

Workers of All Countries, Unite!

World Marxist Review

July, 1959
Volume 2, No. 7
35 Cents

PROBLEMS
OF PEACE
and
SOCIALISM

World Marxist Review:

Problems of Peace and Socialism

Theoretical and Information Journal of Communist and Workers' Parties

CONTENTS

B. KOEHLER: Reorganization of Industrial Management in Czechoslovakia	3
M. MAKAROVA: Socialist Democracy in Economic Management	9
J. JACKSON: Some Aspects of the Negro Question in the United States	16
D. AIDIT: Ideological Work in the Communist Party of Indonesia	24
B. MANZOCCHI: The Struggle against the Common Market in Italy	28
M. BAKKER: Bourgeois Democracy in Holland	32
H. JABLONSKI: Science in Socialist Construction	37
D. CHESNOKOV: Revisionism on Proletarian Dictatorship and Transition to Socialism	42
A. STIL: The Ideology of a Military Dictatorship	49

PAGES FROM HISTORY

P. ALBERDI: Thirtieth Anniversary of the First Conference of the Communist Parties of Latin America	54
---	----

IN THE COMMUNIST AND WORKERS' PARTIES

Program for Rallying the Anti-Fascist Forces	59
Some Forms of Mass Work	63
G. C. LEAL, M. ANDORNO: Political Education Is Not Only a Personal Affair	65
J. FLORES: The Communist Party of Argentina Intensifies Its Struggle	67
P. GHEORGHE: Factory Papers	70
SHORT NOTICES	71

REVIEWS

S. BRUNI: Italian Communists and Modern Colonialism	73
A. COATS: Advocates of Colonialism	75
REVIEWS IN BRIEF	78

LETTERS AND NOTES

J. NOVAK: End the Cold War!	80
A. MIRZA: Sarvodaya, A Utopian Solution of India's Social Problems	83
L. KUHN: Sports and Peace	87

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW: *Problems of Peace and Socialism* is the Canadian edition of the monthly journal published in Prague under the title: *Problems of Peace and Socialism*. The Canadian edition is published by

PROGRESS BOOKS, 42-48 Stafford St., Toronto 3, Ontario, Canada.

Authorized as Second Class Mail, Post Office Department, Ottawa. PRINTED IN CANADA.

Orders from the United States for subscriptions, single copies or bundles should be addressed to the U.S. distributor:

IMPORTED PUBLICATIONS & PRODUCTS, 4 West 16 St., New York 11, N.Y., U.S.A.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: \$3.50 a year. Single copies, 35 cents. Bundle of five or more, 25 cents per copy. For orders addressed to PROGRESS BOOKS from outside Canada, an additional 25 cents is required to cover bank and exchange charges.

PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM is also published in French, Russian, Chinese, Albanian, Bulgarian, Czech, Dutch, German, Hungarian, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Mongolian, Polish, Rumanian, Spanish, Swedish, Vietnamese (distributors: Press Circulation Agency, Sadova 3, Prague 6, Czechoslovakia). Subscriptions to any of these editions may be obtained through Progress Books, 42-48 Stafford St., Toronto. Yearly Subscription Rates for the edition in the following languages: French—\$6.00. Czech—\$6.50. Russian—\$6.50. Spanish—\$6.50. German—\$3.50.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY
540 EAST 58TH STREET
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

1972

1. The first part of the paper is devoted to a review of the literature on the subject of the effect of the concentration of the solution on the rate of the reaction. It is found that the rate of the reaction increases with the concentration of the solution, and this is in agreement with the results obtained by other workers.

2. In the second part of the paper, the effect of the concentration of the solution on the rate of the reaction is studied in more detail. It is found that the rate of the reaction increases with the concentration of the solution, and this is in agreement with the results obtained by other workers.

3. The third part of the paper is devoted to a study of the effect of the concentration of the solution on the rate of the reaction. It is found that the rate of the reaction increases with the concentration of the solution, and this is in agreement with the results obtained by other workers.

4. The fourth part of the paper is devoted to a study of the effect of the concentration of the solution on the rate of the reaction. It is found that the rate of the reaction increases with the concentration of the solution, and this is in agreement with the results obtained by other workers.

5. The fifth part of the paper is devoted to a study of the effect of the concentration of the solution on the rate of the reaction. It is found that the rate of the reaction increases with the concentration of the solution, and this is in agreement with the results obtained by other workers.

6. The sixth part of the paper is devoted to a study of the effect of the concentration of the solution on the rate of the reaction. It is found that the rate of the reaction increases with the concentration of the solution, and this is in agreement with the results obtained by other workers.

7. The seventh part of the paper is devoted to a study of the effect of the concentration of the solution on the rate of the reaction. It is found that the rate of the reaction increases with the concentration of the solution, and this is in agreement with the results obtained by other workers.

8. The eighth part of the paper is devoted to a study of the effect of the concentration of the solution on the rate of the reaction. It is found that the rate of the reaction increases with the concentration of the solution, and this is in agreement with the results obtained by other workers.

9. The ninth part of the paper is devoted to a study of the effect of the concentration of the solution on the rate of the reaction. It is found that the rate of the reaction increases with the concentration of the solution, and this is in agreement with the results obtained by other workers.

10. The tenth part of the paper is devoted to a study of the effect of the concentration of the solution on the rate of the reaction. It is found that the rate of the reaction increases with the concentration of the solution, and this is in agreement with the results obtained by other workers.

Reorganization of Industrial Management in Czechoslovakia

Bruno Koehler

CZECHOSLOVAKIA is entering upon a new stage — that of the *completion of the building of socialism*. This means that she is now developing on socialist lines because the socialist mode of production has won a decisive victory in her economy.

The struggle to complete the building of socialism determines the main features of the work of the Communist Party. To achieve this aim, along with the further strengthening of co-operation with the other socialist countries, the XIth Party Congress held in June, 1958, set these aims: extending large-scale production in agriculture; eliminating the remnants of the exploiting classes; expanding the productive forces in industry through mechanization, automation and the development of chemical technology; raising productivity in industry, construction and transport; increasing agricultural output and ensuring a steady improvement in the standard of living. The Party has also the tasks of extending socialist democracy, encouraging the working people to play a more active part in the management of the state and its economy, strengthening the moral and political unity of the people and completing the cultural revolution.

I

The national economy, as the XIth Congress noted, is the main field in which the decisive victory of socialism will be won. Last year industry accounted for 68 per cent of the national income. Compared with 1937, industrial output has trebled. It should be noted that industry and the economy as a whole began to develop rapidly only since 1948 when the socialist basis of the economy was laid.

The economic progress of Czechoslovakia has proved the viability of the socialist mode of production. At the same time it became evident that the earlier system of industrial organization and management no longer conformed to the new productive forces. That is why the National Party Conference (June 1956) set the aim of raising the efficiency of economic management for better utilization of the advantages of socialism. The problem was how to improve the organization, forms and methods of industrial management

and to bring them into line with a new stage in socialist construction.

The Central Committee and the Conference concluded that a whole system of measures for a rapid and all-round economic advance had to be worked out. Creatively applying the theses of the XXth Congress of the CPSU, utilizing our own experience of socialist construction and studying the laws of socialist economy, we analyzed our successes and difficulties and searched for new ways and means of developing the economy.

The Communist Party has roundly condemned the theories of all kinds of revisionists, especially those of Yugoslavia, who are retreating further and further from the socialist principles of economic management and increasingly tend to revert to the spontaneity inherent in capitalist economy. Guided by Lenin's principle of democratic centralism, the Party began, on the one hand, to strengthen the centralized management, concentrating the central bodies on solving the basic questions and, on the other, to extend the rights of the enterprises and to create conditions for the wider participation of the working people in management.

For nearly two years we had been working out measures to strengthen the leading role of the Party in economic administration, to extend socialist democracy, raise the organizational and educational role of the state and more effectively implement democratic centralism in planning and finance. Before the Central Committee and the Government endorsed these measures, they had been discussed by the people.

A new system of industrial management was introduced on April 1, 1958. It abolished departments — intermediate links between the ministry and the factory. Prior to reorganization Czechoslovakia had 1,417 industrial enterprises. By April 1958, these had been merged into 383 larger units, 316 in combines of enterprises and 67 in associated groups.

The basic unit is the combine. It covers, as a rule, the whole of a given branch of production or a considerable part of it. For instance, all diesel motor works have been united into one combine. The same applies to the fac-

tories producing refrigerators and machines for the food industry and to those making wire and screws, etc.

Associated groups have been established principally in those industries where production was scattered among a number of small enterprises, as in the light and food industries. It is quite possible that some of these enterprises may have common problems, but no one of them is in a position to guide the others and be responsible for the whole of the branch and for supplying the country with its products. For this reason, associations have been established in cotton, wool and some other industries.

Under the new system of industrial management the principle of *democratic centralism* is consistently applied and extended. The administration of the combines has been made responsible for day-to-day leadership, planning and supply of materials. The powers of the local bodies — the national committees — have been extended; they have taken over the functions of the former Ministry of Local Economy. In this way conditions have been created for more practical and effective economic management and for broader participation in it of the working people. Simultaneously, the central bodies have been given greater authority in directing the socialist economy. The ministries now concentrate on the main aspects of management—long-term and current planning, technological advance, guidance and assistance to subordinate organizations and enterprises.

Of great importance is the *improvement in planning*. Experience shows that annual plans no longer serve the purpose. That is why we now concentrate on five-year plans. They will be based on a 10- to 15-year plan determining the general trend of economic development. Long-term plans, whose efficacy has increased greatly with the introduction of new management, provide a basis for better planning. Until recently long-term plans were not being drawn up, with the result that annual and five-year plans were often altered. At present, the state bodies are working out the main lines of economic development until 1975 and, simultaneously, the third five-year plan (1961-65). A feature of this planning is that it takes into account the maximum possible co-ordination with the other socialist countries.

On the basis of five-year plans the factories elaborate their own annual plans. To help them in their planning the system of indices fixed by the central bodies has been simplified. For instance, the number of these indices in industry, capital construction and in the

sphere of labor has been reduced by 20, 50, and 75 per cent respectively. The range of items directly planned by ministries was also reduced. Only one index figure — that of the wage fund — was left in the state plan for labor. In this way planning has been considerably simplified and local initiative greatly encouraged.

But this does not mean that centralized economic management has been in any way weakened. With the reduction of the number of indices set by higher bodies, the factories have a freer hand in making use of local resources and choosing the best ways and means of carrying out the state plan. The ministries, which have been made responsible for determining the balance between the different branches of industry and the main indices of the state plan, can now pay more attention to long-term plans. This is essential to secure a greater stability in and a fuller utilization of socialist planning.

II

Measures to improve industrial management derive from Lenin's precept that socialism must be built on the basis of material incentives and the consciousness of the people. The decision of the Central Committee meeting (February 1958) which endorsed the new principles of industrial management read: "The principle of the material interest of every worker and of every enterprise should be regarded as a lever for raising the economic efficiency of management. . . ."

Incentives of four kinds have been introduced into industry. One takes the form of a share in the profits or in an increase in profits. The second takes the form of a share of the sum written off to depreciation. The third depends on the relation between productivity and wages and lastly there is a system of bonuses. The first and the second apply to the enterprise as a whole, the third and fourth to the individual worker. Enterprises which fulfil the more difficult plans obtain greater advantages than those which overfulfil less difficult ones. Thus, the workers are encouraged to discover new ways of increasing output.

Incentives are an important feature of the new economic management. Their purpose is to ensure that the interests of the workers coincide with those of the state. The incentives vary and are based on the potentials of the enterprises. They are intended to operate over a long period, generally throughout a five-year plan.

The first two incentives mentioned above provide an additional source of finance for the enterprise which enables it to decide the size of circulating funds and what sum should be earmarked for investments and replacements. For instance, the normal share of the CKD-Prague plant's increased profits is 37 per cent, while the share of the sum written off to depreciation has been fixed at 40 per cent. This means that the plant receives 370,000 crowns out of every million crowns in increased profits and 400,000 crowns out of every million written off to depreciation. These sums can be used for capital construction and for the expansion of circulating funds.

It should be noted that the funds which factories can use at their own discretion are only a part of the total capital investment. The bulk of this is planned and financed by the central bodies. Between 1957 and 1965 over 280 billion crowns from state funds will be expended on capital investments.

Individual material incentives, established by the state plan, enable the workers to obtain wages higher than the planned level, provided they overfulfil the plan for raising productivity. It was estimated that a planned rise in productivity of one per cent results in increasing wages by 0.3 per cent. So, if productivity rises by 10 per cent, wages will increase by 3 per cent. If the factory personnel overfulfils the planned figure for increased productivity, wages will rise at an increased rate, for instance, by 0.5 per cent. This means that a two per cent increase in productivity leads to a one per cent wage increase.

The sliding ratio between productivity and average wages is a major stimulus to raising productivity. It is different in various industries and even in different factories and this encourages the personnel to increase output in their own particular branch.

There is also a bonus fund in every enterprise. The amount of the bonus depends on the qualitative indices, e.g., on increased profits. If the bonus fund is fixed at the rate of say 12.5 per cent, it means that out of every million crowns of increased profits 125,000 crowns go to the fund. The bonus fund enhances the interest of the workers in lowering the cost of production.

The amount of this fund can be exactly calculated only at the end of the year and after the verification of the economic results. But usually the factory spends it in the course of the year, in accordance with the results of each month or each quarter. Bonuses are given for overfulfilment of the planned tar-

gets, for early fulfilment of special orders, for rationalization proposals, etc.

No less important among the material incentives is the *workers' fund*, which is made up as follows: when the factory fulfils the planned indices, chiefly the qualitative indices, it receives a sum equal to 0.5 per cent of its planned annual wages. It gets a larger sum when it overfulfils these indices. This fund is spent on financing social and cultural activities, public health and physical training, on credits for individual housing construction, on accommodation in sanatoria and holiday homes and on educational bursaries.

III

It is too early to estimate the results of reorganization. But experience already gained enables us to say that the new system of management is along correct lines and has proved its value.

Although any reorganization affects production, our factories have at all times maintained a high standard of production. Moreover, last year our industry achieved the best results in the postwar period. The plan for industrial output was overfulfilled by 3.2 per cent; the 1957 level was surpassed by 11.3 per cent. Productivity rose by 7.4 per cent and average earnings by 2.2 per cent, while real wages increased even more. No advanced capitalist country can claim such results.

As a result of reorganization the staff of the ministries and central economic bodies has been reduced by 9.5 thousand employees, or one-third, and the managerial staff of the factories by several thousand. The workers welcomed the fact that they had been informed earlier than usual of the state plan for 1959, and that the working out of next year's plan began at the factories and mills.

The new measures to reorganize the planning and financing of industry, transport and construction provide more favorable conditions for leadership in these branches, for strengthening the leading role of the Party and securing wider participation of the working people in management, that is, for making better use of the advantages of socialism. However, we have never supposed that new methods of management would work automatically. To make them efficient, we must improve political and organizational work in every field. This presupposes, as Lenin said, making full use of the political consciousness, experience and initiative of the workers and technicians in the management of the socialist economy. Relying on the active participation of the working people in carrying out

our basic economic tasks, our Party rallies round itself the national committees, trade unions, the Youth League and other organizations. *Herein lies the Party's leading role.*

Last September and October the Party, economic bodies, trade unions and the Youth League concentrated on drafting the plan and the collective agreements for 1959. The Central Committee of the Party used the well-tried *methods of checking up on production*. The check-up was not merely a method of examining the situation in the factories, but a method of economic management with the active participation of the working people. It was at the same time not merely a check-up on the final results of fulfilling detailed assignments, but mass control over the implementing of the general line.

The working out of the plan and the collective agreements for 1959 in connection with the check-up on production aroused the initiative of the masses. Hundreds of thousands of factory workers took part in this campaign. These plans were then approved by the Party branches, and at larger factories even by the district and regional Party committees. In this way the Party organizations could exercise their leading role and ensure that the check-up did not become a purely formal, administrative measure.

The mass participation of the workers in the check-up was ensured by special commissions, technical-economic councils and conferences, etc. Urgent economic problems were discussed at many thousands of industrial conferences held at the point of production. Special groups set up for the purpose and combined teams of workers and technicians sought ways and means of solving production and technical problems. For instance, at the Lenin Plant in Plzen over 900 such teams were formed.

Factory Party branches watched the check-up and influenced its course. Party committees and Party organizations regularly heard and discussed the reports by economic executives and check-up commissions, assessed the course and results of their work. The check-up and the plan drafting were conducted *under Party leadership*. On a national scale, the work was guided by the Central Committee; in regions by regional committees; in districts by district committees, and at factories by Party branches. This was another important step towards the further strengthening of the Party's leading role in the management and development of the national economy.

The central bodies gave valuable assistance to regions, districts and factories. Ex-

perts from ministries, the State Bank, the State Planning Committee and leading members of the higher Party and trade-union bodies — in all 1,200 individuals — were sent to the large enterprises and regional Party committees.

During the check-up campaign the personnel in many factories undertook pledges to overfulfil the planned output. As a result, it became possible to increase the 1959 plan for industrial output by more than five billion crowns, as compared with the rough draft. It is worthy of note that the plan had been prepared in the factories and approved before it was put into operation. Improvements were also made in drafting collective agreements which up to now had never been worked out as consistently and punctually as this year. The present agreements meet more fully the vital needs of production and the interests of the workers; they are integrated more closely with the plan.

Some may say that we should tap new resources, improve production and make use of mass initiative systematically throughout the year. That is true, and we do so. But this does not preclude a special campaign, since such a measure, far from interfering with regular procedure, increases the desire to improve the work throughout the year and in the years to come. This is confirmed by the positive results of the check-up campaign in the sphere of capital construction. An analysis of about 18,000 separate investments revealed that it was possible to reduce the originally planned and approved sum by 13 billion crowns, which is 8.4 per cent of the amount of the investments originally planned.

But the most valuable result of the check-up was the further growth of initiative, of knowledge of economics and of political consciousness of the working people and of their role in economic management. Some 150,000 workers, technicians, scientists, Party functionaries, trade unionists, workers from the national committees and ministries participated in the check-up campaign in the field of capital construction. For all of them participation in the check-up campaign was *good political and economic training*. The activity of the Party and trade-union organizations, national committees and economic bodies has increased. All this *considerably extends socialist democracy* in economic management which has always been the aim of our Party. Every working man and woman now realizes more clearly that it is the people, led by the working class, who hold power, own the

means of production and are responsible for the progress of our socialist state.

The growth of political activity and consciousness of the Communists and of the whole people, initiated by the check-up campaign, continues as a result of the measures adopted last March by the Central Committee and the Government. At a time when the standard of living in the capitalist countries is not improving or is even falling, the Czechoslovak Government has reduced prices, increased pensions and family allowances, with the result that the people are receiving an additional three billion crowns a year towards *improving their material and cultural standards*. Simultaneously, the Central Committee has set the target of building 1,200,000 apartments by 1970 in order to solve the housing problem. The reform of the wage system will lead to a substantial rise in the average wages of the workers. Implementation of these measures is guaranteed by the achievements of the national economy.

IV

Consistent implementation of the socialist principle of distribution according to work done is one of the decisive conditions for the steady growth of output and productivity, and thereby of a constant improvement in the standards of living in the final stage of building socialism.

Wages play a big part in implementing this fundamental principle of the new industrial management. Wages are a form of compensation to the worker for his labor, for his part in creating the national income. An increase in wages, accompanied by the lowering of prices, is the principal means of raising the standard of living under socialism. But it is not the only one. Not all people are wage-earners. In our country there are over two million pensioners, tens of thousands of students, etc. In the final stage of building socialism the material and cultural benefits which people enjoy without payment are of increasing significance.

But first of all we must implement the socialist principle of distribution according to work done. A properly elaborated system of material incentives is needed for this purpose, a system ensuring a close link between the interests of workers as individuals, of enterprises and of the whole of society. The main point is that wages must be based on the socialist principle of payment according to the quality, quantity and social significance of labor.

The present wage system has become obsolete and does not conform to the new level of the economy. In most industries the wage rate has not changed for years; in machine-building, for instance, not since 1946. This system contained elements of capitalist forms of compensation and, naturally, could not properly ensure the payment of labor in line with the requirements of the economic laws of socialism. While the average wage has grown substantially under people's rule due to increasing bonuses and other additions, the proportion of wages in the total pay has fallen drastically and in some industries does not constitute even half of the total received by the worker. For instance, in machine-building (excluding hot shops) the average wage is made up as follows: wages—44 per cent; supplementary payments, including bonuses—56 per cent.

Wage rates are not properly differentiated in accordance with the social importance of industries, the skills required, and the complexity of production processes. The shortcomings of the wage system find expression both in the standard rates and in the award of bonuses. A big difference between the standard rate and the planned earnings results either in lowering the output norms or in selecting indices for the award of bonuses merely to ensure that the planned earnings can be attained.

Thus, a *radical reform* of the obsolete wage system has become an economic necessity. What changes are needed? The chief need is to increase the material incentive of the workers in order to raise their skill and productivity, to improve the efficiency of the factory, to stimulate the use of new techniques as the main source of increased productivity and to attract more labor-power into basic industries.

To achieve this we must introduce scientifically-tested quotas corresponding to modern techniques and the new organization of production; we must also reduce to the minimum the use of the old quotas. We must have a wage rate which gives a greater reward for work in difficult conditions and for skilled work and ensures wage increases in proportion to the importance of the industry.

A new wage system is now being worked out. It will guarantee economic incentives both for individuals and for enterprises. It will require no complicated calculations and will be easily understood by the workers. Under the rules worked out by the ministries it will be applied with due regard for local conditions.

This system will be introduced throughout the country during 1959-1960. It has already been introduced as an experiment in a number of factories and in different industries. The first results show that the reorganization is proving its value. It provides good political and economic training and helps to strengthen and deepen the relations of comradely co-operation and assistance among workers and technicians, Party and trade union organizations. At numerous industrial conferences and meetings at factory and shop level the workers are discussing the reorganization of the wage system, linking it up with their production targets. The active interest of the workers will lead to the discovery of new ways of increasing output.

The Central Committee insists that in each case the reorganization should be effected only with the agreement of the workers. As a result it is *not regarded as a mere administrative measure*. The overwhelming majority of the workers has approved the new wage system. For instance, it has been approved by 99.81 per cent of the workers at the Jan Sverma Works in Brno.

In the factories where the new wage system is in operation the workers show more interest in economic questions; the planned assignments are overfulfilled, and the efficiency of production is increasing. At the ball-bearing plant in Lisen the workers of one shop alone made 49 valuable rationalization proposals. Some factories have greatly improved the organization of labor and the pro-

duction processes, introduced more rational techniques and reduced bottlenecks.

The reorganization of the wage system is in the interests of all the working people. It will ensure consistent implementing of the socialist principle of distribution according to work done, and consequently a more rapid development of the economy; it will increase productivity and average wages and thus improve the standard of living.

* * *

Our people are determined to complete the building of socialism speedily and to create the prerequisites for the gradual transition to communism. This is shown by their selfless efforts in every field of activity. It is confirmed by the tremendous initiative from below, by the active participation of the people in economic management and by the powerful upsurge of socialist emulation.

In their efforts to complete the building of socialism the Czechoslovak people draw on the experience of the USSR and the other socialist countries and rely on their fraternal assistance and co-operation.

We have no right to tolerate indifference or inertia in our economic work. Our plans must be such as will mobilize the people. Our methods of economic management must correspond to the requirements of the Leninist principle of democratic centralism. Only then shall we create an abundance of material and cultural benefits, which is the main task in the final stage of building socialism in Czechoslovakia.

Among Our Contributors

BRUNO KOEHLER—Secretary of the C.C., Communist Party of Czechoslovakia.

J. JACKSON—Secretary of the National Committee, Communist Party of the USA.

M. MAKAROVA—Soviet scientific worker.

D. AIDIT—General Secretary of the C.C., Communist Party of Indonesia.

B. MANZOCCHI—Italian economist, member of the C.C., Italian Communist Party.

M. BAKKER—Secretary of the C.C., Communist Party of the Netherlands.

H. JABLONSKI—Secretary, Polish Academy of Sciences.

D. CHESNOKOV—Soviet scientific worker.

A. STIL—French writer and journalist, member of the C.C., French Communist Party.

P. ALBERDI—Member of the C.C., Communist Party of Argentina.

Socialist Democracy in Economic Management

M. Makarova

IN THEIR endeavors to belittle the role played by the Communist and Workers' parties in the socialist countries, the critics of communism — bourgeois leaders, reformists and revisionists — frequently accuse them of devoting too much time to practical matters. These critics counterpose their solicitude for the freedom of the individual and for democracy (which, they allege, the Communists have buried in oblivion) to the great attention these parties pay to production. "It is not our aim," declared the French Socialist Paul Ramadier, "to build a huge ant-hill society characterized by wealth and ceaseless activity, but to enable each individual to develop his personality."

Marxists are far from holding any such nihilistic views on the material side of life. They believe that in the long run the development of the personality depends upon the development of the economy, upon the position man occupies in social production, upon who owns the means of production and upon which classes stand at the head of the state.

Communists throughout the world are fighting for the needs of the working people, of those who create the material and spiritual wealth for human society. When, after the triumph of the socialist revolution, the people become the owners of the means of production, economic expansion becomes their vital concern. The socialist economy cannot be built or consolidated without constant attention and guidance on the part of the Communist Party. And it is typical that the XXIst Extraordinary Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was convened to discuss one question only: the target figures for the economic development of the USSR for 1959-1965.

The Congress was called when the Soviet Union stood on the threshold of a new historical stage, the period of the all-round construction of communism. Fulfilment of the seven-year plan will signify yet another great leap forward in the development of the productive forces along the path of building a material and technical base for communism,

of improving production relations and forms of economic management.

Khrushchov's report and the decisions of the XXIst Congress envisage important changes in public life, changes which will advance socialist democracy, enlist broad sections of the people into running the country's affairs and draw all the people into the management of cultural and economic construction. This shows that the extension of socialist democracy is regarded by the Party as an essential condition for communist construction.

"Economic Democracy" Under Capitalism

The more striking and convincing the achievements of socialist democracy, the greater is the desire of overt and covert advocates of capitalism to discredit it, to lessen the force of its revolutionary impact upon the working people in the capitalist and colonial countries. On the other hand, they publicize the democracy of bourgeois society: it is "liberal," "universal" and rises "above classes." A great deal is being said about "industrial" and "economic" democracy.

Why is so much emphasis being placed upon democracy in the management of the economy?

The answer is quite simple. The reformists allege that bourgeois democracy provides the working people with all the necessary political rights: to political it only remains to add economic rights. The program of the French Socialist Party lays down as its main task the building of a "society that would supplement (our italics—M.M.) political democracy with economic and social democracy," and the new program of the Socialist Party of Austria has it that "economic democracy supplements and is the completion of political democracy." Reformists in the Social Democratic Party of Germany announce that their aim is to "secure equality of rights for wage workers in the economy, state apparatus and society." These pronouncements seek to conceal the fact that there is no real democracy in the capitalist state and thus to divert the working people from the struggle for democracy.

The fact that some workers share in the profits (usually to the extent of from two to three weeks' wages annually), and also acquire shares, is depicted as a form of economic democracy or "partnership." But, as we know, they do not possess the money to purchase any appreciable quantity of stock and their sharing in the profits means in point of fact that the capitalist divides the money due them into basic and supplementary wages. What is more, the supplementary payment in the form of bonuses, profit-sharing and presents at times of holidays, etc., is used to bind the workers to their employers.

The capitalists remain masters and the working people wage earners. In its policy document, "Equality," the Labor Party admits that half of Britain's national wealth is owned by less than one per cent of the population. In the USA, the capitalists, who comprise a very small section of the population, appropriate more than fifty per cent of the national income. There is naturally no "diffusion of property," or "elimination of distinctions between classes." And as the plants and factories, transport and banks continue to be the property of the capitalists, the economy is managed by the capitalists' employees.

So-called economic democracy is a formal democracy. From the bourgeois standpoint only the owner of property is a full citizen. Property creates the citizen. So wrote Holbach and other spokesmen of the bourgeoisie when the latter were on the way to power and proclaimed principles of freedom and equality.

Capitalism, as is known, abolished social, guild and other restrictions on commodity production. The market is the main economic link between the commodity producers, disunited by virtue of the property they hold. It is their lord and master. All are free and equal on the market. Formally the capitalist and the worker are equal. But in reality their positions are quite different, for freedom and equality for the workers are not made real by their economic rights. Hence, "general talk about freedom, equality and democracy," Lenin wrote, "is in fact but a stereotyped repetition of conceptions which are only a reflection of relations of commodity production."*

For Marxists this has long been a truism. But it is necessary for us to recall it because nowadays there are quite a number of "advocates" of a democracy based, as they see

it, on free competition between producers on the market. Thus bourgeois and Right-wing Socialist economists spread theories concerning the "free market" and "social market economy" with the object of finding "a scientific basis" for economic democracy in present-day capitalist society. "Competition is the cornerstone upon which society is built," cry the advocates of this phony democracy.

Democracy is a form of the state. It is a political superstructure and is in the final analysis determined by the production relations obtaining in the given society. Property—a form of appropriation by people of material values, first and foremost, means of production—determines the form of society and the type of state and hence the form of democracy. It is not fortuitous that in the United States Congress, prior to the November 1958 elections, 102 members of the House of Representatives and 17 Senators were representatives of the big monopolies; 27 Congressmen of both bodies are publishers representing the bourgeois press; 32 are on the faculties of privileged universities, and the 22 so-called farmers, are in fact, agricultural capitalists. Sixty per cent of all members are lawyers, representing big monopoly interests. There are no workers or working farmers in the United States Congress. As only a very limited number of working people can get into government bodies, their part in economic management is hardly enough to alter the trend of development in the interests of the people.

Demagogic promises of "economic democracy" under capitalist rule are intended to divert the masses from the struggle for real democracy.

The Role of the People In Implementing the Economic Laws of Socialism

Real democracy arises out of the socialist revolution and the long struggle for the building of a new society. In the course of this struggle the working people have to overcome the resistance of the exploiting classes, the force of old habits in many millions of petty producers and the survivals of capitalism in the economy and in the minds of people. Only the working class can lead the struggle to build and consolidate socialism, for it has no private property, is the most organized and conscious class by virtue of the place it occupies in social production, and is capable of leading the working people. Hence the very tasks of the revolution predetermine the leading role

*V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Russ. Ed., Vol. 30, p. 96.

of the working class in establishing a new social system.

The broad and creative participation of the masses in economic management is also determined by the specific character of the public property to which the triumph of the socialist revolution has given birth.

Under socialism relations between the state and the economy are altogether different from those obtaining under capitalism, where the interests of individual owners conflict. Capitalist management does not go beyond the individual enterprise, trust or concern. Short-term business forecasts and attempts to influence economic development through state-monopoly regulation take the place of the management of production in society as a whole. This, however, cannot resolve the contradictions of the capitalist system.

Economic management in socialist conditions does not signify compilation of "forecasts" for a spontaneously expanding economy, but the organization of the planned development of the economy with a view to attaining definite targets. It determines the direction in which the national economy should develop, the balance between the sections of industry and the distribution of the national income. It is not the subjective wishes and the abilities of people that decide how the economy should be run, but the character of the social production, by virtue of which the working class must take upon itself the management of the economy and shoulder the responsibility for its development.

What does economic management by the working class actually mean? We will give an example. According to 1957 statistics, 15.7 million workers were employed in over 200,000 Soviet enterprises. Naturally they are acquainted with the conditions and the production potential in their enterprises. But the management of each single factory or plant can be efficient only if there is a thorough knowledge of the state of affairs in similar enterprises of the same or allied industries, of what the demand for their output is. Therefore a central planning body is needed which will utilize the experience and express the will of the working class and the people generally and direct and co-ordinate economic development on a nationwide scale.

Public ownership creates the necessary objective prerequisites for broad democracy in running the state and the economy. Lenin proceeded from this in formulating the basic principle of economic management—demo-

cratic centralism. This means centralized economic guidance which establishes the general trend and ensures balanced development of the economy, and affords infinite opportunity for local innovation and initiative.

In the conditions of socialism, centralism in administering the state and economy does not run counter to democracy, for it is voluntary, based upon the community of interests of all members of society and is implemented by the working people primarily through their elected representative bodies.

Who is elected to these representative bodies? The Soviet of the Union, one of the Chambers of the Supreme Soviet, elected in March 1958, for example, consists of 728 members. Four hundred and sixty-five, or 63 per cent of the deputies are of worker-peasant origin; 327, or 44.3 per cent, work in the factories, 34 deputies are leading executives and experts; 82 work in the spheres of culture, science, literature and the arts, 113 are engineers, 55 agronomists, animal-breeders or other agricultural experts, 10 economists, 22 doctors and 35 teachers. Of the deputies to the Soviet of Nationalities, the other Chamber of the Supreme Soviet, which represents 58 nationalities — 44.9 per cent are workers and collective farmers. All deputies are thus the representatives of the working people, for the exploiting classes have long since been eliminated in the USSR.

Do the elected representatives, once they have become statesmen, lose touch with the people and cease to express their interests?

Bourgeois economists, in criticizing communism, often accuse the Soviet Government of administering the economy as it sees fit and even of arbitrarily ignoring economic laws and the interests of the people. And certain Yugoslav theoreticians follow in their wake. In an article entitled "Competition between Two Systems as a Policy of Blocs," Doctor A. Bebler gives a distorted view of the aim of Soviet socialist economy. "The productive capacity of the whole of society comes first," he writes, "man, as the consumer of material values, second."

What ground is there for this statement? Can a socialist state carry on its economic and organizational activities for any length of time without regard to the needs of the people? Before we can answer this question we must define the objective laws governing economic development under socialism, consider whether the state guidance of the economy is in conformity with these laws, and

ascertain how they are being translated into reality.

The main aim of socialist society is to secure the maximum satisfaction of the material and cultural requirements of the working people through steady expansion and improvement of social production on the basis of new technology. This follows from the objective law of the development of socialist society operating on the basis of public ownership and the abolition of exploitation of man by man.

Bourgeois theoreticians claim that a welfare state can be established under capitalism. But it is not within the power of the capitalists to abolish unemployment, provide material security for all the aged, guarantee real equality for workers of different nationalities and eliminate crises of overproduction. Even a technically advanced industry as, for example, in the USA, is not sufficient. The purchasing power of the people must match their needs, but the antagonistic and insoluble contradiction between production and consumption under capitalism prevents this. Working peoples' incomes lag far behind the growth of production and this hampers industrial expansion.

Labor in socialist society is no longer a commodity; the incomes of the working people are determined by the quantity and quality of their labor and so they increase simultaneously with the growth of production and labor productivity. The generally known fact that the Soviet state annually earmarks 75 per cent of the national income (which in 1957 increased 27-fold compared with 1917) for consumption, is evidence of this. Economic advance and increased productivity of social labor go hand-in-hand with a steady improvement in the well-being of the people. Between 1913 and 1956, for instance, the real wages of industrial and building workers (taking into account the abolition of unemployment and a shorter working day) rose five-fold. The real incomes of collective farmers were six times higher in 1956 than the incomes of the working peasants in 1913. The economic development plan for 1959-1965 envisages an increase of about 40 per cent in the real incomes of workers and collective farmers. Whereas the average wage of a factory worker in pre-revolutionary Russia was less than a quarter of that of an American worker, the working people in the Soviet Union, thanks to the progressive improvement of their conditions, are narrowing this gap. By the end of 1965 the real income level of the Soviet people will be higher than that

in the main European capitalist countries and before long in the USA.

It is evident from this that the economic and organizational activities of the Soviet state are in conformity with the basic law regulating socialist production.

The development of the productive forces, the national income and the actual internal and external conditions of economic development are factors which cannot be ignored in considering the basic aim of socialist society. Taken together these factors determine the proportions of social production for this or that period in accordance with the economic law of planned development. The main tasks and the major proportions in the economy are fixed by the central planning agencies on the basis of plans drawn up in the localities. The proposed plan is then subjected to thorough discussion in which the broad masses take part.

The facts show how effective such discussion is. Having discussed the seven-year plan, the workers and employees of Moscow have decided that they will be able to carry it out in six years. The collective farmers in most Union Republics have resolved to complete their seven-year plan in 4-5 years. These are not isolated instances, they are part of the mass effort to augment the plan, a movement that arose during the discussion of the target figures of economic development.

Here is an example showing how the Bolshevik Collective Farm, Moscow Region, worked out its plan. This large farm is mainly engaged in producing milk, meat, potatoes and other vegetables. It has three dairy farms, four cattle farms, two pig farms, two poultry farms, a sheep farm and 145 hectares of orchards, two fish-breeding ponds, an animal-breeding farm (silver and blue fox) and a building-materials factory turning out 115,000 slag blocks. The processing of milk and vegetables is now carried out on the farm. The farm has 670 able-bodied workers.

The planning agencies sent two target indices down to the farm — by 1965 the farm must have 25 cows for each 100 hectares of land and produce 1,000 centners of milk (when setting targets the state proceeds from the food requirements of the people and the specific features of each agricultural area). In 1958 the farm had, for every hectare of land, 18 cows with a milk yield of 703 centners. The collective farm drew up its own detailed plan on the basis of these indices. The first draft was made by the agronomist, animal breeders and work-team leaders. The collective farm management then went

into it and it was also discussed at meetings arranged by the work-teams. The plan then again came up before the management and was finally discussed at a general meeting of the collective farmers.

The plan endorsed by the farm in November 1958 envisaged an almost 40 per cent increase in the milk herd, the number of pigs was to be almost doubled, and poultry to increase 2.5-fold. An output of 1,200 centners of milk and 140 centners of meat was envisaged for every 100 hectares of land. Later, when the results for 1958 were summed up, the collective farm discovered additional funds which could be used to purchase equipment for the manufacture and use of fertilizers. This will result in higher yields and provide more fodder for the cattle.

