

Perspectives of the National Liberation Movement

Henri Alleg

The author was an active participant in the Algerian liberation struggle, in the course of which he was imprisoned and tortured. He is leader of the Algerian Socialist Vanguard Party and author of The Question.

I THINK it is needless to emphasise to this meeting the crucial importance of the national liberation movement. It is now commonplace to stress that the final victory over the old imperialist and exploiters' world—and the shorter or longer time required for it—largely depend on these hundreds of millions of men and their political choice.

I. THE LESSON OF EXPERIENCE

The present situation prompts us to reconsider certain general ideas which were widespread especially in the newly independent states at the time of the collapse of the colonial system.

At the end of the Second World War, from the days of Indian and Indonesian independence in 1946-47, and after the victory of the Chinese Revolution in 1949 to the birth of new independent states all over the African continent in the sixties, the national liberation movement seemed to break through all barriers with indomitable strength. In May 1954, for the first time in history, the soldiers of a colonised nation inflicted a heavy defeat on a modern imperialist army at Dien-Bien-Phu.

In October 1956, the strong determination of the Soviet Union stopped the intervention of the French and British imperialists against the United Arab Republic, showing clearly to all that the time when imperialists could enforce their will on smaller nations had passed for ever. In January 1959, the American puppet Batista, Cuban dictator, was compelled to flee from the victorious revolution, and two years later, in Havana, Fidel Castro proclaimed that Cuba had chosen to be the first socialist state of America.

All these achievements were like so many magnifying proofs of the new balance of forces in the world, tilting inexorably in favour of the national liberation movement and of socialism. It was the firm belief of many that the way was now free and open for countries which had suffered colonial exploitation to advance to their total political and economic liberation.

This intoxicating climate of success helped considerably in the growth and spread of different

idealistic theses. Frantz Fanon, the writer well-known amongst the French speaking Africans, and who greatly influenced the FLN, has, so to speak "theorised" these ideas.

Birth of Illusions

The core of these different theories lies in the absolute idealisation of the Third World which is not only considered as a whole, but also opposed to the rest of the world—to the developed countries equally regarded as a whole without paying any attention to the differences of social systems and classes.

According to these theses, the working class is no longer capable of leading the world revolution. In developed countries, says Frantz Fanon, the workers are definitely corrupted, and in colonial countries they are the privileged class—"enfants chéris", i.e. "the cherished ones"—of colonisation. That is why, according to these theories, the peasantry is today the only revolutionary class, and the Third World, which is the "village of the world", the real revolutionary force. So the main opposition in today's world lies between the Third World and imperialism, and not between socialism and capitalism. We know how these ideas have since found their Chinese version.

Another illusion was born in the powerful current of liberation; that of finding a "third path" between scientific socialism and capitalism. The objectives for qualifying this "third path" are numerous, if not clear explanations for what they mean. Thus, we have already had specific African, Arab, Indonesian, Tunisian and Kenyan socialisms, and also many others including, if one may quote Sendar Leopold Senghor of Senegal, a "lyrical socialism".

At the bottom of all these ideas which were in full bloom ten years ago, but are still alive, appears the same rejection of Marxist analysis. The science of Marxism-Leninism is considered as inapplicable to the realities of the Third World and with this goes the denial of the existence of class differences within the country and the refusal to analyse the conditions of the Third World countries on a class basis.

Life Contradicts

The events of these last years have patently, and often, also dramatically, contradicted these ideas; the Third World has not shown itself to be the homogeneous whole dreamed of by Fanon and conceived as a single bloc opposed to imperialism. The struggle for national liberation—once independence is won—does not automatically open the way to victorious economic and social liberation. On the contrary, the diversity of regimes which have consolidated themselves or which have appeared in the Third World is very broad. It ranges from countries that have not yet passed beyond feudal reaction or have been chained by new ties under the yoke of imperialism, to others which wage a hard struggle against imperialism for independent development and progress. The words “Third World” are certainly very convenient to indicate that all the countries considered have some points in common, and first of all an identical past of imperialist oppression that has left them chained and in a state of economic and social backwardness; but the same words signify nothing if they are meant to embrace so many different, concrete realities combined in one artificial unity.

Experience has also proved how unrealistic was the analysis that rejected the conception of class and class-struggle as irrelevant. Moreover, many instances have now shown that even in those countries where a deep social stratification did not exist, class differences could appear with extraordinary speed.

