

International

Vol. 1, No. 3

January-February 1971

15p 3/-

The Tupamaros

Connolly by Rayner Lysaght

The Docks by Terry Barrett

Lenin and Trotsky
on Terrorism

3

CONTENTS	page
Editorial	2
<i>The Unorthodoxy of James Connolly</i> by D.R. O'Connor Lyssght	5
<i>Uruguay: A Role for Urban Guerillas?</i> by Jean Stubbs	25
<i>The docks before Devlin</i> by Terry Barrett	44
<i>Lenin and Trotsky on Terrorism</i>	48
Polemic	51
Book Reviews	52
Document	61

Editor Bob Purdie
 Editorial Board Pat Jordan, Marie-Therese Ligougne, Bernard Reaney, John Ross
 Business Manager Connie Harris

Published by the International Marxist Group; printed by the Prinkipo Press Ltd., 182 Pentonville Rd., London N.1
 Tel 01-837-9987

Subs 3s per issue/1£ per annum/£2 airmail to Africa, Asia, Latin America, North America.

Signed articles do not necessarily represent the views of the Editors or of the IMG. Editorials represent the views of the Editorial Board. The official positions of the IMG are to be found in their statements and documents and in those of the Fourth International.

PERSPECTIVES FOR FIGHTING THE TORIES

The present political situation in Britain is dominated by the fight against the Tory anti-union legislation. The outcome of this struggle will be of enormous importance in determining the evolution of the anti-capitalist struggle in Britain. A defeat for the trade unions could well demoralise workers for a whole period; a victory, on the other hand, could open up a period of political struggle and revitalise the entire labour movement. The policies pursued in this struggle are, therefore, not of mere academic interest. Any mistakes made could have extremely serious repercussions.

The experience of the struggle against the Labour Government's *In Place of Strife* proposals demolish all spontaneist arguments. Because this movement was restricted to defensive formulations it virtually disappeared once the Government appeared to be climbing down (however, we recognise the role played by this struggle in stimulating subsequent wages militancy).

The shock wave which went through the Left when the viciousness of the Tory proposals was revealed, induced a powerful desire for unity. While this is obviously to be welcomed, in some respects it clearly lays the basis for "lowest common denominator" politics, so beloved by the Communist Party, Tribunites, etc. It is exactly this tendency which, through its dominance of the anti-*In Place of Strife* campaign diverted the first major political strike movement for 43 years into harmless channels. The ideological and political fight against this tendency is therefore a key task for revolutionaries. The least that would result from a repeat performance of the 1969 events would be the loss of a wonderful opportunity; at most it would be a very serious setback.

One of the chief weapons in the armoury of those who, in the interests of unity, want to confine the struggle to a defensive posture against the Bill, is that the Tories are motivated by ideological reasons. This gives the movement a false perspective and leads to tactical errors. It has the additional danger of underpinning a tendency for the whole affair being transformed into a "Labour to Power" crusade.

We accept, ofcourse, that the Tories are full of hatred of the trade union movement, but this doesn't explain their policies nor why, at this particular moment, they are coming forward with such an attack on the working class. Ideological reasons might affect the precise nature of their proposals and determine minor aspects of their tactics; but far deeper processes are involved.

The starting point for any analysis must be that British capitalism is in a severe and chronic crisis. Its specific weight in the capitalist world has show a constant tendency to decline. Its economic performance has been abysmal compared with that of important trading rivals. Its growth rate has been about half that of comparable capitalist countries and less than a third or a quarter of its most dynamic rivals— Japan and West Germany. In modern capitalism the scale of operations is decisive. British capitalism has been kept out of the fast growing West European market and its rivals have got into its former preserve, the Commonwealth. Despite some successes in the immediate post-Korean war boom, the Tories could not halt, let alone reverse this tendency. Thus some sectors of capitalist

opinion favoured the return of a Labour Government in the 1964 election. Labour was to solve British capitalism's economic ills by getting the economy going on the strength of Harold Wilson's, "white heat of the technological revolution." Labour's ability to achieve this was believed to be in its ability to get the unions to accept an incomes policy, thus clearing away working class opposition to rationalisation measures and integrating the unions into neo-capitalist planning. What actually happened?

In the decade or so leading up to the Labour government, Britain had a rate of growth trend within the range of 2½ to 3% per annum. Mr Brown's National Plan was to change all this drastically. The annual growth rate was to be pushed up to 4%. In the event the annual rate of growth dropped to a mere 1.5 to 1.9%. This is lower than one could expect from purely normal technological development, greater "know-how", growth in the labour force, etc.

Far from changing the pattern, the situation got worse: there has been a slow-down in investment which will result in a tendency for even lower growth rates. The one success of the Labour Government—a 10% increase in exports between 1968 and 1969 was obtained at the expense of slowing down consumption and transfer of resources from investment to exports. When this seen in the light of the "one-off" effect of devaluation, it is not surprising that the rate of increase of exports had dropped to 3.5% between fourth quarter 1969 and fourth quarter 1970. Imports in the same period increased by 5.5%. In the eyes of the business community Labour's policies also led to galloping inflation. So Labour failed, and failed badly, to solve British imperialism's economic problems. Now on to the scene steps the bold Ted Heath. What is his solution?

Firstly, the increase in the expansion of consumer spending must be limited. The purpose of this is to make available more funds for investment and exports.

Secondly, to curb inflation, the main cause of which is, in his eyes, "inflationary" wage settlements.

Thirdly, to reduce Government expenditure. This having the combined effect of being deflationary and reducing tax margins, which in turn gives businessmen more funds for investment.

And how does the Heath government hope to achieve these ends? By a full-scale attack on workers living standards. "Inflationary" wage settlements must be phased out. Huge cuts must be made in expenditure on the social services. To do all this Heath is obliged to attack the trade unions and decisively weaken them.

We leave aside the question of whether such a policy can be successful. The OECD is of the opinion that even more is required: a wages freeze should be imposed immediately. Heath disagrees, but the only point of difference is regarding the best way to cut workers living standards in order to increase profit rates.

Heath's present reluctance to impose a wage freeze is based upon two considerations: one that such a strategy is self-defeating—Labour's efforts in this field are a painful reminder of this and, secondly, that Britain's present healthy balance of payments position gives him enough time to make a more "peaceful" transition to a state of affairs where the unions are corporatised. But such considerations presuppose the rapid introduction of measures, through the industrial relations Bill, to decisively diminish the ability of the trade-unions to resist his economic offensive.

This is just about the sum total of room for manoeuvre which is left to any capitalist government in Britain. The experience of the Labour government demonstrates that any real alternative capitalist solution is non-existent.

Any call to defeat Heath's trade union proposals must therefore be linked with a fight to drive the Tories out of office. Any attempt to make the Tories "see sense" or persuade

them that their policies are "harmful to good industrial relations" (see TUC petition) are ludicrous and utopian in the extreme.

A call to bring down the Tories immediately raises the question: "What is the alternative to the Tory government?" Different tendencies on the revolutionary and reformist left will give different answers to this question, according to their general assessment of the stage of British capitalism.

If one thinks, as the Communist Party, the Tribunites and certain "marxist" groups seem to, that there is an alternative capitalist strategy to that of Heath, then the answer is simple: Labour to Power. Ofcourse a certain sterile qualification will be made: "with socialist policies." That seems even more absurd and utopian than the idea of making the Tories see sense. What forces are there to capture the Labour Party for these socialist policies?

Within the Labour Party the picture is of further decline of internal life and a move to the right. More than 25% of the constituency Labour Parties and boroughs did not even send delegates to the Party's annual conference. Barbara Castle again headed the poll of constituency members to the National Executive Committee. The Tribunites (their leader firmly ensconced in the Shadow Cabinet) withdrew their amendment in the House of Commons without getting any guarantee that Labour would pledge itself to withdraw the Bill when returned. On the other hand we have in this country a very militant movement fighting for higher wages and against the Tory anti-trade union Bill. A movement, despite its hesitant leadership, capable of bringing 600,000 people out on a political strike.

Here there is potential; here there is life and big possibilities of a leftward anti-capitalist development. Moreover, if we can deepen this movement and extend it to include more and more trade unionists we will have the strongest anti-capitalist campaign since the 1926 General Strike.

Herein lies the answer to the question of who should replace the Tories. The present movement against the Bill must be deepened and extended through the Action Committees to become a movement to throw the Tories out of office. A movement strong enough to do this can be, and will be able, if revolutionary leadership develops, to provide the basis for a government based upon the workers organisations under democratic control. If local Labour parties continued to support candidates who would not campaign all out against the Tory Bill and other aspects of Tory policy and for the overthrow of the Tories, then the trade union movement would have to provide its own candidates.

In the Action Committees, in the trade union branches, in the trade councils, these issues should be discussed. Revolutionaries have the duty to play the key role of bringing into these discussions a socialist strategy. A socialist strategy must give an answer to the question of what form of government should come out of a successful struggle to overthrow the Tories. To merely repeat the slogans of the past is to hinder the development of an anti-capitalist movement with a socialist evolution.

Our slogan is that of a workers government based upon democratic control of workers organisations—in the present context the only real mass workers organisations are to be found in the trade union movement.

N.B. The more immediate problems of strategy and tactics are discussed in the IMG pamphlet THE STRUGGLE FOR CONTROL, available from IMG publications, 8d (including postage) from 182, Pentonville Road, London N.1

THE UNORTHODOXY OF JAMES CONNOLLY

CONNOLLY THE BOURGEOIS NATIONALIST?

Among Scientific Socialists, Connolly's prestige is immense. He is certainly the pre-eminent one in the British Isles and the Commonwealth countries, and his position ranks high vis-a-vis the American leaders. Any serious attempt at Socialist theory in Ireland must take into account Connolly's work in this field. It must also consider the reasons for his failure and for the continuing division of Ireland between two neo-colonial states.

Unfortunately too many of the writings on, and editions of Connolly have been produced less to help clarify the present situation or even to find the truth about the man than to justify the special sectarian position of their producers. By themselves, the new explorations about Connolly tend merely to increase the existing confusion in people's minds. The danger of this is that it will tend to neutralise the effect of our increased knowledge. Many will accept as gospel one or other of the simplifications. Worse still many will give up any attempt to consider Connolly at all and relapse into an unthinking admiration for him as "the Socialist leader of Easter Week". Some of these may even come to accept the argument that Connolly, though great, is now irrelevant and that his real importance for us today begins and ends with his signature on the Proclamation of Irish Independence. But this cannot explain the most striking thing about Connolly; his continuing readership. In this he is practically unique amongst his contemporaries. *Sinn Féin* ignores the writings of its founder unless perhaps its members want to bone up on nineteenth century Hungarian history. George Russell (AE) and Horace Plunkett are remembered (inaccurately) as co-founders of the Irish co-operative movement. Their political writings are forgotten. MacSwiney's *Principles of Freedom* loomed out of the surrounding mists some years ago, and has since disappeared again. Only P. H. Pearce has anything like Connolly's survival, and the reason is as much for psychological as political interest. If Connolly is now irrelevant, then there are a lot of people who need to have the fact explained to them more analytically than is now the case.

But of course, this cannot be done. The teachings of Connolly are, in many cases, more relevant today than when he wrote them. That "Nationalism without Socialism is national recreancy" is even more evident now than when it was written. While the Irish experience of the state-sponsored bodies brings home to us the truth that "state ownership and control is not necessarily Socialism - if it were, then

the Army, the Navy, the Police, the Judges, the Gaolers, the Informers, and the Hangmen, would all be Socialist functionaries". The small farmers' predicament was prophesied by him seventy years ago as "the system of small farming crushed out by the competition of great farm and scientific cultivation of America and Australia". This general development of world competition is leading Irish capitalists to agree with Connolly's conclusions in the *Reconquest of Ireland* that "the democracy of Ireland, amongst the first of the steps necessary to the regeneration of Ireland, must address itself to the extension of its ownership and administration to the schools of Erin". Indeed they will probably find it necessary to do this on a basis less satisfactory to the Churches than he proposed. With all this, one finds in Connolly, a major development of Republican Internationalism, initiated by the United Irishmen. Connolly turns it into international Socialism, stating that revolutionary action in Ireland "may yet set the torch to a European conflagration that will not burn out until the last throne and the last capitalist bond and debenture will be shrivelled on the funeral pyre of the last warlord." None of these facts, however, are any more than the expression of Connolly's method and his application of it to Irish problems.

In Ireland itself one of the commonist distortions is that Connolly was an "orthodox" theorist in the traditions of Plato and Aquinas, rather than an "unorthodox" bum like Karl Marx. For example, Mr. Thomas P. O'Mahony, epigone the Irish Press admits Connolly's Socialism but "Socialism" means for him, no more than "stress on the 'social' aspect on society, on all its members". This definition (which could include, in practice, romantic Conservatism or plain Fascism) includes Marxism but (obviously) does not coincide with it. For Mr. O'Mahony, Marxism is an "intrinsically evil" vanity for three reasons. It "envisages at some future point the appearance of a classless society and this is historically inevitable". It "denies the existence of God, the reality of spirit, the immortality of the human soul". It holds "that the basic and most important human activity is production, and that all other forms of activity are derived from, and ultimately related to it (in a dependent sense)".

We may ignore the distortions in these descriptions. What concerns us is the fact that at least two of these distinguishing aspects of Marxism, are also aspects of Connolly's theory. The man wrote: "On the day that the political and economic forces of labour finally break with capitalist society and proclaim the Workers' Republic these shops and factories so manned by industrial Unionists will be taken charge of by the workers there employed and force and effectiveness thus given to that proclamation." That is not the statement of a man who failed "to envisage the appearance of a classless society as historically inevitable", nor did he make any such statements. *Labour in Irish History* is centred on the very assumption 'that the basic and most important human activity is production, and that all other forms of activity are derived from and ultimately related to it.' What is more in the July issue of *Liberty*, Mr. O'Mahony is forced to recognise Connolly's acceptance of this principle in *Labour, Nationality & Religion*, which seems to cause him considerable annoyance. True (and despite some of his more fanatical Marxist supporters), Connolly does not appear to have denied "the existence of God, the reality of spirit, the immortality of the human soul". He accepted the sacraments when he was facing certain death, although Clarke and MacDiarmada (who could not be smeared as "Reds") refused them; although he kept strictly to non-

denominational forms in argument, he allowed himself in his dispute with Walker to refer to "our religion". Even so, his attitude to that religion was his own: "If any special interpretation of the meanings of Scripture tends to influence human thought in the direction of Socialism or is found to be on a plane with the postulates of Socialist doctrine, then the scientific Socialist considers that the said interpretation is stronger because of its identity with the teachings of Socialism, but he does not necessarily believe that Socialism is stronger or its position more impregnable because of its theological ally". To base a defence of Connolly's "Orthodoxy" upon his non Marxism appears, then, to be misinterpreting the concept's meaning.

But Mr. O'Mahony himself, is forced to recognise this. In the August edition of *Liberty*, he solemnly declares that Connolly is "Orthodox" because, unlike Marx, he bases his Socialism on the concept of "Justice". This waters down the whole concept of Orthodoxy. "But it does more: it ignores the facts. Marx did know the ideal of "Justice", one has only to read his early work the *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts* to see this. What is more, he knew it better than Mr. O'Mahony does, for he knew it well enough to recognise that, as a force for social change, it is quite inadequate, precisely because different people (generally corresponding to different classes) have different ideas of it. Thus Marx began his search for Scientific Socialism, and he found it. His discovery was accepted readily by Connolly as well as by others who had found out the utter uselessness of the primacy of "ethics" over "politics" in class society. As far as "Justice" is concerned, Marx and Connolly could be interchangeable. Marx' *Capital* contains many tortured denunciations of the injustice of capitalist society. Connolly's *Labour, Nationality & Religion* ends by putting in the boot on Fr. Kane⁵ when the latter had taken the (very "Orthodox") line of appealing for "pity for the poor".

Mr. O'Mahony however seems to feel that he has proved his point. He writes "it seems to me that in the light of what we have been discussing only a fool or a bigot would dare to call Connolly a Marxist" Later he hopes he has "accomplished with some measure of success my primary task that of vindicating the name and ideals of Connolly from the pernicious charges that people are wont to raise" it seems a pity that the man should have laboured so long in vain. Indeed he appears, now, less a dragon, than as another of those whose minds have been crippled by an early over-dose of Catholic scientology - sorry, social science. Instead of accepting Connolly, he feels he has to defend him from the smears of filthy Marxists and the like. He does not realise Connolly's value to Irish radical politics lies precisely in his acceptance of Marx's methods, and that to try to exclude or diminish the Marxism in Connolly's thought is merely to de-gut the thought itself and reduce its effectiveness in the struggle for the "Justice" to which Mr. O'Mahony pays lip service.

This does not mean that Connolly has nothing to offer the religious. On the contrary, his clarity, the firmness of his arguments, the wide range of his knowledge all make him the ideal guide of Christians towards Scientific Socialism. In this sphere, his writings, however, "Unorthodox" can only be faulted by invocation of the intellectual thuggery of clerical infallibility.

It is when we come to his orthodoxy as a scientific Socialist, that we find his position less tenable.

The basis of Scientific Socialist theory (and thus, Connolly's theory) was summarised by Friedrich Engels. In his introduction to the 1883 edition of the *Communist Manifesto* he writes as follows:

"The basic thought running through the *Manifesto* that economic production and the structure of society of every historical epoch necessarily arising therefrom constitute the foundation for the political and the intellectual history of that epoch; that consequently (ever since the dissolution of the primeval communal ownership of land) all history has been a history of class struggles, of struggles between exploited and exploiting, between dominated and dominating classes at various stages of social development; that this struggle, however, has now reached a stage where the exploited and oppressed class (the proletariat) can no longer emancipate itself from the class which exploits and oppresses it (the bourgeoisie), without at the same time forever freeing the whole of society from exploitation, oppression and class struggles. - this basic thought belongs solely and exclusively to Marx".

But this is only the basis of scientific Socialism. Between the writing of the *Manifesto* and Connolly's appearance as a Socialist activist, many additions were made to it. Marx and Engels' economic and philosophical analyses had expanded their original discovery. Marx' *Capital* and *Eighteenth Brumaire* and Engels' *Anti-Duehring* developed the scientific Socialist viewpoint in economics, history and philosophy. New problems had arisen which had to be considered scientifically. The frontiers of Capitalism stretched financially and geographically so that it reached its highest stage-Imperialism. The Paris Commune provided grounds for a revolutionary analysis of the state whilst Ferdinand Lassalle developed another, reformist, outlook that harmonised with the needs of Labour bureaucrats in party and trade unions. All this means that Scientific Socialism as a whole could not, in Connolly's time, be restricted to the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*. In addition the writings of any Marxist are inevitably shaped to a greater or lesser extent, by the circumstances in which he wrote. Therefore if, for example, we wish to assess the view that Connolly was objectively a "bourgeois" nationalist, then we must consider the background to Connolly's teachings. Without this, the science in Connolly's Socialism cannot be measured, since what is essentially scientific about such Socialism is precisely its basis on hard facts rather than utopian visions.

When we do this, we see that Connolly had to work under conditions, objective and subjective, that made a Socialist revolution in Ireland more of a hazard than in any other area on the North Atlantic seaboard.

In the first place, the relationships of the classes were undeveloped in connection both with external relationships and internal confrontations.

Ireland was placed as a colony of Britain, ruled directly by a foreign Parliament through a bureaucracy and constabulary appointed by the same.

The bourgeoisie was divided between the so-called "national" bourgeoisie and the straight collaborators (or, as they called themselves, "Unionists"). However, the difference between these groups was not the same as that existing under similar circumstances elsewhere. Due to the closeness of the British market, the exporters had acclimatised themselves to it and were now the most ardent Unionists. On the other hand, the "national" bourgeoisie had an economic base that was usurious and mercantile (or, as the Irish term it, "gombeen"). Its interest in nationalism was in that aspect of the ideal that centred on the control of government patronage. Under the Union, certain lucrative areas of a very large and often sinecurist bureaucracy were given automatically to Unionists or even Englishmen. The gombeenmen were intent on cutting this wasteful expenditure and giving what remained to good Irish Catholics. "Home Rule" meant no more than a state of affairs that would enable them to do this. By 1910, divisions as to the tactics of achieving such an ideal resulted in the formation of the breakaway "All For Ireland League", which had the backing of the larger Catholic businessmen, but this was secondary.

The real nationalist demands were put forward by the workers. But here there was another complication: During Connolly's first period in the Irish Labour Movement organised workers were only found among the artisans, a group of people with petty bourgeois aspirations (to run their own business, etc.). They were thus doubtful converts to any clear Socialist line and between 1905 and 1910 (when they were distracted by the immediate prospect of "Home Rule"), they made up the bulk of Griffith's *Sinn Féin* with its demands for the creation of a true "national" bourgeoisie by protection of industries. Until 1907 the unskilled workers were unorganised, but even after Larkin had founded the I.T.G.W.U., the prospects of Socialism among them remained uncertain. The main centres of factory production in Ireland were, for various reasons, difficult to organise; in Belfast, religious strike kept the workers divided; in Guinnesses brewery in Dublin, there was little definite for Larkin's agitational skill to use.

