

LSM NEWS

*Liberation Support Movement
Information Center*

*Volume 1, Issue 3
December 1974*



Contents

Recent and Upcoming LSM Activities	1
Americans in China	4
Giese Convicted	7
US Fascism and American Workers	8
August Seminar: The Enemy Within	12
LSM: Problems in Theory, Strategy and Practice	15
Interview with Edward Ndlovu of ZAPU.	27
To Our Readers	33

**COPYRIGHT © 1974 LSM PRESS
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.**

ISSN 0315-1840

**Liberation Support Movement, Box 94338
Richmond, B.C., CANADA. V6Y 2A8**

Drawings by Selma Waldman/LSM

Become an LSM Subscriber for 1975!

A \$12 Subscription includes:

- 50% discount on single copies of LSM's books, pamphlets, posters, buttons and calendar.

(Does not include books and movement bulletins distributed but not published by LSM or our record, film and filmstrips.)

- A 1975 subscription to *LSM NEWS*
- And a choice between one of the following LSM publications...Free:

-*Toward an International Strategy*, by Don Barnett
-*In depth Interview with Seta Likambwila; Angola/MPLA #3*
-*Angolan Women's Day* poster

We Need Your Support!

Become an LSM Subscriber Today.

Pay only 1/2 price for any LSM publications purchased throughout 1975.

I wish to become an LSM Subscriber for 1975. (\$12 a year)

LSM Associate for 1975. (\$20 a year)

(check one)

enclosed please find \$ _____

Please send me the following LSM publication free, as indicated above

Name _____

Address _____

...Actions



China Pictorial

Laotian Militant

World In Revolution Film Series

September 25, Revolution Day, marked the 10th anniversary of armed struggle in Mozambique as well as the date on which FRELIMO entered the newly formed Transitional Government. In Vancouver, this day was celebrated with a program on the Mozambican Revolution featuring LSM speakers and a film, "Behind the Lines," depicting life in FRELIMO liberated areas.

This event was the first in LSM's "World in Revolution" - a series of seven film and speaker programs held at the Vancouver Public Library thru mid-December. Other programs, drawing crowds of 100 - 150, feature films and speakers on Guinea-Bissau, South Africa, Laos, Cuba and Dhofar. These programs have shown that there is an increasing interest for anti-imperialist work in the Vancouver area, particularly among young people, and we plan to follow up this series with a wider range of local events over the winter and spring.

ZAPU VISITS VANCOUVER

"Smith Sees the Writing on the Wall"

Recent events in Portugal and its colonies have spilled over into the remaining white minority-ruled territories of southern Africa: Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe. As Portuguese forces withdraw from Africa, the liberation movements in these three countries may gain improved access to their homelands; we will then very likely witness a drastic escalation in the struggle on the sub-continent. The center of armed struggle is already shifting to Zimbabwe, where guerrilla campaigns of the Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU) and Zimbabwe African People's Union (ZAPU) have recently been gaining momentum. The racist Smith regime is unable to contain the advance of the liberation forces who, with growing support from the Zimbabwe people, already operate throughout much of the country. The Rhodesian settler community is fast disintegrating and fleeing the country as the pressure of people's war increases.

This, in brief, was the message that Edward Ndlovu and Stephen Nkomo of ZAPU brought to Canadians during their September-October visit here. As part of their national tour, the ZAPU comrades - hosted by LSM - participated in a series of events in Vancouver, speaking and rallying support for ZAPU and the Zimbabwe struggle.

Canadian Capital in Zimbabwe

The visit of the ZAPU delegation served well to expose Canadian imperialism and its extensive operations in southern Africa. The Canadian-owned Falconbridge Mining Co. and Bata Shoe Co. are among the leading "multinationals" which harvest super-profits from the cheap labor and abundant resources of Zimbabwe. In the same vein, Canada maintains preferential trade agreements with South Africa - Smith's chief supporter - and during Ndlovu and Nkomo's visit, Canada became one of only nine countries to support South Africa's participation in the current UN session.

A Basis for Further Work

These points were stressed by the ZAPU delegation. While companies like Bata and Falconbridge go virtually unchallenged here at home, the peoples of Zimbabwe, Namibia and South Africa are rising in armed struggle against the racist, imperialist constellation of which Canada is a partner. A great challenge therefore confronts Canadian progressives: to align ourselves in concrete ways with those in Zimbabwe who are presently carrying the weight of armed struggle against our common enemy.

The visit of the ZAPU comrades was one step toward building a basis for such internationalist practice - a task which must be continued in the future. During their stay in Vancouver, plans were discussed for LSM to train two ZAPU cadre in the various skills of graphics and printing and then help in setting up a ZAPU printshop in Africa. In addition, LSM undertook to produce three informational brochures for the Movement, one of which has already been completed.

*LSM Interview with
Edward Ndlovu on
page 27*





C. Sarrasin/LSM

Edward Ndlovu (ZAPU Deputy National Secretary) speaking at a public gathering in Vancouver, October 1974, with Lori Barnett (left) of LSM.

Arena for Spring Tour - California, Oregon and Washington

Once again the Information Center is planning to hit the road. Two comrades - one from the Information Center and one from the LSM Bay Area Unit - will travel the stretch from San Diego to Seattle with audio-visual programs designed to convey basic information and critical analysis on the liberation struggles in Guinea-Bissau and southern Africa. We have recently added several new items to our list of audio-visual materials which now includes eight films four filmstrips and two slideshows. Any of these can be combined to make up a one or two-hour program complete with LSM speakers, discussion period and a well-stocked resource booth. As before, we have tried to keep our fees as low as possible to enable groups with minimal budgets to sponsor a program.

This tour - LSM's fifth in the West - presents a unique opportunity to inform large numbers of people about some of the most significant events of our era. Continuing our work from past tours, we hope to renew many old friendships and meet a lot of new people.

Our Tentative Itinerary

Southern California	Jan. 20 - Feb. 5
Bay Area, Santa Cruz & the Valley	Feb. 6 - Feb. 20
Northern California	Feb. 21 - Feb. 28
Oregon	Mar. 1 - Mar. 7
Washington	Mar. 8 - Mar. 15

For tour brochure and more detailed information write or call LSM Information Center, P.O. Box 94338, Richmond, B.C. Canada V6Y 2A8, (604) 325-7159 or LSM Bay Area Unit, P.O. Box 756, Berkeley, CA 94701 (415) 532-5490. Hoping to hear from you soon!

On the East Coast

Our East Coast Unit has over the past two months traveled extensively with its film programs in the North-East, working with campus and community audiences. When the present series of programs ends in December, the unit will relocate in New York City to improve its vantage point for political work in the area.



LSM/Bay Area Unit (Calif.) members
Carol Wright (middle) and Beth Youhn
(right) with a member of China's PLA.

Americans In China

Critical Reflections on a Recent Visit by Beth Youhn and Carol Wright

Last May, two LSM-BAU members spent three weeks in the People's Republic of China on a *Guardian* "political activist" tour. The visit presented an invaluable opportunity to learn about the Chinese revolutionary experience first hand. In this article, however, we will confine ourselves to a few critical comments on our experiences as part of the tour group: on the politics put forth by the group and how this reflects some fundamental weaknesses of the American Left.

US National Chauvinism

Despite the label, "political activist," our tour group was an amalgam of twenty-two individuals from diverse backgrounds and with varying levels of political commitment. Common for most was that, throughout the trip, they displayed a great lack of respect for our hosts and their efforts to show us what they consider important about their country and revolution. For example, many felt that our guides were bureaucratic, manipulative and reluctant to show us what we wanted to see. Many kept insisting that the Chinese offer alternatives to each day's itinerary and expressed outright dissatisfaction with some scheduled activities, such as a visit to a People's Liberation Army compound. (Though everyone was finally delighted with this visit, no self-criticism was offered that perhaps the Chinese themselves might best know what to show us of their revolution.) There were also cases of blatant discourtesy and political irresponsibility, like when a talk on China's foreign policy by a Government official was attended by only thirteen tour members. The others chose to go shopping (!) or took walks. In other cases some revealed tourist-like cultural chauvinism, protesting against the "excessive" formality which is a part of Chinese hospitality. Instead, they wanted things to be informal, unstructured and spontaneous - that is, "American." When we were greeted by the Revolutionary Committee of a factory, school or commune we were visiting, it was seen as a bureaucratic device to keep us from relating to "ordinary" workers and peasants. Few among us recognized that the workers and peasants themselves - many of whom we were able to talk to - would have considered it a serious insult to their American friends not to give us the attention of their chosen leaders on the Revolutionary Committees.

Misrepresentation of US Conditions

In discussions with the Chinese, members of our group continually equated today's US with pre-liberation China when, in fact, there is virtually no comparison. For instance, though even today in China several families share a bathroom and kitchen, our Chinese comrades were often told that workers housing in the US is far worse. Much was said about inflation and the high cost of living; but no mention was made of the cars, stoves, refrigerators, TV's and similar "luxuries" which remain "a way of life" for nearly all working class Americans. In this way, our hosts were given a distorted view of material conditions on this continent. No wonder that one of our guides was amazed to learn that a member of our group enjoyed the benefits of a car, TV, stove and fridge on an income from a part-time bookkeeping job. He was even more surprised to hear of unemployment insurance, union pay-guarantees and the welfare system - a "clever capitalist trick," as he characterized it.

Perhaps the most blatant misrepresentation concerned the scope, character and impact of left forces in the US. Our Chinese comrades were told of "mass organizations," large and influential. "Revolutionary pre-party organizations" were reported to be "rooting themselves in the masses of the working class," which was itself pictured as very militant and even class conscious. These views of US society and politics were taken quite seriously by those Chinese we had contact with. For example, the comments of one guide following a discussion with a member of the New American Movement revealed that he had serious misconceptions of the size, influence and base of that organization.

Whose interests are served by such fantasies and distortions? Certainly for the Chinese, such fallacies only make it increasingly difficult to correctly assess events within the US and other imperialist countries. Of course, it also made it difficult, if not impossible, for our Chinese friends to understand our own political practice as LSM members. While they thought that work in relation to national liberation struggles is important and positive, they also felt we should be doing something to organize the vast masses of class conscious and militant US workers they were hearing so much about. And when we used the term "labor aristocracy" to describe conditions in the labor movement, they thought we were talking about fat union bureaucrats rather than the large body of organized workers. And why shouldn't they? The distorted picture of US material and political conditions presented by our tour group can only lead to erroneous conceptions on the part of people who know relatively little of life within the imperialist nations. It appears to us as an act of grave political irresponsibility to mislead our Chinese comrades on this question; a little less breast-beating and a larger dose of humility in face of China's revolutionary accomplishments might have established a more comradely relationship between the tour group and our hosts.

Chinese Internationalism

Before our trip we were aware of the People's Republic's support for national liberation struggles abroad. Now we were anxious to learn how the principles of internationalism were put into practice in everyday life. For this reason we always asked people questions about their feelings toward national liberation struggles; what concrete forms such sentiments took; and their general familiarity with developments in the "Third World." We soon found that the Chinese people "resolutely support all genuine national liberation movements in their struggles all over the world." But we hardly ever penetrated beyond this kind of generalization. For instance, some middle school students working at the Shanghai Friendship Store spoke in strong terms about the right of self-determination for all African peoples, but had no information about specific conditions and the liberation movements in Africa. When, at a primary school, we asked how the children are taught the spirit of internationalism, we were told that they study the examples of Norman Bethune in China and the Chinese volunteer soldiers in Korea. The only case of concrete action we heard of was at the Shanghai Medical Apparatus factory where workers put in extra hours to supply surgical tables for "the battlefields of Vietnam and the Arab countries."

Clearly, the strong and often expressed spirit of international solidarity with struggles elsewhere was authentic. But information on events in other countries seemed

limited to the extent that the masses of workers and peasants had little knowledge of actual conditions beyond China's borders. This, of course, may be understandable in view of its years of relative isolation while the country consolidated the dictatorship of the proletariat. But now that China's door to the world is wide open and the Government is taking an anti-imperialist stand on the world scene, mass-based proletarian internationalism might better be served by more education concerning concrete conditions and revolutionary struggles abroad.

