

OTHER NATIONS

sion than they did in the Khrushchev years." Particularly glaring examples involve the histories of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU), revised once by Khrushchev, and now being revised again.

Under Khrushchev, beginning with his "secret" speech to the 20th Party Congress in 1956 and culminating in his 1962 attack on Stalin at the 22nd Party Congress, historiographers were confronted with a rare opportunity for candid analysis. Party historians laid the groundwork for a wholesale re-evaluation of the Stalin era. Work was intensified on the multivolume general history of the CPSU.

After Khrushchev's removal in 1964, writes Kerst, the "new era" of permissiveness quickly disappeared. Historical studies completed during the Khrushchev years have been revised. Work has slowed on the *History of the CPSU*, and those volumes that have appeared reflect a new focus and contain startling omissions: gone is the standard reference to leading officials who perished in the Stalinist purges, for example, and there is no reference to the infamous Lavrenti Beria, the head of the secret police, who was assassinated in 1953. Khrushchev is all but ignored. The more recent party line has been to soft-pedal Stalin altogether; his worst atrocities are now being characterized as what dissident intellectual Roy Medvedev calls "lesser truths."

Cuba's Other Revolution

"Origins of Wealth and the Sugar Revolution in Cuba: 1750-1850" by Franklin W. Knight, in *Hispanic American Historical Review* (May 1977), Box 6697, College Station, Durham, N.C. 27708.

Between 1750 and 1850, colonial Cuba evolved from an island of small farmers (population 150,000) into a sprawling corporate plantation society with more than a million free men and slaves. The new plantation system gave rise to a "sugar revolution"—sugar mill production increased threefold during the period—as well as to a marked stratification of the island's social classes. Until recently, many historians had assumed that this transformation was sparked by an influx of new men and new money from Spain, then the country's colonial master.

Knight, a historian at Johns Hopkins, argues instead that "the dynamic change came from among the oldest stock of Cubans," whose distinguished ancestry could be traced to the earliest Spanish settlers. In a study of 450 prominent families, Knight finds that the old Cuban aristocracy, established before the wave of immigration, wielded considerable influence and could easily purchase public office on the town councils or *cabildos*. The councils, in turn, regulated commerce, commodity prices, and land tenure.

It was primarily these families, says Knight, and not newly arrived entrepreneurs, who consolidated the vast landholdings necessary for sugar cultivation. Receptive to technical innovations, they

OTHER NATIONS

took advantage of the 1762 British occupation of Havana to expand trade with non-Spanish ports. A high rate of intraclass marriage reinforced tendencies toward greater property accumulation. The Spanish Crown contributed directly to the evolution of plantation society by building the world's largest sugar mill complex on the island and by granting land transfers to loyal colonial subjects.

This effective monopolization of "exploitable sugar land" led to the growth of a large poor, landless class. The pursuit of wealth, Knight writes, largely obscured a "vicious process" of social disintegration, ethnic antagonism, and economic dependency.

Beyond the Fringe: Dissent in Israel

"Gush Emunim: Messianic Dissent and Israeli Politics" by David J. Schnall, in *Judaism* (Spring 1977), American Jewish Congress, 15 E. 84th St., New York, N.Y. 10028; "Native Anti-Zionism: Ideologies of Radical Dissent in Israel" by David J. Schnall, in *The Middle East Journal* (Spring 1977), 1761 N St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Israeli politics, long known for bitter controversy, have become considerably more volatile since the 1973 Yom Kippur War. Factionalism, writes Schnall, coordinator of Judaic studies at Staten Island Community College, has erupted at the extremes of the political spectrum as a result of the Labor Government's failure to forge a lasting peace or define Israel's territorial claims.

On the right is the intransigent, intensely Zionist *Gush Emunim* ("Bloc of Believers"), which considers annexation of all Israeli-occupied land a religious obligation. Despite its Messianic ideology, the *Gush* has won wide secular support for a pioneering and spiritual movement to recover the territory of the Biblical kingdom of Israel. By emphasizing a return to a simpler piety and purity (discouraged by contemporary Israeli institutions), *Gush Emunim* has captured the public imagination in the nation's moments of greatest triumph and despair.

Most left-wing, anti-Zionist groups criticize Israeli life for its spiritual inertia, as does the *Gush*. But there comparisons end. One group, *Haolam Hazei* ("This World"), reflects the ideologies of flamboyant journalist and former Knesset (or Parliament) member Uri Avnery, who remains one of the nation's most durable social gadflies. Among other things, *Haolam Hazei* believes that as long as Israel remains an essentially Western state in an Oriental world, it can never be naturally integrated into the Middle East.

Far more militant is the Marxist Israel Socialist Organization, which refuses to appear on the Israeli ballot but has made its presence felt through violent demonstrations and alleged complicity with Arab intelligence agents. *Rakah* (an acronym for "New Communist List"), by speaking for the civil and political rights of