These past ten years have also vividly demonstrated how vain and deceitful was the search after a “third path” between capitalism and socialism, and how dangerous was the nationalist illusion that an equal balance could be kept between imperialist and socialist countries. These illusions have been very costly to some progressive leaders of the Third World. Kwame Nkrumah, pondering over his defeat in *Dark Days in Ghana* observes that “what went wrong in Ghana was not that we attempted to have friendly relations with the countries of the socialist world but that we maintained too friendly relations with the countries of the western bloc.”

To recall the ideological failure of some of the opinions concerning the Third World which were the most widely held ten years ago by nationalist leaders and also among European bourgeois ideologists impels us to reflect upon our own actions and theses. Has life confirmed them completely, or, on the contrary, have they been proved wrong?

The 1960 Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties gave a very detailed appreciation of the possibilities of the newly independent states to advance towards complete liberation. Even more,

it pointed out that favourable conditions both external and internal existed in many of these new states to build up what was called “national democracy”.

Own Ideas Tested

This state of national democracy was defined as a state maintaining its political and economic independence with determination and fighting against imperialism and the new methods of colonialism; as a state in which the people enjoy wide democratic rights and freedoms and where all possibilities for bringing land reform and other social and democratic demands into effect are given to the masses. The state of national democracy was, in fact, the desired picture of what should have been a state of transition between the newly won political independence and the road to socialism. Today we must confess that this was a much too optimistic and linear approach to the real concrete questions facing the national liberation movement. Doubtless the main trend of our epoch leads towards the final defeat of imperialism, but we cannot be blind to the fact that these last years have shown what resources it still possesses, especially in its former colonial territories, to build up new positions and even reconquer old ones.

In Africa, for example, the governments of the independent states that remain economically and more or less politically linked with imperialism for the time being, are today more numerous than those which pursue their struggle to free themselves from its influence; and even in the countries where anti-imperialist regimes fight with energy against foreign monopolies, no one can say that they correspond to the defined scheme of national democracy. They are more and less than that at one and the same time. They are more if one considers that the leaders of these countries openly proclaim that their goal is socialism (even if the kind of socialism they profess is still vague) and they are much less if one has in mind the fact that not one of them has yet permitted the masses—and more especially the workers—really to participate democratically in political life.

The more suitable expression of “non-capitalist path” is now used to qualify the type of development of these anti-imperialist regimes. But even this is not quite satisfactory. The “non-capitalist path” does not imply such a definite and irreversible orientation as the expression suggests. It is a path of transition during which difficult battles against imperialism and internal reactionary forces are fought out. As experience has shown, it is not an easy way, and failures and set-backs are not excluded.

II. IMPERIALISTS' NEW STYLE

It is now commonplace to stress that in their efforts to maintain their domination over the Third World, the imperialists have not renewed the old methods consisting mainly of brutal and direct intervention. Although they have not quite abandoned these methods, the wars not only in Vietnam but in Guiné-Bissau, Angola, Mozambique, Zimbabwe, and the ferocious repression that goes on in South Africa, the interference of the Americans (under the banner of the UNO) in the Congo, of the British in Kenya, of the French in Gabon and in the Central African Republic, are demonstrative enough. But it is evident that the imperialists now generally use more flexible ways of assuring their domination.

To achieve their purpose, the imperialists still have in hand some important assets. They have condemned the countries they have exploited for years to be single-product producers, the main markets for which are the colonial metropolis. The imperialists through their rule over the world markets can exert heavy pressure on the countries still greatly dependent on these traditional currents of trade. With the generally increasing tendency of raw material prices to decline (the Third World countries are exclusively producers of raw materials) and by the parallel increase in the prices of industrial products which they import, capitalist monopolies have even been able to increase the profits they draw from underdeveloped countries.

This situation evidently gives them means of political pressure. The way in which the Americans and the British used their supremacy on the world cocoa market to make prices drop from 1,700 dollars a ton in 1954 to 371 dollars in 1965 so as to weaken Ghana's economy and prepare conditions for Nkrumah's overthrow is a well-known example. Another example is how, in relation to Algeria, the French use their wine purchases and also the voluntary slowing down of oil production to try to obstruct Algeria's efforts towards economic independence and close relations with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

Profitable Aid

Imperialism hides its new tactics under the different forms of so-called "aid", co-operation and "association". General de Gaulle, who likes to present himself as the "great decoloniser" of our times and great friend of the peoples of the former French Empire, once gave a frank estimation of what this assistance really means and who it really aims to assist. Having to answer some critics who were concerned about his policy towards the former French colonies, he said "It is true that France spends something like two thousand million francs on co-operation with underdeveloped countries.