Information about a new and more economic type of cattle shed in other collective farms with which the Bolshevik Farm is competing, and increased output at their own building materials factory, have made the farmers confident that the cattle herd can be increased still more. After having taken into account all the additional resources the collective farmers decided that their seven-year plan could be completed in three and a half years.

It may appear that this description of how the Bolshevik Farm drew up and revised its plan goes into too much detail and has little to do with the extremely theoretical subject of the operation of economic laws under socialism and the role of the people in applying these laws. But this example clearly reflects the peculiarities of socialist economy under which the requirements of objective laws are translated into reality through the organized and conscious activity of the working people.

Not only the opponents of communism, but many of its sincere and true friends in the capitalist countries frequently ask: what sort of plans do the central agencies endorse if they can be fulfilled ahead of schedule? The explanation does not lie in the weakness of the planning, although it is far from being above reproach, but in the fact that planning is brought to life by the people themselves who, in point of fact, manage industry and are constantly discovering new potentialities.

Only those who really control the economy of their country can plan so boldly, fully aware that no matter how rapidly the economy expands it will always find a ready market, since the growth of socialist production is inevitably accompanied by increased consumption by the people.

The state plays an important part in meeting the requirements of the economic law of socialism — distribution according to quantity and quality of work done. It apportions the national income to accumulation and social and personal consumption, establishes output rates, and fixes wages and planned purchase prices for farm produce.

All workers participate in revising output rates at their factories; collective farms arrange the forms of payment for work done, fix output rates, and distribute incomes. Many collective farms are going over to payment in money. This testifies to the fact that collective farms, which have become stronger large-scale production units, have entered a higher phase of development. The collective farms can now fully satisfy the farmers' needs, and the latter prefer their labor to be paid in money rather than in kind. At the same time the introduction of payment in money will emphasize that collective production is the main source of the welfare of the collective farmers.

The examples cited above show that socialist production and the objective laws governing its development call for real democracy in economic management.

Are there any mistakes in socialist economic administration? Economic laws do not operate automatically. An inadequate understanding of economics and of the tasks and prospects of economic progress, automatic application of one country's experience in another, where the conditions are different, the continuance of obsolete forms and methods of economic management — all this can lead to lack of balance in economic development.

If the state as a whole, or an individual enterprise, contravenes economic laws for any length of time, these laws will operate negatively. To cite an example. In 1930-31 some Soviet industries, particularly the coal industry, regulated wages with too little regard for quantity and quality of labor. This brought about a fluctuation of labor, workers began to lose interest in improving their professional skill and raising productivity. In the postwar years the old system of state purchases and procurement prices for agricultural products was continued for longer than was economically justified. This had a most adverse effect on the material incentive of the collective farms and farmers in developing their economy. The new policy adopted by the CPSU and rectification of the mistakes resulted in a swift rise in agricultural development; farm production made a great leap for-

ward and it became possible to draw up the magnificent new seven-year plan, a plan of the all-round construction of communism.

It follows from this that the management of socialist economy calls for a detailed knowledge of economic laws; it cannot be based upon general and abstract ideas; and account must be taken of the conditions in which they operate.

Even those who deny the existence of democracy in the Soviet Union agree that under socialism the economy develops in the interests of the people. In his book *The USSR Through Open Eyes* Jules Moch, a prominent leader of the French Socialist Party, draws an interesting though illogical conclusion. There is no democracy in political administration in the Soviet Union, he writes, and there is none in the management of enterprises, but the economy is planned in the interests of the working people. He admits, too, that "the stability of the regime is due not to its undoubted and at times brutal strength, but to the fact that it has assured improved well-being." So, according to Jules Moch, although there is no democracy in the Soviet Union, the economy is developing in the interests of the working people; while in France there is democracy, although the capitalists run the economy "in the interests of the shareholders." Jules Moch forgets that a high standard of living for the masses can only be achieved if the people actively participate in political and economic management.

The Evolution of Socialism to Communism and the Further Development of Democratic Centralism

Socialism is not something stagnant and immutable. Socialist society does not mark time. It begins to grow over into communist society.

With the development and consolidation of socialist production, classes change and the political and cultural level of the working people improves. Democracy, too, continually develops on this basis — this is also true of democratic centralism in the administration of the economy.

This process is most marked in the USSR, the country which before any other achieved socialism and is now the first to begin to pave the way to communism. Methods of economic guidance are being steadily improved. In a short space of time the management of industry and construction has been reorganized; administration has been brought nearer to the point of production and construction. This management has taken organizational

form in the economic councils, which have replaced the ministries, and this factor has considerably enhanced the initiative and the responsibility of the workers on the spot, as well as increased the participation of the working people in the management of industry and construction. Attached to the economic councils are technical-economic commissions which include experts and innovators together with heads of Party and government, economic and trade union organizations.

The principle of democratic centralism in economic administration implies guidance from the central planning agencies and the initiative of the broad masses. To encourage their initiative, the direct material interest of the workers in the results of their labor must be enhanced. With the reorganization of economic management the rights of both economic councils and individual enterprises to deal with funds as they see fit have been extended. Whereas, formerly, ministries sometimes made good the losses of lagging enterprises from the profits of the successful ones within the industries which they administered, the position now is quite different. Each enterprise is interested in raising productivity and obtaining bigger profits, part of which will be allocated to the factory fund and used for production purposes as well as for the social and cultural requirements of the workers, housing in particular. At the Gorky Automobile Works, for instance, about 2,000 apartments have been built for the workers in the past two years on funds obtained through economy and accumulation above the planned figure. The greater independence of enterprises in distributing profits over and above the target enhances the individual material interest of the workers and encourages them to participate to an ever greater extent in economic management.

In addition to state agencies, trade unions play an important part in economic administration. The specific role of the trade unions is pre-determined by the position they occupy in socialist society. Only when it comes to power does the working class begin to run the state and the economy. But the ability to administer is not acquired at once, the day after the revolution. For many years before the revolution the working class in various countries was accustomed to look upon the bourgeois state as an enemy. And when the working class becomes the ruling class, it develops, under Party leadership, new qualities which it did not have under capitalism. The trade unions then become one of the

main forms of drawing the masses into economic management. They help the Communist parties to train a new type of worker as the ruling representative of the new and truly democratic state.

"The trade unions," Lenin wrote, "must be the closest and indispensable co-workers with the state power. . . . As they are the school of communism . . . the trade unions must be the school of socialist industrial management. . . ."* In the USSR the trade unions have played a big part in building socialism. Their growing importance in industrial management is a typical feature of the march to communism. The new trade union Constitution adopted last March and the Statute of the Rights of Factory and Works Committees place great responsibility upon the trade unions in implementing control of economic management.

Under the Statute the management must take the opinion of the lower level trade union body into account when nominating workers to leading executive posts. Bonuses, apartments and funds for the improvement of communal and cultural services are distributed only by joint decision of the management and the trade union committee. Trade unions can demand the removal of or other measures against managers in the event of their failing to observe collective agreements, to uphold the interests of the workers in the factory, adopting bureaucratic methods, or violating labor legislation.

Another feature of democratic management are the production conferences at enterprises which work regularly and permanently. These conferences draw up and discuss drafts of current and long-term plans and proposals to improve planning in the factories, hear reports by the management on the current tasks and results of past work. They go into questions pertaining to the organization of production, labor, wages and output rates; raising labor productivity and lowering production costs; plans for industrial, housing, cultural and communal construction; labor protection, training of cadres and labor discipline. This list alone illustrates the great role production conferences now play. They have been elected at all enterprises and building sites and about seven million workers participate in their work. Thus millions of trade union members in the USSR participate directly in economic management. Not only do the trade union organizations take part in working out plans of enterprises and economic councils;

their central committees maintain close contact with the corresponding departments of the State Planning Committee and help to draw up plans for entire industries.

The further development of democratic centralism in the USSR has attracted attention in bourgeois countries. The general tone of bourgeois and other commentators is that "command economy" in the USSR is giving place to the free play of economic laws. Books and articles abound with titles and queries such as "power or economic law?" According to them the development of democratic centralism in socialist society is associated with the spontaneous operation of the law of value, with the "free" market, allegedly the only place where the interests and abilities of individuals and of collectives of enterprises have full scope. Such writing usually counterposes the plan to the market, centralized planned guidance to spontaneous initiative by the masses.

Before the socialist revolution was accomplished and socialism triumphed the market was quite rightly identified with spontaneity. But with the victory of socialism, commodity production was based on public ownership. Trade became one department of planned socialist economy. There is no competition on the market in the socialist economy, no law of the "Stock Exchange jungle" which enables the powerful to destroy the weak, one enterprise to expand by weakening or ruining another.

Reorganization of economic management means that trading and money will be put to better use, that a more careful assessment will be made of the law of value in planning price-formation. Contrary to revisionist assertions it does not mean giving free rein to the spontaneity of the market.

Almost 40 years ago, the demands of the bourgeois counter-revolution in Soviet Russia found expression in just two slogans: "free trade" and "Soviets without Bolsheviks." There was a direct link between these two slogans. Soviets without Bolsheviks, without Communist Party guidance, could have agreed to free trade, and free trade under conditions of a mixed economy would have meant an inevitable return to capitalism. Perhaps this is what the bourgeois economists hope for when they write of the alleged restoration of a "free" market and competition as the basis of "democracy." All we can say is that their hopes and aspirations are 40 years behind the times.

The Yugoslav economists also see the market as the economic basis of democracy.

*V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Russ. Ed., Vol. 33, p. 164.

In his textbook *Fundamentals of Political Economy*, for example, Lubisav Markovitch writes that socialist producers are commodity producers and hence must be independent industrially and possess "authority." Their individual interests, in Markovitch's view, can only interconnect through exchange, through the market. Above all he fears that the state, with its comprehensive planning, will put an end to the spontaneity of the market and thereby suppress the initiative of the producers.

According to Marxism-Leninism genuine democracy in the economy does not come into being on the basis of the market, but on that of public ownership. It expands and consolidates as socialist production develops.

* * *

The continued extension of democratic centralism proves that a great advance all along the line, in which first the majority and, ultimately, the whole of the people participate, only begins under socialism. As socialism develops along the road to communism, democracy will inevitably undergo fundamental changes. As the distinctions between co-operative and state forms of ownership are abolished and as these two forms of ownership merge into communist ownership, the distinctions between the two friendly classes of socialist society — workers and peasants — will disappear. This means that the state, as

the instrument of working-class leadership of the whole of society will gradually wither away. With the transition to distribution according to need it will no longer be necessary for the state to exercise strict control of the quantity of work done and the amount of consumption of each member of society, for under communism man will feel the urge to work and distribution will be made according to his requirements. But an account will still have to be kept of the amount of labor expended.

In the transition from socialism to communism the state gradually transfers part of its functions to public organizations. But this in no way implies that the state becomes weaker. As more and more people are drawn into industrial management, the base upon which the state relies will become broader and stronger. Transference of day-to-day guidance to the localities will enable the state planning agencies to focus attention on the improvement of long-term planning and general guidance of the economy. Trade union supervision of the work of factories will make it possible to utilize resources more fully and to better effect, and to promote new cadres to economic management.

To achieve socialist democracy and ensure its continued development towards communism, reformist and revisionist distortions of the concept of democratic centralism must be ruthlessly combated.

Some Aspects of the Negro Question in the United States *

James E. Jackson

THE STRUGGLE waged by the Negro people in the United States for equality and freedom is growing and playing an ever bigger part in the general struggle for social progress both in the United States and in the anti-imperialist movement of all oppressed peoples.

This struggle, unfolding in the citadel of world capitalism, in direct and intimate association with the working-class and popular

movement, is all the more significant because it is directed against the common oppressor—the monopolies. The efforts to cement a Labor-Negro alliance by mass action for Negro rights are designed to lay the cornerstone for a broad anti-monopoly coalition on which the progressive future of the country depends. At the same time the struggle for Negro rights and equality, taking place against the background of the upsurge of the national-liberation movement in Africa, Asia and Latin America, undoubtedly furthers the cause of world peace and security.

These points were emphasized in the political resolution adopted at the Communist

*The article is based on the report made by James E. Jackson (Secretary for Southern and Negro Affairs) at the December 1958 meeting of the National Committee entitled "New Features of the Negro Question in the United States." The N.C. draft resolution on "Theoretical Aspects of the Negro Question" will be submitted to the next National Convention of the Communist Party—Ed.

Party's 16th National Convention. In the section headed "Rally to the Banner of Struggle for Negro Freedom—Key to Strengthening American Democracy" it is stated: "*The question of Negro freedom, then, is the crucial domestic issue of the day, and a factor of growing international consequence.*"

The fact that today, almost 100 years after Lincoln issued the famous proclamation abolishing slavery, the Negro people are meeting with the fierce resistance of reaction in their fight for freedom, equality and elementary rights, reveals the hypocrisy of those who extol the "free world" and "American democracy."

This article does not cover all the aspects of the present-day situation and the struggle of the Negro people in the United States. It dwells only on some of the theoretical aspects of the problem.

I

Presentation of the Question

The Negro question in the United States is a national question; it is one of the many varieties of the national question embraced by Marxist-Leninist science.

Marxism-Leninism requires a concrete presentation of similar problems. "An abstract presentation of the question of nationalism is of no use at all," wrote Lenin in his letter "On the Question of Nationalities or on Autonomization" (December 1922). This point, which expresses the key to the Leninist approach to the national question, provides the guiding line for a theoretical analysis of the Negro problem. The latter should be treated with due account of the specific conditions obtaining in the country and of some peculiarities of the status and the struggle of the Negroes.

American Negroes constitute some 11 per cent of the total population. The Negro population has doubled since 1900 (from 9,185,000 to 17,922,000 in 1957).

The Negro people are the most severely oppressed and exploited of all the peoples who make up the American nation.

But the Negroes in the United States are not constituted as a separate nation. They rather have the characteristics of a racially distinctive people or nationality and constitute a historically determined component part of the whole American nation which, as is well known, is itself an historically derived national formation, an amalgam of more or less well differentiated nationalities.

Though deprived of equal rights and of the possibility to participate fully in all aspects

of the national life, the Negro people (no less than the other national components) have contributed to, and have an inseparable stake in the American nation's common territory, economic life, language, culture, and psychological make-up.

As a result of their singular historical experiences the Negro people strive to attain a status in the life of the American nation free of all manner of oppression, social ostracism, economic discrimination, political inequality, and racial segregation.

To conclude that the Negro people in the U.S. are not a nation is not to say that the Negro question in our country is not a national question. It is indeed a national question. The question is, however, a national question of what type, with what distinguishing characteristics, calling for what strategic concept for its solution?

In working out the correct theoretical presentation of the Negro question, it is necessary to appreciate the scope of the national question in Marxist thought. Marxism-Leninism regards the national question from the viewpoint of liberating the oppressed nations and nationalities, linking this task with the struggle for liberation of the working class from the yoke of capitalism in a given country and on a world scale.

The national question exists in an infinite variety of forms and manifestations. *Within the scope of the national question, there is included not merely the question of the nation, but also the question of national minorities, national and ethnic groups, national-ethnic minorities, national-communal (religious) groups, etc.*

The national question in each country must be viewed at all times in the context of its relationship to the main social forces of historical development. That is to say, it would be a feckless exercise to present the Negro question in the United States divorced from the historical and social-national and world influences which bear upon and in large measure decide the frame in which it can be resolved.

We were in error to limit our frame of reference in Marxist writing on the national question to that of the nation in seeking scientific guiding lines to an analysis and presentation of the Negro question in the United States. We incorrectly selected the Marxist principle of self-determination for oppressed nations up to secession as the primary category into which we sought to compress the Negro question. By selecting a Marxist principle which has unimpeachable

validity in reference to the rights and logical course of development of oppressed nations, we naturally were led to focus upon the distinctive nation-like features and characteristics of the Negro people as the thing of almost exclusive importance in the Negro question in the U.S. But of no less importance in the life and history of the Negro people is the fact that they constitute a part (although the part most deprived of rights) of the American nation, that they have always fought to obtain the full rights of the American nation.

The path of development of the Negro people toward the achievement of equality does not take the route of struggle for national independence, political-geographical sovereignty and statehood. The Negro people in the United States historically, now, and most probably for the future, seeks a solution to its national question in struggle for securing equality in political, economic, and social fields as a *component part* of the American nation. This course of development is in conformity with the famous words of Marx that "mankind always sets for itself only those tasks it can solve."

This tendency corresponds to the sociological and economic forces operating objectively upon the development of the Negro people. These objective forces are centrifugal. They operate, as we shall point out later, *against* the progressive build-up of closed areas of settlement in the countryside or in the towns of the Black Belt.

By not posing the Negro question as a question of an oppressed nation fighting for national-state sovereignty, are we thereby diminishing the revolutionary import of the Negro people's struggle in the United States? No. A special feature of the American road to socialism is revealed in the fact that the requisite preparation of the forces for effecting fundamental social change in the system necessitates the completion of the bourgeois-democratic norms of political, economic and social development for the South and the Negro people as a whole. Furthermore, unity of the American working class with its allies in the struggle for progressive social changes is impossible without the abolition of the color bar.

The struggle of the Negro people for democratic goals — political, economic and social equality — is a powerful tributary which flows into the general stream of the working-class struggle and swells the torrential power of the forces of social advance. The elementary democratic demands of the Negro people can be met only at the expense of the monopo-

lists and Dixiecrats, by strengthening the popular forces and depriving the monopoly ruling circle of the means of political oppression and extracting superprofits. The Negro people's struggle for freedom and equality unfolds in close association with the progressive movement of the working people and is directed against the class oppressors (the white monopolists and ruling circles) and not against the "native compradors." Any action in the Negro people's struggle which unfolds within the bosom of American imperialism—on the main stage and not in a faraway land or some island property of American imperialism—means that the full force of this movement has its direct impact and consequences in challenge to the enemy and support of all forces of social progress.

Furthermore, the purging of white chauvinist and anti-Negro prejudices from the minds of the white masses is a vital aspect of the subjective preparation of the working class for undertaking the leading role in the struggle for a higher form of social order — for socialism. It is the way the American working class is being educated in the spirit of internationalism.

Thus, this course of development corresponds to the main line of the present-day reality, namely that the solution of all democratic tasks is worked out in conformity with, and on the basis of, the primacy of the working-class struggle to transform modern society along socialist lines. This is the key task in the solution of the general problem of liquidating human oppression and exploitation.

This places the struggle for the solution of the Negro question in direct and strategic relationship to the present-day movement for progress, and its main social force — the working class.

II

Changes in the Class Structure of the Negro People

In the theoretical considerations of the solution of the Negro question, our Party in the past laid first stress on the land question. The chief strategic line was projected in terms of securing land for the landless Negro farmers at the expense of the planters, farm trusts and banks. The thesis behind this approach was that the breaking up of the plantation and the transfer of the land to the Negro farm workers will not only secure the means of economic sustenance and development to the Negro people but will also under-

mine the economic might of the U.S. monopolies.

This approach had meaning in a situation where the majority of the Negro people was exploited by landlord capital and attached to the land.

At present this strategic approach is no good at all, for we are compelled to take into account the changes that have been occurring in the class structure of the Negro population.

In 1900, over 77 per cent of the Negro population lived in the countryside. As late as 1940 about 47 per cent of the Negro population was urban. By July 1956 some 63 per cent of the Negro people were urban dwellers, which was in comparable ratio to the 64 per cent urban for the population as a whole.

Between 1940 and 1950 the Negro population in such industrial states as Michigan and California doubled. In the same decade the Negroes doubled in 45 cities with a population of 50,000 or more each (almost all these 45 cities are outside of the South). There are now about two dozen northern and western cities in which the Negro population is in excess of 100,000. Of the Negro city dwellers (64 per cent of all Negroes), 74 per cent live in 50 major cities.

When the Negro population moves from the country to the city, and from the "job poor" city to the "job rich" city, it translates itself into a movement from the historical areas of Negro population concentration in the southern plantation country (the rural "Black Belt" counties), the southern cities, and from the South in general to the North and West. This movement has resulted in 1) a substantial decline in the absolute numbers and ratio of Negroes to white in the traditional areas of Negro majority — the rural Black Belt area,* 2) a progressive increase in the numbers and proportion of Negroes in the population of the larger southern cities** and 3) a huge growth of the Negro population in the non-Black Belt and non-southern sectors.

In other words, the aforementioned tendencies of the Negro migration from the southern states to the northern and western states testify to the fact that a number of objective factors have operated against the development of the Negro people in the South as a nation. The accepted Marxist-Leninist

definition of a nation which Stalin formulated is: "A nation is an historically constituted, stable community of people, formed on the basis of a common language, territory, economic life and psychological make-up manifested in a common culture." The key word in this definition is "stable." The capitalist development in the United States generates forces which assail the stability of the communities in the South. Two factors gave a certain durability for a time to the Black Belt area of Negro majority. The first was that the bulk of the Negro people were attached to the land as sharecroppers, tenants, and impoverished farmers. The second was the racist barriers erected against Negro integration in economic, political and social life.

The fact that a large proportion of the Negro community's total population was tied to the land gave that community a certain stability. But the demands of industrialization and the development of mechanization and technology in agriculture combined to drive the population from the countryside into the cities, and furthered the distribution of the Negro population at the expense of a "stable community on a common territory." Today there remain in the old area of Negro majority some five million Negroes of whom less than 40 per cent are economically attached to the land.

Not only the operation of the elemental economic forces expelled and drove Negroes from their ancestral lands, but the improvements in the area of economic and cultural opportunity (wrested in the long and fierce struggle on the part of the Negro people and their allies) opened attractive small doors to Negroes, especially in the North and West and in the larger northern cities.

As for the contemporary social make-up, *the Negro is the most proletarian of the larger nationalities which make up the American nation.*

Negroes in the labor force are largely bound to the lowest rungs of the occupational ladder by a myriad system of racist prejudices, racist laws, caste barriers and widespread prejudices. As for the small percentage of Negroes who have overcome the "caste" barriers to attain an occupational status at the level of the skilled categories or professions, they still face economic discrimination which limits their earning opportunity in comparison with that of white professionals or artisans in the same categories.

In April 1958 there were 7,364,000 Negroes in the civilian labor force. Of this total 5,582,000 Negroes were employed in industry and

*In 1940 there were 180 counties of absolute Negro majority. In 1950 there were 170 counties.

**In Memphis, Tennessee, the Negro population increased from 37.2 per cent in 1950 to 51.2 per cent in 1955; in New Orleans—from 29 per cent to 35 per cent; in Washington, D.C.—from 35.4 to 42.5 per cent.

only 758,000 in agriculture. Over a million Negroes were unemployed. One out of seven Negro male workers was unemployed.

Whereas in 1940 some 41.2 per cent of the total of employed Negro men and 16 per cent of the employed Negro women worked on farms (as farmers, farm managers and farm laborers), by April 1957 only 14.8 per cent of the men and 4.8 per cent of the women were so engaged. Between 1940 and 1950 some 608,000 Negro men and 125,000 Negro women left farm employment. This tendency is peculiar to the more recent period. Over a year, between April 1957 and April 1958, an additional 72,000 Negroes left agricultural employment. This constitutes by far the biggest shift in their occupations and in their migration.

All in all, *this has resulted in a basic alteration in the class structure of the Negro people.*

Today, the largest strata of employed Negroes, including both men and women, are found in the class of industrial workers. The percentage of workers among the Negroes is considerably higher than among the white population. There are 1,032,000 Negro men and 387,000 Negro women semi-skilled industrial workers. That is 25.2 per cent of the total of employed Negro men and 15.1 per cent of the total of employed Negro women. (The corresponding percentage for white men is 19.5 and 16.6 per cent for white women.)

In working out its strategic policy, our Party draws definite conclusions from the above-mentioned changes in the social make-up of the Negro people.

The vast changes that have taken place in the class structure and the urbanization of the Negro people mean that *the strategic solution of the Negro question has to be worked out in terms of struggle primarily of the urban working people against industrial monopoly.* In a broad sense, this is a struggle for industrial integration of the Negro people economically and for their social-political integration.

The main class force in the solution of the Negro question, therefore, is the working class and the Negro component part thereof.

This is not at all to say that the struggle of the Negro farmers for land and for a higher standard of living and democratic rights and the action of all democratic forces against the reactionary plantation system and the farm trusts are not of great economic and even greater political importance, both for

the solution of the Negro question and for the general democratic transformation of the South.

It would be a mistake to underestimate the struggles of the Negroes in the South, particularly in the Black Belt, because of the migration of the Negro population from the South to the North. Approximately two-thirds of the Negro population still live in the South. There are sizable areas where Negroes make up the majority or, at any rate, a large part of the population. This is of great importance for the political struggle and economic and cultural development of the Negro people. These areas are bases where the Negro freedom movement can organize and assert the mass power of their numbers in struggle to secure political authority in proportion to their numerical strength in the population.

The large numbers of Negroes in these areas enable them to organize mutual aid and self-help, improve their well-being and develop what is distinctive in their culture.

In general, such areas become the centers of the Negro people's movement which draws into it Negroes living elsewhere.

It should be borne in mind, however, that even in the South Negroes are primarily urban workers. In this connection the chief role in the struggle to solve the Negro question falls on the Negro working class. The poor people in the southern countryside with their economic demands and the struggle for land remain an important part of the forces fighting to liberate the Negroes. But they no longer hold the position they held in the past when the bulk of the Negro population was attached to the land.

III

The Social Forces in the Negro Movement

The common destiny of the entire Negro people suffering from racial and national oppression makes possible co-operation between the various strata of the Negro people in the fight for equality and freedom.

a) The Working Class

The working-class stratum of the Negro population is the first and the most important of the social forces in the Negro people's movement. As already pointed out the workers constitute the most numerous stratum, and their proportion in the total Negro population steadily increases.

The action of the Negro workers is most effective because they, like their white class brothers, are concentrated in vital centers of

the capitalist production system — in the mines, mills and factories.

Not only do the Negro workers seek the support of their white class brothers in the Negro movement; they are an important integral part of the American working class, comprising 11 per cent of all industrial workers — 25 per cent of the miners; 30 per cent of the packing house workers; 15 per cent of the steel and auto workers; 45 per cent of the lumber workers, etc. They are able to help ensure the participation of large sections of the working class in the Negro movement.

The Negro workers share the aspirations of their people and participate in their liberation movement. At the same time they share the aspirations of the entire American working class and participate in its struggle against capitalist exploitation.

Because of their dual identity, the Negro workers ensure the development of ever more profound relations of alliance and solidarity between the Negro people and the working class. At present, this refers to issues of immediate interest and, ultimately, this will affect the questions of fundamental objectives.

The Communists are tireless in organizing and stimulating the working masses to champion the demands of the Negro people. They render every material and moral support to the everyday struggle of the Negro people for political, economic and social equality, against national oppression, disenfranchisement, segregation and discrimination.

b) *The Rural Masses*

The working farmers and agricultural workers are the second important stratum of the Negro people. They are mainly impoverished sharecroppers, tenant farmers and farm laborers. They live and work in conditions of the semi-feudal plantation system, under the barbarous yoke of its slavery-like labor relations, cultural and social degradation and political oppression.

The organized struggles of these rural Negro masses in unity and parallel with the action of the working white farmers for land, livelihood and liberty, from the oppressive yoke of the plantation system, represent, potentially, a powerful force of the Negro people's movement.

The further development of this front of struggle to democratic land reform is an indispensable condition for major advancement on the road to victory for the Negro people's movement.

c) *The Urban Middle Sections*

This stratum, belonging to the urban middle sections, constitutes a small percentage of the Negro population. Yet, individuals from this stratum exert a great influence in the democratic national front of the Negro people. The professionals and small business people — by virtue of their greater proficiency — largely dominate the leadership of various Negro organizations.

This stratum lives, in the main, in much more favorable material conditions than the masses of the Negro workers and farm workers. But when compared with the status of the urban middle sections of white people, the Negroes are held down in an inferior and unequal status by a pattern of discrimination, segregation, and racial oppression.

This explains the positive and valuable role this stratum plays in the struggle for Negro rights. However, their action is not always consistent, for they represent the propertied, higher-income stratum of the Negro people and are influenced by conservatism and tend to compromise, protect their vested property interests and yield to the bank and big business pressure.

The middle sections of the Negro people will remain a component part of the Negro people's movement. However, the present leadership of this movement is a temporary phenomenon. Eventually it must give way to the leadership of the working masses which make up the Negro people, and especially to the working class.

d) *The Negro Capitalists*

This segment of the Negro population numbers only a few thousands. They are found in the category of small capitalists largely limited to the service fields of enterprise (insurance, small loan companies, undertaker's offices, barbers' shops, newspapers and magazines). There are no Negro industrial capitalists engaged in manufacturing commodities on a large scale. Only a small fraction (20,000) of the Negro working people is exploited as wage-earners at the enterprises of more or less sizable Negro capitalists.

The Negro capitalists also fall under the yoke of discrimination. Their investment opportunities are usually limited to the Negro consumer and service market. In matters of securing bank credits, marketing of their products or services, securing licenses and franchises to do business, they confront barriers of national exclusion and discrimination. Although there are "mixed capital"

enterprises (that is, Negro and white investors) operated by Negro capitalists, no Negro "comprador" bourgeoisie exists. The Negro market is exploited *directly* by the big white merchants and capitalists, and not through the agency of Negro "compradors" as is often the case in colonies.

The Negro capitalists enjoy no favored social amenities or freedom from Jim Crow oppression, from racial discrimination. This is the common lot of all Negroes regardless of their class status.

Hence the antagonisms and contradictions between the Negro capitalist and dominant monopoly capital. This motivates the Negro capitalists to enter into the Negro movement, often jointly with working people, against the ruling circles of white monopolists.

While striving to ensure the leadership of the workers, we must draw a larger part of the Negro capitalists into the movement against discrimination or ally it to the progressive and peace forces. It is also necessary for the workers to combat the conservative influence of the Negro capitalists within this movement and the consequences of their narrow-mindedness.

* * *

Such is the broad class spread, the social base of the Negro movement within which there is struggle between the bourgeoisie and the working class for dominance in the leadership and policies of the Negro organizations.

The working class will acquire an ever greater importance in the Negro people's movement for freedom. The high proportion of working people among the Negro population means that this movement will increasingly reflect the influence and strivings of the working class in its program, policy, leadership, alliances, immediate and final goals.

The relation of class forces in the Negro movement is obviously in favor of the working class. This helps to establish its leading role, without which no success in the liberation of the Negroes is possible.

IV

The Slogans and Tasks of Communists

The reappraisal by our Party of the "self-determination" slogan required its replacement by a concept and a slogan which ex-

press a more accurate and scientific solution to the Negro question in the United States.

Such a slogan must reflect an urgent problem—governmental power for the oppressed Negro majority population. This must be accompanied by the struggle for radical agrarian reform in the traditional areas with most backward agrarian relations, intense poverty and brutal landlord rule in what is referred to as the "Black Belt."

In the past, the Communist Party program on the Negro question was expressed as follows:

"The Communist Party stands for the full economic, political, social and cultural equality for the Negro people, *including the right to self-determination in the Black Belt.*"

The Party's position (as stated in the National Committee's draft resolution to be submitted to the Party convention in November 1959) is now formulated as follows:

"*The Communist Party of the United States stands for the full equality of the Negro people: their inalienable right to a fully integrated participation in the political, economic, social, and cultural life of America, including the right to the guarantee of genuinely representative government in the South, with proportional representation, in the areas of Negro majority population.*"

Our Party takes into account the fact that in its present stage the Negro people's movement advances the program demanding elementary democratic rights and liberties, including equal civil rights and economic potentialities and social justice. The Negro movement opposes *racial segregation and discrimination*; it demands political, economic and social equality both for individuals and the entire Negro people.

It strives to rally all forces of the Negro people in active struggle for these pressing common demands. It likewise strives to draw the vast masses of the white population into the struggle for equal rights for Negroes.

The common objective of Negroes, wherever they may live in the United States, is to abolish segregation and free themselves from any discrimination. American Negroes aspire to legal equality with their white countrymen in the political, economic and cultural life of the country. The popular expression "to fight for Negro rights" is understood by the Negro people as the slogan of struggle for these general objectives.

To be able to attain these objectives, the Negro people must secure, in particular, their full and rightful share of governmental power. In those urban and rural communities where

they constitute the majority, especially in the Deep South area—the historic cradle-land of American Negroes—they must be in the majority in local government bodies.

In its essence, therefore, the struggle for Negro rights is not a mere "civil rights" movement. It is a *political* struggle for a just share of representation nationally; a struggle for the majority rule in the localities where they are the dominant people in the population; a struggle for genuinely democratic representative government in the country as a whole and in the southern states in particular.

At the heart of the political struggle for Negro rights at the present time is the fight for suffrage rights. Accompanying this demand is the fight for Negro representation.

To register successes in this respect, certain things are required in our opinion: mobilizing the Negro people and their allies in support of both Negro candidates and "unity" candidates committed to a program of equal rights for Negroes; mutual assistance pacts for political action; the strengthening of the alliance between the organized Negro suffrage movement and the Negro electorate on the one hand, and the organized labor movement and popular democratic rights and peace movement on the other.

The linking of the particular struggle of the Negro people for their rights to the general struggle of labor for democratic advancement and peace, for the welfare of the country as a whole, is required for winning both immediate and long range successes. *As a minority people in the country as a whole, victory of the Negro people is unthinkable except on the basis that the struggle is fought in alliance with the oppressed majority of the whole people, i.e., with the working class, the poor farmer masses, and the other strata victimized by the monopolists.*

In order to unite the Negro people and forge the alliance between them and organized labor it is especially important for the Negro workers to exercise the initiative, and provide leadership.

The Communists work to ensure the most concrete leadership of the left, progressive forces in (1) the trade unions and (2) in the Negro mass organizations. These are the primary channels through which the Negro masses and labor movement are reached and rallied into the fight for Negro rights.

There is no greater task for the Communists and class-conscious workers than that

of furthering the bonds of class unity and brotherhood between Negro and white workers. The Communists strive to stand in the forefront of the struggle to smash every remaining color bar and anti-Negro prejudice, or manifestation of racial prejudices in the trade union and other working-class organizations. The Communists stand forth as tireless fighters for the integration of Negro workers on the basis of full equality in the life and affairs of the trade unions. They ceaselessly work to influence the trade unions to struggle for full equality in job rights for the Negro workers, equal pay for equal work, job classification, training and promotion; to put an end to any discrimination in terms of employment in all branches of industry. The Communists strive to participate actively in solving the urgent task of the American labor movement: to draw millions of unorganized Negro and white workers, especially in the South, into the trade unions.

The Communists devote particular attention to the development of the Negro people's movement in the southern states. Our Party champions the democratic rights of the Negro people to equality in every sphere of American life. It also supports the right of the Negro population in the South to develop freely and fully. The Party works to ensure that the Negro people, the working class and all other democratic forces wage a sustained and concerted struggle for the immediate realization of measures which would create those democratic conditions in the South in general, and in the Black Belt area of Negro majority in particular, for the Negro people there to freely exercise their rights to determine the course of their own development.

The task of the Communists is to influence the organized movements and campaigns which stem from the activities of the progressive forces within the established organizations of the masses. It is not the task of the Communist Party, at this stage, to undertake under its own banner the building of such movements. The task of the Communists is to advance the influence of the policies of the working class and consolidate the forces of the left trend *within* the established organizations of the Negro people, of labor, poor farmers and their allies among the middle sections.

So that the Party and the working class may fulfil their responsibility to the development of the liberation movement of the Deep South Negro community, the Communists attach particular importance to strengthening

the Communist Party in the South in general and among the southern workers in particular.

The Negro people's struggle for equality is an organic part of the democratic struggle of the exploited classes and oppressed peoples

on a national and worldwide scale. It is a separate sector but an indivisible part of the struggle of the working people of our country and the entire capitalist world for security, peace, democracy and genuine freedom.

Ideological Work in the Communist Party of Indonesia

D. N. Aidit

IN THE course of seven years the Indonesian Communist Party has grown into a mass party. At present it is the biggest party in the country and is backed by more than eight million voters.

Early in 1952 it had only 7,910 members and candidate members, but by the end of that year it had 126,671. In March 1954, at the time of the Vth National Congress of the Party, its membership was 165,206 and by the beginning of 1959 had increased to 1.5 million.

The rich experiences of 1945-48 convinced the Indonesian Communists that their Party should be a mass party. During that period Communists played an important part in the government, in all mass organizations, in the army and guerilla units, but their numbers were less than 10,000. This indicates that the Communists had not paid enough attention to winning more members and, consequently, to building a powerful proletarian vanguard — the backbone of the People's Revolution. And so for three years the revolution developed without a strong Communist Party. That is why in the second half of 1948 the counter-revolution succeeded in misleading some Communist supporters, whose numbers were quite considerable at that time. As for the Communists who were loyal to the Party and convinced of the righteousness of their cause, they were few.

This led the Party to the conclusion that the recruitment of new members was necessary to enable it to carry out its tasks and win victory for the people. While participating in the Parliamentary elections, the Constituent Assembly, provincial and regional legislative bodies, the Indonesian Communists realized that a Party with a big membership would be the decisive factor in achieving victory.

A number of factors made the rapid growth of the membership possible: *first*, the correct Party policy, particularly with regard to the peasantry and the national bourgeoisie; *secondly*, unanimity in the Party leadership on the basic problems of the Indonesian Revolution and on the building of a mass party; *thirdly*, a detailed program of Party organization and education.

If the Communists combine the work of enlarging their membership with that of Marxist-Leninist education, they will have no fear of the Party becoming the usual type of mass organization.

The implementation of the Three-Year Program of Organization and Education (started on August 17, 1956) has substantially consolidated the Party organizationally. The program has the following aims: to establish Party organizations all over the country and among all the nationalities; to increase the Party membership in those regions where the number is low in proportion to the population; to train full-time functionaries; to allocate functionaries to regions in need of them; to arrange premises for Party Committees; to collect membership dues regularly, etc.

