



Nahuel Moreno

Carlos Strasser
Interviews
Nahuel Moreno

Nahuel Moreno

Carlos Strasser Interviews

Nahuel Moreno

Taken from the book *Las izquierdas en el proceso político argentino*,
Editorial Palestra, Colección Agramante, edited by Gregorio Selser, Buenos Aires,
1959

English Translation: Daniel Iglesias

Cover and interior design: Daniel Iglesias

Editor notes: Daniel Iglesias, Agustin Gigli

www.nahuelmoreno.org

www.uit-ci.org

www.izquierdasocialista.org.ar

Copyright by CEHuS , Centro de Estudios Humanos y Sociales
Buenos Aires, 2026
cehus2014@gmail.com



Foreword

We present an interview with Nahuel Moreno conducted by Carlos Strasser, originally published in the book *Las izquierdas en el proceso político argentino* (The Left in the Argentine Political Process), published by Editorial Palestra in 1959, which is part of the Agramante collection directed by writer and journalist Gregorio Selser.

The book was published (and the interview conducted) shortly after the overthrow of Juan Domingo Perón (1955) and during the first year of Arturo Frondizi's "developmentalist" government. These were times of prominence for the workers' movement led by Perón, of Frondizi's government supported by sectors of the bourgeoisie as well as political parties that claimed to be leftist, of debates about US interventionism ("Braden or Perón"), the role of the USSR, the Chinese revolution and the countries of Eastern Europe, and the seizure of power in Cuba by Fidel Castro and Che Guevara in January 1959. Moreno already had a career spanning over 15 years and was a leader of Palabra Obrera (Workers Word).

In this interview, Moreno responds to debates such as: What does it mean to be left-wing? Was the Peronist government's policy left-wing or fascist? What role do British and Yankee imperialism play? Did Frondizi continue Perón's plan to negotiate with US oil companies?

Reading this interview provides insight into the national and international situation at that time, which sparked debates that in many cases continue today. To explore these topics further, we suggest reading *The Gorilla Coup of 1955*, available at nahuelmoreno.org.

All notes are by the editors.

The editors

July 2026

Carlos Strasser Interviews Nahuel Moreno

1. — What is the left, and when is one on the left?

The political definition of the left is historically linked to the French Revolution. Since then, any political movement that attacks feudal, clerical or capitalist privileges has been characterised as left-wing. This definition does not take into account the problem of imperialist exploitation and national movements for liberation from the metropolitan¹ yoke. This is logical, since the term and its application date back to the 19th century, when the struggle for national liberation against imperialism and modern imperialist colonisation was unknown. Hence, the anachronism of the term left, which does not include movements fighting for the national liberation of backward countries. The term left must be superseded or modified to encompass political movements that fight or propose the fight against imperialism. Hence, the existence of parties known as leftist that have played or play a reactionary historical role, such as the Communist and Socialist parties in our country.

2. — In general terms, what has been the position of the left in the Argentine political process since 1916? A brief opinion on the Yrigoyen² presidencies.

In general terms, deplorable. They have understood nothing of the Argentine reality, or, if they have understood it, they have consciously worked with the imperialist or capitalist reaction. They have not known how to defend the country from imperialist exploitation, while at the same time defending workers from capitalist exploitation. Forist³ anarchism — that magnificent albeit primitive revolutionary current of the Argentine proletariat — was incapable of and did not bother to understand national problems. The Socialist Party — that theoretical and political filth which, through the mouth of its leading theorist,⁴ assured us three or four years before 1914 that there would be no world wars in this century — has objectively served the imperialist colonisation of the country by advocating class collaboration with the whole world and asserting that there was no imperialist exploitation of our country. The Communist Party, a tiny sect during Yrigoyen's time, transformed itself into a workers' party while also serving as a transmission belt for the sinister international machinations of the Stalinist bureaucracy. Like Stalin, between 1935 and 1947, it was closely linked to the most brutal imperialism in history, Yankee imperialism; during those years, the Communist Party was the workers' agent for Yankee colonisation of the country (except for the years of the Berlin-Moscow pact).⁵

Yrigoyen's presidencies were the most that the Argentine bourgeoisie could offer in terms of democracy, anti-imperialist struggle and concessions to the workers' and mass movement. That this was very little and fell far short of what was needed is further proof that the bourgeoisie of backward countries, at this stage, is completely incapable of solving any national and democratic problems. On the other

1 It refers to imperialist countries, mainly Europe and the United States.

2 **Hipólito Yrigoyen** (1852–1933) was an Argentine politician, a relevant figure in the Radical Civic Union. In 1916, with the male popular vote allowed by the Sáenz Peña Law, he won his first presidential term, thus opening the historical period known as the first Radical presidencies. He was re-elected in 1928 and overthrown in 1930 by a coup led by José Félix Uriburu.

