

The Conference at its opening also sent fraternal greetings and solidarity to the Cuban workers' state and greetings to the Cuban government, the revolutionary masses of Asia, Africa and Latin-America, and condemned the murder of Patrice Lumumba. The Conference also greeted the recent World Congress of the Fourth International, the International Secretariat, and all the comrades who are militant on the various fronts of our struggle.

The work of the Conference was opened by a speech of the general secretary of the Latin-American Bureau of the Fourth International, and afterwards were considered, discussed and adopted resolutions on the following points:

- 1) The Sixth World Congress and the prospects of the Fourth International;
- 2) The evolution and development of the colonial revolution and Latin-American revolution. The building and prospects of the Fourth International;
- 3) Reports, discussions and resolutions on the tasks of each of the Latin-American sections of the Fourth International;
- 4) The balance-sheet, experiences and conclusions of entrism and its prospects in Latin-America;
- 5) Report of activity, and plan of work for the next period for the Latin-American Bureau of the Fourth Inter-

national. The campaign for the freedom of Pablo and Santen.

After the completion of the work of the Conference, the Cadres' School commenced, and developed the following themes:

- 1) The philosophical bases of Marxism.
- 2) The bases, and economic structure of the Capitalist States and the present situation of Capitalism and Imperialism. Economic and social bases of the Workers' States, and their present situation and development. The Federation of Socialist Soviet Workers' States of Latin-America.
- 3) The history of the workers' movement. The Permanent Revolution and the building of the Workers' States. The establishment of new Latin-American workers' states, Cuba, and the building and prospects of the Fourth International.
- 4) The world crisis of the bureaucracy of the Workers' States. The U S S R, China, Yugoslavia and the situation of the Cuban Workers' State.
- 5) The crisis of the Socialist and Communist Parties of Latin-America, and the crisis of the nationalist bourgeois and petty-bourgeois movements and organisations.
- 6) The Latin-American Revolution, and the revolutionary and workers' movements in Latin-America, and the Fourth International.

At the end of the Cadres' School, there was a session of the School to make a balance-sheet, where each comrade expressed, orally and in written form, his opinions and personal impressions of the School. All the comrades present, without exception, expressed their understanding of the great importance of the School for their personal and collective education, the experience, the high level of political maturation, and revolutionary fraternity established during the School.

At the very end of the School, an outdoor party was held, with singing and games.

Final greetings to, and declarations for the freedom of, Pablo and Santen were made.

SECRETARIAT OF THE LATIN-AMERICAN
BUREAU OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

20 March, 1961

SOME PUBLICATIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL

OTHER THEORETICAL ORGANS

Quatrième Internationale (French)

Die Internationale (German)

Revista Marxista Latinoamericana (Spanish)

RECENT BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

Léon Trotsky: *Écrits, 1928-1940, tomes I, II, et III*

Léon Trotsky: *Les Bolcheviks contre Staline*

Michel Pablo: *La Guerre qui vient (Capitalisme ou Socialisme)*

Michel Pablo: *Dictature du prolétariat, démocratie, socialisme*

Michel Pablo: *The Fourth International — What It Is: What It Aims At*

Michel Pablo: *The Arab Revolution*

Ernest Germain: *Les Problèmes économiques de l'URSS*

Orders to: PIERRE FRANK, 64 rue de Richelieu, Paris 2

PUBLIC ORGANS OF SOME OF THE PARTIES OF THE FOURTH INTERNATIONAL

Argentina: *Voz Proletaria*

Bolivia: *Lucha Obrera*

Brazil: *Frente Operario*

Ceylon: *The Samasamajist*

Chile: *Vanguardia Proletaria*

Cuba: *Voz Proletaria*

France: *La Vérité des Travailleurs*

Greece: *Ἑργατική Πάλη (Workers' Struggle)*

Italy: *Bandiera Rossa*

Japan: 永久革命 (*Permanent Revolution*)

世界革命 (*World Revolution*)

Peru: *Voz Obrera*

Uruguay: *Frente Obrero*

Subscriptions may be channeled through:

PIERRE FRANK
64, rue de Richelieu
Paris - FRANCE

BANDIERA ROSSA
Casella 9084
Roma - Borghi - ITALY

LANKA SAMASAMAJA PARTY
49, Drieberg Ave.,
Colombo - CEYLON