The setting up of new Party organizations is linked with the growth of the membership, and this in its turn is closely connected with the struggle of the Communists for better conditions and against economic and social injustice. Thus, in order to enlarge its membership, the Party must improve its work among the masses.

The increase in Party membership must be accompanied by the raising of the ideological level. Party education based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism, the outlook and practice of the working class, is of great importance. Education was organized first for the

leading members and then for the rank and file. The majority of the functionaries and activists are now engaged in political education. The task is to educate all the functionaries and activists and the majority of the members and candidate members. The national school, and the schools and courses arranged by the provincial and regional committees and the classes in the local units are of the utmost importance.

At all levels, from the national school to the local classes, four subjects are taught:

1. *The History of Society*. This subject is designed to acquaint members with the Marxist-Leninist view of society, the laws of its development and the transition to socialism and to communism.

2. *Basic Problems of the Indonesian Revolution*. This is directed towards achieving unanimity on the strategy and tactics of the Indonesian Revolution, which is the indispensable condition for Party unity.

3. *Problems of the National Front*. Here the aim is to ensure a clear understanding by all members of the basic tactical line of the CPI — the building of the national front.

4. *Party Building*. This subject brings out the importance of the Party of the Leninist type and of the active participation of all Communists in its building — the essential condition for carrying out Party policy.

The text-books for each subject are adapted to the educational level and political understanding of the students.

The students attending the national school study two other subjects, namely, Dialectical and Historical Materialism and the International Working-Class Movement.

For those members and progressives unable to enter the national school or the provincial schools for lack of places or because of their daily occupation, a People's University has been opened in Jakarta with branches in the provincial capitals. The term here is two years. Marxist political economy and the basic problems of the Indonesian Revolution are obligatory subjects in which students take their examinations. The enrolment at the People's University in Jakarta (those attending the faculties of social sciences, philology, journalism and the fine arts) numbers 760, and the branches from 300 to 400.

The curriculum of the University is closely linked with the urgent tasks of the Party, namely the building of a national front and the Party. The education is aimed at eliminating ideological confusion, at deepening the understanding of present and future tasks.

The students who study Marxist political economy, the Indonesian independence movement and other subjects will become acquainted with the basic principles and the method of Marxism-Leninism. Our studies pursue a definite aim, that of studying the nature of the Indonesian Revolution. We say to all students: if we study and work successfully, if we master Marxism-Leninism and are able to apply it in practice, we shall certainly fulfil our task, and the Indonesian Revolution will triumph in the not too distant future.

That all Communists should study is taken for granted. No one can deny that the CPI is a Party whose cadres and members have always made a point of serious study. However, not all shortcomings have been eliminated. Some members continue to study theory in isolation from revolutionary practice. In the past students were not trained to assess the practice of the Revolution from the standpoint of theory. At that time revolutionary theory and practice were like two wheels of a bicycle rotating in opposite directions. The teachers did not link up theoretical study with revolutionary practice. True, they talked much about the unity of theory and practice and repeated that "theory without practice is barren," but they did not act in accordance with their own statements about the unity of theory and practice. The teachers relied on the textbooks and the students were taught to echo their teachers. The result was that the students were unable to solve practical problems. At that time, and it sometimes happens now, Marxism-Leninism was studied by a method which had nothing in common with Marxism-Leninism and which violated one of its basic principles, the principle of the unity of theory and practice.

In the old Party schools and courses political economy was not taught with the aim of helping the students to learn the peculiarities of the Indonesian economy. The teachers spoke about the experience of revolutions in other countries but failed to speak about the strategy and tactics of the Indonesian Revolution itself. Before 1951 philosophy, too, was taught in our Party schools, the only aim being to know something about it. The results were very modest. Those who completed the Party schools did not become better Marxists and, in fact, many of them became more dogmatic and arrogant. The reason for this was that the students were out of touch with revolutionary practice and had their heads stuffed with dead formulas. Upon graduation they regarded themselves as theoreticians which

they were far from being, because people who have read a couple of Marxist books certainly cannot be called Marxist theoreticians, any more than persons who have read works of fiction can be called writers.

In the past the term "theoretician" was interpreted as meaning anyone who had memorized a few revolutionary formulas but who could not solve practical problems. These "theoreticians" even believed that their prestige would rise if they displayed inability to solve practical problems. They considered that revolutionary practice was all right for people who were not called upon to use their brains, that practice was "unskilled" work. We called such "theoreticians" Marxist *kiyais*,* that is, people whose job was to publicize Marxist teachings regardless of whether they were appropriate or not, useful or otherwise at any particular stage of the revolutionary struggle.

One of the subjects taught in the political and social sciences course at the People's University is the Basic Problems of the Indonesian Revolution. This indicates the great importance attached to linking up theory with practice. The aim of this subject is to clarify the important problems of the strategy and tactics of the Indonesian Revolution in accordance with the basic principles and method of Marxism-Leninism and with Lenin's theory of revolution in the colonies.

Since 1951 the Communists have begun to make a thorough examination of events, to analyze their mistakes and draw conclusions for their future work. The leaders of the CPI have made a deeper study of theory, welding it to revolutionary practice and earnestly trying to solve the problems facing the people. Serious efforts have been made by the leadership to master the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism. The leadership has really based itself on the principles and method of Marxism-Leninism in solving the practical problems of the revolution. Since then much has been done to conduct work on the basis of the actual conditions in the country.

Today all Indonesians, from the higher officials, members of the legislative bodies down to school children, talk about the "National Revolution" and about the need "to complete the August 1945 Revolution." But how many of these people have made an investigation of the society in which this Revolution is taking place? How many of them are able to decide what are the *aims, tasks, driving*

forces, the nature and the perspectives of the Indonesian Revolution?

Many like to talk about the need "to complete the Indonesian Revolution," but they are not clear as to what has to be completed. Each has his own interpretation. One thinks that "the Revolution will be completed" when he will own a commercial enterprise and reap profits. Another holds that it will be completed when he becomes a minister or ambassador, a high government official or a general, and so on. Naturally, the class-conscious workers and the working people generally have a different understanding of what is meant by "completing the Indonesian Revolution." That is why it is necessary to arrive at a common view on the question of what is meant by "completing the August 1945 Revolution." Only in this way shall we be able to take correct and resolute revolutionary steps.

To decide the fundamental problems of the Indonesian Revolution we must have a thorough and exact knowledge of our society as it is today. This, of course, does not apply to those who deliberately oppose the Revolution. But for all true sons and daughters of Indonesia who aspire to see their nation truly happy, complete understanding of the problems of Indonesian society is indispensable if they are going to play a more conscious part in the Revolution.

We often say that Indonesia is already independent. If we exclude West Irian, which is part of our country, this is indeed true. Nobody can say that our country is still a colony. But how complete is our independence? Can it be compared, say, with the independence of India or the USA, Britain, the Soviet Union, People's China, and so on? Are we really independent politically and economically? What about our national culture in present-day Indonesia? Are we really free to build our national culture, to decide all questions in accordance with our wishes?

The question of how complete our independence is at the moment is far from being academic; it is a practical question, a question raised by the need clearly to determine the practical steps in our revolutionary work. From the answers to these questions we shall be able to clarify the fundamental problems of our Revolution, its strategy and its tactics.

To achieve the objectives of the Indonesian Revolution, which is national and democratic in character, the most important tactic is to unite the progressive and the middle-of-the-road forces, that is, all the forces of the

*A *kiyai* is a person who learns the Koran by heart and repeats it during religious ceremonies.

people. The struggle to rally the entire nation, the workers, peasants, petty bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie, is what we mean by building the national united front.

Those who know little about Indonesian society, and for this reason may have wrong ideas about the Revolution, used to say demagogically that we should carry out a socialist revolution and abolish national capitalism right away. Now, the people who say this may have the very best intentions, people who want the Revolution to proceed rapidly, but obviously their views are formed without paying attention to the actual conditions in our society. They think and act on the strength of subjective conclusions, disregarding the objective conditions. There are others who want to delay the course of the Revolution and to hinder it from reaching its goal. But there are also people who aim to disrupt the Revolution while proclaiming the need for "a socialist revolution now." This demagoguery is particularly dangerous, because it can have serious consequences for the revolutionary movement. One of these is the fear of the Revolution current among the national bourgeoisie. As a result they are becoming hostile to the Revolution, while some who were hostile before are becoming still more hostile. Resorting to such demagoguery, people who sometimes call themselves Lefts are in fact diverting the blows aimed at the imperialists and landlords and splitting the unity of the people.

Guided by Marxist-Leninist theory and by the specific conditions in Indonesian society today, it is possible correctly to determine the nature of our Revolution, its tasks and motive forces. Hence it is clear that the present strategy of the Revolution is to complete the national-democratic revolution, or, using the generally accepted slogan, to "complete the August 1945 Revolution."

Consequently, the teachers of political science should deal with the problems of Indonesian society today, particularly with the problem of whether Indonesia is a fully independent country or still a semi-colony. Is Indonesian society capitalist or semi-capital-

ist? Is feudalism dominant in the country or are only its remnants left? They should also clarify the question of the influence of imperialism and feudalism on present-day Indonesian politics and culture.

The Indonesian Revolution is not something which has fallen from the skies or sprung out of the ground; it is the logical result of the development of our society. That is why it is unthinkable to speak about the Indonesian Revolution unless one has made a thorough study of the conditions and the history of our society.

To become a true revolutionary, one must study the writings of authors in different countries. He who has not studied and understood the works of the leading personalities of the Indonesian Revolution, particularly Sukarno's books *For an Independent Indonesia* and *Indonesia Accuses*, cannot become a conscious revolutionary in the conditions of today.

The material compiled by the Central Committee of the CPI on the country's economy, policy and culture — past and present — will greatly assist the University teachers in acquainting students with the problems of Indonesian society.

In addition to the foregoing, there are other forms of study — seminars, study circles and theoretical conferences arranged by Party committees and the Party groups in the mass organizations. Whenever tendencies appear which can weaken its ideology the Party carries out a rectification campaign.

A feature of the educational work is that the enthusiasm displayed by Party members for study favorably influences the progress of education in the mass organizations, which have their own educational programs.

The task of turning the CPI into a mass party, consolidating its ranks and tempering it in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism is not an easy one. With its fulfilment, the Party will become the powerful and unbreakable backbone of the Indonesian people, who look forward with resolution and strive for full national independence, democracy, lasting peace and friendship among all nations.

The Struggle against the Common Market in Italy

Bruzio Manzocchi

IN DEALING with the Coal and Steel Community and the Common Market, we should bear in mind the general policy of monopoly capital in the six member-countries rather than the consequences of the agreements which are only the instruments of this policy. The aim of this policy is to place the burden of the general crisis of capitalism on the working class, the peasantry and the petty bourgeoisie. This crisis has also affected the countries of "Little Europe" dominated by the big monopolies, particularly of West Germany.

All these countries are faced with pressing problems such as full employment, living standards commensurate with the latest technical achievements, the progress of democracy, the easing of international tension, and peaceful coexistence.

The monopoly circles are ignoring these problems — all their activities run counter to the aspirations of the peoples. They speed up economic concentration and strengthen the political power of the monopolies in order to retard the movement for peace and progress of the working class and other social strata.

* * *

This process is especially noticeable in Italy where social contradictions are sharp. Fourteen years have passed since the country's liberation from fascism but her economic problems remain unresolved.

Unemployment and partial unemployment are chronic. The Central Institute of Statistics reported that eight per cent of employables were unemployed in January 1959. The number of partially unemployed among seven million farm laborers, sharecroppers and small peasants (constituting 39 percent of the gainfully employed population) is the equivalent of two million fully unemployed. Mass unemployment affects wages since it lowers the market-value of the labor power.

Another characteristic of Italian society is the unequal distribution of incomes and the uneven development of the southern and northern areas. According to the "Report on the Economic Position of the European Com-

munity," the southern areas (38 per cent of the population) accounted in 1957 for 21 per cent of the national income, 26 per cent of all capital investments and 15-16 per cent of the investment in industry.

In these conditions the effects of "European integration" were felt even before the Common Market agreement came into force. Mass unemployment is aggravated by the danger (real in many cases) of "technological" unemployment, as the bourgeoisie call it. More factories are closed and workers laid off under the pretense of "reducing the cost of production in view of the competition intensified by the Common Market."

The situation in the countryside is even worse. The government and the capitalists do not conceal their intention of "re-equipping" the large farms at the expense of the small ones. The official newspapers predicted in May 1958 that about three million peasants would have to leave their land.

The policy of "European integration" brings about social and political changes. New social forces come into play; they oppose the policy of the big monopolists and the government and seek to abolish the former and develop society along democratic lines.

It is the working class that first enters the arena of struggle. In the past year it has been joined by people and organizations of differing political trends. The struggle is characterized by the increased unity and militancy of the working people, particularly in the struggle against the closing of factories.

This movement has the support of non-socialist political groups, a large section of the middle strata and many young people, including students from bourgeois families. This indicates that more people are beginning to realize that not only employment but also the whole future of the Italian economy are now at stake.

The workers, in addition to combating unemployment as the first effect of the policy of "European integration," also fight on other issues. Their economic and trade union

demands are acquiring a new political meaning.

Some 400,000 textile workers (over 10 per cent of the industrial workers) recently staged a 24-hour strike, demanding a revision of their collective agreement. The political implication of their struggle is obvious, since most of the textile workers are women influenced by the Catholic organizations and the trade unions not affiliated to the General Confederation of Labor. It is significant that the workers are demanding a wage increase at a time when the employers in Italy and other Western European countries are forcing wages down.

The iron and steel and engineering workers (one-fourth of all industrial workers) won their demands for a new collective agreement on higher wages and better working conditions. This victory testifies to the unity and strength of the workers' movement.

Equally important is the struggle of 1,200,000 civil servants for a wage increase and a sliding scale. Hitherto this means of protecting the workers from the devaluation of the lira operated only in the privately-owned enterprises. This struggle developed at a time when the employers were trying to abolish the sliding scale. The anti-government character of the struggle and its political meaning can be seen from the fact that it was backed by many other categories of workers.

In the countryside mass opposition to the Common Market is combined with the demand for a new policy in agriculture. The first demand of the agricultural workers is the implementation of the "obligatory hire of labor" (the owners of estates are obliged to provide jobs for a certain number of people). This demand is being violently resisted by the big capitalists, since it prevents the mass dismissal of workers.

The peasants are also opposing the liquidation of "unprofitable farms." In this movement the initiative of the democratic organizations merges with the action of the Catholic Confederation of Small Peasants — the organization through which the big capitalists, landlords and the clericals attempt to assume leadership of the peasantry. It is noteworthy that its local organizations are exerting pressure on the leaders who betray the peasants' interests.

The Communist Party has held many meetings in the countryside, at which the consequences of the Common Market for particular sectors of agriculture were dis-

cussed; it has also worked out plans to protect and develop the small farms.

A movement similar to that of the peasants is developing among the urban middle sections. It has the same economic and political content and embraces medium and small manufacturers and handicraftsmen. Here, too, the Communist Party is encouraging the initiative of their organizations and displaying its own initiative which found expression, for example, in the holding of a national conference against the Common Market and for a new policy for industry.

In addition to big industrial and financial associations, there are many small industrial, handicraft and trading enterprises. Enterprises with fewer than 100 workers each make up 99.3 per cent and employ 60 per cent of all industrial workers. These figures indicate the economic importance of the small industrial and handicraft enterprises and show how both the workers and employers are interested in protecting them. That is why the Common Market policy with its emphasis on monopoly concentration, which threatens hundreds of thousands of medium-sized and small industrial and handicraft enterprises, is opposed by the petty and middle bourgeoisie who play an important part in the political and social life of the country.

Thus, the industrial and agricultural workers, small producers and handicraftsmen are beginning to realize the need to combat the effects of the policy of "European integration" and counterpose to it a new economic policy. Its basic aims are full employment, higher living standards, extension of the home market, trade with all countries and, to this end, struggle against the industrial monopolies and financial groups.

The movement of the social forces which are increasingly opposing the monopolists and their home and foreign policy leaves its mark on the relationship of political forces. In other words, the growing consciousness of people belonging to political and trade union organizations has to be reckoned with. For this reason the economic difficulties caused by the Common Market also find expression in the political sphere. All parties, from the Social Democrats headed by Saragat to the Christian Democrats who have been at the helm since 1947, when the Communist ministers were removed from the government, are torn by sharp contradictions. The contradictions within the Christian Democratic Party — the biggest bourgeois party — are the direct result of monopoly rule in home affairs. Christian Democrats, critical of

the monopoly policy, are nevertheless favorably disposed towards the Common Market. They vainly hope that monopoly rule can be restricted by Italy's participation in the Common Market. When faced with questions of principle they are still incapable of overcoming their anti-communism. This does not mean, however, that these people may not take a stand very similar to that of the Communist Party in the struggle against the Italian and international monopolies.

When speaking of the political parties we must note the stand taken by the Socialists. During the ratification of the Common Market agreement the parliamentary Socialist Party adopted a position different from that of the Communists: instead of voting against the agreement, it abstained. Moreover, some of the Socialist leaders wavered on the question of "European integration." They saw in it an objective trend engendered by technological progress, on the one hand, and elements of "planning," which could be used for democratic aims, on the other. Those who think thus do not understand that the main factor determining the nature of an economic phenomenon is not the question of the forms it takes but of the social, class relations it reflects. The Communist Party decided to start discussions with the Socialists in order to clarify the ideological questions. It should be stressed that in spite of the ideological differences the two parties were unanimous on the problems of day-to-day work. This concurrence of views took place in the trade unions, and can be seen from the stand taken by the General Confederation of Labor in opposing the monopolies and the Common Market and in fighting for a peace policy.

* * *

A number of demands aimed at changing home and foreign policies have been advanced by the urban and rural workers and those middle sections who suffer from the Common Market policy of the Italian and foreign monopolists.

While supporting this struggle, the Communists put forward practical solutions which could open new prospects for the Italian people.

On the question of "European integration" the policy of the Communist Party was set out in the resolution adopted by the Party leadership on January 2, 1959, when the Common Market agreement came into force.

Consequent developments have clearly demonstrated that the Communists are right in rejecting all forms of "European integration," from the Coal and Steel Community

to the Euratom and Common Market agreements. Our Party proves by its activity that it is the only political force resolutely opposing these agreements. Its firm position adds to the effect of its political actions.

The Communist Party calls upon all political forces to demand the renunciation of the Common Market agreement in order to put an end to its harmful consequences. Simultaneously, it has put forward its own economic policy the main objectives of which are formulated in the above-mentioned resolution as follows:

—an agrarian reform, nationalization of fuel and power, a state plan for economic development and full employment with the state enterprises being utilized as a means of industrialization, struggle against the monopolies, changes in the socio-economic structure;

—higher wages and salaries to expand the home market, a price and credit policy which, using democratic forms of control over the monopolies and developing co-operation, would deal a blow at the privileges of the monopolies and put an end to speculative profits and parasitic groups;

—ending the discrimination against the socialist countries and the policy of economic blocs in favor of mutually advantageous trade which would be in accord with our economic interests and contribute to international co-operation and peace.

These measures aim at breaking the rule of the monopolists and defeating their home and foreign policy.

The resolution points out that Italy needs active trade with other countries. She imports raw materials and exports manufactured goods in exchange. The maximum labor power must be employed in the output of these goods. The Common Market agreement, however, limits Italy's trade to the countries of "Little Europe" which account for only one-fifth of her imports and one-fourth of her exports. The Common Market countries export to Italy primarily manufactured goods which compete with Italian products. Hence the need to prevent the isolation of the Italian economy and to establish stable economic relations with the capitalist, underdeveloped and especially the socialist countries. This will benefit the Italian economy, while trade with the socialist countries will ensure a steady expansion of Italy's trade.

This foreign policy must be accompanied by a policy of curbing the monopolies at home. This would make it possible to end

unemployment, improve living standards and reduce the disproportion in the economic development of different regions.

A future home policy must be based on achieving a higher standard of living. That is why militant mass action for higher wages and stable employment becomes the starting point of the struggle waged by the working class and other democratic forces against the monopolists and the Common Market.

This is important from the standpoint of protecting the rights of the people and also because a higher standard of living is a factor in weakening the impact of the policy of the monopolists. By winning higher wages the workers deal a blow at the capitalist system.

The struggle of the workers to keep their jobs and obtain a wage increase is growing over into the movement for full employment. This movement aims to influence the production relations in which the monopolists and big landowners play the dominant role.

That is why the Communists head the struggle for agrarian reform as an essential condition for changing the production relations in the countryside. This reform must include the substitution of more profitable for less profitable crops, and supply the small farmers with machinery and credits. Only in this way can the danger created by the Common Market, and the danger of the peasants and agricultural workers being driven from the land be combated. We must also extend the home market by increasing the sale of manufactured goods to the peasants at a time when the Common Market policy leads to the shrinking of the home market.

The policy of increasing employment must be supplemented by measures in the sphere of the power industry, credits, taxes and in the state sector of industry.

Fuel and power, the basis of Italy's economic progress, must be nationalized with a view to increasing the output of electricity, distributing it at lower prices all over the country with special attention to the backward regions.

We must increase employment and output in the state sector, especially in the economically backward regions; produce cheap raw materials, half-finished and ready-made goods. This would enable the non-monopolistic enterprises to reduce the cost of production and resist the pressure of the monopolies.

Lastly, the Communist Party proposes, instead of the Common Market, control of credits, capital investments, prices and taxes. It works for the improvement of the position of the medium-sized, small and handicraft enterprises which are in a state of crisis owing to the lack of funds, and which bear the main burden of a state budget drawn up in the interests of the monopolists and adapted to the growing militarization of the economy. Inside and outside parliament the Communists are demanding democratic measures necessary to end monopoly domination and the disastrous consequences of the Common Market; these demands are also a factor in rallying new socio-political forces for further struggle. All public forces and political groups which regard big landownership, the industrial monopolies and their international links and the government expressing their interests, as the main obstacle in the way of social progress, can be united around these tasks.

Thus, we approach the main objective which the Communist Party sets before the Italian people: a new democratic majority capable of directing the Italian people along the road to peace and democracy.

Bourgeois Democracy in Holland

Marcus Bakker

HOLLAND provides particularly rich material for a study of bourgeois democracy, which in our country dates back to the 1572-81 revolution. At a time when Spinoza, Rembrandt and Grotius symbolized free creative work the Dutch bourgeoisie proclaimed the democratic rights of man and the citizen. But a century later the descendants of the first bourgeois-democratic rulers in Europe had become parasites who enriched themselves by trading in slaves.

One of the historical peculiarities of the Dutch bourgeoisie is that they enriched themselves through the merciless exploitation of colonies. But their golden age has ended, they have lost their pearl — Indonesia. The flow of wealth from the colonies has nearly ceased. Up to the time of World War II Holland granted loans to other countries, but since then has run into debt. This was mainly the result of occupation by the Nazis, who plundered Holland in much the same way as the Dutch bourgeoisie plundered Indonesia; and of the senseless extravagance of the emigrant government in London.

The new situation impelled the Dutch bourgeoisie to change their tactics towards the working class. Formerly, they were able to throw the workers some crumbs from the colonial table in order to divert them from struggle. To a certain extent they were successful: it was not accidental that Right-wing Social-Democratic and anarchist trends originally dominated in the working-class movement which arose in the late nineteenth century. But now the source of such crumbs has disappeared, and there is no possibility of bribing any large section of the working class. To compete successfully in the international capitalist market and preserve their profits, the Dutch bourgeoisie are attacking the working class, slashing wages, speeding up labor, etc.

Formerly, the Dutch bourgeoisie found it advantageous to accept democracy and democratic institutions insofar as they did not interfere with their class interests and ensured order in the country, while the army, navy and police had a free hand in Indonesia. They became like the two-faced Janus: open dictators and military oppressors in the colonies and bourgeois democrats at home.

At present, the economic offensive against the working class goes hand in hand with bourgeois attacks on democracy and the suppression of civil liberties.

It is not only the economic factors which determine the "new" policy of the capitalists, but also their dependence on the USA whose war plans, directed against the socialist countries, impel them to try to curb the working-class movement.

The attack on democratic and constitutional rights has its history. During the war a reactionary reform of the political system was drafted by some of the Dutch emigrants in London, among whom were representatives of big trusts and colonial officials from Indonesia. Plans were also made to instal after the war a near-fascist regime, to restore Holland's former prosperity and, above all, to win over the colonies. The capitalists hoped for the support of the United States and Britain for this program.

But the changes in the international situation arising out of the defeat of Hitler Germany and the growth of new democratic forces firmly opposed to any form of fascism, blighted the hopes of the Dutch capitalists. That being so, the big trusts had to postpone their plans, and now make only indirect attacks on democracy.

The most aggressive group of the Dutch bourgeoisie consists of the monopoly capitalists who seized key positions both in economy and politics. Royal Dutch Shell, Unilever (margarine, fats, soap, etc.), AKU (artificial silk), Philips (electric bulbs, radio apparatus, etc.) and the shipping companies exerted direct influence on the government prior to, during, and after the war. Colijn, Prime Minister before the war, and Van Kleffens, the then Foreign Minister, were yes-men of the oil monopolists; Patijn and Beyen, ex-Foreign Ministers, were associated with Unilever. During the war these monopolists had their agents both in the emigré government in London and in the Seyss-Inquart administration in the occupied territory.

After the war monopoly capital was particularly anxious to bribe the leadership of the Social Democratic Party (the Party of Labor) and bought over many of its leaders. For example, Vorrink, former chairman of

the Social Democratic Party, was closely associated with Unilever, while Schermerhorn, the first post-war Prime Minister, was associated with the oil monopolies. Dailly, former Mayor of Amsterdam, and Van Hall, the present Mayor, are bankers. Willemse, leader of the Rotterdam Social Democratic Party, was an influential figure in the administration of the city port. Vermeulen, former leader of the Socialist Trade Union Movement, came from Philips and Co. Leader of the parliamentary Social Democratic Party, Burger, was lawyer to a number of firms. Social Democrats are given preference in filling well-paid jobs at the factories and in the municipalities. Many of them hold highly-paid posts as heads of personnel departments, accountants, foremen, and so on.

In dealing with the revolutionary working-class movement the Dutch capitalists increasingly employ the methods learned from their rich experience of colonialism. Bourgeois agents penetrate into the workers' organizations. They sow discord and disrupt the movement whenever the struggle develops. This was especially true of the war period when the Gestapo murdered a large number of Communists, and the Dutch imperialists replaced them with people who were ready and willing to help them.

After the war the authorities drafted and are now effecting measures aimed at isolating the Communists. They passed a law prohibiting government employees from joining the Communist Party and the United Trade Union Center, or participating in the women's movement, etc.

These measures evoked such protests from the workers that the government could not put them fully into effect. However, the authorities succeeded in intimidating some of the workers employed in the state enterprises, restraining them from struggle. Consequently the wages of these workers are now much lower than those in the privately-owned enterprises. Every progressive-minded worker is suspected of communism and is threatened with dismissal. For instance, many municipal employees who had been active during the strike in 1955 were fired. Many of them were not and never had been members of the Communist Party.

In their anti-labor policy many big employers readily follow the government. They enjoy the help of the secret police—the "internal security service"—which, as is clear from the government statements, informs the employers of the political convictions and activities of the workers.

In some areas the employers draw up "black lists." Progressive-minded workers cannot find jobs after they have been dismissed and blacklisted. For instance, after the big strikes at the Amsterdam municipal enterprises many of the strike leaders were fired and could not get jobs in the city or at nearby enterprises.

The post-war legislation envisages a whole system of persecution and restrictions on progressive trade unions. Under the corporative system introduced after the war only some trade unions are recognized. The employers' associations negotiate the collective agreements only with these trade unions, while the rest are ignored. Both groups of organizations form a corporative "Socio-Economic Council" with which the government is obliged, according to law, to consult on the proposed socio-economic measures.

Freely elected works committees have in most cases been replaced by "factory councils" which, in addition to elected representatives, include appointed members from the factory administration, usually with the manager as chairman. Officially, councils are elected only by the "recognized" trade unions; the other trade unions are not allowed to participate in the elections. For instance, a branch of the United Trade Union Center at the Amsterdam shipyards (an important trade union receiving 40 to 50 per cent of the votes) cannot, as an organization not recognized by law, elect factory councils. The trade unionists who wish to elect their leaders to a factory council must enter their names in the "free lists" supported by a large number of signatures before the administration allows them to run for election.

Here we see not only discrimination and arbitrary regulations in conducting elections but also shameless intimidation of the workers. Elections cease to be free; workers voting for the opposition candidates are threatened with dismissal and persecution.

It should be pointed out that the leadership of the "recognized" Trade Union Amalgamation, influenced by the Social Democratic Party, the Catholic Workers' Movement and the Christian Trade Union Association, took an active part in the working out of this system.

The Trade Union Amalgamation went so far as to introduce restrictions in accepting new members into some of the affiliated unions. When applying to join the trade union the worker must affirm that he is not a member of the Communist Party, the Netherlands-USSR Society or a peace com-

mittee. In many cases trade unionists were expelled for failing to meet these requirements and, in particular, for participating in the work of peace committees.

It is noteworthy that special wage systems introduced in recent years, chiefly the "merit rating," are used for political discrimination and intimidation. According to this system wage rates are determined by "interest displayed in the work," the influence which "a good worker" exerts on his work-mates, etc. Wages largely depend on how a foreman grades a worker. Thus this system, to say nothing about its other negative features, is used to persecute and render inactive the progressive workers by depriving them of a big part of their legitimate wages.

This persecution of the class-conscious workers by the administration is supplemented by the activity of the secret police which is directed, above all, against the Communist Party.

Many instances can be cited of secret police agents trying to bribe Party functionaries and journalists, to subvert the rank and file and leading members of the Party. The police stop at nothing. Attempts have been made to bribe close relatives of Party functionaries and use them as informers; threats to deprive workers of their incomes have also been resorted to.

De Waarheid, the central organ of the Communist Party, in particular, has been the target of these methods. Some of its technical staff were bribed by secret police agents. An unbridled campaign of intimidation is conducted against its readers.

In defiance of the will of many Communist voters the Party is prevented from full participation in the work of parliament and municipal councils. In 1948, for instance, the Communist deputies were not admitted to some important parliamentary committees, including the Foreign Affairs Committee, while the Communist councillors were unseated. The only municipality in which the Communists had a majority was run for several years by a government commissioner. In Amsterdam, Rotterdam and in the towns along the River Zaan the Communists have for ten years been excluded from the municipal committees dealing with housing construction, distribution of flats, education, public health, jobs, and so on.

It should be mentioned that foreign guests are prevented from attending congresses of the Communist Party and other democratic organizations, while working-class leaders are refused visas. All this characterizes the

new methods used by the Dutch bourgeoisie to maintain their domination.

The big trusts linked with American and West German capital direct the policy of Holland. The colonial bourgeoisie also have an important say in politics. They hope to return to Indonesia in the near future. That is why they cling to West Irian and are ready to sell the country in exchange for American "aid."

They still regard the national-liberation movement as a gross blunder of history which will be rectified any day now. The Dutch bourgeoisie, however, understand that they are not in a position to reverse the course of history. They are aware that the Soviet Union and People's China are the chief factors which prevent this. There is an influential group of the colonial bourgeoisie in our country who hope for an international conflict which, as they think, will end communism and, simultaneously, the national-liberation movement.

The Dutch imperialist bourgeoisie regarded de Gaulle's rise to power as an encouraging sign from Heaven. But the bourgeois extremists did not merely rejoice on this occasion; they immediately began to examine what aspects of Gaullism could be applied in Holland. In view of this, many Right-wing deputies, during the debate on the state budget in October 1958, tabled motions whose underlying purpose is:

a) to transform the Senate into a "corporative" chamber without legislative powers. This measure is prompted by the fact that the Senate, originally established as a body to protect the existing system from radical reforms, has proved on some questions to be a less docile tool of the government's anti-democratic, pro-American policy than the lower chamber. The reason lies in the Social-Democratic fraction in the Senate. The Social-Democratic senators adopt on certain questions an attitude which is somewhat different from that of the party leadership (e.g., concerning the government's policy in West Irian). It is the Right-wingers who have always envisaged the Senate as a reactionary parliamentary institution and now want to restrict its constitutional rights. The idea of turning the Senate into a "representative body for industrial affairs" was advanced by the Liberal leadership. This proposal has met with support from the Catholic reactionaries who control the existing corporative bodies;

b) to deprive the lower chamber of some of its legislative powers in the socio-economic sphere. This proposal which comes from the

Catholic circles is designed to enable the employers to settle a wider range of socio-economic questions, withdrawing them from the competence of Parliament and, thus, from public notice;

c) to introduce the following change in the electoral law: if the number of votes polled by a party in each electoral district does not surpass the fixed figure, they are annulled. It is an old plan which was put forward by the Right-wingers during the war. Its aim is to strike a blow at the Left groups, as has been done in West Germany.

The Social-Democratic leaders are, in large measure, responsible for the fact that many are ignorant of the real intentions behind these maneuvers of the Right-wingers. Some of these leaders are so blinded by anti-communism that they allow themselves to be used by the reactionaries to fan the anti-communist campaign.

Many years ago Romme, leader of the Catholic People's Party, wrote in his booklet, *Catholic Policy*, that he advocated a government including Social Democrats since this would help maintain sharp antagonisms between them and the Communists. This leader, the owner of a big bank and many industrial enterprises, made it quite clear that he considers it expedient to bribe Social-Democratic leaders with ministerial posts. The aim is to keep the working-class movement divided.

In pursuing their dictatorial policy the reactionaries relied on the support of the Social Democrats. But at the close of 1958 they changed their tactics. In December the Social-Democratic ministers were removed, and a Right-wing cabinet was formed.

One reason was that the bourgeoisie, faced with problems they could not solve while still preserving the semblance of democracy, felt the need for "a free hand." This became particularly evident after the end of the boom when the shipbuilding, textile and mining industries and agriculture experienced difficulties.

At the same time, the Dutch people understood that international developments had entered a new phase. The socialist camp greatly influences the course of events and is an obstacle to the unleashing of a new war. The economic development of the Soviet Union has clearly demonstrated the superiority of socialism over capitalism. A part of the Dutch bourgeoisie reckons with the economic achievements of the socialist countries and seeks for peaceful coexistence with them. But that part which is economically

and politically linked with American and West German capital and to which colonial expansion is important, has taken the road of open reaction.

The maneuvers of the Right-wingers in parliament and their attacks on the Constitution led to a government crisis in December 1958 and to their rise to power. The reactionary deputies, who draw their political inspiration from de Gaulle and Adenauer and material assistance from the monopolies, took the initiative in getting the Social Democrats out of the government. It is characteristic that the pretext used was the demand of the Right-wingers to reduce taxes on the employers, a step to which the Social-Democratic leaders could not agree without risking loss of the confidence of the masses.

The reactionaries did not stop at this and, logically, deviated more and more from the parliamentary democratic path. Parliament was dissolved, although no attempt had been made before to form a new government. It should be said that our parliament is dissolved only in exceptional circumstances, in the event of urgent necessity. An early election took place last March. The Right-wing groups made no secret of the fact that their purpose was to install a reactionary regime and to use the snap elections for giving it legislative sanction. The other purpose was to prevent the election of Communists and help the Wagenaar revisionist group to win at least one seat.

But the Right-wing groups failed to get control of parliament. Moreover, the Catholics and Protestants lost their former majority and can form a government only with the Liberals. The number of votes polled by all the Right-wing parties, including the Liberals, fell in comparison with the provincial elections in 1958. The Communist Party again formed its group in Parliament, while the revisionists did not obtain a single seat. Thus, the reactionaries were unable to smash the Communist Party, to prevent the election of Communists and to confuse the working class by the presence in parliament of a group of alleged Communists supported by the big bourgeoisie.

These elections were the most difficult in the history of the Communist Party. The "De Brug" revisionist group, expelled from the Party, ran in the elections with a false "list of Communists." This list was headed by revisionist Wagenaar who was in the previous Communist lists. Moreover, this group used the same number under which the Communist Party ran for many years.

All this was calculated to mask this group and mislead the electors. The members of this group professed to be Communists; they put forward a program resembling that of the Communist Party. Furthermore, the "De Brug" group had large funds and published numerous posters and booklets. The revisionist propaganda, supported by the Right-wing press and radio, was mainly directed at slandering the Communist Party.

The Communist Party, supported by the class-conscious workers, successfully conducted the pre-election campaign. The fact that the reactionaries did not succeed in realizing their aims is of great importance. Paul de Groot, General Secretary, wrote in *De Waarheid* on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the Party: "Our Party won the battle (against the revisionists—Ed.), and this was its biggest political victory during the 40 years of its existence. Despite the intensified propaganda and the support of the bourgeois newspapers, from *De Telegraaf* to *De Groene Amsterdammer*, the "De Brug" group could not mislead the Communist voters and win even one seat out of 150. This was evidence of the unprecedented staunchness and political consciousness of our sympathizers." The revisionists appeared in their true colors and failed to pass themselves off as a "Communist group."

Immediately after the election, in an interview with the anti-communist journal *Vrij Nederland*, Wagenaar hastened to slander the Soviet Union. The Brandsen revisionist group put out in May one issue of a trade union journal which smeared the World Federation of Trade Unions and the Soviet Union. The revisionists alleged that they wished to establish a "socialist party" based, of course, on "Marxist-Leninist principles," as has been done by renegades in the past.

Thus the revisionists expose themselves more and more. They undoubtedly are drawing nearer to bankruptcy. The celebration of the 40th anniversary of the Communist Party revealed that the trust of the working-class in the Party is unshakable.

It must be remembered that the Communist Party suffered during the elections. Many people did not understand that the revisionists acted as lackeys of reaction and, being confused, did not vote for the Communists. That is why the number of their seats in Parliament has been reduced from seven to three.