3 In reference to **FORA**, the Argentine Regional Workers' Federation, an anarchist movement since the early 20th century.

4 It refers to **Karl Kautsky** (1854–1938), a Czech-Austrian philosopher, journalist, and Marxist theoretician. He evolved from the revolutionary positions of Marx and Engels towards centrism and then directly to reformism. After the war, Kautsky was an open critic of the Bolshevik Revolution. Both Lenin and Trotsky argued very harshly against "Kautskyism".

5 The **Berlin-Moscow Pact** (also known as the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact or the Nazi-Soviet Pact) was a non-aggression treaty signed on 23 August, 1939, a week before the start of the Second World.

hand, Yrigoyen was the representative of the strongest and largest sector of the Argentine bourgeoisie: the landowners.

3. — Peronism.

a) What are the economic, political and social reasons for its origin? Was its emergence due to any international factor, cause or phenomenon?

The emergence of Peronism was the result of several economic, political and social reasons. The ones that led to the coup on 4 June⁶ were:

The country's capitalist structure, closely linked to European empires and traditionally anti-Yankee, is fundamentally the livestock bourgeoisie.

The predominance and growing strength of Yankee imperialism and the weakness of European empires, the disappearance of the German empire and the weakening of the British empire.

Total crisis of the Argentine oligarchy, which had served as an agent of the Roca-Runciman Pact,⁷ that had transformed us into a British semi-colony. This oligarchy was formed by: the financial consortium Bemberg,⁸ Tornquist,⁹ Leng, Roberts & Co;¹⁰ and, in a secondary role, the railways, the large grain consortiums, SOFINA,¹¹ the tannin trust, the meatpacking plants, the strongest sectors of the industrial bourgeoisie and livestock farmers (the winterers), the large industrial and wool landowners (the sugar producers, winegrowers, Menéndez Behety,¹² etc.). All these sectors formed a formidable clique that completely controlled the country in the service of British imperialism. The agrarian crisis and the world war triggered a total crisis in this oligarchic united front. Several of these oligarchic sectors considered it much more productive to switch to serving the master of America and the future master of the world: Wall Street. Bemberg¹³ and the grain companies began the exodus. The bigwigs of the industrial bourgeoisie followed

6 The *coup d'état* of 4 June, 1943 in Argentina overthrew the government of President Ramón S. Castillo. Perón was appointed to the Ministry of Labor and Social Security. In 1946, elections were called and Perón was elected president of the nation for the first time.

7 **Roca-Runciman Pact** was an international trade agreement between the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom on May 1, 1933. It was signed by the Vice President of Argentina, Julio Argentino Roca (Jr.) and the British *Chargé d'Affaires* Walter Runciman.

8 **Otto Bemberg** (1827–1895) was a German businessman, financier and industrialist, initiator of the economic empire and dynasty of the Argentine “Casa Bemberg”. Bemberg obtained commissions from Presidents Bartolomé Mitre and Nicolás Avellaneda for the establishment of agricultural colonies in the then-practically undeveloped Santa Fe Province, the site of some of the country's most productive cropland. Retaining financial interests in Paris, he and his son established the Brasserie Argentine Quilmes (Quilmes Brewery) in 1888, and inaugurated its brewing and bottling plant in the company's namesake, the southern Buenos Aires suburb of Quilmes, in 1890.

9 **Ernesto Carlos Tornquist** (1842–1908) was an Argentine entrepreneur and businessman, considered to be one of the most important entrepreneurs in Argentina at the end of the 19th century. The diversified business empire he created played a key role in helping to link Argentina with the trading and financial systems of Europe. Tornquist also founded the Tornquist Bank (Banco de Tornquist), the Plaza Hotel Buenos Aires, the municipality and city of Tornquist, in the south of Buenos Aires Province.