The "Other Side" of Revisionism

Our tour group was probably quite representative of the US "Movement." The cynical liberalism, individualism and anarchism of some group members are the result of a long process of "bourgeoisification" which followed the tide of imperialist expansion. Such tendencies are bolstered by a romanticized identification with the American "working class" which the Left seeks to lead - a vast labor aristocracy which today, as a class, politically tails the imperialist bourgeoisie. Far too little thought has been given as to what this class represents; what its material basis and objective interests are.

Revisionism is the political expression of that sector of the proletariat which allies itself with the bourgeoisie. As the history of the European and North American labor movement demonstrates, revisionism shows itself where the generous surplus of capitalist production has filtered down the ranks to generate the growth of a labor aristocracy among workers. Considering the mechanisms of US capitalism and the current state of the US "Movement," we see that it is precisely within this imperialist nation that the likelihood of revisionism on the Left is greatest. Its material base is solid, its ideology has deep roots in the population and, in fact, it has already manifested itself through class collaboration and social-democratic "moderation" as a dominant feature of life over the past several decades.

The Chinese are correctly concerned with the growth of revisionism, especially where it has seized state power as in the USSR and eastern Europe. Their struggle against the social imperialism of the Soviet bureaucrat bourgeoisie, and their own negation of revisionism - the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution - have had an enormous and healthy impact on the international socialist movement. But our experience in China revealed to us that the Chinese are scarcely familiar with that "other side" of revisionism which is widespread among socialists within imperialist nations.

To be sure, it is not the duty of the Chinese to "complete" the theory of revisionism for handy reference by the world's left forces. Neither is it their duty to analyze the class forces within every advanced capitalist country. What worries us is that most North American organizations which support China's anti-revisionist struggles have not yet even begun to confront this phenomenon - in either theory or practice - within their own country. Instead, they have fallen prey to the dangerous habit of uncritically accepting all facets of China's outlook - as they interpret and understand it - with the justification that China is the unquestioned leader of the international socialist movement.

This inevitably leads to errors. Thus, many US and Canadian organizations rightly denounce Soviet social imperialism around the world, and the corresponding bankruptcy of the CPC and CPUSA, while at the same time shirking their duty of *continuing* to develop the battle against revisionism by identifying its class basis within North America: the vast mass of workers who actively or passively collaborate with the imperialist bourgeoisie.

In order to wage this struggle, we must abandon the political ethnocentrism and implicit national chauvinism which was so clearly demonstrated by our tour group. At this stage of history, the most serious threat to international capital does not come from American workers, but rather from revolutionary masses and liberation struggles in the "countryside" of the empire. Support for such struggles accelerates the breakdown of imperialism. It also gradually generates revolutionary conditions within the imperialist metropolises, where the surplus (the material basis of class collaboration) dissipates in the general crisis caused by the contraction of the system. Revolutionary work in relation to the struggles of super-exploited peoples and classes corresponds to ideological struggle and open rebellion against class collaboration with imperialism by North American, Japanese and European workers. Such praxis is therefore crucial to uprooting revisionism and building socialism on the basis of genuine proletarian internationalism.



LSM member Frank Giese of Portland, Oregon, has been sentenced to five years in prison and a \$10,000 fine for "conspiring to destroy government property." His co-defendant, Jim Cronin, was convicted on four counts plus conspiracy and sentenced to ten years and five more on probation. Both have appealed.

Frank was alleged to have "masterminded" a series of robberies and bombings of army recruiting centers in the Portland area in January, 1973 just after the barbarous US Christmas bombing offensive against North Vietnam. Several people have already been sentenced to long prison terms in connection with these actions. According to the prosecutor, "The philosophical encouragement, active participation and academic sophistication of Giese and Cronin," together with Frank's "Fagin-like personality (sic!)" and "extensive financial support of the group, galvanized these young and decidedly impressionable people into a series of self-destructive acts...."

Two members of this group, Jim Akers and Chester Wallace, both serving time on related charges and also part of this trial, made no defense and were convicted on seven counts each.

The prosecutor's case rested mainly on the testimony of two group members who clearly perjured themselves in return for lenient treatment by the regime. Bail for Robert McSherry, the key witness, was reduced from \$100,000 to \$100 after he agreed to "cooperate" and implicate Jim and Frank, something he had not done in his original confession!

Though the prosecution denied the political character of the trial throughout, much was made of Frank and Jim's political activities, "Look," the prosecutor told the jurors in his final summation, pointing to a copy of Bruce Franklin's *From the Movement for Revolution*, which bore Frank's fingerprints, "this is what Giese and Cronin read. When you go to deliberate, read these pages about revolution and violent overthrow of the government."

Jim and Frank are free on \$75,000 bail and have high hopes of winning their appeals. Meanwhile, they intend to continue their anti-imperialist activities, strengthened rather than intimidated by their ordeal.

Contributions and messages of support can be sent to the Giese-Cronin Defense Committee, P.O. Box 1188, Portland, Oregon 97207.

Giese Convicted

US Fascism and American Workers

by Frank Giese



In the USA today more and more people are coming to see the growing threat of open fascism. To counter this threat we will need a strong and united movement, with a clear understanding of the direction of events and the ability to predict how the battle lines will be drawn.

At the moment, though, there is a great deal of debate and recrimination among the various groups who claim to be in the North American revolutionary vanguard. Most of the organizing and polemics take place in the name of the "working class," that time-honored agent of revolutionary change - at least in the 19th Century Marxist tradition of Europe. But Europe is no longer the world; the 19th Century should not be confused with the 20th; and Marxism is not a tradition but a living method.

What is the working class and whom does it consist of? What is the appropriate unit of analysis - national, geographic or economic - to answer that question? It is surely difficult to organize the working class without knowing what it is. In all, the American Left has been unable, in its theoretical effort, to shake off a tendency toward traditional phrasemongering that relies heavily on the need to "organize the working class." What we need today is a sound analysis which will reflect the economic and political realities of our time.

A Growing Labor Aristocracy

If there is a dialectic of history and social change, then one thing is certain: today's working class is not, and cannot be, the same as it was 100 years ago. As capitalism changes, there will be corresponding changes in the class structure and composition of the system, and to correctly estimate the consciousness and revolutionary potential of any class it is essential that we understand the direction and character of this change.

Capitalist developments over the past century or so have been enormous. Marx and Engels studied small entrepreneurs who enriched themselves to the extent that they were able to extract surplus value from their hired workers. But in their study of the blossoming British Empire they also caught a glimpse of the corrupting influence of that Empire on British workers and the rise of a stratum of "aristocrats of labor," sharing, if only to a minor degree, in the spoils from the plunder of the colonies.

Lenin, in his study of early 20th Century imperialism, used Marxism to evolve a theory of the development of inter-imperialist rivalry to protect interests both at home and in the colonies. He described this both as the "highest" and the "dying" stage of capitalism. And Lenin, too, insisted on the growth of a parasitic labor aristocracy within imperialist nations.

Contemporary Imperialism

As things turned out, two world wars produced, respectively, the first socialist state and a tremendous expansion of socialism to more than one-third of the world's population (if we include the Soviet Union and its satellites, though they may well be lost to the cause of socialism for the present period). But though Lenin's analysis is accurate for his time, and still useful today, it is nonetheless a fact that the "dying" stage has already lasted some sixty years, and that imperialism has gone through important changes which Lenin could not possibly have foreseen.

Contemporary imperialism is far more cohesive than what Lenin saw. Under the leadership of the USA and its "multi-national" corporations, it makes up a bloc that dominates, exploits and terrorizes most of the world; that commits genocide to suppress peoples' aspirations when these go counter to the interests of imperialism. This new stage of capitalist concentration is so evident that a third world war between rival imperialist groups is almost unthinkable today. Internal conflict, by no means to be ignored, is far outweighed by a common need to counter the growing trend of anti-imperialist struggle in the super-exploited parts of the empire.

This is not to say that contradictions within and between the imperialist metropolises have disappeared. Nation-states and corporations still compete with each other and the "socialist bloc" for markets and access to raw materials, and workers still struggle against their bosses for a larger share of the proceeds from their labor. In fact, pockets of poverty still exist within every major imperialist country and in the US, for instance, ethnic minorities have seen little or no improvement in their situation over the past several decades. In Western Europe, immigrant workers now perform most of the low-paying jobs.

Struggles in the Metropole and Countryside

Nonetheless, the most dramatic changes in the world today are taking place in Africa, Asia and Latin America. An authentic world-wide revolution is in progress and despite its zig-zags and periodic setbacks, this global process is irreversible. The revolution is *by* the world's oppressed and under-privileged peoples, *against* those classes and nations which cling to old traditions of domination - like the Portuguese in Africa or the US in Puerto Rico - or new ones - like Japan in the Pacific and the US in Latin America. It has attained different levels in different areas, but in general it has progressed the farthest in those areas which have liberated themselves by force of arms. For the majority involved, the revolution has its main source in the fundamental problems of starvation, exploitation or slaughter. Racism and national humiliation compound the basic problems. But in any case, the ferment of fundamental change in today's world has occurred largely in the non-industrialized and super-exploited areas of the globe.

If the industrial workers of the imperialist metropolises are not today a revolutionary force, the reasons are not hard to find. "Workers of the world unite! You have nothing to lose but your chains!" still makes a rousing slogan; but the second part is no longer strictly true. For the workers of the metropolises have made such enormous gains in the last hundred years that, in fact, they now have a great deal to lose. Their gains have been so great that it is no longer possible to equate their situation with that of their "class brothers" in the so-called "Third World." That some individuals may choose to make common cause with the world's oppressed does not change the fact that, as a class, industrial workers in the "developed" nations are not at this time revolutionary.

The classic example of the non-revolutionary working class is to be found in England. Despite periods of militant action, there has been no concerted effort to replace the established order since 1848. From about that time until 1940 Britain was the most competent of colonial exploiters; and the British working class has been the most complacent of junior partners in dividing the booty.

The situation of French workers is comparable. Under German occupation, a revolutionary mood developed and the Communist Party emerged as the key organizing nucleus of the Resistance. But the struggle was waged on national rather than class terms. After liberation, French workers did not demand, and therefore did not achieve, the liquidation of

the capitalist State, thoroughly discredited though it was by its collaboration with Nazism. Even the celebrated events of May 1968 never posed a real threat to the bourgeois State. Perhaps the most characteristic feature of the general post-1945 situation in France was the total absence of working class solidarity with the long and bloody Algerian liberation struggle.

The situation in the US likewise reveals the existence of a working class with a tradition of militancy that coincides with periods of depression, but whose long-range interests have more and more been identified with "national" goals; at times even with the crudest imperialism rather than with proletarian internationalism. Why would US workers risk their present standard of living in a show of revolutionary solidarity with super-exploited Latin Americans or Asians when that standard is itself based on just such super-exploitation?

The Principal Contradiction

It is therefore ridiculous to maintain today that workers of the industrialized nations are in the vanguard of the world revolutionary movement. The principal contradiction of our time is that between the imperialist bourgeoisie of the metropolises and the super-exploited peoples of the "Third World." The role of "proletariat," the revolutionary agent, falls with the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America. In terms of Mao's military strategy, the underdeveloped "countryside," with its vast human resources dwelling in desert, jungle and bush, will surround and engulf the imperialist "cities," constituted by the industrialized capitalist nations.

Therefore, the most basic element in the development of a revolutionary consciousness among white US workers must be a sense of international proletarian solidarity. Specifically, this means an end to racism at home and open, concrete manifestations of solidarity with revolutionary struggles in the imperialist countryside.

