WORLD MARXIST REVIEW

In this issue:

Communists and Trade Unions in Canada

—*B. Magnuson*

Ideology and Utopia

—*W. Hollitscher*

VOLUME 9, NO. 7 *July 1966* 35 CENTS

WMR CONTENTS

M. REIMANN — 3 **Communist Party of Germany; ten years of clandestine struggle**

I. NORLUND — 9 **European security and the working class**

14 Theory and practice of building socialism

B. BALZHINNYAN — COOPERATIVE AGRICULTURE IN THE MONGOLIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC

20 Monopolies and the working class

B. RAMELSON — 'INCOMES POLICY' IN BRITAIN: ITS THEORY AND PRACTICE

F. LAGER — THE WORKING CLASS AND THE FIGHT FOR DEMOCRACY AT THE ENTERPRISES

H. J. KLEVEN — CHANGES IN THE CLASS STRUCTURE OF THE SCANDINAVIAN COUNTRIES

V. LOUPER — STATE-MONOPOLY CAPITALISM AND THE WORKING CLASS

44 The ideological struggle

W. HOLLITSCHER — IDEOLOGY AND UTOPIA

50 National-liberation movement today

N. CHAOUI — NEW FEATURES OF THE NATIONAL-LIBERATION MOVEMENT

O. VARGAS — PEACEFUL WAY OF ACHIEVING DEMOCRACY AND SOCIAL PROGRESS IN COSTA RICA

A. LEVKOVSKY — BURMA TODAY

67 The war in Vietnam

LE DUC THO — THE PEOPLE WILL WIN

71 Activities of the Communist and Workers' Parties

V. TROFIN — THE RULES OF THE RUMANIAN COMMUNIST PARTY

J. DUCLOS — MEETINGS AT SAN REMO

B. MAGNUSON — COMMUNISTS AND THE TRADE UNIONS IN CANADA

82 Communications and comment

H. FAGAN — THE TENTH CONGRESS OF THE SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL

86 Our diary

JAN PRASKY — IMPERIALIST INTRIGUES AGAINST REVOLUTIONARY CUBA

J. C. ACOSTA, C. BOGADO — FREE ANTONIO MAIDANA AND OTHER PATRIOTS IN PARAGUAY

WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!

World Marxist Review problems of peace and socialism

Theoretical and Information Journal of Communist and Workers' Parties

JULY, 1966
VOLUME 9
NUMBER 7

Authorized as Second Class Mail, Post Office Department, Ottawa and for payment of postage in cash. Printed in Canada.
WORLD MARXIST REVIEW is the North American edition of the monthly journal Problems of Peace and Socialism published in Prague. The North American edition is published by Progress Books, 44 Stafford St., Toronto 3, Ontario, Canada.
SUBSCRIPTION RATES: $3.50 a year. Single copies 35 cents. Bundle of five or more, 25 cents per copy. Outside Canada, add 15 cents exchange.
PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM is also published in French, Russian, Bulgarian, Czech, Dutch, German, Greek, Hungarian, Italian, Japanese, Mongolian, Polish, Rumanian, Spanish, Swedish and Vietnamese. Subscriptions to these may be obtained through Progress Books, 44 Stafford St., Toronto 3, at $3.50 a year.

Published by
PROGRESS BOOKS
44 Stafford St., Toronto 3
Ontario, Canada.

WMR *among our contributors*

MAX REIMANN	*First Secretary, Communist Party of Germany.*
BADAMYN BALZHINNYAM	*Minister of Agriculture, Mongolian People's Republic.*
BERT RAMELSON	*Member of the Political Committee, Communist Party of Great Britain.*
FRITJOF LAGER	*Member of the Executive Committee, Communist Party of Sweden.*
HANS J. KLEVEN	*Member of the Secretariat, Communist Party of Norway.*
WALTER HOLLITSCHER	*Member of the Central Committee, Communist Party of Austria.*
NICOLAS CHAOUI	*General Secretary, Lebanon Communist Party.*
ALEXEI LEVKOVSKY	*Soviet economist.*
VIRGIL TROFIN	*Secretary of the Central Committee, Rumanian Communist Party.*
HYMIE FAGAN	*British journalist.*

Communist Party of Germany: ten years of clandestine struggle

MAX REIMANN
First Secretary, Central Committee CPG

TEN YEARS AGO, on August 17, 1956, the Communist Party in the FRG was banned, its power was suppressed and property confiscated. Because of its uncompromising attitude in defense of peace, democracy and socialism the Party was always a thorn in the side of the German militarists and imperialists. Their preparations for war against other nations was always accompanied by the persecution and suppression of the Communists in their own country.

During the Hitler dictatorship the Party was banned for 12 years. This means that for nearly half the time of its existence (the Party was founded on December 30, 1918) it had to function in conditions of illegality. And always, whether under Hitler, Adenauer or Erhard, the prohibition of the Party was a prelude to the further curtailment of democratic rights; it was the internal reflection of the policy of armament, territorial claims, threats and blackmail against neighboring states in preparation for a predatory war.

The German imperialists, who batten on war and conquest, have always persecuted with blind hatred any democratic and peace movement and, in the first place, the Communist Party. In January 1919, soon after the Party was founded, they brutally murdered its founders and leaders, Karl Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg and Leo Jogiches. Tens of thousands of German workers were slaughtered by the imperialist military in the subsequent period in an attempt to drown the November revolution in blood and to restore the power of the Krupp and Flick, Siemens and Schacht exploiters. The so-called "volunteer corps" whose members killed Liebknecht and Luxemburg, ten years later became the SA and SS. The Reichswehr, which in 1923 with the help of artillery and machine-guns overthrow the elected workers' governments in Saxony and Thuringia, became the Hitler Wehrmacht. The murder of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg was followed by the murder of Ernest Thaelmann; the massacre of Communist and Left Socialist workers after the November revolution was followed by the barbarism of the Hitler concentration camps which were established not only in Germany but throughout almost the whole of Europe and which were put an end to thanks above all to the heroism and self-sacrifice of the Soviet Army under the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. One hundred and fifty thousand German Communists, i.e., half of the Party's membership in 1932, were thrown into prisons and concentration camps or executed, often without trial.

For more than ten years, Communists and other progressives have again been subjected to persecution; again arrests, imprisonment, victimization, police surveillance. As for Hitler's accomplices, the butchers from the SA and SS, they today hold high posts in the police, the Prosecutor's Office and the Courts, ministerial portfolios in the successive governments of the FRG which call themselves "Christian" and "democratic," or commanding positions in the army.

But life has shown that neither German nor international imperialism were able to halt the march of history, to prevent the

Communist Party and the Social-Democratic Party in one part of Germany from joining forces, uniting the working class, uprooting imperialism and militarism and establishing the German Democratic Republic, the first state of workers and peasants in the history of Germany. The ideas of Karl Liebknecht and Ernest Thaelmann have triumphed in that part of Germany and no persecution, no repressions will be able to prevent the people in West Germany from expressing their will for peace, democracy and social progress.

Ten years after the ban, the Federal Minister of Internal Affairs, Luecke, is obliged to admit in an official report that the Communist Party of Germany exists and is gaining influence. Thousands of young people in the FRG, in search of true democracy and a peaceful solution of the German question, are joining our Party which is carrying on the struggle in illegality. Important mass organizations, among them trade unions and youth unions, prominent personalities, including professors, art workers and representatives of the intelligentsia are coming out more and more in support of the Party's proposals and slogans.

In this national struggle for freedom the Communist Party of Germany will hold out its hand to all, whether worker or peasant, representative of the intelligentsia or the bourgeoisie, who want to make the FRG a state of peace, democracy and social progress.

II.

In banning the Communist Party the Bonn government pursued two aims: to suppress the people's desire for social progress and democracy and crush all opposition to the restoration of the Wehrmacht which is bent on once again violating the frontiers of Europe, annexing the GDR and attacking the nations bordering on West Germany.

That the banning of the Party was not merely an "internal political" measure was betrayed by Adenauer's mouthpiece, the *Rheinische Merkur* in an article published on September 18, 1953, which stated: "The big task that should be tackled quickly and purposefully is that of destroying Marxism once and for all and rendering socialism harmless not only in Germany but *throughout Europe.*"

Soon after the Party was banned in August 1956 the then Federal Minister of Internal Affairs, Dr. Schroeder (presently Minister of Foreign Affairs) stated at a press conference in Bonn: "I have been assured that other governments in the NATO orbit will also ban the Communist parties in their countries."

When one of the journalists asked Schroeder whether he believed France and Italy would join the action of the FRG he replied in the affirmative.

For Adenauer, Erhard, Strauss, Schroeder and their inspirers in the world of big business and among the generals the suppression of the Party was always the first step toward intensifying the cold war in preparation for "hot war." They resorted to every means to whip up hatred for socialism and the socialist states throughout Europe. For example, a booklet issued by the FRG government explaining the "legal grounds for prosecuting the CPG" was translated into many foreign languages and circulated among the foreign missions and embassies in Bonn.

The attack on the constitutional rights of the Communist Party clearly followed a strategic plan, elaborated in Washington and Bonn, for at the very same time the U.S. Senate ordered the proceedings of the trial of the Communist Party of the United States to be printed in German by the government's printshop in Washington and circulated in West Germany, in order to influence the Federal Constitutional Court in Karlsruhe and the West German press. During the trial, representatives of the CPG proved that the proceedings instituted by the Federal Government against the Party coincided on many points with the notorious McCarran Report.

The case presented by the government at the trial abounded in abuse and slander against the Soviet Union, the GDR and the other countries of the socialist camp. The enemies of socialism used everything they could scrape together—even the circulation of Lenin's works and the sentences passed by Nazi courts on Soviet citizens forcibly sent to Germany—as "evidence" against the Party.

In the course of the trial it became increasingly clear that the Bonn government sought to ban our Party in order to mount a general offensive not only against any democratic movement in Federal Germany, but also against international law and peace in Europe. Dr. Erich Kaufman, Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs expert, who represented the FRG government at the trial, said on December 7, 1954, that the Potsdam Agreement was a "blank cartridge," that "it should not be considered binding on the German population and the German authorities."

What was intended by this mockery of international law was revealed by Dr. Erich Kaufman himself that same day when he said: "I found no principle prohibiting aggression and intervention or anything about rejection

of war, which the CPG representative claims is clearly stated in the Agreement."

On the twenty-second day of the trial, March 9, 1955, the CP representative, Fritz Rische, former Bundestag deputy, asked the government representatives: "Does the FRG government abide by Article 26 of the Constitution?"* This led to the following exchange:

Kopf, representing the government: "I flatly refuse to answer that question."

Fritz Rische: "Allow me then to read out Article 26."

President of the Court, Wintrich: "That is not permissible."

Fritz Rische: "In that case I ask the FRG government whether it is prepared to establish normal peaceful relations with the Soviet Union."

President of the Court, Wintrich: "Question over-ruled."

The aggressive aims of the trial were again revealed when Dr. von Winterfeld, representing the FRG government, openly declared on the 47th day of the trial that the Bonn government sees the reunification of Germany as an "Anschluss with the lands of the Eastern zone."

Thus, at this trial once again appeared the notorious word "Anschluss" which Hitler used to cover his seizure of Austria, part of France, Belgium, Denmark, Czechoslovakia and Poland for his "Greater Germany." By its own words the Bonn government confirmed that the banning of the Party was to open the road to an assault on peace and international law.

That the aggressive posture of the FRG government with regard to other nations, its reactionary policy at home and the banning of the CPG are aspects of the same policy of German monopoly capital is testified by other facts.

On November 22, 1951, the communique on the meeting between Chancellor Adenauer and the foreign ministers of the United States, Britain and France, the purpose of which was to prepare the ground for the restoration and legalization of the Wehrmacht, was published in Paris. On the very same day Adenauer's government filed application for a ban on our Party with the Federal Constitutional Court.

The Court did not start proceedings until three years later—the parallel with Hitler's policy was too obvious and the public attitude too negative.

When the European Defense Community failed to materialize owing to the resistance of the French National Assembly, Bonn and Washington cooked up the Paris agreements paving the way for the restoration of the Wehrmacht. After signing the agreements Adenauer summoned Dr. Wintrich, Chairman of the Federal Constitutional Court, to Bonn. The Bundestag set the date for the debate on the Paris agreements, while the Constitutional Court fixed November 24, 1954, as the opening day of the trial to ban our Party.

And again, thanks to the arguments put forward by our Party and to the pressure of public opinion, years passed before the judges ventured to issue the ban so desired by Bonn. The summer of 1956 saw the following succession of events:

On July 6 the government majority in the Bundestag adopted a law on the transfer of the anti-Communist case to another court should the First Senate of the Federal Court fail to deliver a verdict within six weeks.

On July 7 the same majority sanctioned the establishment of the Bundeswehr and the introduction of conscription.

On July 24 the law on conscription and the above-mentioned law on the Federal Court were published in the official bulletin and thus entered into force.

On August 14 the Ministry of Defense announced that henceforth former SS leaders could serve as officers in the Bundeswehr.

On August 17 the First Senate of the Federal Constitutional Court passed the decision demanded by Adenauer. That was fourteen days before the deadline arbitrarily set by the government majority, and twenty-four days after the publication of the law on conscription placing West German young men under the command of former Hitler generals and SS leaders.

As the facts show, the ban on our Party is absolutely unlawful. The open blackmail of the court by the government, the aims it pursued—to pave the way for a policy of aggression—are evident to the whole world. And if the Bonn rulers once cherished hopes of extending their suppressive policies to Eastern and Western Europe as well, today the citizens of the FRG and especially the youth reproach them with striking a blow at democracy and the cause of peace by banning the CPG, for having placed the FRG on a par with the fasicist systems in Spain and Portugal.

The socialist countries stand on guard for peace against the aggressive and revanchist

*This Article of the Constitution states: "Actions liable to disrupt the peaceful coexistence of nations, and undertaken for such purpose, particularly with a view to preparing for aggressive war, are un-Constitutional. Such actions are punishable."

aspirations of the West German imperialists. The 23rd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union adopted decisions in accordance with which the Soviet people led by their glorious Communist Party will proceed with the building of communism, thus contributing decisively to the preservation of peace, the strengthening of the socialist world system and the consolidation of the world forces of peace. In their struggle to curb militarism and imperialism, for peace, democracy and social progress, the people of the FRG have an ally in the German Democratic Republic, the first German state of workers and peasants . Despite the ban, the Communist Party of Germany is in the front ranks of the struggle for peace, democracy and mutual understanding, holding aloft the banner of freedom and of the right to national self-determination.

III.

The arguments with which Bonn tried to substantiate its demand for a ban on our Party sound like an exercise in cynicism. Speaking on behalf of the government at the opening of the trial on November 23, 1954, State Secretary Ritter von Lex (who in 1933 was one of the Reichstag deputies who voted the emergency powers which made Hitler a dictator) said literally the following: "This party has for many years suspected the FRG government of remilitarization." Today the Bonn government has the second biggest army in NATO and the biggest military machine in the whole of Central and Western Europe. It has spent on the prepaartion of a third world war more than Hitler spent preparing the Second World War. It commands an army almost half a million strong. This government, a year and a half after the CPG was banned, got the Bundestag to agree to the demand to give nuclear weapons to former Hitler generals. Yet the Party was banned for "suspecting" the Bonn government of remilitarization!

No less cynical was the statement in the government's written demand for the ban that: "The so-called nation-wide poll in West Germany should be regarded as a serious attack on the existence of the FRG." This was a reference to the campaign against the remilitarization of West Germany and for a peace treaty conducted, with the participation of our Party, by millions of workers, intellectuals, women and young people. A more monstrous charge it would be difficult to imagine. What has happened in the years since our Party was banned speaks for itself.

Acting on the strength of the ban and of the so-called laws on the protection of the state, the police, the prosecutor's office and the special court for political offenses have examined more than 300,000 cases against FRG citizens.

According to an official report of the Federal Minister of the Interior, submitted in the spring of 1966, at the end of 1965 about 2,400 political cases were being prepared by the prosecuting authorities. On March 1, 1966, Dr. Guede, former Attorney General and now a CDU deputy, informed the Bundestag that the number of political charges laid by the police, (exclusive of the above) was 5,000 in 1961, 3,800 in 1962, 2,100 in 1963, and about 3,000 in 1964. (No figures were given for 1965.)

Under the "legal system" devised by the government and the judiciary all citizens of the GDR who belong to some party or public organization are guilty of "activities in favor of the banned CPG." Dozens of GDR citizens visiting the FRG have been arrested, tried and convicted on the basis of this system which is contrary to international law. Currently Bonn has resorted to this system in an attempt to stifle the dialogue between the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and the Social-Democratic Party of Germany: SUPG representatives invited to Social-Democratic meetings in the FRG are liable to be arrested and prosecuted for "violation of the ban on the CPG."

The ban on our Party makes it possible not only to slander any political concept undesirable to the government, but to institute "legal" proceedings against its supporters. Hundreds of newspapers have been suppressed. The ban and the so-called laws on the persecute Ernst Aust, editor-in-chief of the Hamburg weekly *Blinkfuer*, who was sentenced to one year imprisonment by the special court for political offenses.

In hundreds of cases the nomination of candidates in local elections was prohibited; prison terms were imposed on some candidates in local and Bundestag elections. The charge, again, was "violation of the ban on the CPG." By contrast, there are no obstacles to the presentation of lists by the fascist National-Democratic Party, whose chief candidates include Bundeswehr officers and government officials.

Hundreds of members of factory councils and trade union delegates were victimized and even arrested for alleged pro-Communist activity.

The new laws were employed to prohibit a nationwide poll, prepared by the Social-

Democratic governments of the *Lander*, on the nuclear armament of the Bundeswehr. Progressives from among the Social Democrats and the bourgeoisie were systematically removed from the press, radio and television. Whole programs were banned. The culmination of this campaign, which attracted attention far beyond the confines of the FRG, came on the night when, by order of the then Defense Minister Strauss, aided by the Attorney General and the Supreme Court for Political Offences, the police surrounded the building of the Hamburg magazine *Der Spiegel*, arrested its editor and staff members and confiscated the archives which contained documents exposing Strauss as a profiteer. The teamwork of the Bundeswehr, the political police and Franco's fascist state machinery enabled Strauss to arrest one of the *Spiegel* editors who was spending his vacation in Spain, and bring him to a West German prison.

To be sure, the *Spiegel* scandal demonstrated the limitations of the FRG government's power: the storm of protest compelled Strauss to resign, the arrested editors were released, and no criminal case materialized. But from this the government drew *only* one conclusion: it is now set on pushing through so-called emergency laws which would legalize methods that would abolish democratic constitutional guarantees.

Like Hitler's law granting emergency powers to the government, these laws are designed to help Bonn eliminate freedom of speech, press and assembly and the right to strike and organize, and turn factories into army barracks. Trade union leaders and university professors were quite right in condemning the emergency laws as "total mobilization for total war," and "martial law in peacetime." Like Hitler's law, these laws serve not only as a home-policy instrument for stepping up the exploitation of the working people, but also for preparing aggression against other countries. Just as Hitler's law was closely connected with the suppression of our Party, so Bonn's present conspiracy against democracy and peace is closely linked with new repressions against our Party, testifying to the anti-constitutional intentions harbored by the Erhard government and the revanchist forces behind it.

IV.

Despite the persecution, our Party has carried on unremitting struggle for peace, in defense of democracy and the Fundamental Law, for agreement with the GDR and the other socialist countries, and for ending the criminal American war against the heroic people of Vietnam. We see a major success in the fact that, despite all the red-baiting and slander, increasingly broader sections of the working class, the youth and the intelligentsia are arriving at conclusions similar to those advanced and upheld by our Party. The resolutions adopted by the Sixth Congress of the Association of German Trade Unions in 1962 and by its Seventh Congress held in May 1966 and directed against any form of "emergency legislation" represent a major victory for the democratic movement in West Germany. The fact that hundreds of university professors appealed to the trade union congress in this spirit and that intellectuals from among the democratic bourgeoisie are opposed to the plans for a putsch hatched by the government and place their trust in the working-class organizations is a significant development in German history and an important step toward building a broad alliance of all democratic forces.

The Communist Party stands foursquare on the platform of the Constitution and, jointly with the trade unions, the Social Democratic workers and the democratic bourgeoisie, defends it against the plans of the government and the generals to establish a dictatorship. The statement made by Police Minister Luecke that the Communist Party can regain legal status only if it proves its loyalty to the Constitution is downright mockery. The fact is that the government has amended the Constitution at least a dozen times and would abolish all its democratic clauses were it not for the resistance of the people, with the CPG in the forefront.

Our Party wants the Federal Republic to become a democratic and peace-loving social state. Taking into account the dangers with which the government's policy is fraught, we issued a call to our people at the Sixth Meeting of our Central Committee: "Preserve and uphold what you have!" Drawing on Marxism-Leninism, our Party is pursuing a policy aimed at preventing another war from being unleashed from German soil, and enabling our people to resist the danger of fascization and social reaction.

Unity of action of the working class and cooperation between Communists and Social Democrats has been and will always be a fundamental principle of the CPG. United action by the working class in the struggle against imperialism and revanchism, against the anti-popular and anti-national policy pursued by the CDU/CSU leaders is an earnest of the unity of all the forces of our people who want a policy of peace, democ-

racy and social security. The task of turning the FRG, now dominated by the monopolies and revenge-seekers, into a state of peace, democracy and social progress is inseparably linked with united working-class action in all spheres of life. The working class and all other working people in Federal Germany represent the overwhelming majority of our people, and they should win the right to have a say in administering the affairs of the state. This is the only road to mutual understanding between the Germans in the two German states and to achieving national unity. We therefore welcome the Open Letter of the Central Committee of the SUPG to the delegates of the Dortmund Congress of the SDPG and all members and friends of Social Democracy in West Germany, and wholeheartedly wish success to the dialogue between the two largest German parties. We know very well that the Bonn politicians, who act on orders from the monopolies, would like to prevent this dialogue from taking place. The experience of the German working-class movement shows that the monopolies want to divide the workers in order to be in a better position to dominate them. Communists, Social Democrats, trade unionists and Christian workers—all of us should draw a lesson from this, join forces against the common enemy together with the workers, peasants, intellectuals and all other working people of the German Democratic Republic.

The resolutions adopted by trade unions and by many branches of the Social Democratic Party against the emergency laws and in support of the right of the workers and trade unions to participate in management show that ample opportunity exists for organizing actions on a broad scale.

Each year more and more people take part in the Easter Marches against the atomic armament of the Bundeswehr; this year the number was roughly 130,000. So many trade union functionaries and rank and file members support the marches that the SDPG leadership has had to renounce the practice of expelling members who take part in them.

Thousands of people in the Federal Republic have held demonstrations and carried out other actions against the criminal American war in Vietnam and against Bonn's support for this barbarous act of aggression.

Among the entire population—in political parties, organizations, universities and organs of the press—there is a growing awareness that the FRG needs a different "policy toward the East," that the policy of deadly hostility with regard to the Soviet Union and the GDR has reached an impasse, and that recognition of the GDR and agreement with the socialist camp alone can avert the danger of war and bring about the peaceful solution of the German question. Whether people realize it or not the entire course of development bears out the conclusions and aims of our Party. This also adds to our strength and facilitates our activity. The Party carries on its work under the slogan: "Legally whenever possible, illegally when necessary." The official report of the Federal Minister of the Interior on the activity of our Party, which the government has had to publish in two editions this year, says the following on this score: "The CPG has been able, with varying success depending on the locality, to improve and extend its 'overt' work. At any rate the Party has kept the discussion of the ban going and, in several instances, has virtually nullified the decision of the Federal Constitutional Court. . . .

"Public discussion about lifting the ban has gone beyond the usual bounds as regards number and background of the participants. . . . Several hundred people take part in such gatherings. . . .

"Many functionaries of the CPG and members of Communist-influenced organizations sent petitions to the government and the Bundestag in 1965 demanding the repeal of the ban on the CPG and an amnesty for political offences. They succeeded in collecting signatures in non-Communist circles as well. . . . Communists have been able to get themselves elected as delegates to trade union congresses and influence other delegates."

Concerning the illegal organization of our Party the Minister says the following in his official report: "All the regional committees on the territory of the FRG have continued functioning, as have the leading bodies in many districts. . . . The CPG has been able to preserve its Party apparatus and in several cases even to extend it or to re-establish it after measures were taken to carry out the decision (i.e., after arrests)."

Thus, the adversary is compelled to admit the continuing activity and growing influence of our Party. He thus willy-nilly has to admit the bankruptcy of his own policy of proscription. The lessons of history and the ten years that have passed since the ban on the CPG demonstrate that the suppression of the Communist Party is fraught with danger for democracy in the Federal Republic and for peace in Germany and Europe. The ban on the CPG must be repealed!

On behalf of the Central Committee of the CPG I thank all the fraternal parties of the

great world Communist movement for their solidarity with us in the struggle against German imperialism and revanchism, in the fight for the legal status for our Party. We extend our gratitude to all people in Europe and elsewhere who support our just struggle.

European security and the working class

IB NORLUND

ATTEMPTS HAVE BEEN made to explain away the crisis of NATO as a chance phenomenon caused by the whims or ill-temper of some individuals. But as time goes on, less and less people believe in these explanations. Even the U.S. *Newsweek* commented recently: "If Washington sees the NATO crisis as the result of a one-man wrecking operation by Charles de Gaulle, a significant body of European opinion is increasingly coming around to the view that it is really the U.S. which is out of step with the times."

The crisis is due to the radical changes in the European and world situation. NATO has been gripped by an irreversible process of disintegration. Moreover, this is a sign that inter-state relations in Europe are reaching a point where major changes are possible. In this situation it is imperative for the working class and the public generally in the European countries to take full cognizance of the existing opportunities and act jointly to channel developments in a direction meeting the interests of the European nations.

The changes in the European scene since the establishment of NATO in 1949 have increasingly disappointed the expectations of its founders. The demagogic trappings with which this aggressive military bloc was surrounded and the military and political concepts which were to underlie its operation are vanishing into thin air.

Since 1949 the world balance of forces has radically changed, with the decisive role played by the all-round strengthening of the socialist world system and especially of the European socialist countries whose economic, political and military weight has greatly increased. It is primarily thanks to this that the plans of aggression against the socialist countries, for "rolling back communism," to use the jargon of that period, were frustrated.

The growing strength of the socialist countries was manifest also in the ending of the nuclear monopoly which the USA enjoyed in the 'forties and which played a key role in establishing NATO. The U.S. Government assured the weaker states in the NATO orbit that their participation in this aggressive bloc involved no risks inasmuch as "massive nuclear retaliation" by the USA would quickly stamp out any major military conflict. How unrealistic this was is now common knowledge. Even the U.S. military and political leaders have to some extent realized this and have renounced the "massive retaliation" strategy for the "flexible response" strategy and plans for "limited war" of the type now being fought in Vietnam. But at the same time this means that NATO is increasingly becoming an instrument for involving the European members of the bloc, and especially the weaker ones, in more or less "limited" conflicts which the USA might start or give its blessing to. And this is hardly an attractive prospect.

Moreover, the absolute and relative strengthening of socialism has had its effect on countries which were persuaded to join NATO by the bogey of a "threat from the East" allegedly hanging over Western Europe. Had this threat really existed, the growing strength and influence of the socialist countries would have heightened the danger or precipitated the realization of the "eastern plans of aggression" of which NATO propaganda made so much. Actually, however, the opposite has happened. The strengthening of socialism and the abolition of the U.S. nuclear monopoly have opened new opportunities for a detente and normalization of East-West relations. As a result, it has become even more obvious that the national interests of the European members of NATO call not for their association with the aggressive actions of the USA but for a search for an advantageous alternative through renunciation of the anti-communist taboos underlying NATO.

The balance of forces has changed also between the imperialist powers, and this has given rise to a number of new tensions and lines of cleavage, which in turn has caused fissures and rifts in the NATO set-up. Regardless of the internationalization of production and the financial links between the monopolies, the various imperialist state machines have remained power centers representing separate segments in the international policy of imperialism. The weight of the USA in the capitalist world has considerably declined, while the share of the European capitalist countries, with the exception of Britain, has increased. This has led to new complications in the economic, political and military spheres between the USA and European NATO countries, as can be seen above all from France's refusal to be a party to military integration in NATO on the grounds that "NATO no longer corresponds to the situation in the world today which radically differs from the situation in 1949 and subsequent years." (Memorandum of March 10, 1966).

Of late, it is true, the United States has again begun to strengthen its positions in the capitalist world, increasingly using NATO to safeguard its interests in the political and military spheres as well as in economic competition. This has led to a further sharpening of imperialist contradictions. For instance, U.S. military aid, as a result of which other countries became dependent on U.S. war production, has been used as a point of departure for stepping up arms exports from the USA. McNamara has in effect admitted as much. Commenting on this, the French General P.M. Gallois said that the "collective security system (NATO-**I.N.**) as it is understood today has become an instrument of economic pressure and infiltration." The question of trade in arms has evoked a sharp conflict even between the USA and West Germany whose relations on other issues are extremely close. When NATO was founded, the rulers of a number of the smaller members of the bloc, Denmark included, claimed that their membership would not involve any great increase in their military spending. Actually, however, these reassurances meant very little. Military spending has increased many times over (in Denmark more than sixfold) and represents an onerous economic burden which with the USA engaged in an "export drive," is bound to become heavier still.

Contradictions have become sharper in a number of spheres not only between the USA and the European members of NATO, but also among the latter.

The chief contradictions are associated with the revival of imperialism and militarism in the FRG, under NATO aegis. Even in its so-called "peace notes" the West German government cannot conceal the revanchist aims of its policy and continues to insist that "Germany's frontiers are still those of December 31, 1937."

The West German armed forces are now the principal contingent in the NATO system. At present NATO has at its disposal over 200,000 U.S. troops (6-8 divisions), 12-14 West German divisions, two French, two British, and half a division each from Belgium and Holland. This throws light on the real nature of the NATO armed forces and the entire alliance as such. The Washington-Bonn axis is increasingly becoming the backbone of the bloc.

This axis is the outgrowth of mutual understanding between the U.S. and West German imperialists, understanding fraught with dire consequences. It is in the interests of U.S. imperialism to use Federal Germany as a base for aggressive actions in Europe and at the same time as a shock absorber which, in the event of this aggressive policy leading to a big war, could draw part of the fire away from the USA. On its part the FRG is out to make itself indispensable to the USA in the pursuit of its imperialist policy of aggression and reckless gambles. This striving is most vividly manifested in the FRG being the most outspoken supporter of the U.S. intervention in Vietnam. The idea is to secure U.S. support for West Germany's revanchist schemes, lay hands on nuclear weapons and be in a position to use NATO to involve *the* USA and other NATO members in conflicts

it might provoke. This kind of community of interests can only evoke profound anxiety and concern among the European countries and peoples.

From the foregoing it can be seen that there are extremely serious objective grounds for the crisis of NATO. And there are other reasons as well. In all the European NATO countries specific conditions reflecting the crisis of the policy of blocs are taking shape.

The crisis of NATO is manifest not only in the objective processes. It finds also a subjective expression in the growing awareness of the people that things must and can be changed. What the future policy will be —a policy of war or a policy of peace— depends on the mass activity and militancy of the people of Europe.

A salient feature of the present situation is that the *issue of European security is an area in which the subjective and objective conditions opening a tangible opportunity for effecting far-reaching changes in inter-state relations in the interests of peace and the security of the peoples are simultaneously maturing.*

The process has been greatly accelerated by the openly aggressive policy of U.S. imperialism, a policy most glaringly expressed in the war of aggression against the people of Vietnam. Never since the foundation of NATO to the accompaniment of paeans to the USA as the "leader of the free world" has the prestige of the United States fallen so low in the eyes of the European peoples. Moral condemnation of the crimes of U.S. imperialism helps to awaken people to the dangers of association with the United States in a war bloc.

The attempts of the U.S. government to appeal to "NATO solidarity" in order to win backing for the war in Vietnam have only aggravated the situation. Washington has had to back down and act with greater caution. For the West European peoples solidarity with Vietnam has become a form of struggle for a new peaceful order in Europe, just as their striving to free themselves from U.S. domination is one of the most effective forms of support to the liberation struggle of the Vietnamese people — the biggest problem facing the U.S. imperialists today.

Indicative of the popular sentiment in Western Europe is the fact that the advocates of the continued existence of NATO must search for new arguments. The original ideological foundation of NATO policy was anti-communism in its crudest McCarthyist form. Today it has been discredited to such an extent that the NATO propagandists know that to lay the emphasis on it would ony isolate them still more. Hence they are casting about for other methods.

In recent years NATO protagonists in many countries have argued that this bloc is essential for "maintaining control over the West German army." This in itself is an admission that broad sections of the West European public see in the remilitarization of West Germany and in its policy of revenge and revision of frontiers the biggest threat to peace in Europe. It was this growing resistance to German militarism that compelled Bonn to circulate its "peace notes" designed to propound revenge-seeking policies in less bellicose terms than those which previously earned the German militarists widespread hatred in Europe. It is plain, however, that the advocates of NATO, which bears the responsibility for the resurgence of militarism in West Germany, are embarking on a highly dangerous maneuver when they try to depict NATO as a "guarantee" against German militarism, as a curb on German expansionist aspirations, when the West German imperialists have shown time and again that they are fully in a position to turn the tables on the other NATO countries and involve them in the realization of their own schemes.

In recent months some NATO politicians, among them Prime Miniser Krag of Denmark, have sought to justify the continued existence of NATO by the argument that it should be "charged with new tasks," in particular, "negotiations with the Eastern bloc and efforts towards detente in the decisive sphere." (*Information*, May 5, 1966). This too is an admission that the West European peoples are critical of NATO activities, that they do not see any reason for their continuation and want relaxation of tension and renunciation of the policy of blocs. One can hardly say that the above argument justifies the continued existence of NATO. The suggestion concerning negotiations raises the question: negotiations about what? And this in turn leads to the question of the content and nature of the system of European security.

The views expounded by NATO politicians indirectly reflect some deep-seated trends in West European public opinion. The crisis of NATO consists also in the fact that broad sections of opinion in the European NATO countries, including many of those who formerly supported it or were reconciled to its existence, are now searching, if often still gropingly, for new alternatives. These quests hinge on the problem of guarantees against the claims of German militarism and promoting cooperation between East and West.

Implicit in these popular movements is the possibility that the masses fighting for peace will exert a far greater influence on the European scene than hitherto. In this connection it should be borne in mind that the expiration of the NATO Treaty in 1969 will be a psychologically opportune moment for the search for a new state of things in Europe.

The crisis racking the entire NATO system should not, however, be seen as the collapse of the bloc. Its disintegration can be brought about only by the efforts of the peace forces. For influential elements among the rulers of the NATO countries are searching for new forms of pursuing the policy of blocs and military integration now represented by NATO.

The crisis has come to a head and one can hardly visualize the bloc continuing to exist unchanged after 1969. But the fact should not be underestimated that some of the trends now manifest stem from the striving to continue a policy of blocs which in no way helps to strengthen peace in Europe. Special attention should be paid to the evolution of the U.S.-West German plans which found expression, for one thing, in the McNamara-Von Hassel agreement of 1965 on stepping up the armament of West Germany so as to bring it to its peak in 1972-75, and in the plans for giving West Germany access to nuclear weapons. This will lead to a dangerous increase in the weight of West German imperialism within the bloc, with all the consequences this will entail.

Without doubt General de Gaulle's policy of French withdrawal from participation in the military integration has served in no small measure to deepen the crisis of NATO and to bring it to the attention of the public. This policy has played a positive role inasmuch as it posed the problem of European security in a new light, which may well provide an opportunity that should be utilized by all the forces of peace. On the other hand, de Gaulle's actions have caused certain elements in West European countries to see the general as the prime mover, the leading figure in the establishment of a new system in Europe. This is an illusion which may have negative consequences. It should be remembered that de Gaulle, who upholds the interests of French monopoly capitalism, has displayed considerable inconsistency. Only a few years ago he stood for a Paris-Bonn axis. It is similarly noteworthy that no sooner had the conflict over NATO begun than he initiated moves to draw Britain into the EEC, and started backstage negotiations with the United States.

In order that the NATO crisis might truly serve to strengthen peace and security in Europe the peoples of Western Europe must take their destiny into their own hands and utilize the opportunities open to them.

If a large part of the population of Western Europe was formerly reconciled to NATO this in most cases was not because of any particular enthusiasm for it on the part of the public but because many people saw no alternative and regarded it as a necessary evil. Today more and more people doubt that this is really so. But if this sceptical attitude and the quest for new opportunities are to become a positive force it is essential to work out an *alternative* to the policy of dividing Europe pursued in the name of NATO and the cold war, an alternative *capable of uniting* broad sections of opinion.

The quest for new ways of safeguarding European security necessitates the enlistment of diverse popular forces extending far beyond the ranks of the present peace fighters and hence capable of placing the fight for peace on a broader base than hitherto. The successful struggle for a new system of European security can hardly be waged within the framework of the existing organizations and committees; much more vigorous efforts should be exerted and far broader sections of the people brought in. To achieve this the alternative offered as a basis for unity should point the way to the solution of precisely those problems which above all agitate the masses; it should convince the people that it can be realized. *Hence the alternative should be worked out through discussion on a bigger scale than ever before among the European peoples themselves, and should link the struggle for peace and the struggle for democracy in a new and imaginative way.* There are plenty of indications that it is possible to organize such a discussion now. At any rate, this is evident from the example of the northern countries where many new sections of the public have begun to take an active part in discussing the prospects for the North after NATO.

It is assumed that this mass discussion and the enlistment of new forces will produce new ideas and proposals concerning the kind of order that might be established after the rejection of NATO and the policy of blocs, in order that the European nations might live in peace and security and preserve their independence. This confronts the working class of the European countries and its parties with a historic task, and lays upon them a historic responsibility.

In the course of the development of monopoly capitalism the national role and respon-

sibility of the working class have steadily grown and become increasingly decisive. The experience of the struggle against Hitler fascism is a striking case in point. Developments since then have merely brought the national role of the working class into still sharper focus. Averting nuclear war and ensuring peaceful relations between independent and equal nations is in our time the inevitable foundation of any genuinely national policy in Europe, and it is the duty of the working class in any country to initiate the elaboration of such a policy.

Of course this can only be done by taking account of the specific features, traditions and problems of each nation. But it cannot be done if these are allowed to obscure the other issues involved. The major problems of securing the genuine progress of the people can only be solved jointly. This is something that is becoming increasingly patent with the aggravation of the NATO crisis and the growing urgency of the problems of European security. By their very nature these are problems that can be solved only by the combined efforts of the nations concerned. This makes internationalism an extremely urgent and practical policy.