10 **Leng, Roberts & Co.** is a prominent, historically significant financial and insurance institution in Argentina, with roots tracing back to 1908. Initially established as an agent for Lloyd's of London, the firm expanded into banking and insurance, eventually spawning Banco Roberts and the Buenos Aires Insurance Company.

11 **SOFINA** (Société Financière de Transports et d'Entreprises Industrielles), Belgian holding company, headquartered in Brussels, and the largest shareholder in the electrical utility company and the tramway network in Buenos Aires and Rosario.

12 The **Menéndez Behety** family, led by José Menéndez from Asturias and María Behety from Uruguay, was a fundamental economic pillar in Chilean-Argentine Patagonia in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Known as the ‘kings of Patagonia,’ they controlled millions of hectares of land, the wool, shipping, and commercial industries, consolidating their power through a marriage alliance with the Braun family, forming the large Braun-Menéndez consortium.

13 **Otto Bemberg** (1827–1895) was a German businessman, financier and industrialist, initiator of the economic empire and dynasty of the Argentine “Casa Bemberg”. Bemberg obtained commissions from Presidents Bartolomé Mitre and Nicolás Avellaneda for the establishment of agricultural colonies in the then-practically undeveloped Santa Fe Province, the site of some of the country's most productive cropland. Retaining financial interests in Paris, he and his son established the Brasserie Argentine Quilmes (Quilmes Brewery) in 1888, and inaugurated its brewing and bottling plant in the company's namesake, the southern Buenos Aires suburb of Quilmes, in 1890.

them, and after them, the industrial landowners. After Bemberg and the grain companies, Pinedo¹⁴ and General Justo¹⁵ left. Ortiz¹⁶ had already defected, lock, stock, and barrel, shortly before. But with the industrial landowners, represented by Patrón Costas,¹⁷ there was a crisis in the Conservative Party, the party of the provincial landowning oligarchies. To restore the balance and broken unity of the Argentine oligarchy and bourgeoisie, the army took to the streets on 4 June 1943. All its attempts to resist Yankee imperialism and return to the previous oligarchic status quo failed. Every day, the scales were tipping further and further in favour of US imperialism. Having failed in all plans to return to the past to halt Yankee colonisation of the country (relying on the British and rebuilding the oligarchy), it was the turn of the army sector, commanded by General Perón, who had glimpsed the future: the only force that could resist Yankee colonisation and bring stability to the government could be none other than the workers' movement organised in the trade unions. Hence, the new phenomenon in the country of a government that was the founder, protector and fierce controller of trade unions. On the other hand, the sinister pro-Yankee policy of the communist trade unions made possible the founding, protection and fierce control of the workers' movement through new trade unions. Adding to this policy, the fundamental fact of the new waves of rural workers coming to the city, we can say that these economic, political and social reasons led to the emergence of Peronism.

b) What was the significance of the Democratic Union?

The Democratic Union was essentially the political movement of Yankee colonisation of the country. The Braden or Perón¹⁸ formula masterfully summarised the situation.

c) Was Perón's victory in February 1946 to be expected as a logical outcome? Or was it unexpected? What was the reason for it?

Personally, I was surprised, mainly in Buenos Aires, but not in the province of Buenos Aires. I did not believe that the new Argentine workers' movement was so strong, so homogeneous, so clear-sighted.

d) Can Peronism's economic and social policy be called left-wing? Was it fascism? Was it Bonapartism? Was it fascism and Bonapartism, depending on the period? Can it be identified with Yrigoyen's policy in terms of a common popular line? Can it be assimilated with the policies observed by the national liberation movements in Asia and Africa?

Bonapartism *sui generis*, because it relied on the workers' movement, controlling it with an iron fist, to defend the country and flirt with imperialism. It can be compared to Yrigoyen's if we remember that the structure of the people has essentially changed from Yrigoyen to Perón (under the latter, the working class acquires primacy). It could be likened to the national liberation movements in Asia and Africa if we do not forget that in Asia and Africa, it is a question of conquering national independence, whereas here it is Yankee imperialism that is on the offensive, and our country is defending itself.

e) Was the industrialisation advocated by Peronism correctly executed? Did it have simple flaws? Was it poorly executed?

It was incorrect, without a plan and without revolutionising the national economy: it did not expropriate the large monopolies or the large landowners, nor did it nationalise foreign trade. That is why it was an industrialisation based on greater use of labour and not on greater technification.