After the elections the Right-wing parties, supported by the Liberals, formed a new government and proclaimed its anti-popular

program. De Quay, representative of the circles close to the Philips monopoly, was appointed Prime Minister; S. van den Berg, vice-president of the Unilever board, became Defense Minister; and Beerman, chairman of the organization of the Rotterdam port magnates — Minister of Justice.

The attack on democratic rights is bound to extend. The new government, as it has already stated, will demand powers to send troops to New Guinea without any hindrance or restrictions. Clearly, this can eventually lead to another war with Indonesia. Moreover, the government is planning to introduce compulsory military service in the semi-military organization—"Defense of the Population"—which by its propaganda and "maneuvers" is aimed at whipping up war hysteria among the population; it is also planning to equip the army with atomic weapons and place it under U.S. control. A law is being drafted to "regulate" the right to strike. It should be said that in the post-war years the trade unions whose members went on strike were more than once punished by the courts and the workers forced to return to work.

It becomes clear to many that these attacks are directed not so much against the Communists and not only against the workers. The measures planned as well as recent developments indicate an all-round offensive against democracy. The Communist Party stresses, therefore, that all the democratic forces must immediately unite to repulse the onslaught on democracy and to protect the rights of the people. A resolute struggle in defense of democracy is a guarantee of success in the fight for peace and better living conditions.

In our country there is a basis for such a democratic front: about two million, mostly in the large cities, recently voted against the Right-wingers, and the Communist Party has proved its strength and preserved its influence among large sections of the working people despite the massive attacks, both from within and without. The attempts by fascist elements in 1956 and by revisionists this year and in 1958 to bring to a head their subversive activities against the Party and its newspaper *De Waarheid* were repulsed by the membership and the class-conscious workers in general.

Now, when the reactionaries are launching an open attack, people of different walks of life are beginning to look upon the Communist Party as a powerful ally in the fight for freedom and the rights of the people.

A split has taken place in the Social Democratic Party, and a new anti-militarist "Pacifist Socialist Party" has been formed. Priority is given in its program to the defense of democratic rights. This party has two deputies in Parliament.

More Socialists and trade unionists are coming out for unity of action with the Communists. The trade unions have for a long time resisted the attempts to establish an overt reactionary regime. Owing to the persistent work of the Communists there has developed a new trend in the Socialist Party and the trade unions whose representatives are coming to the conclusion that the enemy is on their right. This trend seeks to destroy the most harmful forms of anti-communism in this party and in the trade unions.

There are several trade union centers in this country. It is obvious that only a united trade union movement can bring about a powerful democratic force capable of defending the interests of the working class and repulsing any attacks of the Right-wingers on democracy.

But the forces of democracy are not confined to the working class. Progressive tendencies have, for a long time, been growing among the intellectuals, particularly the scientists. They found expression a year ago in a letter to the government from prominent

scientists who resolutely denounced atomic weapons and the anti-democratic methods adopted by the Dutch authorities.

The farmers and the middle sections increasingly resist the attempts to turn them, with the help of various corporative bodies, into a docile instrument of big capital. During the last elections they dealt a blow at a neo-fascist organization which sought to obtain their votes.

The democratic forces are big enough. Now, in order to undertake a joint offensive it is important to help that section of the working people, who still retain petty-bourgeois illusions, to overcome their passivity, vacillation and fear of the Communists. The Communist Party is now much better prepared than before to fulfil this major task—to unite all forces for a democratic counter-offensive. The Party defeated the revisionist trend which endeavored to disarm it and to undermine its principles by subversive activities.

The Party is now able to broaden its ties with the masses, to strengthen these ties and to overcome revisionism and sectarianism. In these conditions it works successfully to increase its representation in parliament and to extend the democratic rights of the people.

Science in Socialist Construction

Henryk Jablonski

SINCE 1944 and 1945 when the foundations of People's Poland were being laid, the Party and the Government and indeed the whole people have shown great concern for the development of science and higher education. The political vanguard of the working class well understood that socialism could not be attained without the assistance of scientists, without the restoration of the ruined laboratories, without the participation of the old intellectuals and the creation of a worker and peasant intelligentsia.

This was not an easy task, and time was needed for its realization. Under the Nazi occupation wide-scale training was out of the question: not only higher educational establishments but also secondary schools had been closed and young people studied only in a few illegal organizations. Besides that, as a result of the inhuman, predatory policy of

the Nazis, Polish science sustained heavy losses. For example, Warsaw University lost 162 scientists, Cracow University—109, and so on. The bulk of the laboratories, libraries and archives were either destroyed or looted. And even before the war the state of Polish science was far from satisfactory.

The people's government was confronted with the urgent task of healing the wounds inflicted by the war and, in a brief space of time, multiplying the number of higher educational colleges and scientific institutions. Despite the great difficulties Poland had to overcome in the first postwar years, this task was speedily accomplished. At present the number of higher educational establishments (particularly technical and specialized), research institutes, and also the number of scientific workers, teachers and students many times exceeds the prewar level. Polish science,

which under bourgeois rule was in a state of neglect, has now become a big factor in developing society along socialist lines.

This could not have been achieved without substantially changing the organization of scientific work, the understanding of the social role played by science, and scientific methodology. The changes in the scientific life of our country did not proceed smoothly. One of the difficulties, perhaps the most serious, was the small number of Marxist scientists, who could not develop under the fascist regime of prewar Poland. The people's government in its efforts to develop science faced the need to implement a resolute and at the same time cautious, attentive policy which would make it possible to recruit for socialism the best cadres from among the university teachers and instructors and simultaneously encourage the rapid growth of new cadres.

The First Congress of Polish Scientists in 1951 was a milestone in this respect. It made a thorough analysis of the situation in the particular spheres of knowledge, of the methods applied and the results achieved, and set forth the tasks and ways for their implementation. Today, on looking back, we realize that though we held erroneous views and made over-simplifications, the analysis made of all the key questions at that time was correct. The congress passed a resolution on the setting up of a Polish Academy of Sciences as the leading scientific body of the country.

As a result of changes in science an invaluable contribution has been made to the development of research and the education of the younger generation of the Polish builders of socialism. Our scientists took an active part in the carrying out of the state economic plans. Though serious mistakes have been committed in carrying through the tremendous task of reorganizing science, this fact provides no ground whatever for questioning the correctness of the Party policy in the field of science, nor for belittling the important achievements in developing scientific institutions and planned expansion of research work. It is not surprising therefore that *the ideas of socialist construction are having an ever greater impact on the overwhelming majority of the Polish scientists.*

Thanks to the political line adopted by the Eighth plenary meeting of the Party Central Committee in October 1956, many shortcomings which previously restricted scientific activities have been overcome. Scientists have

undertaken more serious tasks, and scientific institutions began to take a more active part in the economic and cultural life of the country. Unfortunately, these positive changes were accompanied by some negative phenomena. Revisionist views emerged and gained ground in some spheres of social science. There were even attempts to deny the value of Marxist methodology and to attribute to it elements of bourgeois ideology. This in turn has given rise to and fostered dogmatic and sectarian tendencies among some comrades.

Against the background of big achievements gained by the exact sciences, biology and the technological sciences, the difficulties experienced by the social sciences caused anxiety. The special role of the latter sciences, due to their direct ties with ideology and politics and consequently with the struggle for socialism in our country, compels us to follow their development closely. The important ideological and educational role played by philosophy, economics, law, history, and pedagogy, particularly in the education of the younger, inexperienced generation, is beyond all doubt. Therefore, while appreciating the importance of a more lively exchange of opinion in these spheres and the greater determination in selecting new topics for research, our Party at the same time strives to link these sciences more closely with the theory of class struggle.

There are a number of reasons that explain the difficulties in the development of the social sciences in Poland. The most important of these was the underestimation of their role in the struggle for remolding social consciousness and, arising out of this, a long period of complacency and contentment with the results achieved, although these were often superficial and unsubstantiated. In order to understand how it happened it is sufficient to recall briefly our weaknesses on the ideological front, which we had underestimated. After the war the ground was ill-prepared for Marxism in our social sciences. Before the war and immediately after it these sciences were characterized by the dominance of reactionary ideology, poor understanding of the significance of methodology, conservatism in selecting subjects and failure to arrive at deepgoing generalizations. Against the background of the general crisis in bourgeois sociology, political economy and history, the struggle to switch the social sciences onto Marxist lines proceeded in Poland under extremely difficult conditions. What we needed was a Marxist analysis of the preceding

stage in the development of these sciences and a fundamental re-examination of their methodology. We should bear in mind that in the prewar period Polish scholars were, to a considerable extent, isolated from Soviet science. In such circumstances we could not be content with the limited successes scored in the first years of people's rule and with the fact that tendencies hostile to socialism had not been overcome completely. This was fraught with the danger of a half-and-half policy and of many mistakes the effects of which we are still experiencing.

Marxist ideas, which became widespread at the time of acute class struggle, gave rise to lively discussion, although their impact was superficial and they were often imposed by administrative measures. The vulgarization of Marxism, which caused no little harm, was only gradually replaced by serious scientific work. This was a too-slow process, and the number of Marxists did not grow rapidly. Many of our scholars adopted Marxism only in words, without really changing their methodological views and without any reassessment of their scientific experience. The methods of Marxist research were often clumsily and incompetently handled by those scholars who, although sympathizing with the working class and full of good intentions, and possessing solid professional knowledge, had only a smattering of dialectical materialism and Marxist theory in general.

These circumstances made it easier for the enemies of Marxism to attack our positions when the situation made it possible for them to come into the open. Their attacks, which started in 1955, were not confined to criticism of the real shortcomings in scientific activities, but were more or less openly aimed at eliminating Marxism. Attempts to portray Marxism as an outmoded and compromised theory were repeated more and more frequently. Some sections of our scholars endeavored to rehabilitate bourgeois science. Many of the foreign and Polish works of the prewar period dealing with narrow and partial problems were reprinted without the necessary critical reassessment from the Marxist standpoint. The Marxist theory and method were ignored; modern bourgeois science was extolled, while scientific achievements in the USSR were frowned upon.

Polish Marxists were ill-prepared to meet this reactionary onslaught. Some scholars even abandoned the Marxist standpoint they held before. All this had an impact on young scholars who had not been tested in a poli-

tical struggle. The policy proclaimed by the Eighth plenary meeting of the Party Central Committee convinced many of our scientists that the socialist path was correct. And once the advocates of allegedly "free science" revealed themselves in their true colors the majority of the scientists began recovering their sight. But the damage inflicted could not be automatically undone. The preparation of an effective Marxist counter-attack needed time, clarification of the mistakes made, and the formulation of new tasks.

Even now we cannot be satisfied with the situation in the social sciences, particularly in philosophy; but in the past two years the range of research has been extended, including those spheres which had previously been neglected. The materials, documents and original research accumulated in many fields of knowledge allow us to pass over to generalizations and, consequently, to the resumption of a fruitful exchange of opinion on methodological questions. The desire of scientists to speed up their work on the history of Poland is particularly important in connection with the forthcoming celebration of the thousandth anniversary of the Polish state. Despite all the weaknesses of our historical science we can point to a number of partial and sometimes rather important achievements, enabling our Marxist scholars to develop, with increasing success, the ideological offensive under the leadership of the Party. Among these indisputable achievements we can include the extension of research into the history of the class struggle and the role of the masses in social development, into the productive forces and production relations, into the political and juridical superstructure and the various trends in the field of culture. All these problems were neglected in the prewar period. Good progress has been made in the work of generalizing the history of Poland, preparing a many-volume history of Silesia and the coastal regions, and also the history of the Polish state and law.

Thanks to collective efforts a number of bibliographical works and historical atlases have been prepared, and many original documents as well as an encyclopedia of historical sciences have been published. It should be noted that many researchers who in the past, contrary to their inclinations and background, worked in socio-economic history, have returned to political history. The stepping up of the study of the Second World War has helped to overcome, in part, the stagnation in the field of contemporary history. More attention is being given to the

study of the history of the Polish working-class movement, particularly in the Institute of Party History.

Archaeology is flourishing. Extensive excavations have provided valuable material for the study of the history of ancient Poland and the emergence of the Polish state. The excavations undertaken by our Mediterranean archaeologists in the Crimea and Egypt brought them world-wide recognition. Research into philology and linguistics is being conducted on a much wider scale. Recent years have seen stimulated activity on the part of our psychologists and pedagogues. An Institute of Pedagogy has been set up under the auspices of Warsaw University; the educational section of the Polish Academy of Sciences is studying the system of public education in connection with the school reform.

Last year work started, under the supervision of President of the Academy of Sciences Kotarbinski, on the study of the main problems of labor organization, which are particularly important for our national economy. More attention is being given to the political economy of socialism and the economy of People's Poland. Lately our philosophers have been doing considerably more work on the philosophical aspects of the natural sciences. In the sphere of law mention should be made of the codification of the criminal and civil law. Positive changes can be observed in the other social sciences, too. These achievements, however, are as yet of a partial character and cannot satisfy us; we realize that there are many gaps to be filled before the social sciences can be developed. But there can be no doubt that both the general political situation and the changes in scientific life are on the whole having a positive effect on the development of the social sciences.

Of particular significance for the future is the fact that *the Party now pays close attention to higher educational establishments. The Party has pointed out that lectures for the students on philosophy, sociology and political economy must be based on Marxism.* Of no less importance is the solicitude of the Party for the training of specialists in the social sciences. The Party policy in science and culture as laid down clearly and definitely by the Third Party Congress enables us to take another step in placing the social sciences on a solid Marxist footing. These directives proceed from the results achieved through a stubborn struggle that started long before the Congress.

While mobilizing its members for a sustained battle against revisionism and sectarian tendencies in politics, our Party could not remain indifferent to the shortcomings on so important a sector as science. The result of persistent explanatory work, and the enlistment of scientists for the solution of questions of national importance, has been that the overwhelming majority of scientists have realized that *the Party, while encouraging scientific discussion, will not allow the huge sums and the possibilities placed at their disposal by the people's state to be used to undermine the general political line of the Party and harm socialist construction. This stand by the Party was supported by the majority of our scientists.*

The nationwide discussion of the theses for the Third Party Congress adopted by the Central Committee has marked a new stage in the advance of Polish science. Scientists regard these theses as a starting point from which to specify the immediate plans of research to be conducted in the institutes of the Academy of Sciences, the faculties of universities, technical colleges and industrial research institutes. Scientists are aware that planning in science, despite the mistakes made in the past, is a key question. Modern science achieves outstanding results, provided urgent questions are decided in a collective way, by representatives of all related branches of science, and with the concentration of forces on problems which at a given moment are most essential and decisive for the national economy and all branches of knowledge. It was precisely for this reason that such keen interest was shown in the course of the pre-Congress discussion of planning in research work and its link with the specific tasks of socialist construction. And that was why during this discussion many interesting suggestions were made to implement the cardinal principles which underlie the further development of Polish science.

The Third Party Congress clearly demonstrated that with the advance of socialist construction the role of science in the economic and cultural development increases constantly and that ever greater demands are being made upon it. Science was an important feature in the report of Wladyslaw Gomułka and in the Congress resolutions. Of the 87 delegates who spoke at the Congress, eight devoted their speeches almost entirely to scientific problems, higher education and Party work among scientists and students. The Congress confirmed that notable progress

had been made in all branches of science, and that our scientists actively participated in the solution of the major tasks confronting the nation. The importance of this progress is even greater by virtue of the fact that the tasks the Party sets for 1959-65 signify a transition to a new, decisive stage in our socialist construction. Bearing in mind our conditions, it must be understood that these are very difficult tasks and require that all our potentialities should be brought into operation, and even more so because higher output must be achieved primarily by higher labor productivity.

The Party policy envisages, on the one hand, the utilization and reconstruction of the old equipment, and, on the other, the replacement of traditional methods with new methods, and the development of new branches of technology. Proceeding from this we must perfect our system of public education, improve the research work in the higher educational establishments, the institutes of the Academy of Sciences, and rebuild the system of laboratories, designing and projecting bureaus.

By the time of the Third Congress the Academy of Sciences had elaborated the details of the plans for economic development. Scientists have completed 350 projects which will be introduced into production in the next few years. These include specifications for two new electronic computers and some other electronic installations, some dozen studies of the Electronics Laboratory and the Physics Institute on the use of transistors, on chemical technology (for instance, the methods of obtaining some valuable products from coal-tar), papers on applied mechanics, the theory of elasticity and thermo-elasticity, the theory of designing, acoustics and ultra-sound, metallurgy, and so on. Thanks to the assistance of the Soviet Union we have built a base for research into nuclear physics. In the near future we expect great advances in this sphere.

Important results have been obtained in the study of orogenesis (mountain-formation), the exploitation of coal seams, safety and hygiene in mining, etc. Good progress has been made also in complex research of the Upper-Silesian industrial region, the water and power supplies, the distribution of productive forces, and protection of natural resources. The above examples testify to the closer link between theory and practice, and to the maturity of our scientific institutions. This permits us to set new tasks and draw up perspectives for the development of

science. While concentrating on theoretical research, and paying daily attention to mathematics, physics and biology, we shall exert still greater efforts in the sphere of practical research which directly serves our socialist construction.

The Presidium of our Academy has recently decided to draw up a 15-year plan for the development of science and a 5-year plan for scientific research. Work on these plans has already begun. They provide, in particular, for the setting up of a technical base for a number of new branches (e.g., radio-chemistry and radio-biology), and discovering new fields in physics and other technical sciences. They also provide for the development of nuclear technology, jet propulsion, automation, and the technology of new materials.

During the next few years we must do our utmost to raise the social sciences to a higher plane. Despite some achievements, these are still lagging behind the other sciences. The posing of these questions at the Congress will undoubtedly result in stepping up the work of Marxist scholars. We are beginning to understand clearly that the tasks which confront us will not be fulfilled without the improvement of Party work among scientists. *We are well aware that the scientific forces can be enlisted for socialism not through unprincipled compromise, but through posing questions in a clear and principled way, through frank and direct discussion reinforced by the contribution of the Party members.* Only then will the non-Party scientists rally around us, and together we shall be able, resolutely and finally, to drive out from scientific life the forces hostile to socialism.

If we examine the state of Polish science we shall see clearly that the conditions for its development are favorable. I mean not only the general political situation in the country, although this is the basis, but also the actual situation in science. We must and can reorganize all branches of science. The Polish scientists did not come to the Third Party Congress empty-handed. Representatives of the technical, exact and biological sciences showed how heartily they endorse the magnificent plan of socialist construction, and how deeply they are convinced of the correctness of the Party political line. That is why the Polish scientists will warmly respond to the call of Gomulka who pinpointed the technical sciences in his report: "It is imperative that all men of science should adopt the same positions in order to accelerate socialist construction for the good of the

nation and for the good of science to which they have dedicated their labors. The sooner

this is done, the better for science, and the better for the country."

Revisionism on Proletarian Dictatorship and Transition to Socialism

D. Chesnokov

(Apropos of an article by I. Kosanovič)

ONE of the main controversial issues between Marxism and revisionism is that of the socialist state. It is one of the fundamental problems of Marxist theory and socialist practice. Naturally, therefore, all who cherish the cause of communism will fight any attacks on this Marxist concept. So any articles which propound "new" theories distorting Marxist-Leninist teaching and contain "refurbished" attacks on the socialist state are bound to attract attention.

An article of this kind, "Proletarian Dictatorship, its Essence and Forms," by I. Kosanovič, appeared in the Yugoslav paper *Narodna Armija* of the 14th and 20th of March, 1959. In analyzing it we shall ignore the direct attacks on the socialist countries and the accusations of "tendencies towards bureaucratic statism and deformations of socialist economy," of "bureaucratic and pragmatic revision of Marxism and its theory of proletarian dictatorship," etc. There is nothing new in these accusations which have been current ever since the emergence of Trotskyism. Nowadays they can deceive none but those who wish to be deceived. We shall confine our attention to the author's excursions into theory.

Can There Be a "Non-State" Dictatorship of the Proletariat?

Marxism-Leninism regards the dictatorship of the proletariat and the state as concepts of one and the same order. Proletarian dictatorship is bound to be organized as a socialist state. However, it is a fact that the concept of proletarian dictatorship is broader than that of the state, for the system of proletarian dictatorship embraces both state and non-state organizations. (The latter include political parties, trade unions, youth, women's and

other organizations as well as voluntary brigades for maintaining public order, courts of honor and the workers' militia.)

Such an approach to the question of proletarian dictatorship is not to the liking of I. Kosanovič. In his article he condemns it as a "Stalinist," "bureaucratic and pragmatic revision of the Marxist theory of proletarian dictatorship." He writes: "The state does not comprise the essence of proletarian dictatorship but is just one of the forms of its expression, a form which under certain conditions may acquire decisive importance." Thus, according to Kosanovič, the state is only one of the forms of expression of proletarian dictatorship. But what does this proposition mean? Apparently it means that there can be other, "non-state" forms of proletarian dictatorship. Such is the logic of the author's reasoning, such are the conclusions which inevitably derive from his statements.

In the same article he goes on to say: "The extent to which a certain class exercises its dictatorship with the help of the state and the extent to which it exercises it without the state — with the help of various forms of its public activity — serve to gauge its true strength, its obsolescence or immaturity." It follows that a certain class exercises its dictatorship through the state for a period of time and for another period — without the state.

Kosanovič cannot quite bring himself to say outright that it is possible to do without the socialist state altogether. He even recognizes the fact that, as a form of proletarian dictatorship, the state might be necessary in the early phases of the revolution. A strong state, says the program of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, is necessary until the power of the working class has been con-

solidated; but as soon as this power has grown strong the state will slowly begin to wither away.

The question arises: what happens to the dictatorship of the proletariat? Obviously it remains and in the later stages of socialist construction is exercised without the help of the state.

Let us analyze this "discovery."

The period of transition is a period of struggle between newly-born but not yet consolidated socialism and defeated but not yet abolished capitalism. The main issue of the transitional period is: "who beats whom?" In order to win the struggle the working class should create favorable conditions for the development and victory of the socialist elements and for the gradual ousting and liquidation of capitalist elements. It is impossible to decide these issues without *crushing the resistance* of the exploiters (suppressing counter-revolutionary conspiracies and rebellions, economic sabotage, violation of law established by the working class, etc.), without the use of force which is necessitated by the attacks of the exploiters. Hence, the victorious proletariat cannot dispense with the organs of compulsion such as the army, courts of law, public prosecution, police and state security bodies — components of the state machine. Experience has indeed corroborated this Marxist-Leninist thesis. It is no secret that the experience of Yugoslavia, which retains all the components of the state apparatus, is no exception in this respect.

Restriction and elimination of capitalist elements are inconceivable without a definite system of economic and financial measures which the working class is in a position to enforce only as an organized state force (state credits for socialist enterprises on easy terms, a taxation policy which curtails the incomes of the capitalists, price policy, etc.).

Nor can we overlook the need for the working class to defend the gains of the revolution from the attacks of the foreign imperialist bourgeoisie which makes every effort to help the overthrown native bourgeoisie restore its rule. Aggression cannot be repulsed without an army and security bodies, without a strong socialist state. The victorious working class can wage its class struggle against the bourgeoisie and exercise its dictatorship over the exploiters only through the state. As long as there is a bourgeois class in the country and a bourgeoisie abroad and as long as the capitalist states threaten socialist society, there will be a class struggle, and therefore the working class and the

working people cannot dispense with their state. Only anarchists and outright opportunists can approach this question in any other way.

The resistance of the bourgeoisie is suppressed by the organs of the proletarian state and also by the action of the entire organized proletariat united in mass organizations and working in close co-operation with the organs of the state. This profoundly expresses the democracy of the socialist state which is not only dictatorial in a new way (against the bourgeoisie) but is also democratic in a new way (for the working people).

Let us approach proletarian dictatorship from the main angle. *The dictatorship of the proletariat*, as was invariably pointed out by Lenin, and as is evident from the practical experience of the socialist countries, is *not just violence and is not primarily violence*. (It is known that force is used by the proletariat in reply to violence on the part of the bourgeoisie.) Proletarian dictatorship is a specific form of class alliance of workers and peasants directed against the bourgeoisie and aimed at creating a new society, an alliance in which the leading role belongs to the working class. That is the fundamental definition of proletarian dictatorship. "The supreme principle of the dictatorship," wrote Lenin, "is the maintenance of the alliance of the proletariat with the peasantry so that it can retain the leading role and state power."*

Can the working class enlist the services of the peasants for socialist construction, can it exercise its leadership of the peasants and re-educate them without a state of its own? In answering this question one must bear in mind that, although both the workers and peasants are working people, they still are not identical classes in the economic, political, social and spiritual aspects.**

In exercising its dictatorship the working class cannot and must not use compulsion on the peasants whose basic interests coincide with its own. For proletarian dictatorship to be firmly established, the proletariat has to organize co-operation with the peasantry. To do so it must separate the petty-bourgeois sections from the exploiters and prevent their possible vacillations to the side of the bourgeoisie. The working class enlists the peasantry to take part in the new revolutionary government which embodies the alliance of the workers and peasants. In this way the

*V. I. Lenin, *Speech on the Tactics of the Russian Communist Party at the Third Congress of the Communist International*, July 5, 1921.

**Cf. V. I. Lenin, *On the Deception of the People with Freedom and Equality Slogans*.

peasantry is united with the working class in a single state organization to defend the interests of all the working people against the exploiters.

The dictatorship of the working class is a political concept. But this does not mean that as such the dictatorship and therefore the socialist state does not play an immense economic role. When it becomes the ruling class, the proletariat nationalizes all the basic means of production which used to belong to the bourgeoisie; it concentrates them in its own hands, that is, in the hands of the state. Only by so doing can it undermine the economic power of the bourgeoisie and create a new type of relations — socialist relations.

Why is it that the means of production are concentrated in the hands of the working class, represented by the state, and not in the hands of plants and factories, mines, etc.? In the first place, because large-scale socialist production must be planned and run on a nationwide scale; and this function is performed by the proletariat organized in the state. Secondly, the working class can exercise its leadership of the peasantry only when it acts as a single organized force represented by the state both economically and politically. It is only in this way that the working class can create an incentive for the peasantry to develop socialist industry, control the spontaneity of the market by introducing the principle of planning in the distribution of goods and in production, create a material and financial basis for agricultural co-operation and ensure the consolidation of socialist relations. In short, the dictatorship of the proletariat is in a position to fulfil its economic role only because it is represented by the working class organized in the state.

Thus the aim of the proletarian dictatorship is not to suppress the peasantry but to co-operate with it, to enlist all the peasants — who enjoy equal rights with the workers — in the management of the country both through the central and local organs of state and through the entire system of public organizations which unite the peasants. In this respect the state of proletarian dictatorship is dictatorial in a new way (all working people rallied round the proletariat to suppress the exploiters) and also democratic in a new way (not only for the workers but also for the peasants, intellectuals, etc., in a word, for all working people). Proletarian dictatorship is definitely a higher type of democracy, a type of state whose chief aim is not compulsion and administrative methods but organization of the people and the enlistment of

all working people without exception in the construction of a new society.

State and Democracy

Opportunists of all hues, including the contemporary ones, following in the footsteps of bourgeois ideologists, counterpose democracy to dictatorship and even democracy to the state. This is a particularly subtle and therefore very dangerous thesis. Even the opportunists of the past did not dare to declare bourgeois democracy (that is, the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie) "non-state" in character. They confined themselves to denying the democratic character of the socialist state. Latter-day revisionists agree with the opportunists of the past and go even further. Their argument that the state is the opposite of democracy and democracy the opposite of the dictatorship of the proletariat, is intended to vilify the socialist states. At the same time, while they swear by Lenin, they keep silent about his direct statements on this question. Therefore it is our duty to refer to the classics of Marxism-Leninism.

It was Lenin himself who in his well-known book *The State and Revolution* said: "Democracy is also a state . . . democracy will also disappear when the state disappears."* In the same work Lenin emphasized that "the abolition of the state means also the abolition of democracy; that the withering away of the state means the withering away of democracy."** These tenets of Lenin expose the pseudo-Marxist character of the revisionist assertions to the effect that the state allegedly withers away, while the dictatorship of the working class remains, that state and democracy are concepts of a different order. The propositions of Marx and Engels on the relationship between the state and proletarian dictatorship are also well known. The passage in the *Communist Manifesto* on transforming the proletariat into the ruling class and on winning democracy was the first scientific formulation of the concept of working-class dictatorship. The *Manifesto* runs: "The proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralize all instruments of production in the hands of the state, i.e., of the proletariat organized as the ruling class."***

Hence, first, the proletariat organized as the ruling class is the state. Marx and Engels did not consider the organization of the proletariat as the ruling class apart from the state.

*V. I. Lenin, *The State and Revolution*, p. 30.

**V. I. Lenin, *The State and Revolution*, p. 131.

***Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Selected Works*, 1958, p. 53.

Second, they regarded the concentration of the means of production in the hands of the socialist state as an essential condition for establishing proletarian dictatorship and achieving full victory for the working class over the bourgeoisie.

It is necessary to emphasize that Marx, Engels and Lenin regarded proletarian dictatorship and the state as concepts of one and the same order (and this is also true of the capitalist state and bourgeois dictatorship). These tenets of the classics of Marxism-Leninism are corroborated by the experience of social development.

There can be no "non-state" democracy. Democracy is a form of political organization of society under which classes exist or remnants of class distinctions remain, under which the legal norms regulate through compulsion the relationships between people, under which there are organs of power safeguarding these norms, under which the principle of subordination of the minority to the majority (for socialism only) remains in force, etc. In a word, this form of political organization is the state.

The revisionists are unable to cite a single example of any "non-state" organization of modern society — whether capitalist or socialist. The fundamental difference consists in the fact that under capitalism *bourgeois* democracy is usually the political shell of society and in the transition period to socialism and under socialism it is *socialist* democracy.

Proletarian dictatorship, the socialist state and socialist democracy express one and the same essence: the rule of the proletariat and its guiding role in society. The political forms of the dictatorship of the working class are Soviet power in the Soviet Union, and the people's democratic power in the European and Asian People's Democracies. It is a matter of knowledge that Engels admitted the possibility of exercising proletarian dictatorship, of a socialist state, in the form of a parliamentary republic. Revolutionary changes may give rise to new political forms of the socialist state.

The revisionists make confused assertions to the effect that in the early stages of the transition period it would be possible to use mainly state methods of administration and, at a later stage, when the victory of the working class in the revolution has been consolidated, there would be no need for the state organization of the working class. (In his article Kosanovič refers to the state as "the initial form of struggle for socialism.")

We are not inclined to deal with the allegation that with the consolidation of the victory of the working class in the revolution the state organization is no longer necessary. As to the formulation "that at the early stages . . . it would be possible to use mainly state methods of administration," it is appropriate to note that it ignores entirely the fact that proletarian dictatorship from its inception is a higher type of democracy; it cannot be exercised "mainly by state methods of administration" without the use of political rights by all workers and all working people, without their participation in consolidating their power and in socialist construction both through state and non-state organizations. It is sufficient to recall the example of the Great October Socialist Revolution: in the first months of Soviet rule the organs of compulsion needed by the Soviet state had not been fully established owing to lack of time. The victorious people and its organs of power had no courts of law, no public prosecutors, no state security bodies, and no army. These were being created in the course of the war that had been started by the white-guards and the interventionists. Prior to their establishment (in 1918) and after their establishment, the chief source of strength and prestige of the state were the masses themselves united both in state and non-state organizations. Without such mass organizations as the trade unions, the Soviets, etc., the newly-born socialist state would have been unable to defeat the white-guards and the interventionists in the Civil War and to launch peaceful socialist construction. The levers connecting the Party with the people, which comprised the system of proletarian dictatorship, were in existence from the first days of Soviet rule and without them the Soviet state would not have lasted a month.

In the view of the Yugoslav "theoreticians" any state is a composite body of paid workers of the state apparatus, a bureaucratic administrative apparatus consisting of civil servants, standing in opposition to the people. Such a concept is applicable, though with certain reservations, to the bourgeois state apparatus. An exploiters' state is in fact an administrative apparatus formed of regular civil servants alienated from the people and hostile to them, who are well paid at the expense of the people and faithful to the bourgeoisie.

The socialist state is different. *It is a state of workers and peasants and by no means a closed apparatus of paid workers but a political organization of society drawing all work-*

ing people into the administration of the country. Let us take the Soviet Union as an example.

The Soviets are the political form of proletarian dictatorship in the USSR. On the eve of the socialist revolution, when replying to the opportunists who alleged that the working class had no apparatus capable of governing society, Lenin said that the Soviets were such an apparatus because they were an all-embracing and genuinely democratic organization of the people. It is precisely this apparatus that expressed the essence of proletarian dictatorship and evolved into the state apparatus (as a result of the victory of the socialist revolution in Russia). With the victory of the revolution a definite kind of paid administrative apparatus was developed in the Soviets. But it was always a part of the Soviet state apparatus. It is not a section or a sub-section; its composition is constantly changed. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union has always worked to simplify and cut down the managerial part of the state apparatus, to step up the work of all the deputies of the Soviets from bottom to top and to enlist all the workers, peasants and intellectuals of our socialist society in the state administration. That is why Lenin always spoke of Soviet democracy as the fundamental essence of the socialist state.

One of the main principles of the socialist state is the involvement of the people in the administration of the country. The experience of socialist countries — whether it is the discussion of improvements in a city or national economic plans, whether it is the direct participation of the elected representatives of the working people in the people's courts or in the management of enterprises through permanently functioning production conferences — testifies to the conscious and active participation of the people in managing the state. The socialist state, as Lenin pointed out, is strong because of the consciousness of the people. Herein primarily lies the strength of the Soviet socialist state and here is the source of its further consolidation.

Kosanović claims that the Yugoslavs arrived at the conclusion that it was necessary to democratize the administration as far back as 1950. If that is so it can only be said that it was rather late. It is essential to work for the simplification of the state apparatus and the widest possible enlistment of the people in the management of the country from the first days of the revolution.

The question of the methods and ways of involving the people in the administration of

the country is solved in accordance with the conditions of each country. In China this question is solved differently from Czechoslovakia and in Albania by other means as compared with Poland, etc. Naturally, therefore, the question of the forms of workers' participation in the management of enterprises (production conferences, etc.) causes no differences among the Communist Parties.

Marxism maintains that the socialist state — no matter what changes its functions may undergo — is needed by the proletariat during the entire transitional period and during the phase of socialism; it will wither away completely only with the attainment of the higher phase of communism.

These Leninist theses were further developed in the decisions of the XXIst Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union which emphasized that the socialist state as a democratic organization will play an important role in the building up of the higher phase of communism. The building up of communism in the USSR will confront us, in the near future, with the question of the gradual evolution of the state administration into the self-governing bodies of communist society. It follows from Khrushchov's report to the Congress as well as from the Congress decisions that socialist democracy in the USSR develops in the following way:

- 1) through the enhancement of the role of the Soviets as the all-encompassing organizations of society enlisting all working people in the administration of the country;

- 2) through the extension of the rights of the Union and Autonomous Republics as well as of the local organs of power, with the consistent observance of democratic centralism in the state apparatus;

- 3) through the further strengthening of the role of all mass organizations — trade union, co-operative, scientific, youth, sports, art — in the life of society and through the increasing activity of the members of these organizations;

- 4) through the transfer of certain functions of the state to mass public organizations and the creation of conditions for the gradual evolution of the state administration into the self-governing bodies of communist society;

- 5) through the further improvement, curtailment and simplification of the paid apparatus;

- 6) through the further growth of the role of the CPSU as the leading and guiding force of society.

The state will completely wither away provided that the productive forces reach a point

where they will ensure an abundance of all social wealth, the merging of the two forms of socialist ownership into a single form of national ownership, the abolition of the existing essential distinctions between the workers and peasants and between mental and physical labor, etc. It is only on such a basis—the emergence of communist society—that the state will wither away completely, giving way to the self-government of communist society.

The Transitional Period as Interpreted by the Revisionists

Kosanović deals at length with the transitional period. He boasts that only the Yugoslav League of Communists is working on the theoretical problems of this period; he accuses the Communists of the other countries of "pragmatism," of unwillingness to investigate the laws governing the transitional period.

What have Kosanović and other Yugoslav theoreticians contributed to the elucidation of this question? If one summarizes their statements, they boil down to the assertion that the transitional period is generally the modern period of development encompassing all the countries of the world; that both the socialist countries and the other countries, where the bourgeoisie maintains its rule but where co-operative organizations, state capitalism and bourgeois democracy exist, have entered the transitional period. According to them such countries as the Soviet Union and, as well, the United States, Denmark, and Belgium, have all entered the transitional period.

It would appear that the difference lies only in the strength of the socialist elements and in the degree of their development in one country or another. This view was expressed by Edvard Kardelj at a recent press conference in Oslo, when he replied to a question on the differences between a socialist and a capitalist country. According to the Norwegian paper *Arbeiderbladet* of June 3, 1959, he said that "this was a theoretical and not a practical question," that "a socialist country had capitalist elements and vice versa." From this standpoint the Yugoslav leaders apparently regard the Marxist thesis on the existence of two systems today (they talk of two blocs) as sectarian; they speak of a *unified and general stream of socialism* in various forms which operates with different force in all countries and claim that the socialist world is a movement for socialism in all the countries. In this way they suppress the *fundamental* difference between those countries

which have carried through a revolution and have entered the transitional period to socialism and the countries which have not yet carried through the socialist revolution.

To show how confused some of the Yugoslav leaders are on the question of the transitional period we quote a statement of Blaskevic, a Central Committee member of the Yugoslav League of Communists, at the fourth congress of the Communists of Croatia: "The transitional period of the withering away of the state is a continuous process which is executed by the active working masses, through which the internal forces of society establishing a new social mechanism are released, a process *which started even before the victory of the revolution* (my italics—D. Ch.), which cannot be postponed, 'introduced,' etc., without causing harm to it and retarding it, a process which (and that is even worse—D. Ch.) cannot be considered untimely and hence dangerous to the final victory of the revolution." It has always been generally recognized by Marxists that the victory of the socialist revolution means the establishment of proletarian dictatorship—a socialist state. But according to Blaskevic the withering away of the state starts before the victory of the revolution. Thus, something starts to wither away before it appears. Try to understand that if it is humanly possible! Indeed, the thicker the forest the more wood.

