

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW

Problems of peace and socialism

In this issue:

THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION: ITS IMPACT ON CULTURE

—J. D. Bernal, Pablo Neruda, Rockwell Kent,
Dmitri Shostakovich, and others.

VOLUME 10, NO. 10

October 1967

35 CENTS



- F. FUERNBERG** **3** **Unity—an imperative for the democratic forces**
- A. SALEM** **10** **Consolidation of anti-imperialist forces is path to progress of Arab peoples**
T. BABIKER
- M. DIENNE** **16** **Nigerian patriots want national unity**
- J. PRAZSKY** **20** **Vietnam: the free-elections farce and the real road to freedom**
- 22** **October Revolution—its impact on culture**
- J. BERNAL** **ROLE OF 1917 IN SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL PROGRESS**
D. SHOSTAKOVICH **MUSIC AND THE REVOLUTION**
P. NERUDA **THE INTELLECTUAL AND THE REVOLUTION**
N. TIKHONOV **THE DAWN OF A NEW HUMANITY**
R. KENT **THE WORLD MUST BE MADE BEAUTIFUL**
N. SEMYONOV **SCIENCE IN THE SOVIET UNION**
A. HOFFMEISTER **OCTOBER FOR OUR GENERATION**
F. A. FAIZ **OCTOBER, NATIONAL LIBERATION AND CULTURE**
V. ZAVADA **THE PATHS OF ART AND LITERATURE**
P. GAMARRA **THE JOURNEY TO PEOPLE**
FACTS AND FIGURES
- 37** **Historical significance of the great October Socialist Revolution**
- W. JAROSINSKI** **THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION AND THE STRUGGLE FOR WORLD PEACE**
THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION LIGHTS THE WAY
Contributions by: B. LHAMSUREN, K. KHRISTOV, G. UNC
OCTOBER AND THE WEST EUROPEAN LABOR MOVEMENT Contributions by: J. DUCLOS, R. OEHRMAN, P. MARTINMAKI
THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION AND THE FIGHT FOR NATIONAL AND SOCIAL EMANCIPATION
Contributions by: G. SAVVIDES, K. OKAN, E. CINTRA, R. DALTON, A. DANSOKO, L. BUKHALI
- 81** **Communications and comment**
- R. OTERO** **THE FIRST OLAS CONFERENCE**
R. CASTELLANOS
SUCHAHYO **THE "NEW ORDER" IN INDONESIA**
- 88** **Against the persecution of democrats**
- A. BELIDO** **ANTI-COMMUNIST LAW IN ARGENTINA**
- 89** **Profile**
- W. GEISMAIER** **KAETHE KOLLWITZ—PIONEER OF REVOLUTIONARY ART**

**WORKERS OF ALL
COUNTRIES, UNITE!**

**World Marxist
Review
problems of peace
and socialism**

Theoretical and
Information Journal
of Communist and
Workers' Parties

**OCTOBER, 1967
VOLUME 10
NUMBER 10**

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, 487 Adelaide St.
West, Toronto 2B, 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,
487 Adelaide St. West,
Toronto, at \$3.50 a year.

Published by
PROGRESS BOOKS
487 Adelaide St. W.,
Toronto 2B, Ontario,
Canada.



WMR

among our contributors

FRIEDL FUERNBERG	Secretary, Central Committee, Communist Party of Austria
TIGANI BABIKER	Sudanese journalist
AMIN SALEM	Jordanian journalist
JOHN BERNAL	British scholar, holder of Lenin Peace Prize
DMITRI SHOSTAKOVICH	Soviet composer, holder of Lenin Peace Prize
PABLO NERUDA	Chilean poet, holder of Lenin Peace Prize
NIKOLAI TIKHONOV	Soviet writer, holder of Lenin Peace Prize
ROCKWELL KENT	American artist, holder of Lenin Peace Prize
NIKOLAI SEMYONOV	Soviet scholar, Nobel Prize winner
ADOLF HOFFMEISTER	People's Artist of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic
FAIZ AHMAD FAIZ	Pakistani poet and journalist, holder of Lenin Peace Prize
VILEM ZAVADA	Czech poet, People's Artist, Czechoslovak Socialist Republic
PIERRE GAMARRA	French writer, editor-in-chief of "Europe"

Unity—an imperative for the democratic forces

FRIEDL FUERNBERG

DISTURBING EVENTS have been piling up in quick succession. The U.S. escalation in Vietnam was followed by the Israeli aggression against her Arab neighbors with a view to deposing the governments in Egypt and Syria, by coups in a number of newly-independent African states with a view to crippling the anti-colonialist movement, by the NATO-planned military putsch in Greece and by spadework for a similar putsch in Cyprus against the Makarios Government.

This list is not complete. One could mention the carefully-laid plans of the reactionaries and militarists in West Germany, Italy and elsewhere, backed by action hindering democratic growth and presenting a growing danger to world peace. Visible behind all these events is the hand of the U.S. imperialists, who are working to change the world pattern and tilt the scales in their favor. That, indeed, is the grassroot connection between the seemingly local and limited events, which are creating new factors that cannot be ignored.

Imperialism has not become reconciled to the shape of the postwar world. It is disinclined to accept the fact that more countries have taken to socialism, that colonialism has disintegrated and that the working-class movement has gained fresh strength and influence in the capitalist countries. The imperialists, let it be said, have tried hard during the past twenty years to retrieve their lost positions, but their successes have been scanty. Now, evidently, they are banking on their economic and military power to carry through

a design which combines economic pressure, subversion and anti-communist propaganda with the use of neo-fascist and militarist organizations to touch off "limited wars" and military coups to suppress the democratic and anti-colonialist movement.

It is in order to ask how imperialism has succeeded in mounting a counter-offensive here and there, in making headway despite the widespread feeling for peace and democracy and the increase in anti-imperialist strength.

It would be wrong to think that growth of socialist and anti-imperialist strength is automatically accompanied by a proportionate decline of capitalism and imperialism. The correlations of social development are far more complex than that. Certainly, socialism and anti-imperialism have grown stronger. But so has capitalism, especially in Europe. And the consequences of this are varied. There has been a sharpening of the competitive struggle between the imperialist countries, but there has also been a sharpening of the innate aggressive tendencies of imperialism aimed against socialism, the working class and the peoples of the third world. Testing its strength in different areas, imperialism is deliberately paving the way for a trial of strength on a grander scale. This can be seen within national frameworks and internationally, in world politics, both aspects being closely interwoven.

Imperialist reaction is going about things cautiously, dovetailing its plan with the peculiarities of the country concerned and main-

taining a democratic, peace-loving appearance with a view to reassuring the masses and averting timely counter-action. But despite the specific features of the various countries, they also have traits in common.

* * *

In Austria, the People's Party won an absolute majority in parliament on March 6, 1966, and it was clear that the bourgeoisie would make the most of parliamentary procedure to buttress its rule and prepare the ground for a reactionary offensive. But it has been running into difficulties, because the governing People's Party, though a capitalist party, has a considerable following among wage-earners and counts in its ranks many convinced democrats and champions of peace. This presents a formidable barrier to the reactionary aims of the bourgeoisie and imperialism, acting as a kind of "safety valve" restricting the government to "tolerable" measures that are not likely to cause counteraction.

By various means, however, every wage-earner is made more dependent on the economic power of capitalism.

First, concentration of capital has become more rapid, and Austrian capital is merging with foreign, chiefly West German, imperialism. As a result, efforts are being made to hitch Austria to the European Economic Community. However, access to the Common Market is not the only thing the bourgeoisie is after. The nationalized industries are being either directly linked with West German capital, as in the case of electric power, or their development is restricted, opening the door to foreign capital, as in the case of the contracts with Western oil monopolies.

Second, re-distribution of the national income is being accelerated to the advantage of capital. Endlessly rising prices and creeping inflation, which cut into the wage-earner's real income, are coupled with a tax policy and with other government measures prejudicial to the people's interests and beneficial to capital. There is much talk, too, about cutting down expenditure on social needs, as has been done in some other capitalist countries.

Third, steps are being taken to restore the "full powers" of factory administrations—an aim candidly proclaimed by *Die Presse*, a mouthpiece of big capital. This does not imply powers in regard to production programs, production process, sales, purchases, and the like. In these matters their powers have always been unlimited and, as a rule, used to the detriment of the people. What they now seek are powers over the rights won by the working class in decades of struggle — over wages,

working conditions and social welfare. What this implies is the employee's greater economic dependence on the administration, achieved through restricting the workers' collective rights. In advancing these aims, the bourgeoisie, for the purpose of exerting pressure, is taking advantage of the difficulties experienced by the capitalist economy as a whole or those of individual enterprises.

We cannot afford to take lightly these efforts to increase the workers' economic dependence on capital, for they are in Austria, as in other capitalist countries, the starting point for a general offensive in other areas.

The capitalists know that to maintain and buttress their rule they must control the machinery of state. They will make concessions when forced to do so, even big ones, so long as they can maintain their grip on the governmental machinery and thereby the opportunity to regain what they were forced to concede. In Austria, as in other European countries, the bourgeois machinery of state was in a bad way in 1945. The occupation Powers helped put it back into shape. In the Western zones they restored the old capitalist apparatus and reinforced it with new people. In the Soviet zone and in Vienna it was democratized by an influx of working-class administrators, whose status was formalized by the so-called Law on the Replacement of Government Officials, the passage of which was strenuously resisted by the bourgeoisie, the top bureaucracy and by some in the Socialist Party leadership. But as capital and the capitalist state regained strength, the new people were either "integrated" or shifted to insignificant posts where they were at such a disadvantage that many resigned.

The administrative attack against the democratic forces in the state machine was mounted in the name of democracy and based on the policy and ideology of anti-communism. But it affected not only Communists. Other Lefts, too, and all people with working-class associations came under fire, with administrative measures applied against some and political or ideological pressure against others.

Many civil servants, both old and new, accepted this anti-communist offensive as a move to save democracy, though it was anti-democratic in form and content and served as a basis for new measures strengthening the state machine as an instrument of capitalist rule.

Elements of a new kind of development are now crystallizing among the exponents of anti-communism, who like to style themselves champions of democracy. They have gradually turned on the heat against their democratic

helpers of the previous anti-communist campaigns, preach about an "administrative state," stressing the "particular functions" of governmental machinery in guiding the people and the country. Thus, the ground is being prepared for an assault on the democratic gains of the people when and if the bourgeoisie deems this necessary and the circumstances permit.

Unfortunately, many professors in the higher educational establishments acted, and still do, as supporters of reaction. True, they have not succeeded in convincing all the students, who are also influenced by social development as a whole. But most of the Austrian intelligentsia whose children go on to college and university have always held reactionary views, and the professors, therefore, deal with young people who spiritually and politically are attuned to reactionary indoctrination.

Not all parts of the administration are equally useful to the bourgeoisie in ensuring capitalist rule. Control over the country's finances is important, and in all governments since 1945 the finance ministers have been trustees of big capital, helping greatly to bolster its economic power.

But the main weight lies with the army, police and judiciary. With a solid grip in these areas, the reactionaries have now begun to consolidate and extend their positions. Laws that have been in existence for decades are being twisted to yield loopholes for action against the working class as, for example, in the matter of trade union collective bargaining and of the equality of cooperative and capitalist enterprises. Yet the judiciary can find no provisions in law against the South Tyrol terrorists, neo-Nazi organizations, Otto Hapsburg, anti-Semitic propaganda, and so on.

Reactionaries in the army, police and gendarmerie are frankly encouraged, and measures are taken to tighten discipline and depoliticize the ranks with a view to making them blind instruments of their officers.

True, all this takes a long time. But experience shows that for reaction the first step is always the hardest and, conversely, that it is easier to repel this first step. Later, the train of events gathers momentum and resisting it becomes harder.

Neo-fascist organizations, understandably, are prominent in big capital's war against democracy. These are quite unlike the fascist and Nazi movement of the interwar years in both character and purpose. Despite their efforts and lavish big capital support, financial and otherwise, they have failed to gain a mass following. And for a variety of reasons. One of these is the experience of the European na-

tions before and during the Second World War, the memory of which is alive even among the younger generation. Hatred of fascist dictatorship and a yearning for democracy are deep-rooted.

Yet these neo-fascist organizations serve as instruments of political pressure on the democratic forces. Also, they are a reserve, constantly replenished and likely at some critical juncture to become a source of contagion. The public is misinformed about the degree of this danger, being told, among other things, that the neo-fascists are weak, and their following is negligible. Instead of really combating them and smashing them politically and organizationally, democrats in the Socialist Party and among the Catholics cling to the apron-strings of the anti-communists on this issue, thus giving the neo-fascists the opportunity to entrench themselves, first and foremost, in the governmental apparatus.

Splitting the working class and the democratic forces is given top priority. For this reaction employs anti-communist slander and persecution. This may be a shopworn method, but is still effective because the democratic element in the Socialist Party and in the Catholic camp underestimate the dangers emanating from the anti-democratic forces and from foreign, primarily West German and American, imperialism, and because, still believing that communism imperils democracy, they are suspicious of cooperation with Communists and dread the class struggle.

To split the working class and the other democratic forces, the bourgeoisie is also using, more subtly it is true, the old shibboleth of nationalism, racial animosity, corruption, and do not stop at inciting conflicts between different groups. The moving spirits behind these actions are anything but finicky in their choice of methods and people.

Another supremely important factor is control over the mass media of political and ideological indoctrination. The yellow press has a huge circulation and is backed by commercial advertising and in many other ways. Slanted reporting, outright demagoguery and a show of impartiality are the stock-in-trade that enables it to influence millions of readers, to exert strong pressure on public opinion and on the political parties, affording the conservatives support for their anti-democratic measures and backing the opportunist policy of "integration and submission" pursued by the leadership of the Social Democratic parties.

However, radio and television are more important these days. For one thing, television has wrought far-reaching changes in politics

and exerts a profound, often decisive influence over public opinion. In the past, political parties could reach the masses only at public meetings, or through personal contacts. Now, meetings have largely lost their appeal. By means of television politicians reach an incomparably larger audience, and one that cannot either object or heckle. Man to man discussions in the factory and at home are still practiced, it is true, but are also affected by radio and TV fare.

In the capitalist countries, Communist parties and democratic groups have little opportunity to present their case on radio and television, which are used regularly to disseminate reactionary, anti-democratic ideas, false or only half-true information and insidious propaganda against socialism, the Soviet Union, the other socialist countries and against democratic social institutions. This is having its effect, forcing the Communists and democratic groups onto the defensive.

Capital and reaction are preparing the ground for a decisive assault against democratic institutions and against bourgeois democracy generally. Nowhere have matters gone as far in this respect as in West Germany, where police outrages during the Shah of Iran's visit lifted the curtain on the essence of its "law-keeping" functions. Also, it has come to public notice that "factory guards" at most enterprises are part of an armed reactionary shock force divided into units, platoons and semi-platoons "trained in conditions approaching real warfare, in daytime and at night." The emergency legislation which Bonn is trying to impose is intended to create formally legal grounds for an assault on democratic rights. Tendencies of this kind, coupled with efforts to brainwash the police and the armed forces in a reactionary way and to maintain them in a state of combat preparedness, are evident everywhere in the capitalist world.

Ideological and practical preparations are under way for "limited" or "local" wars. The Israeli blitz aggression in the Middle East has encouraged the supporters of "limited" wars to come into the open. They are urging vigorous arming—in countries like Austria to safeguard the nation's neutrality, and in others, such as West Germany, to prepare a "regional trial of strength" to achieve the aims of West German imperialism by means of threats or, at worst, by use of force. This is added proof that any strengthening of capitalism and reaction adds to the threat to democracy at home and to the danger of war.

We have to ask ourselves whether or not the policy of the peaceful coexistence of states

with differing social systems is still valid in these circumstances?

The policy of peaceful coexistence is the contemporary political form of working for world peace. The working class has always championed international peace, has always been anti-war, while imperialism has always signified war. When the working class was not in power anywhere—or in power in just one country, the Soviet Union—it could not prevent war, which the imperialists consider an essential element of their politics. All that the workers could do then was to delay the outbreak of war. Now the world has changed. Formerly, peaceful coexistence was acknowledged by one side only—the socialist Soviet Union, since revolution is not exportable by force of arms even if there is a need to hasten revolutionary developments in other countries. It was impossible then, despite the peoples' fervent desire for peace, to make the other side keep the peace. The extremists among the aggressive imperialists, bent on wiping out socialism, were prepared to risk a world war and, as we know, started one.

Today, however, the peoples' desire for peace has far greater strength behind it.

The experience of two world wars, the second coming a mere twenty years after the first, has steeled the people's will to safeguard peace. Formerly, public opinion could be persuaded that war is a means of regeneration, on the one hand, and of conquering other nations to achieve a final settlement of disputes, on the other. War, they were told, was an essential form of struggle between nations, that it has always been so and it always will be so. Today, few politicians would risk pitting these ideas against the people's desire for peace, against the peace-loving policy of the Soviet Union. In some countries, in fact, no politician would be so foolhardy as to air ideas of this kind; to do so would isolate him totally from the public.

More than ever before are imperialist politicians compelled, therefore, to masquerade as apostles of peace. This offers good opportunities for extending the peace movement. But on the other hand, it generates illusions about the true aims and concrete armed gambles of the imperialist countries, notably the United States. The imperialists portray as offenders against the peace the colonial peoples fighting for liberation, the Soviet Union, and the other socialist countries, which, naturally, have to keep their armed forces at a sophisticated level. Yet this socialist armed strength is the mainspring in the struggle for peace. Being the armed strength of the working class and of socialism, it is a champion of peace, a

champion of the peaceful coexistence of states with differing social systems. The Soviet Union's political, economic and military strength, including its sophisticated weapons whose power is known to all, is the most potent means of safeguarding world peace against the designs of the aggressive imperialists.

However, it would be a mistake to think that the imperialists have abandoned the hope of tilting the scales and of one day resorting to arms. Their efforts to portray the Soviet Union as a menace to peace in order to prevail on the people that another world war is inevitable, have been effectively frustrated by the consistently peaceful policy of the Soviet Union. Hence for some time the imperialists have been employing a new method, that of "limited" local conflicts in different regions of the globe. They are doing this on the assumption that the socialist countries and other peace champions are incapable of preventing "local" wars, because any Soviet intervention could be speciously portrayed to the masses as a deliberate step towards a world war. The imperialists would then promptly put the blame for straining the international situation on the socialist world and at the same time strengthen their political and military positions.