14 **Federico Pinedo** (1875-1971), was a lawyer, economist, and historian. He was born into an aristocratic family. He was Minister of Finance to President Agustín P. Justo in 1933-1935, Minister of Finance to President Ramon Castillo in 1940-1941, and Minister of Economy to President Jose Maria Guido for 19 days in April 1962.

15 **Agustín Pedro Justo** (1876-1943) was a military officer, diplomat, and politician. President of Argentina from 20 February 1932 to 20 February 1938.

16 **Roberto M. Ortiz** (1886-1942) was an Argentine lawyer and politician who served as president of Argentina from 20 February 1938 until his resignation on 27 June 1942. Ortiz succeeded General Agustín P. Justo, a member of the same party, in a fraudulent election.zz

17 **Robustiano Patrón Costas** (1878-1965) was an Argentine politician and businessman. He was Governor of Salta, provincial senator, and national senator. He also chaired the National Democratic Party, of which he was the main inspiration, ideologue, and first president, and for which he was a candidate for president of the nation in 1943.

18 Perón won the presidential elections of 1946 under the slogan "Braden or Perón" making a clear reference against Yankee imperialism. Spruille Braden, the US ambassador, was one of the main organizers of the Democratic Union that competed against Perón in the presidential elections. The UCR, the Communist Party, the Socialist Party and others were also part of it.

Not forgetting at all the imperialist blackmail, which forced Peronism into this opportunistic industrial policy.

f) Was the almost total opposition of the majority of the left to Perón correct, politically?

“Incorrect” seems to me an inappropriate term. It was despicable: it served Yankee colonisation and the worst regressive forces.

g) How can the police state under the Peronist government be explained? Was it justified?

There is a profound explanation: resistance to imperialist colonisation can be achieved through the workers’ movement in continuous mobilisation, learning and improvement, or from the capitalist state relying on the workers’ movement. The first path is the only sure one, but it has a drawback for national capitalists: the workers’ movement does not know, nor can it distinguish, where national and foreign exploitation begins and ends. In its struggle against imperialism, the workers’ movement must assert its right to power, as the only anti-imperialist and democratic class to the end. When defending itself against imperialism, the national capitalist state needs to control everything for two reasons: to prevent the free play of the agents of imperialism within the country and to prevent the independent, autonomous movement of the working class from endangering the national exploiters. Hence, the totalitarian nature of their governments. Peronism is the most complete example of this type of government; Nasser¹⁹ is another. It is not justified, although it can be explained.

h) In summary, what positive balance did Peronism leave? Were its negative aspects greater?

An enormous positive balance. The most important and progressive government in Argentine history, despite its formally totalitarian character. It deepened democracy by developing trade union organisation and rights. It politically unified the entire working class of the country. It instilled a strong anti-imperialist sentiment. It organised one of the most important labour movements in the entire world. Objectively, it made the country independent from the Roca-Runciman pact, without falling under the clutches of Yankee imperialism. We insist, all this makes the Peronist government the most progressive and democratic in Argentine history, despite its totalitarian form.

i) What would have happened, economically, politically and socially, if Perón had not fallen?

There would have been a deadly struggle between the Teisaires,²⁰ Olivieri,²¹ the Peronist government and the Peronist labour movement, with or without the CGT [General Confederation of Labour], to see who would lead the government and the country and in what direction.

j) What were the reasons for Perón’s fall? Can it be linked to British imperialism?

Perón fell because Yankee imperialism, supported by the British, changed its overall policy in Latin America. Yankee imperialism believes that the best way to get our countries to join in the global carnage it is preparing is to give us a formal democracy that deceives us. This plan has the colossal support of the Catholic Church, which has wholeheartedly aligned itself with Yankee imperialism. The “dictatorial” governments that have friction with imperialism and do not submit to this new imperialist plan of hunger, misery and formal democracy for the people are surplus to requirements. Odría²² submitted to the

19 **Gamal Abdel Nasser** (1918-1970) was the politician and military officer who led the overthrow of the Egyptian monarchy in 1952. He was de facto president from 1954 and elected from 1956 until his death in 1970. In 1956 he ordered the nationalization of the Franco-British company that operated the passage of the Suez Canal linking the Mediterranean with the Red Sea. There was a beginning of military invasion by Great Britain, France and Israel, which after some clashes with Egyptian troops in Sinai was paralysed. Nasser was the most important leader of Arab bourgeois nationalism.