Outside the towns was the bulk of the population: the farmers (of different sizes, usually in inverse ratio to the quality of the land) and, south and east of the River Shannon and Lough Neagh, the labourers. The latter were simply the poor relations of the unskilled labourers of the towns and were to prove less easy to organise successfully. The farmers were in varying stages of transition from tenancy to property owning. For the largest (many of whom had never been tenants, and some of whom were landlords retrenching) the change enabled them to maintain their position amongst the rest of the bourgeoisie. For the smallest, it meant a new form of servitude to the local gombeenman, though the latter's use of credit, such as made the smallholder a potential ally for the worker. This possibility encouraged Connolly eventually to offer an alliance to the Irish Agricultural Organisation Society, the leadership of the agricultural co-operative movement of George Russell (AE) and Sir Horace Plunkett. But this movement was mainly centred amongst the developing petty bourgeoisie of the medium-sized dairy farmers of the south, and was significant, in fact, as a major means of strengthening their capitalist position. Only by attacking the property situation (the remnants of landlordism) could the small and medium farmers be united as a radical force. Fianna Fail proved this in the 1920s. But Irish Labour developing later vis-a-vis its peasantry than

Labour elsewhere, never developed policies that would win that class to Socialism.

Outside all these groups, yet affecting their outlook, were the Churches, of which the Catholic Church was by far the largest. But the centering of Protestantism, in the north-east created divisions along the religious line such as aided the exploiters at the expense both of the exploited and of the national unity. For the rest of the country, the Catholic Church had its feet placed in the camps both of the "Unionist" bureaucracy and of the bourgeois Nationalists working in the departments of the first and presiding at the meetings of the second. Its influence was thrown towards peaceful change in the political status quo, such as could not, in practice, change the class relations within it. However, its control of education strengthened the force of its propaganda in this direction.

These objective conditions, were magnified by subjective factors. More than any other European Socialist of his generation, Connolly was a pioneer, theoretically and organisationally. Marx and Engels had written much about Ireland, but little of their work had been translated. Branches of the First International had been established in Dublin, Belfast and Cork, but they had died with the parent organisation. What was more, there had been no follow-up. Whereas Germany had had Bebel and Wilhelm Liebknecht to prepare Socialist Foundations for Rosa Luxemburg, and Russia had Plekhanov to carry out the same task for Lenin, Ireland had Michael Davitt with his organisational perspective bounded by the trade unions, and with an ultra-left viewpoint on the national issue that isolated him from the working class ideology of Fenianism whilst enabling him to remain an isolated figure amongst the parliamentary Nationalists. A Socialist movement could not be based on such an analysis, nor could it develop in such a sphere.

Personal problems added to Connolly's task. Not only did he have to earn his living as an unskilled labourer, but on the tiny wage he received, he had to support a wife and six children: a larger family than that of any other of the parents of European Socialism. On top of this, in his agitational tasks, he received much of the day-to-day organisation work. Indeed, towards the end, he appears to have developed such a belief in his own talents that he insisted on combining the two full-time jobs of Commander-in-Chief of the Irish Citizen Army and Acting General Secretary of the Irish Transport & General Workers Union. But these facts, though they handicapped him could only have a quantitative effect on his work which had its own overwhelming problems.

When Connolly arrived to begin his political work in Dublin in early 1896, he had an immediate advantage. Both wings of the national movement were in disarray after the fall of Parnell. The Parliamentarians were still split, having been demoralised further by the defeat of Gladstone's second Home Rule Bill in 1893. The physical force I.R.B. had placed its hopes in a misalliance with Parnell that was shattered after the latter's death and the succession of him as leader of his group by the genteel John Redmond. What was more, opportunities for national agitation were obvious, in 1897, "The Famine Queen", Victoria, would have been on the throne sixty years and, the next year, 1898, would be the centenary of the United Irish Rising.

In the face of these facts (and they would be repeated regularly during Connolly's Irish career), denunciations of Connolly's "compromise with Nationalism" appear amazingly confused. Of course, the ideal thing would have been for Connolly to have joined an all-British Bolshevik-type Party with full recognition of the right to self-determination for national minorities, but where was such a party? (In 1896, where was it, even in Russia?) What was more, could such a party have harnessed national feeling, as successfully as Connolly did, to staging any anti-imperialist revolt?

THE EARLY PAMPHLETS

Connolly had to use what he had at his disposal if he was to have any hope of success in his struggle for Socialism. His whole task was to put the Socialist movement at the head of the National struggle, and, from this position, to expose theoretically and actively the limitations of the orthodox bourgeois national perspectives. Towards the end, it might be said that he compromised in practice with the bourgeois nationalists; we shall see, however, that this was not based on theoretical analysis.

What is certain is that the first period of Connolly's career is that where he is the most scientific. Here the party plays a major organisational role. Here, too, many of his less happy analyses of the Irish issues are less prominent than they afterwards became. This is well shown in the pamphlets he wrote at this time. His "Workshop Talks" (published in 1908 as the first part of *Socialism Made Easy*) his *Erin's Hope* (1897) and his *New Evangel* (1901).

In the last two of these publications, Connolly's attention is concentrated on the limitations of the capitalist approaches to Socialism and Nationalism. In his "Workshop Talks" he opposes the scientific concept of the labour theory of value to capitalist wails about "Socialist confiscation". Here, too, he points out the cosmopolitanism that exists behind the nationalism of the capitalist and gives a prophetic vision of how little the achievement of "pure" nationalism would mean to the workers who had been fooled into limiting their sights to it.

In the *New Evangel* Connolly attacked five other aspects of the bourgeois nationalist viewpoint. His recognition of its essentially confused idealism are seen in his articles on the "Economic Basis of Politics" and on "Father Finlay S.V. and Socialism".

The three other articles need still more attention, as being signs of (admittedly small) his future development. His "State Monopoly versus Socialism" shows us his recognition of the "Class State" (as) repository of the political power of the Capitalist Class" and that "Socialism properly implies above all things the co-operative control by the workers of the machinery of production." However, there are hints here (as in articles elsewhere at this period) of what would be expanded by him, later on, into the self-sufficiency of the industrially (not politically) organised workers "to subvert the class state and replace it with the Socialist State, representing organised society." Another contributive tendency to this Syndicalism is found

in his last article "Socialism and Political Reform" here "the Economic Basis" of non-proletarian political parties is treated as non-existent, and their lives considered in an over-simplified manner. At the end of his career in America, Connolly would be reducing his class emphasis on any political party except as a propaganda force.

On the other hand, his article "Socialism and Religion", reveals Connolly in a sphere where correctness scarcely ever publicly left him. Although a practicing Catholic and one who, in the dispute with Walker, allowed himself to denounce the latter's attack on "our religion", he was usually careful to prevent his faith from affecting the day-to-day struggle for Socialism. This article (a worthy introduction to his great *Labour, Nationality & Religion*) shows how he does this. He writes: "Socialism is based upon a series of facts requiring only unassisted human reason to grasp and master all their details whereas Religion of every kind is admittedly based on "faith" in the occurrence in past ages of a series of phenomena inexplicable by any process of mere human reasoning". His stand on religion compares very favourably with that of his most aggressive heirs, the Stalinists of the Irish Workers' Party. He kept his religion to himself and was, as a Socialist, determinedly non-sectarian (and a dedicated opponent of clerical management of schools).

However, it is in the earliest of those three pamphlets, *Éirín's Hope, the End and the Means*, that Connolly mounted his most complete attack on the assumptions of the various schools of bourgeois Irish Nationalism. He would develop various aspects of it in later writings, but, never as a whole and never so correctly. In particular this pamphlet contains his clearest realization that alliances between the working class and the bourgeoisie do not advance the struggle for national freedom, but on the contrary that this "alliance" sabotages the struggle. He states clearly that, "No revolutionists can safely invite the co-operation of men or classes whose ideals are not theirs and whom, therefore, they may be compelled to fight at some future critical stage of the journey to freedom".

This position of course rejects "stages" theories of the national struggle, i.e., views that hold that the struggle for national independence must be separated from the struggle of the working class for socialist revolution. This idea of Connolly's has, of course, proved to be too dangerous for Social Democrats and Stalinists of all persuasions and they have tried to soften the impact by contrasting the later remark of Connolly's that: "The true revolutionist should ever call into action on our side the entire sum of all the forces and factors of social and political discontent". But, in the full text, there is no contrast; Connolly, being a scientific Socialist, linked the two statements with a programme of demands. These included an eight-hour day at a minimum wage for railwaymen and corporation employees, free school meals (and later a state free food distribution system) the end of the poor law, a graduated income tax and incomes over £400 p.a. and comfortable pensions for the aged, the infirm and widows and orphans. By linking these to the national issue Connolly thought to "call into action the entire sum of all the forces and factors of social and political discontent." But no one can say that he was thereby inviting "the co-operation of men or classes whose ideals were not those of the workers."

He is said to have remarked, years later, that this move was the greatest mistake of his life.

CONNOLLY IN THE U.S.A.

James Connolly's period of activity in America was a turning point in his political career. This is admitted by all serious researchers, but different reasons are given. To the orthodox Stalinists, he learnt during it, for some unspecified cause, to trust the "national bourgeoisie" (whatever that was). To the Maoists, the change was not in him but in the objective conditions while he was away. The truth lies with neither of these.

Part of the difficulty in fixing what occurred lies at the very beginning of the task: in the simple problem of discovering the facts. The best outline is C. D. Graves' biography, but its American chapters suffer to a greater extent than the whole from the book's general defects. Most of all, we lack adequate record of Connolly's American writings. The Desmond Ryan - I.T.G.W.U. (Irish Transport & General Workers Union) selected works are least satisfactory in their dealings with this period. Until these gaps are filled one has to grope in a twilight world.

All we can say for sure is that Connolly stayed in America from September 1903 to July 1910: that during this period, he broke with "the clear and revolutionary" S.L.P. and joined, instead, (it seems, on a purely emigrant basis) the looser, less homogeneous Socialist Party of America: that, in this period, he became a prominent organiser of the original "one big union", the Industrial Workers of the World, and that, in the last months of his stay he wrote his most continually relevant work, *Labour, Nationality & Religion*, and, perhaps his most famous work *Labour in Irish History*.

From this, certain facts are clear. Whereas his preaching of the Socialist message does develop in depth, what he preaches becomes less scientific. This is particularly clear in the field of organisation, where his experience with de Leon and his entrance to the I.W.W. can be recognised easily as contributory factors to the Syndicalism of "*The Axe to the Root*". But we shall see, too, that his American experiences had some unfortunate (though less decisive) results in the forms of his analyses of the national issue. Mr. Greaves mentions, also, as contributory causes for Connolly's dispute with de Leon (the leader of the S.L.P.), disagreements on religion, the family and the possibility of real increases in wages. (According to Mr. Greaves, incidentally, the break did not come over de Leon's belief in the peaceful road to Socialism). On the last two issues, Connolly appears to have been correct. On the matter of religion, we have already seen that as a Marxist, he was unorthodox but that his private Catholicism failed to handicap his Socialist practice, and that he was able to put forward theory that is of decisive importance in leading Christians to Scientific Socialism.

"*The Axe to the Root*" was published as the second part of *Socialism Made Easy* immediately after Connolly had broken finally with de Leon to join the S.P.A. The present author has discussed this part of the pamphlet and its importance in Irish Socialist history in his introduc-

tion to the 1968 edition of *Socialism Made Easy*. Here it is enough to remember two aspects.

The more important is the downgrading of the role of the party. As a result of Connolly's experience in America, he learnt the value of industrial unionism. But he learnt it too well. The results of the backwardness of the Irish working class that had forced him to go to the U.S.A. were misinterpreted by him as being entirely due to the absence of industrial unionism. In fact, this absence was itself a by-product of the existing economic weakness which had been the overall reason for the failure of a potentially correct political strategy: the development of the I.S.R.P. On top of this experience, Connolly's disputes with the S.L.P. (as, previously, with Hyndman's Social Democratic Federation) had further prejudiced him against the political party as such. The industrial Workers of the World provided the answer to the weaknesses of craft unionism. By subordinating to it the political party as its "committee", it appeared to offer the answer to the problems besetting the latter body.

The mistake was natural: it was, nonetheless, a mistake. Experience has taught since that if a Socialist political party is to achieve the replacement of the capitalist order, it should become what is termed "a vanguard party". Such a body is primarily a school of united revolutionaries as Antonio Gramsci put it: "A Modern Prince". The trade union, on the other hand, cannot exist only for the future revolution; it must work within society as it is, though it will depend on the revolutionary-minded amongst its members if it is not to degenerate swiftly into accepting that society. Thus many with excellent claims to be trade union officials must be excluded from membership of the vanguard party and the party, itself, may include many revolutionary people who are not trade union members but whose aims are to destroy capitalism. What happens when the functions of the two types of organisation are confused was shown clearly after Connolly's death when the I.T.G.W.U. grew as a trade union while its policies lost their former Scientific Socialism. Of course, it may not be impossible, for a trade union to combine its functions with those of a vanguard party. All one can say is that it has never been done yet and that to attempt such a task would seem, normally, to be handicapping oneself unduly.

But was "the nature" of Connolly so different from Lenin on this matter? The Maoists of the *Irish Communist Organisation* do not seem to think so. In the I.C.O.'s interesting collection of articles, *The Marxism of James Connolly* we find it stated (p.33) "but before we deal with the question of the Party let us dispose of the idea that Connolly thought that the growing concentration of trade union organisation was enough to bring socialism:

"Recently I have been complaining in this column and elsewhere of the tendency in the Labour movement to mistake mere concentration upon the industrial field for essentially revolutionary advance. My point was that the amalgamation or federation of unions, unless carried out by men and women with the proper revolutionary spirit was as likely to create new obstacles in the way of effective warfare as to make that warfare possible. The argument was reinforced by citations of what is taking place in the ranks of the railwaymen and in transport. There we find that amalgamations and federations are rapidly becoming engines

for steam-rolling or suppressing all manifestations of revolutionary activity or effective demonstrations of brotherhood. Every appeal to take industrial action on behalf of a union in distress is blocked by insisting upon the necessity of "first obtaining the sanction of the executive", and in practice it is found that the process of obtaining that sanction is so long, so cumbrous, and surrounded by so many rules and regulations that the union in distress is certain to be either disrupted or bankrupted before the executive can be moved. The greater Unionism is found in short to be forging greater fetters for the working class" (*The Problem of Trade Union Organisation, Forward*, 23rd May 1914: not republished since)

"Concerning the party, he wrote:

"There is only one remedy for this slavery of the working class, and that is a socialist republic there is only one way to attain that, and that way is for the working class to establish a political party of its own In claiming this we will only be following the example of our masters. Every political party is the party of a class (*The Workers' Republic*, p.45). 1903

"'Ah yes', it can be said, 'so Connolly had an inkling of the need for an independent working class Party: but of course he had no conception of the Leninist Central Committee'. Well let's see.

"'I have often thought that we of the working class are too slow, or too loathe to take advantage of the experiences of our rulers

'In the modern State the capitalist class has evolved for its own purposes of offence what it calls a Cabinet. This Cabinet controls its fighting forces, which must obey it implicitly. If the Cabinet thinks the time and opportunity is ripe for war, it declares war at the most favourable moment, and explains its reasons in Parliament afterwards.

'Can we trust our members with such a weapon as the capitalist class trust theirs? I think so' (*Forward*, 23rd May, 1914: not republished since).

"What is this if not a statement of the need for a Leninist Central Committee?"

This explanation does not convince. It is based too clearly on a set order of quotations, using as a link between two passages from a magazine published in 1914, sentences written eleven years previously (they are, as a matter of fact, taken from Connolly's election address for the Wood Quay Ward, Dublin, in January 1903, before he took up his agitational career in the U.S.A.). But even without this, there is nothing in the quotations to suggest that Connolly saw the party as being more than a "Political Committee" of the Trade Union Congress. True, he objects to "amalgamation or federation of unions, unless carried out by men and women with the proper revolutionary spirit". He suggests too, the need for a "cabinet" to lead the working class movement (which, as we have seen, probably means, for him, the trade unions). What he does not ask, in these matters, is how the properly revolutionary men and women are to be discovered and encouraged to take their

rightful places on the workers' "cabinet". Without this, the proposed body appears not as the "Leninist Central Committee" but as the sort of bureaucratic grouping that William O'Brien did actually set over the I.T.G.W.U. within three years of Connolly's death.

In any case, what is known of Connolly's years with the I.T.G.W.U. and what has been republished of his writings (by all parties) gives the lie to the concept of his unconscious Leninism in this matter. Both the Irish Labour Party and the Irish Citizen Army were created after the fashion of committees of the trade union movement. The Socialist Party of Ireland was never encouraged to expand its activities or its organisation beyond the realm of a "pure propaganda" body during Connolly's life-time. And, in 1914, when Larkin was going to America, Connolly insisted on combining with the post of Commander-in-Chief of the I.C.A., that of Acting General Secretary of the I.T.G.W.U., thus weakening his scope in the former office. From his republished writings, it is clear that the creation of a vanguard party was not of major importance to him. It seems likely too, that his confusion of the industrial and the political forces of the working class was a factor in his suggestion of a working alliance with George Russell (AE) and the rural co-operative movement (*Reconquest of Ireland*, Chapter VIII). These proposals involved an uncritical acceptance of Russell's claims for the co-operatives as small, rather than, as they were, medium, farmer bodies. They also showed a decline from the ultra-leftist collectivism of his I.S.R.P. period to a similar avoidance of the class issues in the countryside combined with acceptance of the existing land divisions.

The second significant aspect of *The Axe to the Root* is closely bound up with the conception of the trade union as being a vanguard party. We find him here taking a view that by itself means that the working class can take power peacefully when fully unionised. In practice, this viewpoint was taken in isolation by individuals already developing as bureaucrats and became an excuse for inaction and a readiness to play second fiddle to the political forces of capitalism. However, it should be seen, more correctly, in the context of Connolly's other writings.

Just what Connolly's total theory was may not yet be fully known. Too many of his total writings (especially his American ones) have not been published since their first appearance. Their addition to our knowledge may yet make qualitative changes in one's understanding of Connolly. Nonetheless, a model of his theory should be created, however unfinished it may be. Such a model will serve at least, to protect one from the unscientific assumptions of others, especially on the national issue which so dominated his last years.

At the base of Connolly's theory was his Scientific Socialism. This led him to recognise the inadequacy of all the bourgeois theories of the Irish Question, both Carsonite and Walkerite, but also Redmondite and Republican. On the first he wrote "that the historical backgrounds of the (Labour) movement in England and Ireland are so essentially different that the Irish Socialist movement can only be truly served by a party indigenous to the soil and explained by a literature having the same source (*Forward*, 2nd August 1913). On Redmondism, he remarked: "every succeeding year has seen the Parnellite party become more and more conservative and reactionary" (*Workers' Republic*, 8th October 1898).

On the demand for the Republic he was careful to differentiate between the idea of "a Republic as in France (or) as in the United States" and his ideal of a Socialist Republic. (*Shan Van Vooht*, January 1897). This ideal was, at first, to be achieved merely by means "nearest our hands" (*Workers' Republic*, 5th August 1899). Later as Connolly grew in experience, the means became more certain. We have seen that his concept of the instrument that would achieve this Workers' Republic was the "one big union", with its political (and later, military) committee. How this would achieve the desired end was a matter which varied according to circumstance. Thus, he was prepared to take a stand in general support of the principle of Home Rule (rather than denounce it, as such, as a bourgeois diversion), while the demand was still a living issue. Once home rule had been granted (and shelved) he put forward the call for a republic in alliance with people whose economic theory had not advanced beyond Tone.

The fact is that Connolly never considered that bourgeois 'Home Rule' whether in the shape of 'Home Rule', of a Republic (or, certainly, of a 'Free State') could, in itself smash imperialism in Ireland. Thus, while recognising Irish capitalism's subordination to the world system, he placed the organisations influenced by him (as he had placed the I.S.R.P.) in the forefront of the national struggle (never too far forward, of course) in order to help force a violent break with Britain. If such a revolution occurred, Connolly knew that it would develop in a manner now generally known to Scientific Socialists as that of "Permanent Revolution". This covered several possibilities. One was that the Labour movement would take control of the national movement as the various national bourgeois leaders were driven by fear of it to compromise with Britain. Another was that "Ireland may yet set the torch to a European conflagration that will not burn out until the last throne and the last capitalist bond and debenture will be shrivelled on the funeral pyre of the last warlord" (*Irish Worker*, 8th August 1914). A third was that the national demands of the bourgeoisie would be granted in full (or, at least, as at present, fully enough to effectively kill the remainder as an effective revolutionary force). In such an event, Connolly advised the Citizen Army to "hold on to your rifles". In other words, to act as a nucleus of the force that must eventually take power for the working class from the collaborating capitalists. Such a concept of "Dual Power" existed in Russia a year after Connolly's death, whilst the leadership of the Russian workers got ready to take full control. Once such a concept is understood, it becomes clear that Connolly's ideal of the unionised workers finally shrivelling the shell of the capitalist state merely clarifies certain details of that twilight period he envisaged to be another form of Soviet development within the Dual Power such as Russia would know in 1917.