The common striving to build a new order of peace and security in Europe should be an integral part of the democratic and anti-monoply struggle which the revolutionary working-class movement in all the capitalist countries of Europe regards as the most correct path for their people to take. In certain conditions it is precisely these strivings which engender the greatest exertion of revolutionary energy by the working class and the people generally. There is every ground for the Communist parties of Europe to join efforts in order to work out approaches that would make the public discussion already underway fruitful and would open up new perspectives.

On some continents the peoples have long been building solidarity movements or otherwise rallying forces around common issues. Is there any reason why Europe should be an exception in this respect? Certainly its problems are no narrower in scope, no less important or less urgent.

Yet for many years those who most of all laid claim to speaking on behalf of Europe included in this concept only the capitalist countries, or some of them. Hence, when they spoke of "European unity," they actually had in mind the division of Europe. And when they spoke about "European common action" they had in mind separatist action, corresponding to the interests of the West European and, occasionally, U.S. monopolies.

The fact is, however, that more than half of Europe's population lives not under capitalism but in the conditions of the socialist system. One cannot, therefore, speak of any "European order," "European policy" or "European problems" without taking into account this decisive fact — a fact which makes it possible for Europe to avoid being turned once again into a seat of war. It is this fact which has highlighted the futility of the aggressive NATO policy, and which makes the idea of a system of European security a practicable one. Moreover, it opens new perspectives for the whole of Europe in other areas as well.

The existence of a socialist Europe is a stimulus to action for many of those who are now searching for a solution to the problems of security in our part of the world. The European socialist countries have advanced, jointly or singly, many proposals aimed at creating a real European security system. But many in Western Europe are not acquainted with these proposals or have a distorted idea of them. Yet the fact is that more and more people are evincing an interest in the solutions offered by the socialist countries in the matter of safeguarding European security.

The West European Communist parties have always sought to bring home to the people in general and the working class in particular the significance of the achievements of socialism from the standpoint of the defense of their own interests. This work has been generally recognized as an integral component of the activities of the Communist movement. Consequently, the growing interest in problems of European security prompts people to repose new hopes in the Communist parties and the role they can play in achieving mutual understanding with regard to the ways and means of building a new type of inter-state relations in Europe.

The present situation poses, therefore, some special tasks before the Communist parties of both Eastern and Western Europe. They are expected—to a greater extent than is openly admitted—to take the initiative and to put forward proposals promoting security on the continent. Clearly, these proposals will be all the more weighty if they are put forward as the sum of the experience and convictions of all the European Communist parties.

For those in Western Europe who are searching for new ways forward it is highly important to visualize the *overall prospect* of a system of European security. Hence it is necessary not only to advance suggestions

concerning partial measures towards such a system but also to outline the basic principles and forms of an *overall* security system.

A European security system should be based on the realization and guarantee of peaceful coexistence of independent countries regardless of differences in social systems.

A European security system would put an end to the division into blocs which was ushered in with the establishment of NATO. From the very outset the socialist countries warned against the pernicious consequences of the policy of blocs and emphasized that all of post-war history had left no doubt that the existing frontiers could be guaranteed only through collective security. Article 11 of the Warsaw Treaty declares: "In the event of the establishment in Europe of a system of collective security and the conclusion with this object of an All-European Treaty, towards which the Contracting Parties will invariably strive, the present Treaty shall become null and void the day the All-European treaty enters into force." This is the way that must be followed. *Peace in Europe must rest on guarantees stemming from the principles of collective security.*

Needless to say, the actual realization of a system of collective security involves a number of difficulties engendered by the national problems confronting the various countries, problems which can be solved only through profound examination and agreement. Here we should like to draw attention to some of the more general aspects of the question.

Any system of European security would hinge largely on the *German question.* The most direct threat to European peace emanates from the reactionary and militarist forces in the FRG, which can provoke a new war. As pointed out above, the peoples of all the countries of Europe are alarmed by the revenge-seeking policy of Federal Germany and want guarantees against new attacks and violations of the peace on the part of German militarism. The people of the GDR are specially in need of such guarantees. These guarantees can be given only on the basis of collective security. It would be natural to link them with the conclusion of a peace treaty with the two German states. Under all circumstances the system of collective security should incorporate principles which would compel West German imperialism to renounce its policy of revision of frontiers and aggression.

Needless to say, a collective security system cannot be built overnight. Consequently, *transitional measures* should be undertaken. A number of proposals have already been made on this score, such as the conclusion of a non-aggression pact between the members of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization, and the creation of nuclear-free zones and zones with limited armaments. Such measures should not, however, be regarded as a substitute for general system of European security, but should be incorporated in it and serve as an instrument for achieving it.

The question of *guaranteed neutrality* is of particular importance for a number of nations, including the Northern countries. It would be a good thing to make neutrality an element of the overall system of collective security. It could also be linked with a nuclear-free status and reduction of armaments. On the basis of the existing proposals consideration could be given to creating a chain of states with this status existing across Europe from North to South.

Europe is faced with an epoch-making choice. Time and again this part of the world, endowed with a rich cultural heritage and possessing highly developed productive forces, has been plunged into war and devastation because of imperialist contradictions. Were this to happen again the consequences would indeed be catastrophic. Realization of this reinforces the striving to make use of all the existing possibilities for preventing such an eventuality.

And this makes it incumbent on the European working class to act as the vanguard of the struggle for European security.

Cooperative agriculture in the Mongolian People's Republic

B. BALZHINNYAM

THE FIFTEENTH CONGRESS of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party which met last month to outline a concrete program for completing the building of socialism in our country, pointed to the triumph of the cooperative system of agriculture as the greatest achievement of the Mongolian people in their transition from feudalism to socialism without going through capitalism. The credit for this achievement belongs to the MPRP and its untiring work over the years to direct the working arats onto socialist lines, creatively to apply Lenin's cooperative plan in the specific conditions of Mongolia.

With the abolition of the monarchy and the proclamation of the people's republic in 1924, the people of Mongolia tackled the difficult task of non-capitalist development and building a new, socialist economy. By the beginning of the thirties the people's democratic state had concentrated in its hands the basic economic levers: the state bank, issue of national currency, and foreign trade monopoly. The initial steps were taken in building a state industry and transport system.

Mounting revolutionary uplift among the working people and the gradual strengthening of the state and cooperative sectors of the economy enabled the people's government to carry out in 1929-32 the paramount task of the anti-feudal revolution — the expropriation of big feudal property — while in the main depriving foreign commercial and usurers' capital of its foothold. To solve the problem of Lamaism, the Party pursued a line accelerating differention among the lamas, with a view to isolating the feudal-theocratic upper crust from the mass of the lower and middle strata and to enlisting the latter in socially useful labor by helping them to set up their own households.

By the late thirties industry had emerged as an independent branch of the economy and accounted for nearly 20 per cent of the total output of our national economy. Industrial development was accompanied by the crystallization of a national working class. The process was a unique one, the Mongolian working class taking shape not in capitalist conditions but in the course of the rise and development of a national industry based on public ownership of the means of production.

At the same time important changes took place in agriculture, in which a socialist sector emerged in the form of state farms, machine stations providing haymaking equipment, and elementary forms of producers' cooperation.

In discussing agricultural cooperation, it should be mentioned that in the early thirties mistakes committed by the leftist elements then in the leadership of the Party seriously retarded the development of the cooperative movement among the arats. These elements misinterpreted the political activity of the arats, who rallied around the Party to combat the feudal element, as a sign that the arats were ready and eager to embark on agricultural cooperation, and, closing their eyes to the fact that the conditions were not yet ripe for large-scale collectivization and ignoring the specific situation in the country, began in 1930-31 to introduce higher forms of collective farming by administrative compulsion.

The people of Mongolia had to pay a heavy price for this leftist "play" at cooperation, for the attempt made to skip an uncompleted stage of the revolution caused discontent

among the arats and had grave economic and political consequences. The number of cattle — the principal wealth of the country—dropped sharply, and, what was still more dangerous, the political activity of the arats declined.

The Central Committee and Central Control Commission of the Party, meeting at an extraordinary session in June 1932, exposed and condemned the leftist excesses and distortions. Defining the meaning and tasks of the people's revolution, the session went on record that the Mongolian People's Republic was an anti-feudal, anti-imperialist, people's democratic state which was laying the foundations for gradual transition to the path of non-capitalist development.

After the mistakes made in the sphere of agricultural cooperation, the Party had to reassess its approach to the popularization of collectivism among the arat masses; it had to find forms of collective endeavor best adapted to our conditions and to prove their advantages to the people. The Ninth Congress, held in 1934, called for all-out support of the efforts of the arats to increase their herds while encouraging the establishment of the simplest forms of cooperative associations for joint effort in carrying out the most urgent and labor-consuming types of work in livestock raising. The Party explained that such cooperatives were not collective farms, that they did not call for ownership of the means of production in common but provided only for the pooling of labor power which would make the herders' work easier.

The first arat associations were formed at a time when the economy generally was on the upgrade as the foundations of socialism were being built. They were a manifestation of the strengthening of the alliance of the working class and the working arats, an indication that the latter were voluntarily espousing socialism.

Since Mongolia's agriculture at the time consisted of 200,000 individual herdsmen's households leading a nomadic mode of life, the first cooperatives engaged in livestock, such as haymaking, building shelters for cattle, and digging wells.

The initial cooperatives were small and weak, with 10 to 20 members and no more than 100 head of jointly owned livestock, the equivalent of the national average per individual herdsman. As a rule, the members did not pool their cattle, the basic means of production, the jointly owned herds being acquired mostly through purchase from other sources. As late as 1947, when there were 106 producers' associations, each united on the average only 60 households and had 400 head of jointly owned livestock, whereas the members' personal herds averaged 6,000 head in each association. This was a period when the cooperatives were just beginning to get on their feet and the arats were still cautiously feeling their way about. These pioneer cooperatives were still of a semi-socialist type.

The Party did not seek to force things, but displayed caution and restraint in order to ensure that the cooperatives were built on a strictly voluntary basis, with no pressure from the top, and that the arats should become convinced by their own experience of the advantage of cooperation. The result was a gradual growth of the number of cooperatives, which also gained strength both organizationally and economically. During the first five-year plan (1948-52) the number of producer associations increased to 165, with a membership of 9,000 households and 280,000 head of jointly owned livestock. But this was still only 5 per cent of the total number of arat households and the jointly owned stock, only 1.2 per cent of the country's total.

Important steps to promote the cooperative movement were taken in conformity with the decisions of the 12th Congress of the MPRP (1954). This congress, reflecting the social changes that had taken place in the country and steering a firm course towards the socialist reconstruction of agriculture, called in its directives for the second five-year plan (1953-57) for a substantial increase in publicly owned livestock through voluntary pooling of cattle by the cooperative members and as a result of the natural increase of the common herds. With a view to working out concrete measures to strengthen the cooperatives, the first congress of the arat cooperators was held in 1955, at which the model statutes of the agricultural associations (as the producers' associations were now called) were approved. The congress was a milestone in the cooperative movement; it gave new impetus to the political and labor activity of the arats, who now gravitated more than ever to the cooperatives. During the second five-year plan the number of agricultural associations quadrupled, to 678, while their membership increased to 152,000 and jointly owned stock more than 18-fold. They also grew in size, the average membership rising to 105, and the average number of head of livestock to 7,700, or 4.8 times the 1952 figure By the beginning of 1958, 35 per cent of the country's arat households were members of cooperatives and 26 per cent of all livestock and jointly owned. The movement, reflecting as it did the vital interests of the masses, spread to all districts.

The socialist form of agricultural endeavor had developed into a powerful factor in the country's life.

Experience showed that agriculture could be advanced to a higher stage only on the basis of radical socialist reconstruction, for which the conditions had already become ripe. Consequently, the 13th Congress of the Party (1958) posed the epoch-making task of bringing the basic mass of the arats into the cooperatives within five years, with the emphasis on the continued strict observance of the voluntary principle and the organizational and economic strengthening of the existing cooperatives.

The decisions of the 13th Congress were warmly supported by the entire people. Within six months 55.6 per cent of the arat households had joined cooperatives, and within a year, 70 per cent. By the spring of 1959 the percentage reached 90. The March 1959 meeting of the Central Committee went on record that the Congress decision had been successfully carried out in one year. This means that socialist production relations were now dominant in all spheres of the economy.

This achievement highlighted the important role played by the Party as the organizer and inspirer of the masses, as well as the prestige it enjoyed among the people. It was striking evidence of the maturity and wisdom of the Party, the tried and tested vanguard of the people, which, proceeding from the specific conditions of the country, correctly charted the way ahead and led the nation to a momentous victory—the creation of the cooperative system of agriculture.

At the same time, through the spring and summer months of 1959, many cooperatives merged into bigger associations. Out of the 727 cooperatives functioning on September 1, 1959, 389 large socialist cooperative agricultural associations were formed. The average association now had a membership of 475 households and 43,000 head of commonly owned cattle. Together with the livestock belonging to the members personally, the associations averaged about 60,000 head of cattle, while the biggest exceeded the 100,000 mark. At present Mongolia has 289 big agricultural associations.

* * *

The solution of the complex socio-economic problem of directing the hundreds of thousands of small individual households scattered throughout the vast expanses of Mongolia onto socialist lines called for a wide range of political, economic, financial, organizational, social, cultural and other measures. The most important levers available to the state to ensure the purposeful development of agricultural production were its tax and purchasing policy, the financial and credit system, and the state agricultural enterprises such as the state farms and machine stations.

The state tax and purchasing policy was always based on the class policy of the Party aimed at upholding the interests of the poor and middle sections of the arats. For instance, all the livestock tax legislation (with the exception of the 1941 law[1]) based taxation on the quality and kind of livestock in the arat household. Until 1950 the livestock tax was proportional, but in that year a law was passed classifying all arat households in six groups according to the stock they owned, with a progressively increasing tax rate per head of cattle. The sixth and wealthiest group paid several times more than the first.

Tax policy developed further with the 1954 law on the livestock tax which reduced overall taxation roughly by 25 per cent and set more differentiated rates by classifying the arat households in ten groups. As a result the poorer households paid less and the wealthier more in taxes. The rate for members of agricultural cooperatives was reduced 10 per cent.

Beginning with January 1960, when most herders had joined cooperatives, the agricultural associations and their members were completely exempted from the livestock tax. Since then the cooperatives have paid a 12 per cent income tax on their cash income, or slightly more than half of what they formerly paid in livestock tax.

It should be mentioned that the livestock tax never was the main state revenue item. With the development of the socialist sector and the steady increase of revenue from it, the share of budget income from the livestock tax gradually declined from 35 per cent in 1928 to 16.3 per cent in 1942, 14 per cent in 1953 and only 2.5 per cent in 1959.

The state purchasing system, the second aspect of state economic policy in agriculture, likewise has been of a class nature. Until 1949 purchases of livestock produce, both on the spot and through contracts, were wholly on a voluntary basis. In 1941, 1944 and 1947 compulsory deliveries of meat, wool and milk respectively were stipulated. The class nature of this system was manifest in the fact that arat households with less than 10 head of livestock were exempted from compulsory deliveries of meat to the state and the delivery quotas were progressively differentiated according to the size of the household. Members of cooperatives were required to provide 10 per cent less meat than individual house-

[1]Taxation under the 1941 law was based on income.

holds, and for herders joining cooperatives delivery quotas were in inverse proportion to the number of cattle they contributed to the common herds. Moreover, the rates for the cooperatives were made proportional without differentiation according to the size of their common herds.

The tax and purchase policy was, then, directed at restricting and squeezing out the capitalist elements, on the one hand, and rendering state aid to the poor and middle arats and the new, socialist form of farming, on the other. An important role in carrying out the economic policy of the state in the countryside is played by the state farms and state-owned machine stations providing equipment to the livestock breeders. In the beginning they primarily popularized collective labor and offered a living example of the advantages of large-scale socialist economy over small private arat economy.

The state farms were the first to emerge. Today they are large diversified enterprises equipped with the latest in machinery and play an important educational role, popularizing the experience of the best farmers and helping to introduce scientific methods.

Stations supplying haymaking equipment were first established in 1937. At first they performed work under contract for the arats and played a big part in promoting livestock raising, especially by helping to introduce new methods of laying in stocks of hay. In time they also offered machinery for hire. The hire-service depots were later reorganized into haymaking centers with their own draught animals. Many of the machine stations eventually became state farms. Until 1945 these stations served individual arat households exclusively and then began to lay in stocks of hay for the cooperatives on a contract basis. Since 1950 their prime purpose has been to build up state reserves of hay and other fodder to take care of emergencies arising from our rigorous climate conditions.

The haymaking stations suffered from some serious short-comings due to the seasonal nature of their work. The cooperatives could expect tangible assistance from them only at hay-making time. The rapid growth of the cooperatives, however, called for more organizational and technical assistance from the state. Consequently, reorganization of these stations into centers providing equipment needed in livestock farming generally was begun in 1958. This was a step forward in introducing advanced agricultural techniques and increasing state aid to the cooperatives. In view of the need for more aid of this order, the state undertook to cover 50 to 80 per cent of the cost of the work performed for cooperatives by the stations. There was also a considerable expansion of expert assistance to the cooperatives in promoting both livestock raising and crop cultivation and improving the organization of joint labor and increasing its productivity through mechanization.

The part played by the machine stations in the socialist reconstruction of agriculture and developing its productive forces thus steadily grew. Today Mongolia has 38 such stations, with an average of 63 tractors (in terms of 15-horsepower units) 14 combines and 7 motor trucks, and a great deal of other equipment. They serve more than 60 per cent of the cooperatives and play the leading part in rendering organizational and technical assistance to the latter.

The state credit system has been an important factor in promoting cooperation and strengthening the cooperative associations. When the revolution was at the stage of general democratic tasks credits were channeled wholly to aiding the poor and middle arats and raising their living standard. They were given loans for building cattle shelters, digging wells. For the purchase of pedigree cattle, horse-drawn implements, seed, feed, etc.

The system was developed further at the socialist stage of the revolution. With the growth of the socialist sector the state was able to expand credits to the agricultural associations and arat households. In 1940-60 the total sum of long-term and short-term credits to individual arats increased nearly tenfold while credits to cooperatives went up more than 110 times. This is a good illustration of how our state economic policy is aimed at giving every support to agricultural cooperation.

Now that the agricultural associations have become big and steadily expanding enterprises mastering new branches of production, more credits repayable over longer periods of time have been made available. There is no doubt that the credit system is an important economic lever in the hands of the state. It has played a big part in strengthening the cooperatives and will continue to do so in the future.

* * *

The socio-economic changes in Mongolian agriculture were effected in the course of acute class struggle and were attended by great difficulties. The feudal element and the ecclesiastical top crust which were being ousted from the historical scene fought tooth and nail against the people's government, repeatedly launching frenzied attacks against

the new system. At the democratic stage of the people's revolution they engineered a number of counter-revolutionary conspiracies, capitalizing on the religious sentiments of the more backward arats and appealing to their prejudices in order to sow fear of all innovation. The emerging bourgeoisie, who sought to steer the country along capitalist lines, took an active part in the struggle waged by the feudal class to combat the people's strivings. Moreover, the counter-revolutionary forces within the country enjoyed the support of international imperialists.

It is to the credit of the pioneer cooperators that, in spite of all the difficulties and lack of experience, they trusted the Party, set up cooperatives, withstood the onslaughts of the class enemies, carried the masses with them and ensured the triumph of the cooperative system.

The biggest difficulty which the cooperators had to face from the very outset was the elaboration of the correct forms of organization and remuneration of social labor. In the early years, when such a form of organization of joint labor as the production team had not yet been evolved, the members of the cooperatives mostly carried out separate assignments. But since the bulk of the livestock remained in the arats' personal herds, there often was a shortage of people to take care of the common herds, small though they were. Because of this, the associations frequently hired workers from the outside. Many of the cooperatives were thus only nominal members, being occupied mainly with their private households and rarely taking part in joint labor.

As the cooperatives developed, constant attention was paid to improving the organization of labor, enlisting all members in joint production and making proper use of the skills and inclinations of each worker. In the early years payment for work was on a monthly or daily basis or in accordance with the number of head of jointly owned cattle tended by each cooperator, But none of these forms were closely enough geared to the results of labor, the produce turned out. A form of remuneration closer to that employed now was the payment of 60 per cent of the income accruing from a given type of work to the cooperative member doing the job and 40 per cent to the common fund of the association. This was the practice until 1954, when a more progressive system was introduced based on the work-day unit as the main yardstick of the quantity and quality of labor invested in social production.

Considerable difficulties were caused by the shortage of personnel, especially the lack of leading workers. In order to provide the agricultural associations with qualified managers dedicated to socialism the Party repeatedly sent large groups of Party members and specialists to work in them. At the same time permanent courses training cooperative chairmen and their assistants, secretaries of Party organizations, accountants, team leaders, etc., were organized. Animal husbandry experts, veterinaries, agronomists, mechanization experts, economists and other graduates of specialized secondary and higher schools were likewise sent to work in the countryside. Today the cooperatives are reasonably well provided with trained personnel and attention is now mainly devoted to improving the methods of their work and their political and professional knowledge.

Accounting also presented considerable difficulties to the cooperatives. In the early period the lack of adequate bookkeeping complicated the struggle against private property instincts, which made themselves felt at every step. For instance, when contributing livestock to the common herds the arats tended to leave the best animals for themselves, and while herding cattle they would change the worst animals in their personal herds for the best in the common herds; they frequently used fodder belonging to the cooperative to feed their own cattle and even appropriated cooperative produce. The Party and state bodies conducted a vast amount of work to organize proper bookkeeping and strict accounting in all areas of cooperative activity. A very important role in this was played by the Party branches in the cooperatives.

The Party carried on extensive work to reeducate the former private proprietors in the spirit of collectivism and a socialist approach to public property and labor in order to enlist them in active participation in building socialism, to help the arats get rid of views and customs implanted by the old, feudal system, to overcome their private-property mentality, conservatism and resistance to the new, and to draw them into conscious creative, collective labor.

Needless to say, the difficulties encountered cannot be wholly attributed to the inexperience of the cooperative members or to subversion on the part of hostile elements. Objective factors such as the natural and economic conditions, habits and customs, and the parallel existence of several economic formations played their part.

It must be frankly admitted that the Party, state and agricultural bodies were equally inexperienced in directing the cooperatives. But

they were guided by Lenin's cooperative plan and sought creatively to apply Soviet experience to the Mongolian conditions. At the same time it was necessary to be constantly on guard against manifestations of bureaucracy, conservatism and formalism on the part of some Party and state functionaries who often decided problems not from the standpoint of the interests of the state as a whole but from narrow, parochial positions.

However, the Party and the people's government coped with all the difficulties and foiled the attempts made by hostile elements to retard and undermine the cooperative movement and thereby hinder the country's advance towards socialism. Regardless of all the machinations of their enemies both at home and abroad, the people of Mongolia, closely rallied around their tried and tested vanguard, the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, built a cooperative system of agriculture, thereby solving the most difficult task of the socialist revolution — that of winning the small producers over to socialism. This was accomplished without expropriation of the wealthy arats, who voluntarily joined with the mass of poor and middle herders in the cooperatives.

As a result of the implementation of Lenin's cooperative plan changes of vast revolutionary significance have taken place in the Mongolian People's Republic. The arats, the most numerous class in our society, have become the builders of socialism without having experienced capitalist exploitation. An integral socialist system of economy has been established and the economic foundations for the rise of exploitation of man by man have been finally eradicated. The decisive proconditions of this grand victory of the Mongolian people and their revolutionary party were the creation and development of a national industry, modern transport and communication services and socialist agricultural enterprises, the emergence of an industrial working class which Mongolia never had before, the thriving of national culture and the growth of the revolutionary consciousness of the arats.

* * *

Mongolia's agricultural associations have developed into large socialist farms with an average of 300,000 hectares of land, 63,600 head of jointly-owned livestock, six motor trucks and four or five tractors each, not to speak of other agricultural equipment, electric power plants and other production facilities. At the central settlements of these associations schools, clubs, hospitals, hotels, bathhouses and other public services have been built. In many localities inter-cooperative enterprises are being set up at which motor transport, construction and other equipment is concentrated. The cooperatives have become organizationally and economically far stronger, as can be seen from the results of their work. For example, in 1961-65 the jointly-owned herds increased by 2,600,000 head and their share in the country's total reached 77 per cent. Cultivated area in the cooperatives increased in the five years 2.5-fold, their basic assets 2.7-fold, and cash income more than doubled. Whereas in 1960 there were 294 cooperatives with an annual income of less than one million tugriks, now there are only 15, the average annual income of the cooperatives amounting to 1,700,000 tugriks. As a result, the members' money income went up in the same period nearly threefold. The common economy of the associations accounts for 84 per cent of the meat and nearly 70 per cent of the wool purchased by the state.

From the foregoing it can be seen that the agricultural associations are paying the most serious attention to building themselves up, that they are on the right road and have every possibility of steadily increasing their output. The cooperative system is gaining in strength, and its vast latent reserves are being tapped. Mongolia's socialist economy has laid a strong and stable foundation for the continued rapid growth of the productivity of labor and expansion of the production of meat, milk, wool, grain and other produce and, consequently, will be able more and more fully to satisfy the need for food for the population and raw materials for industry.

'Incomes policy' in Britain: its theory and practice

BERT RAMELSON

THE PRICES AND INCOMES Bill was first introduced into the House of Commons by George Brown, Deputy Minister and Head of the Department of Economic Affairs, with the backing of Harold Wilson, Prime Minister, James Callaghan, Chancellor of the Exchequer and other senior Ministers, just before Parliament was dissolved and the General Election announced for March 31, 1966. This Bill marks a new stage in the efforts of the ruling class over the two postwar decades to impose an "incomes policy." These efforts are to be observed in the developed capitalist countries in general and in Britain in particular.

This article aims to define what is meant by an "incomes policy" and to examine:

a) Why in the advanced capitalist countries, at this given historical period, the concept of an "incomes policy" has become the most popular theory of wages.
b) The validity or otherwise of the arguments used in support of this theory.
c) The various stages in which the Government has endeavored to persuade the workers voluntarily to accept policies of wage restraint and the growing resistance this has evoked.
d) The measures to which the Government has resorted in order to prepare the stage for the imposition by force of law of an "incomes policy."

There has been a glut of phrases on wages in the postwar capitalist world, of which "incomes policy" is the current cant. In Britain its predecessors have been national wages policy, wage freeze, wage restraint, wage pause — all having the same purpose: to disguise the real objective of the ruling class in regard to wages. This objective is *to achieve state regulation of wages at a level below that which could be attained by the trade unions on the basis of their present organized strength in free collective bargaining with the employers.*

THE THEORY OF "INCOMES POLICY"

It is not an accident that the "incomes policy" has become the pet theory of most bourgeois economists. There was a time when the very thought of the State interfering with the free play of the market as the only possible determinant of wages and earnings was anathema to the bourgeois economists. But times have changed, and with them bourgeois attitudes to State intervention to frustrate the free play of the market. What is the essence of the change?

In the past the reserve army of labor—the unemployed—was a built-in feature of the capitalist system. The commodity, labor power, was more or less permanently a glut on the market. In these circumstances of supply in excess of demand, the employer, as purchaser of the commodity, was able to use the conditions of the market to his advantage. In bargaining with the workers as represented by the trade unions, the sellers of the commodity, the conditions of the market favored the employing class. Therefore "no State interference with the free play of the market in determining wages" was the employers' rallying cry.

And the bourgeois economists willingly obliged by developing theories and laws designed to prove that State interference in free bargaining between the unions and the em-

ployers would be destructive alike of the economy and of democracy.

However, for the past two decades in a number of advanced capitalist countries, and particularly in Britain, there has existed a situation unique in capitalist history. Since 1946 (except for brief periods) far from there being a reserve army of unemployed with three workers chasing one job, the reverse has been the case. There has been a general shortage of labor power and a chronic shortage of skilled labor in particular.*

For the first time in the history of capitalist society this has led to the position that the seller of the commodity labor power (the trade unions) has the advantage in bargaining with the purchoser (the employer).

This situation provides the best setting for advances on the economic front within the confines of capitalist society. The higher the standard won, the mare powerful become the forces for further advance.

The true nature of the State (in this connection it is irrelevant whether there is a Labor or a Conservative Government) as the agent of the ruling class now emerges and begins to assert itself. It rushes to the aid of the employers, who may be bested in free bargaining with the trade unions.

The technocrats and the theorists hastened to perform their role, to rationalize the interests of the ruling class in the form of high-sounding theories about society in general and economics in particular. What if the new theories contradict all that the earlier theories regarded as being sacred and inviolate? Why worry, after all memories are short.

What, then, are some of the "brave new theories" presently advanced to justify the "incomes policy"?

1. AN "INCOMES POLICY" IS NECESSARY TO HALT INFLATION

Undoubtedly, this is the most widely used argument. It takes note of the indisputable fact that in Britain during the postwar years there has been a generally mild inflationary tendency. It has been well below an annual four per cent on the average.

However, the argument exaggerates the extent of the inflation, then ascribes it, without a tittle of evidence, to high wages, and proposes the cure: an "incomes policy."

In my view, there are four factors which combine to create the conditions conductive to inflation — none of which is related to wages.

i) *The Huge Arms Expenditure.* The expenditure on arms is unprecedently high. This expenditure is being undertaken in the postwar years in conditions when the organization of the working class is such that it makes it politically inexpedient and impractical to cover the full cost of armaments by increased taxation on the working class. This is bound to have an inflationary effect.

ii) *Changes in Composition of the Labor Force.* There has been a consideralbe increase in the proportion of workers in non-productive enterprises to productive workers. This is a new feature of capitalism and creates a built-in tendency to inflation.

iii) *Monopoly Prices.* The high degree of monopoly development in the postwar means that the prices of an ever-growing number of commodities are less subject to the free play of the market. They are permanently held at high monopoly price levels.

iv) *Deflationary Budgets.* The deliberate action of all the postwar Governments, Labor and Tory alike, to try and outdo each other in reducing demand. This they have done by introducing deflationary budgets. Paradoxically, deflationary budgets using fiscal means to reduce demand by raising the cost of living have contributed to the growth of inflation.

2. THE CHOICE — UNEMPLOYMENT OR AN "INCOMES POLICY."

More and more the threat of unemployment is used in an attempt to get the workers to accept wage restraint. Using the same unproved assumptions, namely that the rate of inflation is leading to bankruptcy and the cause of it is high wages, the solution is often presented as a choice between lower wages or Government action to re-create a reserve army of unemployed.

Callaghan's 1965 deflationary budget did not lead to increased unemployment as the Government and economic "theorists" fully expected, and as Selwyn Lloyd's less deflationary budget of 1961 did. This was because the working class was politically mature enough not to fall for the "incomes policy." They pressed ahead, achieved higher earnings and thus maintained a high level of demand and employment. Had they refrained from winning higher earnings, the deflationary budget would have meant a *cut* in real wages and a drop in *real* demand, a contraction of the economy and a rise in the unemployment figure last winter.

---

*For an explanation of how this has arisen, see symposium in **Problems of Peace and Socialism** No. 11, 1965. In particular the article by L. Urban.

3. WE MUST PAY OUR WAY

In this group of arguments, the starting point is the well-known fact of the chronic crisis in Britain's balance of payments.

The cry is to bridge the gap by converting the present trade deficit into a surplus big enough to cover the costs of foreign military bases and the export of capital, and build enough reserves to retain the £ as a world currency.

To achieve this all that is needed, we are told, is dramatically to increase our exports. To enable us to do so, the argument runs, more must be made available for export, by reducing home consumption. To reduce home consumption, we must reduce home demand and the quickest way to do so is to cut real earnings—*ergo:* "incomes policy."

But it is not enough to have the availability of increased exports, we must be able to sell them. Then we are told (again without an atom of evidence) that our export figures are poor because we are not competitive. We are not competitive because our costs are high. Our costs are high because our wages are high, and so we are back again to the cure-all panacea — "incomes policy."

What are the facts? The first thing to note is that more than *the whole* of the balance of payments deficit in the postwar years (£350 million in 1965) is accounted for by expenditure on military bases abroad (£350 million in 1965) and export of capital (approximately £250 million in 1965).

Furthermore, so long as Britain insists on maintaining sterling as an international currency, she will be vulnerable to speculation against the £, thus aggravating the deficit.

So long as British policy is based on a vast foreign expenditure well beyond her means, she will not be able to pay her way. She will always be compelled to run to foreign bankers (whether in Zurich or New York) and, consequently, will have less control over her own affairs, both economic and foreign.

It is chasing a will-o'-the-wisp to try and increase exports in the present international situation on a scale called for by the National Plan, which calls for a trading deficit of £534 million in 1964 to be reduced to £50 million by 1970.

It lies completely within the power of a British Government to convert the chronic deficit in the balance of payments into a surplus. This can be done by closing her foreign bases abroad and by using the available investment capital to modernize her own industry. The annual savings in foreign currency would be considerably more than the average deficit over the last twenty years.

To attempt to realize a balance, much less a surplus, solely by means of increased exports is not only courting failure. It can but aggravate the position as every such effort by every postwar Government has demonstrated. To rely solely on increased exports is to rely on forces beyond Britain's sole control. The present deficit has accumulated at a time when the terms of trade have been in Britain's favor (at the expense of the underdeveloped countries).

It is completely unrealistic to assume, as is done in the calculations which have been made in the National Plan, that the terms of trade will continue to move in Britain's favor. On the contrary, the signs are that the likelihood is for the terms of trade to move against her. In such circumstances, even a substantial increase in the volume of exports would have no great effect in terms of a balance of trade surplus.

As part of the campaign to sell the "incomes policy" as a precondition needed to expand our exports, our actual export position has been deliberately played down. The fact is that Britain exports more *per capita* and a greater proportion of her gross annual product than most of her competitors. Emphasis is on the totally irrelevant (to the problems of the balance of trade) fact that her *share* in world trade has been declining. What really matters is the absolute growth of exports in relation to imports, not her share or percentage of increased world trade. The only relevance of this fact is to show the stupidity in such a highly competitive world to continue fantastic extravagance in foreign exchange on the basis of foreign investment and foreign bases, to maintain the £ as a world currency and to hope to cover all this by increased exports.

Nor is there any evidence at all to show that our exports are either uncompetitive or, if they are, that this is due to high wages. On the contrary, the available evidence indicates that British hourly earnings in manufacturing industry have, in the last decade, risen *less* than those of our European competitors.* It is the rise in labor costs per unit *relative* to our competitors, not in absolute terms, which is the key factor.

If there is anything in the argument that in absolute terms labor costs per unit are higher here than is the case with some of Britain's competitors, then surely the real answer lies not in starting "a cut in wages competition" (this beggar-my-neighbor policy was tried in

*Increases in hourly earnings in manufacturing industry between 1954 and 1964 were: West Germany 118 per cent; France 130 per cent; Italy 115 per cent; Britain 78 per cent.

the thirties with disastrous consequences for all concerned), but to use the vast sums now spent on arms and invested abroad to modernize British industry and achieve lower labor costs by higher investment and not by lower wages.

4. "INCOMES POLICY" IS SOCIALIST WAGES POLICY

This line of argument has become fashionable since labor became the Government. Used in order to clothe in "Socialist" terminology the attack on wages, it is designed to appeal to the politically advanced and militant section of workers.

Briefly the argument runs that Socialists believe in planning, and this means planning wages too; "incomes policy" is merely a synonym for planning wages. For good measure it is pointed out that in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries wages are planned.

Furthermore, the appeal is made to the proletarian sense of solidarity, by stressing that "incomes policy" is egalitarian in scope, that it will raise the wage level of the lower paid and badly organized, even if it be at the expense of the better paid and highly organized. This argument would carry weight if we were building Socialism, if the rest of the economy were really planned. Of course, the fact of the matter is that the only thing being "planned" is precisely wages and nothing else. How indeed can it be anything else when the levers of a planned economy — the investment capital, the disposal of surpluses — are not in the hands of, or even remotely controlled by, the would-be planners, the Government.

The National Plan has nothing in common with Socialist planning. What it does is to compile and record hopes based on projections provided by the monopolists themselves. Its conclusions are based on unproven assumptions, such as the movement of the terms of trade, the state of world trade and the hopes for expansion of Britain's economy.

There are no provisions in the National Plan for fines and penalties against industrialists who fail to achieve the planned targets, as there are for workers and trade unions.

The argument that incomes policy means closing the gap between lower paid and higher paid is equally false, as seen from the following facts:

Flat rejection by the National Coal Board last month of the lower-paid day-wage miners' claim for higher wages. The cavalier rejection by the Prices and Incomes Board (PIB) during the same month of the railwaymen's claim (also lower paid section). This is proof enough that "incomes policy" is aimed at keeping *everyone's* earnings down, whether they be higher or lower paid.

When pressed to explain how the low-paid workers can hope to gain by the higher-paid workers foregoing the increases that they could win, the answer is that savings in wages, via the incomes policy, would lead to reduced prices to the consumer and, as a consumer, the lower-paid worker would benefit.

The dishonesty of this argument lies in:

i) There are *no* provisions compelling the manufacturers to *lower prices* (the PIB Bill at most reserves the right to refer to the PIB any proposed *increases).*

It would be the height of naiveté to believe that, in the present stage of monopoly capitalism, monopolists would voluntarily reduce prices, and hence profits, below what the market would bear.

And

ii) As the higher paid are also consumers, how it is possible to close the gap in the unlikely event of a general lowering of prices.

Originally, there was some talk about keeping profits and dividends down as well as earnings, but this was soon dropped.

WHAT DO THESE THEORIES AMOUNT TO?

When all the theories and arguments used to justify "incomes policy" are examined, they stand exposed as totally irrelevant as a solution to the real economic problems facing Britain. These problems are the balance of payments deficit, insufficient science-based and capital-intensive industry and inflationary tendencies.

What does become apparent is the real objective of these exercises, which is to assist the ruling class in dealing with the trade unions in conditions when they are relatively strong, and to try the hopeless task of rehabilitating Britain as an imperialist world power at the expense of the living standards of the workers and professional people.

FIRST STEPS TOWARDS AN "INCOMES POLICY"

The 1964 (as the 1966) General Election was fought on the issue as to which of the two major parties, Conservative or Labor, would be more effective in implementing an "incomes policy."