The way to strike back is to step up the peace struggle at all levels. The guarantee of peace afforded by the might of the socialist countries must be complemented by the maximum unity and militant firmness of *all* peace forces. Lack of unity is just what the imperialists are taking advantage of today in their "limited" war tactics, in their attacks on the peoples fighting for liberation. Just as in the past, therefore, the struggle for peaceful coexistence is the foundation of the struggle for peace. It is the cause of *all* the peace-loving forces. But to repulse the tactics of "limited" wars and wars to suppress liberation movements, as well as the danger of a world war, these forces must act in concert. Socialists, Catholics and peace champions of all "denominations" must realize their peace-keeping responsibility. World peace depends largely on their attitude. If they allow themselves to be swayed by anti-communist sentiment and ignore the gradual preparations for war, if they do not act with vigor against the "limited" wars, against the military gambles of the United States imperialists and their aggression in Vietnam, against the West German revenge-seekers getting atomic weapons, and, all the more, if their position, or lack of one, facilitates this course of events, then the war situation for which the imperialist aggressors

are working may very easily come about. All these forces must act on the principles of peaceful coexistence and resist in concert not only the kindling of a "big war," but every imperialist attempt to assume the offensive.

Let us be frank. The masses, including leaders of democratic parties and even Communists, are inclined to think that in the final count the Soviet Union will manage to safeguard the peace on its own.

Though this view stems from a lucid understanding of the historical mission of the socialist Soviet Union as a peace power, it is highly dangerous because it overlooks the strength and multiple capability of the imperialists. It invites passivity at a time when active resistance to the acts of imperialist aggression is most essential. The Soviet Union alone, or the socialist camp alone, cannot each time, in all cases, contain the imperialists. Needed for this are the joint efforts of *all* the peace-loving forces, all are responsible for the struggle and for its outcome.

In the light of recent developments people have been questioning the validity of the peaceful way to socialism in some of the European capitalist countries. There is a distinct desire for debate and dialogue among democratic forces of different political views and trends. Yet as the Communists, Socialists and democrats in the Catholic and bourgeois camp debate the present and the future and their respective concepts of democracy, the enemies of all democracy may become powerful enough, and go far enough in their preparations, to deliver a concerted blow and defeat the democratic forces. The danger of this is great.

For some European capitalist countries the possibility of a peaceful transition to socialism follows from the changed balance of forces in the world and the countries concerned. Peaceful transition to socialism is a realistic prospect. And not because capitalism shows any desire to effect reforms or to give up the ghost, but because the working class and the democratic forces wield great power and are strong enough to nip in the bud any attempt at a civil war, and also because the forces capable of preventing a counter-revolutionary intervention from without are becoming more powerful.

But unity of all democrats is imperative to make the chances of peaceful transition real. The Communists and the workers alone cannot cope with the task. Like the working class, which by virtue of its class condition, needs an alliance with the entire working population in the fight against monopoly capital—with the peasants, the urban petty bour-

geoisie and the intelligentsia—the Communist Party, too, needs an alliance with all other democratic forces in the fight against reaction and neo-fascism.

However, to need alliances does not mean having them. Alliances of this kind are also consistent with the interests of the other groups of the public, who need the working class as an ally in securing their basic needs, peace, democracy and well-being. On the other hand, monopoly capital, reaction and aggressive imperialism are bent on preventing or forestalling such alliances.

This should not lead the Communists and the other democrats to the conclusion that they may abandon the peaceful way to socialism. On the contrary, they should work for it with still greater energy and determination.

In specific terms, they should speed up the formation of the alliance of democratic forces and intensify their struggle against all the divisive maneuvers undertaken by monopoly capital and reaction. This presupposes mutual trust, which, in turn, calls for dialogue and debate. But that is only one side of the question of unity. If the dialogue is not accompanied by political steps towards unity and by concerted action to combat each and every aggressive imperialist act against peace and democracy, the democratic forces may find themselves talking unity while their common enemy acts. The responsibility will lie with all contingents of the democratic camp, and the consequences will affect all without exception.

Communists have amply demonstrated their desire for joint action with all champions of peace and democracy. They have shown, too, that they lay no claim to any special place and respect the interests of all other democratic and peace-loving forces. This is not a tactical maneuver, but part of our basic approach in the fight for progress.

The socialist parties in the different countries have travelled different roads. All of them contain groups which, by virtue of past experience, are striving for unity with other democratic forces. But the degree of their influence varies from country to country. The leaders of the West German and Austrian Socialists have of late veered to the Right and thrown their weight behind anti-communism. Leaders of the Labor Party in Britain, of the West German Social Democratic Party and of the Italian Socialist Party are in the government where they are helping the bourgeoisie to ease through anti-social measures and support U.S. imperialism despite the Vietnam escalation and increasing aggressiveness in home and foreign affairs.

In Austria the leaders of the Socialist Party, though in opposition, are not minded to resist the People's Party government which has officially professed the aim of eliminating the gains still left from 1945. All the greater, therefore, is the responsibility of the Socialists, who are anxious to prevent any repetition of the past in a new form. But they will fail unless they take a more consistent stand. If they do not act in support of the Communist effort to build a united front against aggressive imperialism and succumb to the pressures of anti-communism instead of probing and exposing its true intentions, they will not prove equal to the responsibility placed on them by history.

There is an alarming unconcern among the Socialist parties, progressive Catholics and the champions of democracy and peace in the capitalist countries vis-à-vis the increasing danger presented by the forces of reaction and war. Too much unconcern is also evident in their attitude vis-à-vis the West German revenge-seekers and militarists. This stems largely from the view that "things are being run democratically," and that governments and parties are headed by men who stress their love of democracy and peace. But even if these politicians really believe what they say, past experience shows that such belief is no guarantee for the future.

In many countries, and just recently in Austria itself, we have seen top politicians change course in their political thinking. Two or three years ago, for example, Franz Olah was chairman of the Austrian Trade Unions and leader of the Socialist faction in parliament. Some of his speeches were as radical as one could wish. Yet today even his former party friends say, and do so on perfectly valid grounds, that he has embarked on a neo-fascist course. And Olah is no exception. Besides, new elements may crystallize in a party, often behind the backs of the more or less democratic and peace-supporting politicians, and move into the limelight at a suitable juncture and eclipse the others.

Fascism seized power back in the 'thirties because, among other things, the Socialists, democratic Catholics, and bourgeois anti-fascists thought it could be contained and defeated by democratic means, through elections, whereas the Nazis had long chosen violence as the stepping-stone to power. The progressives relied on the machinery of state, on the democratic judiciary, but discovered, too late, that the law could not protect them from fascist brutality. They fought shy of united action by all democrats, including Communists, because they feared the smears of anti-com-

munism, thereby only adding to the effectiveness of the smears.

Many Socialists, Catholics and bourgeois anti-fascists express opposition to the neo-fascist movement. They back the slogan, "democracy for democrats, not for fascists," and are ready to oppose neo-fascist violence with democratic violence. But history does not repeat itself in these simple terms. It is precisely for the purpose of averting democratic resistance that reaction and aggressive imperialism at the moment use the neo-fascist organizations chiefly as a means of pressure and a reserve, while concentrating on preparing the machinery of state or parts of it for systematic anti-democratic action all the way to a putsch and liquidation of democratic gains. It is this that the champions of peace and democracy should see and combat.

The state machine, the armed forces, police, judiciary, schools and the educational system must not be abandoned to reaction. Every attempt made by reaction to extend its foothold must be publicly exposed and frustrated. Systematic work must be conducted in the state administration in order that reactionary counter-revolutionary neo-fascist groups are directly repulsed by democratic organizations determined to fight for democracy. The public should be told that reactionary violence must be answered with violence by the democratic forces in an organized and orderly struggle.

It should be made clear that this is the concern of all, not of the Communists alone, and that success is inconceivable unless all the democratic forces join in. The Socialists and the democratic Catholics bear much of the responsibility, since they are more extensively represented in the state administration than Communists. If they refuse to work together with the Communists, the tragic mistakes that in the past enabled the fascists to seize power and destroy all democrats, may recur.

Not only must the sallies of reaction, its designs and conspiracies against peace and democracy, be averted or crushed. Peace and democracy must be made secure. To do so, the democratic rights of the people must be broadened and the power of monopoly capital curbed. Either back to the abolition of democratic gains or forward to fresh gains. This is why it is so important to bring home to all champions of peace and democracy that the Communists are working for peaceful coexistence and for a peaceful way to socialism, that they are eager to advance in the chosen direction hand in hand with all men of labor, all champions of peace and democracy. Supporters of peace and democracy will certainly continue their discussion of the present and future, but this should lead more effectively and speedily than before to joint action for more democracy, against reaction and aggressive imperialism.

Consolidation of anti-imperialist forces is the path to progress of Arab peoples

AMIN SALEM, TIGANI BABIKER

DURING THE WEEKS preceding the Israeli aggression imperialist propaganda whipped up a campaign in which Israel was painted as the victim of aggressive actions by her Arab neighbors. Even some sections of the democratic world public opinion, usually opposed to American aggressive policies, were confused into believing that the Middle East crisis was merely an Arab-Israeli conflict and that Israel had acted in self-defense. Though now fewer people believe in this tale, it served its purpose as a pretext for the aggression. The confusion was calculated to cover up the real nature of the Middle East crisis, to camouflage the role and the motives of American imperialism and to paralyze international solidarity with the Arab peoples.

Imperialist and Israeli propaganda maintains that the crisis began with the withdrawal of the United Nations Force and the closure of the Gulf of Aqaba to Israeli shipping. But this is refuted by the Israeli aggression against Jordan and Syria earlier in the year, and by the bellicose statements made by Israeli rulers before the Egyptian moves. The Eshkol and Dayan statements to the press and the facts now filtering through the veils of secrecy are proof that the careful planning of the aggression was initiated at least at the beginning of the year.

Ever since 1948 the Zionist rulers of Israel have played second fiddle in the imperialist designs against the Arab countries. They, of course, have their own expansionist aims. Their notorious dream of extending the boundaries of Israel from the Nile to the Euphrates is well known.

The international importance of the Arab world cannot be exaggerated. It is due, in particular, to its rich resources and to its strategic command over vital air and water ways and its proximity to three continents.

Until recently, the affairs of the Arabs were comfortably controlled from London, Washington and Paris. But the picture has been changing rapidly during the last decade. Thirteen Arab states have gained political independence. The UAR, Syria and Algeria have taken the path of profound social and economic transformations, and have made significant headway in national construction. Attracted by these achievements and by the growing prestige of socialism, a mighty popular revolutionary movement swept across the Arab world. This movement has set itself the aims of liberating all Arab territory still under colonial rule, of liquidating foreign military bases, of pursuing an independent foreign policy, of doing away with all foreign and local vested interests and of using the resources of the Arab world on behalf of its peoples.

The scope of this movement and its increasing militancy have gained it a prominent place in the international revolutionary process.

Thus a situation emerged where the vital interests of imperialism in the area were seriously endangered. Hence the repeated and continuous acts of aggression against the revolution in the Arab world.

Allying themselves with the Arab feudal and capitalist classes, whose interests and privileges are likewise endangered, the imperialists sought to smash the revolutionary

movement. The major thrust was directed against the chief gains of the movement in the Middle East, the progressive regimes in the UAR and in Syria.

Repeated attempts were undertaken to bring down the revolutionary governments by means of coups and assassination. Anti-communism was brandished in an attempt to isolate the progressive regimes, to terrorize the revolutionary movement in other countries and to thwart the efforts towards unity among the progressive and anti-imperialist forces. In many Arab countries, and with varying degrees of success, democracy was curtailed, revolutionary parties were banned, their leaders assassinated and a campaign of terror unloosed. By falsely raising the banner of Islam and agitating for the so-called Islamic pact, the imperialists and their henchmen hoped to rally all the reactionary regimes in the area, to attract the "moderate" ones and thereby isolate and eliminate the revolutionary regimes.

But by the beginning of this year it became obvious that these efforts were losing ground. The Arab revolutionary movement managed, in the main, to uphold its gains. Intrigues against the progressive regimes were foiled one after the other. Political and economic pressures showed signs of failure. The Islamic pact was exposed and discredited in the eyes of the masses. The struggle against British occupation in Aden and in South Arabia was spreading. The forces of progress and national liberation raised aloft the banner of unity, and concrete measures were taken in that direction. The call for unity and the wide response to it heightened the struggle against the imperialist presence in the Arab world.

The imperialists were quick to perceive that they could not afford to allow the fight between revolution and reaction to proceed to its logical conclusion. The stakes were too high for such indulgence in democracy. It was then that they decided to change to conquest and war, and to use Israel and the Arab-Israeli conflict to achieve their aims. The brutality of their tactics of aggression had thus received further confirmation.

(Without entering into the details of the Arab-Israeli conflict, which is in no way religious or racial, it should be noted that in the past fourteen centuries the Jews were never victimized in Arab lands. Whenever they suffered pogroms or hatred in other parts of the world they were sure of finding a safe refuge among Arab communities.)

The imperialists made good use of certain chauvinistic speeches in the Arab countries. They fabricated statements which they later attributed to progressive Arab leaders. Their

aim was to make world public opinion believe that the Arabs were on the verge of launching a war of extermination against the Jews of Israel and to mobilize the sympathy of world public opinion for the Jews against the Arabs.

In Israel preparations for a "defensive" war were stepped up. The government was reshuffled in favor of a militarist one. Armaments were in large quantities delivered from imperialist countries. The U.S. 6th Fleet, kept in a state of readiness, served as a kind of "benediction" of imperialism to the extremists in Israel who whipped up war hysteria. Attempts were made to silence the Israeli Communist Party and its deputies who dared to expose the preparations for aggression.

Despite the repressions and the pressure of the chauvinists the Communist Party held to its consistently internationalist positions also after the aggression took place; it condemned the Israeli aggression and in its resolution of June 22 stated that "the security and future of Israel demand that an end be put to aggression, to all deals with American oil and war monopolies whose hands are stained with the blood of the peoples of Vietnam and other countries."

When the blow fell, early in June, the revolutionary movement, though achieving certain success, was still far from its desired goals. Many Arab countries were governed by reactionary regimes which were deeply involved in intriguing against the basic interests of their peoples. American and British military bases were situated on Arab territory close to the battlefield. Arab oil was mostly in the hands of imperialist monopolies. The economies of the majority of Arab countries were controlled from imperialist capitals.

The most important thing, unity of the revolutionary forces, was most inadequate. In some quarters of the revolutionary movement remnants of anti-communism lingered, doing no little harm to the cause of unity. Above all, unity among the progressive regimes lacked the cementing factor of unanimity of views on a number of basic questions—especially as regards the tactics of the struggle against the imperialist-Zionist intrigues in the Arab world and against Arab reaction.

These and other difficulties in part explain why the aggression resulted in the military defeat of the Arabs. Sizeable parts of the territory of the UAR, Jordan and Syria were occupied. Thousands of soldiers and civilians were killed. Hundreds of thousands were compelled to leave their homes. The material and moral losses suffered by the Arab states were great. Thus aggression achieved a certain amount of success which cannot be underestimated: military defeat was inflicted on

the Arabs, and Israel occupied the land extending from the Suez Canal to the Jordan. Furthermore, the war has resulted in grave difficulties for the Arab states. Besides the material losses suffered, the closure of the Suez Canal and other economic measures signify heavy financial burdens for these states.

But the main purpose of the aggression was not achieved. The progressive regimes in the UAR and in Syria remain intact. They enjoy the support not only of their peoples, but of the Arab masses everywhere. Clear proof of this was when millions of people went into the streets in every Arab town expressing confidence not so much in the person of President Nasser as in the revolutionary course he stood for. Moreover, no amount of literature could have exposed imperialism, especially American imperialism, and debased it in the eyes of so many people as this aggression has done.

Wrath against imperialism and determination to call it to account for the suffering and humiliation fill the heart of every Arab patriot. This is in contrast to the deep respect and gratitude felt towards the socialist countries, especially the Soviet Union, for their sincere and genuine aid to the Arabs.

The fact should be emphatically stressed that it is very largely due to the political initiative and rapid actions of the socialist states that the aggressive forces were compelled to discontinue their advance into the territories of the Arab countries that neighbor Israel, and to agree to the cease-fire order of the **Security Council**. Thus, the actions of the socialist states prevented the further extension of the aggression against the Arab peoples.

The situation in the Middle East remains tense. The continued occupation of Arab territory, the annexation of the Arab sector of Jerusalem despite two resolutions by the UN General Assembly, the steps taken to "solve" the Palestinian question "finally" by setting up an Arab puppet state under the suzerainty of Israel, the swelling of the army of refugees—all betray the intention of Israel and its imperialist masters to gather the fruits of aggression at the expense of the Arabs.

A grave danger emanates, however, from the fact that the main aim of their aggression has not been attained. It is quite obvious that in spite of declarations by the ruling circles in the USA and Israel, professing a false desire for peace, a new bid to strangle the Arab revolution will be made.

Pursuing this aim the U.S. imperialists want to prolong Israeli occupation indefinitely and encourage Israel to take steps which will

complicate a return to normalcy. This is in keeping with the tactics of U.S. ruling circles. By sticking to certain aggressive acts and lending them an air of permanency, they want to make world public opinion accept these acts as the status quo. Such are their tactics in escalating the war in Vietnam and the presence of their Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean.

The continued Israeli occupation will put the Arab states under severe strain. Leaning on it, the U.S. imperialists hope to use it as a lever to keep up the pressure against these states, to sow defeatism among the Arabs and to create an atmosphere in which their puppets can again move; they will strive to weaken the unity of Arab states, especially among the progressive regimes. One aim is to drive a wedge in the relations between the Arab and socialist countries, particularly the Soviet Union.

Nor can we, of course, rule out another resort to arms. That is why the situation in the Middle East is so explosive.

The Arab countries are faced with complex tasks: to regain the lost territory, to ward off any fresh acts of aggression and to cope with the difficulties caused by the war. The solution of these tasks is the concern, not only of the Arabs, but of all the peace-loving forces and countries which must do their best to prevent the imperialists from achieving their aims in that part of the world, for if they did, this would be a loss not only to the Arabs, but to the whole international revolutionary movement.

What, then, is to be done? The question evokes a whole multitude of burning problems connected with the growing aggressiveness of imperialism.*

There is the matter of ensuring genuine freedom and social progress in the developing countries which had been bled during decades, if not centuries, by colonial plunder and exploitation, the matter of working for peaceful coexistence — the duty of every genuine revolutionary—and of searching for new forms and tactics in the struggle against aggression in the conditions of peaceful coexistence; the attainment of unity of all anti-imperialist forces in the world and, first and foremost, unity of the international Communist movement as the basic condition for curbing and eliminating imperialist aggression; and, finally the search for paths and tactics of struggle against aggression—these are the burning issues, issues which are of concern to Arab revolutionaries.

*See article in our previous issue by Comrade Ib Norlund.

Attempts are being made to make the revolutionary movement believe that there is but one choice and no other. Those who argue thus reduce everything to military terms; they have a ready made prescription for all situations; in their enthusiasm they have allowed the enemy something a genuine revolutionary would never allow, i.e., limit the revolutionary's choice of weapons. A genuine revolutionary must always strive to be in a position in which he can benefit from the combined use of all means at his disposal and from the use of the most suitable amongst them at the given moment.

In this respect we should note that President Nasser displayed a sense of responsibility when he cautioned against the view that there is only one path of struggle against aggression. In his address on the occasion of the 15th anniversary of the Egyptian Revolution he said: "There is no short cut to achieve what we want. We have to proceed simultaneously along various roads—strengthening Arab unity, political, economic, diplomatic and military roads."