It appears to us that in the statements quoted above the Yugoslav theorists are *confusing the transitional character of the present world-wide epoch of historical development with the transitional period from capitalism to socialism*. Let us go a little deeper into this question. Can we speak of the transitional character of our epoch as a whole, having in mind the whole world? Yes, we can, if we take as the starting point the world-wide presentation of the question, the interaction of the world forces of socialism and capitalism and the competition between the two systems. This is dealt with quite clearly in the Moscow Declaration of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the Socialist Countries: "The principal content of our epoch is the transition from capitalism to socialism initiated by the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia." Only in this sense can we speak of the transitional character of the epoch opened by the October Revolution.

Does the transitional character of the present epoch mean that all the countries have entered the transitional period from capitalism to communism? Certainly not. The transitional character of the epoch consists in

the fact that there are socialist forces and countries as well as capitalist forces and countries. The essence is not affected by the fact that in some of the socialist countries there are elements who yearn for the restoration of capitalism, or by the fact that in all the capitalist countries there are powerful forces fighting for peace and socialism. Obviously capitalist elements in certain socialist countries do not make those countries capitalist, nor do the forces fighting for socialism within the capitalist countries make those countries socialist until they have emerged victorious and established proletarian dictatorship. This, of course, does not alter the fact that the progressive forces of the capitalist countries fighting for socialism work for the same cause as the socialist countries because they have common interests in the struggle for peace and socialism. That is why the views on international events and the criticism of imperialist policies expressed by the ruling Communist and Workers' parties of the socialist countries coincide with those of the Communist and Workers' parties of the capitalist countries fighting for the emancipation of their peoples from capitalism. Moreover, when it is a matter of such fundamental issues of international policy as the terminating of the cold war, cessation of nuclear weapons tests, non-interference in the home affairs of other countries and disarmament, the views of the Communist parties in most cases coincide with those of the progressives of all countries; this is so because the Communist appreciation of the situation and the policy of the Communists express the interests of the people of all countries.

It is this truth that the capitalists fear; that is why they accuse the Communists of anti-patriotism. The revisionist allegations to the effect that the socialist camp seeks to impose its standpoint and interests on the communist movements of other countries add grist to the mill of such slanderers. The truth is that the supporters of socialism in the capitalist countries are fighting imperialism in the interests of *their own peoples*, and not to please other states. Is there anything bad in the fact that peace, progress and socialism are as dear to the champions of socialism in the capitalist countries as they are to the working people of the socialist countries and in the fact that they see their hopes for the future in socialism?

Thus the transitional character of our epoch testifies to the fact that the struggle of socialism against capitalism has become the main feature of the epoch and that competi-

tion between the socialist and capitalist countries will decide the issue. But the transitional nature of the epoch does not at all prove that all the countries have entered the transitional period.

This confused interpretation of the transitional period by the revisionists is not limited to their inclusion in it of the pre-revolutionary period, thereby belittling the significance of the socialist revolution and replacing revolutionary Marxism by vulgar evolutionism. Sometimes in the transitional period they also include socialism — the lower phase of communism. Thus A. Dragicevic, in an article published in the Yugoslav journal *Nasa stvarnost* of May 1957, tried to prove that socialism was not the first, lower phase of communism but a "transitional period from one great social epoch to another . . . from the epoch of class society ('civilization') to the epoch of classless society." The Marxist-Leninist division of communist society into two phases — the lower (socialism) and the higher (communism) — he calls "the Stalinist revision of Marxism."

In the numerous articles of the half-baked critics of Marxism who lay claim to new "discoveries" in theory, there is no clear-cut distinction between the period of transition from capitalism to communism or between the lower phase of communist society and its higher phase. These distinctions are usually blurred by abstract reasoning about *the transitional period in general*. They forget or do not care to remember that *the question of the dictatorship of the working class and the socialist state cannot be understood if it is divorced from the stages of struggle for the final victory of communism, which were clearly established by Marx and Lenin and have been confirmed by historical experience*.

Let us recall the well-known Marxist formulations on this question. Marx in his *Critique of the Gotha Program* speaks of the period of the revolutionary transformation of capitalist society into communist society. This period is transitional because it contains elements of capitalism and communism. It is a revolutionary period because emerging communism is struggling against the remnants of capitalism with the aim of completely eliminating them.

In his work *The State and Revolution* Lenin analyzes the transitional period, socialism and communism as different phases of social development. In his draft notes to that work, Lenin wrote: "Thus: I — 'long-time birth pangs,' II — 'first phase of communist

society," III — "higher phase of communist society."*

It follows from the characterizations of the transitional period given by Marx and Lenin that the transitional period starts with the victory of the socialist revolution and the conquest of power by the proletariat and is completed by the abolition of capitalist elements and the building of socialist society — the first phase of communism.

The reasoning of the revisionists on "the transitional period in general," in which they include the period preceding the socialist revolution, on the one hand, and the socialist phase, on the other — is nothing but the *blurring of the fundamental differences between the various stages of social development*. This reasoning is completely disproved by facts. The experience of the socialist coun-

tries which are now in transition from capitalism to socialism is evidence of a completely new social organization following the socialist revolution.

How can a Marxist fail to see the *qualitative* difference between the transitional period from capitalism to socialism and the socialist phase of communism? The differences in all spheres of social life—economics, politics and ideology—are so essential and obvious that only a deliberately blind man can fail to see them.

Acquaintance with the "discoveries" of the Yugoslav theoreticians in the question of proletarian dictatorship and transition to socialism leads one to the inevitable conclusion that they contribute nothing to the development of Marxism-Leninism; on the contrary, they are directed against its essence and are completely refuted by revolutionary experience.

*Lenin Miscellany, Book 14, p. 271.

The Ideology of a Military Dictatorship

Andre Stil

IN TWO decades of uninterrupted wars the armies of the French imperialists have suffered severe defeats: especially bitter were the experiences of 1940 and of Indo-China and Algeria.

It is precisely this situation (and taking into account the existence of a strong Communist Party and the determined popular opposition to colonial wars and aggression) that explains the appearance of various theories—theories which, it should be said, have little claim to originality. They have their peculiarities, however, though they may be closely interwoven with ideas imported from overseas, ideas providing a common basis for the doctrines evolved by theorists of the NATO headquarters in Europe.

These theories show that the bourgeoisie is no longer capable of elaborating a *scientific* concept of modern warfare. This incapacity had already been revealed in the defeat of the Hitler forces: the "Blitzkrieg" theory — the latest development in bourgeois military art — proved to be an utter failure. However, the faith in America's atomic monopoly and superiority has revived the "Blitzkrieg" doc-

trine in another version — "push-button warfare." But these illusions were dispelled when it became obvious that "push-button warfare would not solve all the problems." This was disclosed in a rather pessimistic article printed in the *Revue Militaire Générale* (February, 1958), which discussed the Soviet intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM).

The splendid achievements of the Soviet Union in the military sphere, as well as in all other fields, have forced the French military periodicals in the past three years to engage in the "agonizing" re-appraisal of military theories. . . .

The Basic Requirement Is Missing

That is why the French bourgeois military writers are forced to seek for a scientific doctrine in those places where it actually exists and where its effectiveness has been proved to them beyond doubt. The truths that were learned in the POW camps in Vietnam and the theses of Mao Tse-tung have shattered the outdated reactionary principles of the French bourgeois military theories. The selected writings of Mao Tse-tung are first in the list of

the "basic works" recommended for reserve officers now undergoing a refresher course at the Saint-Maxient Military School.

But how can Marxist principles be made to serve reactionary policies pursued in the name of fear and hatred of other peoples? The method of emasculating the essence of these ideas, of recording and classifying the forms a just war may assume and trying to turn these forms into a means for achieving victory in an unjust war is nothing but a ridiculous, absurd utopia. Nevertheless, this is now one of the chief pursuits of such periodicals as the *Revue de Défense Nationale*, *Revue Militaire Générale* and *Revue Militaire d'Information*, which do not indulge in flippancy.

The strength of a people's army waging a just war is derived from the fact that this war is the continuation "by other means" of a sound policy conforming to the interests of the people. The people recognize and uphold this policy. Under such conditions the rear (if it exists), the whole population (if the liberation war is waged over the entire territory of the country), renders full support to the army. The enemy's rear, on the contrary, is unstable and is constantly threatened. In addition, the just cause wins the support of the peoples, especially when it is a question of colonial wars. Faith in the justness of their cause evokes among the soldiers — loyal sons of the people — a lofty sense of duty, high morale, fighting spirit, discipline and heroism. It is precisely the fight for the just cause that molds captains of a new type and soldiers who know no fear. The justness of the cause wins for a Communist Party prestige and influence among the fighters in military or civilian garb.

It is futile to dream of such victories while pursuing a policy of oppression and extermination of peoples. Friedrich II used to say that if his soldiers knew what they were fighting for it wouldn't be possible to win a single war. However, this question is persistently avoided by the proponents of the new military theories. Though they might consider it "necessary to win the people over to their side,"* to enumerate the forms of "guerilla warfare,"** or to express their "views on the importance of the moral factor in the future conflict"***—they invariably think that they can bypass the question: *In the name of what policy and by means of what policy?*

What are their views based on in the final analysis?

*Colonel Rocolle—"Constantly Operating Factors in Wars of Subversion", *Revue de Défense Nationale*, February 1958.

**Colonel Nemo, *Revue Militaire Générale*, January 1957.

***General Lorillot, *Revue Militaire Générale*, July, 1957.

Permanent Warfare

These considerations are above all based on the perspective of an aggressive and, if possible, an atomic war against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. Although the illusions referred to have been dispelled, the military writers are studying with cold-blooded ruthlessness the conditions for employing atomic and hydrogen bombs. They would not scruple to destroy at one stroke tens of millions of people inhabiting, for instance, large areas of Europe. The Soviet Union is publicly proclaimed as the enemy. In a broader sense the enemy is "communist ideology." Any opposition to the privileges and plans of the imperialists — wherever it may occur and irrespective of its form or true aim — is described as an act inspired and upheld by the Soviet Union for selfish purposes. In his *Le Malaise de l'armée*,* Jean Planchet writes: "General Cailles, Inspector-General of the Armed Forces in North Africa, has a map of the world, on which he had a big black spearhead drawn from the very depths of Red Asia with its point aimed at Maghreb. This is his idea of a perfect analysis of the situation in Algeria."

These opinions show how dangerous, particularly from the point of view of international relations, is the latest idea of French military theoreticians as expressed in words by Major Hogard: "From now on war is permanent. . . . The state of peace no longer exists."** This idea is all the more dangerous because such authors, in drawing "lessons" from the wars in Indo-China and Algeria, try to prove the need for organizing subversive activity in the socialist countries — "in the enemy rear," — "on the lines of Viet-Minh activities in Indo-China."*** The experience of Hungary reveals that such ideas do not remain only on paper. . . .

Methods of Warfare

It is clear, bearing in mind the war in Algeria, that the "theoretical effort" of the French military "experts" is concentrated on colonial warfare. It is in the colonies that the "morale" of the army needs boosting. Words on "winning the support of the people" and on "psychological influence" are meant to make up for the reality manifested in tortures, mass slaughters and bombing of the civilian population. In order to get a correct understanding of de Gaulle's policy in

*Sickness of the Army.

***Revue de Défense Nationale*, January 1957.

****Revue Militaire Générale*, July 1958.

Algeria, one should learn to see in this outspoken literature the *true aims* pursued by the "new" methods which are decked out with talk about "fraternity," "moral greatness," etc. . . .

General Chassin was an ardent supporter of de Gaulle and the Algerian rebels during the coup in May last year. His contribution, "On the Strategic Aspects of the War in Indo-China," published in *Revue de Défense Nationale* (December 1954) is a document worthy of study as an exposition of — there is no other way to express it — *the ideology of a war criminal*. The main point of the article is that since the population is not on our side we must replace the psychological factor which is lacking by a means that would secure victory by purely technical methods. What does this mean? Since the atomic bomb is out of the question (because such a step would naturally lead to an international conflict), "a new form of economic warfare" should be devised. In this particular case "it has nothing to do with the old-fashioned blockade — a formidable weapon if used against the Western powers, but hardly effective against the underdeveloped agrarian countries where little is required to satisfy the needs of a population living off what it produces. The blockade, moreover, takes effect slowly, while the object is to achieve quick results. The modern concept of economic warfare could be based on destroying the means of livelihood of the entire area occupied by the insurrectionists and creating a no-man's land. As a result, the rebels would be completely encircled and cut off from the countries capable of assisting them by sending them arms and food. The destruction of the rice crops in the so-called "communized" areas of southern Vietnam was but a small-scale experiment of this kind. But this could be carried out by special aircraft scattering plant-destroying substances (not to speak of atomic bombs which some people favor; such a bomb exploded at a 30-mile altitude would destroy crops within a radius of several hundred miles)." In proposing to destroy also "the dams, dykes and livestock," Chassin adds: "There are other methods, of course. It is up to the Western scientists to tell us about them. . . ."

This gives an insight into the talk about the so-called "modern" methods, the practical outcome of which was the bombardment of the defenseless villagers of Sakiet Sidi Youssef in February 1958.

Evolution from Laws of War to War Against Laws

It was clear even before the May 1958 coup that all talk about "psychological warfare" was directly connected with the internal policy.

Taking the classical Clausewitz formula—war is the continuation of policy by other means—the French military writers elaborated it. They are implying that "policy is war." From this standpoint one of the aforementioned articles defines guerilla warfare: "Guerilla warfare is a form of home policy of a country experiencing a grave crisis."*

"Internal" war is given more and more space in military literature. In stating that the time has passed "when wars were national affairs," Major Hogard wrote in 1957: "War is raging not only in Algeria, but throughout the French Union and even in the mother country."

What is really new in these writings? It is certainly not the discovery of how important the psychological factors are in war, for the question of "morale" has long been one of deep concern to the bourgeois military theoreticians, though it should be pointed out that when this question was studied neither the socio-economic, political and ideological factors nor the morale of a belligerent state were taken into account. The obvious fact that nowadays it is becoming increasingly difficult to maintain the morale of the troops by compulsory means, is not new either. What is really new is the fact that the formulas of "psychological warfare," "permanent warfare," etc., are befogging all existing conceptions and are being used to justify *the use of military methods in politics* as well as in other spheres of public life.

For instance, Major Hoyard demands that "revolution be dealt with before the war assumes violent forms." As if a war can assume non-violent forms! . . . What are they? According to the author they are propaganda, setting up of mass organizations, strikes, demonstrations, etc. . . .

It is obvious from numerous works of this kind that what is contemplated is not only the "destruction" of the Communist Party but an attack spearheaded against the trade unions, government employees, journalists, teachers and politicians who, though not Communist, are insufficiently active in supporting the policy of the government.

According to these writers thought is an act of war. "Ideology," they write, "has be-

*Colonel Nemo.

come a strategic factor.”* The weekly *l'Express* showed what effect this “schooling” had on a paratrooper: “To him ‘deputy,’ ‘journalist,’ ‘intellectual,’ ‘Communist,’ ‘fellah’ and ‘Viet’ are words with one and the same meaning, causing equal physical aversion.” In short, *all this is war*.

On this basis the 5th Bureau of the General Staff for “psychological warfare” was organized in autumn 1957. It has already displayed its activity in France, particularly during the campaign for placing de Gaulle in power.

The whole affair is not confined to propaganda alone. More than that, it is maintained that repressive legislation is a military necessity: “Timely adaptation to new forms of warfare through legislation is imperative. . . . It is necessary to start a general moral mobilization which would be based on appropriate legislation adopted in time of peace.”**

In June 1958 the German General Helmuth Staedke suggested that “the government should, through its legal machinery, display solicitude for the maintenance of a healthy morale by removing harmful microbes. Democratic laws should be enjoyed only by those who believe in freedom and are prepared to defend it.”*** One of the ringleaders of the May 13th conspiracy, the notorious Colonel Lacheroy, declared in his book *La Défense Nationale*: **** “One cannot wage revolutionary warfare on the basis of Napoleon’s legal code.”

War Against the Political System

That is not all. A Surface Defense organization was created by decree on September 29, 1950 and later, by a decree of December 27, 1956, an internal Defense System was established. Obviously, these “innovations” are intended as a means of *waging war against the French people*. The strange expression “internal aggression” has become the main theme of writings on this topic. The maneuvers and military exercises conducted by the Internal Defense System (as, for instance, the operation “Aquitania” in South-West France) are characterized by their subject, “Army in a hostile social environment,” as well as by the fact that the strength of the enemy forces was “gauged” by the election returns of the Left-wing parties. In any case it should not be forgotten that since France is a NATO member *foreign* troops, German forces, for instance, may be called upon to

deal with the “internal enemy.” This point is made by R. Thoumin in his contribution to the *Revue Militaire Générale* (incidentally, General Speidel is a member of the Patronage Committee for that journal). Noteworthy is the shamefaced title of the aforementioned article “Internal Defense and *Inter-Allied Relations*.”*

Finally, to keep the people in submission, provision is made for the organization of *special* combat groups, both military and semi-military — to use the term of du Tillet, contributor to *Revue Militaire Générale* — “a sort of home guard to be formed in each village from among the staunchest (?) citizens who would have arms and equipment even in peace time.” For in his view, defense “should be intended to deal with repelling the onslaught of insurrectionists within the country rather than with the invasion of an enemy from without.”** The army of the fascist gangs after the coup of May 13, the threat of civil war to influence the outcome of the referendum of September 28 last year, showed that such ideas are not solely confined to theory but are already being put into practice.

Proceeding from the possibility of war against the people, the military periodicals have been demanding for the last few years the setting up of a dictatorial regime. In January 1957, Major Hogard wrote: “As a direct consequence of this assertion (namely that today military and political activities are closely interwoven) and since a state of peace no longer exists, the government should exercise permanently at least some of the emergency powers which have always been recognized in time of war. Only a strong and firm government enjoying freedom of action will be able to think out and put into force the necessary measures within the next few years throughout the French Union (including the mother country, of course) and abroad.” A month later the *Message des Forces Armées* carried an article signed “Milites,”*** which posed the question in the following manner: “What is the role of the army? The army plays the principal, indeed, the decisive role. The role it has actually played in Algeria, is only a foretaste, a cautious beginning of the task it will be called upon to accomplish with the launching of our revolution. . . . Consequently, the nation must be organized round the central authority with the help of a War Directorate, which would concentrate in its

**Revue de Defense Nationale*, June 1958.

**General Lorillot, *Revue Militaire Generale*, July 1957.

****Revue Militaire Generale*, June 1958.

****National Defence.

**Revue Militaire Generale*, January 1957.

***Ibid.*, February 1957.

***Latin for soldiers.

hands all political, economic and psychological powers essential for conducting the all-round struggle."* In May 1957, *Revue Militaire d'Information* commented on this statement: "It is time for action, that is, for a counter-revolution, or rather, a revolutionary counter-offensive. The object is not to uphold a political system, the weaknesses and contradictions of which may easily be used by the revolution against us, but to create a new system. Hence a military system is a necessary, intermediate step, a necessary phase."

Finally, in June 1958, the German General Helmuth Staedke wrote in the NATO military journal that from now on it would be necessary "to replace the administrative apparatus of the democratic regime by closed organizations, whose work would be co-ordinated by a small group of selected people. We are engaged in a difficult fight and we must realize that the fighters need above all a leader. . . ."** The journal says that the article was written in French. No doubt, if it had been in German, the word "chef" (leader) would have read "fuehrer." At the same time, in June 1958, *Revue de Défense Nationale* carried the following unambiguous statement: "We have no confidence in our institutions. . . ."

Military Theorists in Power

The role played by certain French army officers in the May 13 coup in Algeria and their subsequent promotion and decoration on de Gaulle's orders ascribe new significance to the numerous theories appearing in French military literature in the last few years. *With de Gaulle's advent to power, these theories have won official recognition.*

These ideas are not new to de Gaulle. In his book *Vers l'Armée de métier*,*** he wrote: "The military corps expresses the spirit of society more completely. . . . In the arduous task of rejuvenating France, the new army will be the mainstay and the inspiration, for the sword is the fulcrum of the world. . . ." The view of General Zeller, newly appointed Chief of General Staff, is well known: "... the army's standpoint in respect to the fundamental problems confronting the country is often sounder than that of most politicians. . . ."

The ideas about the army's leading role in the state and its right to intervene in the political administration of the country formed the basis of de Gaulle's first decisions.

Guided by these considerations, de Gaulle signed last January an ordinance on the "re-organization of defense," the object of which was to militarize the entire life of the nation in peace time. Two theses are set forth to "justify" this measure: threat of atomic war and threat of "subversive" war. The ordinance provides, should the need arise, the mobilization of all men from 18 to 60 and even women. They are all liable to "national service." General mobilization may be proclaimed by an ordinary decree of the government declaring "a state of preparedness" (a term used in lieu of "stage of siege"). In such a case the government is granted unlimited powers; the functions of police prefects are delegated to the generals; infringements of law are subject to military tribunals, etc. Thus, an ordinary striker may be tried by a military tribunal. And all this may take place even if there is no war.

The military ideologists maintain that in this way the army "adapts itself" to "modern requirements." According to General Paul Stehlin: "The object would be to have an army based on conscription and reinforced when necessary by mobilization. The army should consist of district groups quartered throughout the country for defense against subversive activity and for support of operations for civil defense."* Actually, the aim is to organize the population for a possible civil war by compulsory enrolment of all French men and women in military formations, by creating punitive detachments (so-called "militia") and by establishing a permanent state of siege in disguise. That is how the above-mentioned thesis that the state of peace no longer exists is implemented in practice.

The greater the difficulties of de Gaulle's ultra-reactionary government the stronger is the clamor of the fascist clique for the suppression of the growing opposition of the people. High-ranking officers contribute to this clamor. At the very moment of the opening of the Geneva Conference General Challe, Commander-in-Chief of the Army in Algeria, said to reserve officers of the 10th Military Region: "This war (in Algeria) is a foretaste of a European conflict. We have learned to build up a solid regional armed force which will be necessary and useful at another time." One may well ask "Where?" What General Challe means is quite clear—the war in Algeria must be extended to the whole of France; worse still, they dream of turning the whole of Europe into a battlefield stretch-

*Message des Forces Armées, February 1957.

**Revue Militaire Generale, June 1958.

***For a Professional Army.

*Revue Militaire Generale, February 1959.

ing from "Brest to the Urals." The government has never denied or disavowed this statement which is an open incitement to war against the Soviet Union.

There is nothing surprising if pronouncements of this kind are compared with the position of the French government at the Geneva Conference — an attitude of unconcealed hostility to any real negotiations, compromise and relaxation of tension. Nor is it surprising if such speeches are read together with the speech made by Premier Debré on June 9. M. Debré subscribed to the ridiculous view that the struggle of the Algerian people is inspired, directed and supplied by "the East." He "exposed" the "collusion" of the Algerian National-Liberation leaders and the Communist parties and hurled at the French Communist Party the foul epithet, "traitors."

Demagogy has enabled the Gaullists to mislead certain sections of the French people. The above-mentioned "theories" and decisions are used to disguise the real face of de Gaulle's regime, which encroaches upon democratic freedoms, brings France new suffering and leads her to war. At the same time one cannot fail to see that such an ideology is in effect a cover-up for deep-rooted confusion among the big bourgeoisie: indeed, they would not have had to look for new means of waging "war against the people" if their policy had received the real and lasting support of the people. All this talk about the need for a "counter-revolutionary war" is, in the final analysis, an indirect recognition of the growing strength of the forces of revolution and democracy which, in the not too distant future, will sweep away all these criminal and futile dreams.

Pages from History

Thirtieth Anniversary of the First Conference of the Communist Parties of Latin America

Paulino Gonzales Alberdi

IN JUNE 1929 representatives of the Communist parties of Latin America assembled in Buenos Aires for the first time to discuss problems of the liberation movement in their countries.* Contacts between the parties had been extended and some experiences exchanged before this meeting took place.

Delegations from the Communist parties or groups of Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Venezuela, Guatemala, Colombia, Cuba, Mexico, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Salvador, Uruguay and Ecuador, and representatives of the Communist International, Young Communist League International and the Communist parties of the USA and France attended.

Police action stopped the Chilean delegation headed by Elias Lafferte, the present Chairman of the Communist Party of Chile,

from crossing the border, while a serious illness, which a few months later ended in his death, prevented José Carlos Mariategui, notable Communist intellectual in Peru, from being present. However, he sent his theses which were read at one of the meetings. Ill-health also prevented Rodolfo Ghioldi, a leading member of the Communist Party of Argentina, from attending. The conference rendered homage to the victims of reaction, among whom were Julio Antonio Mella, leader of the Communist Party of Cuba, and Quadaupe Rodriguez, leader of the Mexican Communist Party.

The following were the main questions discussed:

The international situation of Latin America and the threat of war; anti-imperialist struggle and the tactics of the Communist parties of Latin America; activities of the Anti-Imperialist Leagues; trade unions; the

*As a member of the Argentine delegation the author reported at this meeting on the work of the Anti-Imperialist Leagues.

peasant question; the race problem in Latin America; the Young Communist League movement; work among women; problems of Party building.

The conference made a valuable contribution to the building and development of the Latin American Communist parties. It represented a considerable step forward in coordinating their efforts and clarifying their points of view on problems which called for the application of the general principles of Marxism-Leninism with due regard to the national peculiarities of each country. No class or social section had hitherto succeeded in rallying the spokesmen of the majority of the exploited and oppressed peoples of Latin America with a view to coordinating their struggle against the oppressors, and against the foreign imperialists. This historical mission fell to the lot of the working class and its Communist vanguard.

The conference was called upon to give ideological and organizational help in building the Communist parties so that they could lead the developing anti-imperialist struggle to victory.

The workers and people could not achieve victory under the leadership of the reformist trade unions associated with imperialism through the U.S. Right-wing trade union bosses and the Amsterdam Trade Union International. The people could not do so under the leadership of the corrupt anarchist organizations, nor under the leadership of bourgeois or petty-bourgeois parties, such as the Liberals in Colombia or the Aprists in Peru, who sought to come to terms with imperialism or else placed their hopes not in the people, but in the victory of one imperialist power over another. Nor could the Right-wing Socialist leaders, who denied that imperialist rule in our countries was of a colonial character and advocated a pro-imperialist policy, lead the people to victory. Only the Communist parties could do this successfully. Only they, guided by scientific Marxist-Leninist theory, could carry on the best traditions of their people, and solve the tasks confronting them.

The Great October Socialist Revolution and the international Communist movement had a great ideological and political impact on the working people of Latin America and this was a decisive factor in the founding of the Communist parties. In some countries, Argentina for example, Marxist-Leninist literature such as V. I. Lenin's *The State and Revolution* and *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, was popularized.

At the end of the 1920's the Communists in Latin America were not yet sufficiently experienced. It is true that the Communist parties of Argentina, Uruguay and Brazil had several years of struggle behind them and had accumulated a certain amount of organizational and ideological experience, but their links with the workers in big factories were still very weak. Reaction was delivering hard blows at the Communist parties of Chile, Cuba and Mexico. At the same time, in view of their ideology and organizational structure some of the parties could not, strictly speaking, be termed Communist parties. A number were only groups whose activities were confined to communist propaganda in trade union organizations.

Strategic Tasks

At the conference the Latin American Communists began an exhaustive study of the vital problems affecting their countries. The socio-economic structure of the Latin American countries was analyzed, and the effects of imperialist rule and of the latifundist character of agriculture exposed. In the light of the decisions adopted at the VIth Congress of the Comintern, the conference noted the typical features of the relative stabilization of capitalism and its repercussions in the Latin American countries. Capitalist "rationalization" signified greater exploitation of the working people (for instance, the saltpeter mines in Chile, the meat-packing plants in Argentina and Uruguay). Unemployment grew. The United States introduced import duties which meant that fewer raw materials were purchased from Latin America and export prices fell. The workers and peasants retaliated by strikes and other protest actions which at times took on an insurrectional character. These actions were brutally suppressed.

The Communists discussed the lessons drawn from the strike at the United Fruit Company's banana plantations in Colombia, where hundreds of strikers were killed and the United States threatened armed intervention.

In its analysis of Latin American conditions the conference stressed the fact that during the First World War light industry had developed in most of our countries. This had led to the growth of the working class and increased the role played by the national bourgeoisie. The national and petty bourgeoisie sought to win the leadership of the masses. They pursued a two-fold aim: to gain concessions for themselves from the imperial-

ists and landowners and to prevent the rise of Communist parties, to prevent the proletariat from leading the struggle waged by the masses. With a view to achieving their aims certain petty-bourgeois parties declared themselves adherents of Marxism and friends of the Soviet Union, while at the same time they fought against the Latin American Communists.

Having won a majority vote, the industrial and petty bourgeoisie came to power in a number of countries. But they immediately capitulated to imperialism or else were overthrown by reactionary military coups. Reaction at first applied the methods used by the Italian fascists. In Chile, for example, the dictator Ibanez, by combining repression with demagoguery and insignificant concessions, gained influence in the trade union movement.

Yankee imperialism's offensive against the Latin American economy and the efforts of the British imperialists to maintain their positions found expression in coups d'état, in artificially provoked conflicts and wars between the countries of Latin America. Yankee imperialism used the liberal parties to bring pressure to bear upon conservative governments associated with British imperialism and, by resorting to blackmail, obtained the concessions and government changes it wanted.

The conference demonstrated the worthlessness of the assertions that imperialism in general, and U.S. imperialism in particular, was progressive, and that it developed the economy of backward countries. It called for action against imperialism and pointed out that the revolution in the Latin American countries at that stage would not be a socialist revolution, but an agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution. For the revolution to triumph, the decision stated, a broad national-liberation front under the leadership of the working class and its Communist parties was needed.

Taking its stand on the Leninist thesis of the bourgeois-democratic revolution, the conference opened up broad vistas before the Communist movement in Latin America; in this respect the documents of the Communist International played an important part. It rejected the stand adopted by some of the delegates who opposed the formation of Communist parties—the political parties of the proletariat. These delegates alleged that a party built on a broader socio-political base would be able to parry the blows of reaction. The subsequent experience of such so-called "broad" parties in a number of countries

demonstrated that they only isolated the class-conscious sections of the workers, and assisted the seizure of the leadership of the working-class movement by the reformists.

Action for Peace

The conference drew attention to the need for action against the imperialist war danger. In his report on this question Victorio Codovilla spoke of the tasks that, in the light of the international situation, would confront the Marxist-Leninist parties should their countries be drawn into a war against the Soviet Union, or into a war between the imperialist states.

If the imperialists provoked a war between the Latin American countries, the report stated, the Communist parties should rouse the masses against the governments responsible for the conflict, organize fraternization, linking it up with the tasks of national liberation and the movement for radical social and democratic transformations. It was at this time that the long-drawn-out war between Bolivia and Paraguay broke out: its underlying cause was the struggle between the North American and British oil trusts for the oil deposits in the Chaco region. The capitalist and landlord groups in Brazil and Argentina, with imperialist contacts, played a part in this conflict.

The young Communist groups of Bolivia and Paraguay were severely criticized for having taken an opportunist line on this war. It should be said that these groups later took steps to rectify their mistakes; for instance, the Paraguayan comrades expelled Ibarrola, one of their leaders, for his pro-imperialist policy.

The anti-war activities of the Communist parties mobilized the people and helped to force the imperialists and their satellite governments to end the Chaco war which for them had been highly profitable. Influenced by these activities, well-known workers' leaders from anarchist organizations in Paraguay, Bolivia, Argentina and other countries and some of the leaders of the petty bourgeois anti-imperialist movement joined the Communist parties.

The conference noted that the Communists acted correctly in supporting the armed uprising of the Nicaraguan patriots under the leadership of Sandino against the North American interventionists.

Questions of Tactics and Party Building

Working-class unity and the question of drawing into the anti-imperialist movement

the many allies of the proletariat were discussed in detail.

The conference was in favor of forming a national-liberation front uniting the different classes under working-class and Communist Party leadership. This would guarantee success. The speeches of some comrades showed that they did not fully appreciate the need for allies, but many others criticized the underestimation of the petty and national bourgeois as possible allies of the proletariat. Eventually this question was clarified and it was decided to encourage and extend the anti-imperialist leagues to form a united anti-imperialist front.

On the trade union question the conference proclaimed enthusiastic support for the Congress which had taken place not long before in Montevideo and founded the Confederation of the Working People of Latin America. It summarized the experience of the struggle and stressed the need to organize the working class into trade unions, particularly those workers employed in the big factories and in the basic industries. The conference exposed the disruptive role of the Right-wing leaders of the American Federation of Labor and the Amsterdam Trade Union International in the Latin American working-class movement. The Communists in our countries supported militant working-class unity.

Erroneous views held by some comrades were not sufficiently criticized. They agreed that the attention of the Party should be centered on the big factories, where the proletariat was most exploited, but affirmed at the same time that the "really revolutionary classes were the agricultural laborers and the exploited landless peasants." "The workers in the cities," they declared, "by virtue of their more privileged position and their European orientation, are an easier prey to the influence of petty-bourgeois reformist and pro-government ideology or the pseudo-revolutionary demagoguery of anarchism and anarcho-syndicalism." These assertions ignored the truism that the industrial proletariat is, by its very nature, the most revolutionary class in modern society. True, there were sections of artisans in the towns with a tendency towards anarchism, and privileged categories of workers with reformist sentiments. But the growth of the big factories and the shift of the masses to the Left reduced the strength of these sections. Furthermore, certain delegates wrongly characterized our large cities as "parasitic cities," forgetting that not only the parasitic landlords and big capitalists, merchant-middlemen, big officials,

high-ranking officers and clericals lived there, but also the industrial proletariat, which was not an artificial product but the result of economic evolution.

An analysis was made, during the discussion on the agrarian question, of the various forms of exploitation of the peasants in Latin American countries with their remnants of feudalism (which to a large extent still obtain). The different conditions of the peasants in the various Latin American countries and of the sections of the peasantry in one and the same country were brought out. The conference advanced demands which reflected the aspirations of broad sections of the peasantry. It was proposed to organize joint action by the peasants and agricultural laborers. The experience of the peasant leagues in Mexico and the worker-peasant blocs which functioned in several countries was summarized.

During the discussion on racial discrimination, the conference dealt with the socioeconomic content of the Indian and Negro problems and criticized the theory of the racial inferiority of the Indians and Negroes. Those who, in their defense of the Indians and Negroes, reduced the problem to one of education, were also criticized.

The conference called upon the Communist parties to pay more attention to the women's movement and that of the youth, to their demands, and to help in organizing Communist youth.

Some delegations, who leaned toward spontaneity in the communist movement, asserted that the lack of a traditional background in Latin America ruled out the possibility of organizing the masses, of their being willing to pay regular dues, and so forth. The conference rejected this view and pointed out that it was precisely reliance on spontaneity and disregard of organizational questions which made for defeat. The discussion on Party building noted that democratic centralism and the system of factory branches and branches in residential areas were the main factors in the organizational work of the parties. Most of the Communist parties represented at the conference had not yet formed such branches.

The conference resolutions pointed out the inevitable deterioration in the economic situation in Latin America, a growth of social struggles and of conflicts between the imperialists, of political instability, repression and the threat of war. In this the conference proceeded from the decisions of the VIth Congress of the Communist International.

Some comrades drew the wrong conclusions from this and advocated as the "task of the day" the seizure of power by the working class in alliance with the peasants. These comrades saw no difference between a big strike and the seizure of power. Worship of spontaneity resulted in neglecting the work of organizing and politically educating the masses, in underrating the importance of building strong Communist parties.

Shortly afterward, the most acute economic crisis known to capitalism set in. Carrying out its first five-year plan, the Soviet Union was in the meantime successfully building socialism. During the years of crisis and new revolutionary upsurge, the Communists of Latin America were subjected to persecution and terror. Sectarian and dogmatic tendencies grew under these difficult conditions, particularly with regard to the question of forming political alliances. In overcoming these shortcomings the Latin American Communists were greatly helped by the speeches of G. Dimitrov to the Nazi tribunal, the decisions of the VIIth Congress of the Communist International and the experience of the Popular Front in France and Spain. The experiences of the Chinese liberation movement, although it had many specific features arising out of the national peculiarities of the country, were also helpful to the Latin American Communists. Summarizing the experience of the struggles waged by the masses under working-class leadership for peace, democracy, national independence and higher living standards, the Communist International played a big part in awakening and uniting the Latin American peoples. The Communist parties, heading the struggle of the people, resisted the offensive of reaction.

Today, 30 years after the First Conference of the Communist parties of Latin America, we see clearly what a glorious path our movement has traversed. Social development has given birth to Communist parties in countries where, in the thirties, only small groups of Communists functioned. Courageously and devotedly defending the interests of the masses, upholding independence and peace, and championing the great cause of socialism, these parties are winning the confidence of the workers, peasants and other sections of the people. And they are succeeding because they are guided by Marxist-Leninist principles.

The working class in the Latin American countries is firmly stepping out onto the path charted by the Communist parties. In Argen-

tina, for example, tens of thousands of workers formerly under Peronist influence, have joined the Communist Party. The policy of trade union and working-class unity guarantees the Party the support of the masses. The Chilean working people highly appreciate the efforts of the Communists who have done so much to build a single trade union center.

Through their consistent anti-imperialist struggle and selfless defense of the nations' interests, the Communists have attracted to their parties the most sincere patriots, people from among the nationalist and democratic sections. When Luiz Carlos Prestes and his fellow-fighters from the legendary column joined the party this was an event of great importance. Outstanding intellectuals have also joined our ranks.