Within days of the 1964 Labor Government being formed, Deputy Prime Minister George Brown was given the task of setting up a spe-

cial Ministry: the Department of Economic Affairs (DEA). One of his main objectives was the implementation of an "incomes policy," to be based on the norm of 3-3½ per cent annual increase in *money earnings*. This norm was laid down as being the expected increase in the real national output.

This point is made clearly in the White Paper on Prices and Income (Cmnd. 2639). Paragraph 11 reads:

". . . An important step will be to lay down a 'norm' indicating the average annual increase of money incomes per head which is consistent with stability in the general level of prices. In present circumstances the appropriate figure is 3-3½ per cent. *This would be subject to re-examination by the Government in the light of reviews to be conducted from time to time by the National Economic Development Council.*" (My emphasis, B.R.)

Thus, if production stagnates and falls below three per cent, the norm will be lowered, too.

Within a couple of months of forming the Government George Brown, on behalf of the Government and leaders of the General Council of the TUC and of the Confederation of British Industry (i.e., representatives of the trade unions and employers) signed a document called "The Declaration of Intent on Productivity, Prices and Incomes."

The Declaration of Intent was an important first stage in the Government's strategy to try and achieve that which all previous Governments had failed to do — the implementation of an "incomes policy" geared to a State determined norm.

Later on the White Paper outlined quite specifically the essence of such a policy in the following paragraphs:

"12. Wages and salaries are determined by many factors, including changes in the supply and demand for different kinds of labor, trends in productivity and profits, comparisons with levels or trends of incomes in other employments and changes in the cost of living. The weight given to these different factors varies with circumstances. They are also influenced by the policies which the Government pursue in relation to the distribution of incomes. . . .

"13. If wages and salaries per head are to keep in step with the long-term rate of increase in national productivity, less weight than hitherto will have to be given to the factors mentioned in paragraph 12 and more weight will have to be given to the incomes norm. Moreover, in applying the norm to wages and salaries, it will be necessary to take into account not only increase in wage and salary rates, but also increases in costs resulting from reductions in working hours without loss of pay for overtime or shift work and from improvements in fringe benefits."

Thus it is made crystal-clear that it applies to *earnings* — not only wage rates — and that the norm applies to those whose productivity may have risen well above the norm. It thus set itself the aim of eliminating "drift," which is the name given to the method developed by the rank and file to achieve, by local struggle, an increase in earnings well above (an average of 2½-3 per cent) the rise in nationally negotiated basic rates. Such a rise in basic rates often approximates to the Government norm. It also lays down that the norm applies to *money wages* NOT real wages and that an increase in the cost of living will no longer justify a wage increase.

Now had the White Paper ended there with an honest statement of the Government's objective, no trade union leader would have dared to support the "incomes policy" in such a form. But the whole aim was to win its endorsement by the trade union movement, and so the wily George Brown added the vague (but very important in gaining the needed support) Paragraph 15:

"15. Exceptional pay increases should be confined to the following circumstances:

"i) where the employees concerned, for example by accepting more exacting work or a major change in working practices, make a direct contribution towards increasing productivity in the particular firm or industry. Even in such cases some of the benefit should accrue to the community as a whole in the form of lower prices;

"ii) where it is essential in the national interest to secure a change in the distribution of manpower (or to prevent a change which would otherwise take place) and a pay increase would be both necessary and effective for this purpose;

"iii) where there is a general recognition that existing wage and salary levels are too low to maintain a reasonable standard of living;

"iv) where there is widespread recognition that the pay of a certain group of workers has fallen seriously out of line with the level of remuneration for similar work and needs in the national interest to be improved."

This is general enough to make every trade unionist feel that the declared "incomes policy" would not apply to him. It was this trick that achieved the agreement of the majority of the General Council of the TUC. It was this paragraph which also later gained majority support from the Congress of TUC, though

a rather impressive minority voted against the present "income policy."

SETTING UP OF PRICES AND INCOMES BOARD

The next step was the setting up of the Prices and Incomes Board by Royal Warrant in April, 1965. Mr. Aubrey Jones, previously a Conservative Minister, a Tory M.P. at the time and a large industrialist, was appointed Chairman with a salary of £15,000 a year.

Mr. Brown as Minister of Economic Affairs was largely responsible for the setting up of the Board, and reserved to himself the right to refer to this Board for consideration and reporting any application for increases in wages, or anything affecting labor costs or proposed increases in prices.

At this stage, cooperation with the Board or willingness to submit evidence to it on behalf of a claim was voluntary. It was also generally thought that in its reports, the Board would confine itself to commenting on whether a particular claim, or a price increase, was in the "interest" of the economy and in conformity with Government policy. The Board's terms of reference, however, were so vague and general that, as will be seen, it could and did arrogate unto itself powers of a very far-reaching nature.

When the rails dispute on wages reached deadlock, the claim was referred to the Board by the Government. In its report, the Board did not confine itself to commenting on whether the railwaymen's claim was justified or not. In addition to rejecting the claim, the Board proceeded to condemn the basis for negotiating railwaymen's wages. This basis had been evolved during nearly two decades of railways being a nationalized industry, and was based on the principle that their wages should be comparable with those obtaining in similar industries. The Board outlined a completely new negotiating machinery, heavily weighted in favor of the Railway Board.

Similarly, in its report on the reference to it on whether the price of coal should be increased the PIB did not content itself merely with approving the proposed increase. It proceeded to lay down the law as to how the increases should operate. The essence being the proposal of a method of pricing aimed at speeding up the closure of "uneconomic" pits along with the condemnation of the existing wage structure.

It is now becoming clear that the PIB is the chosen instrument of the Labor Governmet to impose an "incomes policy" on Britain's wage and salary earners.

THE FIGHT BACK BEGINS

The problem which faced the Labor Government was the same as that which had faced previous governments. It was that the British workers steadfastly refused to forego voluntarily attainable increases in earnings. They resisted under a Labor Government using PIB, as they had done under a Tory Government.

By the autumn of 1965 the Labor Government had finally realized that the British workers could not be exhorted or persuaded or kidded that it was in their interests to accept cuts in real earnings. But instead of abandoning its disastrous policy, the Government decided to try and achieve by force what they had failed to achieve by guile.

In September 1965, George Brown dramatically descended on the General Council of the TUC on the very eve of the opening of its Annual Congress. There he succeeded in inducing a majority of the General Council, despite the opposition of its General Secretary, George Woodcock, and a sizeable minority of trade union leaders, to endorse the introduction of legislation to compel cooperation with the PIB. The nature of such legislation was left vague and the broad hint was given of the possibility that it may never need to be introduced, if the voluntary committee for the "vetting" of wage claims which had been established by the TUC succeeded (by success was meant holding down claims to meet the norm laid down by the Government).

In such circumstances and by laying stress on the need to support the Labor Government with its tiny majority of three in a pre-election atmosphere, plus the fact that every union saw Article 15 as a get-out for itself, the resolution endorsing legislation was passed. But it was passed by a far from unanimous vote. Three million votes were cast against the resolution, including that of the powerful Transport and General Workers Union (the largest single union with a membership of nearly 1½ million), the Boilermakers, the Clothing Workers and the majority of the non-manual unions. At the Labor Party Conference, held the following month, where there appeared a similar resolution, these were joined by the Amalgamated Engineering Union, the most powerful of the unions in the engineering industry.

The five "white collar" trade unions — Supervisory Staffs, Draughtsmen (DATA), Scientific Workers (AScW), Cine Technicians (ACTT) and Technical Civil Servants (STCS) —not only voted against it, but have formed a collective campaigning committee, holding

conferences and issuing material opposing both an "incomes policy" and tse instrument for operating that policy, the PIB.

It is ironic that the railwaymen and miners, two unions who voted in support of legislation, were the first to suffer from the activities of the PIB after the resolution had been passed. Both were convinced that they were amongst the exceptions catered for by Paragraph 15. However, it has turned out that the only ones, who, in the opinion of the PIB were worthy of exemption from the 3-3½ per cent norm were the armed forces. They were awarded an 18 per cent increase on the grounds both of comparability and the shortage of recruits. Both these factors operate in the case of railwaymen and miners, but were rejected as factors worthy for consideration by the Board.

THE PRICES AND INCOMES BILL

When the draft legislation in the form of the Prices and Incomes Bill was laid before Parliament on February 24, 1966, the full implications of "incomes policy" for the first time began to be apparent. The PIB, with its composition of industrialists, technocrats with a sprinkling of ageing trade union leaders, is to be set up as a permanent statutory body. It is given power to summon anyone and any organization to appear before it and produce any document required by it. Failing to comply makes one liable to a fine, in default of paying which a jail sentence is provided for.

The Minister has the right to refer to the PIB not only claims for wages and changes in working conditions, but what is totally new and unprecedented (anywhere), agreed settlements. Such settlements agreed to in normal negotiations between the employer and the trade union must not be implemented or made retrospective until the PIB has made its findings, or four months from the date of settlement, whichever is the earliest.

Workers and/or their unions are liable to a fine of up to £500 or jail in default if they do anything, including taking strike action, to further the implementation of the settlement during the standstill period. Employers who implement the settlement in the interim period are equally liable. The purpose of this provision is to try and stop employers from offering higher wages to attract scarce skilled labor.

This Bill for the first time since the Combination Acts of over 150 years ago makes strikes illegal. It undermines the very heart and core of the trade unions; the right to collective bargaining without outside interference; the right to use its organized strength to further its demands and compel the implementation of a bargain freely entered into with the employers. Whereas the notorious American Taft-Hartley Act imposes an 80-day "cooling-off period" when negotiations have broken down, the British Bill delays agreements actually made for 120 days. This is so not only of national but of local agreements. In the case of the local agreements the aim is to end the "drift" and undermine the Shop Stewards movement, which is the militant heart of British trade unionism. By delaying implementation of an agreement up to four months, it automatically reduces a settlement of 1-1½ per cent above the norm to the norm level.

Above all, it is the thin end of the wedge to introduce State regulated wages.

As the Declaration of Intent was the prelude to the "voluntary" PIB, this in its turn paved the way for the proposed legislation aimed at making the delay in the implementation of agreements binding. Undoubtedly unless this Bill is killed for good, it, in turn, will be but a stage in the process of making the findings of the PIB legally binding aid thus completing the aim of achieving State regulated wages and working conditions, thereby destroying the trade unions as free unfettered bargaining bodies for their members.

Indeed the one issue upon which Tories and Labor during the election campaign vied with each other was who would be the more effective in imposing an "incomes policy" on the British people. But whether this Bill, with all its dangers to the trade union movement and living standards of the people, ever reaches the Statute Book will, in the final analysis, depend upon neither Wilson nor Heath, but upon the British trade unionist. If the British trade unionist becomes fully aware of the Bill's dangers and is prepared to use all the tremendous strength at the disposal of the movement, such a law will never see the light of day.

WHAT ARE THE PERSPECTIVE?

There are indications that during the last few months a greater awareness has emerged. Complacency based on the belief that a Labor Government would not dare to hamstring the unions is giving way to a greater sense of realism. The PIB reports on rails and the price of coal have been a salutary lesson to many. The publication of the Prices and Incomes Bill has opened the eyes of many more.

The annual round of Trade Union Conferences begins in April and leads up to the Trades Union Congress which is held in September. These conferences can be crucial in determining whether the Bill is killed or proceeded with.

Will the Miners and Railwaymen, in the light of their experiences at the hands of the PIB, tolerate support for legislation — or will they oppose it and join the Transport and General Workers, the Boilermakers, the Clothing Workers and the White Collar Unions, to convert the very sizeable minority opposed to the Bill last year into a sweeping majority against it this year?

There are many facts which testify to the strong opposition of the rank and file to any legal infringement of the rights of trade unions, established and built up as a result of generations of struggle and hardship. The fight back has begun, but much still remains to be done for the pressure from the mass of trade unionists to express itself sufficiently strongly to compel the leadership of the trade union movement to heed the danger, and to determine to use its great strength officially to block and defeat the grave menace which it faces.

The working class and the fight for democracy at the enterprises

FRITJOF LAGER

ONE OF THE MAIN political problems now under discussion in Sweden is that of deepening democracy and extending it to the sphere of economy. Factory and office workers are more insistently demanding an opportunity to influence the management of the enterprises and the right to take part in adopting decisions. More and more people are awakening to the injustice of a situation where a handful of monopolists, on the strength of their property rights, fully control the country's natural wealth and the means of production indispensable to society, while the workers are denied the opportunity to participate in making the decisions.

Owing to the continued concentration of capital and the monopolization of the economy, the gulf between the production workers and the owners, who wield the power, is steadily widening. The big banks and various finance groups adopt decisions in the economic sphere directly affecting tens and hundreds of thousands of wage and salary earners, while the latter are neither asked nor given an opportunity to express their opinion about these decisions. Here are some examples.

On March 10 of this year the Swedish Employers' Association gave a week's notice of a lock-out affecting 700,000 workers. The intervention of a government commission postponed the measure. But the workers could do nothing to prevent the employers from taking a decision that would have deprived half of all the organized workers in Sweden of their jobs and paralyzed production for an indefinite period.

The cellulose manufacturers of the three northern countries, Finland, Norway and Sweden, have concluded an agreement on the division of markets and the establishment of a cartel to regulate prices. In order to keep

export prices at a high level, Cellulosakoncern plans to close down its factories for a few months. And the workers can do nothing about it.

Or take another example. Several textile mills recently ceased production. This touched off a public discussion on the need to modernize the Swedish textile industry. But the project for modernizing the industry, presented on a TV program, was submitted not by someone connected with the labor movement or by a spokesman of the government but by a bank director.

The factory owners have no obligations toward the wage workers, who can be dismissed at any time. Workers who lose their jobs owing to lockouts have only the trade unions to turn to for relief. Those dismissed in connection with modernization projects receive benefits from the unemployment insurance fund on a par with those temporarily unemployed, plus a miserable sum paid by the enterprise in the form of what is known as "dismissal allowance."

These examples show who possesses the power and the right to take decisions at the enterprises and why the issue of democracy at the enterprises is such an urgent one.

True, this is not the first time such questions have arisen in Sweden. They emerged at the time of the revolutionary upsurge in Europe following the First World War and the victory of the October Revolution. The working class won at that time what it had fought for since the end of the last century: universal and equal franchise and an eight-hour day. The franchise was regarded by the labor movement as an important weapon in the future struggle for democracy. After it had been won, the demand for democracy at the enterprises became the main issue of practical politics. Following the speech at the Congress of the Social-Democratic Party in 1920 by its Secretary Gustav Mueller, a commission was set up which several years later submitted a proposal to institute production committees. Such committees were formed at a few enterprises, but they played no appreciable role since they possessed no real powers. The labor Left was fully justified in describing them as instruments of class collaboration devised to distract attention from the demands for the nationalization of the key branches of the economy and the natural resources.

For the next 25 years the question of democracy at the enterprises was to all intents and purposes dropped by all but a small minority. The working-class movement was too busy defending itself against the offensive launched by big capital.

The Second World War and the subsequent revolutionary upsurge opened a new page in the history of the working-class movement. After the big metalworkers' strike of 1945, the Swedish working class movement was able once again to advance the demand for workers' participation in the management of enterprises and to make it the slogan of struggle. The immediate result was the conclusion of an agreement between the Employers' Association, on the one hand, and the Central Trade Union Federation and the Central Federation of Clerical Workers' Unions, on the other, on the institution of production committees. Under this agreement (concluded in 1946 and revised in 1956), still in operation, committees are set up at enterprises employing a minimum of 50 employees. At the smaller enterprises, production committees may be formed by mutual agreement between the parties concerned. The agreement specifies the number of members and the powers of the committees, which are limited to the right to supply and receive information, discuss questions pertaining to working conditions, etc. The management is obliged to report to meetings of the committees "on the production activities of the enterprises and on any important changes made or contemplated in the conditions of production and labor, as well as on new lines of output, new methods of production and labor and other technical questions." Incidentally, this provision is limited or nullified by the reservation that furnishing information is obligatory only "insofar as the interests of the employer are not jeopardized thereby."

In practice the production committees are informed of decisions only after they have been adopted by the company board and the management. The members of the committee know no more about the activity of the enterprise than the board of the company is obliged by law to divulge.

The workers and employees are becoming increasingly sceptical about the production committees inasmuch as their functions in no way restrict the sovereignty of the factory owners.

The leadership of the Central Trade Union Federation has submitted a 20-point proposal for the revision of the present agreement according to which the production committees would be given the right to take decisions on a certain range of questions, e.g., social questions, and make suggestions for increasing production, while the employers would be obligated to give more exhaustive informa-

tion, etc. But even if all 20 points are endorsed and added to the agreement, the character of the production committees will essentially remain unchanged.

This does not mean, however, that production committees have no significance. They can be used by the workers in their trade union struggle, in the fight for certain reforms and for better conditions at the enterprises, and also for obtaining specific information needed for the trade union struggle. For example, the production committees could be useful in sounding out the employers' intentions and in general help in the struggle waged by the trade unions and the workers at the enterprises. However, the decisive fight for democracy at the enterprises and for workers' participation in management, for a bigger say for the workers, in other words, for industrial democracy, should be conducted on a broader plane than collective bargaining and with different aims than those of the trade unions and production committees.

On the whole, the trade unions are by their very nature broadly-based class organizations. Their principal task in capitalist society is to unite the workers in the struggle against expolitation and oppression. The Rules of the Swedish trade unions and the preamble to the Rules of the T.U. Federation state that their aim is "to promote the general development of society on the basis of political, social and economic democracy." Nevertheless, this important task is reduced to "protecting the interests of wage workers on the labor market and in the economy."

The trade union organizations established by the Swedish factory and office workers for this purpose are extremely powerful and active. However, if the trade unions were to strive for more far-reaching political objectives they would be faced with some difficult problems. This is reflected in the discussion on democracy at the enterprises, in the course of which grave doubts have been expressed as to whether the unions should demand representation on the boards of the companies and other leading bodies of the enterprises. If this demand were met, it is argued, the workers' representatives might become mere pawns in the hands of the management, with the result that they would be responsible for decisions they were unable to influence.

Since the trade union, by virtue of its role, inevitably comes in conflict with the owners of the enterprises, its representatives in the management would find themselves in a very awkward position. Cooperation with the management of a capitalist enterprise would place the trade union spokesmen in a position running counter to the interests of the union membership he is called upon to protect, i.e., an impossible position.

Formerly, the rights of the trade union are limited by the collective agreement, and if, for example, the Trade Union Federation and the Employers Association were to conclude an agreement on democracy in the enterprise its operation would be limited to the enterprises connected with the Employers' Association and employing members of the trade unions affiliated to the Federation.

Of course this does not mean that the unions are not interested in fighting for democracy at the enterprise. Indeed, democracy in the sphere of production is a matter of vital concern to the union members. The unions can also contribute a great deal to the success of this struggle. By supporting the demand for partial reforms and fighting for them, the unions can do much toward solving the major problems in this sphere.

But the battle for democracy at the enterprises is not only a matter for the trade unions, it is very much a political struggle. It is part of the general struggle of the Swedish working class for the peaceful transition to socialist production relations.

Strengthening the influence of the workers and extending their rigtht to participate in decision-making means reducing the influence and the rights of big business.

There can be no true democracy in society as a whole unless property relations are changed, or, to be precise, unless the private monopoly on the decisive means of production and the basic natural wealth is abolished. Every advance in the fight for democracy at the enterprises helps to weaken the stranglehold of monopoly capital and to promote the cause of the working class. So long as there is wage labor, private ownership of the means of production carries with it power over people. It is the owner who has the final say. The examples given here confirm this. This power of the property-owner is clearly defined in all of our legislation. Hence, the ultimate goal of the struggle for democracy at the enterprises should be to abolish this property right and turn it over to society. The fight for democracy at the enterprises is part of the struggle for a socialist society, and hence it should be an offensive struggle. It cannot be left solely or mainly to the trade union movement. The political parties of the working class must fight for the solution of this issue. In order that the people directly engaged in the economy should assume their share of the responsibility for running things, fundamental changes in our legislation are needed, and

this depends not on the trade union bodies but on parliament and on government institutions.

Up till now the discussion has centred around what form the right of worker participation in the adoption of decisions should take. Neither the production committee, nor the inclusion of trade union representatives on the boards of companies can provide a correct solution of this problem. Some entirely new bodies must be created, and to this end the experience gained in countries where private ownership of the means of production has been replaced by social ownership should be studied. There can be little doubt, however, that the question of the forms of worker participation in management can be decided in the course of the struggle itself. To reduce the entire discussion to the examination of the forms of democracy at the enterprises might shift the emphasis to secondary questions and relegate the main problem to the background.

The important thing is to work out the correct strategy and tactics of the struggle for co-management and for the establishment of democracy at the enterprises.

In order to ensure the success of this struggle, it is necessary to revise the entire legislation governing property in the means of production, particularly the laws concerning joint-stock companies, which define the property relations in this area of economic life. The bourgeois parties take great pains to protect these laws. When, some years ago, the Communists in the Riksdag proposed introducing minor amendments to the law in order to compel the companies to divulge the names of the ten biggest shareholders, this motion was rejected by a majority. Similar proposals have been made on other occasions but have invariably been turned down, in some cases on the grounds that to change the laws governing joint-stock companies would allegedly be too complicated a process. Nevertheless, the struggle to alter these laws must go on, since it focusses public attention on the much more important demand for a change in property relations. The same applies to other reforms which may facilitate public control over the activities of the joint-stock companies and the big enterprises. By and large, it seems to us that the re-examination and revision of the entire body of laws created to protect the rights of private propery in enterprises of vital importance for the national economy is precisely that long-range objective towards which working-class efforts should be directed.

This struggle for a radical revision of legislation affecting property relations should be backed up by actions aimed at restricting the power of the employer and giving the workers a bigger say on some questions. Important changes, for example, could be achieved through labor agreements in the matter of the right to hire and dismiss workers, and also in the distribution and supervision of the work. The employers and their organizations fight tooth and nail to protect these rights. A few changes have taken place in recent years, but on the whole things are unchanged. With the present shortage of skilled workers, the employers are obliged to exercise their rights with prudence. At other times they would not have hesitated to bring the full weight of their power to bear. Another area in which a certain measure of worker participation could be won through labor agreements is the hiring and dismissal of foremen. At present this is the exclusive prerogative of the management, the workers and employees having no say in a matter of such vital importance to them. These are only a few examples of the reforms that could be won. There are many other partial demands for which a struggle could be waged and which in their turn could hasten the achievement of the more distant objective — the winning of genuine democracy at the enterprises.

In the course of the broad public discussion on democracy in production the Communists are the only ones to have pointed out the key to the solution of the entire problem lies in changing property relations. The discussion to date has touched upon secondary aspects of the problems and has shied away from the essence of the matter. There are a few exceptions as cited above. It was the Communists who worked out a proposal for a partial solution promoting the struggle for democracy at the enterprises, and who assessed that struggle from the standpoint of principle. The Communists see the fight for democracy at the enterprises as an offensive against big capital, a policy aimed at enabling Sweden, a country dominated by big finance capital, to become a country ruled by its people, a country where the building of socialism would be a realistic prospect.

Changes in the class structure of the Scandinavian countries

HANS J. KLEVEN

ALTHOUGH THE PRESENT article is based on a study of Norwegian reality it treats of features common to all the Nordic countries. All show the same trend of development with the possible exception of Sweden perhaps, which has advanced somewhat further.

Marxist and bourgeois sociologists alike have been devoting much attention of late to questions concerning the class structure of society. This is undoubtedly connected with the rapid technological progress and appreciable economic and social changes taking place in the capitalist world since the end of the war. Not only the specific features of the technological revolution are being studied but also the more profound problems of the class structure of society.

Opinions differ in the Scandinavian countries as to what is mean by *social classes.* Bourgeois sociology has no clearly defined concept to offer, though its findings in this sphere are of considerable interest. Marxism, on the other hand, gives a clear definition of the class concept, of its common and specific features.

Undoubtedly, important changes have taken place in the capitalist countries since Lenin evolved his concept of classes.* But these changes have not affected the essence of capitalist society, have not altered its character as a society based on private ownership and exploitation. Classes have not disappeared and are not in the process of disappearing. The Marxist concept of classes, then, remains valid to this day. It does not need to be revised or amplified. Neither the "welfare state," social legislation, a higher standard of living, nor the shorter working week have altered the circumstance in our countries that the basic means of production and the finances belong to a small group, the bourgeoisie, while the majority of the people, the working class, do not possess the means of production and are compelled to sell their labor power to the capitalists in order to exist.

In Norway several non-Marxist concepts of classes or the division of society into "sections" are current. Emphasis is usually on the size of, or the differences in, incomes. Not production and property relations, but the secondary feature—distribution—is seen as the basis of the division of society into classes. Another kindred viewpoint maintains that social differences are determined primarily by professions. The representatives of this trend speak of "professional classes." Other sociologists determine classes according to housing conditions, still others, according to level of education and culture, or according to religious or political concepts.

Of course we cannot disregard the outward signs of classes. The working class differs from the bourgeoisie in many respects: in its living and housing conditions, size of property and income, political views, education, etc. But in many others the difference between certain groups of the working class and the bourgeoisie is becoming less marked as, for example, in clothing and food.

This fact which is connected partly with technological progress and the growth of production, partly with the struggle of the working class and the absence in the postwar years of really severe production crises and their aftermath of unemployment, was interpreted by most bourgeois and Social-Demo-

---

See Lenin's Work **A Great Beginning in **Collected Works** Eng. Ed. Vol. 29, p. 409.

cratic sociologists and politicians to mean that class differences in our countries were disappearing. A spate of books and pamphlets appeared on the subject, which found their way also into the working-class movement.

The Social-Democratic Labor Party and the Socialist People's Party of Norway hold widely different views on the question of classes. Since the Labor Party's recent election defeat some of the Right Social Democrats have been saying that it no longer should represent a "class movement," that it should "reorientate" itself, that the "old class" point of view is no longer valid, and much else to this effect. However, during recent debates in the Storting leaders of the Labor Party emphatically rejected the assertion of representatives of the Hoyre Right-wing party that "there are no longer any classes in Norway."

In more left circles of the working-class movement the class basis of society and the need for class struggle are not disputed. Still, there is not enough ideological clarity on this question.

From the aforesaid it is apparent how important it is to rid the working-class movement of incorrect concepts and to affirm the socialist, Marxist view. The point at issue is one that has a direct bearing on our political work. It is, therefore, very important that we make a study of the concrete conditions in our respective countries and give effect to the results of our research. In the course of this research the findings of non-Marxist sociologists may prove to be of considerable value.

CHANGES IN THE COMPOSITION OF THE GAINFULLY EMPLOYED POPULATION

In agriculture their number is steadily decreasing. In Norway, for example, it dropped from 33 per cent in 1900 to 16 per cent in 1960. Agriculture's labor force, and in the first place, hired labor, is decreasing in absolute figures as well, especially since 1950. There has also been a sharp drop in the number of gainfully employed among members of families. More and more farms are now run by the farmer himself and his wife. Hired labor is not widespread in Norwegian agriculture. In 1960 it accounted for only eight per cent of the gainfully employed in agriculture, and that mostly on farms of over 50 hectares, i.e., capitalist farms.

While the scale of hired labor is shrinking, that of paid work performed by the farmer off the land (at factories, on construction jobs, etc.), is growing and coming to play an increasingly important role as a means of livelihood.

Unlike Denmark, a country of relatively high concentration where farms average 18 hectares, Norway is primarily a country of small holdings in the five hectare bracket. And still, beginning with 1950 the number of farms has been declining at the expense of the smallest units.

There has been a decrease also in Norway's *fishing population*—from 7.4 to 3.9 per cent between 1930 and 1960.

After 1945 industrialization in the Scandinavian countries proceeded at an accelerated pace. New industries sprang up and the old ones were expanded. Investments were made chiefly in industries producing the means of production. The organic part of caiptal greatly increased. There was an absolute increase also in the *population engaged in industry*. Its relative growth, however, presents a more complex picture. Both in 1950 and in 1960 Norway's gainfully employed population accounted for 27 per cent of the labor force employed in the mining and manufacturing industries, in power and water supply. The number of industrial workers, however, increased in absolute figures.

The development of technology and science and of the productive forces is having a twofold effect on agriculture. On the one hand, industrial development is draining the countryside of manpower, on the other the mechanization of agriculture is making part of the manpower engaged in it superfluous. Thus, although scientific and technological progress has tremendously boosted industrial growth it has, at the same time, reduced the need for manpower in many branches.

A feature of the changes in the structure of the gainfully employed population is the *increase in the share of employed persons* and simultaneous decrease in the number of small owners.

Statistics show constant changes in the ratio between these two sections. In 1920 wage workers in Norway accounted for 73 per cent and self-employed for 27 per cent of the gainfully employed population; in 1960 the percentage was 81 and 19 respectively (in Denmark the ratio is approximately the same). Thus, upwards of four-fifths of the total gainfully employed population are wage workers. Beginning with 1946 the number of self-employed has been decreasing also in absolute figures.

The increase in the number of employed persons is taking place primarily at the expense of a corresponding decrease in the small owner and "free profession" categories.

The rural population provides the main source of hired labor. Other sources are fishermen, the urban petty-bourgeoisie, i.e., handicraftsmen, petty traders, etc.

The increase in the number of married working women, most of whom want to become clerical workers, is a common development. In Finland married women workers account for 26 per cent of the country's total number of married women, in Sweden, about 24 per cent, and in Norway only some 10 per cent.

A growing share of hired labor is absorbed by the *non-productive industries*. As in most parts of the capitalist world, so too, in the Scandinavian countries the labor force in agriculture, fishing, forestry and other production sectors (excluding industry) is rapidly shifting to trade, finances, administration and the service industry. Thus between 1950 and 1960 alone the share of the population employed in production dropped from 62 to 56 per cent in Norway. The decrease was also in absolute figures. In the non-productive sphere the number of employed increased by 50 per cent for the same period. In trade and banking the gainfully employed population tripled in the period from 1900 to 1960. At present this sector accounts for 12 per cent of the country's labor force.

It is clear that the increase in employment in trade and the service industry is the logical outcome of the expansion of production. However, in modern capitalist society this expansion acquires unhealthy forms and scope as evidenced by the existence of a ramified network of financial establishments, artificially inflated trade network, advertising bureaus, bureaucratic apparatus of clerical workers at big enterprises, and so on.

One of the main reasons for this unhealthy trend is, undoubtedly, the capitalist contradiction between production and the market. For monopoly capital the problem of a market for its goods is even more important than their production. Hence the increased influx of capital in trade, advertising and finances.

Another reason for the inflation of the non-productive sphere are the increasingly pronounced state-monopoly trends. The machinery of the State and of the local government bodies, including the bureaucratic apparatus, is expanding. One of the reasons for this is the State's growing role in the economy.

A current tendency is the *increased share of mental labor*. By mental labor we mean skilled labor requiring in most cases an above-the-average level of education. Not all jobs where manual labor does not play a significant role as, for example, in offices and banks, can be called mental labor.

In our countries this tendency is seen in the *growing number of engineers and, particularly, technicians*. Their number increased fivefold during 1930-60, and in the ten years between 1950-60 alone it doubled. The proportion of engineers and technicians to the total number of clerical workers, and also factory workers, likewise increased. Whereas in 1930 there were 40 workers to every one engineer in Norway, in 1960 the figure was down to 29.

It is quite clear that the volume of manual labor is decreasing and that of mental labor is increasing. In the capitalist countries this evolution is a complex, contradictory process. A great part of the work is of a monotonous and very specialized nature, turning people into mechanical instruments, into automatons. Small wonder that concepts like "alienation" and "human robots" have become so widespread.

Technological progress has invaded all branches of the economy, including construction. It has, as a consequence, made work easier physically, has made it possible in many cases to do away with manual labor and particularly arduous processes. (True, for many professions the nervous strain is now greater.) On the other hand, the wider application of the achievements of technology and science in industry has increased the demand for skilled and technically educated manpower.

As to the changes in *industry* it cannot be said—at any rate as far as Norway is concerned—that more and more workers are becoming skilled workers. Developments in recent years show that the increase in the number of skilled workers in the metal-working industry, for example, has been insignificant, that of workers of limited, specialized skills considerable, while the number of unskilled workers has remained practically the same. However, the further progress of technology and science, and particularly automation, will evidently raise the demand for more skilled workers.

The most significant change in the social structure is *the tremendous increase in the number of clerical workers* in public and private enterprises. "Clerical worker" is not a class concept but a term to denote a status and statistical category. It covers a very heterogeneous group of people—from directors and managers to stenographers and salesmen.

To what social category does the clerical worker belong? Opinions differ among Marxist

sociologists on this score. We think that the greater part of the clerical workers in private and public enterprises belong to the working class and the upper crust of the clerical workers to the bourgeoisie. (Only the self-employed producers come within the middle-class bracket.)

At present there are over 350,000 clerical workers in Norway, i.e., a quarter of the total gainfully employed population. During 1950-60 their number increased by 27 per cent. The percentage ratio between factory and clerical workers has changed as follows in the past 60 years: 1900—86 and 14; 1950—74 and 26; 1960—70 and 30. In Denmark the ratio is 64 and 36. In Sweden the number of clerical workers doubled during the period 1940-60, and in the ten years 1950-60 it increased by 36 per cent. Some sociologists maintain that if this process continues at the same rate every second employed person in Sweden will be working in an office by 1970.

Half of Norway's clerical workers are in industry or in banks, and 37 per cent in government or municipal establishments. Their number increased merely 300 per cent in industry during 1938-60, while that of workers only by some 75 per cent. About 40 per cent of Norway's clerical workers are women. The number of women workers in industry is steadily decreasing, the number in offices, increasing.

CHANGES IN CLASS STRUCTURE

How have these social changes affected the class structure? The *working class* has increased primarily at the expense of an increase in the number of clerical workers. In his book, *The Class Structure of Norwegian Society*, the author of the present article has estimated that the Norwegian working class totals 1,-110,000 persons, or four-fifths of the gainfully employed population. The composition of the working class is as follows:

Factory workers	780,000	70 per cent
Clerical workers	330,000	30 per cent

Together with the members of their families, the working class represents the bulk and constantly growing part of the population.

Its composition too is constantly changing with the emergence of new social groups. Besides the shifts in the ratio between factory and clerical workers, other important changes are taking place.

Between 1920 and 1960 the number of workers, including foremen, in Norway increased from 640,000 to 780,000 (their share in the gainfully employed population dropping, however, from 59.7 to 55.7 per cent). *Industrial* workers (manufacturing and mining industries) make up the largest group, totalling some 280,000 and accounting for about 35 per cent of the entire working class.

In the ten years 1950-60 their number increased by 16,000, or by seven per cent. Thus, the most important part of the country's working class is growing. At the same time an increasing number of industrial workers are concentrating in the large enterprises: over 35 per cent at factories employing not less than 200, and 20 per cent, at factories employing over 500 workers.

Some of these large enterprises are either *state-owned*, or the state holds a major part of their shares. However, only 6.5 per cent of the workers in the groups of enterprises having 6 or more employed work at factories belonging to the state or the municipal councils. Such low indices are much higher in Western Europe, and especially in Austria.

Building workers too represent an important group (13 per cent of all workers). Their number has increased since 1950 though not considerably. By the nature of their work and level of concentration they are more and more becoming industrial workers.

As for *agricultural* workers, their number decreased from 60,000 in 1945 to its present 15,000. There are also only about 15,000 workers left in the *timber* industry. The timber and agricultural workers were formerly an important social group where the Party enjoyed considerable influence. With the decrease in their numbers their political importance has declined. In Denmark agricultural workers from a larger group than they do in Norway, both absolutely and relatively. But even there it has decreased considerably —from 320,000 just before the war to roughly 60,000 at present.

Other important groups are the *transport* workers and *seamen* who together account for about 15 per cent of all workers.

As regards the bourgeoisie, in Norway they make up about two per cent of the total population, or 30,000 "active" capitalists, and together with the "passive" capitalists, i.e., the coupon clippers, and the members of their families, total 70,000. Also the upper stratum of clerical workers in private and public enterprises come within the category of the bourgeoisie.

However, the bourgeoisie differ considerably in the Scandinavian countries both as regards income and property. The difference between the owners of small enterprises and the chairmen of concerns and banks is big. They have no basic "common features" so-

cially or culturally. Socially the bourgeoisie is now less united than it was before. Politically it is its upper crust—the big financial tycoons and monopolists—rather than this class as a whole that needs to be studied.

The upper crust has consolidated its economic position and domination. Socially, this top stratum keeps aloof from most of the other sections of the bourgeoisie. The small and middle capitalists have little chance of getting to the top. Studies made by university sociologists in Norway show the remarkable stability of this section and its tendency not to mix with other sections, not to intermarry. In other words, it shows distinct dynastic features.

Besides the working class and the bourgeoisie, Scandinavian society has a very numerous *middle section*: peasants, fishermen, handicraftsmen, tradesmen, mental workers (writers, doctors and lawyers). In addition to these, new groups have made their appearance—owners of small motor service shops, repair shops, petrol stations, and so on. The means of production at the disposal of these people are often merely the elements of the ramified production apparatus run by the trusts. The petrol stations are a case in point.

As for the class structure in *agriculture*, the division of the peasantry into small, middle and big, though correct as the principal criterion, has lost its original meaning in the case of the Scandinavian countries. An important criterion of such division nowadays is the use of hired labor, despite the fact that extensive mechanization in the postwar years has considerably lessened the demand for it. In our practical politics we must be careful not to overlook the difference between the big and small farms.

The contradiction between monopoly capital on the one hand, and most of the peasants on the other, will more and more become apparent as the main contradiction in agriculture. In the movement against Norway joining the Common Market, the bulk of the country's peasants sided with the working class against Norwegian and foreign monopoly capital. In such a situation differentiation of the rural population is of secondary importance as compared with the big contradictions in Scandinavian society.

What is the general trend in the changing class structure of the rural population of the Scandinavian countries? It is one of a steady decrease in the number of peasants, mainly in the number of the small farmers and agricultural workers while that of big peasants and capitalist farmers is remaining stable or increasing. In short, it is the less well-to-do sections of the rural population that are dwindling.

All the Scandinavian countries have a big *fishing population*. Fishing is the main industry in Iceland. It is also an important one in Norway. The greater part of Norwegian fishermen belong to the middle sections. However, recent years have witnessed the growth of capitalism in this sphere as well. The number of big fishing vessels operating on a purely capitalist basis has increased substantially. The crews of the vessels, which are the property of a minority, having no means of production of any kind, belong to the working class. The latter has increased relatively and probably also absolutely. The middle section of the fishing population, on the contrary, has decreased.