It is true that political and diplomatic means have not yet secured the withdrawal of Israel from Arab territory. But they did much in the way of exposing the nature of aggression and the role played by the USA in it. Fewer people believe in the justice of the Israeli action. Less moral support is given by world public opinion to the occupation of Arab lands and the other unjustified steps taken by Israel in the occupied territories. It should be noted that not all diplomatic and political means have been exhausted. Much can still be done in this field.

Furthermore, the closure of the Suez Canal and other economic measures are also playing their part. The full impact of these measures cannot be foreseen.

In the Arab world itself attention is being focused on many urgent problems: on co-ordinated policies, eliminating friction among Arab states, pooling of efforts in the fight against aggression. The economic difficulties resulting from the war are being tackled. On the other hand, the military aspect is not being ignored. The Arab armed forces are being reorganized and re-equipped. The immensity of these problems was revealed during the Khartoum summit conference, held in August-September.

Thus the passage of time repudiates the "theory" of one path of struggle. To claim that military action is the sole choice for the Arab countries betrays not only ignorance of the international situation, but also of the

ability of these countries to pursue such a course at present.

* * *

The June war has provided the Arab revolutionaries with food for thought. A frank and since exchange of opinions, based on past experience, is underway. This is bound to be fruitful in drawing the necessary lessons for future policies and tactics. Some have expressed views that camouflage Rightist and defeatist tendencies. In the guise of criticizing certain deficiencies and shortcomings they question the fundamental course of the revolution—especially in the progressive regimes—and cast aspersions on the wisdom of some of the most important steps taken by them. On the other hand there are also those who advocate reckless, "Leftist" views. It is significant that both tendencies criticize the attitude of the socialist countries during the crisis, maintaining that these countries, particularly the Soviet Union, failed to render effective help to the Arabs. The reactionary campaign for a retreat from revolutionary positions is trying to hit at the Arab alliance and friendship with the socialist countries, and to liquidate the revolution.

Some statements advancing unrealistic slogans objectively lead to the same aim. But there are enough healthy forces in the Arab world to defeat both tendencies. If these forces are vigilant, if they are able to draw correct conclusions from past experiences, and if they lean squarely on the working people, then the outcome of the present exchange of opinions should be a consolidation of the revolutionary positions.

The problem presently engaging attention is the search for a way out of the present situation, for ways and means of advancing the revolution, for a formula of abolishing imperialist and Zionist positions in the Arab world. It is evident that in all this questing the unity of the revolutionary and anti-imperialist forces is the guarantee for victory.

We are of the opinion that there is a need for the broadest unity among all Arab countries, irrespective of their social and political system, in the fight against aggression. Everything possible should be done to ensure that these countries take unified measures to eliminate the consequences of the aggression. It is clear that imperialism is banking on division among the Arab states, on their breaking up into conflicting blocs. This can only lead to dissipation of energies on side issues, from which none will benefit but the enemy.

A powerful popular movement took shape

during the aggression. Even the most reactionary rulers had to respond to its demands and slogans. The occupation of Arab territory and the humiliation inflicted roused national sentiment among wider strata than those attracted by the social revolution. The national factor has thus acquired a degree of importance which should not be overlooked by revolutionaries. It accounts in fact for the breadth of the forces that are now ready to combat aggression. The revolutionary forces therefore can, and must, bring the weight of this factor to the side of the fight against imperialism.

A common program of action, based on concrete measures to end the occupation of Arab territory, can compel even the reactionary regimes to discharge the tasks allotted them by this program. Otherwise, they will stand exposed in the eyes of their people. This, too, will benefit the cause of revolution.

But it should be borne in mind that basically the conflict is one between imperialism and the forces of progress. Proceeding from this, it is the Arab revolutionary forces, represented by their progressive regimes and by their progressive and anti-imperialist parties, being the staunchest defenders of the national interests, that are called upon to play the main role in the fight against imperialism and aggression. Unity of these forces is a fundamental condition for victory. Hence it is necessary to look at certain important factors relating to this unity.

The June war provided added proof that the working people, above all the working class, are the most consistent fighters against imperialism and the staunchest supporters of revolution. In Saudi Arabia, Lybia, Aden, Sudan, Lebanon and other Arab countries the workers, often against their rulers, performed wonderful patriotic deeds. They expressed resolute enmity towards imperialism not only in public demonstrations, but also by discontinuing the pumping of oil, by refusing to handle cargo in the ships of the USA, Britain or West Germany and by other measures. Millions of workers and peasants actually converged on Cairo from all parts of the UAR to defend the revolution and to prevent the Right from assuming power on June 9 and 10.

These facts confirm that those most interested in complete emancipation from imperialism and in social progress are the working people. This should not be taken as the usual praise of their heroism. Rather it should be the starting point of a consistent and clear orientation of policy. The working people really are the backbone of revolution. This means that they should be organized, en-

lightened and relied upon to hold posts of leadership and responsibility in the movement. The yardstick for measuring the seriousness of a revolutionary party is the degree in which, in deeds, it carries out such a policy.

In the countries with progressive regimes it is imperative to release the vast energy of the working class and working peasantry. This is the guarantee of steady progress by the revolution, of defense of the revolution. It is among these classes that the forces and leaders for a revolutionary vanguard party capable of leading the whole people to freedom and socialism can be found.

And the absence of a party of this kind is one of the graver weaknesses in the countries where there are progressive regimes. True, these regimes have registered substantial successes in recent years. But these successes stand the risk of being lost because of the many loopholes which could be utilized by imperialism and reaction. Recent events have disclosed that opponents of the revolution occupied vital posts in the state administration, using them in repeated attempts to wreck the revolution. The lack of genuinely revolutionary cadres in the administrative machinery and in the armed forces was another reason for the military defeat of the Arabs. A revolutionary vanguard party is not only necessary to check harmful developments, of this nature, but also for the political education of the working people, for heightening their vigilance and guaranteeing their fullest participation in political life.

Consistency in the fight against imperialism and in the march along the pathway of revolution insures the rallying of the masses. It has been proved beyond any shadow of doubt that collaboration with imperialism, allowing it to control key positions in the economy and in other areas, and permitting it to install military bases on Arab territory does grave harm to the Arab peoples. Today, more than at any other time, it is obvious that a different policy is needed, not only from an economic point of view, but primarily from the point of view of preserving the existence of the Arab states.

The rise of a number of progressive regimes has shown, in terms of better conditions of life and spiritual standards and in terms of overall development and international prestige, what revolution can do. Genuine resistance to imperialist activities in the area, genuine defense of the interests of the Arab peoples, is the declared, and practised, policy of these regimes. That is why they enjoy the support of the broad masses throughout the Arab world. Many have shown that they are

prepared to lay down their lives in defense of these regimes.

Consistent struggle for full freedom, freeing the economy from the grip of imperialism, effecting radical social and political changes in the conditions of the working people, building up a revolutionary vanguard party and relying on the working people—such is the path of revolution, such is the reply to imperialist aggression, such is the concrete program for the unity of all progressive and patriotic forces in the Arab world.

For some time before the Israeli aggression the banner of revolutionary unity had been unfurled. On varying levels fruitful gatherings took place and concrete steps were made towards unity. Today it is more imperative to continue these gatherings and insure their success.

Of special importance is the creation of a broad mass base for this unity. Contact should be maintained among trade union, student, peasant, professional and other organizations. Combined with contacts at state and party levels, this can provide a firmer cohesion and consolidation of the unity of the revolutionary and anti-imperialist forces.

In this respect it is necessary to point to the danger of the hangovers of anti-communism. For various historical reasons a sharp struggle took place in the past between the Communists and other sections of the revolutionary movement. It is not the purpose of this article to dwell on the causes of this struggle. However, despite the big changes that have taken place in this respect and the fact that there is now better understanding and even cooperation between Communists and other sections of the revolutionary movement, there are still places in which there is a reluctance to throw anti-communism overboard. This is manifested in continued incarceration of Communists and democrats in some Arab countries, and in restrictions on their activities in others.

Anti-communism has never benefited the Arab revolution. On the contrary it has inflicted much harm in the past. Its continuation can be advantageous only to imperialism and reaction and thus retard the progress of the revolution. The Communists have proved in the past and they are proving now their staunchness in the fight against imperialism,

their absolute fidelity to the revolution and to the people and their readiness for unity in the fight against the common enemy. The lessons of the aggression have forcefully demonstrated that anti-communism has nothing in common with the interests of the Arab peoples and should be abandoned for the serious work of rallying and uniting all the revolutionary Arab forces. This can be best served by releasing the Communists and democrats from the prisons in Algeria and Iraq and by widening the base of the government in Syria.

The future of the Arab revolution and its successful outcome are inseparably linked to the international revolutionary movement. The deepest interests of the revolution call for a pooling of efforts of all genuine internationalists to secure the unity of the three contingents of the movement—the socialist countries, the national-liberation movement and the working class movement in the capitalist countries. *It is in the climate of such unity, and leaning on such unity, that the Arab revolution can be guaranteed the best conditions for victory.*

Above all the Arab revolutionary forces must extend and strengthen the bonds of friendship and cooperation with the socialist countries—particularly with the Soviet Union. The imperialists and reactionaries, alarmed at the growth of relations with these countries, are doing their best to sabotage and frustrate them. Their aim is to deprive the Arabs of their most reliable friends. But now, as in the past, experience shows that the better our relations with the socialist countries, particularly the USSR, the stronger we are, and the better equipped to fight against imperialism and its intrigues.

* * *

Unity of the Arab revolutionary forces, built on the firm base of the working people, on the consistent struggle against imperialism and for social progress, on releasing the energies of all the progressive and patriotic forces and on the closest unity with the international revolutionary movement—this is the guarantee of the liquidation of the imperialist aggression, of opening the door to really big changes in the Arab world and for the victory of the revolution.

Nigerian patriots want national unity

NIGERIA, LARGEST COUNTRY in Africa, is in the throes of war. The conflict was sparked off on May 30, when Col. Odumegwu-Ojukwu, Governor of the Eastern Region, announced the region's secession from the Federation to become the independent republic of Biafra. Early in July, Federal troops were ordered into Biafra. One more war, with all its attendant destruction of life and poverty, was added to the list of wars already raging.

The conflict had been maturing for some time. In fact, its roots can be traced to the divide-and-rule policy customarily followed by British imperialism in colonial territories. Its repercussions were painfully felt after Nigeria became independent in 1960. The ruling feudal and capitalist elements fomented communal strife, pursued a reactionary policy that left foreign-monopoly control intact and aggravated the poverty of the people. These factors, in the aggregate, are responsible for the present tragedy.

In February, the *New York Times* had this to say to potential American investors: "The Federal Republic of Nigeria possesses abundant human and natural resources. Moreover, Nigeria maintains an open-door policy towards foreign capital . . . and has the largest and fastest growing market in Africa."

With the biggest population of any African country, Nigeria probably also has Africa's greatest natural wealth potential. It is the world's biggest exporter of palm products, a major grower of cocoa beans and ground nuts; its northern areas supply 90 per cent of the world's columbite and nine per cent of its tin, and Nigeria also exports quantities of timber, cotton, hides, rubber and soya beans.

Its economic and strategic importance was enhanced in recent years with the discovery of rich oil deposits in the Southeast. With an output of more than 20 million tons last year, Nigeria is Africa's third, and the world's 17th, biggest oil producer, supplying about 10 per cent of Britain's requirements. American eco-

nomists estimate that within five or ten years Nigeria will rank with the world's top ten oil producing countries.

The growth of the freedom movement compelled Britain to grant independence, but Nigeria, as the *Daily Telegraph* rightly stated on August 15, 1967, was to be turned into a "show-window" of successful devolution from colonial paternalism to the responsible exercise of self-government." Independence was hedged off with reservations that safeguarded the interests of the imperialist monopolies, which continue to operate just as they did in the colonial days.

So much so, that practically the entire economy is controlled by the United Africa Company, a subsidiary of the great Unilever monopoly. Its operations extend from production of primary products to the clothing industry and retail trade, and together with other British firms it has cornered the supply of imported foods and consumer goods. The country's finances are controlled by two British banks, Barclays and the Bank of West Africa.

In oil, 85 per cent of extraction, refining and export are in the hands of Shell-BP, a combine of British Petroleum and the Anglo-Dutch Shell firm. Its new refinery at Port Harcourt is owned jointly by the company (40 per cent), the Federal Government (40 per cent), and private Nigerian investors (20 per cent). A pipe line has been built across the Eastern part of Nigeria to carry the oil to Benin. Experts estimate that oil could become the basis of intensive industrialization, but industrialization is the last thing the foreign monopolies want.

Latterly, U.S. business has come into the picture and there have been vigorous efforts to oust the British and to prevent West German and French penetration. The Americans operate through "aid": Nigeria is one of the nine "selected" countries which this year account for 86 per cent of all American eco-

nomic aid. The *New York Times* recently published an incomplete list of 36 American companies active in Nigeria. Some of them are drawing up development plans, others are prospecting for oil, and still others are actually producing and exporting oil.

The whole profit structure rests on rich natural resources and cheap labor, and to maintain that structure the imperialists have trained a cadre of bureaucrats and politicians.

The foreign-monopoly stranglehold, the policy of the feudal chiefs, the compradore and venal bureaucracy have sharply aggravated social conflicts. The gap between the privileged minority and the poverty-stricken majority is steadily widening. And in recent years the feudal and capitalist elements, supported by foreign Big Business, have maintained an offensive against living standards through wage freezes and confiscation of communal land titled by the peasant farmers. The result has been more poverty and more unemployment.

The working people have never accepted this and through their trade unions have been fighting to change the situation. The Marxist-Leninist Socialist Workers' and Farmers' Party, founded in 1963, is in the forefront of the struggle. Nigeria now has a workers' paper, *Advance*. In the summer of 1964, the country experienced the biggest general strike in African history, involving 800,000 workers in practically every branch of the economy.

Discontent grew, and in January 1966 triggered off a coup by a group of progressive officers led by Chukuwma Nzeogwu. The new government, however, did not last long, and power passed to army chief General Ironsi, who was able to hold out for only six months. In fact, Ironsi only succeeded in complicating the situation; he banned all political parties, including the Socialist Workers' and Farmers' Party. General Ironsi was overthrown in July and a new government formed under Major-General Yakubu Gowon.

It leaned for support on the feudal sultans and emirs in Northern Nigeria, but General Gowon realized that, in this complex situation, his administration could survive only if it had the backing of the public, and if it curbed the omnipotence of the foreign monopolies. The ban on the political parties was not lifted, though many political detainees were released, among them Obafemi Awolowo, the West Nigerian radical leader.

The new government announced it would encourage economic and cultural cooperation with the socialist countries. For one thing it envisaged a substantial increase in trade with the USSR, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugo-

slavia, and cooperation with these countries in oil refining, iron and steel and other projects.

The Nigerians attach importance to the recent Soviet visit of their Commissioner for Information and Labor, Mr. Anthony Enahoro, and to the signing of a cultural agreement. *Advance* (September 2) commented that the visit "not only strengthened the relationship between the USSR and Nigeria but also opened a new era of friendliness and mutual understanding between our two countries."

On January 1, the government modified its financial arrangements with the oil companies. It would still receive half of the profits, plus concession payments and taxes, but there would be more stringent financial control. The oil companies, predictably, objected. Shell-BP reluctantly accepted the new agreement, but American and French firms took a tough attitude and suspended production.

The imperialists retaliated by stepping up subversion in an attempt to cut away the oil-rich regions. They adroitly exploited tribal tension, always part of Nigerian life.

Nigeria is inhabited by numerous tribes, the biggest of which are the Hausa, Ibo and Yoruba. The Hausa, followers of Islam, are concentrated in the North, whereas the Yoruba and Ibo are concentrated in the predominantly Christian South. Originally the North formed a separate region, while the South was divided into three—the Western (including the Federal District of Lagos), the Midwest and Eastern regions.

Distribution of the population, according to the latest census figures published in the *Nigerian Sunday Times* in August 1964, is as follows:

Northern Nigeria	29,758,875
Eastern Nigeria	12,394,462
Western Nigeria	10,265,846
Midwest Nigeria	2,535,839
Lagos District	665,246
All Nigeria	55,620,263

The Northern Region, as will be seen from the table, predominated. Nor is that accidental, for prior to colonization the North was an agglomeration of feudal states with which the British compacted to exploit the people and the natural resources through a system of indirect administration, that is, through the feudal emirs and sultans. This tended to keep alive the old, backward structure. In the South, direct rule encouraged the development of capitalist relations, the rise of industry and towns, a national bourgeoisie and a working class and, in the final analysis, a powerful national-liberation movement.

The first labor organizations and the first political parties working for national independence originated in the southern, western and eastern regions. Nigerians still remember the 1949 miners' strike in Enugu, capital of the Eastern Region, when many workers were shot down on orders of the colonial authorities.

The post-independence divide-and-rule policy was designed primarily to divide the Southern Region, where the revolutionary movement was maturing, and place it under the control of the northern feudals. This, in fact, was consolidated in the Nigerian Constitution: each region would have its own legislature and government, but the North would always have a majority (167 seats out of 312) in the Federal Parliament.

Long before independence capitalist industry and trade were growing in the Southern regions, with their predominant Ibo and Yoruba populations. In the Eastern Region, where good land was scarce and there was practically no industry, unemployed Ibos migrated to the North. Here, thanks to their spirit of enterprise and tribal mutual support, they were able to start businesses of their own. After independence many Ibos were brought into the government services.

Meanwhile, in the North, there had been little retreat from feudal customs and religious fanaticism, both formidable obstacles to progress. The peasants were weighed down by the pyramidal system of feudal relationships, religion and foreign monopoly exploitation. In these circumstances — and not without aid and encouragement by the leading element in the Eastern Region — there developed what might be described as a superiority complex, with all its ugly chauvinism in relation to the "backward" North. The Northerners, on the other hand, exploited this, and also relative Ibo prosperity, to incite the Hausa tribe against the Ibos, who were held responsible for the poverty and misery of the peasants. In other words, this was the old British divide-and-rule policy, and it should be said that Nigeria is not the only country where it has been, and is being, employed to sidetrack attention from social, economic and political problems.

The military coup of January 1966 overthrew the feudal-based Balewa government, and the new government under General Ironsi, an Easterner, abolished the feudal system. The sultans and emirs, alarmed at the prospect of Ibo rule and loss of their privileges, engineered a series of massacres in which thousands of Easterners were killed and their homes sacked. Then, in July, came an-

other military coup: Ironsi was overthrown and killed, and Major-General Yakubu Gowon, a Northerner, established a military government. The Eastern Region governor, Colonel Ojukwu, refused to recognize the new regime, though there was no indication of what policy it would follow. This precipitated a new series of anti-Ibo attacks, in the course of which, according to press reports, not less than 30,000 people were killed. Needless to say, this inflamed tribal passions. About two million Easterners fled from the North.