Political and organizational levels differ among the Communist parties of Latin America. Nevertheless, as they point out in their documents, their influence on the masses is not yet to be measured by their numerical strength. They all note the backwardness of the work in the countryside and are taking steps to overcome this shortcoming. Our task is clear: we must speed up the growth of the Communist Party.

Latin America is today an arena of struggle against imperialism and the dictators who serve it; the Cuban victory is a graphic expression of this struggle.

The working class and peoples of Latin America have been ruled by many governments in these past few years, yet the exploitation and poverty of the masses is on the increase, inasmuch as the imperialists, particularly those of North America, are making our peoples shoulder the burden of their economic difficulties. It is noteworthy that, whereas at the First Conference of Latin American Communist Parties the delegates spoke of the demonstrations of protest against the visit to Latin America of Hoover, at that time President of the United States, the whole world today knows of the mass protest aroused by the visit of Nixon, Vice-President of the United States. The strike movement has grown, particularly in Argentina, Mexico, Uruguay, Brazil and Chile. In this way the working class is repulsing the imperialist monopolies (mainly North American) which, acting through various channels, particularly through the International Monetary Fund, are endeavoring to lower still further the working people's standard of living. Workers, peasants, students and other sections of the population are advancing eco-

economic and political demands and fighting for independence against their chief enemy — U.S. imperialism.

The workers and other sections are beginning to understand that there is no other way to solve their pressing problems and to safeguard peace and independence than through the broad unity proposed by the Communists; they are beginning to realize that pressing problems can only be solved by way of struggle, and that the guarantee of success lies in strengthening the Commu-

nist parties. But the imperialists, the landlords and big national capitalists understand this too, and resort to all kinds of provocations and anti-communist campaigns.

Neither slander nor provocation nor even the most savage terror were able to stop the growth of the nascent Communist parties of Latin America. And there is still less reason to believe that reaction will accomplish its objects now, when the Communists have matured, and more and more people are coming under their influence.

***In the Communist
and Workers' Parties***

Program for Rallying the Anti-Fascist Forces

ON the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the termination of the civil war in Spain the Central Committee of the Communist Party has published a document giving a comprehensive analysis of the situation in the country under fascist dictatorship and drawing up perspectives for its overthrow and the re-establishment and extension of democracy.

Civil war, savage reprisals, exile of tens of thousands of people, abolition of freedoms, infringement of national independence and sovereignty, ruthless exploitation of the workers and plundering of the other sections of the people in the interests of a handful of oligarchs and corrupted cliques—that is what fascism has brought to Spain.

The experience of the past twenty years confirms the farsightedness of the political forces which headed the popular resistance movement, in particular of the Communist Party. The Republic owed its defeat not so much to the insurgents as to the Italian and German fascist interventionists and the “non-intervention” policy of the Western powers.

The only state which rendered aid to the Spanish Republic was the Soviet Union. It understood that aiding the Republic meant defending world democracy.

The Spanish people were aided by the International Brigades. Formed in Spain, they were an expression of the solidarity of the peoples with Spanish democracy and of the protest against German and Italian intervention and the “non-intervention” policy. Thirty-five thousand volunteers came from 54 countries to fight for the Republic. Five thousand died the death of heroes on the battlefields. Over 300,000 foreign soldiers, including

150,000 Italians, 50,000 Germans and 90,000 Africans comprising the Moroccan units and the mercenaries of the Foreign Legion, fought on Franco's side.

The Communist Party is justly proud that it did not stop fighting for a single moment although it was often forced to fight under adverse conditions; it is justly proud of the fact that it has always promoted national unity and accord among all Spaniards fighting against the reactionary dictatorship. The guerrilla movement which lasted nearly ten years was one of the factors that prevented Spain from being drawn into the last war on the side of the Axis Powers, thereby contributing to the struggle of the working people of the world for democracy.

We were the first, the document reads, to come out against the feeling of revenge, the spirit of revanchism; our aim has been to reconcile all Spaniards who have been divided into two camps by the civil war and later by the aftermath of the Franco victory.

The policy of national reconciliation proclaimed by the Communist Party in June 1956 quickly won over the broad masses and at present most Spaniards consider it to be the most desirable and workable solution to the Spanish problem. This policy reflects the fundamental changes that have taken place in the relationship between the class forces in Spain.

These changes have led to further differentiation among the bourgeoisie and have sharpened the economic and political contradictions between monopoly capital and the rest of the bourgeoisie. The class antagonisms between the working class and the non-monopoly bourgeoisie, between the farm laborers and the rich farmers, of course,

still exist with all the resulting political and social conflicts. However, the community of interests of the people as a whole engendered by the fascist dictatorship of monopoly capital is beginning to prevail and calls for a political compromise in order to struggle against the Franco regime. The wounds inflicted by the civil war are healing and the enmity it caused is gradually being forgotten, while hatred of the fascist dictatorship is becoming the predominant feeling of the whole people. The side on which a man fought during the civil war is no longer so important.

In promoting the policy of national reconciliation the Communist Party has shown the possibility of abolishing the dictatorship by peaceful means. This policy not only reflects the feelings of the whole people, but also proceeds from an objective analysis of the situation.

The main point is that the abolition of the dictatorship has become the concern of such wide social and political sections that, should they come to agreement, unite and organize mass action (for a peaceful path does not exclude struggle and mass action in a variety of forms, including boycotts, strikes and demonstrations), the dictatorship would be unable to offer any serious resistance. At the same time, if the army and the police were invited to take part in the peaceful establishment of a regime based on national reconciliation, they would, in all probability, withdraw their support from Franco as was the case with Primo de Rivera in 1930 and with the monarchy in 1931. This would considerably facilitate a peaceful transition to the new regime.

The document also sums up the results of the national reconciliation policy which has been pursued by the Party for two and a half years.

This period witnessed mass action under the slogan of national reconciliation, which paved the way to the Day of National Reconciliation on May 5, 1958—the first nationwide political action of millions of Spaniards who, in one form or another, expressed their protest against the dictatorship.

The Day of National Reconciliation has shown that although agreement has not yet been reached at top level, there exists an alliance of the working class with the peasants and urban middle sections, which, day by day, is growing stronger, and that thanks to the policy of national reconciliation the working class is marching in the van of all the forces opposing the dictatorship.

The Communist Party has established direct friendly contact with the Socialists, with the National Confederation of Labor, with the Catholics and Liberals. Particularly strong ties have been established with the younger generation of workers and intellectuals.

Joint Socialist-Communist action is one of the major achievements in the fight for the unity of the anti-Franco forces. This action is indicative of the growing struggle within the Socialist Labor Party against the anti-communist policies of its leadership, policies which are still the main barrier to establishing understanding between all the anti-Franco forces.

The Communist Party confirms its readiness to sign an agreement with the opposition parties on a government program for the transition period following the overthrow of the dictatorship. It is prepared to participate in such a government, to observe and respect all the commitments implied in such a program. It would not even insist on participating in a transitional government, provided two conditions are observed: first—if all democratic freedoms are guaranteed and, second—if it becomes an equal member of the alliance of all the opposition forces. The Communist Party would be prepared to conclude a general agreement on fighting the dictatorship through a flexible system of bilateral pacts between the opposition forces on the basis of a minimum program acceptable to all of them. It would be prepared to give temporary support even to a royal governor (regent), provided the people are given the opportunity to choose freely between a republican system and a monarchy. But the Party would never accept the plans of those who want to impose a monarchy upon the people against their will.

Since the basis of any agreement on unity is the acceptance of a minimum program, the Communist Party suggests that it should contain the following points: 1. Organization of the general struggle against the dictatorship prior to its overthrow by peaceful means. 2. Restoration of all democratic freedoms without discrimination. 3. General amnesty for all political prisoners and emigres, cessation of reprisals for participation in the civil war on the part of both sides. 4. Improvement of conditions for the workers, peasants, office employees and the people in general. 5. Election of a constituent assembly with all democratic rights guaranteed, so that the people could freely choose the system they desired.

At present the Communist Party is the best organized and the most influential force in the anti-Franco opposition. Never, the document goes on, have we been persecuted so ruthlessly as now. Never have we been so strong and never have we enjoyed such popular support as today.

The strength of the Communist Party is primarily the result of the experience of the working class and the entire Spanish people. The growing strength of the Party and its mounting prestige are due to its correct political line, its ability to foresee developments, its correct decisions in each

concrete case and its fidelity to Marxism-Leninism. The struggle against revisionism and dogmatism is a vital condition for the success of the Party and the democratic movement of the people as a whole. "We Spanish Communists," the document goes on, "will always defend the purity of Marxism-Leninism and will always take the side of the international communist movement and its leading detachment—the Communist Party of the Soviet Union."

The document unequivocally refutes the propaganda of Franco and his henchmen who question or even deny the national character of the Communist Party. Some fifty-sixty years ago it was the Socialists that were branded "foreign agents" and before that it was the Liberals and now it is the Communists. Certain Social-Democratic leaders and bourgeois oppositionists, jointly with the foreign reactionaries, question the national character of the Communist Party. In reality it is the working class and its Marxist-Leninist Party that champion the national interests and are the initiators of the fight for the restoration of independence and sovereignty. The interests of our working class are primarily national interests, although they are at the same time closely connected with the interests of the workers of all countries. In capitalist countries the future of the working class is closely associated with the growing strength and further advance towards Communism of the socialist countries. Our proletarian internationalism is a guarantee of our genuinely national policy.

The Communist Party is a party of worker-peasant unity which constitutes one of the sources of its strength.

At present, says the document, we have reached the stage when our Party, thanks to previous successes, should radically change its organizational work with a view to creating Communist organizations at enterprises, workers' settlements and residential areas, in the villages, universities, and other educational and cultural establishments as well as in the trade unions, art institutions, professional and commercial organizations. Closer ties with the people are all-important, ties with those classes and sections which suffer from Francoism. The Communist Party should know and express their demands, should spare no effort to merge their actions into a united movement against the dictatorship for the victory of democracy.

Two paths, two possibilities are open to the anti-Franco opposition forces. Provided an agreement is reached between all the opposition groups on decisive peaceful action against the dictatorship on the basis of the minimum program proposed by the Communist Party, the overthrow of the existing regime may not take long. If the unification of the Left and Right anti-Franco forces is

retarded, if certain bourgeois opposition groups maintain a wait-and-see or a semi-passive attitude and the leadership of the Socialist Labor Party refuses to come to agreement with the Communist Party, the dictatorship may retain its power longer. The decisive factor, however, is the militant mass movement, the development of various forms of organization and unity of the masses. In the first case they will develop very rapidly and in the second at a slower rate, but nothing can stop this process. Even in the latter case the masses will continue to swing to the Left and they will find new forms of struggle that will bring about the downfall of the dictatorship. At that stage the influence of the working class and the Communist Party will grow considerably.

The prospects of abolishing the dictatorship require that the Communist Party define its general policy for the period following the establishment of a democratic system.

In international affairs the Communist Party will consistently fight for peace and disarmament, for the peaceful coexistence of states regardless of their political systems, and for the independence and security of Spain. A concrete expression of this general policy would be the proclamation of Spain's neutrality; the re-establishment of relations with all countries; revision of the 1953 treaties with the United States; the strict observance by Spain of treaties guaranteeing the independence and national sovereignty of Morocco and repudiation of the Iberian Pact; friendship and co-operation with the fraternal peoples of Latin America; consistent struggle for disarmament and prohibition of nuclear weapon tests; development of foreign trade without discrimination; acceptance from foreign capital of loans, credits and technical aid with no political or military strings attached; encouragement of private investments which would facilitate the development of national industries and not damage them; resistance to any attempt on the part of international capital to subordinate our country either economically or politically; disaffiliation from such organizations as the Common Market and the Free Exchange Zone.

At home the Communist Party, while consistently defending democracy, favors a democratic republic with a multi-party system and a parliament elected on the basis of universal, direct and equal suffrage, voting by secret ballot, and proportional representation; the reorganization on a democratic basis of the state apparatus, the army and the police; the right of the peoples of Catalonia, Basque and Galicia to self-determination; the separation of the Church from the state but with state subsidies to the Church.

The program proposed by the Communist Party provides for a number of measures designed to

improve the living standards of the workers and the middle sections. It envisages a fundamental agrarian reform, the basic features of which are the expropriation (with compensation) of the big estates belonging to the aristocrat absentee landlords, as well as of the uncultivated, or inadequately cultivated lands. Compensation will be paid in government bonds. The expropriated lands will be handed over to the peasants either free of charge or on a purchase basis to be decided according to circumstances. The Party suggests a fundamental reform of the tax system based on progressive taxation of profits and substantial inheritances.

The program provides for other measures directed against the monopolists depending on the developments in the country and on the correlation of forces. It also envisages measures for developing public education, culture and science.

The Party reaffirms that the task confronting the Spanish people is the liquidation of the Franco dictatorship and the establishment of bourgeois-democratic freedoms. However, it does not conceal its determination to build socialism in the future.

The strengthening and development of democracy will depend on the ability of the working class to unite its own ranks and to rally all the progressive forces, above all the poor and middle peasants, and to become the leading class in society. It also depends on the ability of the working class gradually to create the conditions which would enable the transition from bourgeois democracy to socialist democracy.

The Party proceeds from the assumption that Spanish democracy will develop in a more favorable international situation than at any time in the past. At the same time, Spain is one of the countries which capitalist antagonisms have made ripe for transition to socialism. At present these antagonisms are characterized on the one hand by an underdeveloped industry due to strong feudal survivals and, on the other hand, by a high degree of capitalist concentration and considerable state capitalism. The economic progress of the country is hampered by the semi-feudal class and the monopoly oligarchy which are closely intercon-

nected. This calls for the victory of socialism, the high degree of monopoly concentration of capital having prepared the economic basis for this victory.

Apart from these factors there is one which may acquire decisive significance in the near future. The working class—industrial workers and farm laborers with their families—comprises about half of the population. Together with the various groups of working people living on modest earnings and the poor and middle peasants, it forms a considerable majority. In other words, the forces which under favorable conditions may, by virtue of their social interests, join the forces of socialism, comprise the overwhelming majority. The position of this majority will be strongly influenced, on the one hand, by the long-standing revolutionary traditions of the working class and the working people in general and, on the other, by the example of the Soviet Union and the socialist camp.

This means that conditions may ripen in the future for a peaceful parliamentary revolution, that is, for the winning of political power by the working class, and for the transition from bourgeois to socialist democracy. Socialist democracy in Spain could develop within the framework of a multi-party system representing the various social classes and sections recruited for the construction of socialism. No doubt the Communist Party will win the leading role in this union.

The Communist-led alliance of the workers and the progressive forces will transform the peaceful transition from bourgeois to socialist democracy from a possibility into a reality.

Such is the perspective for which the Communist Party will work. Whether Spain will follow a peaceful parliamentary road depends not only on the Communist Party. It also depends on the maturity and consciousness of other social and political forces, on the forms of the resistance put up by big capital, and on whether it will be possible to avoid foreign imperialist intervention. There is no doubt, the document concludes, that no force or act of violence or treachery on the part of reaction can prevent the coming victory of socialism in Spain.

Some Forms of Mass Work

(*Experiences of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany*)

The Editorial Board of WORLD MARXIST REVIEW has asked our Party journal NEUER WEG (New Path) to describe our forms of mass work. We have much that we can tell our comrades abroad. But it is not easy to comply with the request, since most of the forms are also used by the other parties of the socialist countries. For instance, various forms of exchanging experiences, improving skills and collective discussion of ethics are practised in all these countries by socialist work teams whose slogan is "Work, Study and Live in a Socialist Way." So we shall describe the forms that are either less known (so far as we are aware) or are specific to our national peculiarities and working-class traditions.

To cover as many forms of Party work as possible we decided to write this article in the form of brief notes.

IN our mass work we concentrate on the questions of production, socialist emulation and the drive to carry out the plan. We apply such well-tried means of encouraging emulation as shop and factory *News Flashes*. They are posted up prominently and report on the course of emulation and mutual aid between teams and shops. Very often pledges in writing are included. People responsible for hold-ups in work and bad organization of production are criticized, and they are expected to give an explanation and report on the steps taken to put things right. Their replies are then published. The News Flash does not replace the wall-newspaper, but it has one advantage—a prompt reaction to events. Items can be changed daily and even several times a day.

The *Emulation Bulletin* is usually in the form of a printed leaflet and is a useful supplement to word-of-mouth propaganda. It reports on the state of affairs at the factory and on the progress of emulation. It tells the workers about innovations and other achievements. These bulletins are distributed especially at enterprises where oral propaganda is not always possible as, for example, in coal and potassium mines, on construction sites and in other industries where teams and even individuals work separately.

A *Book of Good Deeds* is an account of the pledges made at factories, in town districts, villages and mass organizations in connection with the slogan "Let Everyone Do a Good Deed in Our Struggle for Socialism." The fulfilment of pledges is also recorded.

Compass, published by the Free German Youth, is a special form of this book. It popularizes the aims to be attained by the organization by 1960.

Amateur theatrical groups play a notable part in social activities and propaganda. They consist

of five to ten people who sing songs, perform sketches and pantomimes and are led by a professional artist. They give performances in factories, streets, squares and other places. The performances which are always topical deal with political and production subjects such as winning in the peaceful competition with capitalism. These groups, which appeared for the first time in the '20s, carry on our fine revolutionary traditions.

We have some effective forms of oral propaganda. First, talks are held on a certain day of the week. They are called "Wednesday talks" or "Monday talks." Events of the week as well as local matters are discussed. They are conducted by a propagandist, and everybody can take part. But gradually a more or less permanent group is formed. Usually six to eight people discuss, while the others listen. But often everybody becomes involved. Talks go better when the group is limited to about 20 people. Such talks are especially popular among intellectuals.

Forums, or Question and Answer meetings, are also popular. Questions may be on any topic—politics, economics, science or art. Replies are given by authorities in the particular field. Some forums are devoted to special subjects, for instance, the Soviet draft peace treaty with Germany, or how would a demilitarized West Berlin strengthen peace. Talks often last for many hours; sometimes replies are given to 40 or 50 questions. Forums are especially successful when they are arranged separately for different sections of the population—workers, students, etc.

Fireside talks, held more or less regularly, deal with political and local affairs and also with such topics as care for children whose parents are working, assistance to large families, expectant

mothers and women who are ill. Relations between people and socialist ethics are also discussed.

Sunday morning performances are arranged on the initiative of district or factory Party committees and other Party bodies. People enjoy these shows which usually begin with a short report followed by recitations and skits on political topics and often a film at the end.

* * *

New social relationships engender new customs. There are public holidays with a new social content, and some of the old holidays take on a new meaning. Party organizations make good use of new developments in their educational work.

Local holidays to mark significant dates in the history of a town or district have become customary. For example, Corn Day is celebrated in the Neubrandenburg area. For a long time corn was grown in only a few areas of the Republic. A humorous remark by N. S. Khrushchov, during his tour of the Republic, that corn is sausage on a stalk has become popular among the peasants. Corn now has enthusiastic advocates, and a new holiday celebrates the sowing of this crop. A Metalworkers' Day has been initiated in Stalinstadt, a new iron and steel town, and is celebrated on the anniversary of the day on which the plant, built with Soviet aid, produced its first steel. New content has been imparted to the harvest holidays. Formerly, a good harvest was attributed to divine intervention. Today on harvest holidays co-operators sum up the results of collective work and demonstrate their achievements.

The people celebrate the holidays by achieving better results. New parks are laid and sports grounds built.

The exploiting classes used the traditional holidays for nationalist and militarist aims. But now these holidays acquire a new, socialist content. This can be seen from the way the outdoor fêtes proceed and from the decoration of houses and streets.

Much attention is given to the popularization of the revolutionary traditions of the German working-class movement. A mass meeting is held annually on March 21 in Lein where Ernst Thaelmann addressed a big demonstration in 1927. Special badges are made to mark the day. Significant dates of this kind are celebrated in many places.

The Party organizations of Berlin, Leipzig, Gotha and other towns make wide use of *local museums* of the history of the working-class movement, which were opened after the liberation of Germany. Party veterans have contributed documents, photographs and other relics. Museums collect reminiscences of workers about Lenin, August Bebel,

Karl Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg, Clara Zetkin, Ernst Thaelmann and others. Party organizations invite veterans of the working-class movement to tell young people their reminiscences and share their revolutionary experiences. They organize excursions to such places as Buchenwald and Potsdam and others where memorable revolutionary events took place. Party committees set up groups to study the history of the working-class movement and publish pamphlets illustrated with photographs of revolutionary events in this or that town or district. In particular, many pamphlets were published for the 40th anniversary of the November Revolution in Germany.

Attention is paid to *memorial plaques*. One such plaque stands at the place where "the little trumpeter from Halle," who has become a symbol of German revolutionary traditions, was shot by the reactionaries. Many streets have been named after heroes of the revolutionary battles of 1918-23 and of the anti-fascist struggles between 1933 and 1945. A plaque bears the name of the hero and describes how he fought and died.

Exhibitions are widely used for educational purposes. For example, documents from factory archives showing the methods of exploitation, the role of the monopolies in fostering militarism, and the struggle of the workers were exhibited at some of the factories which formerly belonged to the I. G. Farbenindustrie.

Also customary are exhibitions of factory products, usually of consumer goods. Visitors are invited to make critical comments and proposals on the range of goods. Such exhibitions are in the nature of reports to the people of the work of the factories. They also demonstrate the successes achieved in socialist construction in the Republic.

We must also say something about the *youth initiation ceremony*. It started many years ago in the families of workers who wanted to mark the coming to adolescence of their children. It is now a public ceremony preceded by preparations which go on for about a year. During this period young people attend special meetings, take part in excursions and other cultural entertainments.

The ceremony itself is impressive and is held in a gaily-decorated hall. The young people taking part are greeted by prominent public figures and presented with a gift of books. They then take an oath of loyalty to the people and the state, and pledge themselves to fight for peace and friendship among nations. The ceremony includes music and theatrical performances. The number of people taking part, irrespective of their ideology and creed, is increasing year by year.

The reactionary elements in various religious groups bitterly attack this ceremony, opposing to

it the ritual of confirmation. Some clergymen even threaten young people and their parents who agree to attend the ceremony and even both ceremonies. But religious freedom is now guaranteed by the Constitution. The youth initiation ceremony is something new in our socialist life, just as are new wedding and other ceremonies.

Forms of mass work are not invented; they emerge in the course of socialist construction. These forms are used by the Party in solving the tasks confronting the country. Our Party organizations are making every effort to avoid stereotyped methods, and to improve their work among the masses.
Neuer Weg Editorial Board

Political Education Is Not Only a Personal Affair

(Correspondence)

DEAR Comrades,

Recently I exchanged opinions with some of my friends in the Latin American countries. I remembered the arguments I had had with comrades in my own country and decided to drop you a line.

In my view the opinion is widely held that individual study means unplanned work without any check-up, is the concern of the Communist himself and depends entirely upon his own efforts. A friend of mine once said: "Study is a personal affair. The Party can't ensure the education of everybody. This means that a member must study on his own, as much as he can."

This, it seems to me, means that Party education is obviously underestimated, and a purely practical and irresponsible attitude is taken to it. It often happens that comrades, who have been in the Party for five or ten years, have never opened a serious book because they have so many commitments. Nobody cares whether they study, nobody helps them.

At a time when the Latin American parties are growing rapidly and the ideological struggle is becoming more acute, isn't such an attitude dangerous? I have in mind not only rank-and-file members. The same attitude is also widespread among leading Party members.

I think that your journal should publish an article on the political education of Communists. Maybe comrades from Italy or other countries could share their experiences and tell us how matters stand in their parties.

Far more books and journals now appear in Latin America than was the case three years ago. But there is a danger that this valuable Marxist literature, published at the cost of heavy sacrifice, will remain on the shelves and will be of no use. Some comrades think that education is something we can't afford, that it has no bearing on practical work. But when we speak of individual study and classes, we mean an education, closely linked with Party life, providing the theoretical knowledge necessary for everyday work.

Peru

G. Castaneda LEAL

The Editorial Board forwarded this letter to the Italian comrades.

Their reply follows:

DEAR Comrade,

We know these difficulties well. They are to some extent inevitable, particularly in countries where the habit of reading, the need for it, are not very well developed and the general cultural level of some Communists is rather low, while the daily needs of practical work are so great that there is often no time to read and study theory.

The consequences are serious. They adversely affect practical work, for the sake of which Party education is often neglected.

The Party policy will always be accepted glibly if comrades do not understand the theory which guides it. During discussions some of our comrades too readily say: "Yes, we agree;" but when the

time comes to carry out the agreed decisions, the gap between their acceptance of the Party policy and their ability to put it into operation becomes apparent. Long ago this was described as opportunism in practice.

Experience has taught us that we must constantly combat any underestimation of Party education "for the sake of practical work;" we must do this persistently, using convincing arguments. Everybody must understand that education is also Party work, an everyday part of the activities of every member.

Party education begins with reading a newspaper. I think that you also know comrades who do not read the Party press regularly, and at times

do not read it at all. I recall how once, when I had just begun to work in the Party, one of the Party leaders asked me:

"Have you read what *Unita* reports today?"

"Frankly speaking, I haven't . . ."

"Well, don't you know that a revolution has broken out?"

Of course, there was no revolution. It was that comrade's humorous way of telling me that a Party functionary must start his day by learning what is going on in the world, and the line the Party sets out in its newspapers.

Our comrades often complain — this was more often the case in the past — that they are not given instructions or directives. But clear directives can be found every day in the Party press. That is why the first thing on which branch secretaries insist in the education of Party members is that they should read the Party newspapers. For this reason our Party attaches special importance to the distribution of *Unita* and other Communist publications. To develop the habit of reading newspapers, some branches in Southern Italy call insufficiently-educated members together once a week, read the most important articles to them and then exchange opinions. Other Party branches arrange discussions of newspaper articles. All this increases interest in the paper.

Reading a newspaper is the first necessary stage before starting on journals and serious books. Reading books is always difficult at first. It is impossible to encourage individual study and the habit of reading books if Party organizations do not arrange lectures and classes which assist further individual study.

Of course, the type of class depends much on the situation. What is good for one Party is not always good for another. Our experience teaches that the type of class must depend on the composition of the student body and local conditions. We are convinced that schools and classes must be of short duration; they must concentrate on current problems so that education is closely linked with Party policy. It is important that the classes explain, from the standpoint of theory, the problems facing the Party. If the study of theory is not linked with the struggle to implement the Party's political line and does not help towards a better understanding of its ideological roots, it becomes academic and tends to stifle rather than stimulate interest.

Our National Party Schools, one in Rome and the other in Bologna, are also attended by leading cadres from the provinces and districts. Curricula are so arranged that theory is closely linked with current problems. The same principles guide us in arranging classes and lectures for members in

the Party branches. Our Party puts out various "Short Courses" on topical political questions. They are circulated in tens of thousands. The Party organizations have all the necessary literature for their members.

During the broad peace campaign the Party organized short-term seminars on the problems of peace and war, such as the threat of war emanating from imperialism, the peace policy of the socialist camp, the possibility of averting war and the role of the people in this. In addition to lectures, the students discussed booklets published for these seminars. They also received a minimum list of books which they were expected to read. In particular, it was recommended that they study some chapters from Lenin's *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*. The "Short Course" devoted to the VIIIth Party Congress featured the background and current problems of the fight for socialism in Italy.

Other examples can be given showing how studies are conducted. For example, Communists working among peasants attended seminars on the worker-peasant alliance, the agrarian question, the structure of Italian agriculture and an agrarian reform. The list of recommended books included some of Lenin's works. (Our Party has published Lenin's selected works on the agrarian and peasant questions.) The students from factory trade union branches studied economics; they read a few chapters from *Capital*. Seminars were also arranged on the women's movement and the history of the class struggle in Italy.

We see to it that in addition to reading current Party publications these students also study Marxist-Leninist works. Consulting theoretical works for practical needs — such is the method used in all Party schools and classes.

Schools and classes cannot provide an all-round education. The school teaches Party cadres how they should study. To read a book does not only mean to understand it which, of course, is very important. It is even more important that a book should help Party members to understand the conditions in which they work, analyze various specific aspects of these conditions, and formulate slogans for propaganda and action. It is this that determines the success of Party education.

To be able to analyze the situation we must have a thorough knowledge of social life, know how to talk to people and establish contact with them, make good use of statistics and, on this basis, formulate a political line. But to do this we must know how to read books; and here individual reading plays a major role. Marxist-Leninist works give us a method, show us how to analyze experience and draw correct conclusions.

And it is essential that a Party leader be able to tell members which books to read.

If a beginner is advised to read a theoretical work, not directly connected with the job he does, he may lose all interest in reading. But when comrades working among the peasants were recommended to study some of Lenin's works on the agrarian question, many of them began to read systematically.

Experience teaches us that the key to the success of Party education, including individual study, lies in our ability to link education and work for the carrying out of Party policy. Party education is not something we can afford only when we have nothing else to do. Party education, it must be repeated, is Party work. Our more experienced comrades say: better fewer but better, do not try to do everything at once, but rather choose the main link. Guide your work, don't let it guide you. To succeed in what is most important, you must think, discuss and study. And if you do this well (not empirically), you will be able to inspire

others and they will help you. Then you will not complain of the lack of time for reading.

Individual study should be encouraged and guided. For this purpose we publish book reviews and recommend literature. But appropriate organizational work is also required. We have organized, in particular, consultation centers which are also a form of check-up.

Individual study is not counterposed to classes or schools. All of them are linked. From time to time seminars and classes are arranged for members who have completed schools and are now studying individually. For example, a three-day seminar on topical ideological problems was recently organized for such comrades in Bologna. The seminar gave a new impetus to further studies.

A Party leader should encourage members to study individually, set an example, advise them what and how to read; he should be interested not only in their practical work but also in how they study.

Marcello ANDORNO

The Communist Party of Argentina Intensifies Its Struggle

IN the election of February 23, 1958, which brought the present President to power, the overwhelming majority of the people voted against the policy of the land-owning oligarchy, big capital and imperialism. The democratic social and political forces of various trends united for the elections—the Civil Radical Union of Intransigents (now the ruling party), the Communist Party and those sections of the working class and other working people who were still under the influence of ex-President Peron. They were united by the democratic, progressive and anti-imperialist points of the Intransigents' program, the points which their candidates put before the electorate during the election campaign.

A government of the bourgeoisie and petty-bourgeoisie came to power, a government which tends to vacillate and capitulate to the land-owning oligarchy, big capital and foreign monopolies. The Communist Party supported those of its measures which were progressive and at the same time appealed to the people to bring pressure to bear upon the Frondizi government to compel it to drop its reactionary policies. Since, however, strong and organized pressure was not immediately exerted, the government quickly began to capitulate to the reactionary oligarchy and imperialism. It is relying more and more on conservative forces and rightist groups of various shades. Ties between

the government and the landlord oligarchy, big capital and imperialist monopolies have become so strong that they have now merged into a single force.

The government's reactionary policy, which has influential American backing, is aggravating the economic crisis, shifting the consequences onto the working people, and increasing the country's economic dependence.

But resistance to this policy is growing. The working class and the people are becoming more militant and politically conscious; the united action movement is gaining momentum, and the influence and prestige of the Communist Party are growing. All anti-oligarchy and anti-imperialist forces are on the move. The need for far-reaching changes in the economic and political structure is generally admitted.

The government suffered a crushing defeat at the election in the Province of Mendoza on April 26. The votes cast for the government party fell by nearly 75 per cent (from 176,927 in 1958 to 53,054). On the other hand, the votes for the Communist Party rose over 120 per cent (from 15,000 in 1958 to 33,300). This resulted in a crisis in the ruling party, and some of the provincial government bodies began to voice sharper disagreement with the central authority.

All this is taking place in a situation of mounting struggle by the people, first and foremost by the working class. The recent big militant strikes testify to the profound changes in the political consciousness of the working class, which is now putting forward political as well as economic demands. The oil-workers, for instance, struck in defense of Yacimientos Petroliferos Fiscales, the state oil enterprise, workers in the Lisandro de la Torre meat-packing plant organized a strike against the government policy of denationalizing state enterprises and handing them over to private national and foreign capitalists. During the strikes of the iron and steel and textile workers, seamen, bank employees and others there were demands that the government lift the state of siege, stop calling up strikers to the army and release prisoners. The general strike from January 18 to 21 tied up the whole country. It was profoundly anti-imperialist and was in particular a protest against President Frondizi's visit to the United States. April 3 marked a day of action to stop government interference in trade union affairs. The main slogan under which the successful general strike on May 15 was carried out was solidarity and support for the bank workers, who for three weeks had been on strike for higher wages.

Alarmed by the mass struggle, the government prolonged the state of siege indefinitely, while a decree of April 27 banned the Communist Party and other progressive public organizations, and shut down all Party and independent press organs.

The banning of the Communist Party is a part of the general offensive against democracy. The Central Committee of the Communist Party declared in a statement published after the ban: "In view of this infringement of constitutional rights, all supporters of democracy must be on the alert, for the infamous decree is directed not only against the Communists, but against all Argentine patriots upholding democratic liberties, economic independence, prosperity for the people, national progress and peace. After having been applied against the Communists this decree will—unless united action by all progressives prevents it—also be applied against the Peronists, Socialists, progressive Democrats, Radicals and even against those Intransigents who disagree with the official policy . . ."

The democratic forces have reacted by closing their ranks. The Communist Party has not been crippled by the ban and Party organizations are stepping up their efforts. The Central Committee's draft theses for the Party's XIIth Congress give an analysis of the present situation which has strengthened the confidence of the members in the correctness of the Party's policy and in the inevitable victory of the democratic forces. All Party branches are now discussing the draft.

Speaking of the struggle in the Latin American countries, the draft notes a new factor, namely, that not only is resistance to North American imperialism growing, but in many cases the peoples in these countries have gone over to direct action to defend their liberties and independence. It points out, however, that although a great deal has been done towards building broad democratic fronts of national liberation, these fronts have not yet become strong enough to achieve any really drastic changes in the economic and political life of any country, or to achieve and consolidate democratic changes. This is the situation in Argentina also.

The Communist Party explains to the people that the country's development along democratic and progressive lines does not in the main depend upon the subjective desires of members of Parliament, but upon the organization of the working class and the national movement.

In this connection the theses say: "The main task, today more important than ever, confronting the Argentine Communists, is to convince the working class, the people, all progressives and patriots that the only way of attaining economic independence and preserving sovereignty, is through unity of action by all, from the working class to the progressive sections of the national bourgeoisie, through the formation of a powerful national democratic front against the oligarchy and imperialism, a united front for peace and a widely representative democratic coalition government."

A decisive feature of the present situation is the rapid growth of the movement for unity at the plants and factories. This is confirmed by the fact that reaction has failed to prevent the formation of amalgamated trade unions independent of the employers and the state. United action is achieved by the two main groups in the working-class movement—the organizations under Peronist leadership and those under the guidance of the Communist Party and other forces supporting it in this—as can be seen from their joint preparation and conduct of recent mass strikes and other militant actions.

Touching on the role of the working class in the people's struggle, the draft theses point out that when the Argentine proletariat achieves trade union unity by creating a united trade union center independent of employers and the state, "it will become possible for the working class—whose militant spirit and political consciousness are steadily growing—in alliance with the peasantry, to assume the leadership in the struggle for radical changes in the country." With this aim the Communist Party is taking measures to improve ideological work and to win the workers away from the influence of bourgeois concepts and theories,

in particular those which emanate from the trade union leaders carrying out ex-President Peron's orders. Latest developments have deepened the differences among the Peronist leaders, particularly between those who are trying to use the working-class movement to restore the former regime, and those who, feeling the pressure from below, are upholding the people's desire for unity and are, hence, steadily acquiring greater influence.

President Frondizi and his close associates are in collusion with the anti-popular forces, deliberately leaving in their hands the key positions in the economy, administration, police and armed forces. A situation has thus arisen in which the real power in the country is in the hands of the military and the balance of forces has now changed completely in its favor. All the recent anti-democratic measures were carried out by the government under direct pressure from reactionary military circles.

The draft theses emphasize the growing dissatisfaction within the ruling party and the mounting struggle between the leaders and the majority of the party members who, albeit timidly and inconsistently, are nevertheless making efforts to keep their pledges to the people. In other political parties, too, differences are deepening between the people's democratic sections and the advocates of capitulation to the oligarchy and imperialism. The influence of the popular-democratic sections in these parties is growing. It will become stronger as the political and economic situation deteriorates. Inflation has increased to an unprecedented degree and prices are soaring. According to official statistics the cost-of-living index has risen as follows: if 1943 is taken as equal to 100, the index in March 1958 was 1,071, and 2,220 in March 1959. Not only the working class, but the peasantry, professional people, small and medium employers, tradesmen and certain sections of the national bourgeoisie are affected by the "Economy and Sacrifice Plan" which the government is now carrying out. In consequence of the political and military agreements with the USA, Argentina has been obliged to renounce her traditional foreign policy of

neutrality. This has meant granting the United States a base in Ezeiza, permitting it to train the army, supervise the armed forces and conduct joint maneuvers in the South Atlantic.

But the democratic forces are growing, and the Communist Party is confident of victory: "The activity of our Party," says the C.C. statement in connection with the banning of the Party, "will, as always, be determined by its participation in the struggle of the working class and of the whole people for their vital interests and those of the nation. We are certain of victory. The times of reactionary and dictatorial governments which act in the interests of the oligarchy and imperialism, are ending, and the epoch of democratic and progressive governments upholding the interests of the working class and the whole people, national independence and peace, is beginning. It is these governments that will triumph."