Considerable structural changes have taken place also among the *handicraftsmen*. In Norway their number decreased by 21 per cent in the decade 1950-60 (in the building industry, by 30 per cent). Most of those engaged in the handicrafts are hired laborers and their number is steadily growing. There has been considerable specialization in this sphere. Technological progress has strongly affected many trades. Part of them are dying out, and being replaced by capitalist industry. Thus, the number of cobblers, blacksmiths and harness-makers is steadily decreasing. For the handicraftsman capitalist development spells, first, proletarianization, i.e., the extension of hired labor; secondly, industrialization, i.e., the dislodgement of his trade and, thirdly, concentration. All these features have become particularly pronounced in recent years.

The bulk of the handicraftsmen (about 80 per cent) quite obviously belong to the middle sections. Together with the allied branches small-scale industry, transport, hotels, road building) these account for about 50,000 employed, or some three per cent of Norway's total gainfully employed population.

There are different social sections and classes also in *commerce* where you have commercial capital and a working class, groups of small businessmen, including middlemen who carry on the business themselves or employ several people. These groups likewise belong to the middle sections. They do not represent a sizeable stratum in our countries (in Norway, for example, they number about 30,000). This sphere is witnessing big changes in both property and class relations. Big capital is consolidating its positions in trade; chain stores are being opened and also specialized shops. However, this process is only beginning.

The advances in industry, technology,

science and culture are adding a new section of people to the *intelligentsia.* This section, which is engaged principally in mental labor, belongs to different classes.

Lenin spoke about the existence of two class tendencies among the intelligentsia: the tendency to swing toward the bourgeoisie and the tendency to move towards the proletariat. The latter tendency is undoubtedly the stronger of the two today. The greater part of the intelligentsia in the Scandinavian countries no longer occupies an "independent" position. More and more of them are becoming employed persons who have to sell their labor power, and not their work or services, as a commodity. They belong to the working class, whereas those of them who are still "independent" and have a "free profession" belong to the middle sections.

Although the latter still account for a sizeable part of the intelligentsia in our countries, their number is steadily dwindling. In Norway, for example, only about half of all the doctors and lawyers are still independent. It is characteristic that more and more writers, painters, musicians and artists are becoming hired workers. In Norway the independent intellectuals and allied groups in the middle sections number only some 10,000 or 0.7 per cent of the total gainfully employed population. But the role they play in the life of society is of course much greater.

In aggregate, the *middle sections* account for approximately only 19 per cent of the gainfully employed population of Norway. Over half of them belong to the group of small and middle peasants.

In general outline the *class structure of Norwegian society* presents the following picture:

a) Gainfully employed Population

Bouregoisie	30,000	2 per cent
Working class	1,110,000	79 per cent
workers	780,000	
clerical workers	330,000	
Middle sections	275,000	19 per cent
Total:	1,415,000	100 per cent

b) Population as a whole

Bourgeoisie	70,000
Working Class	2,845,000
Middle sections	685,000
Total:	3,600,000

Our Finnish comrades* are quite right when they say that it is not of decisive importance whether the working class accounts for 58 or 60 per cent, and the bourgeoisie for 2 or 4 per cent. In any case, the working class is the biggest class in society, the bourgeoisie representing but a negligible minority.

Will the main trends of development operating until now, and particularly since 1945, continue in the future?

Apparently they will, unless the intensified capitalist process in our countries is interrupted and development is directed along lines of democratic structural changes and restriction of monopoly capital.

According to Norwegian forecasts the gainfully employed population of the country will total two million people in the year 2000. Employment in agriculture and in the timber and fishing industries will drop from 335,000 in 1960 to 100,000-125,000. Employment in industry will increase by 175,000 (from 525,000 to 700,000). However, its share will remain the same (35 per cent). It is expected that employment will also greatly increase in the services; approximately by 500,000 (from 444.000 in 1960 to 940,000 in 2000), and account for between 55 and 60 per cent of the total number employed.

The introduction of new technology, automation, rationalization and intensification of labor might lessen the demand for industrial workers. In Norway, however, there is still a big demand for industrial labor power. New workers are constantly being recruited into the big industries, and particularly in shipbuilding where the organic composition of capital is not as great as, say, in the electrochemical industry. On the other hand, the big chemical enterprises have expanded their production capacity without increasing their labor force.

However, the number of technicians and engineers will, evidently, continue to grow, especially the former. According to forecasts, the technical personnel in Norway will increase from 30,000 in 1965 to 80,000 in 1970, and in Sweden, from 95,000 to 120,000, and nearly 150,000 in 1975.

Also the number of employed persons will increase, and specifically that of clerical workers. However, this growth will hardly be at a rate that will bring them level with the

*The Finnish comrades give the following data on the class structure of the population of Finland: bourgeoisie—2 per cent, working class—60 per cent, middle sections—38 per cent. However, part of the clerical workers, i.e., 6 per cent of the gainfully employed population, is classed as the middle sections. In 1960 workers totalled 881,000, or 43.3 per cent, and clerical workers 455,000, or 22.4 per cent of the gainfully employed population.

number of workers, let alone surpass them.

Counter factors might begin to make themselves felt more strongly. It is clear, for example, that mechanization, automation and rationalization will eventually make their way also into offices and stores. Already all kinds of machines are being used in ever greater numbers in offices. However, the problem of the capitalist market will not become less acute, and the need for clerical workers will remain. Equally, bureaucratization and expansion of the machinery of the state and of the municipal councils will continue. However, "bad times" might necessitate a cut in the non-productive apparatus, both private and public.

At the same time it is clear that the distinction between factory and clerical workers in wages, working hours and nature of work will grow less and less marked and that in a number of spheres it will eventually be of no significance.

PROBLEMS FACING THE WORKING-CLASS MOVEMENT

The numerous changes in the structure of the population is the concern of the entire working-class movement and not only of parts of it. However, the Marxist parties bear a special responsibility and are in a better position to formulate, on the basis of their studies, the tasks to be tackled in this connection.

The recent change of government in Norway, which must be seen as a defeat for the working-class movement, and the fact that the conservative and reactionary party of Hoyre polled over 20 per cent of the vote, have their political and ideological causes which need to be examined. The change of government is undoubtedly connected with the changes in the structure of the population and also with the fact that the working-class movement failed to study these changes comprehensively and draw the necessary political conclusions.

The working class in the Scandinavian countries is growing as a result of intensive capitalist development. However, the process of proletarianization is a complex one and full of contradictions. It should not be understood vulgarly, as many non-Marxists do. It is taking place in conditions of high business activity and a relatively high standard of living. This often means that those who become proletarianized, for example, the small peasant or fisherman, pass from the lower-income group to the higher-income group. This gives rise to a number of petty-bourgeois and reformist illusions. One can therefore speak of a political dilemma facing the new proletariat. It does not immediately join the working-class movement but clings to its old, petty-bourgeois platform for a while.

The increase in the number of clerical workers creates favorable ground for the spread of the petty-bourgeois influence in the working class. This confronts the working-class movement with new problems and tasks. A great part of the clerical workers can and should be won over to the working class.

It is true that the working-class movement has made and still makes mistakes with repect to the clerical workers. The demands of the latter for higher salaries, promotion, smaller taxes should be supported. Apart from having many common interests with the factory worker they have their own, specific interests which should be studied and given every attention.

The ties between factory and clerical workers should be strengthened. Political unity should be established between these two sections of the working class. We believe that for the Scandinavian countries where factory and clerical workers comprise the majority of the population, this is a more important task than the old traditional one of establishing an alliance of the working class and the peasantry.

Our countries have long ceased to be peasant countries. They have become industrial nations. The peasant question is an important question but it is no longer a priority one as it still is in agrarian countries. At present it is a question of cooperating with all middle sections—and not only with the peasantry—and also with part of the bourgeoisie in the struggle against monopoly capital.

The main problem with respect to the peasantry in our countries, at any rate as far as Norway, Sweden and Finland are concerned, is what attitude must we adopt towards the steady decline in the number of small holdings and to the policy of the big bourgeoisie (and also partly of the Social Democrats) aimed at abolishing these holdings.

We cannot, of course, endorse such a policy. However, we cannot indefinitely support small holdings and backward, obsolete forms of production. A long-range, up-to-date alternative to the capitalist form of large-scale production is needed. We must draw up a new agrarian program which would include, besides the traditional demands in support of the small holdings and small farmers, new demands, and also proposals promoting the expansion of the producer cooperative and various forms of collective production. The

small peasants are beginning to appreciate the need for cooperative farming.

* * *

In conclusion I should like to note that it is essential to keep abreast of the changes in the class structure and population structure of our countries and to study these changes. It is essential if our policy is not to lag behind the development of objective reality and if dogmatism is to be reduced to a minimum in our concepts.

State-monopoly capitalism and the working people

V. LOUPER

THE DEEP CRISIS of the West European military and political setup, with sharp conflicts inside the economic organization of "Little Europe," has become one of the key themes of international debate. Most bourgeois commentators view the situation from a superficially subjectivist angle, attributing it to the evil intentions or political shortsightedness of this or that statesman. But even those spokesmen of the ruling classes who are aware of the changes that have come about in the alignment of *political* forces in the imperialist camp and in the world generally refuse to see that the new developments are due to qualitative *class* shifts and the working people's growing influence on every aspect of life in capitalist society. In the light of these facts, a thorough analysis of modern capitalism is a pressing need.

Recent years have witnessed a substantial increase in Marxist research into the economic, social and political changes that have occurred, or are occurring, in the state-monopoly structure of the capitalist countries. Prominent in this research are publications of the Institute of World Economics and International Relations (IWEIR published in *Pravda* theses under the heading "Imperialist Integration in Western Europe (the Common Market)." A subsequent forum of Marxist scholars from more than twenty countries, held by IWEIR and the editorial board of this journal from August 27 to September 3, 1962, aroused appreciable interest in international scientific and political quarters. In October 1964, Marxists from sixty-odd countries met in Moscow for a forum on the theme "The International Working Class, the Leading Force of Modern World Development" sponsored by IWEIR.

The series of monographs published by IWEIR in 1965* was a further contribution to research into state-monopoly capitalism.

The monograph *Changes in the Economic Structure of West European Countries* reveals that in the post-war period the economic structure of the highly-developed capitalist countries have undergone big changes. Under the impact of changes in the social division of labor, with the revolution in science and technology on the rise, the ratio of various spheres and branches of the national economy is reshaping, and so is the pattern of

*Changes in the Economic Structure of West European Countries. Edited by Y. Khmelnitskaya, Moscow, Nauka Publishers, 1965, 433 pp.

these branches and their special subdivisons. Rapid technological progress is changing the production machinery and the technology of the traditional branches, splitting these branches, giving rise to new branches and industries, and upsetting branch proportions of the past.

The monographs *The Working Class in the Modern Capitalist Countries* and *The Technological Revolution and the Working Class in the Major Capitalist Countries* thoroughly investigate the changes in the class composition of society, primarily in the composition of the working class, resulting from progress in science and technology. Their authors reject the erroneous, anti-Marxist contention that the modern proletariat has disintegrated and no longer has common class objectives. Indeed, the changes taking place in the composition of the proletariat, its growing numbers and organization, the shift of the industrial proletariat to industries of decisive importance for the development of modern productive forces, its concentration, its increasing role and activity indicate that it is maturing as the force destined to end capitalist exploitation.

Progress in production techniques has led to tangible changes in the skill pattern of the working class. Automation is abolishing a number of trades, once basic and widespread. The proportion of workers directly engaged in production is decreasing. At the same time there are more and more job-setters, maintenance workers, technicians specializing in electrical and radio equipment, technical service personnel. Different forms of automation have a different effect on the pattern of skills. While comprehensive automation requires highly skilled workers with broad qualifications, partial automation allows of the use of relatively unskilled labor on certain operations. On the other hand, a sizeable proportion of the working people is threatened with unemployment. The skill pattern is affected by both the introduction of new techniques and the monopolies' policy on production organization and rate-setting. This is why changes in the skill pattern of the working class—a pattern subordinated to the interests of capitalist profit like the entire development of production under capitalism — presents a complex, and occasionally a contradictory, picture.

Soviet researchers devote a great deal of attention to the study of so important an effect of this country's revolution in science and technology as the steep growth of the proportion of engineers, technicians and researchers, as well as clerical workers in industry. The ratio of wage-earners and salaried workers in industry is changing. The greatest changes in the pattern of industrial employment are taking place in the new industries. In the electrical engineering and chemical industries of West Germany, for example, the proportion of engineers and technicians and of clerical workers is about 26 and over 32 per cent, respectively. In the chemical and atomic industries of the USA, the respective percentages are about 50 and over 60. The proportion of engineers, technicians and office employees among industrial workers today exceeds one-quarter in the United States and about the same in the other developed capitalist countries.

The authors refute the bourgeois sociologists' allegation that the changes in the composition of wage labor are evidence of the "deproletarianization" of bourgeois society, of the absorption of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in a "new middle class." This allegation, which distorts the concept of social classes, is an attempt to represent the changes taking place in the social division of labor as class changes. It is not the proletariat that is dissolving itself in a "new middle class," as bourgeois theoreticians would have it. The fact is that the mass of rank-and-file office employees is drawing closer to the proletariat, losing its independent and relatively more secure position and becoming an object of increasing capitalist exploitation.

In examining the problem of relations between wage-earners and salaried workers, Soviet analysts stress that the contradiction between mental and physical labor existing in bourgeois society does not rule out closer links and class affinity between mental and manual workers. On the one hand, most of the capitalist exploiters are not mental workers. On the other, most of the office employees, engineers and technicians in capitalist enterprises belong to the exploited and not the exploiters.

It must be stressed, however, that the process of rapprochement between industrial workers and clerical workers is somewhat contradictory and does not at all imply an inevitable and automatic growth of the strength and influence of the working class. To win the support of the clerical workers, the bourgeois parties even meet some of their demands. Only through joint struggle provided the proletarian vanguard works among the

---

N. Ivanov. **The Technical Revolution and the Working Class in the Major Capitalist Countries: Skill and Employment.** Moscow, Nauka Publishers, 1965. 188 pp.

The Working Class in the Modern Capitalist Countries: Changes in Its Structure. Edited by V. Lyubimova, et al. Moscow, Mysl Publishers, 1965, 374 pp. (In Russian.)

salaried workers and defends their interests, can a solid alliance of all wage and salary earners be established.

Soviet researchers differ over the class delimitation of the working class and the class affiliation of salaried workers. Some of them regard the latter as a special contingent of working people who in many respects are close to the working class, while others simply include them in the working class, regarding them as no more than a special stratum of this class. These differences are purely methodological, their exponents fully agreeing that both wage-earners and salaried workers belong to wage-labor having similar interests and an objective stake in abolishing capitalism.

The general improvement of the standard of living of the working class — a result achieved through struggle — raises interesting and important problems. The bourgeois theoreticians' hope that a higher standard of living will prompt the working people to "go bourgeois" and renounce the class struggle, is proving groundless. Having won certain demands, the workers, whose requirements are growing, put forward new demands. It is indicative that the higher-paid workers are often the more active in this respect. At the same time, due to the changing economic conditions of the workers, many habitual outward characteristics are becoming less marked, and certain stimuli for the class struggle of the working people are becoming less important as the struggle centers on other, often deeper social problems affecting the whole of society. In the new situation, the slogan of ending private property — a measure that is a necessary element of socialist reorganization — seems to some sections of the working class to be something quite abstract. To a degree, the struggle shifts to other objectives and concerns itself with other issues arising from new forms of exploitation. A highly important component of it is the movement for control over economic and political power centers at all levels, for respect for professional and human dignity, against standardizing the individual.

The authors of *The Working Class in the Modern Capitalist Countries,* who deal with the problem of the so-called labor aristocracy, amphasize that many aspects of this problem are open to question. They rightly point out that in the new conditions of the labor movement the bourgeois machinery of government and the monopoly bourgeoisie are striving to influence the working class by more varied methods than in the past. The bourgeoisie would like to set up strong points in various sections of the working class through "human relations," the reformist utilization of the demand for co-management, and "sharing in profits." The concept "labor aristocracy" calls for further clarification with due regard to reality. The activity of the Communist parties in recent years has shown that they do not attach very much importance to this concept. It would be hard to describe as "labor aristocracy" the vast sections of the working class that hold reformist views and pursue a policy of conciliation. After all, the overwhelming majority of the Social-Democratic workers believe in socialism even though they have yet to find the right way to it. Reformist views often do not prevent workers from taking an active part in economic struggles against the employers, including strikes. Describing reformist party and union leaders as "labor aristocracy" — for they would be the first to be included in this category — often leads in practice to a revival of the politically erroneous counterposing of leaders, the "agents of the bourgeoisie," to the "misled" masses.

The monograph *Western Europe: The Working People Against the Monopolies* is devoted to the position and fight of the working class.

The authors show that the important technical, economic and social changes that have come about since the war have caused major shifts in the social consciousness of hundreds of millions of working people in the capitalist countries. Underlying these shifts is. first and foremost, the increased desire for an equitable distribution of public wealth, and for social equality. Different contingents and organizations of the working class view these social and psychological changes differently. Reformists regard the continuing favorable economic situation which has been accompanied by a drop in unemployment and an increase in wages and consumption, as an "era of universal welfare and social justice," supposed to have set in without class struggle. Undoubtedly, the changes in question and, above all, the propaganda about them have influenced the thinking of a considerable section of the working people and made for a temporary proliferation of reformist illusions. But an objective analysis of the labor movement in Western Europe reveals another distinctive trend, a tendency to launch anti-monopoly class struggles on new fronts, using the gains achieved so far to present greater demands and to fill them with a qualitatively new content.

Western Europe: The Working People Against the Monopolies. Edited by Y. Ambartsumov, A. Arzumanyan, et al. Moscow, Mysl Publishers, 1965. 445 pp.

One of the burning issues of the labor movement today is the role of the trade unions. The organized unity of the capitalist forces which expresses itself in all sorts of manufacturers' associations, and particularly in the numerous "all-Europe" institutions embodying the administrative functions of the Common Market, is still to be opposed by a solidly united labor movement of Western Europe. Owing to a variety of causes, some of which have already become history while others may be traced to important contradictions in modern life, the trade union movement of "Little Europe" is still split.

The authors do not confine themselves to registering this unfavorable situation. Without indulging in excessive optimism, they prove that as the class struggle goes on there appear increasingly deeper cracks in the seemingly impenetrable wall of disunity. How to extend these cracks and pull down the wall? How to ensure that the Europe of trusts and monopolies is confronted by a Europe of united working people? The authors stress that exposing the reformist unions' acts of conciliation is necessary but not enough. It is vastly important to search patiently for specific common objectives of struggle acceptable to every contingent of the proletariat and capable of uniting them on the basis of real action. It should be borne in mind, moreover, that pressure from the workers has lately compelled reformist unions more and more often to go into action.

The authors carefully examine the relationship between the working-class parties and the trade unions. They disprove the reformist thesis that the party's role in social life is diminishing, that the labor movement no longer needs any parties (meaning primarily the Communist Party, of course), and that the unions should "take the parties in tow." "Practice," they write, "bears out Lenin's proposition that the party is the *highest* form of proletarian class organization!"

Does this mean that the unions must be merely instruments of the party and that the party must shape their policies for them? Of course not. Dogmatic, vulgar notions about the leading role of the party are exceedingly dangerous, for their application undermines the working people's faith in their leaders, undermines the influence of progressive trade unions centers and increases disruptive trends. The authors recall very appropriately that as far back as 1905 Lenin warned against this mistake. In his article "Our Tasks and the Soviet of Workers" Deputies," he wrote that the Soviet local council, an organization representing all occupations, "should *strive* to include deputies from *all* industrial, professional and office workers, domestic servants, farm laborers, etc., from *all* who want and are able to fight in common for a better life for the whole working people, from all who have at least an elementary degree of political honesty, from all but the downright reactionaries." He sharply criticized comrades who proposed expelling from the Soviets those who disagreed, calling this "absurd" and "foolish."

The fact that the Communists uphold the idea of trade union autonomy in no way implies that the party of the proletariat is indifferent to the unions. On the contrary, large numbers of Communists take an active part in union work, adhere to the unions' program principles and strive to ensure that union activities meet the interests of the working class as much as possible.

Unity of action of the working class and other working people can be brought about only through sharp class and ideological struggles over a long period. In an "integrated" Western Europe, establishing a united anti-monopoly front largely depends on the elaboration of a democratic alternative to the imperialist Common Market. The need is for a platform of demands and actions capable of uniting the broadest sections of the proletariat and other working people of different political and ideological convictions following the lead of various unions and political parties, whose thinking is far from socialist. At the same time this platform should be closely linked with the struggle for socialism, which is the goal of the Communist parties.

One of the merits of the book under review is that it systematizes the efforts of Marxists in many countries to formulate a democratic alternative to the alliance of European monopolies.

The Communist stand on the Common Market is based primarily on the proposition that the Common Market has "become an economic and political reality" *(Theses of IWEIR*, September 1962). The Communists realize that at the basis of the Common Market are objective and irreversible technical and economic developments. But to say only this means fully abstracting oneself from the subjective aspect of the Common Market. This aspect consists in the fact that "Little Europe" is an expression of the domination of anti-democratic forces, the result of a definite subjective policy, that of the monopolies. "In other words," we read in the book, "the Communist and democratic movement is opposed to the Common Market, not because

it is an embodiment of economic integration, but because, as it stands today, it serves the monopolies which are also the ones to benefit from it."

Therefore, it would be wrong in combating the Common Market to see a democratic alternative in reverting to the past, to the period preceding the signing of the Rome Treaty of 1957. As well as being unrealistic, such a return would hit the economies of West European countries and cause direct economic damage to the working people.

Needless to say the Left forces are far from wanting to "integrate" themselves in the Common Market system as the Right Social Democrats have done. They are striving to ensure that the class character of the EEC changes and that monopoly capital's control over "Little Europe" is replaced by control on the part of a broad anti-monopoly coalition led by the working class. Of course, this does not preclude and, in fact, implies the abolition of the exclusive character of the EEC, and the promotion of extensive economic relations between all countries of the world.

The authors go into the specific aspects of a democratic alternative to the Common Market, such as nationalizing monopoly property, democratizing economic planning, establishing public control over the steadily growing national and inter-state bureaucratic machinery, and so on. They stress that the democratic program, which is also a very important step toward socialism, can be realized only in an atmosphere of peaceful coexistence and international detente. Hence the importance of the working people of Western Europe fighting for these objectives.

We would like to note in conclusion that the IWEIR book we have reviewed are evidence of the painstaking creative work done by the Institute staff lately. We hardly need add that this work is far from completed. There are many problems bearing on contemporary state-monopoly capitalism and the labor movement that Marxists are only just beginning to tackle comprehensively. The reader is looking forward to new profound analyses, and we hope he will not be disappointed.

Ideology and Utopia

W. HOLLITSCHER

WERE THE WORKING-CLASS movement to be deprived of the socialist ideas and communist aims which are its cementing factor—for it is through the actions and achievements of the proletariat that scientific socialism is realized—it would be doomed to impotence and confusion. Hence the efforts of the capitalist ideologists to persuade Marxists to accept the theory of "de-ideologization," to concede that "Communism is only a new utopia" or, at least, contains a multitude of utopian elements, are tantamount to an attempt to stupefy the mind and paralyze the heart of the working class.

Such an attempt was made as far back as 1929 by Karl Mannheim, a proponent of what is called "sociology of knowledge," who described Marxism as being merely a "nineteenth century ideology" and hence a highly relative phenomenon of dubious objective validity.

Today, when the impact of Marxism has compelled the bourgeoisie to examine it extensively, the critique of the concept "ideology" has assumed new forms, although Mannheim's theses are still used alongside refurbished arguments designed to induce the working-class movement to give up the only ideology corresponding to its interests. Either Marxism is true and hence not an ideology, it is said, or it is an ideology and hence false. In other words, "truth" and "ideology" are regarded as mutually exclusive.

Dr. Ernest Glaser, writing in *Die Zukunft*, the central theoretical organ of the Austrian Socialist Party, puts it thus: "He who has cognized reality, i.e., is in a position to draw on the findings of scientific research, no longer espouses an ideology. A person subscribes to an ideology only when research has not been carried far enough, or when he himself is not concerned with it and acts as if it did not exist." Glaser equates the "materialization" he propounds with de-ideologization," which he regards by and large as a matter of adaptation to the fashionable sociological, psychological and philosophical trends of contemporary bourgeois ideology.

Henri Lefebvre, professor of social science at Strassbourg University, takes a similar view. "What is Marxism?" he asks. "An ideology (the ideology of the proletariat)? Or a science?"

The view has also been expressed that ideology does not represent scientific knowledge of the world, but is a false consciousness, and that elements of such a false consciousness have combined with the true ideas of Marxism to form an ideological amalgam. If we were to return to the simple categories of "right" and "wrong" it would be seen, some writers hold, that the findings of research are not "bourgeois" or "proletarian," "capitalist" or "socialist," but either right or wrong (or partly right, questionable, and so on). The conclusion drawn is that we should not immure ourselves in ideology.

It is symptomatic that Dr. Glaser's views are questioned by another Socialist, Ernst Mayer, in an article likewise published in *Die Zukunft*. Mayer does not agree that "there is no such thing as Marxism, that there exist only Karl Marx's scientific theories which are simply either false or correct." He issues the warning that "it should not be forgotten that our political opponent has his own ideology founded on the firm condition that the present state of affairs must be preserved," and concludes: "Hence Socialists must never allow themselves to succumb to the suicidal fiction of ideological neutrality."

Professor O. K. Flechtheim, of West Berlin, speaking during the Eighth European Dialogue in Vienna, likewise describes the "latest anti-ideological position as a manifestation of a 'philosophy' of adaptation to a present domi-

nated by the past, as surrender to the "ideology' of things as they are."

The theory of "de-ideologization" in the "contemporary industrial society" (a fashionable term used to gloss over the social antagonism between the capitalist and socialist industrial countries) has its champions in the USA as well. These include A. Schlesinger and W. Rostow, who, though invoking different arguments, deny that there is any difference in principle between the modern capitalist and the modern socialist society and that, consequently, the choice is between the two. Hence they look forward to "ideology dying out" (meaning, of course, socialist ideology). A. Kunina is correct in describing these and similar concepts as attempts "to divert the peoples from the ideological struggle and to isolate them from the influence of Marxism-Leninism by alleging that when the world is moving towards a single 'mixed society' there is no need for ideology at all."

THE CONCEPT "IDEOLOGY"

In order to weigh the pros and cons in the controversy reflected in the passages quoted above, a definition of the concept "ideology" should be essayed. Like any other scientific concept, it cannot be defined arbitrarily. The characteristics covered by definitions should correspond to the characteristics of actually interconnected things or processes. Similarly, concepts of relation should reflect real relationships, for instance, between definite material and spiritual social processes resulting from human activity. This applies to ideological relationships as well.

But the simple concept "idea" as such means something more than "notion." In the Marxist sense it carries a real social function; it is a notion to be carried out in practice and to be upheld in class struggle, a guide to man's will and activity.

The pre-Marxian history of the concept "ideology" can be traced to the French philosopher E. B. de Condillac, whose theories on this score were subsequently developed by Destutt de Tracy into the so-called "ideologism." Napoleon I applied the term "ideologue" to the protagonists of ideas neither practicable nor worthy of realization. This connotation of chimerical flights of fancy remained with the word until Marxism came on the scene.

The concept "ideology" acquired a completely new meaning in the course of the rise and development of Marxism. And it will surely be enriched further in the future. The key to understanding it is the Marxist theory concerning the basis and superstructure, the pivotal precept of historical materialism, which examines ideology as a system of sociopolitical, philosophical, religious, artistic and other ideas conditioned by the material basis of the given society and in the light of their role in the class struggle.

Needless to say, the natural relationship between the material basis of society, by which the genesis and spread of ideas are conditioned, and the ideas themselves should not be equated with the relationship between ideas and the reality they reflect either correctly or falsely. Marxist ideological researchers approach the first causal proposition from the positions of historical materialism, of Marxist sociology. The second— the question of the trustworthiness of knowledge, of the extent to which an idea corresponds to reality—is resolved in conformity with the concrete criteria of truth appropriate to the particular science involved and is verified in the final analysis by the criterion of practice. In the process the relation between the socially conditioned appraisals of phenomena and their objective veracity is revealed. This presupposes, among other things, a certain level of social, material and spiritual development, division of labor, etc. In class society it is the class affiliations of the theoretician and the historically conditioned status of his class that determine the extent to which he is able to ascertain the truth, whether in passing judgment he is able to see the world around him as it is, whether the consciousness of his class reflects reality or is a "false consciousness."

Marx and Engels focussed attention on the socially conditioned distortion of ideas, i.e., false notions about social condition, the socially conditioned "false consciousness" of their contemporaries who, unable to see the class roots of their erroneous outlook which Marx and Engels revealed, attributed it to society as a whole. These philosophical misconceptions are exposed in their full class context in *The German Ideology*.

Marx and Engels first formulated their concept of ideology as a critique of contemporary bourgeois thought giving a social definition of "false consciousness"—the "distorted form in which the sanctimonious and hypocritical ideology of the bourgeois seeks to pass off its particular interests as the common interests." This concept, which later was to acquire broader connotations, highlighted the main social feature of the narrow class consciousness of the bourgeoisie, a consciousness with a heavy ballast of self-deception and seeking to deceive others as regards the role and per-

spectives of the capitalist class. Yet in view of the diverse trends and methamorphoses of bourgeois ideology and its changing role, it cannot, of course, be summarily assessed as an indivisible whole.

Marx and Engels regarded also the scientific socialist outlook they founded and upheld all their lives as a product of social development, and this enabled them to perceive the underlying social truth. Basically, the socialist consciousness of the proletariat is by no means "false consciousness' but an ideology that can be—and has been—scientifically substantiated.

It is in this broader sense that Marx discusses the concept "ideology" in his Preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*. "In considering such transformations," he wrote, "a distinction should always be made between the material transformation of the economic conditions of production, which can be determined with the precision of natural science, and the legal, political, religious, aesthetic or philosophic — in short, ideological forms in which men become conscious of this conflict and fight it out." As regards the proletariat, its social consciousness of its position, increasingly corresponds to its actual position and the perspectives that follow therefrom. This is fundamentally *true* consciousness capable of adequately reflecting social being.

As far back as 1902 Lenin declared in his *Letter to the Northern League* that "socialism, as the ideology of the class struggle of the proletariat . . . is founded on the sum total of human knowledge." And in *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* he said: "...Every ideology is historically conditioned, but it is unconditionally true that to every scientific ideology (as distinct, for instance, from religious ideology) there corresponds an objective truth."

The same broad definition is given in recent Marxist reference works, such as *Fundamentals of Marxist Philosophy* edited by F. V. Konstantinov ("Ideology in class society is the sum total of the social views . . . of a given class reflecting its position and interests") and the *Philosophical Dictionary* edited by G. Klaus and M. Buhr ("Socialist ideology is, as regards its scientific content, the sum total of the cardinal findings of philosophical, historical and economic sciences").

Bertolt Brecht gave a concise, parabolic exposition of the fact that the ideology of Marxism thus understood does not contradict its veracity, and anticipated how the law of the basis and superstructure will be assessed in the future. Interpreting the Marxist teaching on ideology, Brecht said: "Consciousness depends on the mode by which in each given case people produce the essentials of their life. He. (Marx—*Ed.)* denies that people can get rid of the economic approach to a greater extent in their thinking than in the economy as such. At first this may sound depressing. But the simple consideration that all the great works of the past were created regardless of this dependence, that recognition of the dependence makes them no less great, once again puts everything in its place. As a matter of fact, the time will no doubt come when this phrase will be fated to lose, if not its renown, then at least its significance. It was first uttered to challenge the dominant ideas of the time under capitalism—*Ed.)* and to remind people that they were the ideas of the ruling class. The purpose was to detract from the value of these ideas. When there will be no more rulers and when economic dependence will not weigh down so heavily on the majority of the people of the world, this phrase too will no longer depress anyone." *(Uber Klassiker.)*

Better than those who feel that for art's own sake they must oppose ideology in art, the eminent writer, here as in all of his writings, perceived the essence of things when he declared that social dependence in itself does not make the great insignificant or the true false. The scientific ideology of Marxism is in our time at once class-conditioned and true. It correctly reflects the objective reality precisely *because* of the class position of its spokesmen.

NON-IDEOLOGICAL CONTROVERSIAL ISSUES

Serious and regrettable mistakes in assessing certain ideas have also been made in the course of the ideological class struggle. Ideas were labeled hostile even when they did not derive from class relationships and, had they not been distorted, could not have served the ends of the ideological enemy. False "ideologization" of this kind has nothing in common either with the spirit of Marxism or the interests of the Marxists. For instance, general theories of natural science were seen to stem from class roots merely because they impinged on people's world outlooks. And be cause our ideological opponents misused them they were branded as "components of hostile ideology" and combatted with the weapons of ideological class struggle.

These mistakes, the consequences of which were damaging to some scientific trends and fatal for some of their proponents, are being

corrected, but not in order to appease the adversary. The essential thing here is the idea expressed by Engels in his *Ludwig Feuerbach:* "The bolder and more determined science is, the more it accords with the interests and aspirations of the workers."

In the sphere of natural science such mistakes affected certain theories in astronomy, physics, chemistry and biology, and partly also in medicine and psychology; in the social sciences, some concrete questions of history (including the history of philosophy, science and technology), and also theories of sociology, econometry and scientific organization of production.

Let us cite a few examples, not necessarily in chronological order. As a rule vigorous efforts were made to correct the shortcomings and errors, which were rectified as soon as they were noted, mostly after a critical examination and, in the case of incorrect assessments, after the underlying political appraisals were corrected.

In the thirties a controversy began during which a false "ideological" label was attached to the implications of Einstein's theory of relativity (this controversy, incidentally, was the first to be settled). Some Marxist philosophers with inadequate grounding in the natural sciences felt that the epoch-making proof adduced by Einstein of the relativity of time and space did not deepen our knowledge but tended towards the theoretical relativization of our scientific conception of nature. The proof provided by the general theory of relativity of the indivisible unity of space time and matter, the fact that "physical geometry" is determined by the distribution of matter variable in time and space, was not at once interpreted as a graphic concretization of materialist dialectics. And this, in spite of the fact that the theory of relativity, just as any other true, profound scientific discovery, gave Marxist philosophy a wealth of material for generalization, providing both confirmation of its methods and new opportunities for their further development.

The cosmological conclusions from the general theory of relativity concerning the general structure of the known and now measurable universe were likewise often regarded as rooted in class ideology and hence were rejected as incompatible with Marxist philosophy before they were clearly understood and empiricably verified. Only *after* the variable distribution of matter in space was established as a fact were the conclusions concerning changes in the structure of space deriving therefrom substantiated. In each given instance, the so-called curvature of space can be ascertained only empirically. In this connection mention should be made of A. L. Zelmanov's view that the finity and infinity of space, hitherto thought to be incompatible, may well prove to have an altogether unforeseen dialectical inter-connection.

The quantum theory was also met by some Marxist writers with unjustified "ideological" criticism. Despite the vast amount of experimental material accumulated to date, this theory is still highly controversial. The diverse interpretations given no doubt bear the imprint of both positive and negative preconceived philosophical notions traceable to the class associations of the various proponents of the theory. Yet the differences in interpretation cannot be wholly reduced to such ideological factors. As far as I know, five different interpretations of the quantum theory are advanced today by outstanding researchers who subscribe to dialectical materialism.

In chemistry, the "ideologization" of the so-called theory of resonance and the "mesomeric" concept of Linus Pauling, the eminent U.S. scientist, winner of the Nobel Chemistry and Peace prizes, was also unjustified. The nature of the chemical phenomena dealt with in Pauling's theory is still being debated.

The discussion of determinism now under way throughout the world in connection with the quantum theory should no doubt be approached also from the ideological angle: the class implications of the views expressed should be taken into account. But, as we see it, no one can tell as yet which, in the overall context of the dialectical materialist picture of nature, is the correct interpretation of the processes involved in the inter-action of the elementary particles. The elementary structural units of matter are neither "pure" particles nor "pure" waves. Nor can their motion judging by all indications, be fully encompassed by our traditional concepts of motion. In view of this, as well as of the universal mutability of elementary particles and their "inexhaustibility," of which Lenin spoke, one must concede that it is quite possible, and even probable, that laws of motion of an entirely new type may be discovered in this area. No Marxist dialectician would rule out such a possibility.

It is a most regrettable fact that cybernetics, before it launched out on the highroad of progress in the socialist countries, was at one time rejected and even branded as a pseudoscience on the strength of the bourgeois ideological prejudices entertained by the otherwise progressive founder of the science, Norbert Wiener. Naturally enough, the newly discovered generalized laws governing control

and communications in machines, animal organisms and social systems were reflected in the minds of Wiener and his colleagues and pupils in an ideologically conditioned, limited or distorted form. This applied especially to their social views. Today the Marxist cyberneticists, who already have signal accomplishments to their credit, have weeded out these distortions, convincing many of their bourgeois colleagues of the correctness and fruitfulness of dialectical materialism, the philosophical ideology of the working-class movement.

The approach to genetics primarily from the ideological angle caused damage requiring a great deal of time to repair. Instead of verifying the real state of affairs, examining the theories involved and assessing their validity, facts and their interpretations were ignored or repudiated simply because some bourgeois ideologists had drawn erroneous, anti-Marxist conclusions from them—an impermissible approach from both the ideological—and cognitive points of view. The resulting neglect of research in chromosomes and molecular biology as a whole was the price paid for these mistakes and blunders.

Clearly, the critic proceeding from ideological positions should be well acquainted with the factual data involved, the conditions from which ideas stem and the objects to which they relate.

When Lenin exposed "physical" idealism, he analyzed the philosophical problems of physics and revealed the class roots of the philosophical positions of some physicists. But he did not see any "philosophical" dogma involved in the professional controversies among physicists. The same cannot be said of the "philosophical" argumentation advanced by Trofim Lysenko who, often misinterpreting Michurin, opposed research into the molecular-genetic foundations of heredity. Bourgeois eugenics is, of course, quite another matter, for, while pretending to draw on genetics, it actually derives its driving force not from the factual content of the latter but from bourgeois ideology (this, however, does not mean that the proper use of the findings of genetics is of no importance in combatting hereditary diseases.)