But was war inevitable? Nigerian progressives say it could have been avoided. In one of its August issues, *Advance* printed a letter by Chukwuma Nzeogwu, organizer of the progressive January 1966 revolution, to Tunji Otegbeye, General Secretary of the banned Socialist Workers' and Farmers' Party: "I do realize that each component portion of our hapless Federation is in itself a little federation. This is all the more reason why the solution of the problem of nationalities should have been tackled in the same manner as the USSR dealt with its own nationalities. We must continue to preach this idea in preparation for the day when the people can fully liberate themselves through a popular revolution."

The letter was written in Enugu, the Eastern capital, at the height of the chauvinist hysteria following the proclamation of the independence of Biafra.

Supported by the progressive forces, the Federal government made several attempts to preserve the Federation. In January, General Gowon had a meeting (in Ghana) with the governors of all the regions. Their communique emphasized the need to "preserve the political unity of the country." Things looked more hopeful but, in a situation charged with distrust and imperialist intrigue, chauvinist passions and acrimony continued to mount. Ojukwu refused to turn in tax revenue to the Federal government, and latter retaliated by cutting off communications with the Eastern Region.

On May 27, the Federal government made a last attempt to keep the country united by revising the administrative map. The old regions were abolished and 12 states formed instead. This broke Northern domination, for the Northern Region was divided into six units and the Eastern into three. This, it was hoped, would weaken the stranglehold of the Northern sultans and emirs. But it also worked against Colonel Ojukwu and his separatists and destroyed the imperialist hopes of creating a puppet oil republic.

The Nigerian press often likens the Biafra

breakaway, backed and largely incited by the imperialists, with the split in the Congo in 1960. And while the comparison applies only to a point, there is this common feature: in both cases the aim is to slice off areas rich in natural resources. Just as they wanted to turn Katanga into a copper republic, they now want to turn the Eastern Region into an oil republic. And in both cases the method has been much the same — exploitation of tribal discord, assiduously cultivated for years by the colonialist administration.

Nor do the monopolies make any secret of the fact that they are interested in Nigeria's oil and other wealth, and not in the well-being and future of its people. Writes the *London Times*: "With the Suez Canal closure and the threat to Western oil supplies from the Middle East, Nigerian oil, mainly concentrated in Biafra, could achieve a vital new importance."

The imperialist powers are officially neutral in the conflict; indeed, some have announced support of the Federal government (a lesson learned from the Congo, one suspects). But in practice—and that much is obvious from the Nigerian press—some of them have been giving support to the separatists. There was, for instance, the incident with the U.S. plane carrying arms to Port Harcourt in Biafra which crash landed in Cameroon. *Advance* charged U.S. intelligence with recruiting mercenaries through Israel and supplying them with weapons.

On the whole, Nigerian opinion regards the position of the imperialist powers as hostile. There have been protests from different circles. The pro-government *Morning Post* noted recently that Britain and the U.S. were gravely impairing their prestige and would henceforth find it hard indeed to win back Nigerian friendship through "aid."

Nigeria's patriots, notably its working class, are campaigning for territorial integrity and

demanding effective measures to block support for separatists. Wahab Goodluck, President of the Nigerian Trade Union Congress, has declared that the task of the labor movement is to preserve Nigerian unity.

And a trade union program to that end calls for nationalization of oil companies that refuse to pay taxes to the Federal government, for measures to stop the espionage activities of U.S. and British organizations and consulates, organization of volunteer security detachments and permission for the Trade Union Congress to rally the workers against imperialist conspiracies.

In Eastern Nigeria itself, many favor national unity, and have been drawn into the separatist movement under pressure. The revolutionary traditions of the working class, which is least of all subject to chauvinist influence, are very much alive in Enugu, Port Harcourt and other parts of Biafra. The Trade Union Congress and the banned Socialist Workers' and Farmers' Party enjoy wide influence too. This is how the situation is described by Tunji Otegbeye: "It is true that the forces of tribal chauvinism have risen to control the affairs of the Eastern Region of our country; that secession has been popularized through the radio and the press. But all the information reaching us here indicates that the common people do not believe that the answer to our teething problems is Balkanization of our country."

Progressive opinion and Communists the world over are deeply disturbed by developments. They hope and believe that Nigeria's patriots, its working class and the people generally will put an end to the fratricidal war and preserve Nigeria's unity. Peace and unity is the first step towards a democratic structure and a just solution of the social and national problems that continue to beset Africa's biggest country.

Mamadou DIENNE

Vietnam: the free-elections farce and the real road to freedom

THE ELECTIONS, SO-CALLED, held on September 3 in occupied and war-torn South Vietnam resulted, as most people know in advance, in victory for General Thieu and Marshal Ky.

The defeated civilian candidates say the elections were rigged and in public statements and press interviews cite instances of fraudulent practices by their successful opponents. These, of course, were "not noticed" by the 22 observers sent by Washington to give the spectacle a semblance of political significance.

It appears that in some of the larger towns, where foreign observers watched the polling, the authorities were careful to avoid the cruder methods of pressure, with the result that Thieu and his running mate polled a minority vote. On the other hand—if one is to credit the official returns—they were unanimously supported in rural areas where the National Liberation Front has a long-established and solid mass following.

That the whole thing was a fraud need hardly be proved. It was a calculated political maneuver by Washington, and it is important to know its real aims and possible repercussions in the light of its present policy and continued escalation.

Two things exert a substantial and increasing influence on that policy. First, the more articulate realization, both by the general public and prominent personalities, that America is waging a hopeless war in Vietnam. Second, next year's presidential elections when the Johnson administration will have to give account to the electorate of the results of its Vietnam aggression. And the picture does not look too hopeful: the latest Harris and Gallup polls show that only 39 per cent approve of the President's foreign and home policy. This is Johnson's lowest popularity rating in his more than 45 months in office. And it is no secret, of course, that the situation in Vietnam, plus the administration's fail-

ure to cope with the civil rights problem, are at the bottom of what news commentators describe as the "credibility gap."

This is how Newsweek magazine put it: "While they do not think the President tells outright lies, the people do not believe he is telling them the whole truth, particularly about Vietnam." Defense Secretary McNamara is even more outspoken: continued bombing, he says, cannot break North Vietnam's will to fight. American losses are becoming more painfully felt with every passing day. Even according to the patently minimized official reports, U.S. aircraft losses reached a record figure in the week ending August 27. At about the same time Liberation fighters staged a highly effective attack on Da Nang, which practically isolated this biggest U.S. air base. "Awful," "confused," "insoluble"—these are some of the "unofficial" replies of administration spokesmen to journalists' questions about the Vietnam situation. And there are rumors in Washington that some of the President's closest aides are about to resign. Even Dean Rusk, reputed to be the most persevering of the lot, recently told pressmen: "I'm very tired."

This indecision and pessimism indicate that the President and his advisers feel that their policy is stalemated. The only realistic way out is to stop the bombing and withdraw the U.S. forces from South Vietnam. This would be tantamount to admitting the failure of Washington's policy, with all the consequences following therefrom. But the President has never, in all his months in office, shown any desire to put national interests above personal ambition. The alternative is still more escalation, with the prospect of its spreading beyond Vietnam. But that is fraught with such perilous consequences for U.S. imperialism that the Johnson administration, at any rate at present, dare not risk it.

True, the more vociferous group, led by a number of influential senators and top-rank-

ing generals, insists on the lifting of all bombing restrictions, the mining of Haiphong port and other measures that would expand and aggravate the conflict. So far, however, official reaction has been negative. Indeed, there are indications that the public is being conditioned to accept the illusion that something is being done to resolve the conflict. Washington, it will be recalled, proclaimed to the world that the purpose of its intervention in South Vietnam was to create a democratic government responsible to the people and capable of defending the country against "foreign infiltration" and ensuring its citizens peace and prosperity. Now, with an eye to next year's presidential campaign, Washington wants to set up what is supposed to be a "progressive democratic constitutional regime," and a few months ago it announced a demagogic program of social reform. That is the background to the "free elections" of September 3.

This illusionary "democracy" has its companion piece; intensification of the war. Social and parliamentary demagoguery are part of that; the aim is to isolate the freedom fighters from the masses of the people. Another move is the building of a wall, a barbed-wire barrier laced with minefields and traps, to seal off South Vietnam from its neighbors, with a view to cutting off all outside support for the Vietnamese freedom fighters.

This policy of ruthless suppression of freedom movements, combined with promises to abolish some of the more flagrant forms of exploitation and oppression, has had temporary success in some countries. In South Vietnam it is doomed to failure. For the men the Americans have installed as their puppets have no link with the masses, represent only themselves and are detested by the entire population.

No matter how the Americans manipulate their puppets, the fact remains that they have no answer to the problems facing the people

of South Vietnam. Bombs they have, but no program for solving the country's basic national and social problems.

But there is such a program. And its appearance, and not the Saigon election farce, is the outstanding political development in the present situation. This is the new political program approved by the Emergency Congress of the South Vietnam National Liberation Front in mid-August.

It calls on all patriots for more active support of the National Liberation Front in its efforts to free the country. It concretizes the basic aims and tasks of the present struggle and outlines the social structure that will be built after victory. It emphasizes that the National Liberation Front is prepared for sincere and far-reaching cooperation with all patriotic-minded elements, not excluding those who do not accept its leadership.

Immediately after the intervention forces are expelled the program says, free general elections will be held and a National Assembly and government formed on a genuinely democratic basis. The program also contains concrete economic proposals, including a detailed agrarian reform plan and measures to develop the public and private sector in industry and trade.

In foreign policy, it calls for neutrality, friendship and cooperation with all peace-loving nations and gradual progress towards reunification.

Even avowed enemies of the NLF admit that the power of attraction exerted by the program is very great. And there need be no doubt that it will stimulate still greater resistance to the aggressor and expose the venal Saigon regime. "The American aggressors and their servants," the program says, "think they can bludgeon our people into compliance and dupe them by political trickery. They are wrong. Never will our people submit to force, never will they succumb to deceit."

Jan PRAZSKY

The October Revolution: its impact on culture

The Great October Socialist Revolution has made a very big contribution to human civilization. Throughout the world various aspects in the life of men experienced the influences of the historic revolution, of its ideas, its practice of social reconstruction. Great indeed has been its impact on the development of culture.

Below are brief appreciations of the significance of the October Revolution for science and the arts by distinguished men of culture, contributed at the request of the Editors for the 50th anniversary of the revolution.

The role of 1917 in scientific and technical progress

J. D. BERNAL

1917 MARKED AN ERA in science and technology almost as important as that it marked in politics and closely linked with it. The handing over of a great imperialist state like Russia to its peoples under the inspiration of Marxism put the position of science in a completely different framework. Not that science had not played a very large part in the history of Tsarist Russia. Peter the Great had, in his introduction of Western ways into Russia, taken over science as one of the major factors for transforming that backward country and had founded the Imperial Academy of Science. Peter, however, was essentially under the spell of German science and his academy was, however brilliant of German character. It took the genius and enterprise of that poly-

math Russian, Michael Lomonossov, to give it a genuine Russian character. He was, in many ways, the founder of Russian science and much of its technology as well.

Lomonossov introduced ceramics and mosaic work as well as a deep interest in the history of Russia and of the geography of Russia itself and its neighboring lands, which were to bear fruit later.

He was, however, only a forerunner. Russian science continued to grow all through the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries but it was essentially academic in character, still strongly influenced by continental and in particular by German science. It had, however, very distinctive individual contributions to make, especially in the fields of geology and mine-

ralogy and that of chemistry with the epoch-making periodic system hypothesis of Mendeleev and the almost equally important mathematical innovation of Lobachevsky of non-euclidean geometry.

The change, however, wrought by the revolution of 1917 was incomparable in importance in itself and in its promise for the future. In the first place, this was to come from the inspiration of Marxist theory in which Marx and Engels themselves laid great emphasis on the natural sciences. Then Lenin, himself very interested in science, had an immense effect. Before then science had been thought of either as abstract theory as in the case of Newton, revolutionary descriptions of nature such as those of Darwin, or, in the Napoleonic era, as a means of enriching capitalist enterprises, making soda and sugar. Now there was a prospect of deliberately using science by the people for the people. This built on the previous foundation of the Russian academy and in doing so transformed it. Science changed its position, its methods and its personnel and this took place in Russia for the first time in history. In spite of all its devotion and effort, a large number, but a minority, of scientists in Russia joined the emigration and spread themselves through Europe. The small number who remained had to build a new kind of scientific civilization from the very start. The word science, "nauka," now included in the Russian language much art, history and philology, which were pushed forward with great enthusiasm in all fields. The importance of research was recognized from the start and many new institutes were built. These included the Physical, Technical Institute in Leningrad under the direction of Joffe, the Institution of Animal Behavior under the already world recognized physiologist Pavlov which changed our whole understanding of the nervous system, and many others.

I do not intend to try to write a catalogue of the Soviet scientific contributions to science and technology. It would take far too long. I will only mention some of the salient directions of work.

In the first place, when the new Soviet government found itself after the civil war in control of the vast territories of the Union, the first thoughts were to find out what they contained and how they could be used. This involved a physical, geological and mineralogical survey which amply paid for itself by its discoveries of mineral resources, including great new fields of iron ore, oil, diamonds and potash. These were not just lucky strikes. They were the fruit of profound understanding of geology, very much in the old Russian tradition but carried out with tremendous energy

and enterprise. At the same time, the basic technological approaches of iron metallurgy were largely innovated by the use of such new techniques as tonnage oxygen and continuous casting. The innovation of basic theoretical metallurgy was very largely a Soviet contribution which has since benefited the rest of the world. It finds its scientific base in solid state physics, especially in the work of the great school of Joffe. Crystal physics is one of the fields in which Soviet scientists have led the world. This has led naturally to the study of solid state, electronics and transistors. At the outset chemistry, particularly organic chemistry, was not so widely developed and was largely in German hands, but this was amply compensated by the work of Semenov which found its practical realization in the synthesis of artificial rubber which saved the Soviet Army during the war. It was only after the war that a real drive was made to find a more complete utilization of chemistry in the plastics and fibre industry.

All these advances in the physical and chemical sciences come together with those of mathematics on which an entirely new school had been founded for the post-war achievements in space science. It should now be realized that the flights of the astronauts and much more the skill of rocketry, itself the fruit of the inspiration of Tsiolkovsky, came to involve practically all other sciences including astronomy, in which the Soviet Union has

The Soviet Union has created much more than just giant factories and machines. That it has created thousands of new people, a generation of fearless, sound, strong and selfless people inspired and animated by an ardent faith in the new world is, I think, loftier by far and more wonderful than anything else. For senile humanity, pining in cold and barren darkness and visited by blood-thirsty dreams, you are carrying the torch of a new day, the torch of an ideal that has struck lasting root in reality and, with it, an onrush of youthful energy breathing life into the ideal. From our tenebrous West we see a new dawn breaking in the East, with powerful rays of light streaking across the horizons of the new era. Hail to the rising sun! I go to meet it, to meet you. And to you I lead those who, like myself, have turned their backs on the night and, in keeping with the Old Evangelical texts, are letting "the dead bury the dead."

ROMAIN ROLLAND, 1931

made notable advances, and that of electronic control. In fact, the success of the first Sputnik has stirred up the USA to the value of scientific research and its educational system as well. That science in the Soviet Union has openly become the guide-light of the whole of world science. As well as this, deep knowledge of the properties of atoms and radioactivity gave to the Soviet Union not only the necessary theory but the means of making the atom bomb and, later, the hydrogen bomb, long before the Americans had thought it possible for them to do so.

Russia in 1917 was the center of a civilization, primitive and agricultural. The first thing was to change this to a more industrial state: to apply mechanical means and set up large new factories for the manufacture of tractors and electrical plant. "Communism is," as Lenin said, "Soviet power plus the electrification of the whole country." The other term implied the understanding of the biological factors in agriculture. This involved the unsuccessful invention of the anti-genetic theories of Lysenko whose desire to get particular results in a hurry unfortunately had a bad effect on agricultural production as well as infuriating the scientists of the West and playing into the hands of the cold warriors.

Finally, the advance of science has been

enormous not only on the technical but on the educational side. Education had largely been a matter of the study of the classics and it has definitely broken with that. Natural science has now become part of an almost universal educational system from the primary schools up to the university and beyond. The idea of a new scientific education in which every child, girls as much as boys, had the right to a secondary scientific education was born in the Soviet Union and is now copied in practically every country in the world. The University of Moscow is a monument of postwar recovery of the country. A generation later, an even grander monument is the great science city in Siberia, the town of science, Akademgorodok. The Academy is definitely an important part of the general government of the Union. I remember hearing someone say that in the old days a general was almost an obligatory guest at a wedding ceremony, now an academician can be even better.

Beginning in 1917, it can be seen that the revolution has fully justified itself as one which has opened science to the whole world and set its character for the years to come. Basically, it is science devoted to peace, but in view of the persistent hostility of the capitalist world, it is also involving science for defensive purposes.

Music and the Revolution

DMITRI SHOSTAKOVICH

THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION called into being a new, socialist art whose significance it would be hard to overrate. By "new" I mean not only the revolutionary ideas of which it is the bearer, but also its imaginative side, its means of expression.

The works of Prokofiev, Mayaskovsky, Khachaturyan, Sviridov, Kara-Karayev and others are outstanding examples of this new art.

Music not related to our time subject-wise, is also imbued with the Great October Revolution, its deathless ideas and the Soviet reality. I hold, for example, that Prokofiev's *War and Peace* could not have been written before the Revolution. It would have differed

substantially from the opera we know. The composer wrote it under the impression of the war fought against the Nazi aggression, the epic struggle inspired him and forged intrinsic bonds between the composer's creative outlook and contemporary events. *War and Peace* is an opera by a Soviet patriot-composer. This determines its civic impact.

Socialist art lends itself to every possible subject and image. Its exponents use all means of expression and all methods, so long as these help them reflect reality more deeply, truthfully and artistically. Soviet music is an example of the artistic scope and uncompromising sense of principle of our arts. How un-

like each other are Myaskovsky and Sharopin, Machavariani and Lyatoshinsky, Shchedrin and Tamberg! There thrive in Soviet music different individual styles and different artistic trends. But common to all our composers is the urge to dedicate their art to the fight for peace and social progress, to the triumph of our communist ideals.

The October Revolution released the creative powers of peoples that have now scaled towering heights in their national culture. The whole world knows of the progress made by the peoples of our multi-national socialist country in literature, music and theatre. The achievements of the splendid composers of Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and some of the other Soviet republics are great indeed.

What I would like to stress is that, though they employ modern techniques, Soviet composers have not discarded the characteristically national art idiom of their people. Kara-Karayev's *Third Symphony* is a typical example.

It seems to me that progressive artists outside the socialist world have also benefited from the stimulating influence of October. Our art principles have a universal significance. This is borne out by the fact that the new socialist art has won global recognition.

Like the other Soviet composers who began writing music after the Revolution, I developed as an artist under the immediate influence of the revolutionary reconstruction that led to socialism in our country.