Despite the fact that Party organizations now have to work under more difficult conditions they are, as developments show, successfully implementing the Party's slogan of increasing the membership to 100,000 by the time of the Party's XIIth Congress. The *Activist*, a bulletin published by the Party Committee in Buenos Aires in connection with the pre-Congress enrolment, gives details of the growth of the Party. Textile workers, metalworkers, railwaymen, building and port workers were among the first to join. At some plants Party branches have been set up in all departments and shifts. Many residential quarters have already from 15-20 and more Party members; more or less the same situation holds good for the provinces. A position is being established in which the enterprises and residential quarters can be made real "citadels of the Party." The working-class, democratic, popular and patriotic movements are gaining momentum and will result in a national democratic front which will lead to the formation of a widely representative people's democratic coalition government and an agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution.

Jorge FLORES

Factory Papers

FACTORY newspapers first appeared in Rumania a little more than ten years ago. They now number 32, and come out either weekly or fortnightly. *Viata Uzinei* (Factory Life), published at the August 23rd Plant in Bucharest, has a circulation of 9,500, and is sold out very quickly. *Tractor*, a paper of the Thaelmann Plant, also in Bucharest, is eagerly read, too. Quite often its 6,500 copies are not enough to meet the demand. Most of the other factory newspapers have also become popular. This is explained by the fact that they use no veneer in dealing with the routine of factory life, and pay close attention to the interests of the workers and their needs. When some factory papers copied the national newspapers, carrying official reports, international news and reviews of films and shows, they were criticized by the Party. Now, although this shortcoming has not yet been overcome, their main feature is factory life.

Prominence is naturally given to production which is the concern of all workers. *Steagul Rosu* (Red Banner), published at the truck works in Stalin, calls for modernization of equipment and economy in raw materials. Every technician in the plant has pledged to save materials to the sum of 15,000-20,000 lei a year. The newspaper keeps an eye on how this pledge is being fulfilled. *Viata Uzinei* campaigns for an economy of 1,000 lei per worker. With the active support of their paper, *Sondorul*, which carried items under the heading "Save Every Pound of Barytes and Cement!," the workers of the Ticleni oil-field economized about one million lei in a single month. This paper constantly features items under the heading "Reduce Standstills." There is no important question of production which is not handled by factory newspapers.

The best results are obtained by those papers which concentrate on two topics — popularizing experience and criticizing shortcomings. In many papers such columns as "New Production Records," "Examples to Follow," "Innovators' Corner" are now permanent. They popularize the best experience, rationalization proposals and new methods of increasing production.

In the past the Party criticized factory papers for tolerating shortcomings. Since then their criticisms have become sharper and more to the

point. Many papers make it their business to see that shortcomings are put right.

The paper of the Bucharest transport workers puts questions to the management and in subsequent issues carries answers—a method now used by other papers. The workers help their papers to disclose shortcomings and find out how rationalization proposals are realized. The factory papers check up on how the collective agreements are implemented.

Criticism of conservatism in work, lack of discipline, absenteeism and a careless attitude to public property is highly effective.

The factory papers do not only feature production questions. They try to give a vivid picture of the varied life of the workers in a socialist enterprise. They carry information about the work of the Party, trade union and youth organizations; review amateur theatricals; write about people's universities at enterprises, about nurseries, kindergartens, canteens, new flats, and how the workers study in higher educational establishments. Workers send in letters about their holidays, about excursions and their discussions with writers.

A short while ago a special issue of the plant paper *Metalurgistul* was published in connection with the 50th anniversary of the Ploesti oil-equipment plant. Veteran workers wrote in it about their hard life in the past, about their sacrifices. In describing the suffering and misery in old Rumania, factory papers remind the workers of the great changes in their life.

The editorial boards of these papers consist of 5-9 persons—the most respected workers, engineers and technicians. Only the chief editor, who is also selected from among the workers and technicians well acquainted with production and having some knowledge of newspaper work, is free from other work. The editorial office enrolls many voluntary correspondents. Hundreds of them send in their proposals, report both shortcomings and achievements. It is these correspondents who make the paper.

From time to time Party organizations discuss the work of the members of the editorial boards and help to raise their ideological and political level. They are concerned with the general line of the papers and see to it that they are readable and well laid out.

Petre GHEORGHE

Short Notices

Albania

SEMINARS FOR BRANCH SECRETARIES

THE Albanian Party of Labor has organized regular seminars and classes for secretaries of Party branches. Every month one-day seminars on current problems are held. Reports are made by secretaries and bureau members of the district and town committees, instructors and branch secretaries. In addition, four- or five-day seminars are arranged twice a year. One of these is held to acquaint the newly-elected branch secretaries with the current problems of Party work. Those taking part study the policy of the Party, economics, etc.

In a number of rural districts it became necessary to lecture to branch secretaries of co-operatives on the remuneration of labor. Except when general questions are under discussion, all seminars are held separately for urban and rural secretaries.

In addition to seminars, two-month classes have been functioning in some of the districts for some years. Included in the syllabus of the classes for secretaries in rural areas are such urgent theoretical problems as "Class struggle during the transition from capitalism to socialism," "Worker-peasant alliance." Many hours are devoted to Party building, the rules and organizational work (holding meetings, drawing up plans, popularization of experience, checking up on how decisions are fulfilled, and the role of the branch committee). Much attention is paid to the organization of agricultural production. Lectures are given on agronomy and animal husbandry. Agrotechnical study rooms have been organized and advanced co-operatives are visited. One-year classes are held under the auspices of the Lenin Central Party School. Sixty per cent of the time is devoted to the foundations of Marxism-Leninism and questions of Party organization and 40 per cent to concrete economic matters. The students do one month's practical work in co-operatives or factories.

Students in all classes and seminars are told that although such studies are important, it is even more important for them to acquire the habit of individual study, to regard reading as an absolute necessity, to study the life of the people and to be able to draw general conclusions from practical work.

Democratic Republic of Vietnam

UNIVERSITY FOR RE-EDUCATION

WHILE training new intellectuals from among the workers and peasants, the Working People's Party pays great attention to re-educating the intellectuals who grew up under the imperialist regime. Special political instruction is given to the old intellectuals to help them get rid of the remnants of bourgeois ideology and culture and of the illusions implanted by American imperialism, and to develop among them patriotism, love for the people, and responsibility for the future of the country.

Among the subjects studied are the foundations of historical materialism, history of the Vietnamese Revolution, and the main points in the policy of the Party and Government. First, lectures are given on these subjects, then the students work independently, read and digest the material, and hold group discussions. The underlying idea of the studies is: "Do everything willingly and consciously; never impose ideas on other people." One rule has become obligatory—to achieve unanimity in discussion, never to coerce people but to convince them.

The students often meet President Ho Chi Minh, Prime Minister Pham Van Dong and other leaders.

Four thousand specialists have already graduated from the classes. Among them are doctors, lawyers, teachers, engineers, journalists, professionals, both men and women. All the graduates have a high opinion of the classes. Some of them feared, as they now admit, that "political education" would violate their "freedom of thought," but their studies have dispelled these fears. The students now understand the policy of the Party, correctly assess the achievements of socialist construction and the role of the intellectuals.

India

A STRIKING EXPRESSION OF THE LINK BETWEEN PARTY AND MASSES

A SUCCESSFUL campaign to collect funds for the Communist Party has been held in the State of Kerala. The State Committee of the Party appealed to all members to use the campaign to strengthen the Party not only financially but also organizationally, and particularly its links with the masses. This appeal as well as the plan of the campaign were discussed at Party meetings, which were also attended by sympathizers. Hundreds of

public meetings and talks were held, and house-to-house propaganda was organized.

At the meetings it was stressed that hundreds of thousands of agricultural workers in the State had received a 20 to 25 per cent increase in wages, and their hours of work are now fixed by law. The anti-eviction law was of considerable benefit to the peasants. The position of the workers has also been improved; bonuses have been guaranteed, long-term agreements have been arrived at, many unemployed have been given jobs. It was also stressed that the people supported the Communist government in its struggle for an agrarian law aimed at abolishing the feudal relations, and for an education act.

The campaign showed the trust of the masses in the Party and the strong support accorded it by people from all walks of life.

The collection of funds became a mass movement in which workers, peasants and handicraftsmen took part, each contributing whatever he could. All Party members in the aluminum factory in Kundara paid two days' wages to the Party fund, and the trade unionists paid one day's wages. This initiative was supported by workers at many other factories. They queued up at the Party offices to give their donations. A transport worker from Bangalore, sending a day's wage, wrote: "Kerala's history has been written in the blood of many brothers who were subjected to inhuman repression . . . To avoid a repetition of that the Communist Party has to be strengthened."

The peasants donated cocoanuts, paddy, poultry, goats, calves, etc. The contributions in kind were auctioned. One peasant, in Mankompu village, donated all the cocoanuts from his compound because, he said, he got this plot back through the laws passed by the Communist government.

Small shopkeepers, barbers, tailors and laundry owners were among the contributors. One cycle repair-shop owner put up a notice outside his shop announcing that the earnings of that day would go to the Party fund. And on that day his takings were doubled.

As a result of the campaign Rs. 450,000 were collected as compared with the Rs. 300,000 called for. Money and articles came from people of differing views who all felt the effects of the policy of the Communist-led government which defends the interests of the people. During the campaign the working people expressed their ardent support for the Party. A woman who bought a cocoanut at an auction immediately planted it to commemorate the Party fund campaign. A wrist watch was sent to the State Party Committee with a letter which said: "I have been lying ill for a year. I have no cash. But I give my most valued possession to my beloved Party." In

the village of Alapatambu, a Congressman who voted against the Communists in the last elections, gave a calf and told the meeting in his village that he was firmly convinced that the Kerala government worked for the people and that the Communist Party should be strengthened.

France

THEORETICAL CONFERENCES

A FEATURE of the work of the Communist Party is its conferences on political-ideological problems prompted by the development of social relations, science and technology. The aim of such conferences is to elaborate specific problems of Marxist-Leninist theory, raise the ideological level of Party members, and assist the further spread of scientific socialism. Prominent experts in various fields take an active part in the conferences.

In the last few years conferences have been held on Engels' *Dialectics of Nature*, the topics being: "Objective Laws of Nature and Society," "Marxists Answer Their Catholic Critics," and others. The conferences contributed to the further development of current ideological questions.

A conference under the title "Lenin and His Method" was held in Paris on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the publication of Lenin's *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*. About two thousand people attended and heard reports by R. Garaudy, member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee ("Marxism and French Progressive Thought"), G. Cogniot, member of the C.C. ("A Book Vital to Frenchmen Today"), G. Besse, member of the C.C. ("Impotence of Revisionism"), J. P. Vigier, a professor of physics at the National Research Center ("Lenin and the First Crisis of Modern Physics").

The conference, held at a time when the class enemy, just as it did 50 years ago, is seeking to strike a blow at proletarian ideology, gave a worthy reply to the critics of Marxism. Opening the conference L. Casanova, member of the Political Bureau, said that in his book Lenin profoundly criticized bourgeois ideology, concentrating on the exposure of philosophical revisionism. Lenin studied the immediate results of research into the natural sciences, and gave a critical analysis of the theoretical conclusions and generalizations drawn from this research. Closely following the work of others, Lenin scrupulously selected even the tiniest grain of truth and strictly verified the principles of Marxist theory on the basis of the

facts of science. L. Casanova emphasized that this method is an example for us. "We will try to assimilate better Lenin's method in order to make our own contribution to the treasure-house of Marxist-Leninist theory, to assist the general development of Marxist thought in France, and to isolate the reactionary forces."

The conference demonstrated that the Communist Party defends freedom of scientific work, and fights against eclecticism and the revisionist at-

tempts to "adapt" revolutionary theory to bourgeois liberalism and the fashionable ideas of the ruling class. It also confirmed the fact that the work of Marxists has had a great impact on the development of a number of branches of knowledge in France.

This conference has evoked keen interest; its documents have been published in *Cahiers du Communisme*, the theoretical and political organ of the Party.

Reviews

Italian Communists and Modern Colonialism

THE disintegration of the colonial system increasingly affects the international situation and the internal life of many countries. Alongside the rapid growth of socialism, it is a factor which cannot be ignored by any country or any party. For this reason the Italian Communist Party has always paid great attention to this problem. This is corroborated, in particular, by the publication of a symposium of articles and materials analyzing the disintegration of the colonial system and questions arising therefrom. The symposium is printed in the form of a special enlarged number of *Rinascita*,* and contains some 50 articles and reviews by Italian as well as foreign political workers and scholars.

The introduction, written by Palmiro Togliatti, points out that "up till now Western civilization, to a considerable extent, has rested not only on exploitation of man by man, but on real slavery. All economic and political life in France is associated with the enslavement and extermination of Algerians. The comfortable life of the middle sections in the United States and the luxury of multimillionaires and film stars are paid for by the abominable misery of the South American Indians or the Arab tribes who are robbed of oil—the wealth of their lands. For two centuries British civilization has been based on the plunder of the natural resources of colonies and on the criminal destruction of the culture of their peoples. Today it continues to live on the wealth accumulated by these means."

Small wonder, Togliatti concludes, that bourgeois philosophers and writers cannot even imagine a world without exploiters, slave-dealers and the shooting down of colored peoples. The colonial and former colonial peoples are inspired by the October Revolution, the Chinese Revolution, and the brilliant solution of the national question in the former

tsarist colonies which have now become flourishing republics within the Soviet Union. We are witnessing one of the most powerful and far-reaching changes in history, which in the past ten years alone has brought freedom to 1,200,000,000 people.

Much of the material of the symposium deals with the history of colonialism, the rise and decline of colonial empires, and the colonial policy of the United States at the present stage of disintegration of the colonial system. It also systematizes the historical and economic material and provides a Marxist analysis of past and present colonialism. Among the many questions of particular importance are the characteristics of the modern colonial policy of the Catholic Church, the prospects of the Asian bourgeois-democratic countries which have recently become politically independent, the struggle of the Italian working class for the abolition of colonialism and its consequences and for the freedom and independence of colonial peoples.

One of the merits of the symposium is that it elucidates a question which is often forgotten and not always accorded sufficient importance, the questions of the responsibility of the Church for colonial wars, for its actions in support of colonialism which are by no means prompted by Christian charity. This theme is the subject of Loris Gallico's article "Catholic Church and Colonialism," of Angelo Franza's "Missions in Africa," and of Ambrogio Donini's article on the heretical movement.

The "colonial" phase in the policy of the Catholic Church began in the XVth century. Since then it has converted the majority of the population only in Latin America. But in recent times its influence there has fallen. In Asia the Catholic Church has failed completely: Catholics comprise less than two per cent of the population, of whom three-fifths are in the Philippines. And it was not Confucianism, Buddhism nor Islam that prevented the

*Crepuscolo del colonialismo. (*Rinascita*, Nos. 11-12). Twilight of Colonialism, Rome, 1958, 190 pp.

spread of Catholicism but its association with colonialism and its concomitants — brutality and greed. It is no accident that in China they used to say: "A missionary is followed by a trader, a trader by a consul, and a consul by a soldier." In Africa too, particularly in the Islamic countries, the results achieved are negligible: Catholics there account for only eight per cent of the population. In Libya, despite the thirty-year rule of Italy and the special privileges enjoyed by the Catholic Church, the number of Catholics in 1956 was . . . thirty. France has ruled Algeria for 128 years, but the number of Moslems converted to Catholicism hardly exceeds the number of Frenchmen who married Moslem women and adopted the Moslem religion. The same is true for all Moslem countries.

An analysis of these failures is revealing since it helps to indicate the political and ideological reasons for them. For centuries the Vatican has supported the ultra-reactionary and conservative forces; it has discredited itself by taking part in the brutal and foul undertaking of colonialism. The Church opposes the Algerian revolution; in Kenya it supports repressions against the people with such zeal that the churches are often turned into military strongholds. In the Congo the Church co-operates closely with the colonial administration. In the Cameroons it supported the collaborationist M'bida who started a civil war against the national movement.

The Vatican does not wish to break with colonialism because it is inseparably bound to the capitalist system. But today one cannot claim to be a friend of colonial peoples without breaking with their oppressors—the imperialists. One cannot be on the side of these peoples and not recognize their great representative—People's China—or bitterly oppose the October Revolution which has awakened the peoples to fight. Precisely because the Church clings to its pro-imperialist positions, all its attempts to influence the colonial peoples are bound to fail.

The articles by Velio Spano, "The National Bourgeoisie in the Struggle against Colonialism"; Mario Galletti, "Africa and Its Place in the World"; Giuliano Pajetta, "Peoples of Asia and Africa in International Affairs" and others, describe the successes of the national-liberation movement in the colonies and the present situation and new problems in the Afro-Asian countries.

These articles deal, in particular, with the development of the bourgeois democratic states in Asia and the political situation in these countries. The problem of national development is particularly topical for India, Indonesia, Thailand, Pakistan and Burma.

The two general elections in India have made it clear that the Socialist and Praja-Socialist parties have no real chance of becoming ruling parties;

at the same time the Communist Party is becoming stronger, more capable of participating in the administration of the country, and is already in office in the State of Kerala. In view of this anti-communist circles are advocating a theory according to which parliamentary democracy is unsuited to India; they suggest that an above-party democracy should be established and a "truly democratic" government formed without Communists. These reactionary plans seek to force India to capitulate to international imperialism, to abolish democracy and, in the long run, to lose her national independence.

In Indonesia, the democratic forces, above all the Communist Party, have repelled the repeated attempts of the militarist cliques to prevent, by force of arms, the revolution from moving to a further stage. In that country a situation has arisen which presents to the other countries of South-East Asia solid prospects of genuinely democratic progress. In Indonesia the progressive forces have put an end to the reactionary attacks on democracy and the independent economic policy. This was done thanks to co-operation between the progressive section of the national bourgeoisie (which is represented by President Sukarno) and the popular forces headed by the numerically strong and well-organized Communist Party.

In Thailand, Pakistan and some other Asian countries, reactionary forces and military groupings linked with foreign imperialism have established anti-democratic regimes trampling on freedom and legality.

From a thorough analysis of the situation in these countries made by Silvia Ridolfi, it follows that in a number of Asian countries the parliamentary bourgeois-democratic system is in or is nearing a state of crisis. In analyzing the situation in these countries, we must not limit ourselves to an assessment of their neutralist positions which in general are of positive significance, and ignore the differences between them and the contradictory nature of bourgeois-nationalist regimes.

Many pages are devoted to the anti-colonialist traditions of the Italian working class and to the struggle of the Communist Party against the colonial policy of the government. An article by Professor Roberto Battaglia, "Anti-Colonialist Traditions of the Italian Working Class," is a research into the rise and features of anti-colonialism in Italy which emerged as a mass movement against colonial policy as early as the 80's-90's of the last century.

In this century anti-colonialism has become a special feature of the anti-imperialist struggle. In February 1935, before the fascist aggression against Abyssinia, the first joint manifesto of the Socialist and Communist parties was published.

"Not a Single Man and Not a Single Penny for the African Gambles!" "Hands Off Abyssinia!" — were some of the slogans spread throughout the country despite the fact that at that time the Communists and Socialists had to work underground.

"The Abyssinian people," said Togliatti in 1935, "are an ally of the Italian proletariat in the struggle against fascism . . . The revolutionary traditions of the Italian people, the traditions of the Garibaldi volunteer legions—traditions in the name of which the first Italian internationalists, of their own will and with genuine enthusiasm, went to Poland and Hungary, Greece and South America, and every other place where the banner of struggle for national independence was being raised—impel the Italian working people to side with the people of Abyssinia against the fascist bourgeoisie."

In one of the concluding articles entitled "A Broker for Imperialism," Celeste Negarville writes that today, according to the Eisenhower Doctrine and Senator Mansfield, "Italy should play the role of mediator in the Middle East between the Western and Arab countries." In other words, Italy must help imperialism, notably American, to replace in the former colonies the traditional outmoded

colonialist methods by economic agreements with political strings attached which would, in fact, abolish the independence won by these countries; agreements designed to make political and economic subjugation appear attractive, and to repair the imperialist chains by forging the missing links.

The plans of the Italian rulers are primarily in the interests of the United States and ignore the basic needs of Italy as a Mediterranean country which is interested in good-neighborly relations and mutually advantageous trade with the other countries in that area.

That is why the Communist Party has opposed the government's policy in relation to the peoples of Africa and the Middle East. While exposing and actively combating the old and new forms of colonialism, and upholding the political, economic and military independence of the country against foreign imperialism, the Italian Communists, together with the working people, are fighting for the independence of the colonies, in support of the former colonies and the peoples whose independence is in danger, for good-neighborly relations and trade with all countries on the basis of equality and mutual respect.

Silvio BRUNI

Advocates of Colonialism

MILLIONS in the colonies are seeking to shake off as quickly as possible the hated foreign yoke, and to abolish colonial oppression and racial discrimination. Hundreds of millions in the former colonies which have won independence and freedom, are fighting tirelessly against the aftermath of colonial rule—poverty, disease, cultural and economic backwardness—and are stoutly resisting the attempts of the imperialists to deprive them once again of their political independence.

American monopolists are worried when they see the colonial system crumbling. They want to consolidate world capitalism and retain what is left of their colonial possessions. While posing as champions of capitalist interests, the U.S. monopolists never miss a chance to snatch from their allies part of or even the whole profit, and grab for themselves the still existing colonies and dependent countries.

To attain these aims they use both the traditional colonialist methods — aggression, enforcement of "law and order" by means of arms—and the more subtle tricks of neo-colonialism, including a spate of whitewashing propaganda. In this connection we cannot overlook the shameful part played by those bourgeois intellectuals who have allied themselves with monopoly interests and have chosen to defend colonialism, to "scientifically" uphold

the right of the imperialists to exploit other nations.

The Idea of Colonialism,* published in the United States, is a typical example of colonialist "literature." The very names of the authors,** among whom are prominent professors and journalists noted for their devotion to the monopolies, indicate that this is a work of official, time-serving "scientists" who accept the viewpoint of the State Department.

The authors seek to elaborate "a dynamic and flexible concept" of colonialism to refute "the ideology of violent revolution" in the solution of the national-colonial question, abolish "anti-colonialism" and lay a firm foundation for the "friendly commonwealth" of the colonial and dependent countries and the imperialist powers. The authors understand, of course, that the liberation movement in the colonies and dependent countries is a revolt against robbery by the imperialists who

**The Idea of Colonialism*, Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., New York, 1958, 495 pp.

**Professor Hans Kohn, Professor Stefan T. Possony, Professor Julius W. Pratt, Professor Norman D. Palmer, Professor William Y. Elliott, Professor Paul M. A. Linebarger, Jr. W. Saxe, Włodzimierz Baczkowski, Arthur P. Whitaker, Irene W. Meister, Michael S. Pap, Alvin J. Cottrell, James E. Dougherty, Erasmus H. Kloran, Richard J. Kozicki and Genevieve C. Linebarger.

This book is edited by Professor Robert Strausz-Hupe, director of the Foreign Policy Research Institute of the University of Pennsylvania, and Harry W. Hazard, a consultant to the same institute.

keep a firm hold on their economies and mercilessly exploit their manpower and natural resources. Therefore, starting on a crusade against "anti-colonialism," Strausz-Hupé and his colleagues are trying to whitewash colonialism and prove that it has played and is still playing a progressive role in the history of mankind. "To the areas which they have ruled the colonial powers have brought many advantages—legal and administrative reform, education, scientific and technological progress, the beginning of industrialization, and improved transportation," points out E. Kloman (p. 364). Hans Kohn writes that it would be incorrect to blame the colonialists since poverty, racial and social injustice have existed in Asia, Africa and Latin America from time immemorial. There is no link, he asserts, between the plight of the colonial nations and colonialism.

But facts are facts and they prove that the history of colonialism is written in blood. The "civilized" conquerors are notorious for their indescribable brutalities. As a result of the Negro hunts and the mass extermination of the refractory tribes Africa lost about 150 million people. The true nature of colonialism can best be seen in the general economic and cultural backwardness which obtains in any colonial or recently-liberated country. In Pakistan, India, Ceylon, Egypt, the Philippines and other economically backward countries the output of steel—the basis of modern industry—per head of the population varies between 4-14 kgs., whereas in the leading capitalist countries it amounts to 600 kgs. Hundreds of millions in Asia, Africa and Latin America are undernourished, starved, badly clothed and homeless. The so-called civilizing mission of the colonialists is responsible for the appalling cultural backwardness. During the three and a half centuries of colonial rule in Indonesia only 250 people completed secondary school. At present, about 90 per cent of Africans can neither read nor write. In Malaya 62 per cent of the population is illiterate, in Egypt 75 per cent and in India 82 per cent. Every year millions in the colonies and dependent countries die of TB, malaria, dysentery and smallpox.

These facts are well-known and sufficiently convincing. Therefore, the authors are compelled to admit, with reservations, of course, that there were cases of "injustice" "under the sun of colonialism." But this admission is made with the sole purpose of whitewashing modern colonialism. Classical colonialism is dead, the authors keep saying. "Modern Western colonialism means something quite different from the older forms of imperialism . . . Its aim is not exploitation of the natives, but a development of both the natives and their resources," writes W. Elliott (p. 432).

Is this true? Do the 150 million people of the modern colonies no longer feel the effects of oppression and exploitation? Let us take as an example the British colony — the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland. In 1956 the companies and corporations representing mainly British capital obtained a profit of over £110 million, but paid out only £71 million in wages to 1,057,000 African workers. The native population in the Federation is deprived of rights. At the elections in November last year Africans accounted for only four per cent of the electorate. Characterizing the "democratic freedoms" in this colony, the *British Observer* wrote in the spring of this year that a few millions of Her Majesty's subjects could now be detained for an indefinite time, although no charges had been made against them and they had not been found guilty by the courts.

Whenever the oppressed nations try to fight for their rights, armed force is used against them. In this way the latter-day colonialists behave as successors to Gordon and Kitchener. According to incomplete data, during the war in Algeria the French colonialists have murdered over 600,000 Algerians. Hundreds of thousands are languishing in concentration camps and reservations. When the Cameroons demanded the right to self-determination, they were savagely repressed. Between November 1957 and January 1959, 5,000 patriots were executed and over 50,000 imprisoned.

The authors are indignant at and alarmed by the fact that the colonial and dependent nations, while fighting for their freedom and independence, are also opposed to the colonial policy of the United States. For instance, here is what A. Whitaker says about Latin American peoples: ". . . Anti-colonialism is deep-rooted among them, and while it was once directed mainly against Europe, in the present century it has been aimed more and more against the United States" (p. 153). The authors allege that such an attitude towards the USA is based on misunderstanding, and argue that juridically the USA has no colonial empire. The use of verbal quibble is a favorite trick of bourgeois "scientists!"

Colonialism exists not only in the classical form in which it had been known since the rise of capitalism. Besides direct and overt political domination imperialism has evolved many other forms of subordinating the less developed to the more developed countries. Primarily it is economic subordination. The U.S. monopolies have already laid their hands on the economies of a number of Latin American countries. In Brazil, for instance, they control 70 per cent of all industry. They also possess enormous riches in the Middle East, controlling all the oil in Saudi Arabia and the Bahrein Islands. At this moment Wall Street businessmen

are invading Africa and South-East Asia. Even according to obviously understated figures the U.S. monopolies annually amass \$1.5 billion out of their direct investments in the underdeveloped countries. These figures do not include the profits obtained from unequal exchange which are many times greater. Although juridically it does not possess vast colonies, the United States is the main exploiter of colonial and dependent nations.

To subordinate and exploit the peoples of other countries, American imperialists make full use of loans and subsidies granted both directly by the state and through the International Bank of Reconstruction and Development, the International Monetary Fund, the International Financial Corporation, etc. The facts show that this "aid" is, above all, given to support the reactionary ruling cliques of those countries which have joined the military blocs and groupings directed against the socialist countries and the national-liberation movements. The chief recipients of American economic aid are South Korea, South Vietnam, Turkey and Pakistan—countries which are bound most closely to American foreign policy.

American "aid" is not sufficient to cover the expenditure these countries have to make as a result of their membership in the military blocs. Their huge military expenditure undermines their economy and weighs heavily on the working people. And it is not fortuitous that the economy of Turkey—a country which for a long time has been receiving American "aid"—according to a pointed metaphor of the *New York Times*, is like a child learning to walk after poliomyelitis. In his book *Ideas, People and Peace* Chester Bowles, former U.S. ambassador to India, describes American aid as a means of economic and political pressure, and asks whether it is surprising that many proud, cautious, recently-liberated peoples regard American economic assistance with suspicion, or reject it altogether.

By entangling many countries in Latin America, Asia and Africa in the cobweb of financial dependence, and imposing on them various "mutual security" agreements, the United States in essence has turned them into its colonies. For instance, what independence can the Philippines have when the country is completely under the control of American capital, and when U.S. war bases and troops are stationed there? Small wonder therefore that Ramon Mitra, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, called the sovereignty of his country "a mere word."

The moment dependent and colonial countries rise against colonialism, the American imperialists and their allies stop at nothing, including armed intervention, to beat them to their knees again. Such was the case with Lebanon whose people

opposed the Eisenhower Doctrine which had reduced the country to the status of a semi-colony. American monopolies inspired a number of reactionary coups in Asian countries. They supplied arms to the rebels in Indonesia who tried to overthrow the lawful government; they support the rotten military dictatorships in Latin America. The peoples of these countries are a thousand times right when they regard American imperialism as the main threat to their independence and sovereignty.

Why then do the authors of the book defend colonialism and the colonial policy of the United States in particular? They do this in order to prove the need for and the inevitability of the continued existence of colonialism, to supply a "scientific" basis to the claims of the American imperialists to world domination. This can be seen from the way in which the authors envisage the future of the colonies and dependent countries.

They state plainly that colonial peoples should not hope to gain independence in the near future. Many of them, they say, are largely illiterate, are not yet ready to govern themselves. "Neither the Belgian Congo nor Kenya nor, for that matter, any of the former mandated areas in Africa is now, or will in the near future be, ready for independence" (p. 441). Self-determination cannot be granted, it appears, to those countries where there is "inner strife," and also to "hot-tempered and hot-headed" peoples. Colonial rule must be retained for small peoples and peoples with small territories, etc. The advocates of colonialism attach particular importance to military bases. "Only the most naive idealist believes that, at this time of world crisis, the metropolitan nations could afford to withdraw from certain dependent areas without making provision that their military security would not be impaired . . ." (p. 33).

What then should the colonial peoples do? The authors recommend that they should wait until the colonialists teach them "the rudiments of civilization." But they are silent on the fact that colonies have existed for tens and even hundreds of years, but in none of them have the colonialists made any serious attempt to educate the population, or quitted the country voluntarily, and that progress in raising the material and cultural standards has been achieved only in those countries which have shaken off the colonial yoke and started along the path of independent development.

In the postwar years a group of young sovereign countries—former colonies—has emerged. The very fact of their existence and their independent and peace-loving policy is not to the liking of the American imperialists who dream of making them their satellites. Fully aware that the overcoming of economic backwardness and the creation of a

national industry is the main condition for the strengthening of political independence, the authors of the book try to convince these countries that developing their own industry is "economically unreasonable." They warn the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America not to count on American aid for such projects. "The United States should not always accede to the wishes of potential recipients of our aid," writes E. Kloran. "The problem may often be how to say 'No' without offending needlessly those who seek our assistance." On the other hand, the dependent areas, "realizing their military impotence," must provide for "their own security" by entering into alliances with imperialist states and "relying on the support of military missions, not to mention satisfying their needs for weapons and equipment as well as technical and financial assistance" (p. 33). In other words, these countries must not only remain the objects of imperialist exploitation, but must also repudiate their political independence.

The constructive part of *The Idea of Colonialism* ends with a suggestion to "internationalize" the colonies and spheres of influence. The administration, it is suggested, should be in the hands of such imperialist instruments as the Organization for European Economic Co-operation, the European Common Market and even NATO. In suggesting "internationalization" of the colonies, the authors unequivocally insist that leadership should belong to the United States. "It is apparent," says

S. Possony, "that motherlands whose economic strength is dependent upon foreign grants and loans do not have the material resources to provide for colonial development to the extent required by circumstances" (p. 40). In this case the author is obviously hinting that Britain, France and Belgium, being dependent on U.S. loans, must cede their colonies to the United States. What would the realization of these plans mean for the colonial and dependent nations? First, greater colonial oppression, and second, the postponing of their liberation. In case of "internationalization" and unifying the "resources" of the colonies and dependent countries, the imperialists would combine their efforts against the national-liberation movements.

Such in general outline is the "dynamic and flexible concept" which the authors recommend to the colonial and dependent nations. No deep understanding is needed to make out its colonialist and imperialist nature. This concept may suit the tastes of the American imperialists but it is altogether unacceptable to the peoples fighting against colonial slavery. And not even the most "flexible and dynamic" theories and concepts of the learned lackeys of imperialism will deflect them from the correct path—the path of heroic self-sacrificing struggle for independence. For only this path can lead them to their long-sought goal.

A. COATS

Reviews in Brief

Gy KALLAI, *A szocialista kultúraért. (For Socialist Culture.)* Budapest, Gondolat kiado, 1958, 237 pp.

THIS is a collection of speeches, articles and reports by Gy. Kallai, a member of the Political Bureau and Secretary of the Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party. The book deals with the struggle of the working class and other sections of the Hungarian people for socialist culture and for the creation of a socialist intelligentsia.

Many of the articles analyze the relationship between the Party and the working class, on the one hand, and the intellectuals, on the other. The reactionary forces, which started the counter-revolution in 1956, succeeded in sowing confusion among the intellectuals and in drawing some of them into the counter-revolutionary camp. The working class with the support of the stalwart communist intellectuals has overcome the influence of counter-

revolutionary intellectuals. It has always trusted the majority of the intellectuals and, without renouncing principled criticism of their incorrect political views, co-operated with them in strengthening the people's power and in the further building of socialism. This correct policy resulted in the consolidation of the worker-intellectual alliance and in the speeding up of the creation of a socialist intelligentsia.

The symposium shows how the Party fought against revisionism and decadence which were given new life by the counter-revolution, and how it exposed and defeated the bourgeois theories of "free culture," "united national culture," "modernism," etc. Another subject dealt with, which is particularly important in the battle of ideas in scientific and cultural circles, is the Party's struggle against bourgeois nationalism conducted from the standpoint of proletarian internationalism.

M. MOUILLAUD, *La mystification du 13 mai au 28 septembre. (Myths of May 13-September 28.)* Paris, Ed. Sociales, 1958, 286 pp.

THIS book by M. Mouillaud deals with one of the most pressing subjects of today — the reactionary onslaught on bourgeois democracy. In May last year the fascist-minded elements of the French bourgeoisie, assisted by their stooges from the General Staff and police and by their Social-Democratic collaborators, together with the rebels from among the Algerian colonizers, carried out a long-prepared coup with the result that the state is now under a tighter control by the big banks and monopolies.

The author does not present a mere chronicle of events, but discloses the social nature of the conspiracy, its motive forces and causes, and exposes the latest methods of fascism. He emphasizes the two sides of fascism — violence and demagoguery—and shows it as it really is: a class system which “is a reaction of weakness to rising strength.” The book explodes the myths about de Gaulle, the grandeur of France, Franco-Algerian fraternity, etc.

It draws an important conclusion concerning the grave responsibility devolving on the supporters of the “middle way.” Adopting an anti-communist stand, the Right-wing Socialists and Liberal bourgeoisie have deprived the slogan of the defense of the Republic of its national and social content, thus leaving it without popular support. Defending the interests of the monopolies and opposing the nation, they are thus trying to divide the working people and curtail the rights won by them. May 13, the author notes, has finally proved the impotence of the “middle way.” Some of its supporters “are passing over to fascism, or, to be more exact, are being absorbed by it, and the differences between them become less and less discernible.”

The book shows the danger of the “middle way” which, far from leading to democracy, encourages reaction. The anti-communism of its supporters provides the basis of the anti-popular policy. The author concludes that the democratic forces of the Left cannot achieve their aims without the working class and its communist vanguard. This conclusion is particularly important now when the monopolists are on the offensive and the democratic forces must quickly close their ranks and fight for progress and a better future.

H. D. MALAVIYA, Kerala. *A Report to the Nation*, New Delhi People's Publishing House, 1959, 128 pp.

AFTER the formation in 1957 of a communist government in Kerala—one of the Indian states—the question was asked: is it possible for a local communist government to operate under a bourgeois constitution? Developments have proved that it is quite possible. Communists can persistently introduce democratic changes proclaimed but not carried out by the bourgeois parties. This is how the well-known Indian economist, H. D. Malaviya, answers this question. In contrast to the reactionary press which is conducting a slander campaign against the Kerala government and tries to misrepresent its actions, Malaviya gives a true-to-life picture of the activities of the communist government. He describes in detail the measures implemented by the Communists while in office.

Despite the tremendous difficulties arising from the fact that the actions of the Kerala government are considerably restricted by the central government, the Communists have taken the first, but very important, steps in improving the conditions of the masses, abolishing unemployment and defending the rights of the peasants. A law was passed forbidding the landlords to evict tenants from their lands. The government prohibited the use of the police force against strikers and took effective steps to settle disputes and conflicts between workers and employers. The Legislative Assembly passed an Education Act to defend the rights of teachers in private schools and improve their position.

Using a wealth of factual material, the author criticizes the attacks on the Communists and refutes the charges against them as utterly groundless. He points out that it was those preaching non-violence who, immediately after the formation of the communist government, resorted to unashamed violence and despicable provocation to overthrow that government; and it was the Communists who displayed extreme tenacity and patience and refused to be provoked.

Malaviya is not a Communist, but he objectively assesses the work of the Communists, and praises highly their activity from the standpoint of a democrat and a patriot. And this adds still more to the value of the book—one of the first to analyze the successful struggle of the communist Kerala government operating within a bourgeois state.

End the Cold War!