These two thousand million are far from being lost money; by giving them, we can maintain very close cultural, political and economic ties with these countries, for they are a large market for our exports. In fact, I consider that it is a very good investment." So, quite cynically, de Gaulle points out that France's assistance to the Third World is—above all—assistance to herself.

But who in effect pays for this assistance and whom does it benefit particularly. In a report prepared by a French official commission under the chairmanship of Jeaneny, a Minister in General de Gaulle's Government, and which aims at proving the disinterested nature of France's assistance to the Third World, it was stated that 95 per cent of the money granted in this respect was provided by state organisations, private investments being almost non-existent. Thus the Jeaneny report unwillingly stresses the essential part played by state monopoly capitalism in this new stage.

This phenomenon is indeed general and not exclusively French. American imperialism in Asia, Latin America and Africa acts in exactly the same way but on a larger scale. Credits are granted by the capitalist states to the underdeveloped countries so that they can be equipped with the infrastructure necessary for their further exploitation by private monopolists. In other words, the capitalists impose on their British, American, French, West German taxpayers the expenditures which are necessary to provide profits to capitalists; but the object of "assistance" is, of course, not only economic.

The imperialists, who are fighting severe battles against each other to defend their former positions, or like the Americans, to oust their weaker rivals, have a common political objective. Expressing his support for General de Gaulle's policy, Monsieur Baumel, former General Secretary of the Gaullist Party, says that helping underdeveloped countries is necessary to prevent "chaos, anarchy and subversive activities."

Clearly, this means that it is used to bar the way to peoples to their complete liberation, progress and socialism.

Allies from Within

With their new tactics the imperialists now aim at winning over allies from within these countries themselves.

Where feudal elements still exist, and where a national bourgeoisie has arisen the imperialists try to reach agreement by giving them some interest in the business and by speculating on their fear of the aspirations of the revolutionary masses.

In those countries where no national bourgeoisie existed at the time of independence, they help to create parasitic strata which draw commission on

the export and import trade and get highly paid jobs in the local branches of foreign companies. They encourage the development and corruption of a new caste—omnipresent in Africa—which has been incorrectly called “bureaucratic bourgeoisie”, and which holds the leading positions in the state apparatus, in the army and in the only official party.

Thus the imperialists—through these direct or indirect agents—not only maintain economic but also political positions within the country. It is quite clear that it was from the inside that the neo-colonialists, using these elements existing in the state apparatus, in the army and the official party, succeeded in their “coups” against the anti-imperialist and progressive governments of Ghana and Mali, for example.

It is also evident that the same dangers are threatening other Third World countries which try to free themselves from the imperialist bonds.

There is, of course, no use in expressing one's indignation at the imperialists' intrigues. Is it not quite normal that the ex-colonisers should refuse to admit their historical defeat and try to perpetuate their rule in other forms?

Other questions likewise need clarification: Why does the powerful outburst of the national liberation movement which irresistibly breaks direct colonial oppression seem to come to a stop once it has to go beyond formal independence? How can the revolutionaries of the Third World help their people to overcome these difficulties?

III. STRENGTH AND WEAKNESSES OF THE NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENT

Some Permanent Realities

Studying the prospects of the liberated countries today, Marxists have rightly laid stress on the new possibilities opened up to them for reaching socialism and by-passing capitalism, progress along this “non-capitalist” road being facilitated by both external and internal factors:

The main external factor lies, of course, in the existence and mounting strength of the socialist system, of the world revolutionary movement and in the all-sided and disinterested aid rendered to the formerly oppressed countries.

Among the internal factors compelling advance towards socialism, is the fact that there is no possibility of independent capitalist development in the economically backward countries. In fact, the choice is not “socialism” or “capitalism”. It is “socialism” or continued exploitation by foreign capitalism.

The circumstances that allowed imperialist states to reach their present economic level will not recur in such a way that the Third World can follow in

their path. The rise of the capitalist countries was linked precisely with the territorial division of the world and colonial exploitation. None of the Third World countries can start such a history again on its own account.