Then, as now, Soviet music was called upon to embody the spirit and the image of the Revolution. I, too, tried. Understandably, it is not for me to say whether or not I have coped with my task. Let me just name the works I dedicated to October.

In the twenties, timing it to the tenth anniversary of the Revolution, I wrote my *Second Symphony*, called "To October," with a choral finale for which the text was written by Alexander Bezimensky.

My *Twelfth Symphony*, "The Year 1917," dedicated to the memory of Lenin, came many years later. It was a program opus completed in 1961, its parts bearing the titles: "Revolutionary Petrograd," "Razliv" (name of the place where Lenin found refuge from the bourgeois Provisional Government), "Aurora" (implying the historic salvo fired from the cruiser *Aurora* on November 7, 1917) and the finale, "Dawn of Humanity."

Soviet composers are now preparing for the 50th anniversary of the October Revolution.

Many works have been written to mark the date. New music is being produced in Moscow and Leningrad, in the Ukraine and Byelorussia, in Georgia and Kazakhstan, and in all the other republics. Some will be performed during the jubilee meeting of the Union of Soviet Composers in October and the remainder during the 1967-68 jubilee season.

I am sure of these works will be a fitting musical response to the auspicious fiftieth anniversary of our Soviet land.

The intellectual and the Revolution

PABLO NERUDA

THE October Revolution, developments in the Soviet Union and the socialist orientation of many other countries are exerting a profound influence on world culture. We can safely say that these factors wrought a revolution not only in culture as such, but also by shaping ties between the intellectuals and the people.

If we look back at the past and especially

at the beginning of our century, we shall see the intellectual almost completely isolated from the masses. A glance at the past reveals that many intellectuals took this as a personal tragedy, while others evolved theories of the autonomy of art. We could mention the tragic fate of Angel Ganivet, the progressive Spanish writer and bearer of advanced ideas who committed suicide because, though sensing the

desperate need for close contact with the masses, he had no direct contact with his own people. Ganiwet's life is the dramatic story of a brilliant writer (judging even by his letters and sundry writings) whose hopes were shattered. At the other pole, isolation led to the search for a refined art, of which the French poet Mallarmé, whose verse is the quintessence of the well-nigh incomprehensible mystical poetry, was a typical exponent.

Fresh hope came with the October Revolution. A new trend appeared among intellectuals, one that is still developing. I mean the trend towards closer ties with the people. It seems to me we should view this trend from two angles: first, as a revival of the ideals of democratic humanism which suffered eclipse at the beginning of the century and, second, as the emergence of a new intelligentsia closely associated with the people and their struggles. I have in mind the revival of the humanist tradition which has always, though in different degrees, prevailed in society. I had in mind also the new literature brilliantly represented by Vladimir Mayakovsky, the outstanding poet of the October Revolution and the immediate post-revolution years.

Fifty years of heated discussion about the purpose of art, fifty years of controversy, have stiffened the intellectuals' loyalty to the world revolution. Yet the question of form and method will forever be the subject of debate. For many, Maxim Gorky's realism is the most consummate novel-writing of the pre-revolutionary and revolutionary period. Others believe that audacious search does not conflict with the social role of art, of the artist, writer or poet. A violent controversy is under way between the two main trends in our century—that of realism and of experimentation. Demonstrating the myriad different approaches, problems and possibilities, it is a consequence of the October Revolution. The majority of writers and artists doubtlessly gravitate to the Left. Beyond doubt, too, this extraordinary surge of militancy among intellectuals is the logical projection of, first, the existence of a great socialist country and, second, the emergence of more socialist countries with all the shades of difference, all the features and peculiarities of their national make-up.

If any friends of justice are left in Europe, they must bow deferentially to this revolution which has, after so many centuries, bestowed on the world the first attempt at government by the people and for the people.

ANATOLE FRANCE, 1922

Take the present. We are witnessing one of the most tragic events in history—the imperialist war in Vietnam. Leaving aside the fury that wells up in us whenever the subject is broached, let us see how Vietnam affects the intelligentsia. No other event in history has been condemned so single-mindedly. In the developed countries, the United States, the heartland of imperialism, in Latin America, Africa and Asia, to say nothing of Europe, all intellectuals, all the eminent men of modern culture, apart from those like John Steinbeck whose pronouncements have been censured and condemned throughout the world, are denouncing the aggression most vigorously. If this colonialist aggression (of which there were so many) had been perpetrated in the 19th or at the beginning of the 20th century, it would have been a trifling episode in the colonial policy of powers accustomed to trampling upon earlier unknown, distant and weaker peoples. The existence of the socialist system and the Soviet Union has made the Vietnamese cause the concern of all nations. At other times things, I think, would have been different. No such thing exists any longer as insignificant or minor episodes of colonial policy, as small-scale aggressions, reported in the press on a par with local crime. The consciousness of writers and artists has been awakened. They stand for progress, the chief reason being that history's biggest revolution took place in the Soviet Union, siding with the peoples oppressed by colonialism and stimulating — by virtue of its very existence — the worldwide liberation movement to which it renders moral and material support. This is changing the historical picture and making us approach the culture of our time with a deeper sense of responsibility and laying the foundations for new art forms whose contours are perceptible even today.

The dawn of a new humanity

NIKOLAI TIKHONOV

ESSENTIALLY, THERE is nothing in history to compare with the October Revolution, the historic victory won fifty years ago in the autumn of 1917 in poverty-stricken, ruined tsarist Russia, except perhaps the emergence of Christianity which hastened to its doom the might of all-powerful Rome and spelled the final collapse of the ancient classical civilization.

October is the starting point of a new era in man's history. A new man, builder of the new, socialist society, a man formerly unknown in either East or West, has appeared on the scene. He is unlike those heroes whom the West has endeavored to depict as the man of the future. The images created by bourgeois literature and philosophy were far removed from the man who astounded the imperialist and capitalist world.

Neither Nietzsche's blond beast nor Max Stirner's favorite "exceptional" man with his anarchist disdain and solitude, nor Kipling's colonialist bearing the "white man's burden," nor the heroes of Wells' utopian romances accomplished, or could accomplish, as much for world culture as the living hero born of the October Revolution.

Soviet man brought into the world a new concept of justice and freedom. He proclaimed new social truths that world culture cannot afford to ignore.

October was the dawn heralding the upsurge of the national cultures of the peoples delivered from the tsarist yoke. Like rivers and rivulets, their literature and art blended with the achievements of world culture. The names of poets, artists, actors and scientists previously unknown abroad have been entered on the common rolls.

The heroic Soviet stand for the freedom of the nations enslaved by fascism has a special place in the chronicle of world culture. But for the victories of the Soviet Army, which crushed the enemies of peace and humanity,

the benighted Hitlerites would for long have tormented the over-run countries.

The colonial peoples followed the example of the October Revolution and rose against imperialism. Numerous Asian and African countries have entered world history, restoring to the common riches of mankind the pearls of their ancient cultures. Consigned to oblivion by the colonialists, these have again become treasures owned in common by all.

Men of all nations have brought back to their countries the spark of the Great October Revolution, lighting the flame of a new culture.

All down the centuries gems of culture were ruthlessly destroyed in wars and in bonfires, in wars unleashed by enlightened and unenlightened tyrants, oppressors and destroyers of nations.

The first day of the October Revolution dawned with the Decree on Peace. It proclaimed the end to a senseless war and exercised an irresistible influence on all subsequent history. For half a century the peoples of the Soviet Union have stood guard over the peace, championing the right to freedom, peace and independence of all nations.

The face of the world has changed since the victorious banner of the October Revolution was unfurled over the ruins of the old world. There began the epoch of struggle against imperialism and capitalism. The socialist world system came into being. The builder of socialist society has made his priceless contribution to world culture by creating new material and spiritual values. He was the first to blaze the trail to the stars and step out into space, previously inaccessible to man. The transformation of nature and of man has begun, presaging a world of boundless opportunity and opening up the road to a happy future for all.

October has pioneered new trails in all spheres of human knowledge, which cannot be ignored when speaking of world culture.

The world must be made beautiful

ROCKWELL KENT

THERE IS A CLEAVAGE in the West between the culture advocated in our press and the politics reported in our press. For example, in one of the biggest papers in the world, the *New York Times*, you can read on the first page of the butchery of still more Vietnamese people, of burning them to death with napalm, or you can read of the beating up of Negroes and killing them in the South, or you can read all kinds of sordid aspects of politics and of crime. Then you turn a few pages and come to the financial section which tells about the progress of business in America; you turn a few more pages and you come to articles on culture, art, music, books, and they are all so beautiful one would think there was no connection whatever between these pages on books, art, music and so forth and what is on the first page—the murder, the crime, the injustice that is reported there.

We have beautiful, touchingly beautiful, poetry about human kindness, love, charity toward all people, yet these bear no relationship whatever to the acts of us in the West toward other peoples. We know, for example, that Britain was at one time the world's biggest imperialist power, yet the English have these lovely, beautiful, touchingly sentimental ideas about life and love and charity and goodness. These ideas, it seems to me, are taken seriously for the first time by the people of the socialist societies. This is of tremendous significance. They mean something; they are no longer just culture to be put on like face powder or pretty clothes and be talked about, but something to be lived by, something to influence the lives of peoples, their attitudes toward each other and their attitudes toward the world.

As far as I know, this is the first time in history this has ever occurred.

Words are not to be taken merely as pretty sentimental things; they are translated into action. That has been conveyed to all the people of the West as it never was conveyed before. The arts are not just embroidery on

life, but the very fabric of life, and they underlie everything we do.

Of course, the development of art and the attitude to it in the socialist society have a history of their own.

I think at first art was brought fully into the service of the revolution itself, sometimes to the detriment of art. I think the artists in the socialist countries recognize this. But art had to be called into service, because the revolution had to be won, and it needed the voice of the artist, his voice in paint, in speech, in everything the artist did to support and win this revolution. Now that the revolution is won a new freedom can enter into the development of culture. As free citizens within the socialist society, the artists are entitled to develop their art and their talent according to the principles established by the revolution.

I think that art's greatest service and duty to mankind is to support the revolution with heart and soul and call attention to the vast terrible injustices that are created under capitalism. In America we have a task to show the people, try to make them realize, the villainy of what we are doing in Vietnam, the villainy of the way we are treating our Negroes, the shamefulness of our slums, of the ghettos all over America. This is the

Let no one doubt my reverence for the Russian revolution, the greatest historic event in my lifetime. It put an end to a long outdated, anachronistic order, raised the intellectual level of a 90-per cent illiterate nation and made conditions of life incomparably more human. It is a great social revolution and will, like the political revolution of 1789, leave its mark on the life of humanity.

THOMAS MANN, 1950

artist's job. I say this despite the fact that, in a way, I have lived away from it all; instead of being a critic of what was I have been a glorifier of what is.

I have been a landscape painter, I have loved the world in which I live, and I keep on loving it and painting it. But with the belief that if we the people love this world of ours, we ought to be greedier and want more and more and more of it. If people see the rich

potentialities of the world they are not going to be satisfied simply with little glimpses of it. They will want it all; therefore, they must protest against everything that makes it ugly.

I think the main duty of the artist in the West is to be a protester against the evil and injustice and inhumanity to man that exists in our bourgeois civilization, to cry out for all to hear: "Look around, and be ashamed of your world—and change it!"

Science in the Soviet Union

N. N. SEMYONOV

IN MY LONG LIFE I have seen the state of science in Tsarist Russia, witnessed how Soviet science began to burgeon under the guidance of the Bolshevik Party and Lenin, and took direct part in its development.

On this glorious 50th anniversary I therefore wish to speak of the truly great role played by the October Revolution in advancing Soviet science.

Tsarist Russia had practically no research institutes. The faculties of the institutions of higher learning were allowed but miserly funds. The number of scientists was infinitesimal and the conditions in which they worked were anything but good. The number of active physicists in the pre-revolutionary Petrograd of 1910-1917 (excluding instructors, who conducted no research of their own and, indeed, had no opportunity to do so) never exceeded 20.

The Leningrad of today has splendidly equipped physics institutes and large physics departments in chemical and industrial institutes. Factory laboratories, too, are staffed by physicists. It is a safe guess that physicists in Leningrad today number many thousands.

How was this staggering advance achieved in the relatively short space of half a century? The decisive factor was that the Soviet government and the Bolshevik Party gave top priority to scientific development, and this at a time when the country was racked by civil war, the economy was dislocated and hunger reigned in the cities.

In those difficult days of 1918-1920, when the very existence of the new social system hung in the balance, there were founded in Leningrad and Moscow a number of research institutes — not narrowly pragmatic ones, but purely scientific. The Joffe Institute of Physics and Technology, the Rozhdestvensky Optical and the Radium Institute of Kolovrat-Chervinsky and Khlopin were among those founded in Leningrad; the Academy of Science founded the Steklov Mathematical Institute and the Pavlov Physiological Institute, with

The country ridiculed in Europe for backwardness and notorious fecklessness turned out to be brimming over with energy, inventiveness and courage. In social matters it quickly outstripped the richest states vaunting their democracy. The world looked on in amazement. Soon the new light penetrated far beyond the borders of Russia, and Lenin's name became almost a household word, evoking fear in some and in others a sense of elation and hope. The names of generals, prime ministers and other politicians lost their lustre. The world began to breathe in a different way. Life had at last invaded its lethargic atmosphere—big, meaningful life that brought the whole world into motion.

ZDENEK NEJEDLY, 1947

more research institutions founded in Moscow.

Lenin knew that progressive natural science had to be developed in top gear to provide a theoretical groundwork for the technology and industry of the future socialist power. His foresight, wisdom and firmness in finding the resources for this purpose in those hard times and in marshalling the handful of scientists for purely scientific endeavor were truly amazing in view of the many particular technical problems of the war-ravaged economy.

Despite the adverse conditions in tsarist days, Russia produced a constellation of brilliant scientists, such as Lobachevsky, Markov, Butlerov, Mendeleyev, Kovalsky and Sechenov, and at the time of the October Revolution there were such scientists of note as Steklov, Friedman, Zhukovsky, Joffe, Rozhdestvensky, Chugayev, Kurnakov, Zelinsky, Bakh who returned from exile, Vernadsky, Fersman, Obruchev, Pavlov and Vavilov. Associated with them were the handful of their pupils, the former teachers and post-graduates. These groups formed the nucleus of the newly-organized institutes.

The government instituted the Administration for Science to establish and supervise the new research institutes.

Despite the acute shortage of foreign exchange, considerable funds were allotted for foreign-made equipment. I recall Academician Joffe going to Germany to buy apparatus for his Institute of Physics and Technology. He brought back first-class equipment in relatively ample quantities, meeting all our needs.

Beginning with 1923, scientists, especially young scientists, were sent regularly to the foremost science centers in Western Europe for post-graduate training.

Among us young and old scientists these measures of the Soviet authorities evoked enthusiasm. Extensive opportunities were offered for initiative and boundless horizons opened for scientific development for the good of the country and its people.

When the universities were re-opened in 1920 capable young people dedicated to science flocked to the lecture-halls. They were sifted for the most talented, who in their second year were appointed to laboratories as junior researchers. My laboratory at the Institute of Physics and Technology, for

example, was staffed entirely with such students. Out of the fifteen who worked with me at the time, two became Academicians, three Corresponding Members of the Academy of Science of the USSR, two Members of the Ukrainian Academy of Science and the rest professors. Men of such calibre were naturally extremely useful to science already at the age of 19 or 20. By the time they graduated at twenty-four they were experienced researchers. Many of them were at once sent for further study to foremost laboratories in Western Europe and on returning took charge of new groups of promising students in their second or third year. This resulted in an extraordinarily rapid growth of personnel.

Specialized technical research institutes sprang up in the early twenties, developing into citadels of applied science and technology. Far-reaching reforms were effected in the Academy of Science, which was transferred to Moscow in 1934, with branches in the Union Republics which developed later into national academies. The Academy of Science of the USSR became the supreme center responsible for the advancement of natural and social sciences.

In the meantime, there flourished numerous specialized institutes and designing bureaus under the auspices of the various ministries.

At the beginning of the Second World War, that is, 23 years after the October Revolution, we had a powerful and versatile science matching that of the technically advanced capitalist countries. That this was so had been proved by the war with Hitler Germany.

After the war, Soviet science and technology progressed at a still more rapid rate. It did not take us long to develop nuclear energy for weapons and we were the first in applying it for peaceful purposes. We were the first to make the break-through in rocketry and the first to begin exploring space.

Acting on Lenin's ideas, our Communist Party and the Soviet government are promoting fundamental and applied science. The nation has every consideration for its scientists and shows a profound and lively interest in scientific achievements. The popular science magazine, *Science and Life*, has a circulation of three million.

This is a far from complete account of what the October Revolution has done for science in our country.

October for our generation

ADOLF HOFFMEISTER

FOR OUR GENERATION memories of the October Revolution have a special significance. Here I shall deal with the culture of the 'twenties, because for our generation it is a particularly happy chapter to remember, being associated with the best years of our lives, with the fervor of our young minds, our revolutionary abandon and audacity. Those days are gone never to return. But they have left their trace and one day our difficult, mathematically realistic youth will no doubt envy us our past, as some probably already do today. Things were much simpler for us than they are for them. All doors were open. We were well posted on world affairs. We were the first generation in a country that had regained its freedom after 300 hundred years of oppression. Though it may sound overpathetic, under no circumstances could one call it a shallow time.

We were patriotic, tearing down the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. On the balcony in Stranice near Prague, where I lived at the time, were maps of all the battle-fronts on which we moved pins to follow the official news from the fronts. We had a map of Russia and one of Siberia, on which pins showed the advance of the Red Army.

In school we posted up announcements about the Russian revolution on a metal screen in front of the stove — and on the stove itself when the fire went out. Our form master pretended not to see them until they were no longer topical. We celebrated the October Revolution with our friends at home and in the street, while school was closed because of a coal shortage.

As time went on news about the cultural life in the new Russia began to trickle in. Our class, and our gymnasium for that matter, were noted for their artistic and literary bent. In 1920 we founded Devetsil, a society of leftist writers and artists. We read avidly and visited the poet St. K. Neumann and the Capek brothers, and visited Tvrdosijdni, an

artists' society. We arranged lectures and held co-educational functions with Minerva, the first girls' school in Prague. We produced plays and organized exhibitions, and on May Day joined the labor demonstration. We were all eyes, observing a world entirely new to us, which awed us somewhat. Futurists came to us from Italy, cubists from France, expressionists from Germany, and from Switzerland and America the dadaists. Our timidity evaporated and we began sorting out our discoveries.

Suddenly we, fervent admirers of France, began taking a delight in reproductions, photographs, journals and books reaching us from Soviet Russia. Ivan Olbracht told us of what he had seen in revolutionary Petrograd and Moscow. Then publisher Borovy put out his book, *Sketches of Contemporary Russia*. There streamed in confusing, often inaccurate and contradictory, but always thought-provoking information. Left journals everywhere published the photograph of a model of the projected Third International tower designed by Tatlin. Lisitsky's approach to book-designing was promptly snatched up. Karel

Among the great revolutionary upheavals of the past century the Russian October Revolution is the greatest. The Reformation, which originated in Germany, strove for a revival of Europe's conscience and fought a bitter thirty years' war for religious and intellectual tolerance. Then came the French Revolution, which by its ethical impact swept away the pretensions of feudalism and sought equality and freedom for the bourgeoisie. The Russian Revolution fought for freedom, equality and fraternity not for one class, but for all men, for all nations, races and beliefs. It fought and won!

