

Hopkins, who was "ignorant of Russia and communism," and how in spite of patent weaknesses the new diplomacy of the system of the United Nations and the many new forms of diplomacy in Western Europe—European integration, NATO, and others—have great merits. These forms of the new diplomacy are extensively described and analyzed in detail by the author providing a wealth of professional information and interpretation for the interested layman as well as the specialist. In conclusion Kertesz delineates the world task of Western diplomacy which includes the adaptation of our techniques of diplomacy to the demands of a rapidly changing world, the strengthening of NATO as important not only for the whole non-Communist world but for the future of mankind, and the creation of an entirely new, more cooperative world system through new diplomatic methods and practices of contemporary diplomacy whose primary task is the preservation of peace.

The usefulness of this stimulating contribution is enhanced by an index.

Reviewed by HENRY M. ADAMS

## *Revolution à la Mode*

**Revolution in the Revolution?**, by Régis Debray, *New York: Monthly Review Press, 1967. 126 pp. \$4.00.*

DESPITE the cover caption, "... a primer for Marxist insurrection in Latin America" (quoted from *Newsweek*), Debray's little book is not a do-it-yourself manual for guerilla warriors. The reader will look in vain for a recipe for Molotov cocktails or the approved way to derail a train. What he will find is a comprehensive and persuasively presented doctrine of guerilla warfare and its role within the total pattern of Marxist-Leninist revolution.

The 27-year-old Debray, a philosophy

graduate of the Sorbonne and member of the Union of French Communist Students, first came to Cuba in 1961. In 1963 he visited Venezuela, where a terrorist campaign to upset the presidential election was in progress, proceeding from there to Colombia and Ecuador (both of which expelled him), Chile and Brazil. After a return to France, where he published an essay on "Latin-American Revolutionary Strategy," he moved permanently to Havana in December, 1965. *Revolution in the Revolution?* was written in the fall of 1966 after a series of interviews with Fidel Castro who, as Don Bohning of the *Miami Herald* puts it, was "smitten by Debray's theories on revolution" and gave him a professorship at the University of Havana.

The Spanish edition of the Debray book, said to have been proofread by Castro personally, was published in a first edition of 200,000 copies by the *Casa de las Americas*, the Cuban propaganda central for exporting the revolution through "cultural exchange." The book is important for students of communism, because it explains a major shift of strategy currently being tried out in the less developed Latin American countries.

Debray's arguments must be read against the background of earlier Communist strategy in Latin America. A meeting of South American Communist Parties convened by the Cominform in Montevideo in 1950 adopted a modified version of the "United Front" tactic first unveiled by Georgi Dimitroff at the 1935 Comintern Congress and used in taking over Poland, Hungary, and Czecho-Slovakia. This called for direct coalition of Communist groups with bourgeois governments, combined with anti-United States and revolutionary agitation through "Democratic Fronts of National Liberation." At a further Latin-American conference following the 61-Party meeting in Moscow in 1957, revolutionary propaganda was tuned down to a low key, both to conform with the prevailing "peaceful coexistence" line and to facilitate the Soviet Union's establishment of diplomatic rela-

tions with several Latin-American countries.

Debray criticizes this "traditional" Communist policy as producing endless talk, a succession of committees, congresses, and fronts, but little or no effective revolutionary action. Although Khrushchev had endorsed "wars of national liberation" as "not only permissible but inevitable" in his speech of January 6, 1961, it was Fidel Castro—guided more by Maoist than by Muscovite precept—who initiated the shift to activist tactics. These were typified by large-scale training of guerilla fighters from mainland countries, by the opening of guerilla fronts in Venezuela, Colombia, and Peru, and by a plot to kill simultaneously the Presidents of Colombia and Venezuela.

The incipient shift in strategy was brought into the open at the Tricontinental Conference of African, Asian, and Latin-American peoples held in Havana in January, 1966, which ended on a seemingly paradoxical note. As the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee points out in its staff study of this conference, Soviet Russia—taking advantage no doubt of its role as a supplier of weapons—outmaneuvered Red China to become the "undisputed controlling force in the new international apparatus of subversion." At the same time, the delegates committed themselves to Maoist strategic and tactical concepts, for which Fidel Castro, in no way hampered by his open alignment with Moscow, emerged as the arbiter and interpreter so far as Latin America is concerned. The Soviet delegate Rashidov endorsed a policy of spreading violence, whereupon his diplomatic colleagues in American capitals immediately backpedaled and explained that Rashidov was merely trying to "outflank the Chinese."