The global strategy of imperialism is evidently to introduce capitalism in under-developed countries and to help the growth of a national bourgeoisie. But they cannot go very far in this direction, because it would mean creating competitors against themselves. This is one of the insoluble contradictions of imperialism. The national bourgeoisie—even where it is relatively developed such as in certain countries in Latin America and in India—will never be able to act as a dynamic factor for the progress of society as was the case with the western bourgeoisie.

The only prospect open for the local bourgeoisie is to be the subordinate partners of foreign capitalism. Furthermore, the colonial masses have had an entirely negative experience of capitalism. In their countries, it has never been an element of progress. It has not developed but, on the contrary, retarded productive forces. Under the yoke of colonialism, they have in a way endured the pains of capitalism in a concentrated form. The majority of the people have the same hatred for both colonisation and the capitalist system that bred it, and this doubtless explains why it has become so difficult to find African leaders to openly advocate capitalism even if they maintain their leadership under the protection of the imperialists.

Thus, Lenin's brilliant forecast remains absolutely valid. As he predicted, the movement of the majority of the world population developed initially towards national liberation, turning against capitalism and imperialism. No revolutionary will deny that the general trend of our epoch leads humanity to socialism, but if we want to explain and help overcome delays and reverses which Third World peoples encounter on their way, we must remember that the laws of history imply an objective tendency of society and this must not be mistaken for some kind of automatic determination which has never existed for Marxists.

Men Make their Own History

There cannot be any revolutionary change without objective factors for it, but ultimately it is men themselves who make their own history, and without revolutionary practice, without conscious revolutionary activity, no transformation of society can be successful. This subjective factor may appear particularly weak today, especially if one bears in mind the former struggle for political independence when a unanimous will developed amongst all classes and social strata in one huge powerful outburst against imperialism.

We have pointed out correctly that the existence of the socialist system and the ever-growing importance of the international working class would permit peoples of the Third World to advance rapidly on the socialist path. But insufficient attention was paid to the inevitable development of internal struggles, to the accelerated development of new social differences and to class conflicts. This process has proved to be of vital importance and the determining factor in the course of political development chosen by the new states.

In those countries where political independence has not been followed quickly by progress towards socialism under the leadership of the working class or elements from other strata who have been won to the ideology of the working class, the class positions of the local bourgeoisie and of some sections of the petty-bourgeoisie retard the second stage of revolution, offering ground for the penetration of neo-colonialism. The spontaneous ideology of the small independent producers is evidently that of the bourgeoisie and not of the working class and the natural tendency of these social strata is to become richer, although the country's underdevelopment and economic dependence set very narrow limits to their possibilities. But these are enough to force them to refuse to go forward to objectives that would contradict their ambitions.

Even in those countries where power is in the hands of men who are pledged to following the socialist path and who really take positive measures against imperialism, neo-colonialism and reaction, the fear of being "out-flanked", by the masses, and—first of all by the organised workers—is evident. Even if the number of workers is small and their movement weak, distrust, anti-democratic methods and repression often constitute the policy which is adopted towards them.

The Important Part Played by the Petty Bourgeoisie

The absence or the weakness of the national bourgeoisie and also the weakness of the working class has often promoted the petty bourgeoisie and the "intelligentsia" related to it, to the leadership of the national liberation movement. Once political independence is obtained, the petty bourgeois leaders have to face new problems. The "choice" of the path the country will take depends greatly on them, but it is never an easy choice. Two contradictory forces pull them: on the one side are the imperialists, their allies within the country and also bourgeois elements who exert their own influence aimed at directing the country's policy towards capitalism. On the other side are the workers and wide masses whose aspiration is to "radicalise" the national liberation movement

so that it begins to move towards their social liberation.

This intermediate position of the petty bourgeoisie can have quite different effects on the political behaviour of the leaders. In certain countries, as, for example, in the United Arab Republic or in Algeria, they conduct an anti-imperialist policy and take positive steps to break the domination of the imperialist monopolies by nationalising foreign companies, by creating an industrial state sector, and by establishing wide co-operation with socialist states, they respond to the deep interests of their nation.

In other countries, leaders, whose social origin is much the same, follow a totally different, pro-Western and pro-capitalist policy. Moreover, within the same country, individuals belonging to the same social strata adopt completely different political positions. Some of them express their faith in socialism and even sometimes in Marxism-Leninism, whilst others have already been corrupted and won over by neo-colonialism. If we wanted to compare, for example, the social origin of the present members of the Governments of Ghana and Mali with that of their former leaders, we would not find any fundamental difference between them. This uncertainty of the petty bourgeoisie—due to its intermediate social position—naturally has both ideological and political consequences. Hesitation to align themselves completely with the world socialist movement and to make a clear choice between the classes hostile and those favourable to socialism have driven many leaders of the national liberation movement to adopt some of the ideas which have already been mentioned and which give them the illusion that they can adopt their own "specific way" between capitalism and scientific socialism.