From this, it is clear that there are a number of errors in the traditional analyses of Connolly's theory. One can clearly discount the extreme lunacies as to Connolly's surrender to bourgeois nationalism, or his acceptance of the method of *Rerum Novarum*. But one can also deny the more subtle mis-statements. There is one, for example, that Connolly believed that something called "national freedom" must come before social freedom (this is confusing because it accepts, as Connolly did not, the claims of bourgeois nationalism). Again it is said the "Dual Power" of the years of the Tan War was qualitatively the same as that put forward by him embryonically, (this is misleading because it ignores the fact that none of the leaders of the then Irish Republic

really wanted more than a reform of the national status within imperialism). And, finally, we have the defence of the slogan put forward by Thomas Johnson in 1919 and by Roddy Connolly (the son of James Connolly) and the C.P.I. in 1921: that "First the Republic - then the Workers' Republic" was qualitatively the same as "The Republic - but hold on to your guns". In fact, of course, the first is merely a magical invocation: the second is a strategic directive.

But in fairness to Connolly's heirs, it must be said that they were handicapped by their scripts. Between 1916 and 1948 little of the total works of Connolly, and after 1923, none of his earliest writings were published. The Ryan - I.T.G.W.U. selections, imperfect though they are, do provide for many what was inaccessible to the cadres of the Labour movement when they were most needed. In the struggle for independence, after Connolly's death, these could only go on their memories and on most (not all) of the pamphlets. Without adequate revolutionary training, their memories confused rather than enlightened them. As can be seen, the pamphlets, by themselves, lack much that is of value, especially on the national issue, the place of which in Connolly's last years we must now consider.

CONNOLLY'S FINAL VIEWS

Two points on this matter should be examined first of all. Mr. Stewart Crehan, for example, accuses Connolly of a "compromise with nationalism" in a context that clearly implies a belief that an all-British vanguard party was a serious possibility (thus, he denounced Connolly for under-estimating the British workers). That this is utopian can be seen simply from comparison with the outstandingly successful revolutionary party: The Bolsheviks of Russia. Despite a line on national self-determination which gave more to the minorities than anything a contemporary British group could do, this supra-national body could not hold Finland, Poland or the Baltic States. Nor was this due, simply, to the foreign invasions of the Russian Civil War, but due, as well, to the inadequacy of a supra-national organisation, centred on Greater Russians, to appeal to nations as developed as these. Ireland was nationally as developed as Poland or Finland: more developed than any of the Baltic States. There is no reason to doubt that a Socialist revolution, centred on Britain, without an independent Irish party, would have merely encouraged an "anti-imperialist" rising that would leave Ireland dependent on the imperialisms of France or of America.

But it is true that, in executing this strategy, Connolly made many mistakes such as resulted in an outcome equivalent to that of a real compromise with bourgeois nationalism. The I.C.O. (Introduction to *The New Evangel*) tries to explain them away:

"It was implied in Connolly's writings (c1901) that nationalist organisations were not necessary and that national demands could be inscribed on the socialist banner making nationalist organisations superfluous by depriving them of their sole reason for existence. But there were powerful economic forces influencing political developments. The gombeen class of men was growing more powerful in the countryside and in the towns due to the effects of the land acts on all sections of the community. Their ambitions for greater economic and political power found expression in nationalism. Nationalist parties grew and

expanded. Nationalist theoreticians like Arthur Griffith began to get a hearing.

"By 1914 the nationalist movement was quite powerful. It had of course a right and left wing; but all sections had more influence than the working class organisation in which Connolly was involved."

This statement is so misleading that one suspects that it was deliberately planned as such. One must concentrate attention on the final part: that "all sections (of the bourgeois national movement) had more influence than the working class organisations in which Connolly was involved". This is too vague to be accepted. In 1914 (or even 1916) the I.T.G.W.U. certainly had more influence on the people than such a "Nationalist theoretician" as Griffith. However, we may assume that the I.C.O. did not mean to refer to a trade union but to the independent vanguard party. However, to have used the term would have given away the fact of Connolly's disregard of that need: a fact which, as has been shown, the I.C.O. denies.

Further light on this matter is thrown by the I.W.P.'s publication in pamphlet form (the first ever) of Connolly's articles on *Revolutionary Warfare*. The present author must admit here to a mistake, in his introduction to *Socialism Made Easy*: he declared that Connolly's practice was better than his theory. *Revolutionary Warfare* reveals that his 'organisational Syndicalism weakened his practice despite his theory. In this valuable work, one sees just how aware Connolly was of the dangers of his course in 1916. Again and again the lessons are driven home: don't rely on holding the metropolis alone: don't trust the capitalists. Again and again, one remembers that this man was defeated because he relied on provincial battalions of the bourgeois Irish Volunteers to back the action spearheaded by his Irish Citizen Army. Such a failure to live up to his own theory can be justified by his belief in an early end to the war and his recognition of the need to act before this. But that does not explain the total absence of attempts to distribute any Citizen Army units over the country. These facts, show once again, Connolly's over-optimistic belief in the industrial union as a revolutionary force, capable of creating its Red Guard spontaneously.

That this mistake was fatal to Connolly's immediate hopes is now history. But what must be added is that the end of these immediate hopes meant the eclipse of the possibility of their revival. Connolly was executed. A vanguard of conscious Socialist revolutionaries was non-existent. Books that he left behind to become the most popular of his works were inadequate to break the petty bourgeois prejudices of most Irish revolutionaries.

One of them, *Labour, Nationality & Religion* gives its readers considerable feeling for Socialism, but is made less effective by the feeble nature of its opponent, Fr. Kane. Future clerics would pay lip service to Connolly while opposing him, in fact, with the doctrine of Distributism, or the division of the capital wealth of the country amongst the individuals therein.

But Distributism itself flourished in a situation where Connolly's early pamphlets could be ignored and where his last pamphlets on the national question gained an extra popularity. In a land where indus-

trialism had scarcely progressed, non-Socialist radicalism was a constant danger. There was nothing to protect against this except Connolly's writings. And, because of the pressures mentioned before, not one of the pamphlets (nobody thought, yet, of collecting the articles) could, by itself, explain his position.

All of them were written for specific purposes, to attack a hostile priest, to encourage industrial unionism or to teach Irish history on class lines. Of them the most impressive work, *Labour in Irish History*, was precisely that which was least likely to provide a scientific basis for opposition to the non-Socialist dreams of property-owning that have haunted the Irish workers. One should mention, too, that Connolly's very last pamphlet, *The Reconquest of Ireland*, gives the impression of being a summary of Connolly's thought, whereas it is simply another work written for an occasion: in this case, to "do" both the Carsonite and Redmondite analyses of Ireland's needs. Were it not written by Connolly, it would be long forgotten.

But *Labour in Irish History* explains Irish historical development in class terms. It relates Irish national feeling to its agent's relations to their means of production and relates all to the international situation. Yet it fails to relate these facts scientifically to the problems of Connolly's time (except for a relatively brief description of the problems of the small farmer vis-a-vis the foreign rancher).

This "Historicism" (or the emphasis on history rather than economics as a decisive factor) can be seen in three ways. In the first place, Connolly, in order to disprove the rubbish written (and still written) about the Irish natural respect for aristocracy exaggerates the significance of the tribal institutions of ancient Ireland. He admits that "Communal ownership of land would, undoubtedly, have given way to the privately owned system of capitalist-landlordism, even if Ireland remained an independent country", but ignores the fact that it was so doing even before 1171. More important is the conclusion he draws from his belief in Celtic institutions. There are times in his accounts of early Republicanism when one feels that one is asked to believe that its advocates not only wished to set up some form of Socialism (which might be arguable) but could have done so (which is not). And there is no reason to doubt that Connolly's expressed belief in the continuance of the tribal feeling served as an excuse for not making any explanation of the form in which national bourgeois (and, of course, national petty bourgeois, or "lower middle class") theory took in his time.

These latter facts must be examined in more detail. The uncritical accounts of the physical force movements, though correct in content, can be justified in form only when it is remembered that Connolly wrote the articles in America. In Ireland he had already criticised correctly the history of the national movement:

"Ireland occupies a position among the nations of the earth unique in a great variety of its aspects, but in no one particularly is this singularity more marked than in the possession of what is known as a physical force party - a party, that is to say, whose members are united upon no one point, and agree upon no single principle, except upon the use of physical force as the sole means of settling the dis-

pute between the people of this country and the governing power of Great Britain.

"Other countries and other peoples have, from time to time, appealed to what the first French Revolutionists picturesquely described as the 'sacred right of insurrection', but in so appealing they acted under the inspiration of, and combatted for, some great governing principle agreement. The latterday highfalutin 'hillside' man, on the other hand, exalts into a principle that which the revolutionists of other countries have looked upon as a weapon, and in his gatherings prohibits all discussion of those principles which formed the main strength of his prototypes elsewhere and made the successful use of that weapon possible. Our people have glided at different periods of the past century from moral force agitation, so called, into physical force rebellion, from constitutionalism into insurrectionism, meeting in each the same failure and the same disaster and yet seem as far as ever from learning the great truth that neither method is ever likely to be successful until they first insist that a perfect agreement upon the end to be attained should be arrived at as a starting-point of all our efforts". (*Workers' Republic*, 22nd July 1899).

The fact that, later in the article quoted, Connolly reveals an over-optimistic belief in parliamentary tactics, does not destroy the value of his historical analysis. It has, indeed been made less relevant for the last seventy years only in that the switches of tactic have found a third corner created by the policies of Connolly's social reformist heirs. But there is no trace of this in his accounts of the United Irishmen, the Young Irishmen or the Fenians. Thus, it is not surprising that many who came after him read the pamphlet but not the article. And these were duly convinced that they were following his teachings in fighting for social liberation in movements that had only a readiness to use physical force as a unifying factor. Thus, too, we find today, Fianna Fail proclaiming its inheritance from Connolly and its Deputies speaking in honour of a man who would, were he alive, be denouncing them, correctly, as turncoats.

/// And this possibility was encouraged further by Connolly's studious vagueness in dealing with the last fifty years of his history. He is content to point out once again that "the Irish question is a social question" and to leave it with a prophesy that "the pressure of a common exploitation can make enthusiastic rebels out of a Protestant working class, earnest champions of civil and religious liberty out of Catholics, and out of both a united social democracy". Only half the analyses of *Erin's Hope* are developed. He does not provide any programme for such a unity. Without that, the six counties were lost to the Republic of Ireland and, in the twenty-six counties, the petty bourgeois leaders of *Sinn Fein* and Fianna Fail appeared to fill the gap.

These criticisms of *Labour in Irish History* should be born in mind while it is being read. The overriding fact is that it is a dangerous book for two reasons. Firstly its clear style makes it appear a work of elementary education for the layman, whereas it conceals truths that can be recognised only by the trained Marxist. Secondly if it is not to mislead the reader, he or she should read it in connection with all Connolly's other works.

This cannot yet be done. Though much has been re-published, much

still remains to be discovered in the files of forgotten newspapers. It is to be hoped that the publication of the Collected Works of Connolly will be carried out as the work of all sections of the Irish Left and in a non-sectarian spirit.

Until such publication is made, or until new discoveries are produced, such as would alter existing knowledge of Connolly and his teachings, the present author suggests that his conception of Connolly is the correct one. This is of a major Scientific Socialist thinker (albeit with reservations as to the supernatural). He was handicapped by his lack of understanding as to the rural question and (decisively) as to the nature of the revolutionary organisation. On the credit side, Connolly understood the dynamics of revolution in their general working, if not in their details.

What is his relevance today? The aims of the bourgeois leaders of the national revolution have been achieved as far as they were practicable. State patronage is controlled within the limits of the island; formal "Home Rule" has been granted. The peasants have the land. These achievements are now seen to be inadequate. The Irish nation is divided. Attempts to produce a new native capitalism through protection have had to be abandoned for the reasons anticipated in *Erin's Hope*. Now, the larger sectors of the "national" bourgeoisie are welcoming foreign monopolies to encourage economic growth and this is being done at the expense of the petty bourgeoisie. The decline of the latter class is destroying the economic basis for the hopes that sustained Griffith's *Sinn Féin*; today, that party has to talk of a "Workers' Republic". What Connolly expected to happen if the capitalists dominated the republic has been fulfilled. England still rules us to our ruin, even while our native rulers' lips offer hypocritical homage at the shrine of that Freedom whose cause they have betrayed.

To finalise the national revolution is a task now more clearly mixed into the achievement of the Socialist Revolution that it was in Connolly's time. Irish capitalism has no life except as agent for imperialism. Thus only a thirty-two county socialist revolution - an attack on the bosses and the ranchers, north and south - can either gain the needed support for and interest in the final national victory. Demands must be made to collectivise farms over a certain size, to nationalise (with full workers' control) firms that have links of any kind with external interests, to guarantee minimums of wages, employment and pensions and to democratise education: to destroy the social order in the interests of workers and small farmers as well as the form of state power. But these demands must be backed by a revolutionary vanguard group, working, if necessary, with or even through other organisations, but without compromising its programme. As Connolly remarked, The Socialist must use the means "nearest our hands".

He wrote, too, (*Workers' Republic*, 5th August 1899): We are told to imitate Wolfe Tone, but the greatness of Wolfe Tone lay in the fact that he imitated nobody'. And thus we can only equal James Connolly by excelling him: by learning from his career the better to achieve that for which he strove all his life.

D.R. O'Connor Lysaght.

(1) According to the theories of Arthur Griffith, the aim of the struggle in Ireland should be to achieve a similar relationship to Britain as existed between Hungary and Austria in the "dual-monarchy" of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Griffith's books therefore deal at considerable length with the constitutional and other details of the founding of this dual monarchy.

(2) George Russell, an Irish theorist of agrarian reform used the pen name of *AE*.

(3) Connolly's book *Labour, Nationality and Religion* is cast in the form of a reply to a series of anti-socialist sermons by Fr. Kane.

RED BOOKS

BOOKS ON IRELAND

Liam de Paor: <i>Divided Ulster</i>	[5/-]
Andrew Boyd: <i>Holy War in Belfast</i>	[8/6]
<i>Fifty Years of Liberty Hall</i>	[3/6]
<i>The Years of the Great Test</i>	[10/-]
J. W. Boyle: <i>Leaders and Workers</i>	[5/-]
Calton Younger: <i>Ireland's Civil War</i>	[10/-]

BOOKS BY JAMES CONNOLLY

<i>The Workers' Republic</i>	[21/-]
<i>Socialism and Nationalism</i>	[21/-]
<i>Labour and Easter Week</i>	[21/-]
<i>Labour in Ireland</i>	[21/-]
<i>The New Evangel</i>	[2/-]
<i>Labour, Nationality and Religion</i>	[2/6]
<i>The Re-Conquest of Ireland</i>	[2/6]
<i>Revolutionary Warfare</i>	[1/6]

CRISIS IN EDUCATION

Warwick University Ltd.: E. P. Thompson (Ed.)	[6/-]
<i>The Hornsey Affair</i>	[6/-]
Risinghill— <i>Death of a Comprehensive School</i> : Leifa Berg	[6/-]
Summerhill: A. S. Neill	[7/-]

BLACK POWER

<i>Seize the Time</i> : Bobby Seale	[9/-]
<i>Black Power</i> : Stokely Carmichael & Chas. V. Hamilton	[6/-]
<i>Soul on Ice</i> : Eldridge Cleaver	[10/-]
<i>Revolutionary Analysis, Strategy & Tactics Today</i>	[4/-]
Books and pamphlets by Malcolm X.	
<i>Genocide Against the Indians</i> : George Novack	[4/-]

182 Pentonville Road, London N.1.

Tel: 01-837 9987

NOW OPEN 10 a.m.—6 p.m.
TUESDAY THROUGH SATURDAY

*Your centre for all books of the left.

*Any book ordered. Mail orders promptly attended to.

*New catalogue in preparation—get on our mailing list.

Postage and packing extra.

* * * * *

SPECIALLY RECOMMENDED

I. Mezzaros: <i>Marxist Theory of Alienation</i>	[20/-]
Lenin's <i>Collected Works</i> , Vol. 45. Contains Lenin's letters to Trotsky (1922)	[18/-]

<i>Key Problems of the Transition from Capitalism to Socialism</i> : Pierre Frank, George Novack, Ernest Mandel	[6/6]
<i>Behind China's "Great Cultural Revolution"</i> : Peng Shu-tse & others	[6/6]
Leon Trotsky: <i>On the Trade Unions</i>	[8/6]
Krupskaya's <i>Memories of Lenin</i>	[8/-]
Trotsky's <i>History of the Russian Revolution</i> , 3 vols.	[30/-]
Netti: <i>Rosa Luxembourg</i>	[25/-]

URUGUAY: A ROLE FOR URBAN GUERRILLAS ?

"... we must carry the war to where the enemy carries it - to his house, to his recreation centres. We must make it total war. Ché"

- Slogan on a wall in Montevideo.

One of the most fundamental problems facing all guerrilla struggles throughout Latin America is the relationship between the guerrilla vanguard and the masses. How can support of the masses be assured for the guerrilla column, so that it can be the vanguard of all the exploited, not just its own vanguard? How can guerrilla fronts, capable of resisting imperialist aggression be concretely organised? An analysis of social classes, of specific problems, and of the demands of concrete groups is essential to the elaboration of revolutionary strategy. Armed propaganda cannot be the universal formula to win the masses. To stress only the political effect of military operations submerges political problems in the military struggle. The problem is not to shoot but to do so in a way that the revolutionary classes will understand that the shots are fired by their vanguard and that those classes will participate in the campaign the vanguard has unleashed. Guerrilla warfare must prepare itself as the war of the people. It is, therefore, up to the revolutionary vanguard to organise itself in such a way as to polarize the revolutionary energy of the masses. A correct elaboration of revolutionary strategy demands not only the military characteristics of the guerrilla unit but also a determination of the nature of the class struggle in the present historic stage and of the general character of guerrilla war as a people's war, of which the guerrilla column is the principal and direct form but neither the exclusive nor sufficient one.

In Uruguay, the (NLM) National Liberation Movement known as "TUPAMAROS" - has been the most effective guerrilla movement to come to real terms with this problem. One of the most developed forms of urban guerrilla struggle in Latin America, NLM has taken this summer the first elementary steps in the widening of the political struggle in Uruguay.

The *Tupamaros*, sprang to world headlines with the kidnappings of the CIA agent, Dan Mitrione, and the Braxilian Consul, Aloysio Dias Gomide on July 31st this year. They demanded the release of all political prisoners in Uruguay (calculated to be some 180 at least) as the price of the freedom of the two men. Seven days later they kidnapped another CIA agent, Claude Fly. On August 8th the *Tupamaros*

tried and executed Mitrione in response to the government's refusal to meet their demands. From the beginning of August, Montevideo has been completely transformed. The government attempted to discover the men and destroy the *NLM* by intensive repression. The army and the police completely occupied Montevideo, the capital of Uruguay. On August 11th all constitutional rights were suspended, and thousands of police searches of hospitals, schools, churches even cemeteries, as well as house-to-house searches became part of daily life for Montevideanos. With repression there was a deepening of class divisions in the city. Workers on strike for higher wages and university and secondary school students have become involved in serious clashes with the police. The public and private secondary schools in the city remain closed. Despite continuous patrols and police vigilance, *NLM* attacks have continued against the reactionary radio and T.V. stations, the bourgeois press and North American corporations. The situation has created serious splits within the government. The opposition to the majority party of Pacheco Areco has become increasingly critical of the President's repressive policy.

On September 17th *NLM* issued a Manifesto to the People. For the first time they challenged the government on basic conditions which must be fulfilled in order to avoid continued war with *Tupamaros*:

"We are ready to discuss the ceasing of hostilities, for a period to be agreed upon, on the basis of the following points:

1. Freedom for all political prisoners.
2. Reemployment of all those dismissed from their jobs, and payment of all wages deducted from workers through union sanctions.
3. Repeal of all wage freeze laws and decrees.
4. Lifting of all government intervention, especially in educational institutes.
5. Restoration of all constitutional rights.
6. Ending of all the reactionary, repressive measures taken by the present government. In no circumstances will we accept discussions on the possession of arms, nor the existence of our organisation. We consider both as the only guarantee of the people in the last instance. We are publicly taking the initiative.

Now its up to the government. If they accept we will discuss, assume and fulfill the promises. Otherwise, we'll have to opt for war. If there's no Fatherland for all, there'll be no Fatherland for anybody. That's our word. That's all."

In effect, for the first time, they have put forward a basic political program for the people of Uruguay. *Tupamaros* have been able to create a crisis situation in which they are able to challenge the government

and elaborate an alternative. That they have been able to do so is firmly based on certain fundamental aspects of *NLM* strategy and the historical development of Uruguay.

"THERE'S NO PLACE LIKE URUGUAY ..."