As an illustration of wrong conclusions drawn from the real or imaginary presence of bourgeois class motives in the social sciences suffice it to mention the attitude towards econometry, a science which employs methods of higher mathematics in economic analysis and forecasting. The fact that these methods were evolved and propagated to serve the capitalist economy based on profit does not in itself make analysis of inter-branch relationships purely a bourgeois proposition or intrinsically incorrect. On the contrary, it is imperative to employ such analysis to promote the socialist economy. At present, when the socialist countries are employing the balance method of ordering inter-branch relationships and programmed management effected with the aid of electronic computers it is not only desirable but also pefectly possible to use these methods of weighing alternative models of economic processes to improve planning.

The same can be said of the theories of organization of labor and mechanization of clerical and managerial work on which much emphasis has been placed in the capitalist countries (with a view, of course, to intensified exploitation and rationalization). In this and similar instances both theory and practice show that the class-conditioned ideological or superstructural nature of an institution in itself does not predetermine its incorrectness (or correctness), or its usefulness only for one particular social system. Only concrete analysis in each given case can reveal the relation between the social conditions in which ideas, methods and institutions come into being and their actual value in a particular set of circumstances.

We cite the above examples of blunders in assessing scientific achievements not only to underscore the importance of thorough study of ideological inter-relationships. The fact is that under the pressure of ideological attacks of the bourgeoisie and its subversive tactics some people reputed to be Marxists were led astray and threw the baby out along with the bath water. From the abuse of "ideologization" of scientific theories they tended to conclude that they were entitled to demand the "de-ideologization" discussed in the beginning of this article. They failed to see that this demand is an attack against the principles of historical materialism (and hence against Marxism), which investigates the general as well as the concrete relationship between social being and consciousness in order to understand past history and to exercise a conscious, planned influence on present and future political developments. Only guided by the principles of Marxism is it possible scientifically to justify the picture of the future still to be won. Not to see this, to ascribe to Marxism allegedly erroneous prognostications amounting to "elements of utopianism" or to regard it as an unrealizable if radiant "dream of the perfect society", is tantamount to wanting contemporary Communism to retrogress from a science back to utopia.

REALITY AND UTOPIA

Marxism does not recognize any condition of "ultimate human perfection." It examines the historical process of continued improvement which is exemplified in the most advanced individuals as a result of collectively achieved social progress. Since only such qualities can be predicted with scientific veracity which already exist in embryo, as a rule only those properties of things to come can be anticipated which have been posed today as a concrete task aimed at creating conditions for their eventual realization.

What Marx said ninety years ago, in a letter to Sorge, about utopian socialism "playing with fancy pictures of the future structure of society," remains valid today. "Naturally utopianism," he wrote, "which *before* the time of materialistic-critical socialism concealed the germs of the latter within itself, coming now *after* the event can only be silly-silly, stale and basically reactionary."

He who today qualifies as "utopian" or "partly utopian" the Marxist forecast of the basic features of communism, to create which the most advanced socialist country, the Soviet Union, is already exerting much material and spiritual effort, plays, whether he wishes it or not, into the hands of the bourgeois ideologists who seek to equate the feasible aims of communism with the utopian and unrealizable figments of the imagination which they both propagate and fear.

The fact is that on the ideological plane the bourgeoisie is primarily engaged in inventing "negative utopias," as the British Marxist A. L. Morton put it, for, having no faith in progress, it visualizes the future as a world of unchanged people living in changed or technological conditions, as a world of people deformed by capitalism (or fascism) conducting military operations and deploying vast forces of destruction on earth as well as in outer space. Both the latest science fiction and the more refined satirical-utopian depictions of the future given by George Orwell and Aldous Huxley are replete with such visions.

Some Christian ideologists, with the interests of religion in view, are also trying to reduce scientific Communism to a simple Utopia. They criticize it for substituting a worldly "paradise" for the heavenly paradise they offer the righteous.

It was into the hands of critics of this kind that Robert Havemann played when, in his paper submitted to the Salzburg session of the Paulian Society last year, he made the categorical statement that "man with his progressive and freedom-loving aspirations needs an Utopia," assuring Catholics that "we are brothers in our Utopias" and that, like the religious Utopia, so the "Marxist Utopia" derives strength "from the impossibility of the achievement of the morally perfect society it envisages."

A static "perfect society" has never been the aim of scientific, Marxist Communism. Although the materialist view on social progress can in no way be equated with the Christian concept, it would be desirable for the Marxists and Christians to join their efforts for peace and justice. But such coordination of action is only made more difficult unless there is a clear-cut confrontation of ideas and ideologies. Cooperation and differentiation are mutually conditioned.

There are also those who hold that Engels' well-known formulation "from Utopia to science" may lead us astray, inasmuch as Marxism has allegedly not done away with Utopia as an undemonstrable vision of the future but has merely put it on a scientific basis.

According to this view the utopian element developed to a higher stage is retained in Marxism, to which are ascribed undemonstrable visions of the future. But would people believe that the undemonstrable can be realized? Is it from irrational, undemonstrable sources that Marxist revolutionaries who are building socialism in order to build communism derive their confidence?

Their convictions are unquestionably the fruit of thought. They are based on consistent, critical, scientific cognition of the social reality, a cognition possible only from the ideological positions of the revolutionary working-class movement and its loyal and determined allies. Any attempt to combine science and Utopia would, on the contrary, only produce intellectual dilemmas. The fact is that the socialist Utopias of the past have long been dispelled by Marxist criticism.

The Utopias propagated today are not concepts of scientific socialism, but mostly negative ideological distortions rooted in a lack of understanding of the problems and tasks of our time. As regards the few "positive Utopias" still current, they are unrealistic inasmuch as they are utopian; they are irrational inventions and often essentially "silly and stale," to use Marx's words. The negative Utopias, to quote Marx again, are "basically reactionary." Both kinds of Utopia have nothing in common with modern science. They are not an ideological expression of the interests of the proletariat. They are false. They are nothing more than a new variety of the false consciousness of bourgeois ideology.

New features of the national liberation movement

NICOLAS CHAOUI

WITH THE DISINTEGRATION of the colonial system and the emergence of new politically independent states in Asia and Africa, the national-liberation movement has entered a new, higher stage of development. That the development of the Afro-Asian countries has acquired a new quality in recent years is evident in the fact that the national-liberation revolutions against colonial rule and for political independence are turning into anti-imperialist, anti-capitalist revolutions tackling the tasks of social reconstruction. The choice of the non-capitalist path of development by a number of newly-free countries and the struggle waged by the masses in other countries to take this path are a salient feature of the contemporary world revolutionary process. The changes taking place in the national-liberation movement today are an objective necessity stemming from the domestic and international position of the newly-independent countries.

I

Upon achieving political independence, the peoples of these countries are confronted with the task of winning economic sovereignty and abolishing their economic dependence on the imperialist states which previously oppressed them and dominated their political and economic life. The prime problem is that of depriving foreign capital, which serves as the economic foundation for the continuation of imperialist plunder, of its positions. It is also imperative to take steps ensuring rapid all-round economic progress. However, the choice of the path to be taken by a newly-free country and its advance along this path are decided not through purely theoretical reasoning but in the course of fierce class struggle involving all classes and social sections of the nation.

The reactionaries tied up with foreign capital and neocolonialism seek to prevent progress towards economic emancipation, urging the people to confine themselves to political independence and, as Lenin said, "leaving out *economic* independence. Yet in reality it is the latter that is the chief thing." The masses of town and country who fought actively and effectively to rid their countries of the political rule of imperialism want political independence to open the floodgates for the new life and make it possible to put an end to poverty and backwardness. They want the fruits of this independence to belong to the overwhelming majority of the nation and not to the narrow group of the bourgeoisie or its small upper crust. This legitimate aspiration of the masses comes up against two main obstacles. First, as experience shows, it is impossible to achieve high rates of economic growth and a rise in the living standard within the framework of capitalist production relations, i.e., while remaining economically dependent on imperialism. The second obstacle is the opposition offered by some sections of the bourgeoisie even to general democratic and anti-feudal measures.

The objective factors impel the people to search for ways and means of overcoming the obstacles impeding the attainment of their aims. In other words, the social forces interested in bypassing the capitalist path are growing in the newly-independent countries.

The new, anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist character of the national-liberation movement as a whole does not preclude a wide variety of concrete forms and ways of development of this movement in the various countries. These forms and ways vary because of the different situations prevailing in the newly-free countries, the disparity of their levels of economic and political development, the different degrees of acuteness of the class contradictions and the dissimilarity of alignments of class forces. Lenin wrote that ". . . subsequent revolutions in Oriental countries, which possess far larger populations, and whose social conditions reveal far greater diversity, will undoubtedly

display even more peculiar features than the Russian revolution."

The national-liberation movement would not have undergone so deep a change and the striving of millions upon millions of people towards socialism would not have acquired so powerful an impact were it not for the new situation in the world arena. The rise of the socialist world system, the growth of its economic and military potential, and the change in the world balance of forces in favor of socialism not only make the transition from capitalism to socialism the principal feature of our time but also accelerate and facilitate this transition on the scale of the whole world revolutionary front, including the front of the national-liberation struggle.

The history of the national movement in the Arab countries clearly demonstrates how much the Soviet Union and the socialist world system have done to support the liberation struggle of the Arab peoples, that it is their influence which has played the decisive role in the extension of this struggle and in deepening its content. True, the national-liberation movements in the Arab countries were aimed from the outset at abolishing foreign domination and creating independent national states. Not infrequently these movements waged a bitter struggle, witness the uprisings of the Egyptian people (1919) and the Iraqi people (1920) against British rule, and the Syrian uprising (1925) against the French colonialists. But these revolutionary actions, too, were directly influenced by the Great October Socialist Revolution. The day after the victory of the Revolution the Soviet Government declared its support for all the oppressed peoples, Arabs included, in their struggle for freedom, and made public the content of the secret treaties concluded by the British and French colonialists with a view to partitioning the Arab countries. The establishment of the Soviet Union and then of the socialist world system changed the entire international climate and created more favorable conditions for all movements for national and social liberation. The socialist world has become the bulwark of the world revolutionary anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist movement.

A radical turn took place in the development of the Arab national-liberation movement when it began to cooperate with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries on concrete issues. The effective political and military aid rendered by the Soviet Union frustrated the attempts made by the imperialist powers to crush the independence of Egypt and Syria and to re-establish their direct rule in the Arab East. The Soviet Union's resolute support for the Arabs played an effective role in repelling the tri-partite aggression in the Suez Canal Zone in 1956, in foiling the plots hatched with the direct participation of U.S. and British agents with a view to overthrowing the system of government in Syria in 1955, 1956 and 1957, and also in preventing the military intervention of the United States and Britain at the time of the anti-colonial and anti-monarchy revolution of July 14, 1958, in Iraq.

Thanks to the aid and support of the Soviet Union the attempts to bring the Arab countries under the domination of neo-colonialism by drawing them into aggressive pacts and blocs have failed. Friendship and cooperation with the Soviet Union have served as a shield preventing the colonialists from exporting counter-revolution to the liberated Arab countries and enabling the latter to continue building the new life. The economic, financial and technical aid of the socialist states helped the Arab countries overcome the "hunger blockade" laid by world imperialism. This support, symbolized by the dams erected and projected in Aswan and on the Euphrates, has helped the Arab countries to lay the solid foundations of an independent national economy and is helping them to forge ahead along the path of social change. Thus, the history of the rapid upsurge of the national movement in the Arab countries with all its new implications is at the same time a history of growing friendship and cooperation with the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist system, demonstrating that the anti-colonial and anti-capitalist revolution, relying on these mutual contacts, can develop in the conditions of peaceful coexistence.

The organic link between the national-liberation movement and the socialist world system is manifest not only in the Arab countries. The experience of Mali, Burma and other developing countries shows that the solidarity of the two is an important feature of world development as a whole which promotes the consolidation and deepening of the national-liberation movement. And this, in turn, aggravates the general crisis of capitalism and increasingly tips the world balance of forces in favor of socialism. The time which Lenin foresaw has come when the struggle of the overwhelming majority of the world's population "cannot but lead to a crisis in the whole of world capitalism," cannot but "give rise to a world socialist revolution." Hence *any attempt to isolate the national-liberation movement from the Soviet Union and the socialist camp can only cause grave harm to the entire world revolutionary movement.*

II

Another new, important feature of the Arab liberation movement is that not only the proletarian masses of town and countryside but also the non-proletarian sections — the poor and middle peasants and the small bourgeoisie — are joining the struggle against capitalism under the leadership of the Communists and other revolutionary patriots (army officers and intellectuals) and are setting themselves socialist aims. Each passing day provides new proof that this trend is neither fortuitous nor temporary. The past several years have shown

that, far from waning, it has grown and developed. The step initiated in Egypt in 1956 with the nationalization of the Suez Canal and then of the foreign companies and banks was consummated with the nationalization in 1960 of the banks owned by the Egyptian finance oligarchy. Subsequently, further steps have been taken towards nationalizing the property of the Egyptian capitalists. Thanks to this the state sector now controls more than 85 per cent of the country's entire industrial production. Thus, we are witnessing a clear-cut trend which, all the vacillations and interruptions notwithstanding, leads objectively to the gradual abolition of the economic foundations of the local bourgeoisie, which has not succeeded in achieving its "grand national goal"; indeed, the initial groundwork for organizing economic life along planned lines is being laid. All this must be taken into account in elaborating our policy.

We are resolutely opposed to superficial, vulgarized interpretation of new phenomena in the national-liberation movement both in the Arab world and in all other developing countries. These phenomena cannot be credited to any one man or group of men, they are not the product of the subjective will of one or another leader. They stem from the vital needs of broad sections of the population, and are determined and conditioned by the new alignment of the class forces not only within the country but also in the world arena. The national-liberation movement is part of the world socialist revoluiton. ". . . The socialist revolution," Lenin pointed out, "will not be solely, or chiefly, a struggle of the revolutionary proletarians in each country against their bourgeoisie—no, it will be a struggle of all the imperialist-oppressed colonies and countries, of all dependent countries, against international imperialism." Those who fail to see this and search for "purely" socialist forms of social progress in countries whose economic development was retarded by colonialism for scores or hundreds of years have patently lost touch with living revolutionary practice and are unable to see the new which life brings to the national-liberation movement. The main danger, in our opinion, consists in an incorrect attitude towards the broad masses which make up the overwhelming majority of the population in the developing countries, failure to understand the role they have begun to play in the common revolutionary struggle, and denial of the *real, objective possibility of the non-capitalist path of development for some countries as a period of transition from colonial and semi-colonial regimes to socialism, by passing the stage of developed capitalist society.*

The objective possibility and reality of the non-capitalist path is confirmed primarily by the experience of the liberated countries which have already taken this road under the leadership of revolutionary patriots. It is also implicit in the growing realization on the part of the masses and revolutionary intellectuals in countries sitll ruled by the reactionaries that it is imperative to bar the way to capitalist development and steer these countries onto the non-capitalist road. The Lebanon Communists and the working class, for instance, are winning over to their side non-proletarian social sections and political organizations, such as the Arab Nationalist Movement, which have set themselves socialist aims and proved their dedication to these aims. In analyzing the genesis of political trends which set themselves socialist tasks we proceed from a Marxist-Leninist assessment of the situation existing in our country.

III

Despite all the specific features which distinguish it from other Arab and Afro-Asian countries (such as the relatively advanced stage in the development of capitalism, the strength of the political and economic positions of neocolonialism, the comparatively high standard of living, the religious composition of the population, etc.), the Lebanon as a state which recently won independence is faced with the main problem common to all of these countries—the need to build an independent national economy by ending the economic domination of foreign powers and to ensure the development of the production branches of the economy in order to lay a firm and reliable foundation for political independence, social progress and a higher living standard for the people. The Lebanon's experience since 1943, i.e., since winning independence, shows once again that capitalist development sharply accentuates social stratification. Suffice it to mention that the bankers, big importers and feudal elements, who make up only 4 per cent of the population, appropriate one-third of the national income while 14 per cent of the population appropriate another third, leaving only the remaining one-third for 82 per cent of the population. This state of affairs could not but give rise to a wave of mass actions. Last year the Lebanon witnessed a series of strikes such as the struggles of the workers of the Ar-Regie Tobacco Company and the oil, electric and other companies, as well as mass meetings demanding higher wages, better conditions and general economic advance. Besides workers, other social sections — civil servants, teachers, and university professors — took part in the the struggle.

There is not a single social group oppressed by foreign capital and the banking-feudal oligarchy in the Lebanon today which does not take part in the nation-wide struggle in one or another form. In the light of the aforesaid, we hold that the various socialist trends and schools which have emerged in recent years in the Lebanon are forms in which the objective requirements of the day manifest themselves. In them nationalist concepts intertwine with socialist ideas, with the views of a number of non-exploiting social strata whose

thinking and aspirations in some cases approximate to and in others are remote from the concepts of scientific socialism. Besides the internal factors, a big role in the development and maturing of these trends has been played by the achievements of the socialist countries in economic and social construction and the progressive changes in the countries of Asia and Africa. The impact of the progress made in non-capitalist development in the United Arab Republic has been particularly great. Some of the socialist trends have emerged as a result of progressive changes in political movements which until recently were bourgeois-nationalist as regards ideology, political slogans and aims.

Our Party still has to determine its attitude to the sections which reject the capitalist path and to find the forms of cooperation corresponding to the level of their development. We realize that the better we play our part in consolidating the progressive forces the more we shall facilitate and accelerate our country's advance towards the non-capitalist path of development. In the matter of cooperation, we proceed not from old concepts which no longer correspond to the nature of the national-liberation movement and its level of development but from the new content of this movement and the serious turn toward socialism that has taken place in the thinking of the masses. These changes make it imperative to introduce amendments in the forms of cooperation within the national-liberation movement. The old formula of the national front embracing, alongside the working class and the peasants, also the anti-imperialist national bourgeoisie implied the existence within the front of two opposite class forces the ultimate interests of which inevitably clashed each time the question of far-reaching social changes arose. Cooperation with elements rejecting the capitalist path and steering a course towards socialism is based on agreement on long-range tasks, on basic reconstruction of society. Hence to cling stubbornly to the old formulas of cooperation, without introducing any changes or amendments in keeping with the new situation, to be prejudiced against revolutionary patriots and their mass following, would mean to arrest the revolutionary upsurge of the people.

This of course, does not mean renouncing the formula of the national front; *what is in question is the emergence of the possibility to cooperate, on a higher plane and for a longer time, with those forces whom objective historical conditions draw into the mainstream of common development initiated by the world working class as a whole and who in the course of struggle accept (in varying degrees) the views and aims of the working class.* In our activity we are guided by Lenin's injunction that "when profound world-historic changes bring about an inevitable turn in our direction among the mass of non-Party, Menshevik, and Socialist-Revolutionary democrats, we must learn and shall learn to make use of this change of front, to encourage it, to induce it among the various groups and sections of the population, to do everything possible to reach agreement with them . . . It is not enough to encourage this change of front and amicably greet those who are making it. A politician who knows what he is working for must learn to *bring about* this change of front among the various sections and groups of the broad mass of petty-bourgeois democrats if he is convinced that serious and deep-going historical reasons for such a turn exist."

Our Party has achieved notable success in rallying the progressive and democratic forces of the Lebanon, especially those who aspire towards socialism. Thus, last year witnessed the formation of the Front of Patriotic and Progressive Parties and Personalities which includes as its core besides the Communist Party, the Socialist Progressive Party headed by Kamal Djoumblatt, and the Arab National Movement. The Front has already emerged onto the country's political arena. One can already see quite clearly its concrete and positive impact on many aspects of Lebanese internal and foreign policy. However, cooperation with the forces striving towards socialist aims has not obscured from us the existence of other patriots who can and must be drawn into the struggle against foreign imperialist plots and the maneuvers of domestic reaction siding with imperialism. We are doing our utmost to isolate the banking-feudal oligarchy and remove its representatives from leading posts in government. Hence we are striving to make the Front of Patriotic and Progressive Parties and Personalities the core around which all the sound forces of the Lebanon could unite, to make it an instrument of their unity. The Political Resolution adopted by the Central Committee of our Party in mid-February declares: "The Communists firmly believe that the unity of the socialist and revolutionary forces plays a vast role in rallying and consolidating the ranks of all patriots and democrats of the Lebanon, in uniting the trade union and working-class movement, in mobilizing the broadest social sections . . . and in building a broad front of all the political forces which want to consolidate independence, heed the people's needs, are loyal to democratic principles and freedoms and maintain no political and economic contacts with the imperialist powers and the banking-feudal oligarchy."

On the other hand, however, our Party has opposed the view held by some of our allies that it is necessary immediately to merge the socialist parties and organizations into one political organization. We maintain that a simplified approach to this question is not in the interests of the revolutionary movement in the Lebanon. The form in which the revolutionary and socialist forces can be united is determined in the process of struggle; it depends on a wide range of factors and conditions and not only on subjective desire. These factors and conditions include: the specific features of political life, the

balance of class forces, the sharpness of social contradictions, the level of revolutionary development and the stage the revolution has reached. As we have shown above, the tasks confronting the country provide favorable grounds for cooperation. Proceeding from this we have proposed a concrete program of joint action. Originally our proposals hinged on the urgent demands of the masses: higher wages, lower cost of living, medical aid, lower tuition fees, etc. But as the joint struggle developed and popular actions gained scope, the conditions became ripe for advancing a proposal to elaborate a common stand on such important issues as the further perspectives of development and the struggle against the domination of neocolonialism and the system of "free" enterprise. As a result, the cooperation has risen to a new, higher plane, there is more mutual understanding, and we feel that the positions and views of our allies are gradually evolving towards acceptance of some of the basic theoretical concepts of scientific socialism.

Today the socialist forces in the Lebanon, despite the differences between the parties representing them, find a common ground in repudiating the capitalist trend, in recognizing the need for the class struggle and activity to promote non-capitalist and socialist development, in striving to strengthen solidarity and cooperation with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. This shows once again that the flexible policy of cooperation pursued by the Communists is a correct policy opening up broad vistas for the entire popular movement of the country.

We resolutely rebuff those who say that the new character of relations between Communists and othe rrevolutionary forces means renouncing the leading role of the working class. What is in question is not renouncing the leading role of the working class and replacing it with the leading role of some other class or social section, but underscoring the possibility existing in the newly-free countries to renounce the capitalist path of development even before all the internal subjective prerequisites of socialism have ripened. Where the young working class has not yet had the opportunity or the time to become a politically and organizationally independent force, a "class for itself," it is unable at the outset to play the leading role in the social changes taking place in its country. However, in the course of non-capitalist development and economic construction more favorable conditions are bound to arise for the numerical growth of the working class and the gradual heightening of its influence on the economic and political life of the country. It is essential to distinguish between two problems here: the commencement of the anti-capitalist process and the perspective of building socialism, which, as Marxism-Leninism teaches us, must proceed under the leadership of the working class. *The non-capitalist road of development is a period of transition to socialism in underdeveloped countries where the material conditions for direct transition to socialism have not yet taken shape.* Simultaneous existence of different economic formations is one of the specific features of the transitional period.

IV

The transitional period lays its imprint also on the ideological and political sphere. The fact that revolutionary patriots have not fully accepted Marxist-Leninist theory does not mean that some of the steps they take while in power cannot objectively lead to abolishing the positions of capitalism, nor does it signify that their striving towards socialism is not sincere. Naturally enough, their ideas are not free from utopian views, nationalist prejudices and vacillation. However, one should not lose sight of the fact that these groups have no established ideology of their own. Their ideology begins to take shape and develops in the course of revolutionary struggle, through experience, especially the experience of defeats; it is shaped in the course of a search for the optimal path of development. This gradually leads them to the theory of Marxism-Leninism which reveals the objective laws of social development and enables them to find the correct solutions to the problems confronting their countries. We have seen for ourselves how a number of groups of our allies have gradually assimilated some of the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism in the course of our joint work. It is in this light, in our opinion, that we should evaluate the position of revolutionary patriots and see the general line of their development, despite the occasional halts, deviations and at times retreats that mark their progress. *To exaggerate the negative features of revolutionary patriots and conclude from this that it is impossible for the newly-independent countries to embark upon the road of deep-going social change until the working class begins to play the leading role, is tantamount to advocating unrestricted capitalist development as the precondition for the numerical and political growth of the proletariat.*

The aforesaid determines only the general trend of development. The process itself is extremely complex and requires great exertion of effort, patience and resolve from the Communists. The ideas and concepts of various groups and the masses at large cannot be changed merely by urging them to espouse Marxism-Leninism. This can be done only in the course of the revolutionary struggle of the people. The higher the level of the popular struggle and the broader the groups of the working class and other sections of the working people, the small and middle bourgeoisie of town and country and the revolutionary intellectuals drawn into this struggle, the sooner will a situation conducive to the transition of the revolutionary patriots to more

radical ideological and political positions be created. The successful fulfilment of these tasks depends in many respects on the tactics adopted by the Communists, on their ability to put forward the right slogans reflecting the interests and needs of the people and capable of rallying them to selfless struggle.

The imperialists and neocolonialists are well aware of the meaning of the profound changes that have taken place and are still taking place in the national-liberation movement. They see the danger to their interests, especially in the Arab countries, arising from cooperation between the Communists and other national forces opposed to colonialism. Hence the imperialists stop at nothing to prevent the peoples from winning complete independence and embarking on the building of a new life. They utilize the methods of interference and direct armed aggression as in Vietnam, and engineer reactionary coups as was the case in Ghana, Indonesia and other countries. In the Arab East the colonialists have launched a violent onslaught against Arab nationalism. *Al-Hayat*, a leading bourgeois newspaper in the Lebanon closely linked with imperialist circles, commented: "The idea of Arab nationalism has no chance of success . . . inasmuch as Marxism is donning its garb . . . and non-Marxist Arabs no longer have any faith in it . . ., the national slogans have already exhausted themselves." On this assumption the paper urges "to turn to religion as an effective weapon to which recourse should have been had long ago . . . in order to resist Marxism in our part of the world". Recent developments in the Arab world show that *Al-Hayat* was speaking not for itself alone. Concepts like these are already being put into effect. Behind a screen of religious slogans the Sudanese reactionaries have launched a campaign against Communism and against all the democratic and progressive trends and movements in the country. Under the "back-to-religion" slogan the Moslem Brotherhood attempted to overthrow the progressive government of the UAR last summer. Today the biggest imperialist plot is being hatched in the Middle East with a view to striking a blow at the national-liberation movement in the Arab countries by concluding the notorious "Islamic Pact."

Besides stepping up conspiratorial activity against the UAR, one of the main objects of the "Islamic Pact" is to deliver a blow at the progressive government of the Syrian Arab Republic which has declared its determination to pursue a steadfast policy of independence and anti-imperialism, uphold and deepen the socio-economic changes effected in the country, and promote cooperation with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

The mounting offensive of the forces of imperialism and local reaction associated with it, the new forms this offensive is assuming, clearly show that we are going in the right direction. However, we do not minimize the difficulties ahead of us on this road, although experience has confirmed that it is possible and realistic. We tell our comrades-in-arms that we must wage a long and difficult mass political and ideological struggle in order to foil the conspiracies and counter the demagogy of neo-colonialism and its stooges in the Arab countries and ensure their development along the path of social progress. We say that the first and main task to be resolved, if this aim is to be achieved, is to reach deeper into the masses, to rally them and set them in motion. The task is also to extend and consolidate our contacts with all anti-imperialist and progressive trends, parties and organizations. Each step along this road brings us closer to the cherished goal. The international and internal conditions are favorable for the cause of independence, peace, progress and socialism in the Lebanon and other Arab countries.

Peaceful way of achieving democracy and social progress in Costa Rica

O. VARGAS

COSTA RICA IS ONE OF the Latin American countries where the process of the national liberation and democratic movement proceeding in peaceful forms is striking ever deeper root and where the working class is becoming the principal motive force in this process.

1. Briefly, the history of the People's Vanguard Party, the party of the working class of Costa Rica, and, correspondingly, the history of the development of the country's working-class and peasant movement, falls into the following two phases:

First Phase:

1931—formation of the People's Vanguard Party of Costa Rica (PVP);

1942—alliance with the National Republican Party (upsurge of the democratic movement);

1948 (January) period of the greatest successes of our Party, the organized working-class and peasant movement and of the forces friendly to them. The PVP had 23 per cent of the seats in parliament and led the Confederation of Working People of Costa Rica (CTCR) which united 98 per cent of the organized working class; it had its own broadcasting station, "Ecos del 56"; it secured social legislation that was the most progressive in America at the time.

Beginning of the civil war.

Second Phase:

1948 (April)—defeat in the civil war. Brutal repressions by the Figueres dictatorship, mass deportations of militant workers (over 30,000 during six months). All this, the consequence of the application of the imperialist "Truman Plan" in Costa Rica, greatly weakened the Party;

1949—convication of the Constituent Assembly and return to constitutionality. Beginning of the reconstruction and reorganization of the Party and the trade unions;

1958—the presidency of Mario Echandi. The Party restores its local organizations and begins to function openly through its press and broadcasting station. Similar changes take place in the trade unions.

1959—victory of the Cuban revolution and its positive impact on Costa Rica's working-class and peasant movement;

1965—the People's Vanguard Party completely restores its former positions and in some sectors achieves even bigger successes than in January 1948.

Thus, the Costa Rican working class and its party, gradually hurdling the catastrophic consequences of the civil war unleashed by reaction in 1948, have successfully forged ahead in recent years in the fight to uphold existing democratic liberties and to broaden the still restricted sphere of their activities. Our working class and its allies have scored big victories in the struggle for democracy and social progress and thus *preserved the perspective of peaceful development of the democratic and national-liberation revolution.*

The most significant event in the life of the country and the Party this year were the presidential elections and the elections to the Legislative Assembly in which the people and its political parties, including the party of the working class, actively participated. The people's direct interest in elections is due to the circumstances—a very unusual one for Latin America — that they have practically always been able to participate in them with a degree of freedom to be found only in the most developed bourgeois-democratic countries. This, in turn, is explained by the specific socio-economic and political features of Costa Rican history (see Eduardo Mora Valverde's article in No. 8 of *World Marxist Review* for 1965).

Democracy in Costa Rica led in practice to an improvement in material and cultural standards. Although the country is not rich in resources, its standard of living is higher than in most of the other Latin American countries. The illiteracy rate is one of the lowest in the hemisphere (16 per cent); education gets the

lion's share of appropriations (relatively to the number of the population).

The Costa Rican does not regard the elections, held every four years, as just another farce. He rightly believes that his voice will carry weight and influence social developments. The earnest of this are the anti-militarist traditions in the country, the 124 years of practically uninterrupted republican, democratic administration. If the Party were, in these circumstances, to boycott elections, to brush them aside as unimportant, it would inevitably find itself isolated from the masses, from the aspirations of the people, who know from experience that important socio-economic gains can be won through the election struggle. Such a situation decisively influences the choice of forms of struggle, it lays an imprint on the mass movement. That is why the Communists of Costa Rica are opposed to the attempts to advance a uniform formula for the Latin American revolution.

2. To clarify our thesis let us refer to history. As mentioned earlier, up to 1948 the Costa Rican working class, under the leadership of the Party, won big social gains. At the same time the broad masses secured the right to participate in the political life of the country, which greatly broadened the regime's base. During the Second World War and in the early postwar years the People's Vanguard Party acted in alliance with the ruling National Republican Party, even though it was not directly represented in the government. However, after international reaction started the cold war, the increasing pressure of U.S. imperialism created conditions for the overthrow of the progressive government by the reactionary forces who could rely, to some extent, on the support of the disoriented sections of the population and even of some democratic trends.

The armed adventure, headed by Figueres, was started on the pretext that the Legislative Assembly had annulled the results of the presidential elections won by Otilio Ulate. The decision of the Legislative Assembly followed an inquiry which revealed that a big fraud had been committed against our Party and the ruling party. Almost throughout the country the ballot papers had been falsified with the aid of two computers placed in different parts of San Jose. On one of them the right cards were punched and then sent to the Central Electoral Council (placed at the disposal of the opposition by President Picado, despite our objections, since he wanted to act the democrat towards his opponents). The cards were then fed into the second computer which deleted the names of the supporters of our Party and the NRP. This election fraud (rigged, incidentally with the help of American experts in the cybernetics of administration), is considered the biggest and "technically most perfect" in the history of Latin America.

Such is the prehistory of the civil war of 1948 which culminated in the overthrow of the government of President Teodoro Picado elected in 1944 with the support of the Party. (This support was given not only in the form of our vote, but also of our propaganda, slogans and program demands.) The civil war brought in its wake brutal repressions against the revolutionary working-class movement. The Figueres junta, speculating on the slogans of anti-communism borrowed from the U.S. State Department, suspended the constitutional regime and outlawed the Party and the Confederation of Working People of Costa Rica. The property of the two organizations was confiscated, their premises closed down and their leaders and middle-level functionaries imprisoned. Thousands of rank and file members and sympathizers who managed to escape arrest were obliged to flee the country. Many Communists were killed. The official press, which was controlled by the reactionaries, jubilantly announced: "The Communist Party has been liquidated for good." According to it, the "nightmare" of revolution and fundamental changes was now a thing of the past.

But the People's Vanguard, undaunted by the difficult conditions of illegality, gradually rallied those of its functionaries and rank and file members who had either escaped arrest or been released from prison. The appearance of a small illegal newspaper was the first indication that, despite defeat, the party of the working class was not smashed, let alone liquidated.

When assessing the situation the Party took into account the traditions of democratic government, deep rooted in the minds of the people, including those sections which had helped to overthrow the Picado government. It also was aware that the pseudo-democratic social-reformism of Figueres' followers who had seized power created favorable conditions for restoring the legality of the trade unions. Proceeding from this, we set ourselves two principal political objectives: to take advantage of the social demagogy of the new regime to force the legalization of the trade unions, and compel the ruling junta to restore the constitutional system as soon as possible.

3. In December 1948 elections were held to the Constituent Assembly. The Party called for "a free and sovereign Constitutent Assembly." Although it could not participate directly in the elections, the Party realized that irrespective of the results the very convocation of the Constituent Assembly would put a restraint on the abuse of power by the junta and would signalize the *first step toward the reorganization of our forces.* Subsequently events proved us to be right.

In view of the refusal of the National Republican Party to participate in the elections and the impossibility for the Party to do so directly it concluded an agreement with a group of citizens who registered under the name of "Constitutional Party." Overcoming countless difficulties the People's Vanguard Party re-

stored its links with the masses and mobilized them in support of the Constitutional Party candidates, six of whom were elected to the Constittuional Assembly as a result. Apart from enabling us to restore our contacts with the masses the election campaign also helped to raise their morale which had been affected by the defeat and its aftermath.

For the government junta the election results spelt a serious setback (it won only three seats in the Constituent Assembly) and were indicative of widespread dissatisfaction with its methods of administration. All the repressive decrees and laws were left hanging in mid-air. The Constitutional Party deputies, elected thanks to our support, honored their promises on the whole. Thus they prevented the new Constitution being patterned exclusively along anti-communist and anti-democratic lines. The reactionaries, it is true, succeeded, through all kinds of devices, in securing an amendment to Article 98 of the Constitution (providing for the right of all citizens to organize in political parties) which read: *"However the organization and functioning of political parties which by their program, their actions and international contacts encroach on the existing democratic system, is prohibited."* This amendment was approved with the following rider: *"A political party can be prohibited by a two-thirds majority of the Legislative Assembly following preliminary consultation with the Supreme Electoral Tribunal."*

When reviewing the general political scene account should be taken of another political party, the National Liberation Party, formed by the ruling circles before the elections, and which later was in power for a long time.

The first steps towards the revival of democracy yielded positive results. In particular, the restoration of constitutional order stimulated the process of reorganization of the trade union movement. Before long it became possible to hold a trade union congress and establish a new trade union center, the General Confederation of Working People of Costa Rica, to replace the disbanded CTCR. In the southern part of the Pacific coast a federation of working people of banana plantations and allied enterprises was formed. Thus, during the presidency of Otilio Ulate (1949-53), the working class gradually built up its forces in the new trade union centers. At the same time, though more slowly, the Party strengthened its illegal organization and achieved new successes: its legal publications began to appear again, the exiled leaders returned to the country, the Party began to appear in public. On his return from exile, Manuel Mora Valverde, General Secretary of the PVP, addressed the nation over the radio.

For our Party these were years during which it restored its forces to a large extent. The most notable events of those years, indicative of the growing activity of the working class, were the two big strikes on the banana plantations. The strikers won their economic demands, including the right to labor protection.

4. The restricted participation of the Party in the next election campaigns, although it did not yield big electoral successes, brought the Party in touch with the broadest sections of the population, enabled it to restore its contacts with the thousands of people whose sympathies were with the Party in its long struggle for a better life for the people. Furthermore, after the events of 1948 and the vicious anti-communist slander campaign in the country and abroad, financed mainly by the imperialist monopolies and the State Department, it was imperative for the Party to restore its good name and to expose the slanderers who had taken advantage of our defenseless position at the time of the brutal repressions to curry favor with the U.S. imperialists.

The 1949 campaign: parliamentary elections. Dr. Calderon Guardia instructed his National Republican Party to boycott the elections. After unsuccessful attempts to persuade him to stand for election with our support the People's Vanguard Party decided to vote for the candidates of the Constitutional Party, thus securing the election of six of them to the Legislative Assembly.

The 1953 campaign: presidential and parliamentary elections. The National Liberation Party, which had gained in strength during the presidency of Otilio Ulate, became the strongest party during this campaign, owing to the fact that Dr. Calderon Guardia again refused to return to the country and head his party which had a broad mass base. Instead, he decided to support a little known politician who had no clearly defined program. After a number of fruitless attempts to unite the progressive opposition and form a united election group around Calderon Guardia, the Party had no choice but to vote for the opposition's only candidate who had little if any chances of winning.

However, as we had surmised, President Jose Figueres, elected this time in conformity with the constitution, adopted a policy fundamentally different from the one he had pursued during his 18 months' dictatorship, when he flagrantly abused his powers. The Party took advantage of the new conditions of democracy to strengthen its legal status still further, to win new democratic liberties and extend existing ones.

The 1958 campaign: presidential and parliamentary elections. This time the strongest candidate was Mario Echandi of the opposition, a skilful parliamentarian who was able to profit from the mistakes of the government and poll the highest vote. During the election campaign he headed the coalition of bourgeois National Alliance and National Republican parties. The People's Vanguard Party again urged Calderon Guardia to return to the country with a progressive program and head his party, and assured him of its support. When

he refused the PVP tried to register but was debarred again under the notorious Article 98. Thereupon the Party instructed its members to vote for Echandi and began to cooperate with the other parliamentary candidates of his party in the different provinces of the country. When he became president Echandi allowed us considerable freedom of action and on the whole carried out what he had promised.