Fascism and Imperialism

If we view the US as part of a vast empire rather than existing in isolation, it is false to claim that fascism has not yet struck in our society. On the contrary, if we accept Dimitroff's definition of fascism, "the open, terroristic dictatorship of the most reactionary elements of monopoly capitalism," then we see that fascism is indeed the most characteristic mode of control within the empire. It is everywhere dominant in the neo-colonies. It is also used to control elements of the metropolitan population, especially Blacks, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans and native Americans. The reason that most Americans, including both organized workers and the white radical Left, do not recognize the presence of fascism is that openly fascist methods are not yet generally used against them. And this is because they do not as yet constitute a real threat to the continued rule of capital.

In Germany, between 1935 and the total collapse of the Nazi regime, large elements of the German population prospered and as a consequence remained oblivious to the most oppressive aspects of the system. In fact, as the *reich* expanded, life became increasingly comfortable for a large proportion of Germans, not only in terms of a higher standard of living, but also through the certainty of their own superiority, first over the Jews, then over the effete and culturally inferior Western Europeans, finally over the genetically inferior Slavs.

In 1943 it would have been hard to convince most Europeans that German fascism did not exist, just because some Germans did not suffer under it. Today, it might be equally futile to try to persuade a South Vietnamese or a Chilean that US fascism is not yet a reality merely because most white Americans are unaware of its existence. From the point of view of subjugated peoples throughout the empire, most Americans must themselves be considered the perhaps unwilling collaborators of the fascist regime.

There are many similarities between colonialist and imperialist methods of government on the one hand, and those of fascism on the other: military occupation, with or without the installation of a puppet regime; intensive exploitation and exportation of natural resources, as well as industrial and agricultural products; slave labor and forced export of manpower; and finally, the systematic humiliation of conquered peoples and the destruction of their cultures. Seen in this light, "fascism" means much the same to Europeans as do



FRELIMO

FRELIMO Soldiers.

colonialism and neo-colonialism to Africans, Asians and Latin Americans.

Historically, fascism depends for its petty-bourgeois and working class support on the notions of racial, national and/or cultural superiority. As long as there are super-exploited races, nations and cultures to denigrate and despise, the populations of imperialist nations are more likely, in times of crisis, to embrace the reality of fascism and its spoils than the dream of proletarian international solidarity. The structure of contemporary imperialism is such that workers and petty-bourgeois of the imperialist metropolises do in fact find oppressed and super-exploited races, nations and cultures to denigrate; do in fact despise them.

Who, then, can bring the empire down, and how? It is important to understand the priorities in this process. Revolutionary consciousness no doubt exists in the US today, but it exists in individuals and not in any class. Its existence is most widespread among ethnic minorities, but because these exist in the form of internal colonies, their consciousness is at first expressed as a desire for national liberation. Objective conditions for the development of revolutionary consciousness along strictly class lines do not exist in North America at this time.

Since the principal form of anti-imperialist struggle today rests with national liberation struggles of the colonized and neo-colonized peoples in the "Third World," and since there is no class in the US today objectively capable of developing a revolutionary class consciousness, the weight of revolutionary sacrifice presently falls on the "wretched" masses of Africa, Asia and Latin America. Certainly, there is ample opportunity for constructive anti-imperialist work within Europe, Japan and North America, but such work must be conceived and carried out within the framework and perspective of an international revolution against monopoly capitalism and Europeans, Japanese and North Americans must carry out their tasks with all due humility in face of the infinitely greater risks and suffering born by revolutionaries and the masses in super-exploited nations.

...August Seminar



The Enemy Within

by Ole Gjerstad and and Dennis Mercer

What is the enemy within us, members of the Liberation Support Movement? This question points to a fundamental contradiction in our praxis: there is little in our material life circumstance which impels us to radically change society; the objective conditions of our lives have in no way prepared us for revolutionary action. Still, we do our best to help bring about revolutionary change, to serve the interests of the masses who today form the basis of revolutionary liberation struggles in many parts of imperialist society. How is this contradiction manifested?

Imperialist society is a class society and we are part of its product. We entered politics with an essentially non-revolutionary class background; with values, attitudes and ways of understanding the world shaped by our class position and by the whole array of our historically acquired needs and means of fulfilling them. Every day these values and needs come into conflict with our revolutionary aspirations. They are the enemy within!

How can we deal with such an enemy? Can we simply annihilate it? Can we transform ourselves into "pure communists"? Not likely. Some of our non-revolutionary ballast will probably be with us for as long as we live; some may even be strengthened by the impact of our immediate surroundings, for the enemy within is a product of "the enemy without," i.e., capitalism and imperialism. Without eliminating the latter we can never hope to rid ourselves of non-revolutionary (or counter-revolutionary) influences. Therefore, in LSM we feel it of primary importance to transform society rather than transform ourselves; to objectively advance socialism before serving our individual, subjective concerns, becoming "true communists," etc. Of course, we realize the process is dialectical and that the two aspects of transformation are related. But given our tendencies toward self-indulgent individualism and other petty bourgeois values, meaningful self-transformation can only come about as a by-product of our efforts to change society - to struggle against imperialism and for international socialism. Thus we can afford to struggle with only a small fraction of our non-revolutionary values directly - namely, those which concretely impede our *work*. Our contribution can only be measured by our practice, not by the time and energy spent in dealing with our personal problems, which are, after all, slight when compared with those of the masses engaged in armed struggle.

However, when our class values do threaten our work and progress, we attempt to struggle with the contradictions involved in a critical and comradesly way.

How, then, do we arm ourselves to meet the enemy within? What forces do we marshal against old values, and how do we engage in this struggle? These are the concerns which led to LSM's August 1974 seminar.

The central theme of our two weeks of discussion was *class analysis*. What is a "class"? How is the concept useful in understanding and predicting people's behavior? How can we use it to advance the struggle for socialism? Our concern was not with arid abstractions or grand theory; it was a practical matter of learning how to use Marxist tools of class analysis. To carry forward its work, LSM needs people who can make analyses at many levels; who can uncover the processes of contradictions and learn to intervene in agentive, creative ways - to correctly interpret the world and change it.

Part of our discussions concerned the need for rigor and precision both in thinking and speaking. The more rigorously we use our vocabulary of analysis - the more explicitly and consistently we give meaning to the terms we employ - the better can we understand and express reality. This seemed easy enough to grasp in the abstract. Once we got into *practicing* analysis, however, we found out how difficult it was to overcome the vagueness and ambiguity in our everyday thought and language. Most of the terms we use have any number of meanings; but they can be useful analytical tools only to the extent that they enable us to predict. For instance, when we call an object a "chair," the inference is that, at some point, we expect somebody to use this object to sit on. Somebody may climb up on a chair to reach something, or may use a box to sit on; but we still distinguish a chair from a ladder and a box, since a chair is made specifically to sit on. If we were to call a box a chair, or a chair a ladder, simply because they can be used in various ways; or if we were to use the same term for all three objects, it would create insurmountable confusion in communication.

Though we could grasp this, the problems mounted when we switched to more complex concepts such as "family," "nation," or "working class." We found that all such terms are products of history, arising from social practice and expressing predictions about the world. But with the passing of decades and centuries, people's ways change and so do the meanings of their terms. This holds true for "family" and "nation" as well for most words in our political vocabulary: "peasantry," "workers," "imperialism," etc. They had their origins in particular historical circumstances which have since changed or passed out of existence. Thus, in many cases, their generic meanings no longer correspond to reality.

This brought the discussion to a point of central concern to all the comrades. As Marxists, we are not seeking to simply memorize a theory, complete with its own vocabulary and strategic predictions. Ours is not an exercise in religious faith, trying to cram reality into predetermined conceptual slots, but one of trying to *make* theory. Our task is not simply to combat dogmatism, but to go beyond. We must develop concepts useful in explaining reality; in laying bare the processes of the world around us and identifying the forces which work to either change or preserve the status quo. In other words, we must learn to develop correct theory so as to guide our practice. Then we can formulate a more effective strategy and tactics designed to advance revolutionary interests.

How do we practice our analytical skills? Of course, the ultimate test will be LSM's ability to contribute to the international socialist revolution already in progress throughout much of imperialist society. We cannot expect to have our theories verified or disproved in isolation from this revolutionary process; their worth can only be tested through practice as the balance of forces shift and new contradictions emerge to replace those being resolved. Our present difficulties in analysis are but a reflection of the limitations in LSM practice so far, substantiating Mao's statement that "social practice alone can give rise to human knowledge."

At the seminar, however, in order to get beyond mere abstraction and try out our new-found tools, we had to find a suitable starting point. So we picked a subject on which each comrade has sufficient data to arrive at some verifiable conclusion: our own social being. We used the concepts we had developed to analyze our own motivational and value formation, searching for the causes of particular ways of thinking and behavior in our particular historical and class context. We sought to identify the critical junctures or turning points in our lives as well as the contradictions at work. We tried to discover unfolding patterns and gain insight into the historical basis of the "enemy within." If correct, such

insights can be used to point out conditions favorable to the "enemy within" as well as those which enhance our moving in a revolutionary direction. If we can understand how we got here, we will no doubt be in a better position to consciously set the course for a future which involves continuous efforts at "class defection," a breaking with bourgeois praxis and throwing in our lot with the revolution.

Naturally, this is no easy or straightforward task. But if we cannot understand our own history, see the interplay between material and subjective forces; if we are unable to map our journey through life up to the present, how can we ever expect to understand the situation and development of others, whether individuals or classes? And if we capitulate in this effort, our work in organizing and mobilizing for the anti-imperialist struggle will be like walking blindly in the dark, stumbling and feeling our way through unknown terrain.

Most of us experienced great difficulties in maintaining the required rigor in our analyses, getting lost in descriptive accounts of our lives. Equally common was the tendency to disregard or play down the force of material conditions and property relations in determining our thought and behavior. Though we "know" that "*being* determines *consciousness*," we did not find it easy to trace the intricate relationship between ideas and values on the one hand, and our material life on the other.

Despite these deficiencies, certain common class tendencies began to emerge.

Individualism: putting one's personal needs and problems ahead of everything else, and the corresponding unwillingness to accept the fact that this tendency is best dealt with by consciously placing the needs of the organization, one's comrades and the revolution first.

Opportunism: adapting old values (e.g., that intellectual work is "more important" than manual labor) to new politics, rather than struggling to transform these values in political practice. *Liberalism*: seeking social acceptance rather than forthrightly expressing our political position, especially when it may be unpopular. These tendencies and others have surfaced in each of us in various forms and degrees. Our attempt to uncover and analyze them helped reveal their persistence and, more often than not, determining their social origins helped expose the illusion that it is all a matter of "personality hang-up's." We can now better appreciate what is involved in defecting from our class-of-origin and joining our lives with those of the revolutionary masses.

To be sure, such class tendencies embody both positive and negative aspects. It is to some degree *because of* (and not despite) our individualism, etc. that we have been able to come as far as we have in a revolutionary direction. Things like competitiveness, personal ambition and pragmatism have in strange ways been important ingredients in our work to destroy the system which gave rise to such values in the first place. But in order to move on, this dialectic interplay of positive and negative aspects of our class values must be brought under control. We must learn to see the relation between the contradictory aspects of these tendencies in any given situation. Only then can we "turn our weaknesses into strengths" and advance both our work and our politics.

"Class defection" is not an act accomplished by joining LSM or any other political organization; nor can it be the product of a two-week seminar. It is a life-long task demanding conscious effort and achieved only in practice combining initiative and self-discipline. At the organizational level, it requires the practice of criticism/self-criticism. Individually, it calls for honesty and a willingness to learn; to study the "enemy within" and find ways of dealing with it.

Such were the major subjects of our seminar discussions. We also spent time in trying to analyze the class composition of imperialist society as well as two full days in reading aloud and discussing parts of *Prairie Fire*, the recent political statement by the Weather Underground. As the latter is no doubt an important document with regard to the North American anti-imperialist "movement," we intend to publish our comments and comradely criticisms in a later issue of *LSM News*.