20 **Alberto Teisaire** (1891-1963). Rear admiral of the Navy, he participated in the military government of 1943. He held several positions. During Perón’s government he was vice president between 1954 and 1955. After the overthrow by the “liberating revolution” he filmed a confession (which was screened in all the cinemas of the country) where he denounced Perón, accused him of having corrupted the Armed Forces and harshly criticized his management.

21 **Aníbal Osvaldo Olivieri** (1903-1984). He was Minister of the Navy during the Perón government and part of the attempted coup that bombed Plaza de Mayo in 1955.

22 **Manuel Arturo Odría Amoretti** (1896-1974). Peruvian military and politician. He was president after carrying out a coup d’état in 1948. Between 1950 and 1956 he was constitutional president. His government was characterized by a policy of

Yankee plan and did not fall. All the other “tyrants” have already fallen or will continue to fall if they do not submit.

The fall of Perón is the most important stage of this plan, but it is only one stage. To this, we must add that the entire Argentine bourgeoisie supported the fall of Perón, speculating on an economic agreement with imperialism against the economic, political and social gains of the Argentine workers’ movement.

k) How important is Peronism today, and what are its prospects?

It all depends on the program and the leadership. If Peronism definitively transforms itself into a revolutionary workers’ movement, its future is assured, regardless of any circumstantial ups and downs. If not, it will suffer one or more crises.

4. — Frondizism.

a) Why did the extreme right and extreme left support Arturo Frondizi’s²³ candidacy?

I have already clarified that the terms “left” and “right” are misapplied or useless. In any case, the heterogeneous support for Frondizi was because, on the one hand, he was supported by Yankee imperialism and also by almost all the nationalist currents of the different sectors of the Argentine bourgeoisie and by the Peronist working class, the vast majority of the working people.

b) What was the national integration that Frondizi advocated?

That the entire population, mainly the working class, should subordinate all their struggles and improvements in their standard of living and working conditions to the plans of the bourgeois sectors that supported and continue to support Frondizi.

c) From the point of view of our economic development, are British and Yankee imperialism equally detrimental to us?

They are equally detrimental, although with different modalities and characteristics. Today, the main enemy of the Latin American peoples is Yankee imperialism, not British imperialism. Just as under the Roca-Runciman pact, the main enemy was the British, not the Yankees. But distinguishing between primary and secondary is merely highlighting a balance of power at a given moment and nothing more.

d) To what extent can US imperialism help the general industrial and economic development of the country?

A misconception must be clarified before answering this question. It is false, totally false, that industrial and economic development equals economic independence, political sovereignty, and social liberation. Frondizi’s regime makes strenuous efforts to popularise these falsehoods that had already been propagated by bad Marxist theorists. It is not just a question of production but of the distribution of what is produced. A country can continue to produce the same amount and gain independence and social liberation by taking more away from imperialism. The opposite is also true: it is possible to produce more and more, and for the country to get less and less. During the “infamous decade”,²⁴ industry developed enormously, but the country and the working class were worse off because imperialism took twice or three times as much of the national income as it did during Yrigoyen’s time. This does not mean that there is no relationship between production and distribution. There is a close relationship, but it is not mechanical but dialectical and contradictory.

It is false that Yankee imperialism can help the country’s economic and industrial development if it suits its plans for the super-exploitation of the country and the working class. I do not believe that

strong repression against APRA and the left, protected by the Internal Security Law, combined with a broad plan of public works and a liberal economy.

23 **Arturo Frondizi** (1908–1995) was an Argentine lawyer and politician who served as President of Argentina from May 1, 1958 to March 29, 1962. He was elected on the ticket of the Intransigent Radical Civic Union (a splinter group of the Radical Civic Union). Under his program of “developmentalism” he encouraged greater foreign investment. He was overthrown by a military coup in 1962.

24 **Infamous decade** is the name given in Argentina 13 years after the coup d’état of General José Félix Uriburu against President Hipólito Yrigoyen. This decade was marked by a lack of popular participation, repression of opposition, torture of political prisoners, and a growing reliance on British imperialism and the growth of corruption.

imperialism is synonymous with the lack of economic and industrial development in backward countries. On the contrary, imperialism is equal to deformed, partial, and limited economic and industrial development, at the service of large corporations and against the country and the workers.

e) What results and consequences will Frondizi's economic plan bring, in the short and long term?