Uruguay seemed to be one of the most Europeanised, most modern, most stable, most developed, most reformist and most democratic of all Latin American countries. 'Como el Uruguay no hay' - there's no place like Uruguay - was the title of a Uruguayan film made in 1957. But Uruguay was really an integral part of Latin America; its similarity with the rest of the continent was simply obscured. The idyllic image was incompatible with the reality of underdevelopment and economic dependence within the world capitalist system. Gradually a complex crisis of economic stagnation and repression developed, accompanied by a crisis of ideologies and values. During decades a model for the rest of Latin America, Uruguay is today the source of a new form of urban insurrection.

Uruguay, with its 183,926 square kilometers (little bigger than Cuba) and three million inhabitants (Cuba has eight million) suffers the general law of poverty, underdevelopment and dependence which characterizes the whole continent. Sandwiched between two powerful giants, Brazil and Argentina, the terrain is an extension of the pampas of Argentina. The fertile land is suitable for agriculture and pasture but is little populated and little exploited. The only port is the capital, Montevideo, which is concentrated on 4 percent of the land area and has over 50 percent of the total population. The economy is based almost exclusively on cattle and sheep farming around Montevideo. The city became the centre for industrial processing and packing of meat, wool and hides for export. It was also the centre for the imports of industrial machinery and consumer goods for the expanding urban market. From 1900-1925 Montevideo grew tremendously with the livestock industry for an expanding foreign market. Meat processing and packing improved and expanded with the installation of four large 'frigoríficos' (refrigerated plants). Increased capacity in turn created the demand for extensive railway and transport services, more electricity and public services and light consumer industries for the urban population of Montevideo.

From 1911, the second Battle government carried out large scale social reforms: the secret vote, separation of the Church and State, the nationalisation of public services and various industries, control of banks and credit, and an advanced system of social security. In 1912, the State Electricity Company, UEE (Usinas Eléctricas del Estado) was formed; in 1914 the State Telegraph Company; in 1915 the State tram and railway companies. Scientific services and educational institutes under state control were created as an integral part of development policy. This formed the basis of several decades of prosperity and social peace.

Like all Latin American countries, Uruguay was hard hit by the 1929 Depression. But new State policies in the 1930's boosted recovery. Monopoly sectors were consolidated - the most important were SOYF (fisheries), the incorporation of telephones into UEE to form UTE (Usinas Eléctricas y Teléfonos del Estado) in 1931, and later, in 1945, the railway monopoly. World War Two, with the increased

demand for meat products for Europe and the United States, together with a temporary cutting off of imports from Europe, gave a boost to a process of import substitution, the growth of new home industries and advances in technology and agriculture. The standard of living and consumption almost reached European standards, creating unprecedented urban comfort. Post-war prosperity allowed further expansion of the existing Welfare State. Life expectancy of Uruguayans was calculated to be 65-68 years in 1956-60 - one of the highest in Latin America. The net birth rate was 22.5 per thousand inhabitants, and the death rate 7.8 per thousand. The annual increase of the population was one of the lowest in the continent - 1.4 percent. Uruguay also had the most notable educational development and the least illiteracy. In 1965 the census revealed that 9 percent were illiterate, and 20 percent partially illiterate.

But development was not balanced. Despite the fact that Uruguay was an agricultural country, 82 percent of the population was in the cities. The middle class - the enormous number of public officials, executives, professionals, and technocrats - developed as an active, even decisive element in politics, culture and public opinion. In Uruguay, 'todo el mundo es clase media' - everybody is middle class! In 1956 it was calculated that in Montevideo there were 15,000 bank employees, 38,000 commercial employees, and 11,000 professional employees in private industry alone.

The active population of Uruguay was estimated in 1963 as some 1,031,300 persons (40 percent of the population). Twenty-eight percent of the workers were agricultural labourers and 18 percent industrial workers. If the middle class and sectors of the working class lived well, others did not. Concentration of land and capital in the hands of latifundists meant that the rural population was small and the number of unemployed high. In 1946, there was a discussion in the House of Deputies on the fact that rural salaries had remained the same for twenty years. In that period (1926-46) wool prices had risen 50 percent while the wages of sheep shearers stayed the same. These workers still worked a 12-13 hour day in unhealthy conditions. No shearer keeps his job for more than ten years and on average he works only 45 days of the year. Rural workers and marginal and casual labour in the cities live in appalling conditions without stable employment.

Moreover the prosperity for favoured sectors was short lived. The late 50's came to remind Uruguayans that they remained part of the underdeveloped two-thirds of the world. The economy depended on exports of cattle and sheep farming products. Expansion in other sectors in the 30's and 40's was limited, and depended directly or indirectly on the fate of livestock. When the markets and prices for these exports fell, the effects were felt throughout the economy. In the 50's came the endemic crisis which other Latin American countries had been facing for some years. For, like other Latin American economies, the Uruguayan economy depended on a product for North American and European markets. For all her higher level of development, Uruguay remained trapped in the structure of relations of the world imperialist system, - producer of raw agricultural materials, importer of industrial products. The Depression of 1929-33 destroyed the fundamental basis of these markets. From the 30's onwards all Latin American governments have been attempting to keep an economy

going which no longer corresponds to the changing world situation. In Uruguay the effects of this fundamental change were not evident until 1955, when the temporary stimulating effect of the Second World War ended, and trade relations became normal again. Uruguayan exports have fallen drastically, causing cuts in production. From 1955-61, 22,000 agricultural workers were left without work. Two of the largest 'frigoríficos' - Swift and Artigas, both American owned - closed down, throwing large numbers of men out of work.

Technically backward in other sectors, Uruguay was snared in MONOPRODUCTION. In her attempts to stave off total crisis she was forced to rely more and more on foreign loans. Early economic development from the late 19C to the 1930's had been promoted by British investment. Later this was surpassed by US capital. In 1911 British investment amounted to £46,145,393 comprising £25,552,548 in government bonds and £20,592,845 in private enterprise, (of the last £5,552,548 was invested in railways). The bonds payed 4.7 interest. By the 1920's returns were so high that Uruguay was considered the second most attractive country in Latin America for investment (Argentina came first). Transport, electricity and the meat industry paid off particularly high profits to foreign interests. The drain from Uruguay in profits was so great by the 1930's that the press was constantly denouncing the extent to which the country was captive in the hands of foreign capital. However, as a consequence of the Second World War, by 1949 British Investment had dropped to £26,624,198 (although still with an interest rate of 4.7 percent). Since then, the pattern of investments has changed. U.S. investments have replaced British and go far less to public services and far more directly to commercial and industrial enterprises. U.S. capital was heavily invested in North American subsidiary corporations, for example, in Swift and Armour in Montevideo and Anglo, in the city of Fray Bentos companies which together dominated the Uruguayan market. Trade and export of wool, the greatest source of wealth, in the 1950's was 90 percent in the hands of six international trusts.

Attempting to compete on a world market which had changed, Uruguayan prosperity came to an end. At the end of the 1950's, the United States imposed through the International Monetary Fund, IMF, a policy of loans and monetary devaluation, which produced a fall in the standard of living of workers and numerous middle class. As the economic crisis began to be felt, the extended bureaucracy of public and welfare services was seen to be one of the main factors of official expenditure which the economy could not support and substantial cuts were made in benefits and services. In the 1960's the situation worsened. In 1965 the only bank crisis in the whole history of Uruguay almost paralysed the country. In June 1965, the Uruguayan peso was at 24 per dollar. The external debt on May 31st 1965 was 580,000,000 U.S. dollars. State reserves in May 1965 were estimated at 211,000,000 U.S. dollars - 171,000,000 in gold and 40,000,000 in currency. Direct U.S. investment amounted to 57,000,000 U.S. dollars in 1963 - 45 percent of this was in the manufacturing industry. In 1964 exports were valued at 179,000,000 U.S. dollars against imports of 190,000,000 U.S. dollars - that is, with a deficit of 11,000,000 U.S. dollars. By 1970 the Uruguayan peso was at 250 per dollar. As the value of the peso fell, with successive devaluations and the national debt increased the government began to make more concessions and to mortgage gold reserves to the U.S.

With the increased cost of living, public officials and workers in industrial sectors were badly hit. Strikes multiplied, demanding higher wages to cope with higher prices. The work stoppages paralysed textiles, banks and metallurgy industries, frigoríficos, UTE and public health services. By 1967 the national debt had risen to 5,000,000 U.S. dollars with government promises of partial repayment within the next few years. Riches were increasingly concentrated in the hands of 200-300 families, owners of land, banks and large enterprises, linked to foreign capital. Financial collapse and dependence on foreign capital gave rise to widespread administrative corruption and political instability.

"...

*the Electoral College ballot boxes
every four Novembers we're free
the majority will build the future
and the sick society will get well*

...

*only one problem we have to hurry
democracy won't wait
vote vote before everything goes to hell
to Chase Manhattan ..."*

- *Voting Instructions, in the book of poems
Prison Diary, by Carlos María Gutiérrez (Uruguay).*

From the 19th century Uruguay had been a model of political stability - of peaceful elections and a stable two party system - as well as of economic expansion. In 1830 Uruguay won independence. A Constitution was drawn up and the Republic declared. From the civil war which followed independence, between the *Blancos* - Whites - identified with rural sectors and the *Colorados* - Reds - representing city interests, emerged the two dominant political parties, *Blanco* and *Colorado*. The civil war ended with the dominance of the *Colorado*, although internal struggles continued. It was not until 1958, however, that *Blancos* came to power for the first time, ending 90 years of *Colorado* government.

In 1951 a new Constitution was drawn up which established a collegiate system. The executive and the legislature were elected every four years, with the compulsory secret vote of all over 18 who can read and write. The legislature comprises Senate of four members and a House of Commons of 99 members, which together form the General Assembly. The Presidential council rotates every year between the four first councillors of the majority party. The Executive National Council is made up of nine members, six of the majority party and three of the next. This form of sharing the government between two parties is reproduced in almost all administrative posts, especially those in State Corporations with their own administration. These thus become a political instrument. The system is completed by the mechanisms of the electoral process which ensures the electoral monopoly of the two traditional parties. Because of this the force and size of the popular movements isn't reflected in the equilibrium of the electoral force. In 1966 the presidential system was introduced.

The majority party is the *Colorado* party which represents an amalgam of tendencies from the reactionary big bourgeoisie to the nationalist bourgeoisie, and small liberal petty bourgeoisie groups. The main opposition party is the *Blanco* party. The *Christian Democrat Party* has some support in the masses and some parliamentary representation but its reform program has had little success. The *Communist Party*, the largest popular grouping, is firmly rooted in the working class in Montevideo, and has a small, but growing base in the interior. In 1962 the *Left Liberation Front (Frente de Izquierda de Liberacion - FIDEL)* was formed, which included the *Eastern Revolution Movement*. The *Socialist Party*, with its traditional anti-imperialist stand, has declined in electoral importance since 1962.

The union movement is firmly controlled by the *Communist Party*. The majority of the labour unions and increasingly the white collar unions, are grouped in the powerful *CTU - Central de trabajadores de Uruguay*. On the basis of this in 1964, the *National Convention of Workers - CNT* - was formed, integrating more than 90 percent of the union movement in the country. The union movement in the interior is recent. *UTAA* - the union of sugar workers in Artigas, in the north-east is one of the most important.

In the 1960's this tenuous 'harmony' of social forces broke down. In 1967 Pacheco Areco, the current president of Uruguay came to power not through direct election, but through the death of the then President, General Oscar Gestido. As vice-president, he was constitutionally empowered to take the presidency. During his three years in office his 'hard-line' policy of wage freeze and cut backs in public and welfare expenditure has directly protected the interests of the bankers, traders, industrialists and landowners, and has struck hard on the workers. To meet growing social discontent arising from the economic crisis and government policy, the regime has been building up its repressive machinery. In the face of social and economic crisis, democracy degenerated into open dictatorship. Closer association with the neighbouring military regimes of Argentina and Brazil, and more open US imperialist intervention. The armed forces of Uruguay are small and poorly equipped, without a repressive tradition. The Army, Navy and Airforce total only 10,000 men. The police force is stronger especially in Montevideo, where the police are well-equipped for political repression with US material and training.

Left opposition parties have been dissolved, opposition press has been closed down. Workers and students have met police brutality. Union leaders have been imprisoned.

In 1964 three leaders of the sugar workers' union, *UTAA* - Vigue, Santana and Castillo were imprisoned following an abortive assault on a bank to get money for the sugar workers. The history of the sugar workers which led up to the attempted bank robbery was an important step in the political development of Uruguay.

In the 50's industrialisation had led the traditional left to concentrate on urban problems. But with the first symptoms of the crisis, it was isolated groups of rural workers who began to radicalise their demands. One of the most important of these groups was the *cañeros* - sugar cane workers. Without land, they and their families were forced to rely for their livelihood on seasonal labour

on the sugar plantations of the State enterprises, CAINSA and AZUCARLITO in Artigas. Unorganised, cut-off from the rest of the country, neglected by the Central Government in Montevideo, they had never been given even the minimum labour rights which were legally theirs. Raul Sendic, one law student in Montevideo, in that period a militant of the *Socialist Party*, became a 'peludo' - long-haired or shaggy one - as the cane workers called themselves. He lived and laboured with the workers and their families. Through UTAA, radicalised by the long patient work of Sendic, the peludos fought for and gained the enforcement of social legislation with which the company had never complied. For the first time, the Union gained basic labour conditions, an eight hour day, a weekly rest, a minimum wage, etc. In 1962, under Sendic, the cañeros marched to Montevideo to bring attention to their problems. For the first time they saw the city and the city saw them.

The most important political step forward was when UTAA demanded 'tierra para trabajar', the expropriation of land for the cañeros. UTAA identified 30,000 hectares of land whose owners were either widows or spinsters and who lived in the city. The land was left abandoned. In 1963-64 the workers came up against an outright refusal - there was no land for the cañeros, the government said. But the workers knew different. They came up against the bourgeois system with its indifference to their problems. The very struggle began to teach the workers that they were fighting not for economic demands but against the whole exploitative system in which they were forced to live. They marched to Montevideo to demand legislation and land reform. Each time, they went back defeated, but much clearer and more politically conscious. It was this that led the three leaders to attempt the bank robbery. They were beginning to act in a different way. They were beginning to attack. But they lacked the technique and organisation.

In the city, the reaction to economic hardship and government policy also hardened. There were strikes in textiles, metallurgy, frigoríficos and government paralysed key sectors of the economy. Long organised by reformist leaders the workers only demanded increased wages, but in the critical situation in Uruguay this was a lot. Strikes were repressed. Workers were jailed. In the University of the Republic in Montevideo, the Federation of University Students demanded University autonomy. Especially militant were the Faculties of Medicine (the oldest), law and agronomy. In demonstrations many students were hurt, many arrested. In August 1968 a student, Liber Arce, was killed. In September, two more were killed. In August 1970 demonstrations in commemoration met heavy repression. Pacheco Arce closed all secondary schools and the University. In September, students and workers marched through the streets of Montevideo together. On the 16th workers of the Pepsi-Cola company, already on strike for a few months marched with students. The same day the medical union was involved in clashes with the police. On September 18th, the National Convention of Workers assembled for an act of solidarity with the imprisoned strikers from Pepsi-Cola. Textile, metallurgy, chemical and brewery and soft-drink workers, together with students, teachers and pensioners participated in the meeting, applauding speeches declaring: 'The strike will not be destroyed', 'Students and workers unite', 'Uruguayans are not sheep', and 'Solidarity strengthens'.

The experience of repression faced by an open defenceless movement speaks for itself. A new type of movement began to emerge - *NLM*, *TUPAMAROS*. They take their name from Tupac Amaru, a cacique of the Incas, who led an early uprising from Peru against Spanish domination. Years later, after the defeat of Artigas, the great independence leader of Uruguay, at the beginning of the 19th century, the oligarchy attributed continuing incidents in rural areas to groups of so-called *Tupamaros*, robbing and assaulting landowners and landed property. In reality they were the last attempts of resistance of decimated groups of Artigas' gauchos. The name *Tupamaro* is, thus, rooted in the origins of indo-american rebellion and in the revolutionary tradition of Uruguay.

The first signs of the movement came in 1963 when a group, including Raul Sendic, assaulted a shooting club of the interior, carried off the arms of the club and went underground. From that date urban guerrilla groups have coolly carried out spectacular underground attacks on Montevideo. Their early operations included attacks on *Radio Carve* and *Voz del Aire* for defamation of the Cuban Revolution, on the City Bank and other North American firms, the explosion of bombs in the houses of government advisers, fires in buses when private firms attempted to put up fares, the capture of food-warehouse lorries to distribute food to families of strikers, the explosion of a bomb in the house of Chief of Police, Colonel Aguerro, in reply to an attack ordered on frigorífico workers on strike, and an assault on the Bayer Company when it was revealed that they produced Napalm for the US war against Vietnam.

From 1968 their operations have been openly directed against key persons and enterprises in the economy. On August 8th 1968, *Tupamaros* kidnapped the President of *UTE*, and held him prisoner for five days. In September 1969 eight men arrived by taxi at the offices of the two largest newspapers, *Mañana*, and *El Diario*, and carried off with them the owner, Gaetano Pellegrini Giampietre. Giampietre was also the principle owner of a chain of banks, whose intransigence before his workers had led to a 70 day strike. He was freed for 50,000 dollars deposited in a health clinic for workers.

In 1969, *Tupamaros* carried out a spectacular attack in commemoration of the death of El Ché, on October 8th. *Tupamaros* entered Pando, on the outskirts of the capital, as a funeral cortege. They then split up into three action groups. The first took the local police station. The second occupied the fire station and destroyed the electricity and telephone centre, stopping communications from the town. The third assaulted three banks, taking 40,000 dollars. The whole operation was carried out in ten minutes.

Tupamaros have no respect for a totally corrupt and exploitative system which robs the people. There exists in Uruguay commissions to investigate fraud, commissions such as the *Comisión de ilícitos, tribunal de cuentas*, and *Comisiones con funciones fiscalizadoras*. But *Tupamaros* protect public funds far more efficiently. In February 1968, *NLM* confiscated thousands of dollars and confidential papers from the Monty Co. exchange offices. Within days they had placed copies of the documents in the hands of the courts denouncing the fraudulent dealings of the firm. The investigations on the case produced the dismissal of

the Minister of Livestock and Agriculture, Frick Davies, and caused a great financial scandal. In December 1969, they took documents from the central safe of the French and Italian Bank; these documents revealed illegal operations of the foreign bank designed to manipulate the financial market and national credit with the aid of leading Uruguayan figures. In January 1970, they pulled off 'Operation Pounds Sterling'. A commando group of *Tupamaros* entered the house of Luis Eduardo Mailhos Queirolo, 75 year old owner of a huge tobacco empire, dismantled a heavy safe, loaded it into a van and drove off - taking with them a lump sum of \$25,000 sterling in gold. Mailhos had systematically kept money since the beginning of the Second World War to avoid paying taxes to the Uruguayan government. They also took the arms which Mailhos kept and the powerful radio transmitter sets he used to communicate with his estates. They left no trace except that written on a wall by an ex-worker of Mailhos, Robert Barbeito; 'Hasta la victoria siempre, Roberto'. The government was forced to jail Mailhos for fraud. His fine was the largest recorded in the history of Uruguay - 578,000,000 pesos (2,300,000 dollars).

From March 1970 attacks have been stepped up. On March 8th *Tupamaros* freed thirteen women accused of belonging to *NLM* from the jail where they were being held.

On May 17th they carried out eight attempts with fire bombs against banks, laboratories, and industrial and commercial enterprises.

Tupamaros are quite clear who the enemy is. The oligarchs, the politicians, foreign diplomats, *OAS* officials, foreign advisers and their repressive forces are all responsible for the present situation. They are all answerable to the people. None will be respected. In May this year, a perfect attack was carried out on a centre for naval instruction. All apparently began with a dispute outside the centre. Two uniformed men arrived in a car, apparently a police car, and intervened in the dispute. Without success, they then went over to the guard on the gates, Fernando Garin, who let them through. The rest was easy. Forty to fifty persons surrounded the centre and entered the building. They found 30 inside, including the captain, sleeping and forced them to lead them to the arsenal. There they appropriated over 700 arms, radio equipment and munitions. Among the arms were 300 M-1 guns, heavy machine guns and gas grenades. The guard left with them.

At the beginning of July the *Special Repressive Commando Unit* was formed. On July 12th *Tupamaros* assaulted the houses of four police. They appropriated eight cars (some taxis) from their drivers during the afternoon. The drivers were held till late afternoon by *Tupamaros*, then they were told where they could find their cars and released. The taxi drivers were given the full amount of fare corresponding to the time during which the cars had been used. Meantime, during the afternoon, four groups, each including one girl, simultaneously searched the houses. In each case they explained that they were not against the police but against the regime, and that these searches were "just like the ones the police carry out against the rest of us and the workers."

On July 13th they freed two political prisoners from the jail where they were being held.

On July 28th they kidnapped Judge Daniel Pereira Manelli and on the 31st, Dan Mitrione and Aloysio Dias Gomide. On August 8th they kidnapped Claude Fly. Both Mitrione and Fly worked for AID - Agency for International Development, but both were important CIA agents. Mitrione was adviser to the Uruguayan police and was largely responsible for new torture methods used. Fly posed as agricultural specialist, but, as Mitrione declared in an interview by *Tupamaros* before his death, Fly was one of the chief CIA agents in South America. When the Uruguayan government refused to free political prisoners in exchange for the detained men, *Tupamaros* tried and executed Mitrione. On August 11th in 'Comunicado No. 10, they made quite clear why; "The oligarchs of the Pacheco government, the repressive forces, and North American advisers will answer for our detained companeros."