In every way our seminar challenged LSM members to develop Marxist analysis as a tool to strengthen our practice and extend and improve our political work. Our responses to this challenge were varied and, predictably, not entirely positive. Some comrades reacted subjectively, becoming confused and demoralized for a time. All in all, however, we came away with a deeper appreciation of our politics as well as encouragement and renewed determination to realize democratic centralism as our organizational principle and carry forward the struggle for international socialism.

LSM: Problems in Theory, Strategy and Practice

by Don Barnett, LSM Chairman

In the last issue of LSM NEWS we discussed some aspects of the important nexus which exists between LSM theory, strategy and tactics. A brief and necessarily skeletal examination was made of LSM's theoretical position and historic origins so as to situate our discussion of LSM praxis within a concrete historical setting. Several questions were raised for future discussion and we began dealing with those centering around LSM's relationship with the MPLA of Angola - especially since the recent split within MPLA and the coup in Portugal. Before continuing that discussion and trying to sort out some of the relevant data, it will be useful to consider at a more general level some of the realities and problems we must deal with in attempting to establish and maintain comradely and critical relationships with liberation movements - relationships firmly rooted in concrete forms of collaboration, based on mutual respect, and carried forward in responsible and principled ways.

International Realities

To begin with, it should be borne in mind that the complexities and exigencies faced by contemporary liberation movements require considerable flexibility and tactical maneuvering at the international political and diplomatic levels. Here, in practical terms, the Chinese strategy of *unifying* all positive forces for the revolution, *neutralising* elements whose interests are immediately threatened, and *isolating* the principal enemy at each successive stage of the struggle, is applied with varying degrees of success by all liberation movements. This, of course, has created many strange bedfellows and alliances at numerous junctures in every revolutionary process. In Mozambique today, for example, with FRELIMO participating in a transitional government until complete independence is granted on 25 June 1975, we find Portuguese soldiers fighting alongside FRELIMO guerrillas against fascist white settler gangs and ex-security officers - a phenomenon difficult even to conceive of but a few months ago. And while FRELIMO is attempting to consolidate its power in Mozambique against white settler and potential mercenary forces - the principal enemy at this juncture - it is also trying to neutralize the white minority regimes of South Africa and Rhodesia, as well as major imperialist powers such as the U.S., whose economic and political interests are seriously threatened by the possibility of an independent, socialist and hostile Mozambique. Thus we note the absence of advance plans to expropriate foreign corporate holdings, the continuous departure of ban-busting Rhodesian goods from Mozambican ports, and work proceeding on schedule on a Cabora Bassa Dam designed to provide needed hydro-electric power to South Africa. While recognizing the danger of such tactics becoming prolonged and entrenched under a banner of expediency and national well-being, no one on the left should be so arrogant or undialectical as to prejudge such an abandonment of internationalist duty by a vanguard party tested through ten years of armed struggle.

Another reality we must face in our work is that of a divided, unevenly developed and "stratified" socialist world. Not only has the Sino-Soviet split, centered on the important questions of revisionism and social hegemonism, affected liberation movements and alliances in various and not always positive ways, but a prestige hierarchy based on presumed power and influence extends to metropolitan socialist/communist organizations as well. During the mid-1960's, in the course of China's cultural revolution, numerous alliances among African liberation movements were formed or consolidated. On the one hand, there was the relatively close alliance within CONCP* of PAIGC, FRELIMO and MPLA - all movements struggling against the common enemy of Portuguese colonial rule. These three movements were, in turn, though less closely, allied with the ANC (South Africa), ZAPU (Zimbabwe) and SWAPO (Namibia). Until the late 60's, when Chinese policy toward FRELIMO changed, these movements effectively cut themselves off from Chinese support by refusing to break all ties with the USSR and repudiate the Soviet Union as a revisionist and social imperialist power. On the other hand, there emerged a loose alliance between generally weaker and largely exile-spawned movements which were supported to one degree or another by the Chinese: COREMO (Mozambique), UNITA (Angola), ZANU (Zimbabwe), PAC (South Africa) and SWANU (Namibia). China was obviously, and perhaps correctly, giving primacy to the contradiction between socialism and revisionism as opposed to that between imperialism and colonized nations. In any event, settler and colonial regimes, as well as imperialist powers, were able to exploit and manipulate such divisions within the national liberation struggles of southern Africa for their own ends, sowing discord, planting agents, and spreading confusion among the masses wherever possible. Added to this was the further complication of an increasingly conservative OAU which pressed continually for "unity" within national liberation struggles - often in very heavy-handed ways - despite the fact that such unity, where possible, had to be achieved in the course of struggle within the country concerned and not as a result of external pressures. Numerous paper agreements - between PAC and ANC, ZAPU and ZANU, MPLA and FNLA, etc. - which were no sooner signed than ignored, generally led to heightened conflict and hostility rather than unity between the movements concerned. The most recent example of such paper agreements is that which supposedly united the three factions of MPLA - but more on this later.

It must be understood, finally, that within every liberation movement and revolutionary struggle there are to be found, in differing degrees of strength, both revolutionary and reactionary tendencies and elements, as well as those which are wavering or vacillating in the middle between these two poles. At each stage in the struggle, the specific character of "left" and "right" tendencies will differ. In general, however, it is those tendencies which advance socialist democracy and proletarian internationalism which are revolutionary, while those which promote privilege for the few, racism and chauvinist forms of nationalism are reactionary. Under certain conditions the contradiction between such tendencies sharpens, resulting in splits, expulsions and/or radical shifts in policy and practice by the movement or organization concerned. The most celebrated recent manifestation of this phenomenon was the struggle in China between the "rightist" tendency of Liu Shao-ch'i (revisionism, elitism, etc.) and the "left" tendency of Mao Tse-tung (proletarian democracy, continuation of the class struggle, etc.). In Africa we have seen the split off of the Simango-Kavandame faction within FRELIMO along narrow nationalist and racist lines, which culminated in their defection to the Portuguese in 1969. Prior to that, in Kenya, there was the left tendency within KANU, led by Odinga and Kaggia, which eventually split and formed the now-banned Kenya People's Party. Most recently, we have seen the three-way split of MPLA between left, centrist and opportunist elements.

Anti-Imperialism in North America

How, you might ask, does all this relate to LSM? To our relationships with the liberation movements? Our own strategy and objectives? First, let me say that over the past several years these phenomena have indeed affected us very much. LSM, as stated earlier, is a relatively small, openly Marxist-Leninist organization which devotes a considerable portion of its energies toward advancing revolutionary developments and struggles in the "Third World." Unfortunately, very few Marxist or "left" groups in North

*For all abbreviations see glossary at the end of article.

America have programs related concretely to liberation struggles outside the homeland. Most focus their practice around such themes as "organizing the working class," "building a vanguard party," "small-scale sabotage," "establishing collectives," "educating prisoners," "liberating North American women," "creating united fronts," "participating in electoral politics," "combating pollution," "protecting the rights of tenants or gay people" and numerous other national and/or local issues. Some support is also given by the white left to assisting the struggles of internally colonized Blacks, Chicanos and Native Peoples for self-determination.

Without attempting here to evaluate the positive and negative aspects of such praxis, or the theoretical assumptions guiding it, we must be frank in asserting that far too little concern or effort by such left groups has gone toward supporting anti-imperialist comrades abroad struggling arms-in-hand against the common enemy. And not infrequently, such support as is given to these "foreign" comrades is of a low-level propagandistic nature and often blatantly opportunistic in character. An example which comes vividly to mind is when the Trotskyist YSA in Vancouver refused to allow collections to be made for the NLF during a Vietnam demonstration they had organized, arguing that all monies raised should go toward local organizational work. In the same vein, much recent CPC support for the Chilean cause is geared essentially toward building support for the Party. The CPC(M-L) has recently engaged in similar campaigns vis-a-vis the Native Peoples of Canada.

Such political practice, it might be argued, is correct in that it helps to build a stronger organization which can then undertake even greater tasks. What is essentially opportunistic in such work, however, is that the struggles of internally colonized peoples and those struggling for national independence and socialism in the "Third World" are viewed primarily as a *means* toward enhancing the popularity and power of the metropolitan left organizations concerned. Performing one's "internationalist duty" means, in many cases, jumping on highly publicized events (e.g., the counter-revolutionary coup in Chile, the Armed Forces coup in Portugal, etc.) so as to reach as wide an audience as possible with a particular line or, even worse, to mask one's "revolutionary" line while attempting to build a base around support for "popular" issues and causes.

In any event, most of the material and informational support work being done in North America for liberation movements - especially those in Africa - is carried out by religious, left-liberal and philanthropic organizations. It is the United Church, Oxfam and local support committees (CFM, TCLPAC, SAC, ACOA, etc.), plus certain para-governmental organizations like CUSO, DEAP (in Canada) and the AAI (U.S.), which are setting the pace in this international arena! Without delving into their various motives for such work, it is clear that few if any are moved by a desire for international socialism and communism, by proletarian class values, or by a scientific socialist understanding of the world. It is also clear that despite the many well-meaning people involved in such work, they are sometimes financed and manipulated so as to advance the interests of the international bourgeoisie . . . largely by helping to pave the way for neo-colonial accommodations in the remaining colonial and white racist ruled territories of Africa.

What, one wonders, has happened to Lenin's strong and correct call to Communists around the world: "Parties in countries whose bourgeoisies possess colonies and oppress other nations must pursue a particularly distinct and clear policy in respect to the colonial and oppressed nations. Every Party wishing to join the 3rd International must ruthlessly expose the colonial machinations of the imperialists of its 'own' country; must support - *by actions and not merely by words* - every colonial liberation movement, demand expulsion of the imperialists from the colonies, educate the workers in a spirit of brotherhood with the laboring population of colonial and oppressed nations, and conduct systematic agitation among the armed forces against all colonial oppression"?* (Italics added)

But regardless of the reasons for the abandonment in essence of this important Leninist principle, which we hope to go into in greater detail in later articles, it is clear that liberation movements seeking material and other forms of support in North America have attempted by and large to develop tactics unifying and mobilizing that range of liberal - religious - philanthropic organizations which, on their own, have shown the greatest interest in their liberation struggles. Again at the tactical level, this has meant a toning down where necessary of their Marxist orientation and socialist aspirations.

*Lenin, *Against Revisionism*, p.555. Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow 1959. From "Conditions for affiliation to the Communist International," July 1920.

Diplomatic Tactics

While we recognize the need for such tactics by the liberation movements at certain historic moments in the struggle - even where, as in the case of Canada, this involves dealing with imperialist tools like CUSO and provincial social-democrat parties - we are also aware that there are certain negative aspects and dangers involved. Not only are the neo-colonial "aid" gambits quite real and of proven efficacy, but it is not uncommon for movement representatives - themselves more often than not of petty bourgeois background and training - to get caught up in dissimulating the "pure nationalist" role of seeking support and understanding from all quarters. This is especially dangerous when such people work for prolonged periods in the West (or in the Soviet block countries), removed from the criticism of their comrades and the life and struggles of the masses. The tactics of relating effectively to liberal, religious and philanthropic organizations can, unfortunately, become easily transformed into a way of life and thought no longer reflecting the revolutionary ideology and values of the movement. Elitist and opportunist tendencies can come to the fore, especially during low or difficult periods in the struggle. Defections have sometimes occurred when such men are recalled to work among the masses; as was recently the case with MPLA's representative in Sweden. Perhaps this is why the Chinese always sent their strongest cadre to work in areas furthest removed from the struggle and the masses. Again, many African movements have attempted to rotate their foreign representatives or periodically recall them for work in the liberated areas or war zones.

The above mentioned dangers and negative aspects are, of course, for the movements themselves to deal with as they will. We hope that any such observations as we might make in this or other sensitive areas are received in the same comradely spirit as they are given. It is certainly not our intention to tell any movement "what to do"; but we also believe it important to avoid uncritical servility and timidity in our relations with the liberation movements and seek an honest and critical exchange of ideas wherever possible in our struggle against the common imperialist enemy.