Disastrous ones: we will be transformed into a Yankee colony with all that this entails. Immediately, a growing deficit in the balance of payments. If it were applied to the bitter end, we could see separatist movements in Patagonia or in the north at the service of the Yankees. The history of Central America would be repeated, corrected and amplified. I believe that the workers will prevent the plan from being implemented, so I prefer not to make any further predictions.

f) When Frondizi took office, was Argentina facing a serious economic crisis, with the country close to defaulting on its payments?

Yes, it is true that Argentina is facing, and was already facing under the Peronist government, a serious structural economic crisis. This crisis is the result of two previous crises: the agrarian crisis, which began in 1930, and the crisis of economic development without renewal of machinery, which originated under Peronism as a consequence of imperialist blackmail and Peronist lukewarm policies. Peronism attempted to resolve this incipient crisis, but without adopting the only useful remedies: bold and revolutionary measures against the enemies of the country and the workers. Aramburu²⁵ and Frondizi have done nothing to resolve it; rather, they have aggravated it.

g) If this had not been the case, what other reason could explain the shift from Frondizi-candidate to Frondizi-President?

Frondizi, a fearful enemy of the workers and representative of powerful sectors of the industrial bourgeoisie, has found no better way out of the crisis than to surrender to Yankee imperialism to exploit the people and the country together.

h) Can Frondizi's policy be linked to a process of bourgeois-democratic revolution?

From no point of view. If we settle for the most superficial aspect of the phenomena of bourgeois-democratic revolution — achieving national liberation and agrarian revolution against imperialism and the landowners. In other words, this policy is the opposite, the antithesis, of bourgeois-democratic revolution.

i) What role and possibilities of contribution do the Argentine petty bourgeoisie and industrial bourgeoisie have in a bourgeois-democratic revolution?

Both have an opportunistic, centrist, inconsequential role. They are neither permanently pro-imperialist nor anti-imperialist. But there are important differences between the petty bourgeoisie and the industrial bourgeoisie. The most numerous strata of the former are part of the exploited people, and therefore it is a matter of life and death for the bourgeois-democratic revolution led by the working class to win them over or neutralise them. The industrial bourgeoisie, which may have friction with imperialism at a given moment and flirt with the bourgeois-democratic revolution, is part of the sectors that exploit the people. As such, it tends, sooner or later, to be the junior partner of the ultimate exploiter: Yankee imperialism. To summarise in a few words: the petty bourgeoisie must be an essential part of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, but it cannot lead it because of its opportunism; the industrial bourgeoisie essentially tends towards an agreement with imperialism and the landowners, against the workers and therefore against the country and against agricultural workers.

j) Do the interests of the Argentine industrial bourgeoisie coincide with Frondizi's economic plan? Is the coincidence absolute, partial, or non-existent?

²⁵ **Pedro Eugenio Aramburu** (1903–1970) was a soldier in the Argentine army, who after the military coup against Juan Domingo Perón headed the dictatorship from November 1955 to May 1958. He was kidnapped and executed by the Montoneros in 1970.

Historically, yes. The industrial bourgeoisie cannot, in fact, have any other policy than Frondizi's: repression and crushing of the workers' movement, surrender to the capitalist of capitalists, to Yankee imperialism. Individual capitalists protest against banking capital, but they resort to it.

Today, important sectors of the industrial bourgeoisie, mainly light industry, are revolting and enraged against the Frondizi plan, considering it beneficial for livestock farmers and heavy industry and tragic for themselves. These frictions are very important for understanding current national politics.

k) Is Frondizi's policy representative of the petty bourgeoisie?

No. Sectors of the petty bourgeoisie supported him, which is not the same thing. Those sectors either rose to become negotiators with imperialism or have broken with Frondizi.

l) Did Frondizi resume the path that Perón would have taken — negotiating with Yankee imperialism — with his frustrated contract with the California [Oil Company]?²⁶

In a very limited sense, yes. Very limited because Perón began negotiations that no one knew how they would end. Frondizi negotiated with the entire country and reached agreements by which he surrendered the country in its entirety. This does not rule out the possibility that some friction or dispute may arise between Frondizi and Yankee imperialism in the future.

m) What role does the famous Article 28 on private universities play in Frondizi's policy, and how important is it?