The Pacheco Areco regime replied with intensive searches throughout Montevideo - hospitals, churches, schools, and cemeteries were not spared. Parliament suspended all constitutional rights for a period of 20 days (12th - 31st August) to help the forces of 'law and order'. Many innocent people were arrested. In the jails police attempted to get information from prisoners by torture. On August 4th, the Uruguayan paper, *Marcha*, published an interview with two of the political prisoners, Felix Bentin, a sugar worker, and José Alberto Mercado, ex-student of the Bar. Both were victims of brutal treatment and of manifest sadism on the part of the prison guards. Felix Bentin, after a month in jail, arrived for the interview, supporting one leg, unable to move his hands for bandages, his back bent low, his left eye closed, already useless. Moreover, last month the Uruguayan police began to apply drugs to prisoners to obtain information. In at least two cases the drug used was Penthotal, a poisonous barbiturate, which has the properties of releasing the subconscious of a person just before losing consciousness. No doctor administers this drug without taking the necessary precautions, one of which is that the patient is hospitalised. Uninterrupted police interrogations and Penthotal didn't produce results. It was decided that the courts should finally decide the fate of the prisoners. Hence, on August 31st, when constitutional rights were reintroduced, the political prisoners were brought under civil jurisdiction.

In the face of this reaction from the government, the *Tupamaros* started the attacks they had promised on the reactionary media, and North American corporations. On August 22nd they took over local radio stations. On August 26th bombs were planted in radio stations and papers of the extreme right. The *Tupamaros* declared: "The fascist press, allied to the dictatorship, sold out to the oligarchy, is entrusted with telling lies and playing down the truth of the facts before the people".

In September, the *Tupamaros* intensified their attacks. On the 4th they carried out 15 commando attacks on North American marines, on bank magnates, (one of the banks attacked was the Mercantile Bank of Uruguay, directly linked to Chase Manhattan), on the office of Eastern Publicity (which runs publicity for the ultra-right-wing group, *Adelante Uruguay*) on OAS officials, on agents in government and political police, and on an official radio commentator.

On the 8th they robbed 40 pounds of dynamite. On the 9th two men assaulted the offices of a textile company, *La Mundial*, and carried off 4,000,000 pesos (16,000 dollars). On the 10th a *NLM* commando group of five or six (one of which was a girl) posing as police, got into a Coca Cola bottling plant. Rounding up the workers, they said, "This isn't with you. It's with gringos", adding, "We don't want anything to happen to you." Taking the employees away from the plant, they planted bombs. Part of the factory was destroyed. The group was immediately picked up by a Mercedes Benz. The same day another commando group arrived in two cars at the North American Standard Oil Company offices. In a 10 minute operation they locked employees in the bathrooms, forced the cashier to open the safe, and took 1,400,000 pesos in cheques (5,000 dollars) and 350,000 pesos in cash (1,000 dollars). They also robbed a Mercantile Bank Security van which was parked but the amount taken is not known.

On September 13th a group of six assaulted the house of secondary school teacher, Carlos Maria Trianon, known for his extreme rightist activities.

On September 14th, two operations were carried out. A group of 15 arrived at the warehouse of the North American textile firm, Sudamtex. They entered through a small side door opened unsuspectingly by the night watchman. The whole of the stock of material for all next year's spring and summer production went up in flames, causing an estimated 4,000,000 dollars damages. Once again, *Tupamaros* were careful to explain to the workers that this wasn't against them: "Don't be worried or afraid, this won't go against you but against the owners of the factory." It was the most spectacular fire since the General Motors' fire in 1969 during Rockefeller's visit. Meanwhile, three *Tupamaros* posed as fishermen got permission to fish in a small lake in San Jose which was alongside the North American Press Wireless. The three arrived at the transmission station, quickly surprised the only person present, a German operator, took him away from the plant and left a bomb. The explosion came out over the air.

On September 16th a fire was started in the North American machine importing firm, International Harvester. The same day, they robbed 4,000 dollars from the National Chalk Factory.

On September 29th *Tupamaros* blew up the Carrasco Bowling Club and the restaurant Rochelle, completely destroying the former and causing serious damages to the latter. The three *NLM* militants explained to the proprietor, cleaner and breadman present in the Bowling Club that they were going to blow the building, "not because of the firm, nor the proprietor, but because it was North Americans, almost exclusively, who met there".

On September 30th attacks were carried out on the property of two pro-government members of Parliament. The first was on a private health clinic of Senator and ex-minister Justino Carrera Sapiza, the second on the private home of Deputy Wilson Graviotto. Both were known for their campaigning for the re-election of Pacheco Areco.

"... insurrection is an art quite as much as war or any other, and subject to certain rules of procedure which, when neglected, will produce the ruin of the party neglecting them ...

"never play with insurrection unless you are prepared to face the consequences of your play ..."

- Marx and Engels. *Revolution and Counter Revolution.*

As part of its repressive policy, the government prohibited the use of certain words- such as *Tupamaros* and *National Liberation Movement* by the media. They are to be referred to as 'common delinquents'. On September 17th, in their *Manifesto to the People*, *Tupamaros* replied:

"The present situation of the country demands political, social and economic solutions. Repression is of no use at all. We hope that now they have us, they understand once and for all that the *National Liberation Movement* isn't a band of delinquents. NLM is no more, no less than the armed political organisations of students, workers, public employees, agricultural labourers, intellectuals, and the unemployed - all the sectors exploited by your (the government's) injustices.

Our militants come from those sectors and we organise, help, and fight in the defence of the interests of those sectors."

In August 1968, after kidnapping Ulyses Pereira Reverbel, President of *UTE*, *Tupamaros* spelt this out more clearly:

"In the face of the flagrant attack that six or seven bankers, speculators, latifundists and traders set up as ministers and governors, are carrying out against the fundamental rights and liberties of our people;

In the face of the fascist attack on the true organisations of the people, workers and students, manifest in the union laws, beatings, militarisation and arrests;

In the face of the immorality of freezing wages and incomes of the poorest sectors, leaving intact the interests of those who have caused the crisis which the country is suffering, and fraudulent devaluations which fill the pockets of speculators who are in government positions;

In the face of the farces of justice which doesn't touch those who have swindled millions from the country, but imprisons and persecutes social fighters like Vique, Santana, Castillo and others;

In the face of handing over our country to North American capital through the international monetary fund and the increasing interference of neighbouring dictatorships in our affairs;

In the face of all this, what we need is to organise the defence of the people, to continue organising the struggle enough to reply to reactionary violence with the revolutionary struggle."

During this period, the article, *30 Questions to a Tupamaro*, appeared in *Pronto Final*, a Chilean periodical (reproduced in *Juventud Rebelde*, Cuba, September 16, 1968). The answer to key questions on

the basic principles of NLM makes this the most important ideological document of the movement:

- "What has been the fundamental principle on which NLM action has been based?"
- The principle that revolutionary action in itself, the very fact of arming, equipping and carrying out acts which violate bourgeois legality generates revolutionary consciousness, organisation and conditions.
...
- What is the basic difference between your organisation and other left-wing organisations?
- The majority of other organisations seem to put more faith in manifestos and giving out theoretical announcements referring to the Revolution, to prepare militants and revolutionary conditions, without understanding that fundamentally it is revolutionary actions which precipitate revolutionary conditions.
...
- Can you give me a historical example of the principle that revolutionary action generates consciousness, organisation and revolutionary conditions?
- Cuba is an example. Instead of the long process of the formation of a mass party, a guerrilla foco is installed with a dozen men and this generates consciousness, organisation and revolutionary conditions which culminate in a true Revolution ...
...
- Nonetheless, a revolutionary movement needs platforms, documents, etc.?
- Of course. But we shouldn't get confused. You don't make a revolution polishing up platforms and programs. The basic principles of a socialist Revolution are given and tried out in countries like Cuba, and there's no need to discuss it more. It's enough to stick to those principles, and show - by deeds - the path of insurrection to achieve their application.
...
- Do you believe that a revolutionary movement should prepare itself for armed struggle at any stage, even when the conditions for armed struggles are non-existent?
- Yes, for two reasons at least. Because an armed left-wing movement can be attacked by repression at any stage in its development and must be prepared to defend its existence ... remember Argentina and Brazil. And because, if from the beginning there is no combative spirit imbued in each militant, then other things will develop: a mere movement which aids the revolution others will make - for example - but not a revolutionary movement in itself.
...
- What are the concrete tasks of a militant in a mass movement, who belongs to NLM?
- If you mean a militant in a trade union or mass movement, he must try to create a circle, whether a group in the union, or all the union, where it is possible to organize help for the action of the armed movement and preparation for entry into that movement.

Theoretical and practical preparation and recruitment will be the main concrete tasks in this circle. And, whenever possible, to carry the union to more radical struggles and to more definitive stages in the class struggle.

...

- What are the main general objectives of the movement at this stage?
- To have an armed group, the most prepared and equipped possible, proved in action.
- To have good relations with other popular movements which help the class struggle.
- To create organs of propaganda to radicalise the struggle and create consciousness.
- To have an efficient mechanism for recruitment of militants with possibilities of theoretical preparation and groups in the mass movement which carry out the tasks we have already mentioned.
- ...
- Does the importance which the movement gives to preparation for armed struggle imply the affirmation that a combatant cannot improvise?
- Armed struggle is a technique which requires knowledge, training, materials, and a combatant psychology. Improvisation in this field will be paid for dearly in lives and failures. The spontaneity put forward by those who vaguely talk about the 'revolution the masses will make' is merely to prolong, or to improvise, precisely the culminating stage of the class struggle. Every vanguard movement, to be able to keep this characteristic in the culminating moment must intervene in that struggle and technically know how to channel popular violence against oppression in such a way that the object is achieved with the least sacrifices possible."

NLM stresses that the movement has no detailed strategy, but general lines which are themselves subject to modification with a change of circumstances. Strategy is worked out according to real contexts:

- "On what real basic facts had the organisation based its general lines of strategy during this period?
- The conviction that the crisis, far from getting better, will get worse every day ... This means that we have a few years ahead in which the people will have to keep on tightening their belts ... A second basic fact for strategy is the high degree of unionisation of the Uruguayan workers. Even if not all the unions are very militant - either for their composition or for their leaders - the very fact that practically all the fundamental services of the State, Banks, Industry and Commerce are organised, constitutes in itself a very positive fact without comparison in America ... It isn't the same, for example, to attack a State in possession of all its forces, as it is a State semi-paralysed by strikes. Another strategic factor to bear in mind - which is negative - is the geographic factor. We haven't got impregnable areas in the territory to set up a guerrilla foco ... To compensate we do have a huge city, with more than 300 square kilometers of buildings, which allows the development of urban struggle ... this means we

have to develop our own strategy ...

Moreover in a strategic study we must always take into account the forces of repression. Our armed forces, some 12,000 men, weakly armed and trained are one of the weakest repressive apparatus in Latin America.

Another important strategic factor is the level of preparation of the revolutionary armed group."

The international character of imperialist repression makes a policy of international solidarity essential for the national liberation struggles of Latin America. *Tupamaros* stress that liberation movements must act irrespective of the frontiers dictated by colonialism and imperialism. As yet, the struggle cannot achieve a global scale but it must be on a continental scale. The first formal indication that this solidarity is being achieved came with the *Declaration of Solidarity* with *NLM* by the *National Liberation Army of Bolivia* on July 31st 1970

"This now begins to constitute an integration on an international scale which will allow us to destroy imperialism more easily. Moreover, it is an indication that not only the enemy is capable of uniting. Revolutionaries can also eschew artificial frontiers so that the ideas of Bolivar and El Che begin to bear fruit."

Equally important in terms of growing solidarity between Latin American revolutionaries, is the tremendous increase of urban commando tactics in neighbouring Brazil and Argentina. On September 27th the Argentine Forces of Liberation assaulted a train and carried off almost 14,000 dollars. At the time another commando group assaulted a subsidiary of the North American Ford motor company, in Cordoba province.

Action in Argentina and Brazil clearly makes intervention by these countries in Uruguay more difficult. The US and Brazilian government clearly put pressure on Pacheco Areco to help liberate the kidnapped men. But there is no doubt they did not pressurize for the exchange proposed by the *Tupamaros*. The lives of a few men were, and still are, less important to the United States and Brazil than the freedom of 180 political prisoners. What the *Tupamaros* are trying to show is that the enemy is a continental enemy, the struggle is a continental struggle.

"...A REVOLUTION IS NOT MADE, IT IS ORGANISED." LEM

It is quite evident that the Pacheco Areco regime is faced with a highly technical military organization. *Tupamaros* are trained combatants, with a considerable proportion of women. The cadres are, on the whole, between twenty and thirty years old. They are experts in the handling of automatic weapons, explosives, and electronic systems of communications, in the driving of all types of vehicles and commando tactics in urban zones. Appropriations of arms, munitions and finances in many of their commando attacks have kept them equipped with the latest of weapons and resources.

On May 10th 1969, the Chief of Police, Raul Berger, admitted the strengthening of the *National Liberation Movement*. He said, "In the whole country we have only 20,000 men and not all of them can be after *Tupamaros*. Moreover, one of them is worth twenty of our men."

The cost of the kidnapping operations was dear to *Tupamaros*. Over 20 of the known militants fell into the hands of the police, including Raul Sendic, who has been underground since 1963 and whom police believe to be leader of the movement. But recent events have shown the *NLM* has suffered no serious setback. Periodically over the past three years, Pacheco Areco's police have arrested, tortured, or simply killed certain militants whom they declared to be leaders, proclaiming at the same time that the movement has been destroyed. Invariably, after suffering losses, *Tupamaros* have struck back with more force than ever.

Secrecy is essential to any revolutionary movement facing the modern repressive system which exists in urban Uruguay. It is evident that the very structure of the movement prevents its disintegration. Anonymity is the weapon of the *Tupamaros* to maintain security. In March 1969, in reply to twelve questions put to *NLM* in Uruguayan periodical, *Al rojo vivo*, *NLM* declared:

"We want to reaffirm our certainty that at this moment is indestructible. The separation of different cells, whose members do not even know each other, gives us the complete certainty that although leaders, middle cadres or militants at the base may fall, the movement will carry on."

What is more, the movement has no 'leaders' as such. In the recorded interview which the *Tupamaros* did with Mitrione, the kidnapped CIA agent, there is the following dialogue:

Mitrione:

"You (Tupamaros) do a good job. You are well organized. You must have good leaders."

Tupamaro:

"Well - I ought to tell you - and I hope you believe me: We have no leaders. There are some who are more or less important, but nothing like leaders. We discuss everything. We aren't important, at least I'm not, but there are others who are. We are all compañeros."

The nucleus of *NLM* is formed of militants who are completely underground. But there obviously also exists a large network of people who lead normal lives but provide help for the movement in many different ways. These peripheral helpers are considered very important by *NLM*:

"The one who gets materials necessary for operations, the one who deals with financial matters, the one who loans his car for operations, who loans his house, is moving a risk as great as, or greater than, the members of the action group. You must realize that revolutionaries have spent most of their time in small practical things without which there is no revolution."

- 30 Questions to a Tupamaro.

Specialists in the movement include lawyers, doctors, economists, and electronics experts. On various occasions they have analysed documents they have taken, and within days have placed them in the hands of commissions and courts, together with thorough economic and financial studies. Electronics experts have given NLM the capacity to interrupt radio and T.V. broadcasts to transmit their declarations to the people. The mobile underground transmitter which they have been operating since 1969, has not been discovered even by US experts sent to Uruguay for that purpose.

Invisible to the people by the very nature of their movement, *Tupamaros* depend on the understanding of the masses that NLM is acting in their interests to gain popular support. For this reason, all operations have been specifically directed against the interests of the Pacheco Areco regime. NLM declarations and proclamations explain in simple terms the real nature of the present crisis in Uruguay, and why *Tupamaros* have, over the past few years, sharpened class divisions in Uruguay, and provoked serious ministerial crises and splits in the government. In 1968, in *30 Questions to a Tupamaro*, when asked, "In what way does crisis and popular discontent enter into strategy?", the answer was quite clear:

"In the objective and the subjective conditions for revolution. It is of basic importance that the majority of the population, although not ready for insurrection, at least is not prepared either to kill itself for a regime striking against the people. This, among other things, reduces the strategic calculations against the enemy practically to its armed forces, and allows a climate favourable to the first measures of a revolutionary government."

Highly organised, trained and equipped to challenge the forces of repression, *Tupamaros* have succeeded in creating the polarization of revolutionary energy and the political crisis which at this moment challenge the whole basis of the Pacheco Areco regime.

Jean Stubbs;

* * * * *

This article was originally sent in to the Red Mole. It was too long for that paper. The editor of the Red Mole felt that he would not like to shorten it because of the large amount of factual material of interest to British Revolutionaries it contained. He therefore suggested that the INTERNATIONAL should print it. We readily agreed although we are not in full agreement with its entire political line and its author may not be with ours, nevertheless, we felt it was a valuable contribution to an important debate and needed to be printed in full - The Editors.



THE RED MOLE THE RED MOLE THE

For regular information on the struggle in Britain, read *The Red Mole*, a 12-page fortnightly which carries articles on working-class history, trade union struggles, etc. in addition to detailed coverage on anti-imperialist struggles in Asia, Africa and Latin America. In the last few issues, for example, we have carried:

TRADE UNION NEWS:— 3 articles on the miners strike, a detailed discussion on the struggle against productivity deals in British Oxygen, on the trade union struggle in the South West, report on the Women cleaners' strike.

WORKING CLASS HISTORY:— Articles on the trade union movement in the 1920s, on the 1926 General Strike, etc.

IRELAND:— Analysis of recent events in northern Ireland, interviews with the leaders of the Irish Republican Movement, a controversial exchange between Conor Cruise O'Brien and Raynor Lynght.

FOREIGN NEWS:— Special reports on the situation in Central Africa; detailed analysis of situation in Nigeria after the end of the civil war; accounts of attacks by Italian police on Italian militants. Special reports on repression of revolutionary socialists in Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union and their struggle against bureaucracy.

SPECIAL FEATURES:— Articles on the attitude of revolutionary socialists towards the Trade Unions and detailed analysis of the Tory anti-worker proposals.

Send for a sample copy to 182 Pentonville Road, London N.1, or your nearest Red Circle (see list).

SUBSCRIBE SUBSCRIBE SUBSCRIBE

Please send me *THE RED MOLE* for the next 6/12 months. I enclose cheque/P.O./cash for £1/£2.

Name

Address

INTERNATIONAL

SUBSCRIPTION FORM

Name

Address

Subs: 3/- per issue/£1 per annum/£2 airmail to Africa, Asia, Latin America/N. America

Send to: INTERNATIONAL, 182 Pentonville Road, London N.1.

THE DOCKS BEFORE DEVLIN

The acceptance by the docks unions of the implementation of the second stage of the recommendations of the Devlin Commission into the docks will change the entire face of dockland. This present article deals with the problems of dockers as they existed before the acceptance of the Devlin Report. In a future issue we hope to deal with the problems of trade union organisation in the docks following the introduction of Devlin Stage two.

THE HIRING

When you think of the traditional militancy of the dockworker, it seems surprising that the Port employers have reduced the Dock labour force nationally from 63,000 in 1966 to the present 52,000. To understand the dockers' fairly passive acceptance of the first phase of Devlin, it is necessary to examine the day to day life and insecurity under the 1947 Dockworker Regulation of Employment Scheme (now known as the "Old Scheme").

The daily lot of the docker was humiliating, degrading and insecure. A good example of what regularly occurred throughout the country is Sector 5, the West India Docks and Millwall. Employed in these enclosed docks were some 2,000 men, of which 1,200 were permanently employed by the Port of London Authority. The remaining 800 were employed by the National Dock Labour Board, on the "Pool".

The Pool men would attend the employers' call-stand each morning at 7.45. In a busy period most of them would find work at wages at least as good as the national average. In slack periods, the situation would be that 800 men lined in front of the call-stand, pushing and shoving each other, jockeying for a position in order to attract the attention of the call-on, and gain the coveted work-ticket.

Slack periods could last two, three, four or even eight weeks, and the unemployed men would compete even more fiercely, to the point of physical violence. On a number of occasions the pushing and shoving from the back of the crowd has resulted in the iron barriers being broken down. Whilst not common, neither was it uncommon for the scuffle work to end in some of the men sustaining injuries such as broken arms and legs.

Should the employer only require 300 of the 800 men, the remaining 500 men would then report to the NDLB for allocation to work in other sectors; if work happened to be available there. If not, they would be credited with 9/- a turn, or 18/- a day unemployment pay; and should they have been unemployed for any full week, they would enjoy the princely sum of £9, less deductions for normal unemployment and tax.