Splits within the Angolan Liberation Struggle

It is in this spirit that we wish to raise the following matters pertaining, respectively, to MPLA and the ZAPU/ZANU split in Zimbabwe. At the outset it must be said that, while we fully understand the need for employing such tactics as mentioned above, we do not believe that tactical maneuvering is ever an acceptable basis for the abandonment of principled and responsible conduct between fraternal organizations. Despite difficulties in our relations with MPLA due to logistical factors (e.g. distance, transport facilities, etc.), changing priorities and a certain degree of (perhaps unavoidable) disorganization, we firmly believed that LSM and MPLA - despite the often intimidating difference in our relative size and strength - had established and maintained fraternal relations for over half a decade. I use the past tense with some hesitation and tentativeness due to the fact that since 1972, MPLA has been rent with internal struggles, military setbacks and splits.

Nevertheless, when Dr. Neto, MPLA president, led a delegation to Canada (apparently aimed at seeking support from liberal/religious organizations and government bodies) in May of this year, we felt the question of tactical abandonment of principled behavior was seriously raised. In July 1970, LSM organized the North American tour - MPLA's first - of Commander Toka. Our experience in organizing tours had, since then, greatly increased as a result of the many audio-visual tours and programs we have organized throughout North America. However, we are an open Marxist organization and perhaps the MPLA leadership believed it best, given their objectives, to have their Canadian tour organized by the government-financed CUSO. This we can understand, though perhaps not agree with. The question of principle arose when MPLA failed even to inform or contact us regarding their visit to Canada. It is true we are small and not indispensable - to MPLA or the world revolution in general. We believe our contribution to the struggle is of some significance, however, and in order to continue and increase our efforts we must maintain a certain degree of self respect and integrity in our relations with liberation movements. For this reason, we sent the following cable to the MPLA central committee on 9 April 1974.

Have learned through local liberal group and opportunist Roy of planned Vancouver visit by President Neto. If true, why hasn't LSM been notified directly? LSM is a Marxist-Leninist organization which has worked seven years reliably in collaboration with MPLA, doing much to raise consciousness of and support for MPLA throughout North America with distribution of many publications and numerous film programs. If we are now being ignored it is a principled matter for us, calling into question our continued fraternal relationship with MPLA. Please clarify as soon as possible.*

Though Dr. Neto returned to London before the Vancouver end of his tour, the above matter was discussed at some length with the then leading member of the delegation, who expressed a strong desire that LSM continue its collaboration with MPLA and said he would bring the matter up with the CCPM (Politico-Military Coordinating Committee). Given the three-way split within MPLA and the fact that the CCPM was probably no longer functional, we are not surprised that, as yet, we have had no response from MPLA. The question therefore remains open regarding future LSM/MPLA relations.



Angola Medical Committee

MPLA Militant.

*Jacques Roy, then working for CUSO's French division, SUCO, was personally conducting the Neto party on their tour. This, too, seemed peculiar to us since Roy had for some time been falsely passing himself off in Europe and elsewhere as "Boavida Cuidado," an MPLA member, and had been caught several times using funds raised for MPLA to pay for his personal travel. In late 1972, the MPLA leader, Paulo Jorge, indicated that they intended to repudiate Roy because of his impersonations and comportment - which certainly weren't doing MPLA any good.

Now, what of the split and the situation prevailing within the Angolan liberation struggle. Let me say at the outset that the situation remains both confused and confusing. What follows by way of interpretation is clearly tentative on our part and, perhaps, the full and correct picture will only emerge with time and more direct investigation. We will be maintaining an LSM cadre in Africa on a permanent basis beginning early next year and are hopeful that this will enable us to better achieve that intimacy with current historic events which yields critical insights. For now, we must depend on already accumulated experience and the "facts" and interpretations presented in such publications as *Facts & Reports*, *Afrique-Asie*, *Jeune Afrique*, etc.

Very briefly then, this is how the situation now looks to us. First, there have been achieved no operative agreements or meaningful unity between either (1) MPLA, FNLA and UNITA, or (2) among the three factions of MPLA. The MPLA/FNLA agreement of December 1972 to form a Supreme Council for the Liberation of Angola never got off the ground. MPLA militants sent to Zaire to work with FNLA were arrested and turned over to Holden Roberto, FNLA leader. They are still being held captive at the Kinkuzu military base. Zaire President Mobutu, it seems, is still attempting to secure FNLA/Roberto hegemony over any African-led Angolan government - and perhaps a share of the oil-rich Angolan enclave of Cabinda. He has recently provided the Gulf Oil sponsored secessionist movement of Cabinda (FLEC) with extensive facilities in Kinshasa, including time on Zaire Radio. A complicating factor is the recent (June 1974) arrival in Zaire of 112 Chinese military instructors whose task, according to the Associated Press, is to train and equip two-thirds of a regular FNLA division of 15,000 men. Under continuing pressure from the OAU and those African countries most deeply concerned (Congo, Zaire, Tanzania and Zambia), the MPLA's provisional central committee has reached "partial agreement on holding talks with the . . . FNLA" (*Zambia Mail*, 10/13/74). The "partiality" of the agreement probably hinges, as it has in the past, on the release of MPLA prisoners by FNLA as a sign of good faith.

Both MPLA and FNLA have repudiated Jonas Savimbi's UNITA, especially so after the disclosure on 1 August 1974, in *Afrique-Asie*, of documents revealing treacherous collaboration between UNITA and the Portuguese military forces dating back as early as July 1972. UNITA, in addition, was the first movement to unilaterally proclaim a ceasefire in Angola - prior to the left-wing move which removed Gen. Spínola from power in Portugal on 30 September 1974 - and has since become the "darling" of reactionary white settler forces in Angola. Savimbi, while trying to build a base of support among the Kwanyamas in southwestern Angola, has "declared himself in favor of a multi-racial Government for Angola, and eschewing Communism, (has) endeared himself to the moderates (sic!) among the territory's 450,000 whites, many of whom would like to see him president of an independent Angola" (*Daily Telegraph*, 10/19/74). General Amin of Uganda, perhaps because of Savimbi's anti-communism, has presented UNITA with the largest gift the Ugandan government has ever given to a liberation movement - some 300,000 shillings.

An important additional point should be touched upon here. Certain "Marxist" organizations in North America (the CPC(M-L) in Canada, Progressive Labor in the US, etc.) as well as some cultural nationalist and opportunistic Afro-American organizations in the States (IFCO, AIS, etc.), have over the past couple of years given increasing support to UNITA - in some cases combined with attacks on MPLA as "revisionist" or mulatto-dominated. In large measure this was due to the public support given UNITA by the Chinese Government since 1966 and to the big PR job done by UNITA representatives in Europe and the US. UNITA propaganda combined fantastic claims regarding areas and peoples it had liberated with an "all-Black" image designed to woo black cultural nationalists and chauvinists.

Critical Marxism never accepts on faith that which demands proof; it never blindly accepts something as "truth" merely because of the prestige attaching to the claimant; it is never servile, slavish or timid in its efforts to analyse concrete historic realities and be guided in its practice by such understandings. Though LSM believes China to be in the forefront of the movement for international socialism, this does not mean that we accept as unquestionable truth all aspects of China's analysis of the world situation, nor that we believe China is "above" comradely criticism or serious questioning regarding some of its policies and practices. History reveals, I believe, that we must "dare to struggle" with comrades (in positive, constructive ways), as well as with our enemies. Failure to do so -

as was so blatantly the case during the long period of Soviet hegemony over the world communist movement - is in itself an abandonment of one of our most important internationalist duties.

The disunity and confusion within MPLA surfaced in March 1973 when, according to President Agostinho Neto, an attempt to assassinate him and eliminate "mestizo intellectuals" in the leadership of the movement was foiled. In *Afrique-Asie* (23 June 1974) it is claimed that a conspiracy was formed to carry out this plot in mid-1972 between Chipenda, Holden Roberto (FNLA leader) and certain Zambians linked to the banned ANC of Harry Nkumbula, who favored "dialogue" with racist South Africa. In any event, Chipenda withdrew to Lusaka mobilizing significant support for what he called the "eastern revolt" faction among Zambian officials, who effectively barred the movement of men and supplies to MPLA, thus causing the near collapse of the struggle in the Eastern Region. A third faction, led by Pinto de Andrade and his brother Mario, emerged in Brazzaville and, calling itself the "active revolt faction," criticized both Neto and Chipenda for their personal power struggle, saying that "Neto exercised his position without being accountable to anyone. But because of his personality and prestige (they) would agree to let him continue on condition that his powers be limited and subject to checks . . ." (*Jeune Afrique*, 14 Sept. 1974). On Chipenda, Andrade felt that he was not fit to become the movement's leader.

Neto, for the time being shifting his headquarters to Dar es Salaam, where he had the firm support of President Nyerere, claimed that the "active revolt" faction of Andrade was comprised of militants who had long since removed themselves from the struggle, while Chipenda was "driven by personal ambition, a thirst for power" (*Ibid.*). Under terrific pressure from Nyerere, Kaunda, Ngouabi (Congo) and Mobutu, a "congress" of MPLA was held for the first time in twelve years in Lusaka in August. 400 delegates from the three factions attended - 165 each from Neto's group and Chipenda's, and 70 from the "active revolt" faction. It lasted almost two weeks before Neto and Andrade and their comrades walked out. The remaining Chipenda delegates elected him "president" of MPLA. Then, between 31 August and 2 September, another pressure-packed meeting was held in Brazzaville during the Ninth Summit Conference of the Heads of State of East and Central Africa. An agreement was reached whereby Neto remained president and Chipenda and Andrade became co-vice presidents. A 39-member Central Committee was formed with 16 members from the Neto faction, 13 from Chipenda's "eastern revolt" and 10 from the "active revolt" of Andrade (*Afrique-Asie*, 22 Sept. 1974). A political bureau of nine members was also formed, each faction providing three members, including the president and two vice presidents.

The provisional leadership, however, is not very stable. Chipenda, on 14 October in Brazzaville, said that "Neto was not elected MPLA President by any congress, he was not elected by militants, but only by four chiefs of State. . . . As I said in Dar es Salaam: I was elected MPLA President at a legitimate congress, called by the MPLA, and allowing only our militants to vote. . . ." (*O Século*, Portugal, 15 Oct. 1974).

Regardless of such claims, pressures and external maneuvering, it is events in Angola itself which will determine the character and leadership of MPLA. It seems safe to say that the Andrade "active revolt" faction, with little or no base of popular support in the country, will disappear in the near future. The "eastern revolt" faction of Chipenda, now located in Kinshasa with 700 militants, would, in our opinion, fail to win substantial support among MPLA members or militants in Angola. Regardless of the claims concerning Neto's weaknesses and arbitrariness (Neto never laid claim to being a military leader and, from personal experience and observation, I would say his main weakness lay in the area of political organizing - i.e., getting the right people in the right positions and efficiently coordinating their activities and responsibilities), there is little question that he is a man of high personal integrity, with compassion for the masses and a strong base of popular support both in the countryside and cities. According to a source obviously unfriendly to Dr. Neto's leadership, the South African *Star Weekly* (26 Oct. 1974), "A ceasefire was signed in eastern Angola 70 km from the Zambian border by an Angola Government delegation and by Dr. Agostinho Neto, leader of the MPLA. . . . This week's signing means that Portugal has officially recognized Dr. Neto as the true MPLA leader and not the opposing factions. And although their office (in Luanda) opened only on Friday, the MPLA have wasted no time in flexing their political muscles here by organizing two strikes this week - one of which crippled the port for some time." Again, from the same source, we learn that "In Luanda there is little doubt the MPLA - with massive support among the African population - is

virtually in control of the political scene. The MPLA, say locals, is running the capital."