The 1962 campaign: presidential elections. This time too the Party tried to secure the legal right to register a progressive group at the election. However, as in the previous campaigns, at the last moment the new political group was deprived of its legal rights. After an absence of 14 years, Dr. Calderon Guardia returned to the country to participate in the elections. But, this time, unlike during 1942-48, he tried to come to power not with the support of the people but with that of the U.S. Embassy. As a result, his Party was defeated and the presidency went to Francisco Orlich of the National Liberation Party, a coffee magnate. Article 98 was again applied against the Party. However, as in previous election campaigns, it was able to establish new contacts with the masses and to champion the interests of the working people in more favorable conditions.

5. As a result of its active participation in the election campaigns the Party considerably consolidated its positions, politically and organizationally. During that period it held its Sixth and Seventh congresses. At the Seventh Congress the leadership was strongly criticized for its attitude before and during the civil war, particularly for having allowed the Party to be involved at a time when the situation on the international arena was extremely unfavorable. The congress acknowledged that the civil war could have been averted if the leadership had pursued a more independent policy and not followed the lead of its allies in the National Republican Party. It took the Party 17 years to regain the positions it had lost as a result of the hasty decision to take up arms.

In April 1962 the PVP held its Ninth Congress which reviewed its activities for the preceding ten years. It laid bare the mistakes made in policy, but also noted the important successes achieved in the reorganization of the Party. The congress reported that the membership had increased by 50 per cent between 1960 and 1962, and stated that it was possible not only to retain this rate of growth but to accelerate it. The task was advanced to double the membership in the next two years. This was accomplished. The congress approved the Party's general line oriented on peaceful development of the revolution, on using and broadening all legal avenues of struggle, winning complete legality and comprehensive democratization of political life.

The struggle for democracy in Costa Rica is closely linked with the movement for international solidarity. For example, when Guatemala was invaded in 1954 by the troops of Castillo Armas with the support of the U.S. imperialists (the progressive government of Jacobo Arbenz was overthrown as a result), the People's Vanguard Party collected 10,000 protest signatures in one week. Before that it collected 50,000 signatures in support of the Stockholm Appeal. The actions for peace, democracy and international solidarity have always been closely interconnected. By defending freedom of assembly we defended the right to hold campaigns of solidarity with the Cuban revolution, with the struggle of the peoples of Venezuela, Guatemala, Panama, the Dominican Republic, the Congo and Vietnam.

By upholding freedom of the press we are helping the masses to awaken to their immediate needs and the broader national issues, are educating them in the spirit of proletarian internationalism. At present the Party publishes more than twice as many papers as it did when legal, besides pamphlets, books and other publications in thousands of copies, which are read in all parts of the country and also abroad.

The imperialists are exerting pressure on the government to do away with Habeas Corpus and the right to political asylum, but with little success, thanks to the stiff opposition of the working class, led by the Party. Our brothers from the countries of Central America who are compelled to leave because of persecution by the "gorillas," continue to find political asylum in Costa Rica. Throughout its history Costa Rica has given refuge to political emigrants from most of the Latin American countries. Needless to say this has been made possibly by the action taken by the organized forces in defence of this right, a right which the Party has consistently upheld during the 35 years of its activity.

Much has been written about the revolutionary impact of the Cuban revolution on the Latin American countries. The imperialists, too, drew certain lessons from this epoch-making victory. To offset its impact they started an insidious propaganda campaign to distort the character and gains of the Cuban revolution in the eyes of the Latin American peoples, a campaign which reached its climax during the Carribean crisis.

Evidently thinking that "their hour had come," various anti-communist organizations stepped up their activity. In Costa Rica all kinds of groups bearing the features of U.S. McCarthyism and European neofascism cropped up. The U.S. Embassy had a hand, and still has, in setting up and financing such organizations. Even their names are very like those of kindred organizations in other countries of the hemisphere. In Costa Rica anti-communism is a profitable source of income for adventurers, an easy way of "making money." But fascism, no matter its guise, is dangerous wherever it exists. The Party fully appreciated the need to relentlessly combat these groups which constitute a new and serious threat to democracy in Costa Rica.

Of these anti-communist organizations the most influential is the so-called "Free Costa

Rica Movement" (MCRL) which is given every support by the U.S. Embassy and the local oligarchy. This movement formed its own armed gangs whose principal job is to attack demonstrations of the working people. The May Day demonstrations of the last two years were accompanied by fierce clashes with these cutthroats. The Orlich government supplied the MCRL gangs with arms and military instructors trained in Fort Gullik, Panama. It aso helped them to equip their own training camps, to open a kind of officers' school, whose first graduation ceremony was attended by the President of the Republic himself. (All this was done despite the fact that the Constitution prohibits the existence of a regular army.) The MCRL has close contacts with the counter-revolutionary Cuban emigrants in Costa Rica, Nicaragua and Miami (USA). In Costa Rica the Orlich government helped them to establish training bases and bringing arms. Most of these training bases, which function with the connivance of the authorities, were used jointly by the MCRL and the Cuban gusanos. Many of them have their own takeoff and landing strips, shooting ranges and harbors. However, it was not long before these gallant knights of anti-communism found a more profitable and less dangerous avenue for their "patriotic" feelings: They began to engage on a big scale in contraband whiskey, and expensive textiles and to traffic in arms.

The Party vigorously combated these groups and exposed their shady transactions. The more progressive section of the ruling party reacted to our exposures. Following our example, the Free Youth organization openly came out against the MCRL. This was a big victory for the Party in its struggle against the various anti-communist organizations in the country.

The exposures by the People's Vanguard Party compelled the government to make a statement on the contraband operations of the local anti-communist groups and Cuban gusanos. Under the pressure of public opinion supported by members of the ruling party, the government took certain concrete measures to liquidate the training camps and to restrict the criminal activities of the MCRL. The U.S. Embassy, as might have been expected, came out in defense of its protégés.

Early in 1965 the Party, continuing its exposures of the unlawful activities of the militarized groups and Cuban emigrants, declared that their organizations were plotting a coup d'etat. This statement was submitted to the Legislative Assembly in the form of an interpolation to the Ministry of Public Security. The Minister replied that the group headed by Marshall was indeed involved in subversive activity and that Marshall had applied to Anastasio Somoza, chief of the National Guard of Nicaragua, for military assistance. The latter, however, had refused to help his old boon companion, for this suited the interests of the State Department at the time. In this case imperialism played a double role: on the one hand, the U.S. Military Mission acting in accordance with the plans of the CIA and the Pentagon, was helping organize a coup d'etat; on the other, the State Department opposed these machinations, probably believing that the government of the National Liberation Party could be relied upon to protect the interests of the imperialists in Costa Rica. Whatever the reason, the State Department helped to prevent the coup d'etat. As for the government, while recognizing that it was at fault, it tried nevertheless to conceal the MCRL's participation in the plot rather than incur the displeasure of the U.S. military Mission.

The danger of a coup d'etat still exists although it is not an immediate one, thanks to the public exposures of the activity of the paramilitary fascist-oriented groups.

6. Last February the country went to the polls to elect its president, vice-president and parliament for the constitutional period 1966-70. The presidency was actively contested by the ruling National Liberation Party (PLN) whose candidate, Daniel Oduber, offered the electorate a moderate reformist program in home policy and a strongly anti-communist and pro-imperialist program in foreign policy. The PLN is the party of the petty-bourgeoisie; it champions so-called representative democracy and opposes to a certain extent the oligarchy of the landlords and big compradore bourgeoisie. At the same time, however, it is ready to compromise with imperialism. The other contestant for power was the oligarchy. It collaborates with the anti-communist groups and and the National Republican Party. Although the latter enjoyed the support of the progressive sections of the population who were friendly towards our Party, it completely abandoned, as a result of the leadership's capitulation, the policy it had followed in alliance wtih our Party during 1942-48. The oligarchy put forward as its candidate Professor José Joaquin Trejos, a conservative-minded person without any political antecedènts. The coalition group that nominated him entered the elections as the Party of National Unification.

The Left opposition forces, including the People's Vanguard Party, registered as the Popular Socialist Alliance with a membership of 11,000. Two months before the eection the Legislative Assembly, under presure from the U.S. Embassy, decided to ban this party on the strength of Article 98 of the Constitution. Popular indignation against this decision was so widespread that 40 of the 57 deputies were obliged to submit a bill calling for the abrogation of the anti-democratic clauses in Article 98. The majority of the more conscious Left forces having been deprived of the right to be elected, gave their vote (although with major reservations) to Daniel Oduber, the candidate of the National Liberation Party, since this party represented the lesser evil. The Left forces also took into account that the Party of National Unification which had nominated Pro-

fessor Trejos, included the most rabid enemies of the working class and our Party.

The imperialists placed their main stake on this party. During the election campaign their agents tried to blackmail the electorate with the threat of an armed conflict in the event of the defeat of its candidate. With the support of the Pentagon a campaign was started against Daniel Oduber who was accused of being a Communist supporter. The reactionaries even threatened intervention by the National Guard of Nicaragua if Daniel Oduber were elected President. In the event of such intervention the private armies formed in our country by the U.S. Embassy were to act jointly with the notorious National Guard of Nicaragua.

The Presidential election was won by the Party of National Unification by a margin of 4,000 votes, the National Liberation Party receiving 25,000 votes more than its opponent in the Legislative Assembly. Thus the National Unification Party will control executive power whereas the National Liberation Party will rule the Legislative Assembly.

The present situation opens up new, broader prospects before the Party. The National Liberation bloc is an influential democratic force based primarily on the masses. If the latter succeed in ridding this bloc of the reactionary elements entrenched in its leadership it will be possible to establish a powerful alliance of democratic forces joined by the left wing of the National Republican Party and the People's Vanguard Party.

For this and a number of other reasons connected with the economic situation in the country and the increasing unpopularity of U.S. policy which is discrediting itself throughout the world, and particularly in Latin America, it will be extremely difficult now to get Costa Rica to accept the policy of the Rights. And the People's Vanguard Party aims, in alliance with the other progressive forces, to prevent this ever happening.

The Party is waging a consistent struggle to preserve and extend democratic freedoms and institutions, and, in the first place, universal suffrage, for it realizes that democracy has not completely consolidated itself in Costa Rica, although it has taken deep root. The forces that want to undermine it are very influential and tenacious. Imperialism is the most dangerous enemy of our democratic gains. The people must learn from their experience in the fight for democracy to discern the enemy. Firmly upholding the democratic traditions of the country, the Party is campaigning for fundamental socio-economic reforms. We do not consider this course to be politically naive.

On the contrary, what is naive, in our view, is the belief of some groups that once they themselves have realized the need for immediate armed action to overthrow the puppets of imperialism, it follows that so have the masses and hence the road is clear for achieving this objective.

The experience of all revolutions shows that before the people took to arms extensive educational political work was carried on among them to win them over to the side of the revolution, that only when they were convinced that there was no other way did they embark on armed action.

Of course the aforesaid does not negate the general character of the laws of social development. We only wish to stress that it is essential to comprehensively study and understand the peculiarities of every country. We, and not only we, believe there is nothing more difficult, and may be more absurd, than to draw a uniform pattern of revolution for all the countries of Latin America or other areas of the globe, to write the same prescription for all maladies.

The victory of the Cuban revolution is a new landmark in the democratic and national-liberation movement of Latin America. Cuba is building a socialist society. It is the duty of revolutionaries to learn from the experience of the Cuban revolution, and judiciously to follow its example, to show the same vision and decision as that displayed by the men who led the armed struggle. But, of course, not mechanically. Account must be taken of the concrete conditions. The example of Cuba shows that we are fighting not just for reforms and democratic demands, but for power. The question of the conquest of power must be the focal question of all truly revolutionary parties. However, it must be raised in the context of the concrete conditions of the countries concerned. There must be no haste in deciding this question; impatience must not replace historical necessity. The experience of the People's Vanguard Party shows (here it is pertinent to note that in 1948 the Party became, relatively, one of the most influential parties in the country and on the continent, for that matter) that whenever we displayed impatience in the matter of armed action, we paid a very heavy price for this.

If the forces of reaction will not embroil the country in an armed conflict the new President, if he means to live up to his obligations, will have to seek the support of the people. In view of this the People's Vanguard Party considers it necessary to uphold legality and to explain to the masses the decisive role they will play in the struggles ahead.

Burma today

A. LEVKOVSKY

THERE IS INCREASING evidence that many of the newly-independent countries have either entered or are on the eve of a new stage of development. A new balance of class forces is taking shape, new political problems are being posed and new solutions to these problems are being advanced as the fight for social progress goes on. The transition to the new stage is an extremely uneven and painful process; more, the solutions put forwards are fundamentally dissimilar. The social and class struggle for particular ways of transition to the new stage is mounting and the trends of advance are becoming more marked, though in both respects the possibility of serious ups and downs is manifest. The situation is complicated by *growing subversion on the part of the imperialist powers,* which are out to impose on the developing countries the most reactionary solutions for their main internal problems and, above all else, to prevent them from breaking with capitalism.

Recent developments in Burma and the official documents and statements by the head of state reflecting these developments throw valuable light on the common problems a number of developing states are faced with at the new stage of development as well as on the specific features of this stage in the various countries.

On March 2, 1962, the Revolutionary Council headed by General Ne Win came to power in Burma. The new government proclaimed as one of its main objectives the overcoming of internal splits and achievement of national **unity.** Furthermore, the National Solidarity Protection Law of March 28, 1964, stated: "The prevailing condtions in Burma reveal and the history of the country proves that no system other than a socialist system is compatible with Burma and that only the socialist system can contribute the greatest benefit to peasants, workers, artistes and the working intelligentsia of the country." This is not an uncommon situation nowadays, when radical solutions are often objectively dictated not simply by the direct class interests of the proletariat, but by the needs of the majority of the people among whom the petty bourgeoisie of town and country predominate. This, in its turn, explains why their class interests and demands take on mainly a national form.

CHANGES IN FORMS OF ECONOMIC STRUCTURE AND CLASS CHANGES

Official sources give the class composition of Burma's population as follows: peasants 80 per cent, workers about 15 per cent, others 5 per cent. In 1963 there were about two million landless peasants. There are also exploiting classes. Survivals of semi-feudal land tenure and exploitation persisted even after 1962. As of mid-1963, 7.3 million acres, or 37 per cent of the cultivated land area (19.8 million acres) was leased. Roughly one million tenant farmers paid 350,000 landowners 13 million kyats in rent annually. From these figures it can be seen that small landed proprietors form a rather numerous group.

Multiformity is typical of the socio-economic structure of Burma. The patriarchal-natural, small-scale commodity (in town and country), private capitalist, foreign private monopoly, and state forms (the latter being generally state-capitalist in content) vary considerably from one developing country to another and are intertwined with various forms of landowner, merchant and usurer exploitation. Still, the trend and character of the development of society in these countries depend in decisive measure, particularly in the economic sphere, on changes in the correlation of the various forms, that is, on what forms are growing and what are being ousted. Transition to the stage of far-reaching internal socio-economic changes, usually described as the stage of non-capitalist development means, in the final analysis, establishing a fundamentally new correlation of socio-economic structures (and classes) and providing especially favorable conditions, including political ones, for some of them.

As a result of a series of government measures, *the state sector expanded rapidly* in Burma, first at the expense of the foreign monopoly capitalist sector, and later due to a dras-

tic reduction of the private capitalist sector in industry, transport and circulation. Large-scale economic endeavor, in both production and circulation, is controlled by the state, which owns 40 per cent of transport, 60 per cent of the factories and mines, 80 per cent of construction, and 100 per cent of power, communications and banking. This means that the big bourgeoisie and part of the middle bourgeoisie have been eliminated, and capitalist enterprise has been substantially curbed.

With regard to the rest of the private enterprises, the government policy is one of restriction and control. On February 15, 1963, General Ne Win said the government had originally decided to leave in private hands a number of enterprises it could not run. But the owners, bent on profit, had begun to bribe government officials, whereupon the government realized that if it were to authorize the establishment of new private industrial enterprises it would come up against subversive activities from without.

This is a reflection of new developments in the class struggle, which affects both the conditions of the working class and the government's attitude to it. The Labor Policy Statement expressing the government's views on labor, (April 30, 1963) declared that "every able individual should work according to his ability. The material and cultural values that accrue shall be distributed in accordance with the quantity and quality of labor expended by each individual in social production." The document stressed that the workers should take a more extensive and active part in socialist construction, and pointed out the change that had come about in their conditions. May 19, 1964,saw the enactment of the Workers' Fundamental Rights and Responsibilities Law, which governs labor relations in the state-owned and private enterprises. The law laid down the right to work, to labor protection in industry, social security, equal pay for equal work and skill, the promotion of cultural standards, and other important rights.

In the rural regions, which account for the bulk of the population, the class struggle has developed along three main lines: land and rent, agricultural loans and the rate of interest, and trade and the middlemen. On the first point, the most important measure, which dealt a telling blow at the landed estates, was the abolition on April 5, 1965, of land tenancy rent. This improved the property and legal status of the peasants.

The official view is that the peasant should be allotted enough land to provide for all the needs of his family. The average size of the allotment was tentatively fixed at 10 acres. The object was to put the peasant farms on a solid footing. But how to ensure a marketable surplus was not clearly visualized.

The economic fight against money-lending is being waged by granting loans on easy terms at 3 per cent annual interest. Government loans to peasants have trebled, according to official data released early this year. Besides, the government imported 4,000 tractors and set up 78 tractor stations. These and other measures had a beneficial effect on agriculture and the incomes of a section of the peasantry.

Special difficulties in the relations between forms of economic structure and between classes developed in the sphere of trade. Addressing a peasants' seminar, Ne Win said that the peasants' job was to farm and the government's, to find outlets for their produce. The aim was, in effect, to achieve a specific type of state trade monopoly. In this way the government expected to link up the peasant—chiefly small commodity production, and to some extent small-capitalist—structure of farming with the state sector and the state as a whole.

The government sought to fix stable prices for rice and other consumer goods by setting up a special organization for the purpose. But it soon discovered that controlling a multitude of small farms was extremely difficult. After a uniform price was fixed for rice the peasants switched to other, more profitable crops. Difficulties are encountered in fixing not only purchasing but also selling prices.

To combat an expanding black market, the Revolutionary Council took increasingly drastic steps against the private capitalist sector in the trade sphere as well. In March 1964 the large and medium private stores in Rangoon were nationalized. But the difficulties of supply increased rather than decreased. The Law Empowering Actions in Furtherance of the Construction of the Socialist Economic System, adopted on October 19, 1965, was designed to heighten the economic role of the state and to combat profiteering and blackmarketing. It granted the government wider powers with regard to nationalization, regulation of private production and trade, and fixing of prices and other payments.

In December 1965 Ne Win admitted that the nation's difficulties in supply and trade were due to sabotage and partly to inexperience. The government had tried, he said, to bring competent people into the trade sphere but they had proved either incapable of working on the new basis or downright dishonest. It was fortunate that food requirements could be met and no one had to starve. Certain difficulties were due to inadequate planning of the nationalization, Ne Win said. The first part of the measure—nationalizing the shops and stores in Rangoon—had been carried out according to plan. But as these establishments had branches elsewhere, nationalization had proved ineffective. The government had had to nationalize some shops in the provinces without adequate preparation. The government was in the position of a man who had "seized hold of a tiger's tail" and did not dare to let go, Ne Win concluded.

In January 1966 the private sector in trade was further restricted and the existing state trading network reorganized. In conformity with the law mentioned above, the Ministry of Trade transferred to a newly-established

Board of Trade the purchase, storage, transport and sale of 426 commodities of home origin. As a result, over 60 per cent of internal trade today is in government hands. The old organizations, which were accused of corruption, arbitrary methods and bureaucratic practices, have been replaced by 22 trading corporations dealing in specified types of commodities. Free trade zones have been preserved in some regions. Small commodity producers — peasants and fishermen — may sell their produce direct to consumers, but not to middlemen.

This measure will have far-reaching consequences, especially of a social nature. The state distributive system today is run by 50,000 people while private trade formerly employed almost 2,000,000. The government plans to increase the number of state trading personnel to 1,500,000, which implies, in fact, tackling the formidable task of creating a completely new system. The question now is not merely of putting profiteering capitalist elements out of business, but of radically recasting a substantial segment of the small-proprietor structure in this branch of the economy.

What is likely to come to the fore in the relations between the state and the petty bourgeoisie (or between the state sector and the small-proprietor sector) in the near future — if it has not already done so — is not the "negative" aspect of their alliance (curbing or eliminating class adversaries or social obstacles), but the positive aspect — the establishment of completely new relations between the state and the petty bourgeoisie, the preponderant and leading class in the country. With the economic and political evolution of this class, one of its two intrinsic aspects — the worker, proletarian aspect, or the property-holder, bourgeois aspect — tends to gain the upper hand. This means a struggle within the petty bourgeoisie between socialist and capitalist trends, which may cause certain ups and downs in economic and political life. It is sheer utopia to assume that small-scale commodity or semi-patriarchal production can go on for ever. In this connection it is noteworthy that the challenging problem of setting up rural cooperatives of different types and barring exploiter elements from their leadership is receiving ever greater attention.

THE STATE AND THE NEW PARTY

The class struggle going on in the country, the conflict between the forces of reaction and progress, is obviously not limited to economic, basic relations. Perhaps it is more pronounced in such elements of the superstructure as the state. The adoption of a non-capitalist path by a developing country ushers in a long and complicated transition period with objective *contradictions of its own* in both the basis and the superstructure, as well as in their interaction. Examination of these contradictions in specific countries provides the key to an understanding of the real laws and the nature of the machinery of non-capitalist development, enabling us to distinguish between necessary and accidental phenomena and actions at this transitional stage.

Fundamental changes have been taking place in Burma ever since 1962 in both the class content of state power, no longer wielded by the national bourgeoisie, and its organizational forms and methods. According to the policy statement "The Burmese Way to Socialism," it is impossible to advance to socialism through the form of democracy which formerly prevailed in Burma. It is therefore necessary to develop "only such a form of democracy as will promote and safeguard socialist development," and to set up a socialist democratic state in order "to build up a successful socialist economy . . . The vanguard and custodian of a socialist democratic state are primarily peasants and workers, but the middle strata and those who will work with integrity and loyalty for the general weal will also participate."

The advent to power of radical elements from among the military and the consequent change in the class base of state authority necessitated a reorganization of the machinery of government. The problem of "scrapping" the old machinery presented itself in a specific way. It is no accident that "The Burmese Way to Socialism" says in so many words: "In our road to socialism the existing bureaucratic administration is a big stumbling block. To achieve our socialist aims with this effete machinery is impossible. Steps will have to be taken to remove this bureaucratic machinery and lay firm foundations for a socialist democratic one." Actual progress in fulfilling this task, however, is slow, and the propertied classes continue to sabotage its implementation and to block important reforms. The class struggle around the issue of the state goes on unabated. In working to reshape the machinery of government, an effort has to be made to overcome a certain passivity on the part of a section of the working people, who tend to leave, as has been admitted officially, the solution of all problems to the army and the government.

On July 4, 1962, the Revolutionary Council announced the founding of the Burma Socialist Program Party(BSPP). The question of the attitude to the existing parties came up immediately. After a relatively brief pause and abortive talks with some of the parties, the Revolutionary Council came to the conclusion that a multi-party system would not be in keeping with the tasks set in "The Burmese Way to Socialism," and on March 28, 1964, it banned all other political organizations under the National Solidarity Protection Law.

Following the decision to found the BSPP, the Constitution of the Party for the transitional period of its construction was published. According to it, the Party was founded with the aim of gradually replacing the Revolutionary Council, since the latter "believes that the natural leader of a revolution should be a revolutionary political party."

The distinctive character of the new party is evident from the way in which it came into being. As a rule parties are founded from below, so to speak, and only when they have gathered strength they begin to work to win power in order to carry out their program. But in Burma the reverse was the case—first state power was taken over and then work was begun from the top to establish a party and provide it was a mass base. In the given instance, the party is not an instrument used by a class or any of its sections to win power, but an *instrument for holding power already won and using it* to carry out a program worked out in advance. This is a new development in the working people's struggle, but not necessarily unique, for it may recur in other countries, opening up hitherto unknown ways of overcoming internal obstacles to the deepening of revolutionary changes already taking place. This unusual method of founding a new party, or substantially reorganizing an existing party, is possible when power is seized by some other organized force; such as the army, though not necessarily it alone.

Organizationally, the Party will at first be a cadre organization based on the principle of centralism. Subsequently, when the first stage of its development has been completed, it will become a "party of the entire nation," and will be based on the principle of democratic centralism.

Who is to form the mass base of the Party? According to the Constitution of the Party, those who "accept out of conviction the Burmese Way to Socialism," abide by the Constitution of the Party, and are "resolved to carry out unswervingly" the tasks assigned to them by the Party and "to submit to the scrutiny of the Party Discipline Committee." An idea of the class composition of the Party may be gained from the following. 'The Party will rally to its fold the entire mass of peasants, workers, intelligentsia who have the public welfare at heart and those who earn their living in vocations which do not exploit the labor of others." Party documents stress the principle of serving the people, and the priority of the people's interests. The Constitution states that "the Party shall aways be mindful of preventing members of the Party from turning into a privileged class at the expense of the people."

"The Burmese Way to Socialism" defines the socialist objectives and the specifically Burmese ways of achieving them. The BSPP Constitution stipulates how to build up the new Party with a view of attaining these ideals. The document "The System of Correlation of Man and His Environment. The Philosophy of the Burma Socialist Program Party" sets out in popular form the theoretical foundation of the Party's views on the main processes of development in nature and society. It states that "man matters most," and stresses the decisive role of the working people.

Certain declarations of the Party leadership, such as "Specific Characteristics of the BSPP," deal expressly with the ideological features which set it apart from other parties, primarily the Social Democratic and the Communist parties. The former are criticized — sharply and on the whole rightly — for "arbitrarily discarding the texts and treatises on Marxism-Leninism and relying entirely on those by the bourgeois reformists," for their vague and eclectic ideology, for the lack of a clear-cut class orientation. "The result is that the leadership falls into the hands of bourgeois gentry who use the working class as a stepping stone."

The Communists are accused of dogmatism and of underestimating the role of man and of his mind. This appraisal is completely unacceptable, for scientific socialism (Marxism-Leninism) is by its very nature a constantly developing doctrine absorbing every element of the truth, irrespective of who has discovered it. Dogmatism is a dangerous deviation from and distortion of Marxism-Leninism. To criticize manifestations of dogmatism in the Communist movement (where they actually exist) is to condemn distortions of Communism, not Communism itself.

The "Party and Organizational Tasks of the BSPP," another important document which presents the party's platform, further specifies the tasks of the Party and the forms and methods of its activity. It points out that the Party must become the leading force of Burma's society and do everything in order properly to assimilate the laws of historical development and use them as a guide in its practical activities. Primary importance is attached to links with the masses. The Party can lead the masses, the document states, only if it has not cut itself off from life and takes into account the experience gained and the level of the working people's class consciousness. It must be free from subjectivism.

In order to be able to provide correct and principled leadership, the Party is called upon to fulfil its main tasks with due regard to time and place. Fulfilling the slogan "Agrarian revolution first" is regarded as one of these tasks for the whole country, and training cadres as a major task for the Party organizations. At the same time the importance is pointed out of forming class organizations of the working people that should translate the policy and program of the Party into reality. The Party must become a practical school of socialism for the mass organizations of the people, the document states.

Work to build the BSPP was stepped up, and the interest of the Revolutionary Council in it became much more marked by late 1965, in all probability owing to the aggravation of social and class conflicts and to the subversive activity of the opposition. The need for an organized mass base became more and more imperative. Late in November 1965 a conference of the commanding officers of the defense services discussed the general situation in the country. Later, from December 6 to 10, the BSPP held its first seminar, which may be described as a conference. The seminar was at-

tended by 846 government and Party officials and, needless to say, numerous armymen. According to press reports, the seminar summed up the results achieved by the Revolutionary Council since its assumption of power, and outlined future policies. It was reported that the Party had 20 charter members, 99,638 candidate members and 167,447 sympathizers, and that over 600,000 people had applied for membership. In terms of social composition, the urban petty bourgeoisie predominates, servicement make up about 40 per cent and the inhabitants of Rangoon and vicinity, about as much.

The seminar stressed the importance of selecting and educating Party members, in view of the heterogeneity of the applicants. Speakers condemned factionalism and proposed combating it by frank discussion of new ideas and problems while enforcing strict observance of the will of the majority. At the same time the opinion is gaining ground in the country that the Party shoud take in the many people who have supported its program from the first but who still remain outside its ranks, and that full use should be made of the available cadres of revolutionaries.

The radical reforms carried out in a number of developing countries and the curbs imposed on the propertied classes prompt the internal opposition to step up the class struggle. The opposition seizes upon every difficulty, whether due to objective cause or to subjective mistakes or miscalculations, upon every instance of inconsistency, hesitation or undue haste, to mislead the masses, to discredit radical reform and socialist ideas, and — what is most important—to win support among the working people.

The situation is complicated by the fact that external imperialist and neocolonialist forces are trying to take the offensive and to link up with internal reaction. Specifically, aggressive elements in the United States have been intensifying, especially since early 1966, their propaganda and other subversive activities against the Burmese government. They allege that the situation in Burma today may be described as the most chaotic after Vietnam in all of Southeast Asia, and that the future of the country is "clouded." The U.S. press claims that "the Burmese economy is seriously out of joint mainly because the country's military regime has tried to advance too quickly down what it describes as a 'Burmese road to socialism.'."

Events in Burma show once again that the greater the unity of every section of the revolutionary movement in both the countries concerned and the world as a whole, the more effectively imperialism and neocolonialism can be combated.

The people will win

The following is the abridged text of a speech at the 13th Congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia by LE DUC THO, head of the delegation of the Party of Working People of Vietnam.

THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM and Southeast Asia is becoming more and more complicated due to the U.S. imperialists' open military intervention and policy of aggression.

It is common knowledge that the 1954 Geneva agreements recognized the independence, unity and territorial integrity of our country. But the U.S. imperialists, brazenly assuming the role of the world policeman, grossly violated those agreements. They directly interfered in the life of our country, and are engaged in open aggression in South Vietnam with the object of turning half of our country into a new type of colony, a military base for use as a bridge head for attacking the socialist camp and undermining the people's revolutionary movements in Indochina and Southeast Asia.

The United States has set up in South Vietnam a dictatorial, fascist puppet regime which terrorizes the population. Hundreds of thousands of patriots have been killed, arrested or imprisoned during the last eleven years. Over five million peope were herded into 8,000 prison camps known as "strategic villages." You witnessed the atrocities of Hiter fascism in the years of occupation. The Lidice massacre kindled in each of us a hatred that will never abate. Tragic events of the same kind are a daily occurrence in the South of our country—indeed, they are often of an even more brutal order. But however brutal the terror, the heroic people of South Vietnam will never be brought to their knees. They have courageousy risen to fight for their right to live a free and independent life. They are advancing from victory to victory under the glorious banner of the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam.

At the beginning of the revolt, the people of South Vietnam fought for their rights all but unarmed. But their patriotism and their hatred for the U.S. imperialists and their underlings made them invincible. They skillfully combined political with armed struggle, and action in the rural areas with action in the towns.

Three methods were used against the enemy: political struggle, armed struggle, and propaganda among the enemy troops. In other words, our people waged an all-out war. In the course of a few years they succeeded in foiling two strategic plans of the enemy, first the Staley-Tailor plan and then the McNamara plan, both of which were aimed at an early conquest of South Vietnam. The people of South Vietnam did away in the main with the system of "strategic villages" and freed four-fifths of the area of the country, with a population of roughly 10 million. As a result of the gains of the revolutionary forces, the puppet army and regime are fast disintegrating. Since the overthrow of the Ngo Dinh Diem government there have been a dozen coups in South Vietnam precluding all stabilization of the regime. The disintegration of the puppet army has assumed vast proportions. Walter Lippmann, the American columnist, noted that money and medals are by no means materials fit for building a solid dam against the flood of fresh ideas sweeping the minds of the puppet troops of Saigon. The U.S. imperialists tried to suppress the people of South Vietnam by means of their "special war" tactics and a strategy envisaging a speedy victory. They counted on early success. But the mainstay of the "special war"—the puppet regime and its army and the "strategic villages"—were shaken. The "special war" failed to produce results and the strategy aimed at an early victory was completely defeated. Today the Americans are compelled to wage a protracted war of attrition. Strategically, this is a major reverse for them.

Despite their setbacks, the U.S. imperialists still refuse to abandon their aggressive aims, to desist from attempts to seize the southern part of our country. They see retreat as a catastrophe for the "free world" undermining the prestige of the USA in the eyes of its puppets and a stimulus to the revolutionary movement in various countries. In an effort to check the disintegration of the puppet regime and its army and to stave off complete defeat, the

U.S. imperialists began early in 1965 large-scale shipment of combat troops to South Vietnam. Moreover, they launched a devastating air war against the northern part of our country, and extended the war to Laos. They hoped they could in this way recapture the initiative on the South Vietnam front, stop the flow of aid from North to South Vietnam, break the resolve of the people of North Vietnam and force the DRV into accepting their spurious plan for "peace talks."

As a result of the extension and intensification of the war by the U.S. imperialists, the struggle waged by the whole of our country entered a new phase. The war is raging throughout the country. The "special war" in South Vietnam has become a "local war" which completely exposes the aggressive and colonialist nature of the USA. At the moment the U.S. expeditionary corps in South Vietnam is 255,000 strong. With the U.S. Seventh Fleet, which regularly takes part in military operations, the troops of America's vassals and the puppet army of Saigon, the enemy force adds up to more than 800,000 troops well armed with the latest weapons. But since the U.S. imperialists increased the strength of their troops in South Vietnam and directly engaged them in military operations they have suffered more reverses than ever. In 1965 alone 240,000 U.S. and puppet troops were put out of action, including 19,000 Americans (the number of enemy troops put out of action in 1964 exceeded 180,000, including 2,000 Americans).

Early in 1966, in Honolulu, the U.S. rulers held a summit meeting with ther puppets to find a way out of their continual reverses. They discussed plans for escalating the war. Besides resorting to political fraud by praising their discredited flunkeys, Thieu and Ky, the U.S. leaders made false promises to invest $1,000 million in the development of Southeast Asia, carry out social reforms, take steps for the advancement of rural regions, and so on. They boasted that during the "dry season" they would conssolidate their positions, take the offensive and recapture the liberated areas, that they would destroy the regular troops of the Liberation Army, regain the initiative and reverse the military situation. Yet the situation in South Vietnam today is shaping against the U.S. imperialists' calculations. The first five months of the "dry season"—from November 1965 to March 1966—saw heavy fighting, major victories for the people of South Vietnam and their armed forces, and severe setbacks for the enemy.

The U.S. imperialists and their puppets put almost all their mobile forces in action, and carried out "mopping-up" operations, many of which involved from 10 to 15 battalions, and some as many as 27. During these operations they did not shrink from employing the most inhuman methods of warfare.

Strategic B-52 bombers fly on massive bombing raids. Napalm and poison-gas are used indiscriminately. In some areas, the number of bombs dropped per inhabitant averages four. During the first three montss of this year gas attacks affected 150,000 people. Tens of thousands were killed or wounded. Crops and fruit trees were wiped out on hundreds of thousands of hectares. Amost 40,000 houses were destroyed. The savage "scorched earth" policy pursued by the U.S. imperialists and their puppets is designed to burn and destroy everything, to wipe out the population and force our South Vietnamese people to their knees.

But these barbarities cannot save those who perpetrate them from defeat, any more than clouds can put out the sun. The people of South Vietnam and their armed forces thwarted almost all of the enemy attacks during the "dry season," an achievement they owe to their resolve to fight and win, to their courage and ingenuity and flexible tactics. The greater the strength of U.S. troops in South Vietnam and the greater their part in military operations, the more telling their reverses. In the first five months of the "dry season" the people of South Vietnam and their armed forces put out of action over 120,000 enemy troops, including more than 40,000 American aggressors, and wiped out 30 enemy battalions, including more than 14 Americans. The number of Americans killed or wounded during the "dry season" was more than three times as great as during the previous four years. The number of completely routed U.S. battalions increased by half over 1965. We shot down or otherwise destroyed 1,400 aircraft in five months of the "dry season."

These losses show that the U.S. imperialists have been unable to carry out their strategic plan for the "dry season." In fact, they find themselves bogged down more hopelessly than ever. The gains of the people of South Vietnam and their armed forces during the "dry season" are highly important. They entitle us to the conclusion that the South Vietnamese people can defeat thte U.S. imperialists militarily as well. U.S. Senator Mansfield had to admit that the people of Vietnam have the resolve and strength to resist any number of U.S. troops sent to Vietnam.

The U.S. imperialists' major military setbacks during the "dry season" aggravated their political refeat. After the Honolulu meeting they had hoped to bolster the puppet regime and to effect so-called reforms. The U.S. representatives in Honolulu were still extolling the South Vietnam flunkeys when conflicts broke out within the puppet regime and its army surpassing in acuteness all the conflicts of the previous eleven years. The armed conflicts in Hue and Danang will hasten the downfall of the regime. The growing cost of living, soaring prices, and severe inflation in the temporarily occupied towns show up the fraudulent character of the declarations about reform. The present situation makes possible the rapid development of the political struggle of various sections of the population in the towns, where increasingly resolute demonstrations

have been taking place against the U.S. aggressor and the Thieu-Ky clique of generals. The demonstrators demand peace, national and democratic rights, and better living conditions. Simultaneously with the movement in the towns, the peasant struggle for the abolition on the "strategic villages" and against "mopping-up" operations is spreading in the countryside. These facts provide favorable conditions for achieving in the foreseeable future military successes that will weaken and isolate the U.S. imperialists and their helpers more than ever.

The air war against the northern part of our country is also being waged by the most brutal methods. Nearly all the provinces and towns, and al the more important communications have been raided. Some areas have been raided more than two hundreds times. In some areas of North Vietnam, the U.S. imperialists even used B-52 bombers. They claim that they raided military targets only. But on dozens of occasions the raids led to the destruction of villages, schools, hospitals and shrines, and to the death of thousands of women, children and sick people. Unquestionably, the air war against North Vietnam has caused us definite losses and difficulties. But neither the people nor the army of North Vietnam have ever succumbed to fear or panic. On the contrary, they have closed their ranks and are courageously continuing their war effort while carrying on production. We have reached the targets of the first five-year plan, and the economic and defense power of our country has increased. As of May 31, 1966, we had shot down 1,065 U.S. aircraft and taken hundreds of American flyers prisoner. The prestige of the U.S. Air Force has been badly shaken. The attack on North Vietnam has not affected our morale, nor has it prevented us from continuing to help South Vietnam. It has aroused intense hatred in the people of North Vietnam, and strengthened their determination to defeat the U.S. imperialists.