Anyone reading this might be justified in thinking that the description of the call took place in the bad old days of the 19th century. But these animal-like scenes occurred on most call-stands every day of the week as recently as 1966. Places such as Sector 4 (Royal Group) would have a number of call-stands for the 8,000-strong labour force. Thus these scenes were multiplied many times over.

The unemployment pay which the men received from the NDLB was in fact deducted from their wages whenever they were at work *in addition to their normal unemployment contributions*. Even though the NDLB acted as a private Labour Exchange, these men had paid twice for that unemployment pay and yet received several pounds less than they'd have drawn if they came from any other industry and drawn State benefits.

WHAT BOSS-WORKER RELATIONS WERE LIKE

The conditions which prevailed were excellent from the point of view of the Port employer. He had at his disposal a highly skilled labour force which could be readily transferred on a short-term basis between sectors. And for this privilege, he had to pay proportionately less in times of unemployment than other comparable employers in outside industry.

The competition for work brought sharp divisions and bitterness among the men and this was to the employer's benefit, as was the favoured treatment of a minority of perman.

The disadvantage to the employer was that the Pool system produced solidarity among the men. Those left unemployed in the "pen" after the call would often discuss their common plight. But besides this, the Pool men went from employer to employer never having a regular relationship with any one of them. Thus it was impossible for the myth of employer loyalty (prevalent in only too many industries) to condition the dockers' minds.

Another factor which rankled many a Port employer was that if a man was too militant or committed a misdemeanour, he could not be directly disciplined by the boss. Instead, the employer would have to report him to the NDLB who in turn would receive the Doctor's excuse in writing, and if they saw fit, they would summon the man to appear before a Joint Employer-Trade Union disciplinary committee of the NDLB.

Another peculiarity was that although the employer in a slack period would instruct his caller-on not to engage a difficult man, in a busy period where the employer had to indent to the local board, he could not refuse the man allocated, even though the man may have had a militant record.

This relationship between boss and worker is most unusual.

Under the present social system of capitalism, the boss has a range of arbitrary powers. In particular, he has the "right" of hiring workers when they are profitable to him, and firing them when they are no longer useful to his ends. The NDLB system limits this dictatorial power somewhat, and provided a basis for the confidence that workers need to be militant.

THE ATTRACTION OF DEVLIN

How could a traditionally militant group of workers like dockers be divided and in some sectors demoralised by the Devlin rationalisation? The answer is to be found in the minimum security that Phase 1 offered. A guaranteed minimum basic unemployment pay of £17 was the main carrot that the employer dangled, in addition to permanent status.

Something which sapped dockers' strength and solidarity was the obvious inequalities that took place daily in their working lives.

Some of the labour force were permanently employed before the Devlin scheme. The rest ("Pool men") suffered week after week of unemployment on a take-home pay of £8, and saw some of his fellow dockers in his own Union enjoying a regular income in some cases four or five times as great as his own.

Of course, the employers would aggravate this situation. Where it was necessary to the smooth running of the Dock to employ three gangs of men in striking cargoes from lorries or railway trucks, or in delivery to road and rail transport, the boss would only engage one well-paid gang, and thus add to the overall unemployment position. Devlin seemed to offer the Pool man a better basis for meeting his domestic commitments.

THE STAND OF THE UNIONS

The underlying idea of a system of joint control should be that *all* the labour force receive equal opportunity. For the unions to allow a minority of men to be permanently employed and under the control of private Stevedoring Companies must surely weaken and eventually destroy the joint control. Despite many claims that joint control was a step towards workers' control over their industry and their lives, the so-called "Left" T.U. leaders who paid lip-service to the principle of workers' control never even took advantage of periods of full employment and traditional militancy to prevent the employers damaging the old scheme.

Strangled by yards of red tape of their own making, the bureaucracy conveniently forgets that Rule 2a commits them to the opposite of what they allowed to take place. This rule has been gathering dust in the rule book for 50 years; surely long enough even for the sloth-like Officialdom. It has been the practice of all the major unions and the TUC to play about with pious proposals on paper. But such resolutions remain paper tigers without the determined leadership and rank-and-file commitment. (A close parallel is the Equal Pay for Women resolution of the TUC now 80 years old; and only resurrected by the strike action of the Ford women workers).

Besides the paper rule, the demand of nationalisation has come from below. Instead of mounting a campaign on this issue, they chose to collaborate with the employers' rationalisation programme, as contained in Devlin.

It was the union leaders who accepted that dockers must bargain for a decent minimum security level, by selling their hard-won practices in exchange for what should in any case be automatic rights. These misbegotten people never before nor at any stage during the Devlin negotiations advanced alternative proposals on behalf of the rank and file.

For two years the union branches had voiced objections and raised alternatives to the new scheme: only to be told that the negotiations had gone too far already. Yet when the Royal and West India Docks Unofficial Liaison Committee had successfully fought for an enquiry on Devlin itself, the T&G was forced to voice 189 separate objections to the scheme—other than those of the Liaison Committee. These objections had not suddenly arrived from the branches, but had been held up in the bureaucratic channels.

Although in theory it is lay committees like the Docks Divisional and the Docks Trade Group that have the final say, in practice it rests with the full-time, appointed, paid T.U. officials. Seeing their role as guardians of the National Interest, they set out to help solve the ever-present Problems of the Economy by spending hours convincing the lay membership to subordinate their interests to those of the employers.

How often are these officials, paid from contributions, going to use their time to kid and con us rather than representing us and initiating improvements? There is a saying that it's easier to get an audience with the Queen than to find a union official when a dispute occurs. Some dockers having been on many delegations to Transport House think that Mr. Tim O'Leary O.B.E., National Docks Secretary of the T&G, is a figment of somebody's imagination since he's never in. If he's out negotiating on our behalf, perhaps he'd find out what the rank and file want if he made time to meet us.

Why does Mr. O'Leary find it difficult to meet us? *It is because he has no need to, since he is not under our control, i.e. not elected and not subject to recall.*

Dockers need to have control of their union as much as they need control of their lives.

THE HONEYMAN ENQUIRY

In April 1966 the threat of unofficial militant action forced Mr. Gunter (the then Minister of Labour) to promptly set up another enquiry into all the clauses of Devlin, and its effects.

T.U. officials had for a year been touring the branches trying to sell Devlin, and counter their members' objections by saying that negotiations had gone too far for them to change the course of events. *But they and the Government found out that one of these events was the resistance of the rank and file.*

In May 1966 one of the main propagators of productivity and rationalisation bargaining Tim O'Leary, was put in the invidious position of voicing the objections to the scheme.

Since there have been more High Court Judges employed on Docks enquiries than there are dockers employed during slack periods in the dock, very few gave any credence to the new enquiry. However, many militants used the enquiry to publicly voice their grievances.

Many politicians have bemoaned the fact that workers seldom consciously relate their industrial actions with political questions. But during Honoyman, the whole theme of the rank and file's objections focussed on the issue of *control*. Every rank-and-file spokesman

who addressed dock gate meetings at London, Liverpool, Hull and Manchester was emphatically against any extension of the power of the private employers. The attack on the scheme was also directed against the precedent of denationalisation, which could jeopardise any industry in which there was a limited measure of joint control.

Furthermore, any extension of the power of private employers *condones the major restrictive practice in the Docks*, i.e. the very existence of those employers. Not only do they use and control labour, but they do this in their own interest of private profit, instead of in the interest of the community and common good. The 1947 scheme and even Devlin despite its conclusions are indictments of the employers on moral, economic and humane grounds. Of course social responsibility comes nowhere, when your only concern is to get a casual job done as quickly as possible, with as little commitment to the men who do the work as possible, for as much profit as possible.

Without being politically conscious, nevertheless dockers saw what infringements to their freedom total employers' control would mean. The issue of control is highly political: but dockers must become aware of the political nature of their actions. Pointing this out is central to the role of the revolutionary agitator.

THE ROLE OF ENQUIRIES

Whenever T.U. officials can no longer hold back the rank and file with delaying tactics, vague promises and constitutional buck-passing, then the employers ask the State to intervene. In a capitalist economy (i.e. where production takes place for profit) the State always and inevitably takes the side of the employers. In the atmosphere created by the State's intervention other agents of the bosses—the monopoly press—embark on a programme of discrediting the militants and distorting the root causes of the dispute.

On examination of Government Enquiries, one finds the same pattern emerges in all cases. The Devlin Enquiry on the Docks saw the militants as Luddite-type wreckers, while also saying, tongue in cheek, that the employers had some responsibility. The Cameron Enquiry on the Barbican strike took exactly this stance. The pattern continues with Geddes on Shipbuilding; Pearson on Seamen; Devlin on Printworkers; Roberts on the Port Talbot Steelworkers, etc.

The role of the Enquiry is to appear as a neutral, unbiassed referee. Yet the result is always the same. A return to work is required. Production must not be held up further, in the name of the "National Interest". The most powerful right of the workers, their collective refusal to work, is itself threatened nowadays, again in the "National Interest".

We reject this high-sounding phrase as being part of the propaganda smokescreen that surrounds every dispute and enquiry. The society we live in is split into those who have only their labour to sell in the form of wages or salaries; and those who own property in the form of firms, stocks and shares, land, housing, etc., from which they get profits, rents, dividends and interest. The minority in the second group are unnecessary in the process of production, being parasitical upon the labour of the great majority of society. Through their economic power (Inland Revenue figures for 1967 show that 10% of the population owns 75% of the total wealth, leaving 50 million people to share the remaining 25%), this class rules politically. Between the forces of Labour and Capital, there is no community of interest: in a class-divided society, appeals to anything "National" obscure these divisions and thereby help the rich and the powerful to become richer and more powerful.

Terry Barrett

LENIN AND TROTSKY ON TERRORISM

The recent trial of Basque nationalists and the assassination of Pierre Laporte both bring up the question of the attitude of Marxists towards terrorism as a political weapon. Most of the commonly quoted Marxist writings on this subject were in fact heavily biased in one direction or another because of immediate political considerations. For example, Trotsky's testimony to the Dewey Commission was concerned to rebuff charges that he was supporting terror as a political tactic against the Stalinist leadership inside the USSR. He therefore stated very clearly the arguments against terror as a political weapon while he did not discuss to the same extent the position of solidarity which Marxists adopt towards, for example, oppressed national groups who resort to the use of terror against their imperialist rulers. Similarly Lenin's polemics with the Narodniks were heavily influenced by the need to combat the view that terror was in itself a sufficient weapon to change society. For this reason we print here two short articles by Lenin and Trotsky on the subject of terror which were written in very different circumstances. Both articles show that the attitude of Marxists towards terror and towards terrorists is far more complicated than is presented by those who simply condemn terrorist actions out of hand and forget the obligation of Marxists to defend those who are struggling against exploitation and oppression even when those actually engaged in the struggle adopt methods which Marxists know will not attain the aims which are being fought for.

TROTSKY: FOR GRYNSZPAN

This article was written by Trotsky on the occasion of the trial of Herschel Grynszpan, who killed a Nazi official in the German Embassy in Paris on 7th November 1938. His trial was postponed indefinitely when France and Germany declared war in 1939. After the occupation of France, he was transferred to a concentration camp in Germany and his subsequent fate is unknown.

[Reprinted from *Socialist Appeal*, 14th February 1939.]

It is clear to anyone even slightly acquainted with political history that the policy of the Fascist gangsters directly and sometimes deliberately provokes terrorist acts. What is most astonishing is that so far there has been only one Grynszpan. Undoubtedly the number of such acts will increase. We Marxists consider the tactic of individual terror inexpedient in the tasks of the liberating struggle of the proletariat as well as oppressed nationalities. A single isolated hero cannot replace the masses. But we understand only too clearly the inevitability of such convulsive acts of despair and vengeance. All our emotions, all our sympathies are with the self-sacrificing avengers even though they have been unable to discover the correct road. Our sympathy becomes intensified because Grynszpan is not a political militant but an inexperienced youth, almost a boy, whose only counsellor was a feeling of indignation. To tear Grynszpan out of the hands of capitalist justice, which is capable of chopping off his head to further serve capitalist diplomacy, is the elementary, immediate task of the international working class!

THE STALINIST CAMPAIGN

All the more revolting in its police stupidity and inexpressible violence is the campaign now being conducted against Grynspan by command of the Kremlin in the international Stalinist press. They attempt to depict him as an agent of the Nazis or an agent of Trotskyists in alliance with the Nazis. Lumping into one heap the provocateur and his victim, the Stalinists ascribe to Grynspan the intention of creating a favourable pretext for Hitler's pogrom measures. What can one say of these venal "journalists" who no longer have any vestiges of shame? Since the beginning of the socialist movement the bourgeoisie has at all times attributed all violent demonstrations of indignation, particularly terrorist acts, to the degenerating influence of Marxism. The Stalinists have inherited, here as elsewhere, the filthiest tradition of reaction. The Fourth International may, justifiably, be proud that the reactionary scum, including the Stalinists, now automatically links with the Fourth International every bold action and protest, every indignant outburst, every blow at the executioners.

It was so, similarly, with the International of Marx in its time. We are bound, naturally, by ties of open moral solidarity to Grynspan and not his "democratic" jailers, or the Stalinist slanderers, who need Grynspan's corpse to prop up, even if only partially and indirectly, the verdicts of Moscow justice. Kremlin diplomacy, degenerated to its marrow, attempts at the same time to utilise this "happy" incident to renew their machinations for an international agreement among various governments, including that of Hitler and Mussolini, for a mutual extradition of terrorists. Beware, masters of fraud! The application of such a law will necessitate the immediate deliverance of Stalin to at least a dozen foreign governments.

The Stalinists shriek in the ears of the police that Grynspan attended "meetings of Trotskyites". That, unfortunately, is not true. For had he walked into the milieu of the Fourth International he would have discovered a different and more effective outlet for his revolutionary energy. People come cheap who are only capable of fulminating against injustice and bestiality. But those who, like Grynspan, are able to act as well as conceive, sacrificing their own lives if need be, are the precious leaven of mankind.

SEEK ANOTHER ROAD

In the moral sense, although not for his mode of action, Grynspan may serve as an example for every young revolutionist. Our open moral solidarity with Grynspan gives us an added right to say to all the other would-be Grynspans, to all those capable of self-sacrifice in the struggle against despotism and bestiality: **Seek another road!** Not the lone avenger can free the oppressed but only a great revolutionary movement of the masses which will leave no remnant of the entire structure of class exploitation, national oppression and racial persecution. The unprecedented crimes of fascism create a yearning for vengeance wholly justifiable. But so monstrous is the scope of their crimes, that this yearning cannot be satisfied by the assassination of isolated fascist bureaucrats. For that it is necessary to set in motion millions, ten and hundreds of millions of the oppressed throughout the whole world and lead them in the assault upon the strongholds of the old society. Only the overthrow of all forms of slavery, only the complete destruction of fascism, only the people sitting in merciless judgement over the contemporary bandits and gangsters can provide real satisfaction to the indignation of the people. This is precisely the task that the Fourth International has set itself. It will cleanse the labour movement of the plague of Stalinism. It will rally in its ranks the heroic generation of the youth. It will cut a path to a worthier and a more humane future.

LENIN : ON THE ATTEMPTED ASSASSINATION OF THE AUSTRIAN PRIME MINISTER

The following extract is from a letter Lenin wrote to Franz Koritschoner in October 1916. It deals with the attempted assassination of the Austrian Prime Minister. Notable is the way in which Lenin attacks terrorist action but at the same time emphasises that for Marxists the question of individual terrorism is a purely tactical question and it is for tactical reasons only that he does not support the attempted assassination. He also stresses, in a section of the letter we have not included, the necessity for conducting a defence of the attempted assassin. He therefore finishes the letter by stating that, "I fear that the Austrian Government will pronounce Frederick Adler insane, and will not allow a trial. But if he is brought to trial then a distribution of leaflets must be organised without fail."

I would ask you to send us information about Friedrich Adler's action [attempted assassination of the Austrian Prime Minister, Count Sturg, 21 Oct., 1916].

The local papers here (the "Berner Tagwacht" and "Volksrecht"; do you receive both, or neither?) extol this act. "Avanti" (do you ever see it?) says Friedrich Adler is the author of the well-known manifesto of the Austrian Internationalists. Is that so? And how can one speak openly about it?

- (1) Did Friedrich Adler mention his plan to anyone?
- (2) Did he hand over to some friend his documents, letters and announcements so that they might be published later on?
- (3) Is it true (as the Vienna "Arbeiter Zeitung" says) that he was in the minority everywhere (in the Railway Club and other places), and how great was that minority?
- (4) Is it true that his position in the organisation became "intolerable"?
- (5) Did he have only seven votes to support him at the last Party Conference?
- (6) At the last two meetings of trusted members [the Social Democratic Party Executive] he very bluntly attacked the Party and demanded demonstrations (and what sort of demonstrations?).

Please write as fully as possible about these questions and send more information to me about Friedrich Adler. Unless you give us special instructions, we shall print in our newspapers everything we receive from you (and we shall also publish it in the local German press, as our editorial material).

As far as the political value of this act is concerned, we obviously keep to our confirmed opinion, based on many years' experience, that individual terroristic acts are impractical means of political strife.

"Killing is no murder" our old "Iskra" [No. 20] said about terroristic acts. We do not at all oppose political killing (in this sense, the servile written statements of the Opportunists in "Vorwärts" and the Vienna "Arbeiter Zeitung" are simply revolting), but as revolutionary tactics, individual attempts are both impractical and harmful. It is only a mass movement that can be considered to be a real political struggle. Individual terroristic acts can be, and must be, helpful, only when they are directly linked with the mass movement. In Russia the terrorists (against whom we always fought) made a number of such attempts, but in December, 1905, when the cause had at last reached the point of being a mass movement, a rising, and when it was necessary to help the masses to use force, then the terrorists were not there to do it. That is where the terrorists fail!

POLEMIC

In International No. 2 there appeared a review of Rayner Lysaght's book *The Republic of Ireland*. Here he writes his reply to the review. We naturally disagree with the comments he makes but we have not answered them here. Instead the very important points he raises are dealt with in a forthcoming article on Marxism and the National Question which will be appearing in International.

Remarks on the Bourgeois and Peasant Revolutions in Ireland

The *International* reviewer (*International*, No. 3) has been more than kind to the present writer in his review of his book, *The Republic of Ireland*. It is, therefore, with reluctance that he must remark on the essentially algebraic nature of Mr. Jones' criticisms thereof.

He suggests that "Where we might have some more important disagreement with Lysaght is on his views on the bourgeois revolution in Ireland". He is telling the truth. His definition of the Irish bourgeois revolution is reached by the non-Marxist method of creating a yardstick by which to measure such a concept. He states that "the content of the bourgeois revolution is the taking of state power by the bourgeoisie and the shaping of the country's social and economic structure in the interests of that class". This is correct theoretically (though it avoids the whole question of national unity, so important in Ireland and so tied up, through the building of the home market, with the "shaping of the country's ... economic structure"). The trouble is that it ignores the realities of revolting bourgeoisies. For, with the exception of the French one, no bourgeois revolution has, in fact, carried out the tasks allotted it in copybook style. One can add to this two corollaries. Firstly that the French example makes a nonsense of the assumption as to the relationship between the democratic revolutionary tasks and their potentialities to help fulfill the tasks of capitalism: the country with the earliest successful European bourgeois revolution was also one of the last to manage to industrialise itself. Secondly, the impossibility of being able to talk in real terms of a generalised "bourgeois" or "democratic revolution" must be so due to the laws of combined and uneven development. Imperialism has intensified these laws to the point where a classical bourgeois revolution is unthinkable.

So, in Ireland, the fulfillment of the "bourgeois revolution" could not mean as much as it had done in France, or in Italy, because no section of the Irish bourgeoisie could, being capitalists, break cleanly with imperialism. There could be no *Kulturkampf*: 6 of the 32 Counties had to be renounced, the economic benefits could not be used immediately. Nonetheless, Cumann na nGaedhach had fulfilled the Irish bourgeois revolution as it had occurred. Fianna Fail could do no more than modify it; nor can any other Party of bourgeois revolution. What the latter could do was achieve the peasant revolution within the limitations maintained by capitalist control of the state power. Peasant revolution is bound to be a form of petty-bourgeois struggle; its aims are tied to a form of property (the land); its enemies are the landlords and, where the capitalists have been ready and willing to attack its enemies, it becomes an interest allied distinctly to that of the small businessmen, hostile to big capital, mistrusting labour and, objectively, only able to achieve liberation on terms that will liberate them, effectively, from their beloved property.

In the earliest stages of the world development of capitalism, the peasant revolution petered out in isolated *jacqueries*; the capitalists allied with the landlords against the king who tried, half-heartedly, to appeal beyond them to his poorer subjects. From this, matters developed in different ways. In France the king became identified with the nobility, whilst the bourgeoisie united with the rural tenants to bring down both. In Italy, the old system continued; the bourgeoisie, to unite the country, made a deal with the landlords against the ducal and royal rivals to the House of Savoy (a deal shown vividly in Lampedusa's *The Leopard*). In Germany, the capitalists were still less able to help themselves, let alone the peasants. In Russia, the *muziks* were rebuffed consistently by the capitalists and turned in desperation to the Bolsheviks and Left S.R.s. In Ireland the bourgeoisie used the peasants' demands to take over the national movement from the remnants of a previous and aborted national capitalist class. However, Ireland was still a colony: the metropolitan power tried to take the wind from the national movement's sails by granting its peasant supporters the form of their demands. But, as Davitt knew well, the reality of their claims could not be granted except by socialistic measures. Accordingly, the peasant struggle continued until, in 1932, Fianna Fail came to power and halved the land annuities that the peasants paid instead of rents.