Again, according to the usually reliable Swedish publication, *Kommentar*, a meeting was held in Early August within Angola of 83 MPLA military commanders and political cadre resulting in the formation of the People's Armed Forces for the Liberation of Angola as "an independent entity under the political guidance of MPLA." Their proclamation made it very clear that the entire military wing of the Movement gave full support to Agostinho Neto and opposed the maneuvers of the Chipenda and Andrade factions (10 Nov. 1974). In the same article, it was pointed out that immediately after the Brazzaville Agreement, on 3 September 1974, an Inter-Regional MPLA Conference was held in Angola with 250 delegates from all parts of the country. They met for over two weeks and discussed, among other things, MPLA's statutes and program, their position on negotiations with Portugal, international affairs and, not least of all, their position as regards the "eastern revolt" and "active revolt" factions. They concluded by holding elections for a provisional Central Committee and approving the declaration on the formation of FAPLA and support for Dr. Neto.

Though the FNLA has unquestioned support among the Bakongos of the Northwest, and Savimbi may temporarily have mobilized support among the Kwanyamas, we believe that a Neto-led MPLA will emerge over the next few months prior to independence as the major African force in Angola. Hoping that MPLA can overcome its weaknesses and move forward, we continue to think this is the movement deserving support among Marxist revolutionary groups in North America and elsewhere. Perhaps the Chinese know something we don't (other than that MPLA has received considerable support from the Soviet bloc countries), but Roberto's history of close ties with the US and a very reactionary Mobutu regime, his soft line regarding Cabinda secession and foreign corporations and a deeply entrenched Bakongo regionalism should caution those who would follow the lead of the Chinese at this juncture. Of Savimbi's UNITA, little more need be said. We have long felt that without internal support from the Portuguese, UNITA could not have maintained itself in Angola given the logistics problems created by an unfriendly Zambia. MPLA, in the meantime, and at present, is firm in their position to oust foreign corporations, support the South African and Zimbabwean liberation movements, and advance a political line and policy which is socialist in content and will act independently, not "bowing to pressure from its Eastern bloc supporters" (*Ibid.*).

We also hope, during our visit to Luanda next spring, that we can resolve the questions of principle raised earlier in this article and re-establish fraternal, critical and principled relations with the MPLA. Angola remains a vital front in the anti-imperialist struggle. The fighting has stopped (perhaps only temporarily), but the revolution lies ahead.

ZAPU/ZANU Differences

In Zimbabwe the struggle has unfolded quite differently from that in Angola; as have the conflicts between the major liberation movements, ZAPU and ZANU, and LSM's relation to that struggle and internal split. After ZAPU was banned in Rhodesia in December 1962, two organizations emerged to carry on the open struggle against British colonial rule: the People's Caretaker Council, a front for the underground ZAPU; and ZANU, a faction of the old ZAPU which split off after the banning to form a new national organization. ZANU itself was banned in 1964. The reasons for the split remain, for us at least, somewhat confused. Obviously there were differences of a personal and tactical nature, but each organization claimed the other was "reformist," wishing to negotiate independence with the British, while it was "revolutionary," viewing armed struggle as the only path to national liberation. At present, this remains ZANU's primary criticism of ZAPU. It maintains also that ZAPU is undemocratic in that Joshua Nkomo is a "lifetime" president, while all ZANU officials are elected; that ZAPU's guerrilla forces are only token, while ZANU is prepared and currently engaging in a protracted armed struggle; and the constant practice of criticism/self-criticism gives ZANU a unity which ZAPU lacks.

ZAPU, on the other hand, maintains that it sees no hope for a negotiated settlement with the Smith Regime; that it too has embarked on a protracted people's war, but differs with ZANU strategically as regards the feasibility at the present stage of achieving liberated areas - seeing small-scale generalized military actions and effective political

education and mass mobilization as necessary prerequisites to consolidating liberated zones; that the differences with ZANU are non-ideological - as both are Marxist and socialist in orientation; and that their differences have largely been the result of external pressures, connected to the Sino-Soviet split (with China supporting ZANU and opposed to a merging of the two movements) but also tied to certain conflicts involving African governments in East and Central Africa. ZAPU also maintains that conflicts centering around "personalities," some dating back to 1962, and all other outstanding differences between the two movements could be dealt with and resolved if outside forces would allow this to happen.

Between 1963 and 1967 both organizations were relatively ineffective at the military level within Zimbabwe. Most of the leadership was outside, where their respective headquarters were located, and many others were being held in detention by the racist regime. Both presidents, Sithole and Nkomo, were arrested and detained in the early 1960's. In 1967-8, ZAPU and ANC of South Africa launched a joint military campaign in Zimbabwe. Though achieving some successes, tactical and security weaknesses led to major setbacks and eventual defeat by the Rhodesian forces. ZAPU then went through its lowest period, with internal conflicts eventuating in the split off of a faction led by central committee members Nyandoro and Chikerema, calling itself FROLIZI - which has since been virtually dormant. In 1972 ZAPU began pulling itself together. Trained military personnel were sent into Zimbabwe to carry out small-scale sabotage but mainly, at first, to live among and politically educate the people. The Movement now claims to have approximately 1,200 armed guerrillas and its military actions have escalated over the past few months.

ZANU, on the other hand, was confined to few and small-scale military actions until 1972 and it wasn't until 1973 when, using the corridor created by FRELIMO successes to the north in Mozambique (in Tete province), they sent larger numbers of militants to Zimbabwe and created a fairly big military operational zone in the Northwest. At present, ZANU claims to have "liberated" some 50,000 square miles with a population of over two million people. They operate a civil administration in this area, including schools, clinics, courts, etc., according to their US representative, Tapson Mawere, and have inoculated large numbers of Zimbabweans recently against cholera.

There is no question that today ZANU is carrying the major burden of armed struggle in Zimbabwe, though we have to remain somewhat sceptical regarding their claims to "liberated" areas and population. No outside observers or sympathizers have as yet visited these liberated areas and LSM was told by ZANU leadership that it was still too dangerous for outsiders to go in. Some "outsiders" might be unwilling to run the risks involved, but we certainly are not. In 1968 and 1969 we visited the eastern region of Angola and survived the first major Portuguese dry-season offensive. We hope to visit Namibia sometime next year and Southeast Asia as well. After all, even bourgeois journalists "cover" wars from the trenches and run the risks involved. Why should those claiming to be revolutionaries be willing to do less?

Again, ZANU has published very little information regarding civil administrative techniques or machinery in the liberated zones and refused such comment when asked during a recent interview. Taking fully into account that much seemingly innocuous information can be of value to the enemy, we feel that certain general features - such as were provided by the NLF, FRELIMO, MPLA, etc. - could be given without endangering those involved or being of operational use to the enemy. In any event, we remain sceptical, though we certainly hope that ZANU claims are substantiated in the near future.

LSM became associated with ZAPU first in 1968, when we did an interview with the then general secretary, George Nyandoro, in Dar es Salaam. At that time ZANU was rent with division and corruption and had little visible presence or popular support within Zimbabwe. Again, and perhaps mistakenly, it was LSM policy at the time to collaborate only with African liberation movements fraternally related to MPLA, FRELIMO and PAIGC - which, in effect meant that we didn't establish relationships with ZANU, PAC or SWANU. Until late 1973, however, when we began reprinting ZAPU's bulletin, *Zimbabwe Review*, we did no concrete support work for ZAPU - though we discussed certain projects in December 1972. It is only very recently, after the visit of ZAPU representatives to Vancouver - which LSM sponsored - that we took on some concrete support projects for ZAPU.

Let me go back a step now to reveal some aspects of the developing relationship between ZAPU and ZANU as it was reported and known to us. At the time we were in Lusaka in late



Don Barnett/LSM

MPLA Fighter with his daughter.

1972, an agreement was reached under OAU pressure creating a Joint Military Command and at least operational unity between ZAPU and ZANU. This faltering unity was propped up again by an agreement in March 1973 according to which a provisional central committee was formed and joint meetings were to be held in order to achieve unity in the Zimbabwe liberation movement. The movements were to refrain from attacking one another publicly and many, including ourselves, were of the view that unity - despite or because of outside pressures - was finally coming to the Zimbabwe Struggle. This was made clear earlier as ZAPU policy in a December interview with George Silundika* and reaffirmed in later correspondence. It was only last month (October 1974), when we had a chance to talk in depth with the two visiting ZAPU comrades, Edward Ndlovu and Stephen Nkomo, that we came to learn of the breakdown in relations between ZAPU and ZANU and the sharpening of conflict between them. This became apparent when we were criticized for our new poster advocating support for "ZAPU-ZANU in the Armed Struggle to Free Zimbabwe." After a frank exchange of ideas and no little struggle, it was agreed that LSM would go on with its support of ZAPU while at the same time not closing the doors to relations with ZANU, whose claims and organization we felt it necessary to better understand. The ZAPU comrades were self-critical and acknowledged the credibility gap regarding their own activities in Zimbabwe and certain deficiencies in *Zimbabwe Review*, which failed to report on current military developments due to weaknesses in organization.

LSM Relations with ZANU

We had written ZANU regarding the possibility of distributing their *Zimbabwe News* and began receiving issues of this bulletin regularly in July. Our East Coast Unit did an interview in New York, with Tapson Mawere, their US representative, and arrangements were made for us to record an interview for publication with acting-President Chitepo when he visited the UN in October. With this background, it obviously came as something of a surprise to find in the August 1974 *Zimbabwe News* (before the interview with Mawere!), in the context of an article entitled "The Zimbabwe Ghost: the waning fortunes of ZAPU," that LSM was attacked as a "dubious, half-baked and reactionary" support group - along with other unnamed organizations in North America that supported ZAPU - apparently because we had published an interview with George Silundika, some of whose comments they take sharp exception to. In the same article, we are contemptuously referred to, in passing, as the "so-called Liberation Support Movement based in B.C., Canada and composed of pseudo anti-imperialist white (sic!) liberals" and as "the reactionary and capitalist oriented Canadian Liberation Support Movement."

Apart from the fact that such slanderous comments are simply false, it is obvious that they were based on no investigation of LSM, being merely inferred from the fact that we published interviews with ZAPU and ANC (South Africa) leaders. Strange indeed from a liberation movement which claims to be guided in its praxis by Marxism and scientific socialism! But other aspects of the attack and subsequent events also seem peculiar to us. For example, if by publishing interviews with ZAPU and ANC we become "reactionary," "capitalist oriented," "pseudo anti-imperialist (white) liberals," what are we then when we publish materials and do support work for such organizations as PAIGC, FRELIMO, MPLA, SWAPO, PLO, PFLOAG, NLF, etc.? And do such organizations also become reactionary, etc., due to their fraternal relations with ZAPU? Such facile "guilt-by-association" logic would seem to place ZANU in the contradictory position of attacking many liberation movements and other organizations with whom they are obviously seeking fraternal relations. But perhaps such offhanded and unfounded attacks are reserved by ZANU for what are considered small, unimportant, "white" groups, which can be manipulated or dispensed with at will if it serves some minor tactical purpose.

Again, the *Zimbabwe News* containing this attack on LSM was issued in August 1974. In September an LSM East Coast Unit member met with Tapson Mawere to learn more about ZANU as well as establish relations with their representative in New York. Many things were discussed in a friendly manner and Mawere indicated several ZANU needs in the event LSM wanted to undertake a material support project for them. Now we hadn't seen the August issue of *Zimbabwe News* at that time, so perhaps Mr. Mawere hadn't either. But certainly by

*See Interview in Depth, Zimbabwe/ZAPU, G. Silundika. LSM Press, 1973.

late October, when Rick Sterling of the Information Center did an interview at the UN, arranged by Mawere, with ZANU's Secretary for External Affairs, there had been plenty of time for all to read the *Zimbabwe News* article in question. Mr. Noel Mkono, however, was quite open and friendly toward Rick and seemed very willing to tape an interview for publication by LSM. What seems strange to us is that the leadership of a liberation movement would do a taped interview with a small group it considers "reactionary," etc. We are not, after all, *Newsweek*; nor are we important enough in international circles to require the "correct" diplomatic protocol. Why, then, bother with us at all?