We realize that the U.S. imperialists are unwilling to reconcile themselves to defeat despite their continuous heavy reverses in both North and South. They are planning to extend the war. They intend to drop on our country in one year the equivalent of 40 per cent of all the bombs used during World War II. They intend to send 400,000 to 500,000 troops to South Vietnam and to escalate the war against North Vietnam. But extending the war will never save them from defeat. It is our people who will win in the end. Ours is a just cause, our people and our armed forces in North and South alike are united and fighting courageously for their homeland. History shows that even a small and weak people is invincible if it rises to fight as one man and if it pursues the right policy. Besides, our just struggle enjoys increasing sympathy and support from the peoples of the world, including the American people. It has a vast home front in North Vietnam and is aided by the mighty socialist community. We are waging a people's war which cannot but end in victory. The armed forces of South Vietnam have been growing fast. They draw on the valuable experience of our past battles against the French colonialists and of our fight against the U.S. imperialists and their puppets over more than ten years. These are the fundamental factors guaranteeing our victory. Although the USA enjoys material superiority and possesses modern weapons, and although it is the leading imperialist power and much bigger than our country, it is waging an unjust war, a war of aggression that is not supported but condemned by the American people and the peoples of the world. Differences in the ruling circles of the USA and within the imperialist camp are increasing. The U.S. imperialists find themselves in complete isolation. The combat discipline of U.S. troops is very low because they are fighting a hopeless war. More and more men in the U.S. Army refuse to carry out orders. On one occasion a whole battalion came out against the war. Many soldiers have committed suicide or refused to fight.

The puppet regime and its army are torn by discord and are disintegrating. Discipline in the puppet troops has sunk low, desertions are becoming more and more frequent, and soldiers refuse to execute orders. Even the U.S. press has had to admit that 180,000 men desert from the puppet army every year. Actually, however, this figure does not give a full picture of the situation. There are deep-going reasons why the Americans and their puppets cannot win. The aggressor is suffering and is bound to suffer defeats because the human factor is decisive in war. U.S. tactics and weaponry are ill-suited to South Vietnam, they cannot be applied flexibly, and therefore are far from fully effective. In fact, this tends to inhibit the U.S. troops.

The U.S. imperialists sent their troops to South Vietnam at a time when the people of South Vietnam had won absolute political superiority over the enemy and were coping with the "special war," and when the Liberation Army had deployed its forces in every sector and taken the offensive. This is why, ever since they set foot on Vietnam soil, the U.S. troops have been on the defensive. They are confronted with a people's war in the full sense of the term. Associated Press compares the U.S. army with an almost blind heavyweight wrestler in unaccustomed surroundings full of traps and obstacles. His adversary (that is, the Liberation Army), on the other hand, is a clever and experienced lightweight who can even see what goes on behind him. This is why the U.S. imperialists cannot abandon their defensive tactics and extricate themselves from the impasse. They cannot ecape crushing defeat no matter how many troops they pour into South Vietnam. Moreover, with the present scope of the people's war in South Vietnam, they do not have the mobile forces the Liberation Army has and hence are unable to carry out their aggressive plan of overrunning the entire territory and bringing it under their con-

trol. Less than one-third of the 800,000 U.S. puppet and satellite troops is mobile. The rest are stationed at nine U.S. bases and over 3,000 outposts of the puppet army. To use these forces for operations in any particular sector they have to be transferred from other places. No sooner do they strike a blow in one place than they have to be moved elsewhere. It is like pounding water with one's fist. Besides, the U.S. troops are operating thousands of kilometers from their rear bases, which inevitably complicates supply and increases expenditures. All this reduces the material superiortiy of the enemy and makes for the defeat of the U.S. imperialists in their war of aggression.

The people of Vietnam bore the burden of nine years of resistance to the French colonialists, and now they are in the eleventh year of their struggle against the U.S. aggression. We long for peace to rehabilitate our country, ravaged by twenty years of war. But genuine peace is inseparable from genuine independence. The U.S. imperialists have repeatedly proposed "peace talks." But their every "peace proposal' 'is accompanied by greater aggression, by an escalation of the war. We will never fall into this trap. We adhere to the position set out in the four-point statement of the DRV government and the five points advanced by the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam, which we consider the correct basis for the solution of the Vietnam problem. As long as the Americans refuse to give up their plans of aggression and to recognize those points, we will carry on our fight. We are resolved to fight to the victorious finish in spite of the tremendous sacrifices and difficulties involved. The revolutionary struggle we are waging to save our country, to uphold our freedom and independence, is a noble cause that cannot be won without sacrifice and loss. But no sacrifices or hardships, however great, can break our resolve.

We note with deep satisfaction that the Vietnamese people's fight against the U.S. imperialists, for national salvation, is sincerely supported and actively assisted by the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, by the government and people of the fraternal Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. The Communist Party and the government of Czechoslovakia have repeatedly condemned the U.S. imperialist aggression and voiced their support of the just position of the DRV government and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam on the Vietnam problem. At this Congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, too, we have heard statements emphatically condemning the U.S. aggression and supporting our just cause. This support and assistance is a vivid example of solidarity and friendship between our parties and peoples. It speaks of the tradition of proletarian internationalism deeply rooted in the Czechoslovak working class.

The Party of the Working People, the government and the people of Vietnam express their deep gratitude to the Communist Party and the people of fraternal Czechoslovakia for their valuable support and assistance. They extend their heartfelt thanks to the socialist countries, the fraternal parties and the working class, as well as to the peoples of the rest of the world, who sincerely help us and support our just fight. We are firmly convinced that the Vietnamese people, drawing on your active support and aid, will accompish their sacred duty in fighting against the U.S. imperialists, and that they will be abe to uphold their lawful national rights and at the same time to fulfil their internationalist mission by defending the outpost of the socialist community in Southeast Asia and world peace.

Along with their war of aggression against Vietnam, the U.S. imperialists and their puppets are stepping up their war of aggression against Laos, committing acts of provocation against the Kingdom of Cambodia, and causing tension in many parts of the world, as in the case of Cuba. They want to undermine the socialist camp, hold up the national-liberation movement, perpetuate capitalist domination, spread neocolonialism in its every form, and pave the way for a new world war. But they are very much mistaken, for the balance of world forces has radically changed — the strength of the socialist community exceeds that of imperialism, and the peace forces are superior to the forces of war. The international situation will by no means deveop as the imperialists would like it to.

We are convinced that if the socialist community, the international Communist movement, the working class and the peoples of the world unite their efforts, they can defeat all the imperialist plans of aggression. The Communists of Vietnam vow allegiance to the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. They will devote all their energies to the fight for the unity of the socialist camp and the world Communist movement on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, which they regard as the decisive factor of victory in the struggle for peace, national independence, democracy and socialism.

The rules of the Rumanian Communist Party

THE NINTH CONGRESS of the Rumanian Communist Party held in July 1965, summing up past achievements in building the new life and elaborating a program for the all-round development of socialist Rumania during the next several years, laid down the organizational guidelines for both party and state activities for the coming stage in the country's advance. Of particular importance in this respect is the adoption by the Congress of the new Party Rules. The Rules define the role and nature of the Party, stipulate the qualities demanded of Communists, set forth the rights and duties of Party members, the functions of Party bodies and organizations, and the general standards by which the Party should be guided in its activities, thereby ensuring the basic organizational and political conditions for the implementation of the Congress decisions.

The need for the new Rules was dictated by the changes which had taken place in the life of the nation and its Marxist-Leninist Party in the interval between the Eighth and Ninth congresses of the Party. Thanks to the efforts of the workers, peasants and intellectuals, of all working people irrespective of nationality, who bent their energies to give effect to the Party's policy of socialist industrialization, of channelling agriculture along cooperative lines and promoting science and culture, socialism had triumphed finally and completely. The alliance of the workers and peasants was further cemented as the unshakable foundation of the Socialist Republic of Rumania. The working class had proved equal to its historical mission as the leading class of society as a whole. The prestige of the Party, around which the entire nation rallied in solid unity, had grown.

The Rules of the Rumanian Communist Party, the Charter of the Rumanian Communists, sum up the wealth of experience accumulated by the Party since its inception and are an instance of the creative application in our conditions of the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the role of the party as the vanguard of the working class.

The profound implications of renaming the Rumanian Workers' Party the Communist Party should be underscored. It will be remembered that the name "Workers' Party" was adopted by the 1948 Congress which put an end to the division of the working-class movement by uniting the Rumanian Communist Party and the Social Democratic Party on the basis of the organizational, tactical, political and ideological principles of Marxism-Leninism. The return to the name "Communist Party" has a threefold significance for our working people: it recalls the traditions of the heroic struggle the Communist Party waged in the difficult years of illegality, it best reflects the role of the Party and the content of its activities at the present, final stage in the building of socialism, and it gives fullest expression to the goal ahead—the building of a Communist society.

In his report on the Forty-Fifth Anniversary of the Party, Nicolae Ceaucescu, its General Secretary, painted a comprehensive picture of the path traversed by the Party since its foundation. It has proved itself a worthy continuer of the century-old struggle of the people for national and social emancipation, for the shaping of Rumanian nationhood and a united national state, for accelerating social progress; it has enriched the traditions of the working-class and socialist movement in our country. The most momentous events in Rumania's history between the two world wars, the heroic struggle waged against exploitation and the reign of terror instituted under the bourgeois-landlord system, the struggle against fascism, the organization and successful conduct of the armed uprising of August 1944, the entry into the war to defeat Nazi Germany, the class struggles waged to win political power and the upswing during the years of building socialism —all are associated with the name of the Rumanian Communist Party.

It is to the eternal credit of the Communist Party that it waged an unflagging and consistent struggle for the political and organizational unity of the working class, a struggle which culminated in the establishment of a united Marxist-Leninist party of the working-class.

The Communist Party is the embodiment of all the finest traits of the proletariat—its loyal-

ty to the fundamental interests of the people, ardent patriotism and dedication to the cause of socialism and proletarian internationalism.

The new Rules, as the basic law governing all the activities of the Communist Party, ensure the implementation of the fundamental principles of the party of a new type—unity of its ranks, conscious discipline, and close ties with the mass of the working people.

Underscoring the fact that the Rumanian Communist Party represents the highest form of organization of our working class, that it is the vanguard of its class and the leading political force in the Socialist Republic of Rumania, the Rules reflect the Party's role as the organizer and leader of all aspects of the socio-political life of our country, and the growth of its strength and its maturity. Uniting as it does the most advanced workers, peasants and intellectuals, the Party has grown substantially since the Eighth Congress, numbering at present more than 1,500,000 members. In other words, one out of every 10 adult citizens in Rumania is a member of the Communist Party. The bulk of its membership are workers, who account for nearly 40 per cent of the total. This reflects the nature of the Party as the vanguard of the working class.

The Party's ranks include the most advanced section of peasants belonging to agricultural producers' cooperatives. They account for more than 31 per cent of the Party's membership. Nearly one-third of all specialists engaged in the spheres of science, technology, education, art, and culture generally are Party members. This testifies to the active part taken by our intellectuals in building socialism.

The composition of the Party is a reflection of the boundless faith reposed in it by the workers of all spheres of endeavor—the confidence earned in the course of 45 years of tireless struggle and sacrifice in the interests of the people. Of paramount importance from the standpoint of the realization of the Party's political line is the fact that nearly 80 per cent of its members are engaged on the decisive sectors of production—factories and mills, construction sites and socialist farms. In all areas of socialist upbuilding the Party organizations and committees are the prime movers. The new Rules further enhance their ability to guide the masses and to mobilize them to complete the building of socialism.

"The Rumanian Communist Party," the Rules state, "bases all of its work on the Marxist-Leninist teaching creatively applied to the specific conditions of our country." The sum total of social progress in the two decades since liberation, the revolutionary changes that have altered the face of the country have proved the correctness of the Party's general political line. The Party has shown itself to be equal to its historical mission.

The present stage of development, the complexity of the Party's tasks and its greater responsibility for channelling all the efforts of our people to ensure the country's progress in all spheres place greater demands than ever on every member of the Party. Awareness of this is the leitmotif of the Rules. The supreme duty of every member is indefatigable struggle for the common cause—the building of socialism and communism, the well-being and happiness of the entire people.

It is in the name of this cause that Party member are required constantly to heighten their ideological and political level, to assimilate the Marxist-Leninist teaching, and the political line and injunctions of the Party, to be exemplary at work and in public life, setting an example of integrity and morality, to develop their abilities, to display initiative, devoting all their talent to the achievement of the common goal. Strict observance of the obligations and full utilization of the rights stipulated in the Rules will heighten the activity of Party committees and organizations.

One of the cardinal duties of Party members is jealously to guard the unity and purity of the Party ranks. "The main distinguishing feature of our Party," states the report of the Central Committee to the Ninth Congress, "is the firm cohesion of its ranks, its unshakeable unity around the Central Committee. This is an earnest of new victories in the struggle for socialism and communism." Years of experience have shown that it was the unity and cohesion of its ranks that gave the Party the strength to surmount the many obstacles and difficulties on its path and forge ahead to new successes.

An important decision adopted by the Ninth Congress was that abolishing probationary membership of the Party. This was dictated by the changes that have taken place in the life of our society. In the years since the establishment of people's government the exploiting classes have been abolished. The working class has consolidated its position as the leading class, the peasantry has firmly embarked on the road to socialism, the intellectuals have joined in the nationwide effort to build the new society. The political consciousness of the working masses has grown and their general cultural level has risen. The close ties between the Party and the workers of town and country, the multiform political and education work conducted by Party organizations now functioning at all plants, factories, construction sites, agricultural producers' cooperatives, state farms and machine-tractor stations, educational institutions, scientific, art and cultural organizations, and the fact that Party members work directly among the masses enables them to obtain a clear idea of the moral and political qualities of those who apply for membership in the Party. Some 600,000 non-Party activists work together with the Party and under the guidance of its organizations. A large part of those accepted into the Party come from the Communist Youth League. Moreover, the mass and public organizations functioning under Party leadership number millions of members many of whom come to the fore as capable

and conscientious activists devoted to the people's cause. All this on the scale of the country as a whole adds up to a veritable school of political enlightenment and preparation for membership in the Party.

In the light of the foregoing the Party decided that the probationary period of membership could now be dispensed with. Those who were candidate members at the time of the adoption of the Rules by the Ninth Congress automatically become full-fledged members of the Party, the length of membership being counted from the time of acceptance as candidate members.

In the brief period since the Congress the results of the decision to abolish the probationary membership have been highly satisfactory. Some of the foremost workers, peasants and intellectuals who have demonstrated by their activity and general conduct that they are worthy of the lofty title of member of the Rumanian Communist Party have been admitted to its ranks.

The new clause of the Rules granting Party members who have retired on pension the right to remain in the Party branches to which they belonged before retirement has been heartily endorsed by the membership as a tribute to Communists with a long record of labor and political activity; they will no longer feel cut off from their old job and the comrades they worked with for so many years, and will be able to pass on their experience to the youth and continue to help their Party branch to cope with its manifold tasks, particularly the education of the young generation.

Another Congress decision which was met with deep satisfaction was that according to which revolutionaries who, although not Party members, worked during the years of illegality directly under the leadership of the Rumanian Communist Party or in mass organizations influenced by it, and who gave a good account of themselves in the struggle against the class enemy, are henceforth recognized as members of the Party from the time they joined the revolutionary movement. Similarly, previous membership in the Social Democratic and Socialist parties is taken into account in determining length of membership in the RCP. Thus due recognition is given to the services of thousands of veterans of the revolutionary movement, champions of the cause of the working class, who at the risk of their liberty and their very lives, carried the message of the Party to the masses and drew them into the struggle for democratic rights, freedom and a better life, that radiant future we have lived to see. Cherishing the highest esteem for comrades who contributed many years of devoted effort to the cause of socialism, the Party takes account of the fact that many of them are of venerable age and can no longer be as active as in the past. It affords them every opportunity to continue to contribute whatever they can to the work of the Party, at the same time surrounding them with care and affection, providing them with the best possible living and working conditions and continuing to draw on their rich experience.

Focussing the attention of Party bodies and organizations on the need to devote constant attention to the ideological and political education of Party members, the Rules stress the importance of combining responsibility for upholding the principles and norms of the Party with concern for each individual Communist. The purpose of the various penalties for misdemeanors of one or another kind is to help offenders to rectify their mistakes. The supreme penalty—expulsion—is applied only in exceptional cases, for serious violations of the general political line and Rules of the Party, for jeopardizing the unity of the Party, for compacting with the enemies of socialist upbuilding, for double-dealing, moral depravity and other misdeeds incompatible with Party membership.

It is precisely because it believes in the educational value of disciplinary measures that the Party leadership seeks to prevent punishments, and particularly expulsion, from leading to the withdrawal from the movement of the person concerned, or affecting his status on the job or in the community. After careful consideration of the case, Party bodies may on their own initiative or at the request of the person concerned, decide to remove the penalty (after no less than two years), provided he has demonstrated his devotion to the Party's policy.

The Executive Committee of the Party has already taken steps to remove penalties from Party members who have proved their loyalty to the Party by their persevering efforts in the posts assigned to them and show themselves capable of rectifying their mistakes. The April (1966) Meeting of the Central Committee approved these measures.

The organizational structure of the Party is based on a combination of the territorial and industrial principles, which enables the Party to extend its influence to all areas of political, economic, social and cultural life of the country, to fulfill its function as the organized vanguard of the working class, the guiding force of the nation.

The organizational core of the Party is the Party branch. In view of the influx into the Party of many highly skilled workers, cooperative farmers, engineers, scientists, teachers and prominent intellectuals, and considering the broader ideological, professional and cultural outlook of Party members, and the increased competency of the branches, some new points have been added to the Rules defining more precisely in the light of the new developments, the general and specific tasks of the Party organizations in their particular spheres of activity. These points provide better conditions for the fulfillment of these tasks by giving Party organizations the right of control over the management of enterprises, ensuring the heightening of the leading role of the Party branches

as well as their ability to organize and rally the masses. The work of each Party branch is judged by the results achieved in carrying out the policy of the Party, fulfillment of production programs, development of the socialist consciousness of the masses, and close contact with the working people.

The Rules reaffirm the principle of democratic centralism as the guiding principle of the organizational structure and the entire activity of the Party. The consistent application of this principle makes it possible to concentrate all the forces of the Party on the realization of its political line, to combine a high level of organization and discipline with the broadest activity and initiative of the membership. Defining the forms of organization and leadership, beginning with the Party branches and up to the highest bodies, the Rules lay down that the decisions of the higher bodies are binding on the lower, and that the minority must submit to the majority. In this way centralized leadership is combined with inner Party democracy, greater opportunities—and indeed their duty—for Communists to discuss all questions of Party policy, with the obligation unconditionally to carry out the Party directives and decisions. The profound democracy of the Party's activity is reflected in the provision that all leading Party bodies must be elected, that they must report regularly to the Party organizations and that the decisions of the latter are valid only if adopted by a majority of the members. Inner Party democracy is manifested also in the right of members to participate in elaborating decisions and measures toward carrying them out, to elect and be elected to Party committees, to take part in meetings called to discuss their activity, and to take up any question with Party bodies, all the way up to the Central Committee.

The strict observance of democratic standards within the Party helps in large measure to heighten the activity of the Communists, the mobilizing force of the Party, promotes its organizational capacity and raises its militancy. All these are the basic features of a revolutionary political organization.

Indicative of how the principles recorded in the Rules are applied to the day-to-day work of the Party life is the fact that the overwhelming majority of the Communists have concrete assignments connected with current economic, political and socio-cultural tasks either in their capacity as elected members of Party committees and bureaus of Party organizations, leading trade union and Communist Youth organizations, people's councils, women's committees and other public organizations, or as lecturers and propagandists, members of editorial boards of factory newspapers, etc.

The active participation of Communists in Party life is expressed also in the conduct of Party meetings. More than 96 per cent of Party membership took part in the annual election meetings in autumn last year. In many Party branches attendance was 100 per cent. More than one-third of those present took the floor, offering suggestions for the further improvement of the work, analyzing the progress made in carrying out the tasks set by the Congress in the various spheres, and advancing valuable proposals toward their realization.

The new Rules stress that the activity of the Party organizations and Party bodies rests wholly on the principle of collectivity, the highest principle of Party leadership. Our Party attaches vast importance to the strictest observance of this principle inasmuch as experience has shown that it ensures a profound understanding of reality, enriches the thinking and experience of the Communists and the popular masses, enables Party organizations to work out the most rational measures and decisions. At the same time, collective work is one of the most powerful instruments for strengthening the unity of the Party and its leading committees, Collective leadership and collective work influences the entire style of work of the Party bodies, of Party workers, and all Communists. The consistent application of this principle safeguards our cadres, Party bodies and organizations against subjectivism and voluntarism, ensures the correct choice of the main link in the chain of planned measures, makes for well-founded, concrete and differentiated decisions. Collective work makes possible the most rational distribution and utilization of the forces and means at the disposal of the Party, helps to improve methods of organization, leadership and control, heightens the dynamism, flexibility and efficiency of Party work in keeping with the complex tasks of the present period.

In order to ensure collective work at all levels, the Party leadership took steps to augment the district, city and regional Party organs, improve the organization of the work of the bureaus and secretariats of these bodies.

Concern for the consistent application of the collective principle in the work of the Party and its leading bodies is reflected in the section of the Rules providing for the establishment of two new bodies to exercise leadership in the intervals btween the Meetings of the Central Committee—the Executive Committee and the Permanent Presidium. This measure was dictated by the increase in Party membership and the consequent increase in the composition of the Central Committee which called for a broader executive body than the former Political Bureau. Setting up the Executive Committee facilitates the fulfilment of the tasks confronting the Party in the sphere of Party of endeavor. At the same time, as experience building, Party and State life, and all spheres has shown, problems are constantly cropping up which must be examined and resolved by a smaller group. The Permanent Presidium of the Central Committee deals with current problems; the Secretariat organizes and verifies fulfilment of Party decisions and handles the

selection and promotion of cadres.

Of vast importance for the development of inner Party democracy and collective work is the provision that the Executive Committee, the Permanent Presidium and the Secretariat report to the Central Committee on the work done, while the Central Committee keeps Party organizations regularly informed about its own work and consults with them on basic questions of Party policy.

It has become the established practice for Party bodies to make a thorough study of the various spheres of activity, enlisting the active cooperation of all members concerned and the aid of the more experienced Communists expert in the different branches of work, in drawing up decisions and carrying them into life. In furtherance of this practice, the new Rules note that Party bodies should draw on the experience of Party members well versed in the various areas of political, economic, social, scientific and cultural activity.

Our Party organizations have built up a large body of Party *activists* working on a voluntary basis and numbering more than 200,000 Communists throughout the country. Much valuable experience has been accumulated in this respect. Although the membership has increased by more than 700,000 since the Eighth Congress and the number of Party branches by about 26,000, in the past five years, thanks to assistance of the Party spare-time workers, it has been possible substantially to reduce the number of full-time Party functionaries.

In this connection we may mention here that following a decision of the Party leadership on improving the work with the activists, commissions were set up at regional, district and city Party committees to give organizational guidance to the voluntary Party workers and to heighten their efficiency. The regional, district and city committees of the Party have enlisted some 40,000 Party members to help direct and control the work of the Party organizations on a voluntary basis; besides this, tens of thousands of other activists are working on economic committees, in committees of organizational departments, carrying out political and propaganda assignments, working in the sphere of science, art, culture and education. More than 55,000 Communists, possessing the necessary political and ideological training, are working as lecturers and propagandists in the Party educational system. Add to this the numerous groups formed by the Party bodies to study diverse aspects of the work and to help popularize advanced experience and eliminate shortcomings, and some idea of the multiform activities of the Communists will be obtained.

The political line of our Party, its major decisions and measures, are worked out collectively and discussed at plenary meetings of the Central Committee, in the local bodies of the Party and meetings of the Party activists, at conferences with the participation of workers in all fields of endeavor. These decisions thus reflect the opinion of the entire Party and accord with the concrete conditions, possibilities and requirements of our country. A striking example in this respect was the discussion of the draft documents subsequently adopted by the Congress. The draft directives on the national economic development under the new five-year plan and the plan for power development for the period 1965-75 were discussed in Party organizations, among factory workers, at construction sites and agricultural enterprises, in mass organizations, scientific, art and cultural institutions. Hundreds of thousands of people, expressing the will of the nation, declared verbally and in writing their approval of these documents. Some 30,000 proposals were submitted, part of which were incorporated in the final draft. The documents of the November (1965) Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee which discussed and outlined measures for improving the direction and planning of agriculture were worked out in a similar manner. These documents were discussed at meetings of regional, district and city committees of the Party, in Party branches and among the masses of the peasantry. Conducted in an atmosphere of optimism and confidence in the future, this discussion underscored the inseparable link between the Party and the people and the determination of the masses to carry out the tasks set by the Party.

The consistent application of the principle of collective leadership and collective work, as well as inner Party democracy, is expressed in the point of the Rules stipulating that a Communist cannot occupy more than one post in the political leadership involving constant working Party or government bodies. This prevents burdening Party functionaries with an excessive load of work, questions can be dealt with more thoroughly and settled more quickly. At the same time conditions are created for a more rational distribution of assignments within the Party bodies, the actual participation of members in the work of the leadership is ensured and an end is put to the distortion of the relations between controllers and controlled caused by one and the same functionary holding down two jobs. By clearly defining the responsibility for the fulfilment of various duties along government and Party lines the optimal conditions can be obtained for exercising effective Party control and avoiding a situation when, for example, the chairman of regional and district agricultural councils worked simultaneously as secretaries of the corresponding Party bodies.

The Rules offer clear evidence of concern for the steady strengthening of ties with the masses as the source of the strength and invincibility of the Party. The section dealing with the leading and guiding role of the Party in relation to mass organizations notes that it is the duty of the Communists working in these organizations to see to it that they are run along democratic lines. As regards relations between Party

organizations and state government bodies the Rules demand that Communists employed in these bodies display a high sense of responsibility in carrying out the policy of the Party and government, and strict observance of Party and state discipline. Observance of the collective principle and socialist democracy in mass organizations and government bodies heightens the effectiveness of their multiform activities. The norms set forth in the Rules enable the Party to carry on extensive work to organize and rally all the forces of the nation for the revolutionary reconstruction of society, and to give constant guidance to the state bodies, trade unions, youth and women's organizations. Thus, there is no sphere of political and social life in the country in which the Party does not act as the motive force.

The documents of the Ninth Congress of the Rumanian Communist Party vividly reflect the Party's position with regard to the international Communist movement. "In the spirit of proletarian internationalism, on the basis of the principles and standards of Marxist-Leninist relations," states the first section of the Rules of the RCP, "the Rumanian Communist Party stands for relations of cooperation with fraternal Communist and Workers' parties, actively contributing its share to consolidating the unity and cohesion of the international Communist and working-class movement." Concern for the consolidation of the unity of the Communist and working-class movement, the unity of the countries of the socialist world system, the defense of peace and socialism permeates the whole of the activity of the RCP. Our Party holds that the consistent observance of the basic standards of inter-party relations, the principles of independence, equality and non-interference in the internal affairs of other parties, the principles of proletarian internationalism, development of mutual confidence and esteem between the fraternal parties are of the utmost importance for realizing and strengthening this unity, the cementing of which is the supreme duty of every Marxist-Leninist party. The Rumanian Communist Party believes that what unites the Communist parties—a common ideology, identity of aims and interests, a common struggle and a single historical mission—is basic and should outweigh any differences in views. As for the Rumanian Communists, they are fully determined to continue to spare no effort to make their contribution to upholding and consolidating the unity of the world Communist movement—that great force of our time.

The Rules of the RCP, the guiding document for the entire work of our Party, have proved their effectiveness and continue to do so from day to day. Inspired by the vistas opened to the entire people by the Ninth Congress of the Party, the Rumanian Communists are devoting all their energies, all their strength to the task of achieving the prosperity of their country, to the struggle for the triumph of the noble ideals cherished by workingmen the world over —socialism and communism.

Virgil TROFIN

Meeting at San Remo

LAST MAY A DELEGATION of the French Communist Party and a delegation of the Italian Communist Party met in San Remo, Italy.

The French delegation included Waldeck Rochet, General Secretary, Jacques Duclos, Political Bureau member, and Jean Capievic, Jacques Denis and Roger Loubet, Central Committee members.

The Italian Communist Party was represented by its General Secretary Luigi Longo, Giorgio Amendola, Political Bureau member, Carlo Galluzzy, member of the Party Leadership and Guiseppe d'Alema and Sergio Segre, Central Committee members.

The meeting, which was held in a fraternal atmosphere, showed the militant unity of the two parties and their full agreement on the three problems examined, the struggle against U.S. aggression in Vietnam, NATO and European Security and the Common Market.

The two parties again condemned American aggression in Vietnam and expressed their solidarity with the Vietnamese people in their struggle for independence. They underlined that U.S. intervention had entered a new stage with the direct and increasingly massive concentration of American troops in South Vietnam and the intensified bombing of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam.

It is clear to both parties that no escalation

of the aggression, no matter how brutal the methods and how dangerous the consequences for world peace, will ever bring about a solution. On the contrary, the facts show that U.S. imperialism is becoming more and more isolated in the world and that in the United States itself the social conscience is awakening, a fact which the two delegations welcomed.

Recent developments and the successes scored by the Vietnamese patriots expose to the hilt the fictitious character of the South Vietnamese government. The only acceptable solution is recognition of the legitimate positions of the DRV and of the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam.

It must be driven home to the U.S. warmongers that a peaceful and just solution of the Vietnam problem presupposes cessation of the bombing of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam; recognition of the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam and negotiating with it; observance of the Geneva agreements and evacuation of U.S. troops from South Vietnam in conformity with these agreements.

Fully conscious of their responsibility, the Italian Communist Party and the French Communist Party in their joint statement called on Communists, working people and peace forces of the two countries to increase their solidarity with the Vietnamese people, in order to isolate U.S. imperialism and put an end to its aggression. This is imperative if all the peoples are to win the right to freedom and independence. This will be a contribution to world peace for it is precisely when the aggressor finds himself in an impasse that he becomes more reckless.

Both delegations noted that American aggression is greatly adding to world tension not only in Asia but also in Europe where it is encouraging the forces opposed to a detente.

As regards the second question both parties confirmed their determination to work for a system of collective security in Europe which would include all countries of both East and West and guarantee peace to all peoples. They stressed that the division of the world into two opposing military blocs does not correspond to present conditions and the aspirations of the peoples for peace. Hence the crisis in NATO; it is the result of the realization of this fact and also of the aggravation of the contradictions in the imperialist camp.

Both parties noted that France's withdrawal from the military organization of the Atlantic Pact has created a new situation which makes it even more urgent to take action to replace the opposing military blocs by a collective security system. They recalled in this connection that the Preamble to the Warsaw Treaty, concluded in answer to NATO, states that in the event of the establishment of a system of collective security in Europe, the Warsaw Treaty will be abrogated, and that this has been confirmed recently by leading personalities of the socialist countries.

Both parties likewise stressed the importance of the fact that in 1969 the 20-year term of the Atlantic Pact will expire, and declared their determination to participate in all actions and initiatives by the forces of peace and progress aimed at rallying public opinion to reject blocs, to take measures that will nullify their practical meaning.

In the opinion of both parties favorable conditions exist at present on the international scene which make it possible to take steps towards achieving a detente, general, gradual, simultaneous and controlled disarmament and also European security.

Among such steps are: the conclusion of a non-aggression pact between NATO and the Warsaw Treaty organization and also bilateral agreements against the build-up and proliferation of nuclear arms and excluding the possibility of Germany receiving atomic weapons of any kind; the creation of nuclear-free zones and the freezing of atomic wapons; the dismantling of foreign bases; recognition of the present frontiers in Europe; recognition of the existence of the two German states and, in general, normalization of relations with them.

As regards the Common Market both parties recalled the warning sounded by the Communists at the time it was formed and stressed that even among the supporters of "Little Europe" many are critical of the fact that the development of the productive forces and the internationalization of production are used solely to further the interests of the monopolies. In every country the competition within the Common Market is given as justification for the serious economic and social consequences of this policy.

Both parties noted that capitalist concentration, which is encouraged in every way by the Common Market organizations, is placing increasing economic and political power in the hands of the monopolies; that big capitalist groups of different countries are concluding more and more agreements, particularly to the benefit of the German monopolies; that the invasion of American capital is increasing and its concentration in certain key sectors is threatening the independence and development of the countries concerned.

All these facts give the lie to the thesis according to which Europe will become, with the help of the Common Market, a third force independent of the United States.

Both parties reaffirmed that the fight against the monopolies is inseparable from the fight for democracy and stressed that every people has the sovereign right to choose its own way way of economic and social development, that this is by no means incompatible with international democratic cooperation which takes into account the interests of the working people of each country.

The Communists are determined to defend in the European institutions the interests of the working class and the national interests of their respective countries, and to prevent

the process of integration putting obstacles in the way of democratic reforms, including nationalization, urged by the people.

The Communists are determined to fight for a policy which will not be a policy of the trusts and cartels, and to deprive the Common Market institutions of their technocratic character, particularly with the participation of the representatives of the parliaments and trade unions of the member countries.

At this meeting the French and Italian Communist parties renewed their demand that the elected spokesmen finally be allowed to take the place in the European institutions that is due to them as representatives of big workers', democratic and national parties.

They stressed the need for concerted action by the working class of the Common Market countries in defense of their interests and the national interest and against the monopolies and cartels that dominate the Common Market. They welcomed the initiative taken in this direction by the French Federation of Labor (CGT) and the Italian Federation of Labor (CGIL) and the increased number of meetings and actions of late by trade unions affiliated to the WFTU or the CISL.

They also welcome and pledge to support the spreading economic and social struggle which reflects the profound dissatisfaction of the working class and of all those who have been hard hit by the monopolies.

The two parties consider that a democratic alternative to the present policy of integration, which upholds the interests of the monopolies and the cold war, should seek to overcome the limits of the Common Market and promote equality of the rights and respect for the interests of all the European states, both capitalist and socialist, and thus pave the way to agreements in the spheres of production and science.

The parties reaffirmed their solidarity with other liberation movements and progressive parties and their commitment to fight for the legalization of the fraternal parties that are still banned, against fascist regimes still existing, and to support the peoples fighting against imperialism and for a world free of oppression, wars and hunger.

They stressed the importance of joint action by working-class and democratic forces, irrespective of the different situations in the different countries, and the new possibilities favoring such action.

Proceeding from the situation and experience both in France and in Italy the two parties arrived at the conclusion that there are new openings for cooperation between the democratic forces.

To this end both parties, which are determined to work in this direction, called on the Socialists and other Left forces and all workers to seek common points of agreement on the objectives of political and economic democracy, social and cultural progress and peace.

They also noted with satisfaction the changes favoring a rapprochement with the Catholics in the great battle for man's happiness in a world of freedom and peace.

The meeting at San Remo confirmed the unity of the two parties on the three problems discussed, problems which are of particular importance for the peoples of Italy and France.

Both the Italian and the French people are interested in the development of solidarity with their Vietnamese brothers and in intensification of the struggle against the U.S. aggressors.

Both the Italian and the French people are interested in continuing the fight for the triumph of the policy of collective security over the policy of military blocs.

It is in the interest of both the Italian and the French people that Communists should have an opportunity to combat the policy of the capitalist monopolies directly in the Common Market organizations.

Both the French and the Italian peoples have a common vital interest, namely, that the working class and democratic forces unite to secure the triumph of the policy of peace, social progress and democracy.

Jacques DUCLOS

Communists and the trade unions in Canada

CANADA TODAY IS A country where the most profound contradictions inherent in state monopoly capitalism and imperialism are to be found. Its productive forces are developing unevenly. Its labor force is one of the most rapidly growing in the capitalist world. The development and use of abundant natural resources, the growth of industry, trade, and commercial enterprises, is largely dependent upon the movement of foreign capital, mainly United States monopoly capital. The productive forces are coming into sharper conflict with production relations.

The drive by the biggest monopolies toward continental economic integration with the United States has advanced to the point where Canada's political independence is at stake, and has already made Canada a subservient tool of U.S. foreign policy. Canada's federal state structure is threatened by a deepening constitutional crisis arising from the inequality that exists in the relations between English and French Canada.

The rising democratic and anti-imperialist movements of the people throughout the capitalist world find their expression in Canada in the growing mass struggles over socio-economic and political issues. Basic to this process is the growing influence of the socialist world, and the struggles for national liberation in Latin America, Asia and Africa, as well as the movement for civil rights and democracy in the United States.

It is on this background that one has to see the rising strike movement and growing militancy of the working class in Canada. In 1965 there were more strikes than in any previous year. Nearly one-half of the strikes were unofficial, or "illegal strikes" by definition of existing labor laws. This indicates much frustration and impatience with the status quo, particularly on the part of the hundreds of thousands of young workers now entering the labor force for the first time to face inhuman speed-up, worsening working conditions and economic insecurity.

High economic activity and a relatively high degree of employment provide workers with more favorable conditions to wrest concessions from the employers. Most of the struggle, and collective bargaining in general, is centered on economic demands for big wage settlements, extended vacations, pensions and other fringe benefits. The reduction of the hours of work including overtime has not as yet loomed very large in collective bargaining demands advanced by the unions. This may be accounted for by the excessive overtime still worked in many industries, and which many workers accept as a source of added income.

The economic boom has not overcome the contradictions besetting capitalist society. On the contrary, these contradictions have multiplied and intensified.

The technological revolution has intensified the exploitation of labor. Nearly 400,000 Canadian workers are unemployed. The increased rate of productivity—a worker in 1966 produced over 70 per cent more than he did in 1946—has not resulted in lower prices and an all-pervasive rise in the standard of living throughout the country. Instead, prices are increasing Monopoly profits are rising more than twice as fast as wages. A considerable share of the tax burden is being shifted from the rich to the working people whose relative share in the national income is declining.

The benefits of the protracted economic boom have been appropriated by the monopolies. The result is that the gap between poverty and wealth is growing. More than one-third of the population live on sub-standard incomes, which means that they are denied minimal levels of health, housing, food, and education, which our technological and scientific knowledge is capable of providing. Almost six and one-half million persons, or over 35 per cent of the total population of Canada, live either in deprivation, poverty, or destitution.