To appease the Catholic Church, which supported Frondizi as a transmission belt for Yankee policy throughout Latin America.

5. — Why are left-wing parties a minority in our country? What are their prospects for growth in terms of votes?

Because they have been totally incapable of combining the national struggle with the workers' struggle against exploitation. Leaving aside the fact that the Communist and Socialist parties have, at certain times, been at the service of imperialist colonialist policy.

6. — Is it necessary to form a popular front? On what basis? Is it viable?

Agreements to defend the country or democratic freedoms are necessary and desirable. The Popular Front, where the working class is a political prisoner of foreign forces, is the worst enemy of the workers and the country.

7. — What is your opinion of the reformist student movement and its organisations?

I know very little about it, and it is a movement that is outliving itself. The student movement must give rise to several fundamental currents: one nationalist and anti-imperialist; another subservient; and finally, one that is frankly revolutionary, anti-imperialist, and anti-capitalist. I believe this is the process that is taking place, albeit very slowly. This slowness is a consequence of the fact that, under Peronism, the student movement was at the vanguard of the imperialist colonisation of the country. The anti-imperialists within the reformist movement played a role: they were useful idiots of the imperialist offensive. Hence, fundamentally, the current slowness of the process.

8. — What is your opinion about socialist construction in the USSR? And in China? And in the people's democracies?²⁷ And in Yugoslavia?

That the experience of those countries is what should enlighten all humanity, especially the backward countries. The nationalisation of land, industry, foreign trade and economic planning has proven in those countries, and not just in books, that this is the only known remedy for the permanent comatose state of the capitalist and imperialist world.

²⁶ In 1958, Frondizi announced the "battle for the oil", a set of measures to achieve supposed energy self-sufficiency by signing exploitation contracts with foreign companies, mainly American. This policy represented a pragmatic shift from his earlier nationalist stance expressed in his book *Oil & Politics* (1954).

²⁷ It refers to the Eastern European countries occupied by the Soviet army after the Second World War.

None of this means that we should abandon our critical independence. In all these countries, there is a bureaucracy that oppresses workers ideologically, politically and economically. The defence of these countries from any imperialist attacks also involves an uncompromising struggle against the privileges of that bureaucracy.

9. — Can a national, particular path to socialism be admitted?

The class struggle in all countries responds to a series of general laws; one of them is that they are links in a global, all-encompassing struggle; another is that significant victories cannot be achieved through class collaboration, but only through the uncompromising struggle of the working class against all forms of exploitation.

This does not preclude the application of these general guidelines from varying from country to country, according to the specific characteristics of each country and each stage of the class struggle.

The “national paths “ to socialism is the name that the Stalinists have given to the old class collaboration practised by international social democracy. Full of shame for calling for class collaboration with Mendès France²⁸ or with Italian Christian Democrats of the “left”, class collaboration, they have called the “national path” to socialism. That national path brought de Gaulle²⁹ to power in France and will lead to the rise of other de Gaulles in other countries.

10. — What is your opinion of the national movements in Asia and Africa?

Completely favourable and fully supportive. Of course, I completely disagree with their bourgeois or petty-bourgeois leadership.

11. — What is your opinion of the British Labour Party, the Italian Social Democrats and Socialists, and the French Socialists?

They are agents of imperialism because of their leadership. In the case of the Labour Party, which brings together the vast majority of the British working class, and therefore every revolutionary must work within it to combat its leadership, which is beholden to imperialism.

12. Do you think there is a possibility that a new war will break out?

At the moment, yes, although I believe that the extraordinary and powerful British and American workers’ movement will prevent it.

28 **Pierre Mendès France** (1907–1982) was a French radical-socialist leader, representative of the post-war “progressive” liberal bourgeoisie. Prime Minister between 1954 and 1955, he put an end to the colonial war in Indochina through the Geneva Accords, not because of an anti-imperialist rupture, but because of the need to reorder French imperial rule in the face of an unsustainable military defeat. Defender of parliamentary democracy.

29 **Charles de Gaulle** (1890–1970) was a French military officer and statesman, head of Free France in World War II and founder of the Fifth Republic in 1958. He embodied a Bonapartist way out of the French bourgeoisie in the face of the crisis of the regime and the pressure of the masses: he promoted decolonization (especially of Algeria) to reorder French imperialism; he strengthened presidential power while preserving the capitalist order. He was president during the French May of 1968.