As mentioned earlier, all movements contain left, right and wavering elements and tendencies. Not infrequently, rightist elements appear as ultra-leftists and employ tactics including irresponsible and unfounded attacks on supposed "enemies" of the revolution. A glaring example of this was Liu's early attacks on the Red Guards at Peking University; and many others were wrongly attacked as "capitalist roaders" by rightists seeking cover behind the red flag. Is it possible that such a person authored or edited the article and attack on LSM in *Zimbabwe News*? Or that the staff of ZANU's bulletin contains an ultra-leftist tendency? Given their Secretary of External Affairs' response and behavior toward LSM in New York recently, we believe this might indeed be the case. Unfortunately, and largely due to errors on our part, the matter was not discussed with Mr. Mkono in October. We will certainly seek clarification when one of our members is in Africa next year. In the meantime, while we hope to strengthen our relations with the Zimbabwe liberation struggle in the near future, we will always oppose unprincipled and opportunist attacks on us (or any other organization) such as appeared in ZANU's August *Zimbabwe News*. Criticism, where it is to advance the revolution, must be based on fact and offered constructively.

In summary, then, I have tried to indicate some of the realities which LSM, as a Marxist group, has to operate within in establishing and maintaining comradely, critical and productive relationships with African and other liberation movements. In the context of shifting political and diplomatic movement tactics, a stratified and divided "socialist world" with great inequalities in power and prestige, and both revolutionary and counter-revolutionary tendencies present within all movements, I have attempted - admittedly too briefly - to deal with some of the contradictions and problems LSM has experienced in its relations with the Angola and Zimbabwe liberation struggles and, more particularly, with MPLA and ZAPU/ZANU. It was obviously an undertaking far exceeding the limitations of a single article. In future issues of LSM NEWS we hope to be able to deal in far greater detail and analytical depth with many of the important points and questions only briefly touched upon here.

GLOSSARY

AAI	African-American Institute
ACOA	American Committee on Africa
AIS	Africa Information Service
ANC	African National Congress (of South Africa)
CFM	Committee for a Free Mozambique
CONCP	Conference of Nationalist Organizations of the Portuguese Colonies
CPC	Communist Party of Canada
CPC (M-L)	Communist Party of Canada (Marxist-Leninist)
CUSO	Canadian University Students Overseas
DEAP	Development Education Amateur Program
FAPLA	Popular Armed Forces for the Liberation of Angola
FLEC	Cabinda Enclave Liberation Front
FNLA	National Front for the Liberation of Angola
FRELIMO	Mozambique Liberation Front
IFCO	Inter-religious Foundation for Community Organizing
MPLA	Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola
OAU	Organization of African Unity
PAIGC	African Party for the Independence of Guiné and Cape Verde
SAC	Southern Africa Committee
SWANU	South West African National Union
SWAPO	South West Africa People's Organization
TCLPAC	Toronto Committee for the Liberation of Portugal's African Colonies
UNITA	National Union for the Total Independence of Angola
YSA	Young Socialist Alliance
ZANU	Zimbabwe African National Union
ZAPU	Zimbabwe African People's Union

Zimbabwe: Toward Liberation!

Interview with Edward Ndlovu,
ZAPU Deputy National Secretary



J. LaBounty/LSM

Edward Ndlovu was born in the Gwanda district of southern Zimbabwe. After receiving secondary education in South Africa, he returned to Zimbabwe where he became involved in the African trade union movement. In 1954 he joined the African National Congress of Southern Rhodesia and has ever since worked in the leadership of the Zimbabwe nationalist movement. He left Zimbabwe clandestinely in 1964 and is presently stationed at ZAPU's external headquarters in Lusaka, Zambia. He was interviewed by LSM during his recent visit to Vancouver.

Guerrilla Activities

WHAT PROGRESS HAS ZAPU MADE IN THE ARMED STRUGGLE SINCE GUERRILLA ACTIVITY IN ZIMBABWE WAS STEPPED UP TWO YEARS AGO? WHAT TYPES OF MILITARY ACTION HAVE YOUR FORCES BEEN PRIMARILY ENGAGED IN?

By 1972 ZAPU was emerging from a serious internal political crisis and at the end of that year we resumed military actions to reassert our position as a revolutionary movement. We started by planting road mines and carrying out other forms of sabotage. Smith got so upset by our offensive that he closed Rhodesia's border with Zambia a few months later. He gave as the reason a long list of activities by the Zimbabwe People's Revolutionary Army (ZPRA), ZAPU's military wing. This was one indication of our progress.

At the present stage our efforts include sabotage, mining, ambushes and attacks on enemy bivouacs. Our largest actions are still in the North and Northwest, but we are doing our best to step up the struggle elsewhere as well. The incident which precipitated the closure of the border, for example, involved an enemy troop carrier setting off one of our anti-tank mines. More than twenty soldiers were killed, and when South African and Rhodesian senior officers arrived to inspect the site, they too detonated a mine which killed another seven. Incidents of this kind wear down enemy morale and have sent the Smith regime into a state of panic.

EXPERIENCE FROM OTHER COUNTRIES INDICATES THAT TO GAIN FULL SUPPORT FROM THE MASSES, A LIBERATION MOVEMENT MUST DEMONSTRATE THAT IT CAN EFFECTIVELY CHALLENGE THE ENEMY AND WREST CONTROL OF REGIONS WHERE THE POPULATION CAN RECEIVE SOME DEGREE OF MOVEMENT PROTECTION. HOW CLOSE IS ZPRA TO ACHIEVING SUCH LIBERATED ZONES?

Conditions in Zimbabwe are in certain ways quite different from those, say, in Angola and Mozambique, where MPLA and FRELIMO were able to quickly establish liberated areas and begin the process of national reconstruction. The size and terrain of Zimbabwe have made this unfeasible. We tried it in 1967-68 by concentrating large forces in the Wankie area of the Northwest..., trying to gain a foothold there. Well, this proved a disaster and we were forced to change our strategy. We now use small units - three or four militants - which never operate in isolation from the people. We have some 800 - 1,000 trained guerrillas who are fed, sheltered and provided with information on the enemy. Spread out over most of the country, their tasks are to carry out political education among the masses and engage in small scale military actions.

Our objective in this is two-fold. First, we have to prepare the masses for higher levels of struggle and sink deep roots among them to counter the terrorist tactics of the settler regime. Second, we must try to disperse the enemy forces. At the present time, they are well equipped and relatively well trained. Their main limitation is size - by themselves, the Rhodesian forces cannot effectively occupy the entire country. Our task, therefore, is to generalize the struggle and disperse their troops; only then can we start challenging the enemy in larger scale combats and establish liberated areas.

WITH A LARGE NUMBER OF SMALL UNITS LIVING UNDERGROUND AMONG THE PEOPLE, WHAT PROBLEMS DO YOU ENCOUNTER IN COMMUNICATION AND OVERALL COORDINATION OF ACTIONS?

For organizational purposes, we have divided Zimbabwe into fifteen military regions with a regional commander heading operations in each. The units take their orders from the regional commander and report to him on a regular basis. The commander, in his turn, is in touch with our Central Command, which at this stage is still outside the country. Sometimes the communication is by radio, especially between regional and central commands, but we also rely heavily on couriers. Of course, the danger of enemy interception is always there and causes problems. In general, though, our communications system is now working adequately and enables Central Command to keep in touch with developments inside Zimbabwe.

WHAT LOGISTICS PROBLEMS DO YOU ENCOUNTER IN SUPPLYING ZPRA MILITANTS?

The question of supplies is a very difficult one. Since we operate with small units inside, we are not yet in a position to capture much from the enemy, or even carry off and use whatever we may capture. For example, after our attacks on South African patrols in the Victoria Falls area last year, we had to leave a lot of enemy equipment behind simply because it was too heavy and we didn't have the personnel to carry it away. This is obviously a serious problem, especially since we don't have enough equipment to arm all our militants and recruits. It is one we shall have to solve before we can start operating with larger units.

At the moment we depend heavily on outside supplies of arms and funds to carry out our operations. In the long run, however, such a situation tends to hamper the progress of our struggle. Just the enormous time between requesting certain equipment and actually getting it into areas of operation makes planning very difficult. Our revolution demands patience,

but having to wait a long time for supplies can become a cause of demoralization among our fighters. It is therefore of great importance that we achieve greater self-reliance as soon as possible.

Logistics problems also limit recruitment and training inside Zimbabwe. Some of our fighters are trained inside, but there is a very definite limit as to how much of this we can do. We give recruits basic knowledge of explosives and training in the use of light weapons. However, we don't have adequate arms and ammunition for most of those who want to join us inside. Most of our guerrillas, therefore, are still trained outside in socialist or independent African countries. In the future, when we can improve our logistics situation, this should change.

I should add that all our militants also receive political training. They study Marxism-Leninism, Maoism, the history of Zimbabwe and writings on other revolutions, such as in Vietnam, Algeria, Cuba or the Mau Mau in Kenya. Whenever we can, we spend time on political education, since it is crucial in building and maintaining the morale and good comportment among our guerrillas.



OVER THE PAST FEW YEARS A PROBLEM OF CREDIBILITY HAS ARISEN DUE TO A LACK OF PUBLIC INFORMATION ON ZAPU'S ACTIVITIES INSIDE ZIMBABWE. CAN YOU COMMENT ON THIS?

Unfortunately, there is little doubt that our information services have not been functioning as they should. Our bulletin, *Zimbabwe Review*, hasn't adequately reflected the level of ZAPU activity inside Zimbabwe and this is regrettable since it has given rise to the credibility gap you are talking about. We have come to recognize this, especially during this tour abroad, and will do our best that the situation is rectified.

ARE YOU ABLE TO DEAL WITH THE REGIME'S RETALIATORY MEASURES, IN PARTICULAR ITS CREATION OF SO-CALLED "TRIBAL MILITIAS" AND "PROTECTED VILLAGES"? HOW HAVE THE PEOPLE RESPONDED TO THIS KIND OF REPRESSION?

All these things are designed to separate the people from the guerrillas; every Zimbabwean knows that and only a small minority are inclined to support the regime. Most people, on the contrary, resent its counter-insurgency tactics and are more than ever coming to realize that the armed struggle is the only way to achieve positive changes.

You must understand what happens to people when they are moved into these so-called "protected villages": their crops are destroyed, their livestock is confiscated; and the people are just dumped at their new "home" and left to starve. Whatever can't be taken along is simply destroyed by the troops to prevent its being used by the guerrillas. The regime has completely depopulated large regions along the Zambian and Mozambican borders, moving entire villages as far as the Limpopo Valley, close to South Africa, where they think they will be "safe" from the liberation forces. But ZAPU militants are already there - having been moved with the rest of the population - and continue doing political work among the masses. The creation of such concentration-camp villages has made our movement and communication more difficult, but we are laying the basis for a rapid escalation in the level of activity in these areas in the near future.

The ZAPU/ZANU Joint Military Command

MANY ATTEMPTS HAVE BEEN MADE TO ESTABLISH COOPERATION BETWEEN ZAPU AND THE ZIMBABWE AFRICAN NATIONAL UNION (ZANU), ZIMBABWE'S OTHER LIBERATION MOVEMENT. BY MARCH 1973 A JOINT MILITARY COMMAND AND POLITICAL COUNCIL WERE FORMED, BUT SINCE THEN LITTLE PROGRESS SEEMS TO HAVE BEEN MADE. WHAT IS IT THAT MAKES COOPERATION BETWEEN ZAPU AND ZANU SO DIFFICULT?

Unfortunately, the agreements which led to the formation of the Joint Military Command and the Political Council were never implemented. The inability of ZAPU and ZANU to come together presents admittedly a very serious problem, since there is little doubt that effective collaboration between our two movements would advance the Zimbabwe liberation struggle as a whole.