BERNHARD KELLERMANN, 1950

Teige proudly professed to be a follower of that Russian graphic artist. Malevich's Red Quadrangle had terrific impact. We relished Chagall's scenes from the life of the Jewish poor in Vitebsk, the austere paintings of Shternberg, highly restrained in his use of means of expression, and the works of a constellation of powerful artists, the Slavic paintings of Moshkov, the thrilling Konchalovsky, the naive canvases of Larionov and Goncharov, and the experiments of Tatlin. Among the sculptors we were attracted to Pevzner and Gabo, the pioneers of structural realism, and to the elegant Arkhipenko. But, as I recall, we were thrilled most of all by the architects — by the brothers Vesnin, those three old gentlemen with beard and moustache, by Melnikov, Gurov, Ginz and Kolli, each of whom was poised for the five-year plan building projects. Never before had architecture enjoyed such prodigious opportunities. Le Corbusier revelled in the assignments he was given in Moscow.

A new decorative art evolved in the streets. The artistic charm of various forms of propaganda, poster art, the arrangement and guidance of demonstrations and processions, were a new discovery. Children's art was cordially invited to take its place among the muses.

Czech and Slovak writers and artists travelled to Soviet Russia and brought back bagfuls of books and materials. We knew that modernity in art could never be complete without the Soviet Russian artists. We were deeply impressed by their contribution to the progressive school. Translations of Mayakovsky, Blok, Yesenin and Pasternak came to hand. Avidly, we studied photographs of scenes from the stage productions of Meyer-

hold, Tairov and Vakhtangov. Then, *The Battleship Potemkin* was screened in Prague, and we learned of Eisenstein, Pudovkin, Dovzhenko and Vertov.

The Soviet wave of experimentation and new advances in art led to a confrontation between ourselves and the then influential Parisian school of Western leftist intellectuals. But this confrontation did not end in disaster. Nobody's feelings were hurt, we sacrificed nothing. In our country, in the very heart of Europe, we were able to absorb the heady spirit of two different art trends. Despite our craving to keep abreast of world art, our own art idiom lost nothing of its originality.

Yet the influence of the two trends on our culture was not the same. The difference was substantial. With the cultural trends emanating from the Bolshevik East, our artists naturally absorbed leftist political views. We were sucked in by the vortex of history and saw the world of politicians, of elders, of our venerable parents, changing before our eyes. The tempo of life quickened, and lost its rhythm—not from heart disease; it was our emotions that quickened its pulse. Our generation had a perfect sense of time. The old world was turning into our world, a world that had points of resemblance with Soviet reality. From the Soviet artists we borrowed the tools of revolution together with the spectrum of new ideas. I doubt if all of us made the choice consciously. Many merely drifted into the leftist political movement. But only a few abandoned it in later days.

Progressive thought was moulded under the influence of the different trends. The impact of Soviet art imparted to our art a progressive political orientation.

October, national-liberation struggle and culture

FAIZ AHMAD FAIZ

THE GREAT OCTOBER Socialist Revolution was an event of universal importance. For our country, that is, India and Pakistan, which at that time was undivided India, it had a little more direct significance, than perhaps

for some of the other countries. It is not generally known that in 1919, while the revolution had not yet been completed, a large number of people from our country trekked across Afghanistan into what are now the

Central Asian republics in the quest of their romantically conceived freedom. Many of them were religious people, others were liberals, but all of them had an idea that the Soviet Union, after the revolution, was the place where you went in search of support for your freedom struggle. And when these people came back after staying in the Soviet Union for a long time, most of them became active in the working-class and other progressive movements inside the country—so they brought back with them a more or less personal impact of the revolution.

Then the revolution coincided with the rise of the first great nationalist movement in the Indo-Pakistan subcontinent — the movement against British imperialism. The Soviet revolution gave to this particular movement a new kind of perspective, a new kind of clarity of thought. There began the formation of militant class organizations of the nationalist movement. There also emerged an independent movement by young people who were romantic revolutionaries and who wanted to overthrow British rule by individual acts of force and resistance. Most of these young men were killed within a comparatively short time, but on the youth of the country and on the intelligentsia they had a very powerful impact. Also the October Revolution gave to the general nationalist movement a new kind of hope, a new kind of optimism, a new kind of feeling of confidence because such a large country occupying one-sixth of the world's land surface had come over to their side. These were political factors which had their impact on the intelligentsia and through the intelligentsia on the cultural development inside the country.

In India at that time, the British India, all Marxist literature was banned right up to 1942 when the anti-fascist war in Europe impelled the Left organizations to support the war effort. Until then, all political Marxist literature was banned, but other literature was not banned. Gorky, for instance, could be read, also Sholokhov and then books like *Ten Days That Shook the World*. These writings created an interest in understanding the processes of the revolution, and an interest in Russian literature, classical as well as modern literature. And through this twin interest a completely new attitude was born among the writers and intellectuals and artists of various types, an attitude which gave us, too, concrete movements; for instance, among the writers, the progressive writers' movement was born.

This movement dominated the literary scene of the sub-continent right up to the end of the forties, when with the coming of national liberation and national independence

new problems arose and new situations called to life new kinds of writings. But for three decades this was the predominant movement to which everybody belonged. It gave us the Indian people's theatre, which again was a movement of young people, amateurs, who tried to interpret the values and the ideas of the revolution through the medium of the stage. Then it also produced a very large number of revolutionary songs which were a direct instrument in political action. It also produced a new realistic school in the cinema of which the films of Indian director Satterjee and some Pakistan directors are well-known examples. Through studying the revolution, the revolutionary literature and Marxist literature as well as literature produced by people like Gorky and Mayakovsky and Sholokhov, the artists and the writers began to see, or learned to see, their subjective personal problems in a social context. They learned to see the national problems in the perspective of history. And these things gave them an understanding of what may be called social realism, and of what on the universal side might be called humanism. And apart from that, it gave them a new passion, a passion which transcended their personal problems. They wanted to build a better India, to create a better social order. They directed their writings against the reactionary forces of the whole world and expressed warm sympathy with the people who were fighting for freedom and national independence. If one sums it up, this whole process, the main impact of the October Revolution — through these agencies that I have mentioned — was firstly to bring the intelligentsia closer to the people, and, secondly to establish closer links with the literature of the whole world.

As I see it from the writer's or artist's point of view, there were three elements in the revolution which were directly relevant to any conscientious writer as well as to any conscientious citizen in the world. Internationally, its main content was the liberation of all oppressed peoples. Nationally, its main content was the social liberation of the masses through the elimination of the exploiting classes. And culturally, it was the liberation of the individual from his personal obsessions and reuniting the individual with mass experience, the experience of both his own people as well as of contemporary humanity.

Harmonizing all these elements in one's intellectual endeavor is as important today, if not even more important, as it was ever before, because in the world of today the conflict between the forces of national liberation

and the forces of imperialist domination and exploitation, particularly in Vietnam, has taken the form of a mortal struggle between the forces of liberation and the forces of domination. In the same way, insofar as social liberation of the peoples is concerned, that again is a very live problem because of the very large number of countries which have been liberated from imperialist domination but which have yet to solve the problems of eliminating social and class exploitation. The topicality of the cultural aspects of the October Revolution increases in connection with the threat of nuclear war and the rise of neo-

fascism in various countries, of which Greece is an example.

The writer has a special responsibility to young people because the disillusionment in the spiritual values propagated by bourgeois leaders has generated a certain cynicism, a sense of alienation among the young in many countries. It is essential for young people to get out of this cynicism, out of this escapist, defeatist, demoralized mental state, and to get back to the faith, get back to the hope, get back to the militant attitude that the October Revolution produced in the twenties and thirties.

The paths of art and literature

VILEM SAVADA

I WAS TWELVE when the revolution broke out in Russia in October 1917. At school, I avidly read Russian classical literature—Tolstoy, Dostoyevsky, Pushkin, Lermontov, Gogol, Turgenev, Pisemsky, Saltykov-Schedrin and the others, who enabled me to picture life in tsarist Russia. My first money was spent on Skapichevsky's *History of Russian Nineteenth-Century Literature*, which added considerably to my knowledge of the ideological trends in that country. In my last years at school I began to read the Prague literary and art magazines, which aroused my interest in the Russian revolution and in the life of the new Soviet state. I was greatly influenced by the Czech Communist writers, whom I, a novice in literature, held in deep respect: Josef Hora, Jiri Wolker, A. M. Pisa, Jaroslav Seifert, Vitezslav Nezval, Konstantin Biebl, Vladislav Vancura and Karej Teige, and of the older generation St. K. Neuman, Ivan Olbracht, M. Majerova and Pujmanova. In those days, all or nearly all the *avant garde* writers were Communists or Communist sympathizers. In their journals they published modern Russian literature, in the cinema, theatre and in the fine arts. I was captivated by the things that were being done in the Soviet Union, of which I learned more from the writings of Russian authors than from the articles of our own publicists and critics.

We thrilled to the poetry of Blok and Mayakovsky, and the films of Eisenstein, Pudovkin and Dovzhenko, and were also deeply moved by Yesenin, Pasternak, Akhmatova and Tsvetayeva who, unlike Mayakovsky, did not at first respond to the revolution. We also liked the poets Kliuyev and Klichkov, who could hardly have understood the purport of the revolution and in their poetry captured the traditional image of the peasant. In those days most of us could distinguish the obviously progressive from the candidly reactionary writers hostile to the revolution — such as, say Marezhevsky—most of whom had emigrated, but we made no distinction between the writers and poets who had remained in the Soviet Union.

Russian literature had always been widely translated in our country. All the main works had been available in Czech for years. And we owe it to Bohumil Mathesius and Jiri Weil, not only superior translators but also disseminators of the new Soviet literature, that we were kept posted on its latest achievements. Also, I recall with gratitude Frantisek Kubka's book, *The Poets of Revolutionary Russia*, which added greatly to our knowledge of Soviet literature.

Reactionary politicians and publications were critical, even hostile. But many literary journals and publishers did not hesitate to

publish Soviet authors. This applies not only to Left publishers, but also to Aventinum, Sfinx, Cin, etc. In the thirties the Melantrich publishing house also put out new Russian books. If at first we were attracted by the new content and interesting discoveries in form, we later drew from Soviet literature the experience of Russian revolutionary development. A very big impression was made on us by Sholokhov's *And Quiet Flows the Don* and *Soil Upturned*, which gave a truthful and striking picture of life in Russia with all its contradictions during and after the revolution. We were also deeply affected by the writings of Maxim Gorky, Alexei Tolstoy, A. Bely, Alexander Fadeyev and many others.

It is safe to say, I think, that most of our prewar progressive intellectuals formed their

views of the revolution, of socialism, of the Soviet Union precisely from our own and Soviet literature.

These are times when the writer should not evade his responsibilities. I am sure I do not underestimate the significance of our artistic experiments, but I believe that only an art which assumes responsibility for the destiny of man and peace can help human society comprehend itself and find a way out of all crises obstructing the path of progress. This is an area where the arts are afforded the broadest opportunities. Historical experience is a precious thing, but history does not repeat itself, and life never stands still. It is essential, therefore, that writers should study reality and turn their eyes to the future.

The journey to people

PIERRE GAMARRA

SPEAKING ABOUT CULTURE and literature, we should, I think, consider the latter in the process of materialization, that is, from the moment an idea is conceived in the writer's mind and put down on paper until it is transmitted to the heart and mind of the reader.

Culture is created for others, not for oneself. That seems to be the proper starting point in a discourse on the cultural influences of the October Revolution.

The revolution liberated the people of a vast country. Their political and social emancipation had an immense bearing on culture. What I mean, among other things, is universal education and the growth of cultural institutions — schools and libraries designed to develop children into really cultured people. The same craving for culture, stimulated by social and political emancipation, was witnessed during the Paris Commune, which engendered considerable cultural activity, and at the time of the Great French Revolution (I have in mind the educational and social activity of the Convent). The need for such activity persists to this day. What I wish to stress is the importance of emancipating the reader, the potential consumer of culture.

There is the reader's and the writer's viewpoint. The October Revolution, I feel, gave impetus to the development of both the reader and writer.

It gave momentum to an artistic questing so absorbingly interesting that people go back to it even in our time. Lessons are still being drawn from it. The wind of freedom is sweeping across the world. The October Revolution, which restored to men their sense of dignity, showered respect on the writer but also burdened him with profound responsibilities. The writer is conscious of being a member of a society advancing towards freedom and light. This fills him with optimism, with enthusiasm, it animates his creative powers. He is no "unit" bent over a sheet of paper or a musical score, or sitting before an easel. He is part of a huge whole. It is not for himself alone that he writes. I know of no writer who did so. And if any writer says he does, he is not being honest. He writes for others. He writes to give expression. Modern humanist literature must have courage in all things that concern the arts and their possibilities, but the writer must be conscious of his power over other people too.

To make my point I shall refer to Romain Rolland. He saw two roads along which the writer could travel: the road "outside himself" and the road "inside." In point of fact, that is the title of one of his books: *The Journey Inside Oneself*. It is a book of a man's reflections on himself, his thoughts, his distinctly personal creativity and, in a way, his solitude. When a master is at work there is no one beside him to direct his hand. Therein lies his greatness, and his weakness too. Yet the writer is constantly *en route*, making the journey "outside himself," the journey to people, the journey to events. Romain Rolland, too, though he wrote of his own thoughts and feelings, devoting himself to reflection and questing in solitude, was a man straining with all his being towards the outside world. It was not just a question of visiting the Soviet Union and other countries where important social events were taking place. It was also a question of his thinking, of his soul, of being attuned to social life, gathering the grains that subsequently went into the making of his works.

I think a writer does not like being lectured. What I mean is that nobody has the prescription for how to write a masterpiece and no-

body can offer a formula for how to write a novel. There is no such chemical compound or cabalistic number that helps one to write a good poem or a brilliant play. That is something the master must do himself; it depends on his talent, on his genius. We mortals, regrettably, cannot fabricate genius. This is one side of the problem. But there is also the reader. The writer is not alone. So a writer who corrupts the reader is not worthy of his name. No writer peddling racialism or hatred, no writer spreading what I call human evil, all that is unworthy of man, can create anything of value because what he creates summons to the destruction of man, of his soul, of his powers. The real master looks at the world around him, at people, at countries, at the past and the future, with wide-open eyes. A man like Karel Capek had a keen sense of his time, he was a citizen of progress, a man attuned to the future.

For me a writer worthy of the name is a citizen and an artist. I do not mean to say, of course, that all works should serve as a lesson, that they should be didactic. Every writer must settle for himself the question of combining his civic duty with his creativity. Therein lies his responsibility as an artist.

FACTS AND FIGURES

IN THE USSR 72,600,000 people, or nearly a third of the population, attended educational establishments of different kinds in 1966-67. The Soviet Union ranks first in the world for annual graduation of engineers. In 1966, Soviet higher schools graduated 179,000 engineers, or four to every one graduated in the United States. The 767 Soviet higher educational establishments have an enrolment of more than 4 million. The country ranks first for the number of doctors, with 24.7 per 10,000 population in 1966.

Every fourth book published in the world is printed in the Soviet Union. Four times as many books by foreign authors are translated in the USSR as in the United States, 4.5 times as many as in Japan and 9 times as many as in Britain. The country has 368,000 libraries with 2,300 million books.

Attendance at Soviet theatres topped 100 million in 1965. Besides the 500 professional theatre companies, the country has 907 amateur companies. Recreation and entertainment is afforded at 127,000 clubs in towns and villages.

The October Revolution and the struggle for world peace

WITOLD JAROSINSKI

Secretary, Central Committee,
Polish United Workers' Party

THE OCTOBER Revolution, which 50 years ago started the transition from capitalism to socialism, laid the foundations for a new, just social system on one-sixth of the earth's surface and inaugurated the first state committed to a policy of peace and self-determination for the nations.

The Polish working class and people have a special reason to celebrate, together with progressives everywhere, the Revolution's golden jubilee. For the Revolution was decisive in restoring their independence after 120 years of foreign domination. One of the Soviet government's early decrees, of August 29, 1918, read:

"All treaties and agreements concluded by the government of the former Russian Empire with the Kingdom of Prussia and the Austro-Hungarian Empire relating to the division of Poland are hereby proclaimed *null and void* as contrary to the principle of self-determination and the revolutionary conscience of the Russian people, who recognize the inalienable right of the people of Poland to independence and unity."

Tens of thousands of Polish revolutionaries fought on the barricades in October 1917 and later during the foreign intervention. Inspired by the same ideals of social and national liberation, the Polish soldiers of the Western and 52nd infantry divisions and of the Polish Red Army regiments contributed in no small

measure to the defense of the October Revolution.

In the difficult inter-war years Polish revolutionary workers, peasants and intellectuals, led by the Communist Party, defied terror and persecution to demonstrate their solidarity with the Land of Soviets, in which they saw the bulwark of anti-imperialism and the staunch ally of all oppressed peoples.

In World War II, when the Polish people faced extermination at the hands of the Nazis, the victorious offensive of the Soviet army brought them liberation.

For the second time, thanks to the October Revolution and the forces it created, Poland acquired independence, and this time its working people opted for socialism.

I propose to deal with only one point, namely, how the October Revolution influenced the struggle for world peace and security.

Before 1917, even the most radical demands did not go beyond the slogan proclaimed by the French Revolution—the right of nations to self-determination and independent statehood—and this was seldom achieved. The October Revolution made the slogan a reality for the subjected peoples of Tsarist Russia. But it did more than that, it gave them the right freely to choose their social system. Classes and social groups that lived by exploitation of the workers were dispossessed of their political and economic power.

But to assert this right to political and social self-determination the Soviet Republic had to wage a long and costly war against

We continue publication, in abridged form, of contributions to the international theoretical symposium held in Prague over June 22-24 under the auspices of this journal.

counter-revolution and foreign intervention. Victory was won with the help of the revolutionary forces within the Republic and the solidarity campaign of workers, peasants and intellectuals in Europe, America and Asia. Unity of the world revolutionary process was thus manifested in the community of interests of the Soviet Republic and the working people of other countries, and not, as was then widely expected, in the simultaneous triumph of socialism in all the advanced countries.

Even in those early days it was evident that unity of the national and international revolutionary process was an essential element of revolutionary change. This acquired all the more importance, the longer the process of world socialist revolution was delayed.

The Soviet Union, which had proclaimed fraternity of all the peoples and the liberation of mankind, was for a long time the bulwark of the revolutionary labor movement and of the struggle for democracy, progress and independence. On the other hand, the political and moral support it received from the world's progressive forces helped it to surmount its difficulties and develop into one of the world's strongest powers.