The essential teaching of Debray, who must be credited with distilling from Castro's practice a theory of revolution, is that in view of the conditions existing in the underdeveloped countries of Latin America, the city is the wrong place for Communists

to start. City workers and even city comrades undergo a process of unwitting *embourgeoisement* through their dependency on creature comforts such as butchered meats and cosy houses; they would rather temporize than get out and fight. Guerilla movements dependent on urban parties have always shriveled for lack of support, since officials' salaries, publications, and meetings absorb the entire Party budget. Localized revolts under the doctrine of "self-defense" favored by Trotskyists are likewise useless, since they are unrelated to any strategy aimed at seizing power in the country as a whole, while government troops can easily surround and overrun workers' or farmers' settlements.

Under the strategy favored by Debray, a small group of dedicated revolutionaries retreats to the mountains, where it sets up a guerilla *foco* (headquarters), the main virtue of which is its extreme mobility. Unencumbered by families or directives from the city, the guerillas obtain supplies and weapons by raiding villages and ambushing isolated police or military patrols. Combat is sought on a scale reflecting the guerillas' capability, both as a means of procurement and so as to destroy the myth of government invincibility. Debray outlines steps for gaining the support of the rural population and for gradually expanding the guerilla forces into a "people's army." The leadership of this army should become the vanguard of the revolution: the Party should proceed from the "people's army" and not vice-versa.

As recent reports indicate, the Debray strategy is being tried out in Venezuela, Colombia, and Guatemala. It is favored by one of the two Communist factions in Brazil. Debray himself was arrested in April, 1967, in Bolivia, where he had ostensibly gone to report on guerilla fighting for the Mexican weekly *Sucesos*. Last November, after the killing of "Che" Guevara (who had apparently fallen into the "self-defense" trap against which Debray had warned), Debray was sentenced to 30 years in prison for active participation in the re-

volt. He admitted at that time to reporters that he was "politically co-responsible" with Guevara, but asserted in a letter published in the February, 1968, *Evergreen Review* that he had *not yet* taken part in combat. According to Debray, the CIA had intervened to dissuade the Bolivians from liquidating him out of hand; Department of State sources confirmed (*New York Times*, December 31, 1967) that the United States Embassy in La Paz had added its representations on Debray's behalf to those of Sartre, Bertrand Russell, de Gaulle, and Pope Paul VI. Whether any American purpose is served by keeping alive a highly capable writer who, by his own admission, is totally committed to the world revolution remains a debatable question.

Reviewed by KURT GLASER

;

## *The Bloomsbury Cult*

**Downhill All the Way: An Autobiography of the Years 1919-1939**, by Leonard Woolf, *New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1967. 259 pp. \$5.95.*

I went to Rodmell [Mr. and Mrs. Leonard Woolf's house near Lewes, Sussex] for last night, and very nice it was too. We sat out in the garden watching the late sunlight making the corn all golden over the Downs . . . . Oh my dear, what an enchanting person Virginia is! How she weaves magic into life! Whenever I see her, she raises life to a higher level . . . . And Leonard too: with his schoolboyish love for pets and toys (gadgets), he is irresistibly young and attractive. How wrong people are about Bloomsbury, saying that it is devitalised or devitalising. You couldn't find two people less devitalised or devitalising than the Wolves . . . .

THE FORCE of the truth of these words, from a letter written on August 3, 1938 by Vita Sackville-West to her husband Harold

Nicolson,<sup>1</sup> comes to mind in reading *Downhill All the Way*, the fourth volume of Leonard Woolf's autobiography. (*Sowing: 1880-1904; Growing: 1904-1911; Beginning Again: 1911-1918* are the titles of the earlier volumes.) Her words underline not only the vitality but also the dignity that these volumes communicate, starting with 1880, the year of Mr. Woolf's birth, and ending with 1939, on the eve of World War II. We shall look forward to the fifth volume and to experiencing once more the pleasure of coming into contact with a man who speaks for the "civilization of mind" and for the things that matter, that really matter as E. M. Forster, a good friend of Mr. Woolf's, has insisted: tolerance, good temper, and sympathy.

*Downhill All the Way* covers twenty years of an energetic, productive life and attests to an intense involvement in the life of England. Mr. Woolf's reactions to life are always reactions to the different states of human consciousness and to a concern with human values. Invariably his book reflects the thought and actions of a man dedicated to the continuity of civilization, which he sees threatened by technology and vulgarization and mediocrity and war. His world is not that modern world in which, as Henry James complained, life has become "an awful game of grab," with its "greedy wants, timid ideas and fishy passions." At once much higher and better, Mr. Woolf's world is characterized by the search for cultural excellence, as embodied in a free mind, a belief in good taste, a faith in the human race, a passion for honesty, a love for a sense of humor, a contemplation of beauty.

Mr. Woolf lives and breathes in another world—in "the air of Bloomsbury," as it has been phrased. That is, he can be seen as a representative of the "Bloomsbury Group," which came into existence in the early 1900's and counted among its members both Woolfs, Lytton Strachey, John Maynard Keynes, Clive and Vanessa Bell, Roger Fry, E. M. Forster, Desmond MacCarthy. Bloomsbury, according to J. K.