Since then, helped by the facts that they had their land in title (however circumscribed in fact) and that the Labour movement was incompetent to win their support, the Irish small farmers have "moved steadily rightwards. Hence "all that can be expected from (most of) them immediately" (i.e. in the immediate period) is neutrality. What the author does add to this (and what his reviewer fails to mention) is that "a minority (centred on the free collectives) may be expected to become entirely progressive and the small farmers' land hunger may yet be used to this effect, as Sinn Féin's Seamus Costello is hoping", in the long (normal) or short (revolutionary) run. The author is not dogmatic on the subject; his bias, such as it is, was a necessary corrective for a time when Stalinites and opportunists of all kinds were professing (as does the Labour Party still, it seems) to see in the rancher, Deasy, the Michael Davitt *de nos jours*.

One point the author did neglect, however, and surprisingly, the reviewer failed to correct him. Much more should have been made of Ireland's dependence on the process of Permanent Revolution. The last paragraph but two of Chapter 8 is far too vague on this. A clearer statement is needed that a United Socialist States of Europe is the real alternative to the E.E.C. and that it, alone, can help the Workers Republic of Ireland to thrive.

But such faults can be corrected in the second edition which must come if enough people buy the book.

BOOK REVIEWS

Karl Marx: Early Texts: translated and edited by David McLellan (Basil Blackwell). 25/- (p&p 3/-) from Red Books.

In the 1930s, "Marxism" became fashionable among a large section of the intellectuals in Europe and America. It largely took the form of fellow-travelling with the Stalinised Third International. Even the trials of the 1930s failed to shake the loyalty of all but a few of these fellow-travellers. Here and there a protesting voice was heard. Some, like Koestler, turned from Marxism to unbridled anti-communism. A few others, unwilling to throw the baby out with the bathwater, claimed to discover in the younger Marx of the early 1840s a "more critical and undogmatic humanism" than in the later Marx and, of course, in Bolshevism, which they were now beginning to equate with Stalinism. The destruction of German Social-Democracy by Hitler also led to a lot of "new thinking" about the future of socialism, and its exponents also turned to the earlier writings of Marx for inspiration.

But the cult of the "Young Marx" received its greatest impulse after Khrushchev's 20th Congress speech, exposing the crimes of Stalin. Although everything he said had long been known—especially through the writings of Leon Trotsky—even the most devoted fellow-traveller could no longer shut his eyes to the nature of the regime in the Soviet Union. To denounce Marxism, however, would be to denounce their own past and especially their theoretical integrity. So they sought refuge in the "Young Marx". This tendency received a fresh impetus after the events in Poland and Hungary in 1956/7.

This neo-Marxism even became respectable. Courses in Marxism were instituted at universities which had never before even included it in their curriculums. The whole intellectual world seemed suddenly to be debating Marx's theory of "alienation". While ignoring his writings on economics and dismissing dialectical materialism as so much "metaphysical hot air", there was increasing interest in Marx as a "humanist" and respect for his profound understanding of history and human nature.

To these people it appeared that there were "two Marxes" and an irreconcilable clash between the early writings and the mature system of Marx's later years. The "Young Marx", according to these newly fashionable thinkers, was first and foremost a philosopher rather than an economist.

Marx: Early Texts

This collection of Marx's earlier works should convince any honest reader that the "two Marxes", which the neo-Marxists claim to have discovered, simply show how little they really understand Marxism, despite their intellectual pretensions. What is true, of course, is that his thinking developed and matured over the years. Marx was no ivory-tower philosopher shut up in the reading room of the British Museum, as so many assume. He, with Engels, was passionately involved in the class struggles of his day. They learned from actual events and applied their analytical method—dialectical materialism—to these events. Their aim was to help to change the world and not merely to explain it. A study of these writings leaves no doubt about the unity of Marx's thought after he had broken with the idealistic conceptions of Hegel.

As David McLellan points out in his valuable introduction, there is no justification for those who claim that alienation as a concept was central to Marx's early thought but abandoned by him later. Daniel Bell, for example, has said that "whereas in the young Marx there was a double vision of the nature of alienation... Marx's thoughts developed along one narrow road of economic conceptions of poverty and exploitation while the other road which might have led to new, humanistic concepts of work and labour, was left unexplored." McLellan replies that "not only the concept but also the term itself occurs on several occasions in *Capital*". In Vol. I (p.432 Moscow Edition), Marx writes: "the character of independence and estrangement which the capitalist mode of production as a whole gives to the instruments of labour and to the products, as against the workman, is developed by the means of machinery into a thorough antagonism". McLellan goes on to say that "it is not only a question of terminology, the contents too of *Capital* is a continuation of Marx's early thoughts. The main theme of Volume I of *Capital*, surplus-value, rests on the equation of work and value that goes back to the concept of man as a being who creates and the conditions of his life—a conception outlined in the *Paris Manuscripts*." (1844) Marx the philosopher, Marx the economist, Marx the revolutionary socialist, was one, the unifying thread being dialectical materialism.

Any doubt which may still have existed about the continuity of Marx's thought was finally laid to rest by the publication of *Grundrisse der Kritik der Politischen Oekonomie (Elements of a Critique of Political Economy)*. Written in 1857, mainly for the purpose of clarifying his own thinking, this 1,000-page draft served as a basis for *Critique of Political Economy* (1859) and of *Capital* (1867). Marx himself wrote to Lassalle that the *Grundrisse* represented "the result of 15 years' research, that is to say the best years of my life."

Early Texts is essential reading for all who want to thoroughly understand Marxism and the development of Marx's thought. It is an excellent collection and lucidly translated.

C. van Gelderen.

Guerrilla Movements in Latin America by Richard Gott. (Nelson, 100/-)

For many who have been overawed by the fact that Latin America is an extremely large geographical entity, thousands of miles away and therefore a trifle difficult to study in detail, Richard Gott's book will provide a useful

starting point. However the book does not cover the whole of Latin America: the only countries discussed are Guatemala, Venezuela, Colombia, Peru, and of course Bolivia. This somewhat limits the scope of the book; for instance Nicaragua and Uruguay, where the guerrillas are both active and, within their own terms of reference, partially successful, are mentioned only briefly, and that too only in the concluding chapter as though an after-thought. Neither is there any reference to the guerrilla experience in Brazil and Argentina, which is rather unfortunate, as developments and changes in these two countries to a certain extent determine the future of the rest of Latin America, and without an analysis and balance sheet of their respective revolutionary movements it is impossible to grasp the totality of the struggle.

However, despite these failings the book provides certain useful documentary information relating to the role which the Stalinist parties and formations have played in Latin America.

The betrayal of the Guatemalan C.P. which found itself quite at home when it came to supporting the candidacy of liberal members of the bourgeoisie for various positions, but which adopted ambivalent positions towards the guerrilla struggle, and which withdrew party cadres when total manipulation of the struggle could not be ensured, is well documented. A similar, but in the final analysis a more treacherous, role was played by the Venezuelan C.P. The situation in Venezuela was so obviously pre-revolutionary that the C.P. was forced despite itself to set up a guerrilla front. While this front included a certain number of non-Stalinist radicals, its political and military policies were decided by the Venezuelan C.P. Despite this, the C.P. leadership in Caracas, the Venezuelan capital, could not totally control the actions of the FALN (Fuerzas Armadas de Liberación Nacional) in the countryside. The latter engaged in what the Party was later to term "ultra-leftism" and "adventurism". With a "reactionary" President replaced after an "election" by a "less reactionary" one (the degree of his reaction depending, of course, on his attitude towards the C.P.), a convenient excuse came into existence. The new President announced publicly in his inauguration address that if the C.P. was prepared to renounce "violence" he would personally remove the ban on it and its activities. In May 1964 the Central Committee of Venezuelan Stalinism announced:

"We the Communists again say to the country: if an all-embracing amnesty is declared, if public liberties are restored, if the right to legal action for the banned parties is restored, if officers jailed or exiled because of their national-

list positions are re-admitted into the armed forces with full rights, then political struggles in the country can be directed along peaceful paths."

From now on the Venezuelan C.P. were to move rapidly rightwards. A slanderous campaign was begun against the guerrilla leader Douglas Bravo who was not allowed any rights inside the C.P. Several months later he broke with the party as did numerous other militants. This led Fidel Castro to publicly denounce the C.P. as having betrayed the guerrillas. The Cuban state began to help the guerrillas directly. The Venezuelan experience demonstrated even to the blind that the Latin American C.P.s were no different from their European counterparts. With a few exceptions the "peaceful road to socialism" became the norm, and while similar positions in Europe at least enabled revolutionary militants to attack the reformism of the C.P. and engage in fierce polemics, in a continent like Latin America many C.P.s are quite happily prepared to betray the "ultra-lefts" to the oligarchy and its repressive forces. Polemic is thus avoided. The total degeneration of the Communist Parties in Latin America is ably and painstakingly demonstrated by Richard Gott.

Where Gott does make mistakes is in his remarks regarding the "Trotskyist" movement. He fails to acknowledge the fact that the "Trotskyists" who, by their lunatic (literally) sectarianism and bad faith, completely alienated themselves from Yan Sosa's guerrilla detachment and as a result were expelled, in fact belonged to a faction led by Juan Posadas. The latter did not in any way represent the mainstream of the world Trotskyist movement, a fact which Castro also preferred to ignore when he made his celebrated, but completely indiscriminate attack on "Trotskyism" at the Tricontinental Congress in Havana in 1966. (The Cuban *Posadistas* were attacking the Cuban government for building workers' flats, when they felt that the state should have been concentrating on building underground nuclear shelters to prepare for the coming holocaust!). This lapse by Gott is somewhat unfortunate and inexplicable as he is undoubtedly aware of the "Trotskyist" tendencies outside the Fourth International and has written about them elsewhere. A similar mistake is made regarding Peru: in this case Gott categorically states that Hugo Blanco ended his connection with the "international Trotskyist movement" when in fact what Blanco did was simply to cease contact with the Argentinian "Trotskyist" group of Moreno. For many years now Blanco has been a leading member of the International Executive Committee of the Fourth International, which waged a worldwide campaign to secure his release and in doing so probably saved him from almost certain death at the hands of the oligarchy.

What Gott does demonstrate conclusively is that the reason why Blanco could not maintain his peasant base was because of the lack of a fighting unit and he speculates that if the guerrilla bands which spring up later had existed at the same time as Hugo Blanco was leading the peasant struggle, the picture in Peru could well have been different.

While the entire book contains a great deal of valuable information, the chapters on Bolivia are without doubt the most perceptive, and here Gott writes from an intimate knowledge of the territory (he was the first journalist to identify Guevara's dead body) and a deep sense of commitment to the struggle itself. He explains how the political/economic situation in Bolivia combined with its vigorous revolutionary tradition made it the most obvious country in Latin America where a revolutionary overthrow of capital seemed possible. Those militants who think that Bolivia was simply a name on a small piece of paper which Che pulled out of a hat should carefully study the background of the country.

However, what Gott is quite unable to explain is why Che Guevara, who understood better than any other Cuban leader the real nature of the C.P.s, made the fatal mistake of imagining that an alliance with the Bolivian Stalinists led by Monje was a practical possibility. It was precisely this fact which ensured that Che's plan was doomed from the beginning, and to appreciate this fact one has to understand the global role of Stalinism. The links of the Cuban state, or rather its dependence on the Soviet Union, meant that Monje had to be consulted, but surely a revolutionary of Che's experience should not have depended on Monje and the C.P. to provide the urban network so essential for any real success. Gott also is probably not aware of the fact that the POR (Revolutionary Workers Party, Bolivian section of the Fourth International) offered Che their support from the first day of the struggle. Che cabled Havana for approval, but by the time the Cubans replied in the affirmative, the game was already played out and Che's group was encircled by the gorillas. It is possible that if the comrades of POR had been involved in the struggle, Che would still have been alive today. Their knowledge of the territory and their numerical size could well have been decisive.

The defeat of the Bolivian guerrilla, symbolised dramatically by the death of Che, should be seen as the 1905 of the Latin American Revolution. For defeats are not uncommon in struggle, no matter where or how it takes place. The important fact is that we must learn from these defeats and ensure that they are not repeated. Gott correctly quotes Marx as saying:

"With the exception of only a few chapters, every more important part of the annals of the revolution . . . carries the heading: Defeat of the Revolution!"

"What succumbed in these defeats was not the revolution. It was the pre-revolutionary traditional appendages, results of social relationships which had not yet come to the point of sharp class antagonism . . .

"In a word: the revolution made progress, forged ahead, not by its immediate . . . achievements, but, on the contrary, by the creation of a powerful, united counter-revolution, by the creation of an opponent in combat with whom only, the party of overthrow ripened into a really revolutionary party."

But Gott continues to maintain that the *foco* theory could still work, when in fact the whole experience of the guerrillas over the last ten years suggests the very opposite. What is needed is a strong, disciplined, Leninist organisation, based in both the cities and the countryside and capable of sustaining the armed struggle by its roots in the masses.

The guerrillas have not been wrong in recognising that throughout Latin America there exists a pre-revolutionary situation. The imperialists have recognised this as well, which is why they are prepared to permit experiments in "military reformism" in Peru and Bolivia and of "parliamentary socialism" in Chile. They see them as medium-term solutions to contain mass struggles and from that point of view they are partially correct. But this situation cannot last long. The military reformists will soon begin to feel the pressure; Allende will either make decisive moves to pull Chile out of the capitalist world market (in which case we will see a civil war with likely U.S. intervention) or what is more likely, he will simply become a Chilean Harold Wilson.

As Marxists we abhor impressionism and therefore, while we must take into account, the manoeuvrings of American imperialism and its puppet regimes, we cannot afford to lose sight of our own objectives. We have to understand that a pre-revolutionary situation exists in Latin America despite the twists and turns of the bourgeoisie. The weakness of the guerrillas has not been that they have misjudged the objective situation. It has been exactly the reverse: they have not made the adequate preparations to ensure that the subjective factors were capable of meeting the needs of the objective situation. Richard Gott is clearly a bit confused about this himself or else he would not write off not only the peasantry, but also the urban proletariat in Latin America. To make a revolution - neither a party nor the best-prepared of *focos* can substitute its own consciousness for that of the class. They can take steps to develop and arouse working-class consciousness, but that is a completely different story. Impatience is no substitute for theory and only an extremely short-lived substitute for

practice. Rural guerrilla warfare without an organisational base in the urban working-class is a recipe for disaster and if there isn't even an adequate base in the countryside, then the disaster is multiplied. To think that certain aspects of the Cuban experience can be repeated mechanically is to abandon the dialectical method. It would be absurd to think that US imperialism has not learnt the lessons of the Cuban Revolution.

The whole question of organisation, therefore, becomes paramount. Unless revolutionaries have the perspective of building a combat Leninist organisation from the very start they can succumb to political confusion under pressure from "organisational centrists." Of course it goes without saying that revolutionary marxists have to participate in the struggle. They have to help in its preparations and coordinations. They have to be ready to intensify the struggle. In Latin America or rather in many other parts of the semi-colonial world as well, this is the best way to build revolutionary organisations. To simply proclaim the superiority of a programme from the side lines is to fetishise the programme and consign oneself to being a propaganda group indefinitely. It is in fact to caricature revolutionary marxism. Even in Argentina, where the urban proletariat is extremely powerful and where there have been more General Strikes than anywhere else since the Second World War, the failure of these strikes to develop insurrectional forms demonstrates not only the necessity of armed struggle for the seizure of power, but also the need to prepare for it.

Only if Latin American revolutionaries understand and grasp the importance and the necessity of organisation will we be able to say that they have understood and learnt the real lessons of Latin America's 1905. Only then will they be able to lay a firm and solid basis for the extension of the Cuban revolution to the rest of the continent, thus freeing not only their own oppressed masses from the yoke of American imperialism, but also freeing the Cuban Revolution from the oppressive weight of the Soviet bureaucracy.

G. Camillo

50 Years of World Revolution (1917-1967): An international symposium edited by Ernest Mandel. (Merit Publishers. 21/- + p&p 2/6 from Red Books)

This Symposium is necessary reading for all who want to acquaint themselves with the best in current Marxist thought. The introduction by Ernest Mandel alone is almost worth the price of the book. It ranges over the whole vast field of the revolutionary movement since the Bolshe-

vik victory in 1917 and shows how richly our epoch deserves the name "The Age of Permanent Revolution". Despite the defeats, the setbacks and the betrayals, the international working class and their allies in the Third World continue the struggle which can only end with the destruction of capitalist-imperialism.

In his analysis, Mandel shows how Lenin and Trotsky prepared the way for October because they, almost alone among their contemporaries, understood the real nature of the situation. Lenin forged the weapon which would ensure that victory—the Bolshevik Party. Trotsky, with his Theory of Permanent Revolution "made clear the only form the seizure of power could take in (backward) Russia—that is the establishment of the proletariat allied to the poor peasantry." By 1917, Lenin had also come to this conclusion and the result was his famous "April Theses" which was the blue-print for the October Revolution. Trotsky, for his part, had abandoned his illusions about an ideologically loose party united with the Mensheviks—since when, as Lenin put it, there has been "no better Bolshevik".

Unfortunately, most of the other leading Bolsheviks only superficially learned the lessons of October—or regarded the Russian experience as "exceptional"—and have applied (or rather, misapplied) some of Lenin's pre-1917 conceptions to revolutionary situations in other countries, with disastrous results for the proletariat. It was left, first to the Left Opposition in Russia, under the leadership of Leon Trotsky, then to the Fourth International, to continue the ideas of Bolshevism. This collection of articles is a good reflection of the ideas of the Fourth International. All the writers are leaders of the International or, in the case of the Americans, leading members of parties in very close association with the Fourth International. (The laws of the United States make international affiliation illegal).

Luis Vital, a well-known Chilean revolutionary communist, goes back to Marx and Engels and shows how their fundamental prediction—the socialism would supplant the capitalist system—has been confirmed by history. This theme is taken further by Livio Maitan of Italy, whose article on "The Theory of Permanent Revolution" shows that it was in direct line with ideas already developed by Marx and Engels—even the name "The Revolution in Permanence" was first used by Marx. He deals fully with the differences between Lenin and Trotsky on this issue, differences which were resolved in the "April Theses" and in an even more emphatic manner by the October Revolution itself. Maitan also deals with the post-Lenin controversies about the Theory of Permanent

Revolution and indicates that events in Cuba and China have vindicated the theory.

Sirio Di Giandomaria, another leading Italian Trotskyist, deals with the "Three Phases of the Russian Revolution", and draws from it three principal lessons: 1) The absolute necessity for socialist revolution; 2) the necessity of building a revolutionary party in which theoretical and practical work are based on a democratic relationship between an elected leadership and a conscious and militant rank and file; 3) the necessity of developing the tactics to bring the masses to attack the bourgeois state without hesitation at the most favourable moment.

Ross Dawson of Canada deals with the rise and fall of the Third International, while the German Trotskyist Georg Junckel writes on the tragedy of the German proletariat, led to defeat by Stalinism and Social Democracy. This is a valuable article, all the more so because of the very clear definition of fascism which it contains, in contradiction to the loose and often irresponsible way in which the term is often used.

The Argentinian Marxist, Nahuel Moreno, deals with the developments of the Chinese and Indo-Chinese Revolutions. The theory of Permanent Revolution is effectively used to show how the Chinese Revolution of 1925-27 began as a reflection of the revolutionary upsurge which followed the Russian Revolution and argues that the Revolution which brought Mao to power "cannot be explained except by the revolutionary pressure of the European workers and the attitude of the Americans in the armed forces" following World War II. He discusses the lessons of the failure of the 1927 revolution and the consequences of that defeat, and goes on to deal with the eventual victory of the Chinese Communists and the subsequent developments. He shows how that victory was followed by an intensification of the struggle in Vietnam and concludes that the safety of the deformed workers states in Asia (as in the Soviet Union) can, in the final analysis, only be secured by the victory of the world revolution, and, in the first place, in the main capitalist countries—most importantly the United States.

Hugo Gonzalez Moscoso, general secretary of the Bolivian section of the Fourth International, deals with the lessons of the Cuban Revolution. Cuba once again shows that the revolutionary process does not go by stages. He deals very effectively also with those who would deny the proletarian nature of the Cuban revolution because it was not led by a Leninist Party.

George Breitman applies the Leninist teachings on the national question to the black liberation struggle in the United States and shows how the role of the black liberation fighters is "akin to the leading role of the insurgent colonial

masses at this stage of the world revolution". It also served as the trigger which set in motion the wave of student revolts which surged through the campuses.