In its early formative years, the revolutionary labor movement made peace and opposition to imperialist war one of its major aims. This striving for peace and socialism are inseparable for they follow from the very nature of working-class interests.

With the emergence of the USSR, labor's efforts for peaceful international relations acquired a new dimension. For now there was a great power that spoke for the working class and was committed to universal peace. The USSR sought neither spheres of influence nor colonies, nor domination over smaller nations. It was the first country in history whose ideology and interests prompted it to support and assist small nations against the exploiter powers, to combat imperialist expansion and capitalist exploitation. The USSR became the standard-bearer of freedom, independence and peace.

The process which led to the socialist revolution in Russia should be seen against the background of one of the most costly and savage wars. World War I precipitated a crisis which the propertied classes of Russia were wholly unable to resolve. Lenin and the Bolshevik Party won the support of the people not only by their program of social and economic demands but, to a very large extent, by their demand for an immediate end to the war. The appeal of the Bolshevik peace slogan was fully demonstrated in the Decree on Peace, promulgated by the Second All-Russia Congress of Soviets.

For weeks the new Soviet government urged a peace conference of all the belligerents and other powers. It called for a peace without annexations, that is, in full accord with the right to self-determination, and without indemnities. The Western imperialist powers, Tsarist Russia's war allies, rejected this, and Germany resumed military operations against revolutionary Russia. This compelled the latter to accept the onerous Brest-Litovsk peace terms. But the peace negotiations, which lasted for weeks and, for the first time in history, were conducted in public, left a deep imprint on public opinion and stimulated the revolutionary movement. This forced the victor powers to adopt a number of more or less democratic decisions at the 1919 Paris Peace Conference.

The conference, which concluded with the signing of the Versailles Treaty, tried to build up a system of European equilibrium and security without Soviet Russia or, more correctly, against Soviet Russia. The plan failed, and in a comparatively short space of time the Soviet Union repaired the damage caused by war and intervention and developed into a powerful socialist country. It exerted an increased influence on international affairs and consistently worked for peace. One of its major peace initiatives, the plan for general and complete disarmament, was made in the preparatory commission for the world disarmament conference.

The Soviet government's unremitting efforts to safeguard peace in the period between the two world wars stemmed neither from pacifist illusions, nor from a desire to gain propaganda advantages. The Soviet Union was fully aware that the capitalist countries surrounding it could be rebuffed only by a powerful military force backed by an equally powerful defense industry. But the building of the new social system was a highly complex task requiring time and international peace. The Soviet Union's national interests were, therefore, fully identical with those of the working class and with the worldwide popular longing for peace.

After the October Revolution the menace of imperialist war was increasingly directed against the USSR. In fact, preparation of an attack against it began immediately after World War I. The imperialists were determined to reverse the course of history by destroying the first socialist state, and to achieve that they were prepared, it seemed, to sink their differences. The resurrection of German imperialism showed the Western Powers that they, too, were threatened with aggression. But even then they were thinking

in terms of resolving their contradictions at the expense of the Soviet Union.

The USSR and the communist movement as a whole campaigned against all aggression, whether in Africa, Asia or Europe. Their slogan was "peace is indivisible," for experience had shown that aggression in any area jeopardized world peace.

The aims and methods of the peace struggle changed with the growth of Soviet strength and influence and the rapidly changing world situation.

In the 'thirties, the aim was to build up a stable system of European collective security through agreements between the socialist Soviet Union and the European capitalist powers, big and small. This became a pressing issue especially after Hitler's advent to power in 1933.

The potential aggressor, who had at his command Europe's biggest industrial complex, could be deterred by the concerted effort of all, or nearly all the major European powers. Accordingly, the Soviet Union proposed an agreement based on international guarantees of Europe's territorial status quo, or, in other words, a guarantee of the frontiers established after World War I. That, too, was the underlying principle of the Soviet Union's 1933 proposal for a definition of aggression and an agreement based on it.

The USSR and the world Communist movement were fully aware that defense of the territorial status quo was central to the whole struggle against the war danger and, consequently, to the defense of independence and political and social progress.

Accordingly, the Soviet Union worked towards agreement between all countries interested in European peace, which it regarded as an integral part of world peace. More, it suggested a collective security system that would include all the constructive elements of international relations. That is why it joined the League of Nations, from which the aggressive powers, Japan and Hitler's Third Reich, had withdrawn, followed later by fascist Italy. It also agreed to guarantee the 1925 Locarno agreements, i.e., the inviolability of the French and Belgian frontiers with Germany, but only on the understanding that there would be a similar French-guaranteed arrangement for Eastern Europe.

These Soviet initiatives did not materialize. Only a fragment of the over-all plan was realized in the Soviet Union's 1935 bilateral pacts with France and Czechoslovakia, which were later annulled by the Western Powers' Munich policy.

The last attempt to form a European collective security system prior to World War II

was made in the spring and summer of 1939, during the Soviet negotiations with Britain and France. It will be recalled that they were unproductive of result, due entirely to the attitude of the Western Powers, and this opened the way to World War II and the German successes in its early stage.

* * *

Gradually and inexorably, the anti-fascist war engulfed the entire world. The USSR, attacked by Nazi Germany, played a decisive part in the latter's defeat and in the liberation of Central and Southeast Europe.

While the war was still in progress agreement was reached, with the active participation of the Soviet Union, on the underlying principles of the post-war peace and security structure. One of these principles was sovereign equality of all states in accordance with the right to national self-determination; all states would be equal in relation to each other; there would be no interference in their internal affairs, no policy dictation. Acceptance and strict observance of this principle would, in effect, have made for peaceful settlement of all conflicts, would have ruled out war and established enduring peace.

Based on the experience of the fight against Hitler Germany and approved by all the progressive forces, the post-war structure suggested by the USSR has a permanent significance. It stands out in sharp contrast to the imperialist drive for hegemony and the subjection of small states and division of the world into spheres of influence. The Soviet proposals had a definite influence on the principles of the United Nations, public thinking and public opinion.

However, shortly after the war the imperialist powers abandoned the principles they had themselves proclaimed during the war, shifted to their positions-of-strength policy and began to prepare for another world war.

The defeat of Nazi Germany and imperialist Japan, the weakening of British and French imperialism, the growth of Soviet prestige, and the role played by the Communist parties in the resistance movement—all combined to produce far-reaching social changes in post-war Europe and elsewhere in the world. In 1944-49 a number of countries turned to socialism, among them China. The disintegration of colonialism was proceeding at an accelerated pace, particularly in Asia.

The cold war, imposed on the world by the U.S. and other imperialist states, was designed to retard, if possible reverse, this process, which was rapidly tilting the world balance in favor of socialism. The nuclear and con-

ventional arms drive, West German remilitarization, aggressive pacts, war bases surrounding the socialist world, economic discrimination—the cumulative effect of these cold-war weapons, the imperialists hoped, would soften the ground for another world war.

The basic and dominant social antagonism of the post-war period is between the worlds of socialism and imperialism. It penetrates every area of economic and political life, and upon its outcome depends the future of the human race.

The problem of war and peace has assumed a new quality in this struggle. It has become the pivotal issue chiefly because of the emergence of nuclear weapons, which make world war especially perilous, threatening the extermination of whole nations. Peace, its maintenance and consolidation, has become the towering problem of our time. But it should also be clear that there are incomparably better opportunities to combat the imperialist policy of war.

The dynamic development of the Soviet Union and other socialist states, the disintegration of the colonial system and the progressive development of a number of third-world countries, also the growing influence of the labor movement in the capitalist world, have given a new dimension to the issue of war and peace.

When the Soviet Union was the only socialist country, and the imperialists had a considerably bigger margin of strength, there could be no question of preventing world war, for the operation of the intrinsic forces of imperialism made war inevitable. But with the rise and rapid development of the socialist world system, and with the disintegration of the colonial system, there was created a situation in which imperialism, though its essential substance has not changed, is no longer able to command the course of world affairs. This means that there is a realistic possibility of sparing mankind the horrors and suffering of another war. But this has to be translated into reality and that, in the final analysis, depends on the outcome of the competition of the two social systems for political, economic and military superiority.

As a counter-weight to the imperialist cold war, the socialist camp's peace policy took form and shape as the forces of socialism and national liberation grew in strength and scope. The heart of that policy is Lenin's idea of peaceful co-existence of states irrespective of their social structure. Its present form has been worked out by the socialist states over the post-war years, notably after the 20th CPSU congress.

Confrontation of the two policies ended with the defeat of the cold war. It will always remain to the credit of the state born of the October Revolution that it initiated a way out of the dangerous stalemate in which mankind was caught. The Soviet peace offensive and the peace initiative of the other socialist countries transformed the international situation. However, it has to be said that possession of the nuclear weapon was one of the main factors in the success of the Soviet initiative. By 1957 the Soviet Union was building inter-continental missiles with thermonuclear warheads. This was one of the chief reasons for the failure of the positions-of-strength and cold war policy. But not the only reason. Washington's cold war policy crumbled also—and this is important—because it failed to check the comprehensive development of the socialist countries, the advance of the world revolutionary movement and suppress the anti-imperialist movement in the third world, which is becoming stronger from year to year.

The United States has also found it more difficult to retain its influence over the other NATO powers, for Western Europe is increasingly breaking out of American economic and political tutelage. The West European nations no longer swallow the myth of "communist aggression," but they have a real fear of being embroiled in dangerous conflicts outside their continent as a result of Washington's reckless policy.

People in many parts of capitalist Europe look on with mounting resentment at the way Bonn is building up its influence and becoming the chief support point of U.S. imperialism in Europe. This and other factors are convincing West European nations that their interests call for cooperation, not enmity, with the socialist part of the continent.

America's global policy is heading for failure and this has induced Washington to shift to another, but no less dangerous strategy of local wars, aimed chiefly at holding back the spread of the national liberation movement.

That was the purpose behind the armed intervention in the Congo and in the Dominican Republic, behind the threats to Cuba, the barbarous aggression against the people of Vietnam, the instigation of war in the Middle East. The United States has become the world's gendarme. It has undertaken the unenviable job of protecting reactionary regimes. It is helping the Portuguese colonialists to crush the people of Angola and Mozambique, and encouraging the South African colonialists. It is engineering military-fascist coups like the recent one in Greece.

This policy is epitomized in Israel's aggression against the Arab states, launched in collusion with U.S. and British imperialism. The idea was to get rid of the anti-imperialist governments in Syria and Egypt, reverse the alignment of forces in this politically and strategically sensitive area and safeguard and advance the interests of the oil monopolies.

The Israeli aggression, though it placed the world before a new and extremely dangerous menace, resulted in a serious moral and political setback for the aggressor and in America's political isolation in the Arab world. The task now is to eliminate the consequences of the aggression, force Israel's withdrawal from occupied territory and condemn the aggression. For a long time to come the Middle East will be the scene of confrontation and conflict between the forces of imperialism and war and the forces of socialism, national freedom, progress and peace. Victory in this struggle is of decisive importance for the continued development of the international situation and the prevention of aggressive action by U.S. imperialism.

The statement issued by the leaders of the seven parties and governments of socialist countries at their Moscow meeting, in which our Party participated, shows how the conflict can be peacefully resolved. It formulates the only correct program of action for the governments of socialist countries and their Communist and workers' parties in re-establishing peace in the Middle East.

Our Party and government, the entire Polish people, vehemently denounced the Israeli aggression. We are in complete solidarity with the Arab countries which in their anti-imperialist fight for independence are resisting violence and defending ideals we cherish. We urge a peace based on inviolable frontiers and mutual respect of sovereign rights. That is a cardinal condition of peace and security.

In present-day circumstances, work for peace is inseparable from the struggle for national freedom and recognition of the sovereign rights of each nation to shape its destiny. Neo-colonialism and its defense by the imperialist powers holds out a clear danger of aggression, a danger to world peace.

The U.S. policy of intervention and local wars has stimulated closer unity of socialist and third-world countries. Close cooperation of these powerful forces can bar the road to aggression and prevent a *pax Americana* being imposed on the world.

It will require complex and comprehensive measures to compel imperialism to accept peaceful coexistence. And the effectiveness of these measures will depend on the resistance of the peoples throughout the world,

and above all, on the might of the socialist countries and their correct policy in a rapidly changing international situation. Today peaceful coexistence implies a pattern of international relations that will guarantee the security and sovereign equality of all states, while at the same time offering optimal international conditions for progressive development and reform at home. More, action for peaceful coexistence is the means by which the international situation can be transformed and the world set on a socialist path.

Unity of the socialist countries is the determining factor in the struggle for peace and security. In the two decades since the war, relations between these countries have gone through a profound evolution. The socialist countries are developing in widely different conditions and it is therefore not easy to achieve unity on all international problems. On the other hand, there is an imperative need for unity of views on key issues, without which there can be no unity of action. Any discrepancy between the national and international tasks of the socialist revolution might, in the long run, do damage not only to the socialist countries, but to the whole of mankind.

The desire to re-establish world communist solidarity and unity on a new basis can provide an additional impulse to cooperation by the Communist and Workers' parties on a regional scale. All the more so that, considering that we are living in one world, coexistence, even on a regional scale, will be a serious contribution to world peace and security and, consequently, will further the interests of the whole of mankind and of the communist movement.

These, indeed, were the aims pursued by the regional conference of Communist and Workers' parties in Karlovy Vary last April.

It brought together representatives of 24 Marxist parties in the socialist and capitalist part of Europe and has had far-reaching political implications. For, first, it formulated the parties' unanimous appraisal of the European situation, indicated the forces menacing peace and security in our continent and advanced a program for durable peace based on European collective security. The conference called on all European peace forces to unite for joint action.

Its program, calling for a Europe without military blocs and artificial barriers to all-inclusive cooperation of the capitalist and socialist countries, enjoys immense popularity. With the sole exception of the Federal Republic of Germany, all European states, notwithstanding difference in social system, base their relations on peaceful coexistence. There

are no differences between them that might jeopardize peace. Only the Federal Republic of Germany is committed to a policy that holds out a clear threat to European peace: it challenges existing frontiers, claims the right of exclusive representation for the entire German people, wants access to nuclear weapons.

The principal requisite for a European collective security system—and this is emphasized in the Karlovy Vary statement—is that all states should face the realities of post-war Europe. And this implies the recognition that existing frontiers are inviolable, particularly the Oder-Neisse line and the border between the two German states; acceptance of the existence of two sovereign and equal German states, the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany.

This constructive program stands every chance of winning the support of the peoples of Europe and most of its governments.

The Karlovy Vary conference has a very important relevance to the international communist movement also in another respect. Despite the movement's present difficulties, it demonstrated that international meetings of Communist and Workers' parties are not only necessary, but possible. It showed, too, that these conferences lead to the working out of a common position on the questions discussed.

Last, but not least, the Karlovy Vary conference demonstrated that even if not all invited parties participate, the decisions taken by such conferences are of vast importance for the international communist movement.

In the view of our Polish party, the time is ripe for preparatory measures for a world conference of Communist and Workers' parties.

Seen from the summit of this half-century of the October Revolution, one can fully appreciate the changes that have taken place in the world. We can clearly see the ascending line of socialism and the falling line of capitalism. The trend is clear enough: substantial contraction of imperialism's sphere of influence. The alignment of forces has changed sharply in favor of socialism. The socialist world system now includes 14 countries in Europe, Asia and America, accounts for more than 26 per cent of the earth's surface, over 35 per cent of its population, and about 40 per cent of its industrial production. And because of its territorial, manpower, military and economic potential, plus its ideological appeal, socialism, as Lenin foresaw, now exerts an increasingly decisive influence on the future of mankind and on the issue of war and peace.

The degree of this influence will be directly proportional to the degree of unity of the communist movement and, more especially, of the socialist parties in power.

Now, after 50 years of the Communist movement born of the victorious October Revolution, we can look back with pride on our record of achievement. It is living proof of the unity of the national and international tasks of the workers' movement proclaimed by the Revolution, a unity that raises mankind to higher forms of life in conditions of peace and security.

The October Revolution lights the way

BADAMYN LHAMSUREN

Alternate Member of the Politburo,
Secretary of the Central Committee,
Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party

THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION, a landmark in man's history, has done much to reshape the destiny of the oppressed peoples, rousing them to action against their oppressors, for freedom and independence. We owe it to the October Revolution that the working-class movement in the capitalist countries and the national liberation movement in the colonies and semi-colonies merged into the powerful stream of world revolution.

Mongolia was one of the first Eastern countries to embark on the path blazed by the October Revolution, the immediate influence of which, coupled with the all-round aid of the Soviet Republic, helped us effect the people's revolution, safeguard its gains against the class enemy and consummate the transition from feudalism to socialism.

At the turn of the century Mongolia ruled by a colonial feudal regime, was one of the most backward countries of the East. The national liberation struggle inspired by the first Russian revolution of 1905, put an end to the two hundred years of Manchu rule. But the fruits of liberation went to the feudal lords, who reinforced their political hold on the country and stepped up the exploitation of the people. The nation's craving for independence was in vain, however, due to the predatory policy of the imperialist powers. In effect, Outer Mongolia became a protectorate of Tsarist Russia.

National independence was, therefore, still the focal issue. The Russian Communists headed by Lenin were the only political force in Russia that backed the Mongolians' fight for liberation.

Lenin's party denounced the grasping policy of the Tsarist government. Its nationalities program championed freedom and the right to self-determination of all oppressed peoples.

"We Great-Russian workers," Lenin wrote in 1916, "must demand from our government

that it get out of Mongolia, Turkestan, Persia . . . We shall exert every effort to foster association and merger with the Mongolians, Persians, Indians and Egyptians. We believe it is our duty and in our interest to do this, for otherwise socialism in Europe will not be secure" (*Collected Works*, Eng. ed., Vol. 23, pp. 66, 67).

After the October Revolution Lenin's party put its program into effect. Annuling all unequal treaties, the Soviet Republic rejected the imperialist policy of the Tsar, the Russian bourgeoisie and the landowners.

In a message to the government and people of autonomous Mongolia in August 1919, the Soviet government set out the substance of Lenin's Decree on Peace, denouncing the imperialist powers for annexing or keeping in subjection weaker peoples. "The people of Russia," the message read, "have annulled all treaties with the Japanese and Chinese governments concerning Mongolia. Mongolia is a free country. The Russian advisers, Tsarist consuls, bankers and tycoons who hold Mongolia captive by force and gold . . . must be driven out. All power and justice must belong to Mongolians. No foreigner has any right to meddle in Mongolia's affairs. Countermanning the 1913 agreement, the independent state of Mongolia may communicate directly with all other nations without the tutelage of either Peking or Petrograd. Announcing this to the people of Mongolia, the Soviet government is offering Mongolia forthwith to establish diplomatic relations with the Russian people."