The only remedy for this situation is mass struggle to defeat big business and government policies. In Canada this struggle is developing and is assuming a new dimension around issues of a more fundamental nature than the customary economic issues in labor-management relations.

Among such issues are job security, labor's right to bargain over all issues affecting conditions of employment, against compulsory arbitration, for the unrestricted right to strike and

picket, against the use of court injunctions to limit labor's rights, for the abolition of fines and other penalties imposed on unions and their members for doing what they ought to have a right to do, and for the unrestricted freedom of association which the capitalist monopolies and the bourgeois state are attempting to interfere with.

These demands have developed out of a situation in which court injunctions, police violence and government strike-breaking have been the order of the day.

Today unjust laws are being challenged and defied to bring about a more equitable balance of power between the workers and management in the enterprise. The customary line of class collaboration practised by the Right-wing trade union officials is being rejected by the workers.

At the same time new sections of workers are being drawn into the struggle. This includes office workers, people in various service occupations, engineers, technicians, professional employees, teachers, civil servants, etc. A strike of postal workers opened the way for legislation to provide collective bargaining, including the right to strike, for civil servants.

During the late fall of 1964 some 2,800 railway workers stopped work in protest against unilateral imposition of technological changes in the government-owned Canadian National Railways which meant the loss of many jobs and abandonment of communities. The government appointed a Commissioner to look into the issue, conduct public hearings and make recommendations. The result is a report which recommends prior negotiations on technological changes with labor and with communities affected by such changes. One important principle brought forward by this report is, that; *when technological changes are introduced which will have the effect of fundamentally altering the relationship between an industry, its employees and the community, the cost of reasonable proposals to protect employees from its adverse consequences is a proper charge against its benefits and savings.* It also recommended advance notice to communities and aid in adjusting to the impact of changes proposed. In addition to collective bargaining, legislative action is also called for. These recommendations can be applied to any and all technological changes in any industry, federally or under provincial jurisdiction.

In November 1965, the British Columbia Federation of Labor (CLC) called for a 48-hour general work stoppage in defiance of restrictive labor laws on an issue similar to that of the railway workers but now involving striking oil workers. Instead of risking a showdown with organized labor over the issue the B.C. government stepped in to bring about a settlement of the strike in this west coast province which later served as a pattern for settlement across all of Canada.

Early this year, 49 employees of a small town newspaper belonging to absentee publisher Lord Thomson of Fleet struck for wage increases and job security. When the $300-million newspaper empire secured an injunction from a judge to break the strike, some 16,000 automobile workers in the town of Oshawa, Ontario —the cradle of industrial unionism in the auto industry in Canada in 1937—rallied to support the strikers and with the help of the rest of the labor movement defied the court injunction and won the strike. Presently the trade unions are embarked upon a public campaign to secure the abolition of court injunctions as a strike-breaking weapon.

On July 1st, 1965, the federal government proclaimed a Labor Standards Code passed by an Act of Parliament and providing for a $1.25 per hour minium wage and a 40-hour work-week in all employment coming under federal jurisdiction. Only two months later the government succumbed to employer pressure and granted sweeping exemptions from the provisions of this law. Since then, thousands of truck drivers in Ontario have been on strike for the 40-hour work-week, already granted by an Act of Parliament but refused by arrogant employers in the transport industry.

In this year's bargaining for over a million workers in basic industry, the issue of shorter hours without reduction in pay is being raised by some unions directly, while others approach the issue indirectly by demands for extended vacations with pay.

The Communist Party takes the position that this era of electronic computers and rapid scientific progress calls for public control of private monopoly, extension of public ownership through nationalization, and economic planning in which the working class must play an ever-greater role through the participation by the trade unions in such economic planning.

The educational system has to be fitted in with vocational requirements. The scope of on-the-job training and re-training has to be expanded with full pay to a worker while undergoing such training. Apprenticeship and on-the-job training, fully paid by industry and governments, is a must if the steady stream of young workers entering the labor market are to be integrated properly in the economy of the country. Relocation in employment has to remain voluntary, with iron-clad guarantees against loss of income for the worker in case of job relocation.

The Canadian trade union movement is confronted with a serious crisis in both policy and structure. This crisis has its roots in the traditional craft and international union structure where the bulk of a union's membership as well as its headquarters are in the United States. This set-up, which parallels Canada's branch-plant economy dominated by U.S. parent companies, makes it possible for top leaders of U.S. unions to interfere in the internal affairs of their Canadian membership. In the years of the cold war this has deepened the crisis of policy and widened the gap between

the membership of international unions in Canada and top circles of labor leadership in the United States.

The leadership of the Canadian Labor Congress, under pressure from its membership both in international and purely national unions in Canada, has begun to assert its independence on such issues as foreign policy, disarmament and peace, while still maintaining a passive stance on issues of national independence.

While political discrimination and anti-communism has long served as the cover-up for labor-splitting thus weakening both the economic and political struggle, the growing mass struggles are beginning to make for long overdue changes. With Communist support for increased trade union participation in the 1965 federal election campaign, with particular emphasis on the New Democratic Party as an alternative to the capitalist parties, labor is emerging as a stronger factor in political as well as economic life in Canada.

To successfully advance labor's proposals and to rally support for its aims Communists seek to combine electoral and parliamentary action by labor with mass actions, such as picketing, parades, meetings, lobbying, demonstrations and solidarity movements in support of economic action and the growing strike movement. To advance the struggle for Canada's national interests, to advance our independence and the cause of peace requires a better understanding and agreement on common issues between Communists, members of the New Democratic Party, its supporters and all progressive forces within the trade union movement.

While actively fighting side by side with fellow workers in the trade unions, on the picket lines and for immediate economic as well as political objectives, the Communist Party seeks to project the vision of a socialist society, how it will be achieved in Canada, and how it will function.

Illusions sown by the class enemy have to be dispelled. False concepts about Communists and what we represent and stand for have to be combated. The prejudice planted by our class enemy runs deep. It will take more than propaganda and agitation to combat this. It takes active participation in the day-to-day struggle conducted by the working people and their allies in the course of which Communists apply their theoretical concepts and prove them in practice.

Patient explanation to promote understanding, a preparedness to give and take in debate with others, a firm conviction and confidence in the historic role of the working class as the most consistent and dynamic force in the struggle for democratic progress and peace, only this can lift the movement as a whole out of its narrow and pragmatic concepts and project in its place the perspective of a new society free from capitalist exploitation in which the working class will be the guiding force.

The main role of our Party has always been, and continues to be, the merger of scientific socialist theory with the every-day work and struggles of Canadian labor, to win the working class to the concept of the need for the socialist transformation of our society.

Bruce MAGNUSON

The tenth congress of the Socialist International

THE TENTH CONGRESS of the Socialist International, which took place in Stockholm on May 5-8, was attended by about 200 delegates, observers and guests. The delegates represented the Social Democratic and Socialist parties of 24 countries, chiefly of Western Europe. The observers and guests came from various parties and organizations of several African and Latin American countries and the Socialist parties of Italy, Portugal and India.

Congress discussed the international situation, Europe in the world context, development of democratic Socialist thought and action in new countries, and disarmament. Besides, problems of liaison in Asia-Oceania and Latin America were examined at private sessions. A similar session to discuss liaison machinery in Africa failed to materialize, because "it aroused no interest."

Congress decided to institute a fourth post of Vice-Chairman, to which W. Brandt of the FRG was elected. B. Bitterman of Austria was re-elected Chairman and T. Erlander of Sweden, Guy Mollet of France and H. Wilson of Britain, Vice-Chairmen of the Socialist International.

In the Congress resolutions on international issues one can detect certain new trends, some attempts, albeit hesitant, to break away from cold war dogmas.

Below our correspondent at the Congress discusses some aspects of its work.

If a comparison is made between the 1961 (Rome) Congress of the Socialist International and the 1966 (Stockholm) Congress, two significant things emerge. The first is that the loud, strident, Cold War note was muted—not that it was not sounded, for electoral reasons, by the Dutch, West German and Austrian delegations, but it was pitched in a low tone. The second very important fact was the emergence of the Afro-Asian and Latin American delegates, observers, and guests, as a fighting force within the Socialist International.

A forecast of this had actually taken place at Rome. Congress had before it the draft of a new declaration of the Socialist International. Ten years had elapsed since the Frankfurt Declaration had been issued at the founding congress of the Socialist International, and many changes had taken place. It was to tackle the problems of the new era, to re-state the aims and tasks of Democratic Socialism that the new draft had been prepared. The leaders thought that it would go through without any trouble. They could not have been more mistaken.

Led by the Japanese Socialist Party, the Afro-Asian delegates refused to endorse the draft. It was, they insisted, nothing more than a NATO, cold war, anti-Soviet and anti-Communist declaration of West European Social Democracy.

After a number of amendments, it re-emerged at the Oslo Conference in 1962, to be published as "The World Today—A Socialist Perspective." To compare it with the resolution on the international situation passed at Stockholm in 1966, is to see the impact world developments have had upon the leaders of the International, and particularly developments among the emergent nations.

One of the British delegates to the 1961 Rome Congress declared that unless the Socialist International could bring the emergent nations into its ranks and learn to work with them as equals and not as second-class citizens, then the Socialist International was doomed. Judging from the behaviour of the leaders of the Socialist International in Stockholm, particularly those in the British delegation, they have still not learned the lessons, even though most of them have been forced to recognize that the emergent nations must be given their rightful place, at least those whose parties either are, or want to be, affiliated to the International.

Thus Lee Quan Yew, the Prime Minister of Singapore and leader of the People's Action Party of Singapore, has been given a seat on the Bureau of the Socialist International, whilst two seats have been reserved for Latin American parties, should some decide to affiliate. On the other hand, the left-wing Malayan Labor Party was expelled for "Communist" activities whist one of the left-wing parties of Mauritius is being investigated also for suspect "Communist" activities.

Since the 1961 Rome Congress there has

been a significant turn by the Socialist International from purely European concerns. It has edged a bit towards Africa, Asia and Latin America. According to one of the Asian delegates, the basic reason for this turn is that, apart from their determination to prevent the advance of Communist ideology in these continents, the imperialists are seeking not only to protect their investments but are also seeking new areas of investment. Hence, he explained, the sudden sympathy and interest shown by the Dutch delegation for the Africans.

In his speech to Congress, Willy Brandt, leader of the Social Democratic Party of Federal Germany, boasted that "never before has an international Congress of Social Democratic parties been attended by so many delegates and guests from the emerging nations—representatives from Africa, Asia and Latin America, from the wide reaches of the uncommitted world." This, he added, was "highly gratifying," but his joy was to turn sour by the end of Congress.

The Africans were treated so "terribly," as an observer from Mozambique put it, that when they left the Stockholm Congress they felt that Democratic Socialism, at least as represented at Stockholm, was not for them; the Congress, which had been devoted to furthering the influence of Democratic Socialism in Africa, had clearly failed in this respect. What had gone wrong?

At the suggestion of the British Labour Party, the Socialist International had invited a strong delegation from Africa to attend the special Seminar on "Socialist Thought and Action in the New Countries," at Uppsala University from April 27 to April 29, and then to stay on as observers at the Stockholm Congress. This was important since Congress was to discuss the growing problems of the emergent countries. The Africans were the guests of the Swedish Social Democratic Party who gave them to understand that they would be allowed to address Congress. But if the British leaders and the leaders of the Socialist International believed that this strong and important delegation from Africa would sit meekly and politely in their seats whilst delegates condescendingly spoke of aid, birth control, clinics and education, important as these might be, when such burning issues as Rhodesia existed, than they simply have not got a clue about the political situation in Africa, nor how the Africans feel about it—which is hard to believe.

Present at Uppsala were Africans from Zimbabwe—two from ZAPU and two from ZANU, nine from Zambia including Mr. S. Kapwepwe, its Foreign Secretary, and one from Mozambique.

The Africans might have been invited to attend as "observers" but they came as fierce advocates. They had burning speeches ready on the way Britain was handling the Rhodesian issue and they intended to let the Socialist International and the world know how they felt about it. They would "fight to the death" to achieve democratic rule in Rhodesia and force Smith into unconditional surrender, said Mr. Nelson Samkange of ZAPU. If African rule in Zimbabwe were delayed, he added, there might be disaster. "No price is too high for our Party and people to pay in order to regain our country and our right to govern ourselves." A fierce attack was made on Britain's policy in Rhodesia, which was defended at Uppsala by Anthony Greenwood, a Cabinet Minister. But his was not the full reply by the British delegation.

The British delegation took steps to prevent the issue of Rhodesia being raised in open Congress by the Africans. It was a strong delegation, amongst whom were G. Brown, Deputy Prime Minister; W. Padley, Minister of State for Foreign Affairs; Len Williams, General Secretary of the Labour Party; Lord Chalfont, Minister for Disarmament; Tom Driberg, member of the E.C. of the Labour Party, and J. Gormly member of the E.C. of the Labour Party and National Union of Mineworkers.

At a special meeting of the Bureau of the Socialist International the British delegation banged its fist on the table. They believed that Congress would turn into a conflict between the Africans and themselves over Rhodesia, therefore the Africans must not be allowed to speak. But with true British hypocrisy, or "subtlety" as Lee Kuan Yew preferred to call it, when the delegation demanded that the Africans be gagged, the question of Rhodesia never came up at all as a reason. It was a question of rules, nothing more. Non-members, observers and guests, unless specially invited to do so, had no right to address Congress. The Africans were non-members, only guests of Congress; therefore they had no right to speak, and the British delegation insisted that the "rules of Congress must be upheld."

In his union, said J. Gormly, spokesman for the British delegation, a man either had the legal right to speak according to the rule book, or else he had not. If a man had the right to speak, then he spoke. If he did not have that right, then he did not speak. What was good enough for the members of his union should be good enough for the Africans. They did not have the legal right to speak at Congress and therefore they should be stopped from doing so.

Finally, the views of the British were upheld by the officials of the Socialist International. They were afraid of the embarrassment which would be caused by the African attacks against Britain's Rhodesia policy at the very moment that the talks with the representatives of the illegal Smith regime were starting in London. Moreover, the British play a powerful role in the Socialist International, which has its headquarters in London.

Congress was thus faced with a dilemma. It was out to make a good impression on the Africans and the other guests, observers and delegations from the emergent nations. It was hoping to attract the Africans away from the influence of Communism towards Democratic Socialism, and now this had arisen. It was

made all the worse because Pietro Nenni, the leader of the Italian Socialist Party, who had been invited as a guest on equal terms with the Africans, had been allowed to address open Congress and had been loudly acclaimed by it as a strayed sheep who was now returning to the fold. If Congress had allowed Nenni to speak, why not the Africans? This was being loudly asked by Africans.

Finally a compromise was reached. The delegates from ZANU and ZAPU "were the only organizations which can tell us at first hand exactly what is going on inside Rhodesia at present," said an official. Why not therefore allow them to tell us? Let the Africans speak at a special closed "information" session on Rhodesia outside the regular business of Congress with the press and public excluded. The Africans would make their speeches. The British would be satisfied that the rules had not been broken since the Africans would not "officially" be addressing Congress. But the compromise was not accepted by the Africans.

A private talk was then arranged between the Africans and G. Brown, who invited them to his hotel for a drink. Afterwards it was announced that there would be a special session still "outside the framework of Congress" but that this time the press, radio and television would be allowed in and that the Africans had agreed to this.

The following morning Congress met in a state of excitetment. The hall was packed for the "unofficial special session of Congress." The Africans were in attendance. The chairman declared the "unofficial" session open and called for an African to take the floor. But no one moved. The chairman called again for a speaker, but again no one went to the rostrum. Then it dawned on the platform that the Africans were boycotting the entire procedure in a most dignified and public way, and the chairman closed the "unofficial" session two minutes after he had opened it. Now the world press and the entire Congress had seen the Africans' dignified refusal to be treated as second-class citizens by the Socialist International.

The British delegation insisted that it had not been afraid of an argument, that it was prepared to answer any attacks made by the Africans against Wilson's handling of the Rhodesian issue. In any case Greenwood had got the better of the Africans in Uppsala. As far as they were concerned, the difficulties had arisen "solely because the Africans are not members of the Socialist International." Rules had to be obeyed.

The Africans declared that they had been singled out for insult. No white guest or observer had been treated in this way. "They are embarrassed to have us here," said one African, speaking to a reporter. "They adopt a high moral tone and speak of aid as if it was charity."

This was particularly the case when Congress was addressed by Mrs. G. Meir of Israel.

Called to the rostrum of an "official session" which was opened immediately after the "unofficial" session was closed ,she spoke in highly emotional tones about the suffering of the African people, adding that rules were not immutable. Congress ought to be ashamed of itself for not being more flexible. She poured out soothing syrup in bucketsful hoping it would be as balm to the African wounds. But, as one African said afterwards, would it not have been better if she had made her protest earlier and demanded that we speak, instead of trying to win our sympathy afterwards? Furious at it all, the chief Zambian delegate, Simon Kapwepwe, flew to London, "disgusted with this white man's Socialist International."

Another African spoke very frankly to the press about the Congress. He compared the treatment of "white Nenni with black Kapwepwe who, after all, is Foreign Minister of Zambia." He called the delegates "hypocrites" and contrasted them with Communists, who, he said, are really interested in our prob ems. . . . In Eastern Europe they ask how they can help and they do not quibble about rules or whether it's an official or unofficial session. There they just let us speak." The face of Social Democracy as revealed in Stockholm, he concluded, "was very unattractive to Africans." He saw no reason why independent strong African parties should affiliate to it.

Naturally enough the Swedish people were very indignant that their guests should have been treated in this way, especially at the instigation of the unpopular British who were in general isolated, not only on this but also over Vietnam. The Swedish youth in particular were incensed. The Swedish Social Democratic Students Union passed this resolution which was distributed to all at Congress:

"We strongly protest against the discriminating treatment of the African guests at the Congress of the Socialist International in Stockholm.

"We thought that the Socialist International was a Socialist and international organization, not a European club to discuss internal security and European economic integration. There are more adequate organizations for that purpose.

"We fully realize that it may be embarrassing for some Western delegates to discuss Rhodesia and the Portuguese colonies, but from the point of view of freedom, equality and brotherhood, these should be the main topics at an ordinary session of the Congress.

"The attempt to neglect these questions by refusing to discuss them discredits the Socialist International amongst Socialists in the poor as well as in the rich countries."

This resolution expressed the feelings of the majority of the Swedish people who went out of their way to be friendly, hospitable and helpful to their African guests. The Swedish delegation tried very hard to enable the Africans to speak in open Congress. Indeed in his closing address to Congress, Mr. Tage Erlander,

Prime Minister of Sweden and leader of the Swedish Social Democratic Party, the host of the Africans, made a "diplomatic" protest.

Speaking of the "new situation" which existed in the Socialist International because of the "many delegates and guests from the emerging nations" who were present, he said that the International could no longer focus its attention only on European problems. Its outlook, discussions and range would have to be broadened as a result of this new situation. It would be a difficult process to adapt the International to this changing situation, and "we will all fumble." The Socialist International would have to consider the situation very carefully indeed in order to find the best way of making this approach and "we must also take a close look at the rules of the International."

The final resolutions showed that whilst the Socialist International was still basicaly an anti-Communist and anti-Soviet organization, nevertheless it took a lot of care to tone this down. Most delegates wanted to avoid any increase in tension between East and West. Indeed the delegate from Canada, J. Cadbury, went as far as to say that "some alliances might even be endangered" for that purpose, a bold statement to make in front of the British and West German Social Democrats who stand so firm behind NATO, whilst M. Pineau, a French delegate said that an anti-Soviet statement would embarrass the French in their dialogue with the French Communist Party.

Another positive factor of Congress, although not reflected in the Resolution on the International Situation, was that a majority of the delegates urged an end to the bombing of North Vietnam, a negotiated peace based on the Geneva agreements, with delegates from the National Liberation Front taking their place at the negotiating table. Not a single delegate supported the United States policy as unequivocally as the British. Implicit in all this was an anti-Americanism expressed for the first time at such a Congress.

The leaders of the Socialist International consider it vitally important to secure the affiliation of parties from the emergent nations. But even if they succeed in this, the future of the Socialist International, as Stockholm has shown, promises to be stormy.

H. FAGAN

Imperialist intrigues against revolutionary Cuba

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS on the world arena leave little doubt that international reaction, headed by U.S. imperialism, is out to take revenge for past defeats in the contest with socialism and the national-liberation movement, to consolidate its positions and to pass over wherever possible to the counter-offensive against the world revolutionary process.

What is happening in South Vietnam is a glaring instance of the export of counter-revolution. The United States is engaged in direct aggression against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. It has turned Indochina into the main seat of international tension. But disturbing events have been taking place in other parts of the world as well. Socialist Cuba has once again been the object of U.S. provocation. Bands of spies and saboteurs armed and trained by the CIA are being landed on the coast of Cuba. Hostile sallies are constantly being made from the territory of the Guantanamo base, stationed on Cuban soil against the will of the Cuban people.

According to a statement issued by the Cuban Ministry of the Revolutionary Armed Forces, on May 21, a Cuban border guard, Luis Ramirez Lopez, was killed by U.S. servicemen in Guantanamo. This was one of the many acts of provocation which compel the Cuban people to maintain a state of constant military preparedness to meet attacks such as the invasion attempt at Playa Giron in April 1961.

Of course Cuba is not alone in her struggle against U.S. imperialism. As was noted in the TASS statement of May 30, "anyone who harbors aggressive designs against the Republic of Cuba should remember that Cuba has loyal and reliable friends." The Latin American people, the socialist camp and the new sovereign states of Asia and Africa solidly support revolutionary Cuba.

"The Pentagon and the State Department," writes the Argentine *Nuestra palabra* "are mistaken if they imagine that the countreis of America will allow their first socialist revolution to be crushed. Never! The Latin American peoples will rise up and, arms in hand, will march over mountains and plains to defend the Cuban revolution to the last drop of their blood." The working people of the Latin American and other countries are volunteering to go to the assistance of the Cuban people in the event of aggression by U.S. imperialism.

Cuba's relations with the United States have long since ceased to be a matter of normal relations between two neighboring countries. No one could seriously believe that the Republic of Cuba, with its population of seven million, could threaten the security of the United States, the biggest capitalist country in the world.

The United States has entirely different reasons for holding the Damocles' sword over Cuba. Cuba is a socialist enclave situated in the immediate rear of U.S. imperialism. But it is politics rather than geography that determines Washington's attitude toward Cuba. The very process of Cuba's political, social and economic reconstruction has upset all the colonialist foreign-policy concepts of United States diplomacy still based on Theodore Roosevet's tenet that the United States is called upon to play the part of "international policeman" in the Western hemisphere.

The emergence of a socialist state in Cuba imparted a new quality to the situation in the Western hemisphere. It highlighted the inability of imperialism to retard to any appreciable extent the revolutionary process even in this area which the U.S. imperialists have long considered their bailiwick.

Yet Washington politicians still fail to see that Theodore Roosevelt's bellicose concept is an anachronism in the world today.

"Somebody has to be a policeman and the task is usually given to the strong," the U.S. commentator Sulzberger observed recently. Strictly speaking, contemporary imperialist ideology is pivoted above all on the advocacy of the "right of might," of violence, to which the imperialists resort in order to interfere in the internal affairs of other nations.

There is any amount of doctrines expressing the aggressive foreign policy of the USA. The latest of these is the so-called "Rusk doctrine" representing the quintessence of the present political strategy of the USA which has openly arrogated to itself the role of world policeman. Rusk insists on nothing more nor less than the right to intervene by force of arms in the

affairs of all states on the periphery of the Communist world, flouting both world public opinion and America's own allies, not to speak of international law.

The foreign policy of the United States, as a bulwark of international imperialism, has always been spearheaded against the socialist countries and the national-liberation movement. Its methods and outward forms naturally change with the passage of time, but the principal obojectives remain the same. Not so long ago U.S. imperialism was guided by the doctrine of "liberation" of the socialist countries; one of the protagonists of this rabidly anti-communist doctrine was John Foster Dulles. It has been replaced by the "Rusk doctrine." It is easy to see that the substance of both is the "right" of imperialist reaction to intervene in the affairs and destinies of other nations against their will.

The U.S. machinations against socialist Cuba are a manifestation of imperialist strategy in conditions when the international situation is unfavorable for the reactionaries. The overwhelming majority of the newly-emerged states of Asia and Africa has come out on the international arena as proponents of independent foreign policies. This is indicative of a clearly defined anti-imperialist trend and represents a form of anti-imperialist struggle. What might be called a united front of the newly-independent sovereign states has taken shape and asserted itself as an active international force. The decisions of the conferences of nonaligned states held in Belgrade in 1961 and in Cairo in 1964 did much to change the situation on the world arena in favor of the forces of peace. The Asian, African and Latin American solidarity conference held in Havana last January consolidated the united anti-imperialist front. It gave a rebuff to the attempts to counterpose the struggle of the peoples of these three continents to the other two principal components of the world revolutionary process—the socialist world system and the international working-class movement. The solidarity organization of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, established in Havana, constitutes, together with the socialist world system, a formidable force. Hence the resolve of the U.S. imperialists to "police" the international situation to their own advantage.

Above all they have sought to deprive the newly-emerged states of the powerful weapon of unity—unity amongst themselves and with the socialist world system. Attempts are being made to undermine their cohesion with the assistance of reactionaries within these countries. The colonialists are out to breate better international conditions for an onslaught against the national-liberation movement, for the pursuance of a "big stick" policy in the newly-free countries.

It should be noted that the internal situation in the developing countries has also become more complex latterly. The process of national liberation in a number of these countries has entered a new phase—that of struggle for economic liberation and complete political independence. This has naturally caused a certain political differentiation on the domestic scene; the class and national contradictions have been aggravated and a bitter struggle has developed over the choice of the lines of further development. It is against this background that the U.S. imperialists embarked on aggression against Vietnam and are stepping up their intrigues against Cuba.

As a country that rapidly progressed to the building of socialism, Cuba cannot but hold the attention of many peoples. Hence the imperialists are anxious to frustrate its efforts to create new social relationships. But the Cuban people stand alertly on guard against the imperialist machinations, fully determined to upheld their freedom and independence, to repel any aggression and to continue the building of the new society.

The imperialist offensive against the revolutionary forces is one of the realities we must face today. This poses with renewed urgency the question of unity among all contingents of the world revolutionary movement in the common fight against imperialism. This unity is the guarantee of successful advance of the revolutionary process as a whole.

Jan PRASKY

Free Antonio Maidana and other patriots in Paraguay

AT THE 23rd CONGRESS of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the delegation of the Paraguayan Communist Party proposed launching a worldwide campaign for the release of Antonio Maidana, people's hero of Paraguay, Secretary of the CC, PCC, his comrades Julio Rojas and Alfredo Alcorta, and other Paraguayan patriots now in prison.

Ever since August 1958 Antonio Maidana, who was first atrociously tortured, has been confined to a small, dank, sunless cell which he shares with eleven and sometimes as many as fourteen other comrades.

The prisoners are never allowed to go into the fresh air. They are fed abominably and at irregular intervals. It is impossible to observe even elementary sanitary rules. The inmates are denied medical assistance and lack the simplest medicines. They are forbidden to read even the official press or books on science and technology. They are allowed neither paper nor pencil. The Stroessner police see to it that the prisoners are completely shut off from the outside world. For months they have no opportunity to see their relatives or consult their lawyers. They are not allowed to receive any foodstuffs or medicines from outside.

The result is that the health of Comrades Maidana, Rojas and Alcorta has been deteriorating from day to day, and gives serious cause for concern.

It must be stressed that the prisoners are held in such appalling conditions in gross violation of the law. As far back as October 17, 1961, a court of justice ordered the release of Antonio Maidana, his term of imprisonment having expired. The court decision was signed by Judge Luis F. Garbarino, and Raul S. Vera, secretary of the court. Nevertheless, several years after this decision and another decision of the same character, adopted by Tomas Benites Acosta, Maidana is still in his dark cell, in the third department of the Asuncion police headquarters.

The latest reports are particularly alarming. We understand that Maidana and his comrades are tortured daily. On the pretext that they plan to escape they are held in chains. At any moment they may be killed for "attempted escape" or die as a result of "suicide while of unsound mind," as the police term it. It is therefore urgently necessary to save Maidana and his comrades from death and to secure their release.

On August 13 it will be eight years since Antonio Maidana was arrested. Our Party calls for a worldwide campaign from August 6 to 13 for the release of the patriots languishing in Stroessner's jails. Through this authoritative journal, *World Marxist Review*, we ask all fraternal parties, all the workers', democratic and popular organizations of the world, to display active solidarity with our comrades, which is all the more necessary because their health has deteriorated and the danger threatening their lives now is greater than ever.

At the 23rd Congress of the CPSU, our delegation stated: "We propose making the campaign for the freedom of Antonio Maidana, people's hero and national leader held by the dictatorship, the focal issue of this international week."

In his youth Maidana was one of the leaders of the Federation of Secondary School Pupils of Paraguay. In 1941, under the Morinigo dictatorship, he led a major teachers' strike. He was arrested and held for months in a Chaco concentration camp. Between 1947 and 1949 Maidana was in detention with dozens of functionaries and active members of the Party. In 1949 he was exiled to a desert region. He escaped and engaged in underground work. Shortly afterwards he was elected secretary of the CC, PCC in charge of organizational matters.

From then on, to the day of his arrest, Maidana led underground Party work in Paraguay. He was the main organizer of the 1958 general strike which shook the foundations of the anti-national dictatorship and started an upsurge in the people's revolutionary movement in our country.

The people think highly of Maidana, whom they know as a staunch patriot, a champion of national liberation. This is why the working class and the people of Paraguay will fight with still greater energy for the release of Maidana and his comrades. The powerful international solidarity campaign that is gathering momentum will greatly stimulate and support

this fight. Maidana can and must be brought out of jail as was Comrade Jesus Faria, the outstanding Venezuelan working-class leader and anti-imperialist fighter.

Depending on local conditions, the international solidarity campaign may be carried on in different forms, such as meetings, broadcasts, the press, letters and telegrams from mass organizations, politicians, scientists and cultural workers to the Paraguayan government, demanding that the court decision to release Antonio Maidana, Julio Rojas and Alfredo Alcorta be carried out. At the same time we suggest that various organizations and individuals protest in writing to the human rights commissions of the UN and OAS. It is also important to publish and acquaint the world with these exposures and petitions—an effective means of exerting pressure on the dictatorship.

Let the mighty voice of solidarity of the international working-class, democratic and revolutionary movement save the lives of Maidana and his comrades! Let it help to bring them out of the dungeons of the barbarous military fascist regime of Stroessner and Insfran!

José C. ACOSTA, Calixto BOGADO

Prague, June 3, 1966.

WMR new books

Books listed here are in the language of the country of publication unless otherwise indicated

MARX, K., ENGELS, F. *Works.* 2nd Ed., Vol. 39. Moscow, Politizdat, 1966. 713 pp.

LENIN, V. I. *Works.* 4th Ed., Vol. 42. October 1917-March 1923. Moscow, Politizdat, 1966. 600 pp.

BERGER, W., REINHOLD, O. *Zu den wissenschaftlichen Grundlagen des neuen okonomischen systems der Planung und Leitung.* (Scientific Foundations of the New Economic System of Planning and Management.) Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1966. 100 pp.

CERVINKA, A. *Prace a volny cas.* (Labour and Leisure.) Prague, NLP, 1966. 181 pp.

Geschichte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung in acht Banden. (iHstory of the German Working-Class Movement in Eight volumes.) Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1966.

GOROKHOV, I. and others. G. V. CHICHERIN —*A Diplomat of the Lenin School,* Moscow, Politizdat, 1966. 112 pp.

HIRSL, M. *Postavenf delnicke tridy za kapitalizmu.* (Position of the Working Class under Capitalism.) Prague, Svoboda, 1966. 99 pp.

Logika nauchongo issledovaniya. (The Logics of Research.) Ed. by P. KOPNIN and M.

POPOVITCH. Moscow, Nauka, 1965. 398 pp.

LOMBARDI, C. M. *Las ideas sociales de la Argentina.* (Social Ideas in Argentina.) Buenos Aires, Editoriales Platina, 1966. 180 pp.

MASTIKOV, P. *Problemi na optimalnoto planirane na narodnoto stopanstvo.* (Optimal Planning of the Economy.) State Publishing House, Varna, 1966. 194 pp.

Materialy XXIII syezda KPSS. (Materials of the Twenty-Third CPSU Congress.) Symposium. Moscow, Politizdat, 1966. 304 pp.

PAVLOV, T. *Izbrani proizvedeniya.* (Selected Works.) Vol. 9. Philosophy and Aesthetics. Sofia, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences Publishing House, 1966. 680 pp.

SCHIMITZEK, S. *Przeciwko falszerstwom.* Jak w statystyce i literaturze NRF fabrykuje sie straty przesiedlencow niemieckich. (Against Falsehood. How the losses of German resettlers are fabricated in the statistics and literature of the FRG.) Warsaw, Zachodnia Agencja Prasowa, 1966. 293 pp.

TERNOVOY, O. *Jose Marti.* Moscow, Mysl, 1966. 208 pp.

ULBRICHT, W. *Zum neuen okonomischen System der Planung und Leitung.* (The New Economic System of Planning and Management.) Berlin. Dietz Verlag, 1966. 764 pp.

ZIENKOWSKI, L. *Zagadnienia podzialu dochodu narodowego.* (Distribution of the National Income.) Warsaw, PWE, 1965. 204 pp.

THE MARXIST QUARTERLY

SUMMER 1966

THE MACKENZIE-PAPINEAU BATTALION IN SPAIN

•

PROJECT CAMELOT — THE PENTAGON IN QUEBEC

❖

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION $2.00
SINGLE COPY (QUARTERLY) 50c

Order from your local bookstore or direct from

PROGRESS BOOKS

44 Stafford St., Toronto 3, Ont.
Canada

For the first time in English . . .
the complete text of

Lenin's collected works

This authoritative editon will run to 40 volumes, and contains much material never before translated. Volumes 1-32 (incl.) and 38 have now appeared.

SPECIAL OFFER
become a subscriber for the complete set
$1.00 per volume
($40.00 for the complete set)
Volumes not on subscription sell at $1.50 each. A deposit of $3.00 is required with your subscription—to cover the last three volumes of the set.
As volumes appear they are immediately mailed C.O.D. to subscribers.

PROGRESS BOOKS
44 Stafford St., Toronto 3, Ont. (in Canada)
NEW ERA BOOKS
80 East 11th St., Ste. 212, New York 3, N.Y. (in U.S.A.)

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

.....

..... Deposit enclosed $.....

mail your subscription deposit now

FREE SAMPLE COPY

We would like to send a sample copy of

World Marxist Review

to interested people. Will you

fill out the coupon below and mail to us.

• • •

PROGRESS BOOKS
42-48 STAFFORD ST.
TORONTO 3, CANADA

NEW ERA BOOKS
80 EAST 11th ST., STE. 212
NEW YORK 3, N.Y.

Please send a sample copy of WORLD MARXIST REVIEW to the following:

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

.....

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

.....

Sender .....

Address .....

.....

Editions of the journal

"PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM"

EDITIONS IN ENGLISH
(World Marxist Review):
Central Books Ltd.,
37 Grays Inn Road,
London, W.C. 1, England

Progress Books,
44 Stafford St.,
Toronto 3, Ontario,
Canada

FRENCH EDITIONS
(La Nouvelle Revue Internationale)
Societe d'Edition et
d'Information 9, Boulevard des Italiens
Paris (2e) France

Librairie Du Monde Entier,
5, Place St-Jean,
Bruxelles

Librairie Rousseau,
36. rue J.-J. Rousseau,
Geneve

RUSSIAN EDITION
Stredisko pro rozsirovani tisku,
Praha 6, Thakurova 3
Czechoslovakia

BRAZILIAN EDITION
(in Portuguese)
Rua da Assembléia, 34
3.o andar, sala 304,
Rio de Janeiro, Estado da Guanabara
Brazil

BULGARIAN EDITION
Raznoiznos,
1, Rue Tzar Assen
Sofia

CEYLON EDITION
(In Singhalese)
91 Cotta Road
Colombo, Ceylon

CYPRUS EDITION
(in Greek)
Laikon Praktorion,
Tricoupi Street, 53 T. Nicosia

CZECH EDITION
Artia, Praha 2,
Nove Mesto, Ve smeckach 30

DUTCH EDITION:
Progressief Algemeen Vertaalbureau,
Chr. Snouck Hurgronjehof 22",
Amsterdam W

GERMAN EDITIONS
Deutscher Buch-Export und Import
GmbH,
Leipzig C I, Leninstrasse 16

"Globus" Vertrieb ausländischer
Zeitschriften, Wien XX,
Höchstädtplatz 3,
Austria

Genossenschaft Literaturvertrieb
Zürich, Zürich 4, Feldstrasse 46,
Switzerland

HUNGARIAN EDITION
Kossuth Kiado, Budapest, V,
Arpad-U6

ITALIAN EDITION
Libreria Rinascita, Via delle Botteghe
Oscure 2, Roma

JAPANESE EDITION
Nauka Ltd.,
2, Kanda-Zinbocho
2-chome, Chiyoda-Ku, Tokyo

MONGOLIAN EDITION
Mongolgosknigotorg,
ul. Lenina 41, Ulan-Bator

POLISH EDITION:
P. K. W. Z. "RUCH", Warszawa,
Wilcza 46

RUMANIAN EDITION
Directia Difuzarii Presei,
Palatul administrativ C.F.R.,
Bd. Dinicu Golescu, Intrarea G.
Bucuresti

EDITIONS IN SPANISH
Agencia de Distribucion de Prensa
Praha 6, Thakurova 3

Ediciones Paz y Socialismo,
Apt. Nacional 1253,
Bogota, Colombia

Ediciones Pueblos Unidos,
Casilla Correo 589, Montevideo,
Uruguay

Fondo de Cultura Popular
Apdo. postal 2352
Mexico I, D.F.

Empresa Editora Austral
San Francisco 36,
Casilla 13201
Santiago, Chile

Editorial "Anteo,"
Entre Rios 1033,
Buenos Aires,
Argentina

SWEDISH EDITION
Arbetarkultur, Kungsgt 84,
Stockholm K, Sweden

VIETNAMESE EDITION
So'o xuât nhâp khâu sach bao 32,
Hai Ba tru'ng, Hâ-noi