Their irresolute behaviour has a most important effect on their ties with the masses, and first of all on the political organisation, Front or Party, which were meant to be the instruments for the mobilisation and advance of the masses.

The powerful front that united all classes during the struggle against colonialism and which played such an important part, seems to lose all its dynamic power over the masses. In those countries where leadership lies in the hands of the local bourgeoisie and of those people who now support neo-colonialism as in Senegal, in the Ivory Coast Republic, Kenya or Tunisia, the former fronts which often call themselves "the sole State Party" have been turned into organisations which hide the domination of the new masters. The spectacular and sometimes heroic past of these leaders during the fight for independence can, of course, blur for a time the clear vision of the masses, but they finally discover

what mystification lies behind the constant apology of the official party and its unity whilst internal class differences become more and more apparent.

Rejection of Class Conception

In countries which follow an anti-imperialist and progressive line, the "Fronts" are something different—but here also they have failed in their attempt to be the leading political force of the new society. Here also, the different fractions of the petty-bourgeoisie have shown themselves unable to build up efficient revolutionary parties capable of mobilising and guiding the masses towards true independence and progress, through all the dangerous traps laid by imperialism.

Again, the explanation for this must be found in the rejection of the class struggle concept by the petty bourgeois leaders and in their strong distrust of the working class: the leaders of the Algerian FLN (amongst whom, one, Kaid Ahmed, is not only the General Secretary, but also a wealthy landlord with over 3,000 hectares in the south of Oran) act in no other spirit when they decide to remove from the trade unions the leaders elected by the workers and replace them by their own men, to forbid the workers' weekly paper *Révolution et Travail*, to dissolve militant trade unions and to publish a new law under which strikes are declared illegal.

These attacks on the workers' rights have been paralleled in other fields. Repressive measures have been taken against all popular organisations, including the students' movement. All this is accompanied by some anti-communism and restrictions of democratic rights of which it is said falsely that they are a luxury for the Third World people. But this policy, instead of consolidating the new state and making it fit to meet the imperialist attacks, weakens it because it leads to the demobilisation of the workers and of the popular masses and to their disinterest, thus creating favourable circumstances for intrigues and plots by imperialists and reactionaries.

With such conceptions, it is impossible to forge the indispensable tool for the second revolution—that is, a workers' party. Although the creation of the "vanguard party" is much discussed, it cannot go beyond the chaotic political coming together of different classes as long as there is no class selection for its membership. The answer given by Kaid Ahmed, secretary of the FLN to a question asked by an Algerian worker during an FLN meeting is very characteristic of the problems that remain unsolved:

"May rich people be party members?" asked the worker, and the answer was—"The rich man who is good can, but not the bad one."

The rejection of the working class conceptions not only prevents the building of a strong revolutionary party, but also results in the political impotence of the official party, its inability to have any real influence on the masses.

The workers, kept outside political life and resenting the suspicion and the repression to which they are subjected, cannot feel that this party is their own, although they approve of the anti-imperialist trend of the government's policy. The poor peasants who have paid the heaviest price for the nation's independence and whose part in the struggle is constantly glorified, do not any longer feel any rapport with an official party that, seven years after liberation, has not yet carried out the long promised—but always postponed—land reform for which they fought. On the whole, the popular masses do not recognise in the ossified and authoritative apparatus of the present FLN, often dominated by rich local personalities, traders and landowners, the former spirited movement that led them to victory over French colonialism.

The Character of the Party

That is why the party of the Socialist Vanguard of Algeria, which is still compelled to work underground, can write:

"Experience and life have shown what has become of the single party and how the different reactionary and bureaucratic strata of the bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie have used it for their own interests. Instead of permitting effective action against reactionary ideology, the way this party is organised only helps to discredit socialism. The FLN does not play any real leading part in the country and has no proper life of its own. The wide popular progressive forces are not concerned with it. The FLN has now been reduced to a mere instrument which entirely depends on the balance of forces between the different groups that share the state control or are disputing it."