That there is no "third way" based on a mixed economy for the underdeveloped countries of the world is the theme of the article by Sitaram B. Kolpe, a leader of the Socialist Workers Party of India. The tragic developments in Algeria, Ghana, Indonesia, etc. have effectively shown where this "third way" leads as compared to the revolutionary direction taken by Cuba and China.

George Novack gives a lucid outline of how to apply the laws of unenew and combined development to the world revolutionary process. Fernand Charlier of Belgium discusses the roots of bureaucracy and how to fight it. Ernest Mandel makes a valuable contribution on "Economics of the Transition Period", while Joseph Hansen deals with the relevance of Marxism-Leninism for today. Pierre Frank, a member of the United Secretariat of the Fourth International, traces the history of proletarian internationalism and shows that for "true revolutionary Marxists, proletarian internationalism is not a sentimental notion that falls apart at the first sound of rifles, cannon and bombs (but) a fundamental concept . . . which has deep objective roots; a concept whose application the capitalists dread."

James P. Cannon, leading United States Trotskyist, makes crystal clear that without the vanguard party as organiser and director there can be no thorough-going proletarian revolution. The building of such a party is no easy task. Cannon shows the tremendous difficulties encountered by the world Trotskyist movement over the past three decades. The presence of powerful, wealthy Labour, Social Democratic or Stalinist organisations, exercising bureaucratic control over the labour movement, has to be overcome. Of particular interest is his reference to the tactic of Marxists going into mass parties for extended periods (entrism) with the aim of creating, consolidating and expanding the initial cadres and establishing firm ties with the advanced elements, with the ultimate objective of building a new mass revolutionary party of the working class. He shows the pitfalls in this kind of work, but concludes that it is a necessary tactic at certain times.

CVG

The Irish Tragedy: Scotland's Disgrace *by John MacLean, published by the John MacLean Society. (1/- + 5d)*

As one of MacLean's sole surviving associates, Harry McShane, says in the introduction, "It seldom happens that a pamphlet dealing with

political events merits re-publication fifty years later on the grounds of its appropriateness. This is that kind of pamphlet."

Published originally in 1920, and distributed in 20,000 copies all over Scotland by MacLean's "Tramp Trust Unlimited" (a small group of roving socialist agitators), the pamphlet sets out to reveal the facts about the brutal suppression of the Irish struggle at that time. Fired with anger at the use of Scottish troops to crush the Republicans, MacLean heaps fact on fact, tearing away the hypocritical excuses of the government of the day.

But he goes further than mere accusation, he attempts briefly and simply to explain to Scottish workers the economic reasons for the attempt to retain a hold on Ireland. This he explains in terms of rivalry between the USA and British imperialism; as Harry McShane explains, a common theme among Marxists of his day, and one which Trotsky emphasised.

But one of the most interesting aspects is MacLean's understanding of the nature and significance of the Irish struggle, which he explains thus:

"Should Ireland get a Republic, the class war will then burst out and be fought out till Irish Labour wins and establishes Communism finally again in the 'Ould Counthrie'."

"Ireland's victory is obviously the undoubted prelude to Labour's triumph throughout the world, when robbery shall give place to justice in the mighty Communist Commonwealth."

In other words, MacLean, like Connolly, saw the victory of the Irish national struggle as the prelude to a rapid victory of the socialist revolution. If this concept is not a developed expression of the permanent revolution, it is nevertheless very far from the Stalinist "two stage" theory, and offers further proof that this reactionary concept was artificially grafted onto the Irish struggle in later years.

Robin Mor

A Plea for a Labour College for Scotland *by John MacLean (John MacLean Society, 1/6)*

At first glance this little pamphlet might appear to have a rather limited interest. John MacLean is little known outside Scotland, and his address to a long-forgotten conference, which founded a long-dead college, might not seem to be of great relevance.

But even from the point of view of learning about MacLean, the pamphlet is valuable. He was, after all, the most important figure in the mass workers' struggles on Clydeside, during and after the First World War; the most extreme

revolutionary situation Britain has known. The relevance of this address to those struggles is underlined by the fact that MacLean was prevented from giving it in person. On Sunday 6th February 1916, six days before he was due to deliver it, he was arrested and incarcerated in Edinburgh Castle, charged with subversive activities (i.e. telling the workers the truth about the war).

That fact that, on Clydeside in particular, the repression directed against the workers during World War I should lead to revolutionary ferment is no accident. The long patient work done by MacLean and others like him in educating workers about the nature of capitalism meant that thousands of them were able to see the connection between their economic problems, the speed-up in the factories, repressive legislation, and the imperialist war which was slaughtering workers on the battlefields of Europe. They transcended the narrow trade union consciousness of the rest of the British working class, and saw the solution to their problems in terms of revolutionary struggle. The fact that they did not have the leadership capable of formulating a strategy to direct and guide that militancy does not alter the importance of what was achieved.

Marxist Sociology in Action: A Sociological Critique of the Marxist Approach to Industrial Relations. *J.A. Banks (Faber and Faber)*

Anatomy of a Merger: A History of G.E.C., A.E.I., and English Electric. *Oliver and Marriot (Johnathon Cape 75s)*

Both these books in effect attempt to account for different features of modern capitalism. The difference is that whereas Jones and Marriot give a purely descriptive account of the development of one industry, Banks attempts to give a systematic exposition of a wide range of the features of capitalism. It is an interesting comment on the state of bourgeois research that Jones and Marriot give a far better account of contemporary capitalism than does Banks.

Banks's book is in fact in many ways a most curious effort. Firstly the book is not at all about what its title says it is. The section on industrial relations is in fact only an incidental part of the book, most of which is devoted to a general discussion of everything from the problems of motive forces of the Chinese revolution (p.139-158) and Lenin's theory of the Labour aristocracy (p. 218). It is as such as not as a book on industrial relations that it must be

Unlike most non-Marxists who write on Marx, the author actually does appear to have read something other than Karl Popper's *The Open Society and its Enemies*. He thus avoids falling into any of the usual "Marx was relevant to the appalling conditions of the 19th century but not today" type of argument. He thus for example gives a reasonably good definition of Marx's definitions of social formations when he says that "... what in the Marxist analysis distinguishes slavery, feudalism and capitalism from one another is not the fact that the ruling class uses the system to its own advantage, but the different ways in which it is done. If there has been a managerial revolution in some Marxist sense of the term, it must be because the managers have introduced a new way of extorting surplus value from the workers." Unfortunately, having said this he then plunges into a garbled version of Burnham's *The Managerial Revolution* (which as the erudite know is itself only a garbled version of Bruno Rizzi's *La Bureaucratization du Monde*). From that point on the discussion becomes singularly uninteresting.

The problem is that Banks, like Burnham but unfortunately for him unlike Marx, believes that Marxism can be broken down into a set of separate postulates. Thus for example he states a possible theory of the Russian Revolution in terms of two separate premises. This means that he sees no connection between economics, politics, sociology, philosophy, etc. in Marxism and cannot therefore give an account of any basic ideas that Marxists use. This renders the book virtually worthless apart from a few pieces of empirical information scattered around its pages.

The Oliver and Marriot book is a very different kettle of fish altogether. Perhaps the most startling thing in it is the way in which deals with the existence of cartels and monopolies. Anyone reading an economics school-book talking about the competition of industry should simply read this book in order to see what a load of rubbish the "conventional wisdom" of capitalism is. The first chapter reveals clearly the origins of the Electrical Industry—it is simply entitled "The Lamp King".

The working of cartels and modern capitalism is perfectly revealed by passages of the following sort:

"The venue chosen was the offices of Lord Cowdray's Whitehall Securities . . . Lord Poole, English Electric's financial adviser, is also a director of Whitehall Securities"

or:

"One such firm was Kleinwort Benson, and there was a Kleinwort partner, Reginald Maudling—the former Conservative Chancellor of the

Exchequer—on the AEI board, ready to advance Kleinworth's claims. However, another AEI director, Alexander Hood, was a director of merchant bankers Schroders"

or:

"AEI, where Sir Archibald Forbes, chairman of the Midland Bank, and Lord McFadzean, chairman of British Insulated Callendar's Cables, brushed shoulders with Lord Caldecote, chairman of British Aircraft Corporation".

Again we have a very clear understanding of the role of profit in a capitalist economy. This is beautifully summed up in the penultimate paragraph:

"Thus the shareholders of English Electric, which with sales of £411 million in 1967 had been much bigger than either AEI (£260 million) or GEC (£180 million), ended up with, at the very best, one-third of the equity of the combined three companies. That is the measure of the premium for better GEC profitability and for the Weinstock touch." (The Weinstock touch of course consisting of the ability to make these bigger profits.)

We also have marvellous examples of bourgeois ideology at work. Consider for example the title of Chapter 8: "AEI: The Years of Prosperity (1930-53)". What other system than the capitalist could consider the years of the slump, of the war, and of post-war reconstruction, years of prosperity! Here we have a perfect example of how the making of profit is totally unconnected to the needs of society.

Remarkable too are the examples of sheer lying and hypocrisy by the capitalist class. My

favourite here is the manoeuvres carried on by GEC and English Electric in order to stop the unions kicking up a fuss about the merger. The following passage reveals all.

"Even more important was the visit paid by Sir Jack Scamp on Barbara Castle, who as Secretary of the Department of Employment and Productivity would have a crucial say in the Government decision. Sir Jack . . . went bearing a letter signed by Lord Nelson and Lord Aldington promising full consultations with the unions concerning any possible redundancies that might arise from the merger. They promised to initiate 'immediate discussions between Sir Jack Scamp and national Trade Union leaders concerning arrangements for consultations on matters arising from the merger with a view to maintaining and improving communications between workpeople and management'."

I trust that the 12,000 workers sacked from GEC were grateful for the immense amount of trouble that went into ensuring that they lost their jobs in a suitable way and not through any rash actions.

All in all, this book is just about the best description of the capitalist system that we ever going to get from a "reputable" source. As for the problem of the price, well, I suggest that you put in a request to your public library before the Tories make the charge for borrowing books from there almost as much as the cost of the book itself.

Alan Jones

**"If you're not part of the solution,
you're part of the PROBLEM!" - Cleaver**

Come to the SPARTACUS LEAGUE

(REVOLUTIONARY YOUTH ORGANISATION)

National Conference LONDON - FEB. 20 - 21

PLENARY SESSIONS AND WORKSHOPS ON: The Black Struggle; Anti-Imperialist Solidarity (South Africa, Indo-China, Ireland, Middle East); Women's Liberation; Young Workers; Students; Schools Struggles; and Youth Culture.

REGISTRATIONS NOW OPEN: WRITE—SPARTACUS LEAGUE, 182 PENTONVILLE ROAD, LONDON N.1.

DOCUMENT

Over a long period of time, the Ligue Communiste (French Section of the Fourth International) and the organisation around the paper Lutte Ouvriere have been having discussions in order to explore the possibilities of fusing their two organisations. It is perhaps necessary to explain the background to these talks in order to emphasise their lessons for revolutionaries in this country.

Lutte Ouvriere, unlike organisations such as International Socialism accepts the basic tenets of "Trotskyism". That is to say, as is pointed out in the document we reproduce, it bases its political views on the Transitional Programme of the Fourth International. It means for example that it accepts the characterisation of the USSR as a degenerated workers state, it accepts the theory of Permanent Revolution, it believes in, and practices democratic centralism. In all these points it is in fundamental agreement with the positions of the Fourth International. On the other hand in the period since 1938 it has developed differences with the Fourth International on a whole number of points. For example it characterises China, Cuba and Eastern Europe apart from the Soviet Union as states in which the Dictatorship of the Bourgeoisie exists, it does not believe that it is possible to build a democratic-centralist international in the present period and it has important differences with the Fourth International on the question of how to build national organisations. Despite all these differences it however believes that a unification with the Fourth International is possible provided that these differences are recognised and not treated lightly.

The discussions between the two organisations have been protracted, but in the case of something as important as the fusion of two organisations this is to be welcomed and not regretted. The two organisations have still not decided to fuse but have decided to take more concrete steps to see if this is a realistic perspective. Because of the possible importance of this unification we have therefore included their preliminary agreement as an information document. We obviously hope that the process of unification can continue until a principled unification is achieved which will be in accord with the fundamental principles of Trotskyism. - Eds

PROTOCOL AGREED BETWEEN THE LIGUE COMMUNISTE AND LUTTE OUVRIERE

The crisis of May-June 1968 has once again demonstrated the absolute necessity of a revolutionary party capable of offering to the workers alternative perspectives than the reformist ones of the traditional political and trade union structures.

The Ligue Communiste and Lutte Ouvriere are conscious that the unification of their two tendencies would be an important step in the building of such a party and are conscious therefore of their responsibilities in this direction. For this reason they have for the last six months been engaged in discussions to investigate the possibilities for such a unification on the basis of their common theoretical positions; the programme of the Communist International of Lenin and Trotsky, and that of the Left Opposition in its struggle against Stalinism. The theoretical outcome of this latter struggle is contained in the Transitional Programme of the Fourth International.

Taking account of the present differences between the two organisations, the leaderships have decided to effect the unification in three stages.

The exploratory stage of these discussions is brought to an end by the signing of this document. These discussions have allowed us to see the political and practical which exist between the two organisations. Although one should not underestimate these differences nor ignore them, nevertheless the Ligue Communiste and Lutte Ouvriere believe that they

can only be overcome in the cadre of the unified organisation. The differences are not so great as to prevent this.

The second phase, which is opened from now, is the verification of these views in practice. This phase must show the possibility of common work by the *Lutte Ouvriere* and the *Ligue Communiste* and therefore the viability of the common organisation.

As a first step in this task, the *Ligue Communiste* and *Lutte Ouvriere* have co-ordinated part of their activities in order to lead a number of campaigns.

They have, for example, put out a common appeal to militants to participate in the international meeting of revolutionaries at Brussels on the 21st and 22nd of November. They have organised a campaign for equal increases for all workers against the resistance of the large unions who supported the principle of maintaining wage differentials. They have exposed the working conditions in the large factories and the scandal of public transport in the Paris area.

These are some of the instances in which the *Ligue Communiste* and *Lutte Ouvriere* have collaborated in order to put their agreement into practice.

During this period of joint activity, and as soon as possible in the light of the development of joint work, the *Ligue Communiste* and *Lutte Ouvriere* will see that a fusion will take place between their newspapers *Rouge* and *Lutte Ouvriere*, in order to verify the possibility of free expression of tendencies in a common organisation. Only such a preliminary period is capable of showing that the *Ligue Communiste* and *Lutte Ouvriere* understand the rights and limitations of the right of expression of tendencies.

At the same time as these common activities, the *Ligue Communiste* and *Lutte Ouvriere* will continue their discussions in order to proceed to the drawing up of a common programme dealing with the French and International situations. They will also draw up statutes governing the functioning of the common organisation.

These discussions will be in public and will take the form of meetings, of debates, of common pamphlets, exchanges of articles and other means that will be jointly decided upon. It is understood that each tendency will be able to deal with the matters involved in this discussion in its own press.

If the test of common activity gives positive results, if the issuing of a common press shows the possibility of the collaboration of the two tendencies, and the programme of unification gains the support of the members of the two tendencies, then a third phase will start. This will proceed on the basis of a common agreement and will lead to the holding of a unification congress of the two organisations.

From the exploratory discussions which have been held it appears that the following five points would define the functioning and activities of the proposed unified organisation.

1) The unified organisation will be the French section of the Fourth International. The militants of the unified organisation will participate in the discussions of the leading bodies of the Fourth International (World Congress, International Executive Committee, and United Secretariat). They will also take part in the international discussions and will participate in building the International.

On the basis of this agreement, the United Secretariat agrees not to change the democratically elected leadership of the French section. It also agrees to respect the orientation adopted by the majority at congresses and decided upon by the leading bodies of the unified organisation. The United Secretariat will also make a declaration to this effect at the time of the unification congress. This declaration will be published as an appendix to the statutes.

2) The functioning of the unified organisation will be according to the rules of democratic centralism, that is to say unity in action and the right of free expression of tendencies. The statutes of the organisation will provide for minority representation on all leading bodies of the organisation. In particular the unification congress will agree to proportional representation of the two tendencies at all levels. This basis of representation will be maintained as long as the two separate tendencies exist in the organisation. The Congress of the unified organisation will determine the orientation and sectors of intervention for the entire organisation.

The tendencies will have the right to express their points of view through the medium of the publications of the unified organisation. (These will have proved in the period before fusion their capacity to guarantee free expression.) A leading body for the journal will be established which will give political supervision to the expression of tendencies in the press. This body will be elected on the basis of proportional representation of the two tendencies

and will be under the control of the Central Committee of the unified organisation. The minority will automatically be granted right of expression in the journal with a certain number of pages set aside for this purpose. The leading body in control of the journal will be charged by the Central Committee with ensuring the democratic running of the press. The leading body concerned with the journal will be responsible for securing suitable persons to ensure the regular running of the press. It will also establish an editorial board which will be established without distinction as to tendency, and will involve militants of both tendencies in the editorial work of the newspaper.

The same procedure will apply in the case of other publications such as theoretical journals. For example the minority will automatically be granted four or five pages or an article in each issue.

As well as this day to day discussion, which would be carried out as outlined above and which the minority will be free to carry on if it chooses, there will be national discussions involving the whole organisation and involving contributions from members of both tendencies and any other tendencies which may be formed.

The tendencies would participate in discussion meetings. The nature and importance of these discussions would be determined by the prevailing circumstances (particular political questions, preparation of conferences, congresses etc.)

At the public level, whenever questions of such complexity as to warrant it arise, the publishing of discussion bulletins without limitations of length will be undertaken. These bulletins will appear, according to the choice of the two tendencies, either in the form of a discussion between the two points of view, or in the form of the exposition of a single position. They will be publicly sold.

A commission will be set up for the control of the internal bulletin which will have equal representation from the two tendencies. It will be charged with the preparing and circulating of regular issues of the internal bulletin.

3) The task of implanting the organisation in the working class both in the trade unions and politically, will determine the policy of the unified organisation; this involves the main allocation of members being to this type of work.

However the unified organisation will intervene in all fields and milieus. For each of these areas (workers, students, peasants and farm workers, teachers) the allocation of forces will be decided at congress and with consideration to the fundamental aim of the organisation as it is outlined above.

4) The basis of organisation of the unified body will be the cell. In all fields of activity the work of the cells will be under the direction of the leading bodies of the organisation. The cells will elect the leaderships of the section, of the town, and of the region. These will direct their activity.

The allocation of new members will be ultimately decided by the appropriate leading body but will be done after discussion with the member and the cell concerned. Members of the two existing tendencies will not be moved from the fields where they were working before the fusion without the agreement of the two tendencies.

5) The implantation of revolutionaries in the factories involves both autonomous political intervention by the unified organisation by regular activity of workers cells, and regular activity by working class militants in the Trade Unions, particularly the C.G.T..

The Ligue Communiste and Lutte Ouvriere are aware that they have often had different experiences in this field, but they believe that their political agreement on the necessity of working towards such an implantation in the working class will allow them to realise a synthesis of their different points of view and this will enable them to develop and strengthen the unified organisation.

For Ligue Communiste

Pierre Frank
Charles Michaloux
Henri Weber

For Lutte Ouvriere

Francois Duburg
Jean Lievin
Jacques Morand

'IRISH CITIZEN'

PAPER OF THE IRISH SOLIDARITY CAMPAIGN

THE FIRST ISSUE OF IRISH CITIZEN WILL BE AVAILABLE IN FEBRUARY. IT WILL CONTAIN MATERIAL ON THE IRISH STRUGGLE WHICH WILL BE OF VALUE NOT ONLY TO IRISH MILITANTS IN BRITAIN, BUT TO ALL WHO RECOGNISE THE IMPORTANCE OF THE CURRENT SITUATION IN IRELAND FOR THE REVOLUTION ON AN INTERNATIONAL SCALE.

Enquiries to "Irish Citizen" 37 Gordon Mansions, Torrington Place, London W.C.1.

'SOCIALIST WOMAN'

PUBLISHED BY THE NOTTINGHAM SOCIALIST WOMANS GROUP, "SOCIALIST WOMAN" HAS LED THE FIELD IN DISCUSSING THE PROBLEMS OF WOMEN IN CAPITALIST SOCIETY. PUBLICITY FOR, AND AID TO WOMEN INVOLVED IN THE INDUSTRIAL STRUGGLE HAS BEEN A CONSISTENT FEATURE OF THE PAPER. A SUBSCRIPTION COSTS ONLY 5s FOR 6 ISSUES (BI-MONTHLY).

Send to 16 Ella Rd, West Bridgeford, Nottingham.

'INDOCHINA'

SPECIAL NOTE TO SOCIALIST SOCIETIES: "INDOCHINA" (FORMERLY "VIETNAM") IS THE MAGAZINE OF THE VIETNAM SOLIDARITY CAMPAIGN. LATEST ISSUE: WHAT DO NIXON'S PROPOSALS REALLY MEAN? MADAM BINH'S PROPOSALS: THE TORIES AND MALAYSIA: IF THE WAR EXPANDS. SPECIAL ONE THIRD DISCOUNT FOR SOCIALIST SOCIETIES.

Write: "Indochina", 182 Pentonville Rd. London N.1.