(Letter from Geneva)

IN MAY this year when the Foreign Ministers took their seats around the Geneva table, a new stage began in international relations. No meeting of the Four Great Powers had taken place for four years; the blame for this lay with the Western powers who, after the Geneva Conference of 1955, concluded that there was much to be said for their "position of strength" policy. During these four years the imperialists made desperate attempts to achieve their aims by force and threats of force. The roar of guns and the explosion of bombs re-echoed in the Near East, trouble was deliberately stirred up in various parts of the world, and new military bases were established—and are still being established—around the socialist camp. The West "balanced on the brink of war," the generals doing their bit on the proscenium, the diplomats compiling hypocritical notes in their offices.

The future historian, when he analyzes developments during the years 1955-59, will probably designate this period as one of failure for the "policy of strength." And indeed, it has proved itself completely bankrupt. Bellicose gestures failed to frighten anyone and where the imperialists did resort to arms they received a stern rebuff.

A mighty force has arisen on the world arena, a force made up of ordinary people, the real makers of history, a force which the cold war strategists are obliged to reckon with. The unprecedented marches undertaken by the people of Japan for the banning of atomic and hydrogen weapons, the mass demonstrations by the people of France and Britain against the dangerous policy pursued by the ruling circles, and the actions by the people of West Germany against "atomic death" will go down in the history of mankind's battle for peace.

Action by the peoples in the different countries has taken different forms, but the aim has been the same: the peoples demanded that a stop should be put to the parade of military strength, that negotiation should be the only means of settling international disputes. The Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic and all the other countries of the socialist camp, as well as a number of non-socialist states took this stand. Their peace efforts and international co-operation, merged into a powerful movement of the people of all continents, have become an invincible force.

Hundreds of journalists gathered at the entrance to the Palace of Nations just before the first meeting began. Someone recalled that on this very spot, in 1955, the summit meeting statesmen had chatted with the journalists. The photographs taken had appeared in the newspapers of every country. Those had been the days when the "spirit of Geneva" was born. The whole world had learned that, regardless of the social system they represented, statesmen could negotiate and understand each other.

The bourgeois journalists, who during these years had been at great pains to make the people forget the "Geneva spirit" are now shamefaced. Their efforts were wasted. Once again the representatives of the Great Powers have come to Geneva, and the whole world knows that this marks the *beginning of a new stage in international negotiations.*

The journalists got a shock when a car bearing the black-red-gold flag of the German people drove up with the delegation of the German Democratic Republic headed by Foreign Minister L. Bolz. This is another victory for the peace camp. The first German worker-peasant state known to history, whose standard bears the motto: "Never again will Germany be a hotbed of war," has made its appearance on the international stage! The voice of the peace-loving forces of the German people is now heard not only in Germany but at the table of international negotiators.

The last to arrive was the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany, whose car carried no flag and no Foreign Minister. Von Brentano, the West German Foreign Minister is staying at a hotel near the French frontier; he cannot bring himself to appear in the Conference hall on an equal footing with the delegation of the German Democratic Republic which he does not recognize! But the West has recognized *de facto* the GDR and Brentano's display of stubbornness is merely childish.

The Geneva Conference is not just a series of official meetings in the Palace of Nations, it is not just a series of unofficial meetings in the residences of the foreign ministers; in the Geneva Conference of 1959 we can discover not only what statesmen and politicians are thinking about the destinies of the world, but also what the ordinary people are thinking. From early morning till late

at night letters and telegrams pour into the residences of the ministers, more than 60,000 have already been received. There are letters of all kinds, some on the letterheads of public organizations, some on plain notepaper, others on pieces of paper torn from office pads and exercise books; letters bearing hundreds of signatures and proclaiming the wishes of organizations, and letters from individuals. Those who work for their daily bread everywhere think alike. They want peace, and refuse to believe the ballyhoo of bourgeois propaganda that the cold war is an inevitable and natural phenomenon.

From morning till night groups of people, some large, some small, are to be seen near the ministers' residences. They come by buses or on foot. They are the envoys of the working people of Europe. They represent thousands, sometimes millions, of people. Some have come to Geneva on trade-union funds, others on the donations of the people in the houses and streets where they live. They are sent by the peace supporters in various countries as their representatives. The world peace movement did a great deal towards the convening of the Geneva Conference. Its members have always insisted that issues should be resolved by negotiation, and their delegations have now appealed to the Foreign Ministers to solve the German problem speedily. Because it is in Germany more than anywhere else that the threat of a new world war is most imminent. The supporters of peace have expressed the hope that the meeting in Geneva will be a step towards ending the cold war and towards the summit meeting.

These envoys always find a warm welcome at the residence of the Soviet delegation. They speak of the hopes and aspirations of their comrades, hand in letters and petitions, and find out how the Conference is progressing. Gromyko, Soviet Foreign Minister, received a delegation from the European trade-union conference held in Goerlitz-Zgozhjec. It had called for a peace treaty with Germany, disarmament and the banning of atomic arms. He also spoke to a delegation from the international conference of chemical and oil workers which had been held in Leipzig. A group of public figures from West Germany visited the head of the Soviet delegation.

A great number of delegations are coming from France. The French working people are disturbed by the resurgence of West German militarism and by their government's policy of flirting with the German revanchists and aggravating the situation in Europe. "We are distressed and apprehensive," states the resolution of the workers from the Renault Works in Billancourt (a suburb of Paris), "when we again see West Germany under the

leadership of aggressive and militarist politicians, and when the French delegate at Geneva advocates a policy that cannot lead to a just solution of outstanding issues . . . We wish to live in peace and friendship, and hereby declare that it is our firm will that all problems should be solved by peaceful means and that a world conflict should be avoided. Rather a year of negotiations than an hour of battle."

The working people of France believe that the first essential is to conclude a peace treaty with Germany, liquidate the occupation regime in West Berlin, ban atomic weapons, establish an atom-free zone in Europe, and hold a summit meeting. These demands were signed by 5,649 workers from Saint-Denis and are contained in a resolution presented by the delegates of the working people in the 15th arrondissement of Paris, in the resolutions of the Chausson works in Gennevilliers and Saviem in Saint Ouen.

Joint delegations of French and German workers often come to Geneva and this is a good sign of the unity of the European working class. The railway workers of France and West Germany, for example, sent a delegation of this kind to Geneva. It arrived from Munich, where on May 23-24 there had been a meeting of the French and West German railwaymen. The keynote of this meeting was, the delegation stated, a call for action to preserve European and world peace. In their resolution, which was handed to the Conference, the railwaymen wrote:

"It is our view that a relaxation of international tension and the preservation of peace can only be assured by:

- ✓ the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany which would explicitly prohibit the resurgence of militarism and nazism (from which both our countries have suffered so much) and the rearmament of Germany;

- ✓ West Berlin to be a free, demilitarized city;

- ✓ the prohibition of atomic weapons.

We request you to take our wish into consideration, for it is likewise the wish of hundreds of thousands of railway workers in both countries. . ."

As the Geneva Conference is discussing the German problem, it is natural that most of the delegates are from the two German states. The vast majority of the German working people believe that a German peace treaty would ensure a peaceful life for the German people and pave the way to a solution of the problem of reunifying the country. These ideas run through the resolutions adopted by the citizens of Hamburg, the youth organizations in Federal Germany, the appeal bearing 920 signatures of the West German women, the appeals of the Hamburg Standing Committee of Opponents of Atomic Armament and the Central

Peasants Committee as well as through many other messages.

The delegation of well-known public figures from West Germany created a stir. They handed the Conference a memorandum signed by 3,000 Bundestag and Landtag deputies, public figures, scientists, writers, trade-union functionaries, and clergymen. The memorandum emphasizes the need to sign a peace treaty with Germany, to establish an atom-free zone in Europe, and for the reunification of Germany.

A meeting took place between the delegations of the Council of the National Front of Democratic Germany and the spokesmen of public bodies in the Federal Republic. West Germany was represented by Pastor Niemoeller, head of the Lutheran Church in Hessen; Count von Westphalen; Brenner, ex-Secretary of State; Dehler, former chairman of the Free Democratic Party, and Ungeheuer, press officer of this party. They refuted the arguments advanced by those Foreign Ministers who opposed reunification.

A letter from the Council of the National Front of Democratic Germany voiced the opinion of the majority of the working people in Germany. It said: "We are guided by the lessons drawn from German history. Hence the sense of responsibility, which every German feels towards himself and his people, prompts us to support the initiative shown by the Soviet Union's proposal for a peace treaty with Germany."

The working class and its Communist vanguard have clearly defined their attitude on the German question. Millions of people are demanding a peace treaty and calling for a solution of the Berlin problem. An "Action for Peace" month is under way in the countries of Europe. All this proves that the main preoccupation of the working people of Europe is a peace treaty with Germany which would guarantee peace and security in Europe. If further proof is needed there are the messages received by the Foreign Ministers from the German Democratic Republic, Federal Germany, France, Italy, Luxemburg, Poland, Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Union and other countries. Those from the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic carry over eight million signatures.

The representatives of the German Democratic Republic have received more than 50 delegations from the two German states and have been flooded with great numbers of letters and resolutions expressing confidence in them and the wish that they should do their utmost towards relaxing international tension. What does this show? First and foremost that the peace policy of the worker-peasant government of the GDR has the warm support of the people of Germany and beyond it.

It testifies to the growth of the consciousness of the West German working class which, despite the lies and slander spread by imperialist propaganda, regards the Government of the GDR as a true defender of their vital interests and is prepared to thwart any attempt by the West German militarists to "liberate" and deprive them of their social gains.

The work of the foreign ministers is influenced by world public opinion, and cannot be ignored by the bourgeois propagandists.

When the Western "package plan" was produced, the bourgeois correspondents were perturbed. It contained only old propaganda rubbish. The West German semi-official press correspondents, spurred on by the Bonn propaganda headquarters, at first lauded this creation of Western diplomacy. Then, following the example of the British, French and American press, the Federal Republic newspapers began criticizing the Western "package."

That the "peace plan" is recognized as worthless is evident from a caustic joke played by some bright spark, who added the words "Western package" to the list of lost property at the Press House. Another joke went the rounds: all lost property except the West's "package" has been claimed.

No one in the West believes that the "package plan" can lead to an agreement at the Foreign Ministers conference. Its only purpose in effect is that, under its cover, the Western diplomats can hold forth on "reunification" without fear of any dangerous repercussions. The fact that their demands are quite unrealizable suits the Western diplomats down to the ground. The ruling circles in the West are not anxious for a reunited Germany. Some of their spokesmen say outright that the Western powers will gain nothing by the reunification of Germany, on the contrary, it contains danger for them. If West Germany, wrote the well-known American columnist Walter Lippmann, was able so rapidly to become the second capitalist power in the world as far as economic potential is concerned, a united Germany would undoubtedly take a leading place in Europe and could quite easily compete with the United States. Those who pretend to see Germany united display in fact, in Lippmann's opinion, no interest in reunification.

The Western powers sustain the old policy of supporting reaction and militarism in West Germany and of turning them into a shock force of world imperialism. The West German revenge-seekers who are taking advantage of this are having an ever-greater say among the capitalist nations. Is not that why Adenauer and his men in Geneva are so zealously poisoning the atmosphere

of the conference and preventing positive decisions being reached on any of the questions under discussion?

* * *

The Foreign Ministers' Conference is still in session and it is therefore difficult to speak of the results. But one extremely important point has to be stressed: the opponents of international co-operation could not prevent the conference from taking place. And this is no small achievement on the part of the people. They are present, unseen, at the conference in the Palace of Nations. They are following its proceedings and are worried by the unrealistic attitude adopted by the spokesmen of the Western Powers. Whether tension is reduced or increased depends on the stand taken by the Foreign Ministers of the United States, Britain and France. The Soviet delegation, seeking to further the work of the conference, is showing understanding for the position of the Western spokesmen and

is taking into account their ideas on a German peace treaty and the Berlin question. The new Soviet proposals for a Berlin settlement went a long way towards meeting the West. But again the Western diplomats said "No." Such an approach to the negotiations demonstrates that the U.S., British and French Foreign Ministers wish to evade the solution of outstanding issues, solutions that aim to relax tension.

World public opinion is now a tremendous force in world politics, and those who ignore it assume a serious responsibility.

The peoples have compelled the Foreign Ministers to come to Geneva. They will compel their governments to take the next step forward — a summit meeting at which the cold war will be replaced by the friendly co-operation of all nations in the interests of peace.

Jiri NOVAK

Geneva, June 1959

Sarvodaya, a Utopian Solution of India's Social Problems

(On Modern Reformism in India)

IN INDIA today, the Sarvodaya (welfare of all) philosophy is being widely propagated as the panacea for the country's economic, political and social problems. Its main exponent is Acharya Vinoba Bhave, a disciple of Gandhi.

In an economically backward country like India, in which small-scale production predominates and an idealistic outlook is current, the Sarvodaya ideology has influenced some sections of the Indian people, including well-meaning persons, and has in recent years become a mass movement. Presented as a constructive, even superior, *alternative* to scientific communism, the exploiting classes and their ideologists are boosting this movement in their press. Since it is harmless to the ruling circles, Sarvodaya enjoys generous support from a government favorably disposed towards it, and Sarvodaya conferences and meetings are attended by ministers who declare their solidarity with it. The Sarvodaya leaders receive help in various ways from government circles, help which is intended to spread reformist illusions among the Indian working people and so blunt their class consciousness. Some anti-communist elements in India and the capitalist West regard it as an important weapon in combating the growing influence of the Communist Party.

Being aware of the evils of the feudal and capitalist systems, and under the impact of com-

munist ideas, the Sarvodaya leaders advocate an ideal society based on the principle "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs." They quote Engels and nurture the idea of a society in which administration of men would be replaced by administration of things; at the same time they reject mass political action as a way of achieving this ideal. Ignoring reality, the Sarvodaya ideologists are instilling into the people the idea that the establishment of an ideal society calls for the moral regeneration of people, a change of heart and not a change of system.

Some time ago *New Age*, political-theoretical monthly of the Communist Party of India, devoted its pages to a discussion on Sarvodaya. Several contributors wrote on various aspects of Sarvodaya and examined it from the Marxist-Leninist standpoint. B. T. Ranadive, editor of the journal, summed up the discussion in a comprehensive article (*New Age*, 1958, Nos. 8 and 9). The discussion graphically demonstrates how the Communist Party of India ideologically educates its members and the working people.

* * *

In origin and content Sarvodaya is an extension of Gandhism attuned to the new historical conditions which developed in India after she had attained political independence, and the advent

to power of the national bourgeoisie. Gandhian philosophy is based on moralizing speculations, non-violence and reformist pacifism which, naturally, has had some negative effects on the struggle of the Indian people for independence and social progress. Gandhi nevertheless roused the masses to the struggle against the British colonialists, and the liberation movement of the Indian people eventually drove out the imperialists. It was this circumstance that made Gandhi a great leader of India.

The social conditions obtaining in India explain the rise and spread of Sarvodaya. When, under pressure, the British colonialists quitted the country in 1947, they left a ravaged semi-feudal and semi-colonial country behind them. The peasants, who comprise the overwhelming majority of the Indian people, were backward and poverty-stricken; industry was poorly developed, handicraft production predominated. The middle sections in the towns and cities, including the intellectuals, were likewise victims of British oppression. After independence had been proclaimed, India was naturally faced with the urgent task of overcoming the age-old poverty and backwardness and of taking the path of economic, political and social progress. The various classes and sections of the population interpreted differently this historical task—depending upon how each was affected. The vast masses, peasants and artisans in particular, identified a centralized state with the colonial state system; industry with foreign firms; up-to-date technology with foreign exploitation, and so forth. Many of their ideals lay not in the future, but in the past, in the social system of India before the British conquest when, in their view, the country was free and independent. Many of Gandhi's followers saw the future of India in the revival of the so-called self-sufficing village communities with scattered artisan production. This ideal reflected the sentiments and thinking of the peasants, artisans, small shopkeepers and petty-bourgeois intellectuals. *Their aspirations have profoundly influenced the content of the Sarvodaya philosophy and foster it now.*

Vinoba Bhave, in his Sarvodaya theory, retains only the idealistic, reactionary elements of Gandhian teaching. In his view even Gandhi's Satyagraha method (pertinacity in upholding truth), i.e., non-violent mass pressure on the ruling circles, is no longer needed. The following quotation confirms this: "The definition of Satyagraha has assumed a negative character, that is to say, it has come to mean some movement for coercing people who differ from you into adopting your view of things. . . . We ought to learn that Satyagraha which seeks to be effective in democracy will have to

be more constructive and less in opposition to one or the other."*

Bhoodan (gift of land), Gramdan (gift of whole villages), Sampatidan (gift of wealth and property excluding land), are, according to Sarvodaya, some of the stages towards the establishment of a classless and stateless society based on love. Leaders of the movement go into raptures in describing their future social order. They affirm that the Sarvodaya society will be based on co-operation and mutual love; it will be a society without classes, injustice or exploitation. The wealthy will voluntarily give up their riches and privileges; the state will relinquish its supreme power and hand over its functions to local government bodies, and when decentralized, small-scale production will replace large-scale industry, and hand-spinning will replace textile factories and when everyone toils, a time of plenty and prosperity for all will arrive and each will receive according to his needs.

This picture is enough to show the limitations of the Sarvodaya theory, its lack of scientific value and hence its bankruptcy. It is true that the Sarvodaya leaders have borrowed some propositions from the theory of scientific communism, but this merely indicates that advanced socialist ideas have had an impact even on those who reject Marxism-Leninism. A wide gulf separates the theory of scientific communism and the Sarvodaya concept of the future social order and of the ways to achieve it. A close examination of Sarvodaya exposes its illusory nature. The passive methods of struggle of its leaders and their preaching will not realize their proclaimed ideals; and these ideals, too, are restricted and questionable.

Bhoodan is the first step towards creating the idyllic Sarvodaya society. It is obvious that in an agricultural country such as India, any attempt to develop the economy and reorganize the social system must begin with the solution of the land problem. What does Sarvodaya offer in this respect? Its adherents hold that the land problem will be solved if the landowners, both big and small, make a gift of part of their land to the agricultural laborers. "My target is 50 million acres of land," Vinoba Bhave writes. "Since there are 300 million acres of cultivable land in India and an average family has five members, I felt that every family could give away one-sixth of its landholding, accepting the poor landless man as the sixth member of the family. This is a way of bringing about a peaceful revolution in the country."

Without disputing the good intentions of the Sarvodaya followers, one asks what about the millions of tenants and the small peasants who

*Vinoba and His Mission, p. 122.

do not have enough land to make a decent living? Agricultural laborers, the most exploited and oppressed section in the countryside, by uniting with the poor peasants and leading them, could be a force capable of securing agrarian reforms for the benefit of all the rural poor. But the Sarvodaya leaders have their own ideas on this. They ask starving small peasants to hand part of their tiny plots to the agricultural laborers and thus set a good example to the big landlords: "We say that first the small owners should give up their desire for property; not till then will the big owners lose their appetite for it," say the "Sarvodaya Principles." Their champions dispute the right to private ownership of land and say that "all land belongs to God." But at the same time, and again in the name of God, they demand that the peasants pay compensation to the big landlords for the land received from them. They not only hamper organized peasant action against feudalism, but even oppose legislation for abolishing landlordism, considering it a form of violence and coercion against the landlords. Incidentally, it is interesting to note that the idea of Bhoodan came into being when, alarmed by the growth of armed peasant struggle for a division of the landowners' lands in 1950, the landlords in Telengana themselves suggested making a "gift" of part of their land to the peasants in order not to lose it all.

What are the achievements of this "land-gift mission?" The leaders of the movement calculated on securing 50 million acres by 1957. Although big donations were announced, the actual land-gifts did not exceed 10 per cent of the target. What is more, the bulk of the land secured by gift is barren and uncultivable; and part of it is under litigation inasmuch as the right to ownership is being challenged. While the Sarvodaya leaders were collecting land gifts for the agricultural laborers, big landowners were evicting thousands of tenants to add to the list of the landless. Considerably more land was taken away from the peasants (to say nothing of its quality) than the Sarvodaya followers were able to collect. To take but one example. Fifty-seven per cent of the protected tenants in Bombay State were evicted from their lands under court orders; the land lost by them amounted to 58 per cent of total land area in the State. The Sarvodaya leaders did nothing to arouse the peasants to action against this wholesale eviction. And so the idyllic dream of achieving a land revolution through Sarvodaya by 1957 did not come true.

Abolition of feudalism in the countryside and the turning over of the land to the tiller—this is the solution to the land problem in India. The problem can be solved only through agrarian reform and organized action by the peasants. But

class struggle is anathema to the idealistic Sarvodaya philosophy which relies mainly on a change of heart of the people, and on the good will of the exploiting classes. This, no doubt, is exerting a pernicious influence on the growth of the peasants' consciousness and militancy. The failure of Bhoodan is inevitable. A movement which ignores the economic realities and the contradictions arising therefrom and which disregards the laws of class struggle cannot achieve anything in the direction of social change.

Gramdan is the next and more advanced phase of Bhoodan. It is supposed to be the realization of a complete land revolution. Here instead of individuals offering their land, an entire village gives its land to the gift fund. Gramdan professes, moreover, the following objectives: elimination of poverty; awakening of affection and love in the hearts of the big landowners for the sake of improving the moral atmosphere of the country; strengthening society by forging bonds of mutual help and fellowship and overcoming class hatred; building a new social order on the basis of voluntary labor, non-possession, co-operation and self-reliance; providing an opportunity to all political parties to come together on a common platform and work to root out mutual bitterness and self-aggrandisement.*

Despite the good intentions of the Sarvodaya proponents, it is not difficult to foresee that the Gramdan movement will suffer the same fate as Bhoodan. The factors which caused the failure of the Bhoodan mission apply in equal measure to Gramdan, for both movements are based upon the same idealistic conceptions of society. Even if Gramdan were realized (which is, of course, inconceivable), it could never create an advanced and prosperous life in the Indian countryside, since the antagonism between town and countryside would remain and capitalist exploitation of the laboring peasantry would continue. With the means of production in the towns still owned by foreign and Indian monopolies, Gramdan would be powerless to stop exploitation and poverty in the countryside. True, the Sarvodaya leaders want to protect the villages from exploitation by restricting exchange with the cities, and they promise them self-sufficiency. But to think in terms of villages independent of the capitalist relations prevailing in the economy (industry, finance, transport, etc.), is equivalent to building castles in the air. "Self-sufficiency" of this kind could only perpetuate backwardness, poverty and hunger in the rural areas. The advocates of Sarvodaya laud small-scale artisan production and condemn modern large-scale industry based on machine production.

* Cf. Vinoba and His Mission, p. 134.

However, individual, small-scale production, as the history of development in all countries shows, has never put an end to exploitation of man by man.

Sampatidan is the third and final link in the Sarvodaya teaching. "As the work of the Bhoodan progressed, it became increasingly clear that the idea behind the movement could not be fulfilled unless we went further and asked for a portion of wealth and property (excluding land). And hence I made up my mind that I must also ask for a share of wealth and property from the people. I have now done it and placed my demand at one-sixth of it."*

One of the aims of *Sampatidan* is to finance the Bhoodan movement. Through it Vinoba Bhave and his followers want the rich to win the love and confidence of the poor; to make both rich and poor shed possessiveness and regard all property as belonging to society as a whole; to render money and gold valueless and uphold labor as real wealth; to encourage self-government, enabling the people to conduct affairs themselves and rely less on the government; to reconstruct the social order.

Once again we come up against the same illusions. To abolish exploitation and the extreme inequalities created by private ownership of the means of production and the class system, all that is needed is to appeal to the rich to share the wealth created by the labor of the masses. Nothing is said about the need to end exploitation or at least to restrict it through progressive reforms. All that we hear is an appeal for charity. Both the multi-millionaire and the humble artisan are asked to contribute one-sixth of their wealth. The example set by the poor artisan or the small shopkeeper is supposed to create so much moral fervor that the big capitalists, who normally resort to police force at the protest of the workers, will gladly offer their property on a platter to society. The single idea running through Bhoodan, Gramdan and *Sampatidan* is rejection of a consistent scientific program of action. Those who nurture the idea that a new social system is to be achieved by preaching and changing the heart of the exploiting classes ignore the experience of history. And this experience teaches that no exploiting class voluntarily relinquishes power or willingly agrees to social changes which affect its ownership of the means of production.

The Communist Party of India gives credit to Vinoba Bhave and his followers for their peace activities. One can sympathize and respect the Sarvodaya rank-and-file for their solicitude for the welfare of the people and their wish for social

transformation. Many of them work among the masses, and their experience has convinced them that private property is the source of social injustice. They therefore advocate its abolition; they oppose the exploitation of man by man. Marxists welcome condemnation of private property and exploitation, as this helps the people to focus attention on the evils of the present class society in India. The Communists endorse the demand made by the advocates of the Sarvodaya movement for a just solution of the land problem and are ready to co-operate with them to improve conditions for the rural population. But the Communists warn them that their hopes are futile, because *the idealistic outlook and passive methods of action proclaimed by the ideologists of this movement cannot bring about a realization of their aims, no matter how splendid.*

The Sarvodaya leaders are opposed to the very institution of the state, considering any state an evil. In their view the state is not an organ of domination of one class over another, but an institution standing above classes. The state, they affirm, is an evil because it restricts the liberties of the individual by concentrating economic and political power in the hands of a few individuals. This anarchistic approach to the state sees only the individual in relation to the state, and ignores the relations of the various classes to the state. No wonder, therefore, that the Sarvodaya theoreticians cannot distinguish between the socialist state and the bourgeois state. They want a stateless society now, ignoring the obvious fact that in the transition from capitalism to communism a state of the working people headed by the working class is needed in order to suppress the resistance of the exploiters and to carry on economic and social transformations. Moreover, they claim their anarchist viewpoint is more advanced than the Communist.

How then, in their view, will the state wither away? Through abolition of the existing capitalist-feudal state? No! Strange as it may seem, they demand, on the one hand, control by the people of the present state by making it adopt measures to encourage handicraft industries, especially in the village, and new forms of education (in a word, they advise the working people not to struggle to take charge of state power, but to influence it from outside) and, on the other hand, immediate measures to abolish the state as a form of government without abolishing its coercive organs. This idealistic concept clearly has nothing in common with the scientific and revolutionary concept of the withering away of the state which implies among other things a classless society, a material and technical basis for communism, and communist consciousness.

*Vinoba and His Mission, p. 84.

According to Sarvodaya, all parties are power-hungry organizations; no distinction is made between the political party of the working class and the parties of the exploiters. Similarly, because of its idealistic outlook, the Sarvodaya followers see no difference between centralization under capitalism and under socialism. To them any centralization is an evil. And to do away with this evil the Sarvodaya leaders insist that their ideal society is preceded by decentralization of political power and economy. In point of fact, however, centralism in a socialist state is inseparable from democracy for the working people; it serves to educate and organize the working people in the process of building socialist society. Centralized management is inherent in large-scale production. Without an industry equipped with up-to-date machinery there can be no question of a communist society or of an abundance of material and spiritual values.

* * *

About a century ago Engels, reviewing the activities of the great 19th century utopians—Saint Simon, Fourier and Owen—wrote that without a vanguard class taking over political power, a new social system could not be built. And the following words of Engels have a direct bearing on the Sarvodaya ideology: “. . . the production of the means to support human life and, next to production, the exchange of things produced, is the basis of all social structure; . . . in every society that has appeared in history, the manner in which wealth is distributed and society divided into classes or orders is dependent upon what is produced, how it is produced, and how the products are exchanged. From this point of view the final causes

of all social changes and political revolutions are to be sought, not in men's minds, not in man's better insight into eternal truth and justice, but in changes in the modes of production and exchange . . .”^{*} What the Sarvodaya ideologists offer as an ideal society for the Indian people promises them, in fact, a bleak future; self-sufficiency of each small locality, and minimum exchange with the outside world; small-scale production and minimum development of large-scale industry and machinery. In actual practice, the attitude of the Sarvodaya leaders to the state means nothing more nor less than allowing the state of the big capitalists and landlords to dominate the working people for all time; in short, perpetuation of poverty, exploitation, backwardness and depriving the working masses of political rights.

Speaking of the Tolstoyan influence, Lenin noted that the combination of protest against social injustice and inequality with dreamy, vague and impotent longing is a new, refined and subtle poison for the oppressed masses that weakens their struggle for emancipation.^{**} Not utopian dreams are needed to abolish poverty, backwardness and exploitation in the country but practical activities based on a correct understanding of the laws of social development, class struggle and the building of socialism and communism. The theory of scientific communism, as the Constitution of the Communist Party of India notes, provides the working people with all this pointing out to them the true road of struggle for social justice and well-being.

A. B. MIRZA

^{*}K. Marx, F. Engels, *Collected Works*, 1952, Vol. II, p. 126.
^{**}V. I. Lenin, *Works*, Vol. 16, p. 295.

Sport and Peace

(Letter from Vienna)

SPORT is acquiring increasing importance in public life. It is no longer a diversion for the few, but a broad mass movement. It cannot be isolated from social ideas. The Frenchman Pierre de Coubertin, educator and founder of the modern Olympic Games, once said that there was no sport for sport's sake, that it should serve the good of man. Athletics, he said, could arouse the noblest and basest of passions, develop unselfishness and honor or bring out greed, it could be chivalrous or venal, foster human virtues or encourage bestial instincts, could be used as an instrument of peace or in preparation for war.

It is not fortuitous that in our day the “Olympic idea” is called the idea of peace. Sport is a contest in strength and skill, and it develops

through international contacts, through the exchange of experiences between nations. That is why sportsmen, irrespective of the views they hold, protest against any political discrimination in sport.

Austrian sportsmen, like those of other countries, strongly object to any attempt to narrow down the representation at international contests and to rule out democratic sports associations. By opposing artificial barriers in international sport, the sportsmen are playing an important part in the struggle to end the cold war.

After the war the European socialist countries tried to re-establish their traditional sports relations with our country. But this did not fall in with the plans of anti-communist politicians. Both

the conservative People's Party and the leaders of the Socialist Party made no small effort to prevent contact with the socialist countries on the sportsfield, seizing on every insignificant incident. But in the long run the desire of all sportsmen for unhampered international sports contacts gained the upper hand.

We recall, for instance, the Peace Cycle Race held annually over the route through Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic and Poland. This major international event in sport was at first ignored by the anti-communist press of Austria, while the heads of sports associations did not permit Austrian sportsmen to take part in it. Our cyclists, however, insisted on being allowed to participate in this international competition and in 1952 the Austrian Cyclists' Committee was obliged to give way. As soon as this decision was announced the press launched a big smear campaign against the Peace Race. But it met with no success and the deep-felt desire of sportsmen to establish contacts with their colleagues in all countries, including the socialist, has resulted in their taking part in the Race, and the event is even reported in the bourgeois press.

The same was true of the World Youth Festivals. Austrian sportsmen came to the first three festivals without the permission of their associations and ran the danger of disciplinary measures being taken against them and of not being allowed to take part in any future contests under the Austrian flag. However, there were 250 Austrian sportsmen at the Fourth Youth Festival in Bucharest. Some obtained permission from Austrian sports societies while others went as official representatives of Austria.

Every effort was made by the authorities and ruling parties and some sports organizations to prevent Austrian sportsmen from participating in these youth rallies for peace and mutual understanding, but all their attempts have failed. This is proved by the preparations for the VIIth World Youth Festival shortly to be held in Vienna. And any attempt to prevent our athletes from taking part in the Festival contests is doomed to failure.

This spring Emil Zatopek, the well-known Czechoslovak endurance runner came on a fortnight's lecturing tour to Austria, where halls, packed to overflowing, gave him a hearty reception. The heads of sports organizations and even the authorities could not ignore this evidence of the triumph of the spirit of friendship.

After the liberation from nazism the Austrian people felt the need to set up joint organizations of all patriotic and democratic forces. Important results were achieved in reviving Austrian sports organizations. But soon afterwards there arose forces whose aim was to divide the sportsmen.

The Socialist Party leadership revitalized the Workers' Association of Sport and Physical Culture, and this gave the clerical elements in the People's Party the opportunity of re-establishing the Gymnastics and Sports Association as a base for their reactionary policy. The Austrian Gymnastics Society was set up with connivance of the authorities, as a successor to the German Gymnastics Society (a disbanded Nazi organization). It serves not so much the interests of sport as those of reactionary pan-German propaganda.

Sport is extremely popular in Austria. About ten per cent of the population are eager sportsmen; in addition hundreds of thousands are fans. Sport exerts a far greater influence on the youth than do the political or religious youth organizations.

Reaction seeks to influence the sports organizations. In this it is assisted by the Socialist Party, which shares the leading posts in the Austrian sports organizations with the People's Party. Dr. Heinrich Drimmel, Minister of Education (People's Party), is president of the Austrian Olympic Committee, and Walch (Socialist Party) is president of the Football Association. If, in addition, we take into account that War Minister Graf (People's Party) is president of the Association of Swimming Societies, and Polcar, former People's Party M.P., is president of the Flying Club, it will be obvious that the capitalist parties exert a great influence on sports organizations.

Not satisfied with this, however, the War Ministry drew up a plan for setting up an Austrian Military Sports Society. This spells great danger to the development of sport, for such a society would become a powerful political weapon in the Minister's hands. So far the plan is meeting with great opposition, but the People's Party has succeeded in establishing other associations (Invalids' Sports Society and the Gendarmerie Sports Association) which it uses in pursuance of its reactionary aims.

Drimmel is on very good terms with the Vatican and the clerical reaction. It is noteworthy that Cardinal Koenig, the Archbishop of Vienna, takes a lively interest in sport. Last January he said at a Mass in honor of sportsmen that the "church and sport are allies." In another prayer he stressed that the church had to influence the sports movements in the spirit of Catholicism.

Pan-German reactionaries and their neo-nazi "Liberation Party of Austria" are also trying to gain greater influence in sports societies, first and foremost in the aforementioned Gymnastics Society and tourists' clubs.

A fierce struggle is waged against workers' sports societies whose leaders include Communists. Thus, the People's Party launched a campaign in the press against the Olympia Sports Association in the hope of gaining control of this association

which united tens of thousands of workers and employees of the Austrian Oil Board and of weakening the influence of the Communists among oil-workers. A similar campaign was conducted against the Turbine Society at the Voith-Werke in St. Poelten with a view to removing the Communists and other progressive functionaries from the leadership. In both instances the plans fell through.

Reactionary circles, who talk a lot about "sport being above politics" but seek to turn it into an instrument of reactionary influence on the masses, have set the sportsmen against them. The attempt of the People's Party to push through a bill on sports which would place the sports movement under authoritarian leadership has twice met with failure because of the unanimous opposition of sports associations.

The Austrian Communists are resisting the attempts to channel physical culture and sport along a reactionary path. They have repeatedly pointed out the danger which reaction represents for sport and have frustrated a number of its plans. Communist deputies to Parliament, Landtags and local councils have frequently voiced the just demands of Austrian sportsmen during debates on the budget.

Communists uphold free and all-round development of sports contacts with foreign countries, since they promote friendship among peoples, better understanding and peace. The interests of peace are in line with the real interests of ordinary people in all fields and, hence, in that of sport. Peace is of paramount importance for the flourishing and development of sport.

Leo KUHN

NEW BOOKS

Below are listed a few of the many interesting Marxist works that have been published recently. The list will be continued in forthcoming issues of the magazine.

(Titles of works in other languages are given in English)

- (Facts on Socialist Construction in the People's Democracies.)
- S. Angelov. *The People's Democratic State—Main Instrument for Building Socialism in Bulgaria*. Sofia, the BCP Publishing House, 1958, 216 pp.
- V. Buduru. *Essays on Collectivization in One Region*. Bucharest, Ed. politica, 1959, 152 pp.
- Hungarian Agriculture after the Counter-Revolution*. Budapest, Kossuth konyvkiado, 1959, 288 pp.
- National Conference of Peasants and Workers in the Socialist Sector of Agriculture*. Bucharest, Ed. politica, 1958, 546 pp.
- W. Gomulka. *Speeches (September 1957-December 1958)*. Warsaw, Ksiazka i Wiedza, 1959, 556 pp.
- D. Dokov. *Executive Committees of People's Councils*. Sofia, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, 1958, 192 pp.
- Kim Il Sung. *The Building of Socialist Economy in Our Country*. Pyongyang, 1958, 568 pp.
- O. Kishazi. *The Wage System in Hungary*. Budapest, Kossuth konyvkiado, 1958, 112 pp.
- Economic and Cultural Development in the Korean People's Democratic Republic in 1946-1957*. Pyongyang, 1958, 192 pp.
- Finances in Modern Czechoslovak Economy*. Prague, Statni nakladatelstvi politicke literatury, 1959, 488 pp.
- A. Sergiyev. *The Role of the People's Democratic Dictatorship in Building Socialism in China*. Moscow, Gospolitizdat, 1958, 339 pp.
- H. Sinoyferi. *The Building of Agricultural Co-operatives*. Tirana, Ministri se bujqesise, 1958, 111 pp.
- V. Starodubrovskaya. *The Economic Aspect of the Worker-Peasant Alliance in the European People's Democracies*. Moscow, Gosplanizdat, 1959, 250 pp.
- E. Szyr. *Some Problems of Economic Development in 1959-1965*. Warsaw, Ksiazka i Wiedza, 1959, 46 pp.
- For the Consolidation and Development of Producer Co-operatives in 1959*. Budapest, Kossuth konyvkiado, 1959, 112 pp.
- W. Ulbricht. *Development of the German People's Democratic State, 1945-1958*. Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1958, 691 pp.
- I. Khajiyiliyev. *Problems of Socialist Accumulation and Consumption in Bulgaria*. Sofia, Science and Art, 1958, 218 pp.
- Economy of the Mongolian People's Republic*. Ulan-Bator, 1958, 263 pp.
- Czechoslovak Industry. Symposium*. Prague, Statni nakladatelstvi politicke literatury, 1959, 408 pp.

e
.
-
,
e
-
,
t
,
r
-
s
z
r
e
i
.

Éditions HOC TAP,
61, Rue Nguyen Du,
Hanoi.