So why all these problems...? Genuine collaboration and unity between ZANU and ZAPU can arise only out of our own initiative; from the initiative of Zimbabweans and not from the schemes and aspirations of external forces - even those sympathetic to our cause. Our advances must be based on a spirit of brotherhood among Zimbabweans and, left to ourselves, I think we would be able to work out our differences. As it is, however, the continuous interference of imperialist and reactionary forces has effectively sabotaged all efforts up to this point. I believe there is a reactionary conspiracy to prevent the unity of Zimbabwe liberation movements, and it will require a strong common effort by both ZAPU and ZANU to neutralize these forces.

CONFUSION ON THIS QUESTION CLEARLY DETRACTS FROM THE AMOUNT OF PROPAGANDA AND SUPPORT WORK THAT CAN BE DONE ABROAD IN RELATION TO THE ZIMBABWE STRUGGLE. ZAPU IS OFTEN IDENTIFIED WITH THE INTERESTS OF THE SOVIET BLOC, WHILE ZANU APPEARS TO HAVE AN OPEN MARXIST-LENINIST POSITION AND LINKS WITH CHINA. WHAT, THEN, ARE YOUR IDEOLOGICAL DIFFERENCES WITH ZANU, ESPECIALLY AS THEY RELATE TO THE QUESTION OF REVISIONISM AND THE SINO-SOVIET SPLIT?

Let me start with this question: What is revisionism and what is its relevance to our struggle? The central issue with ZAPU is the liberation of Zimbabwe from racist settler rule. We will accept assistance from any source so long as there are no strings attached. The Sino-Soviet split is an issue concerning these two countries and, as a liberation movement, ZAPU cannot afford to be used by any power for its own ends. We have approached both China and the USSR for support, but we are not interested in becoming enmeshed in their feud.

Our differences with ZANU are not ideological. As I have said, the major obstruction to unity and cooperation is represented by external forces - both within and outside Africa - which neither we nor ZANU control. But we must go on cultivating the spirit of national brotherhood, which we are sure will lead us to genuine unity at some stage. This is necessary for the sake of the Zimbabwe people and revolution.

WHEN YOU SAY THERE ARE NO IDEOLOGICAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ZANU AND ZAPU, I TAKE IT TO MEAN THAT BOTH MOVEMENTS BASE THEMSELVES ON THE PRINCIPLES OF SCIENTIFIC SOCIALISM AND MARXISM...

ZANU must speak for itself. As for ZAPU, it is no secret that we base our work on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and that our ideological position is rooted in the masses. The struggle to create a new society such as we are striving for must be based on the principles of scientific socialism. We want a non-racial Zimbabwe, based on the principles of human equality and dignity, and where exploitation of man by man will have no place. If exploitation persists, it doesn't matter whether it is carried out by Whites or Blacks. Capitalism and racism are today the major enemy of the Zimbabwe people and they must both be uprooted and done away with. Socialism is the only answer for Zimbabwe.

REPORTS ON MILITARY ACTIVITY IN ZIMBABWE HAVE PLACED YOUR ACTIONS MAINLY IN THE WEST, WHILE ZANU AT PRESENT APPEARS TO BE OPERATING IN THE EAST. THIS HAS BEEN USED BY THE SMITH REGIME TO SUGGEST THAT ZAPU GETS SUPPORT ONLY FROM THE NDEBELE PEOPLE WHILE ZANU RELIES STRICTLY ON THE SHONAS - THAT BOTH MOVEMENTS, IN FACT, ARE BUT INSTRUMENTS OF TRIBAL AND REGIONAL ASPIRATIONS. COULD YOU COMMENT ON THIS?

First of all, ZAPU is a *national* organization; our structure embraces the entire country and our militants operate not only in the West. Since our formation in 1961, we have mobilized the masses from the Zambezi to the Limpopo, from Wankie to Umtali, and our actions reflect this. If our popular base were only regional and tribal we would be no match for the regime; we would have been unable to carry out this kind of struggle. To defeat the settler forces is a task for the entire nation, united in opposition to minority rule, and with a burning desire to see a free and prosperous Zimbabwe.

Of course, Smith and his gang try their best to use internal differences among Zimbabweans to foster regionalism and tribalism. You may recall that Cecil Rhodes and the other European invaders claimed that their presence was necessary to "protect" the Shona and Ndebele from each other! Since then, tribalism has been cultivated by the colonialists to advance their own interests: Their claim that ZANU represents the Shona and ZAPU the Ndebele must be seen in this light.

ZAPU represents both national groups. Of our seventeen Central Committee members *only five* are Ndebele; our People's Council has fifty-two members of which thirty are Ndebele. Until recently, about 75% of our armed militants were Ndebele, but the ratio of Shonas is growing rapidly. In fact, I believe the composition is now close to fifty-fifty. It should thus be clear that this claim of the regime is sheer propaganda designed to split the people of Zimbabwe and mislead international opinion.

"We are Establishing a Socialist State"

GIVEN THE LACK OF UNITY WITHIN THE LIBERATION MOVEMENT, THE QUESTION REMAINS: HOW CAN WE, AS SOCIALISTS IN THE IMPERIALIST METROPOLES, BEST SUPPORT THE STRUGGLE OF THE ZIMBABWE PEOPLE?

We realize that unity is one of the most effective weapons in the struggle against minority rule and imperialism. The present state of affairs, however, should not discourage the work of supporters abroad. After all, we are still fighting and the struggle is intensifying week by week. Our task is to build unity as well as to fight the enemy; and the more support we receive, the better we can carry out this dual task. We therefore ask groups like LSM which have worked with us in the past, to continue and even step up your support, since our needs are now greater than ever.

For emphasis, let me repeat what I said about achieving unity between ZAPU and ZANU. This is a question for Zimbabweans to resolve by themselves. Progressive forces abroad, no matter how good their intentions, cannot help us in this. They don't understand the root of the problem; they don't know its history; and they haven't been part of the long struggle to resist it. Only we Zimbabweans can deal with it.

MAYBE YOU CAN COMMENT ON THE SIGNIFICANCE OF RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN THE PORTUGUESE COLONIES? FOR INSTANCE, WHAT WILL A FRELIMO-LED MOZAMBIQUE MEAN FOR THE ZIMBABWE STRUGGLE?

There is little question that when FRELIMO effectively controls Mozambique - which should be in June of next year - our struggle will greatly intensify. The Zimbabwe-Mozambique border is 800 miles long and, unlike the 400-mile long border with Zambia, it is not made up of a big river or lake. It will therefore be virtually impossible for the Smith regime to effectively control it. This, of course, is bad news for the settlers and they are now doing what they can to adapt to the new situation.

DO YOU THINK SMITH WILL ATTEMPT A NEGOTIATED SOLUTION IN ZIMBABWE?

The settler regime has made clear its intentions to remain in power for the foreseeable future and, quite frankly, I don't see circumstances arising under which we could negotiate. Their position makes this impossible; they don't want to *share* power with the Africans, much less hand it over. Our *minimum* demand is majority rule, and this is not negotiable. So, obviously, there is little basis for talks.

With the British it was slightly different. Their interests were different from those of the settlers; but when Smith and his cronies refused to budge, the British gave in and sold out the African population. Even when still in control, they never bothered to consult the Zimbabwe people regarding their future; all discussion was between the British and their "kith and kin" - the settlers. It was as if the Africans did not exist. Later, they supplied the Smith regime with arms to strengthen its position. This is what they are doing - Labour, Tory and Liberal - so why should we trust their initiatives to "mediate" in our conflict with the Rhodesians?

No, there is nothing more to talk about. We believe that only through our own efforts in the armed struggle can we solve the "problem" of Zimbabwe.

TO CONCLUDE, WHAT DO YOU FEEL IS ZAPU'S MAIN TASK IN THE COMING PERIOD?

Conditions are now very favorable for escalating and generalizing the armed struggle in Zimbabwe. First, the masses are being mobilized at a rapid rate and are encouraged as they see the position of the regime deteriorating. Second, the contradictions within the Rhodesian community have been sharpening and more and more Whites are leaving the country thus further weakening Smith's position. Third, the victory of FRELIMO has created a favorable situation in the context of the whole of southern Africa. Not only are we hopeful that FRELIMO and Mozambique will provide us with a strategic rear once they have consolidated their position, but its implications for South Africa have been such as to weaken Pretoria's support for Smith. And without South African support the Rhodesian settlers are lost. Fourth, the continued support for our struggle by a country such as Zambia is invaluable. The convergence of these factors create a favorable climate for stepping up the armed struggle to defeat the Rhodesian regime.

As we get closer to this goal, I believe that more and more white Rhodesians will start to openly sympathize with our struggle. Many have quietly backed our cause all along with the threat of deportation or worse by the regime. All those who are prepared to live by their own labor and contribute to the collective progress of the nation have nothing to fear from ZAPU. We are committed to a program of establishing a socialist state and society in Zimbabwe and this we will do. We will need the support of everyone who has something to contribute, irrespective of race, color or creed. In the short term, there will be land reform and the establishment of people's control over all large companies, including the multinationals operating in our country. Later we will go further, ...but it is difficult to be more specific at this stage. Nevertheless, I am convinced that a free and socialist Zimbabwe will be a better place to live for all Zimbabweans.

Movement Bulletins for 1975

Beginning in 1975 LSM will be receiving the following bulletins direct from the movements for redistribution to individual subscribers.

		YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION COST:
NAMIBIA NEWS	SWAPO (South West Africa People's Organization)	\$3 for bi-monthly issues
SECHABA	ANC (African National Congress)	\$10 for monthly issues
ZIMBABWE REVIEW	ZAPU (Zimbabwe African People's Union)	\$3 for qtrly issues

ALL ORDERS MUST BE PREPAID.

To Our Readers

After reading this issue of *LSM News* you have some idea of the scope and purpose of our work. LSM's only source of funding is through individual contributions and literature sales. To date, this has not been sufficient. Several of our full-time members also work at outside jobs in order to meet subsistence needs. It is thus becoming increasingly difficult for us to sustain the ever-growing demands of our political and publishing work. . . especially in the face of constantly rising costs of living and supplies. Each year since 1969 we have doubled or trebled our distribution of literature -- one of our primary objectives. But in order to do this, we have had to put in more hours and find a larger shop.

The fact that we are now behind schedule with some of our publications is the result of a contradiction between (1) the growing inadequacy of available LSM labor power and (2) the need for our members to hold outside jobs in order to subsist. We will continue to do our best, but *you too can help*. LSM members work for a subsistence "wage" within the Information Center of \$1.00 an hour. Your contributions can help sustain these full-time political workers! Your monthly pledges can help us resolve the above contradiction, enabling LSM to concentrate its full energies on the important and expanding work which lies ahead in 1975. The struggles for national liberation and socialism are reaching a critical juncture in southern Africa. Popular awareness and consciousness, the pressure of an informed and concerned world public opinion, have an important role to play in this process.

While the "mass" (read: "ruling class") media frantically works to falsify and distort contemporary history, sowing confusion and false consciousness among the people, it is of particular importance for Marxists to seek out and analyse the concrete historical facts and situation. While the ruling class tries to neo-colonize southern Africa under the banner of support for "national self-determination" and "majority rule," we must seek clarity and a critical understanding of this process, supporting those revolutionary national liberation forces and movements which are struggling to move beyond "independence" to socialism, and exposing those elements which seek a self-enriching accomodation with international capital at the expense of continued oppression and exploitation of the African masses. To help accomplish this task we are sending two LSM cadre to various parts of Africa during 1975. We hope in this way to provide *LSM News* readers with critical analyses of the developing situations in Mozambique, Zimbabwe (Rhodesia), Angola, Namibia and South Africa. By 1976 we plan to send members to the Middle East (and perhaps South East Asia) as well.

Your contributions will enable us to expand the scope of our work and more rapidly achieve these important objectives within the struggle for international socialism!

1975 LSM CONTRIBUTIONS/PLEDGES

I would like to:

Contribute \$ _____

Name _____

Pledge \$ _____ a month to advance
LSM work.

Address _____

Phone# _____

PRINTED MATTER