Experience elsewhere has also proved how unreliable such parties were. In Ghana, the Convention People's Party undertook no visible action at the time of the coup to defend Nkrumah's regime. Similarly in Mali, the USRDA did not do anything more to save Modibo Keita's power. In the United Arab Republic, when Nasser's regime appeared to be condemned as a result of the defeat of the Arabs in 1967, it was not the Arab Socialist Union that helped to re-establish the situation but the masses themselves, acting without any direction from the official party, which appeared completely inefficient.

So it appears clearly, that the broad, open, single party is no guarantee against imperialist and reactionary subversive attempts. Neither does it appear to offer the ideal framework—as some

people assure us that it does—for the people's anti-imperialist unity, nor does it necessarily permit the constitution of an efficient revolutionary party.

IV. WHAT SOLUTION AND WHAT PERSPECTIVE?

To safeguard the newly won independence against all attempts of neo-colonialism, to fulfil all tasks required for real economic liberation and finally to open the way towards socialism, an indispensable tool, a Marxist-Leninist type party is necessary. This is quite clear for Marxist-Leninists. But equally, it is also proof that such parties find difficulty in taking shape because of the lack of a social basis, the forces of the working class being still relatively small and weak.

Must we then conclude that these countries will have to wait for the working class to grow strong enough before considering the possibility of having Marxist parties and passing on to their second revolution? That would signify considering neo-colonialism as a necessary stage at a time when it has been proved that it is possible, after a short time, to pass on from the tasks of national liberation to those of social revolution. Such a possibility exists when national oppression and capitalism appear intimately linked together, when the masses are convinced that it is impossible to suppress the first one without also destroying the second, and when a party exists which rests upon the working class (however small it may be) and its ideological positions. Under these conditions, countries like China, North Korea, Vietnam and Cuba have been able to overcome their historical and social handicaps and establish a basis for a socialist society. The example given by the heroic Workers' Party of Vietnam is particularly enlightening. The action of this party, deeply rooted in its people by years of struggle, has been—without any possible doubt—decisive and fundamental.

"Our party was born", writes comrade Truong-Chinh, member of the Political Bureau of the Workers' Party of Vietnam, "in a country where the working class was numerically small; the majority of our leaders and of our militants come from the petty-bourgeoisie."

It is most probable that in other countries of the Third World, as class differences appear more closely and the struggle against foreign monopolies gets sharper, important sections of the petty-bourgeoisie will also place themselves on the side of the working class. The proper growth of the working class will naturally speed up this process and open new facilities for the building up of these parties.

In 1962 there were 15 million workers in Africa

(about 6—7 per cent of the whole population of the continent). In Asia, at the same time the number of manual workers and employees was estimated at about 100 million. Today, the Third World is in a way much better off than Central Asia was at the time of the Russian Revolution. In 1917, the working class there represented scarcely more than 0.35 per cent of the total population. Of course, the existence of a common border with Soviet Russia offered facilities for receiving help from the victorious Russian proletariat.

But can we not say that in 1969, this geographical factor is much less important? Africa today is nearer to the socialist countries than Kazakhstan was to Russia, in Lenin's time. The assistance of the socialist countries, and especially of the Soviet Union which, by 1980, will have increased its trade with the Third World countries fivefold, thus helping to build up national industries, will also have its influence on the development of the young working classes. The growth of the specific weight of the working class should help unite patriotic forces against imperialism, for an independent economic development and for a land reform, where such a problem exists. It will enlarge the influence of the ideology of scientific socialism and facilitate the strengthening of real vanguard parties which can lead the struggle of the workers in the cities and the countryside, and be able to express, at every different stage, correct objectives and slogans to unite and lead the masses forward.

How will these parties be formed when there is no Communist Party? Will it spring from the coming together of members of a former Communist Party and of other revolutionary groups, as was the case in Cuba or as the example provided by the party of the Socialist Vanguard of Algeria, which was born from a merger of the ex-Algerian Communist Party's membership with Marxist militants from the FLN? Will it be the result of the growth of these Marxist nuclei which exist in some countries? History will answer these questions differently, but it will, no doubt, confirm that no "second revolution" for the peoples of the Third World is possible without such a party—which will not necessarily be a single party.

Along this path setbacks and provisional defeats are inevitable, but they are reasons for despair only for those who had beguiled themselves with the illusion that the way to socialism is an easy one.

It is not; but the peoples of the Third World, in alliance with the socialist countries and the international working class, and in spite of all objective difficulties, have real possibilities of achieving their complete independence and of advancing towards their social liberation.