Alarmed by the October Revolution, the rulers of autonomous Mongolia refused the Soviet offer of friendship and joined the enemies of the revolution in hostile acts against the Soviet Republic. But the response among the people was immense. Their sympathies for the October Revolution were sti-

mulated by developments at home. At the end of 1919 Outer Mongolia, betrayed by the feudal princes, was overrun by Chinese militarists. The autonomy was trampled in the dust. The Chinese occupation regime, followed by that of the Russian White Guards, and the reign of terror they unleashed, evoked a fresh surge of anger and resistance. It was clear that the only people from whom the Mongolians could expect help in their fight for freedom were the Russian workers.

In the early twenties, under the revolutionizing impact of October, conditions ripened for the fusion of our national liberation movement with the victorious struggle of the Soviet workers and peasants.

The *arat* revolutionaries under Sukhe-Bator, who worked in close association with the revolutionary Russian working class, were the most consistent of the fighters for Mongolia's emancipation.

The political organization of Mongolian revolutionaries went through the following formative phases: revolutionary circles during the foreign occupation, merging of these circles into a single organization, establishment of contacts with Russian emigré revolutionaries resident in Mongolia, the visit to Soviet Russia of *arat* revolutionaries who established close relations with the Communist International and the Soviet government, and the meeting with Lenin.

The talk with Lenin in November 1920 had a powerful impact. Lenin demonstrated that the only correct course of action for the people of Mongolia was to fight for national and economic independence in concert with the Russian workers and peasants. To succeed in their struggle, he pointed out, the Mongolians needed a people's party with a class approach and the tactics of mass struggle. When founding their party, and in all their later work, the Mongolian revolutionaries followed this sound advice.

The People's Revolutionary Party was formally established at its first congress in March 1921. The program adopted at the congress contained a Marxist-Leninist appraisal of world events and the international situation of Mongolia, expressing solidarity with the workers of Soviet Russia and other countries. Political independence and transfer of power to the people were defined as the main aim of the people's revolution, and the ways and means of achieving this aim with the aid and support of the Russian and other workers were outlined.

The congress served notice that the people now had a militant vanguard, equal to the task of heading the revolutionary struggle by

virtue of its close ties with the world Communist movement. The founding of a party built on the ideological principles of the working class in a country with no working class of its own, where the people were chiefly peasants, was a direct result of the revolutionizing influence on Mongolia of the October Revolution.

The Party rallied the progressive elements in the country, built up a people's army to fight the foreign invaders and home reactionaries. Defeating the Chinese militarists at Maichan on March 18, 1921, the revolution gained a base in the country's north for further action.

Soviet successes in Siberia encouraged the Mongolians in their fight against the roaming White Guard troops. Lenin pointed out at the Second Congress of the Communist Organizations of the East in 1919 that "what the Red Army has accomplished, its struggle and the history of its victory, will be of colossal, epochal significance for all the peoples of the East. It will show them that, weak as they may be, and invincible as may seem the power of the European oppressors, who in the struggle employ all the marvels of technology and of the military art—nevertheless, a revolutionary war waged by oppressed peoples, if it really succeeds in arousing the millions of working and exploited people, harbors such potentialities, such miracles, that the emancipation of the peoples of the East is now quite practicable, from the standpoint not only of the prospects of the international revolution, but also of the direct military experience acquired in Asia, in Siberia, the experience of the Soviet Republic, which has suffered the armed invasion of all the powerful imperialist countries" (*Collected Works*, Eng. ed., Vol. 30, pp. 153-54).

On clearing much of Siberia and the Soviet Far East of interventionist troops, Soviet Russia responded to the request of our Party, helping the Mongolians against the White Guards, who planned to use the country as a staging area for an attack against the Soviet Republic. The Whites were wiped out in battles fought jointly by the newly-formed Mongolian Revolutionary Army and Red Army units in the spring and summer of 1921.

This put an end to foreign occupation. The former autonomous government, a puppet in the hands of White Guard General Ungern, was replaced with a people's government.

The people's revolution, part of the world revolutionary process, was a turning point in Mongol history. The colonial regime was abolished, an independent people's state emerged in its place, with Mongolia dropping

out of the imperialist colonial system and joining the new socialist world born of the October Revolution.

Lenin had high praise for the people's revolution. To a delegation that came to Moscow in autumn 1921 to establish friendly Mongol-Soviet relations, he said: "Although Mongolia is a cattle-breeding country and the bulk of her people are nomad herdsmen, she has made impressive headway in her revolution and, moreover, consolidated her success by founding a people's revolutionary party" (*Collected Works, Eng. ed., Vol. 44, pp. 232-233*).

After winning independence, the revolution had to be developed in depth. The people had inherited an extremely backward and dislocated economy, consisting mainly of extensive nomad husbandry. Predatory foreign capital, controlling the Mongolian market, stunted the productive forces, and the secular and ecclesiastic feudals, who claimed numerous hereditary privileges and owned most of the country's wealth, continued to exploit the *arat* herdsmen. Downtrodden politically and economically, the masses were also held in the thralls of the lamaist church.

To advance the revolution and effect deep-going socio-economic reconstruction, the Party—admitted to the Comintern as an associate member—took its bearings from the ideas of October, from communist policy and tactics, adapting them to the conditions of our country. The Party tackled problems whose solution, as Lenin aptly said, "you will not find in any textbook on communism," namely, the problems of arousing "the working masses to revolutionary activity, to independent action and to organization, regardless of the level they have reached; to translate the true communist doctrine, which was intended for the Communists of the more advanced countries, into the language of every people; to carry out those practical tasks which must be carried out immediately, and to join the proletarians of other countries in a common struggle" (*Collected Works, Eng. ed., Vol. 30, p. 162*).

Our Party proved equal to these difficult tasks thanks to its close alliance and solidarity with the Communist International and the CPSU.

Even before our revolution triumphed, the Party put down in its program that "matters of foreign and home policy, like those of religion and of changing ingrained customs, traditions and morals, will be dealt with by our Party in the spirit of the times and in accordance with the changes in world affairs to promote the welfare and progress of the Mongolian people. As for the outdated and

wasteful customs and harmful traditions that go against the spirit of the times, they will be abolished in due course . . . if possible by mild and, in extreme cases, by decisive means" (Choybalsan, *Outline History of the Mongolian People's Revolution*).

The Party geared its policy to the basic interests of the herdsmen, striving to elevate their political awareness and revolutionary activity.

To consolidate the gains of the revolution, the Party's tactical line was to unite all social forces, for many patriotic feudals and officials had joined the anti-imperialist struggle alongside the *arat* masses. The monarchy was therefore preserved in the first three years after the revolution, though the monarch's secular powers were substantially curtailed. In the meantime, measures were taken to dislodge and destroy the political and economic pillars of feudalism. The privileges of the feudal princes were abolished, serfdom and the feudal system of duties annulled, debt to foreign merchants and usurers cancelled, with the government assuming control over trade and finance.

Feudal local administrations were replaced by democratically elected bodies—a revolutionary measure which stimulated the political activity of the people. The *khurals* created during the revolution were a variety of the peasant councils or councils of exploited recommended by Lenin for countries with pre-capitalist conditions.

Following up the big political, economic and social changes, the Grand Khural in 1924 proclaimed Mongolia a people's republic and adopted the country's first constitution, formalizing the gains of the revolution and the democratic rights and freedoms of its citizens.

Social reconstruction in the early years of people's rule brought Mongolia to a stage where it had to decide on its future development. Acting on Lenin's teaching about the possibility of backward countries by-passing the capitalist phase in their transition to socialism, the Party charted a clear revolutionary perspective. Its Third Congress in 1924 set the country's development on non-capitalist lines, with the Fourth Congress, held the following year, working out the concrete program.

What made non-capitalist development possible was that the people carried out their revolution in the new historical environment created by the October Revolution, and they enjoyed the aid of a socialist country when setting up and consolidating people's democracy.

In the new stage of the revolution, the main

force behind the reconstruction consisted not only of the class of *arats*, but of the young working class and intelligentsia which had risen from its midst.

In our Republic Lenin's teaching about the possibility of backward peoples by-passing capitalism on the road to socialism has been borne out in practice. Our country has accumulated revolutionary experience in reconstructing society along non-capitalist lines. Profound socio-economic changes of both a general democratic and socialist nature have been effected over the years. Because of the country's extreme backwardness, the transition to building socialism, by-passing capitalism, took up the relatively long time of thirty-odd years.

In the overall view, the main content of this process in terms of the economy was to strip the feudals of their economic power in the interest of the *arats*, end the country's dependence on foreign capital, develop the private initiative of *arat* farms at a definite stage while restricting and gradually ousting the burgeoning capitalist elements, converting them gradually to socialist beginnings and, at once, promoting the socialist system through state-operated industry, farming, transport, credit and finance, and trade.

In the political context the non-capitalist way meant abolition of the feudal class, formation of a working class and intelligentsia, previously non-existent in Mongolia, consolidation of the people's state as the revolutionary democratic dictatorship of *arat* herdsmen and its gradual development into an authority exercising the functions of the dictatorship of the proletariat and promoting genuine socialist democracy.

In the cultural sphere progress was achieved by removing the influence of the lamaist church, combating religious prejudice, asserting the socialist ideology and carrying forward the cultural revolution, giving the people access to science and culture.

This was the main content of the non-capitalist path travelled by the nation under the guidance of our Party. In democratic and socialist reconstruction the Party made use of the general guidelines of Marxism-Leninism, which it adapted to the national and historical peculiarities of our country. Despite the many unique features of our struggle for the non-capitalist way, our experience bears out that, given the existence of the socialist camp, for backward peoples the content and principles of historical progress are common and international.

Peasants, who comprise the overwhelming majority in countries with pre-capitalist social

relations, are the main revolutionary force in the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal struggle. The Mongolian revolution and the national liberation movement elsewhere have confirmed Lenin's tenet that the masses can be roused to independent political thinking and activity also in places where practically no working class exists. It is to be noted, however, that our Party was careful not to over-rate the role and capacity of the non-proletarian mass in effecting social, especially socialist, reconstruction. Ingrained nationalist, religious and other survivals act as a drag on class consciousness, and guidance by a revolutionary party adhering to scientific socialism is, therefore, of crucial importance during the transition to socialism.

Our Party surmounted the tremendous difficulties created by the resistance of class enemies and various distortions of policy by opportunist elements. It upheld its Marxist-Leninist line in confrontations with Right opportunism, which endeavored to divert the country from the correct path, and Left opportunism, which, ignoring the country's specific conditions, led to mistakes and distortions.

Lenin based his proposition about backward nations by-passing capitalism in the transition to socialism on fraternal bonds with the victorious workers of the foremost countries and the latter's aid and support. The validity of this has been proved by the relationships of the Mongol and Soviet peoples. Friendship and cooperation with the world's first socialist country, and its all-round aid, have been decisive in our winning and consolidating freedom and independence, bridging the backwardness and building the new life. The brotherly alliance of our two countries is a model of the new type of relations between large and small countries, based on genuine equality, mutual aid and on the Leninist principles of proletarian internationalism.

Lenin censured those who identified internationalism with mere recognition of equality of nations, ignoring the other all-important aspect—the unity and solidarity of the revolutionary forces. And the loyalty of every contingent of the world Communist movement to the Leninist principles of solidarity is doubly important in our time, when the impact of the October Revolution has raised proletarian internationalism to a new level. Conscious of its duty, our Party has always worked for the unity and solidarity of all the revolutionary forces of our time on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, exposing and combating the chauvinist policy and splitting activity of the Mao

group, which has betrayed the cause of proletarian internationalism.

By virtue of correct Party guidance and devotion to Marxism-Leninism and the ideas of the October Revolution, Mongolia has accomplished its history-making transition from feudalism to socialism. In contemporary Mongolia socialism is a reality.

Our Fifteenth Congress a year ago summar-

ized the nation's achievements and adopted a new—our fourth—program, outlining the tasks that will bring about the complete victory of socialism in our country. Our people are marching forward confidently under the leadership of their militant vanguard, the People's Revolutionary Party, along the trail that is being blazed to communism by the world's first socialist country.

KHRISTO KHRISTOV

Bulgarian Communist Party

THE DEVELOPMENT of Bulgarian-Soviet friendship falls into three distinct periods: the first, the pre-October, when contact was established between the Bulgarian and the Russian revolutionary movements; the second, which covers the period from the October revolution in Russia to the victory of the September 9, 1944, insurrection in Bulgaria, and the third, the period of building socialism in Bulgaria.

This friendship between the two countries has deep historical roots in the common Slav origin of the peoples, in the common features of their spiritual development in the Middle Ages and in the cultural exchanges between them. Friendship was further cemented in the years of Bulgaria's national-liberation struggle when Russia came to the aid of our people, helping them to achieve independence in 1878 and to carry out the anti-feudal, bourgeois-democratic revolution.

However, despite the traditional bonds linking the two peoples their friendship was not given full scope under the bourgeois system. Relations between the young Bulgarian state and Russia became strained and were completely undermined in 1915 when Bulgaria, despite popular opposition, allied herself with Germany in the war against Russia. Both the class interests of the Bulgarian bourgeoisie and the reactionary policy of Russian Tsarism were responsible for this.

The October Revolution radically changed things. It restored and deepened the friendship between our two countries and imparted a new quality to it. After October, the friendship began to develop on the basis of proletarian internationalism, drawing strength from the common, joint struggle of the peoples of Bulgaria and the Soviet Union to overthrow capitalism and build a new, socialist society.

From its very inception the revolutionary working-class movement of Bulgaria established close relations with the revolutionary movement of the Russian working class. Dimitr Blagoyev, the founder of scientific socialism in Bulgaria, received his revolutionary baptism in St. Petersburg, where he formed one of the first Marxist organizations, known in the history of the CPSU as the Blagoyev group. These bonds were further cemented during the 1905 revolution in Russia.

After the October Revolution, Bulgarian Communist groups were formed in Petrograd, Moscow and other cities of Soviet Russia. They actively campaigned to enlist Bulgarians in Russia at the time—prisoners of war, emigrants and settlers (there were several hundred thousand Bulgarians in Russia at the time), in the struggle to consolidate and defend the Soviet power.

Influenced by the October Revolution and by the Tesnyak party—which subsequently affiliated to the Third International and called itself the Bulgarian Communist Party—ever larger sections of the working people joined the revolutionary movement.

The Bulgarian Communist Party vigorously opposed the crusade against Soviet Russia and the aid extended to the interventionists by the Bulgarian bourgeoisie. It conducted propaganda among the Wrangel troops stationed in Bulgaria. In this work it was supported by the Agrarian Union which had considerable influence among the peasants.

This unity of action by the two parties in support of the Soviet people and to establish political and economic relations between our two countries did not suit the interests of the Entente. Moreover, the spread of the revolutionary movement in Bulgaria endangered the class rule of the bourgeoisie.

To forestall this danger a military-fascist coup was staged on June 9, 1923, which overthrew the Stamboliski government. The workers and peasants replied with an armed uprising which, however, was brutally suppressed. Three months later came the September uprising, the first anti-fascist uprising in the world.

The insurrection met with a wide response in all countries where people were fighting for democratic rights and liberties, it evoked an international movement in support of the working people of Bulgaria. After the crushing of the uprising hundreds of revolutionaries, savagely persecuted by the fascist government, emigrated to the Soviet Union where they were given every aid by the government and the people. It became their second homeland. This was yet another expression of the deepening Bulgarian-Soviet revolutionary friendship.

Although the defeat of the September uprising was a heavy blow to the revolutionary forces of our country it did not halt the revolutionary movement. Our people fought a long and persevering battle against the fascist dictatorship, guided by the ideas and example of the October Revolution. The fascist regime made it well-nigh impossible to spread the ideas of October and of friendship between our two countries. Under pressure of the imperialist Entente, Bulgaria joined the ideological, political and economic crusade against the Soviet Union. All manifestations of sympathy with the Soviet people were brutally suppressed.

But despite the fascist terror the tradition of Bulgarian-Soviet friendship was kept alive and popularized by such men of the Bulgarian intelligentsia as Georgi Bakalov, Todor Pavlov, Todor Samodumov and Savva Ganovsky. Revolutionary propaganda was conducted by various organizations established under the leadership of the Party. A broad movement was started to send worker-peasant delegations to the Soviet Union. An Association of Friends of the Soviet Union was organized in Sofia in June 1932. Its members included leading artists, writers and public figures. The Progressive Writers' Union, formed in the same year, did much to disseminate the ideas of Bulgarian-Soviet friendship.

One of the biggest mass organizations was the Bulgarian-Soviet Friendship Society, founded in Sofia in September 1934. Within six years it had a membership of 50,000 and branches in 42 towns and 14 villages. It popularized Soviet achievements in science, culture and the economy through lectures, film shows and Russian language studies.

In the pre-war years the Friendship Society's

most important political activity was the campaign urging the government to accept the Soviet proposal to conclude a Soviet-Bulgarian treaty of friendship and mutual aid. Hundreds of thousands of working people of town and country participated, anxious to save their country from the conflagration of World War II. However, the bourgeois government rejected the Soviet proposal, thereby predetermining Bulgaria's fate as the future ally of Hitler.

Bulgaria's adherence to the tripartite pact and the outbreak of war against the Soviet Union on June 22, 1941, fundamentally changed the Bulgarian scene both as regards home and foreign policy. The day war was declared against the Soviet Union the Central Committee of the Party called upon our people to resist the Hitler invader and the Bulgarian quislings.

A broad partisan movement started, headed by the Communist Party. Patriots returning from the Soviet Union joined the armed struggle. Soviet prisoners of war transported via Bulgaria were helped to escape. Many Soviet citizens and Red Army men fought in the ranks of the partisans. In the Soviet Union, hundreds of Bulgarian political emigrants, their sons and daughters, fought in the war against the invaders.

The struggle of our partisans and the people's resistance to the monarcho-fascist regime compelled King Boris and the government to abandon the idea of sending Bulgarian soldiers to the Eastern Front.

On September 9, 1944, as a result of a general insurrection and the support of the Red Army, which decided the successful outcome of the struggle, our people overthrew the monarcho-fascist dictatorship and established the democratic rule of the people. Bulgaria took the road of building a new, socialist society.

In the autumn of 1944 the Red Army forestalled the occupation of Bulgaria by Anglo-American and Turkish troops which had been decided upon on the eve of September 9 by representatives of monarcho-fascist Bulgaria, Britain and the United States. On the initiative of the Soviet government, an armistice was concluded on October 28, 1944, between Bulgaria and the countries of the anti-Hitler coalition.

The Soviet government rendered invaluable aid to democratic Bulgaria also when the peace treaty was signed in Paris. It was thanks primarily to its decisive support that the peace conference rejected monarchist Greece's claims to Bulgarian territory, and compelled it substantially to reduce the amount of reparations it demanded.

The armistice and the peace treaty put an end to Bulgaria's international isolation and enabled her people, who had fought against fascism and were in no way responsible for the crimes of the monarcho-fascist regime, to take their place among the peace-loving and progressive nations of the world. These treaties also precluded the danger of interference by the Western powers in Bulgaria's economic and political affairs.

After September 9, 1944, Bulgarian-Soviet friendship found expression in our country's active participation in the anti-fascist war. Bulgarian troops joined with the Third Ukrainian Front and took part in the liberation of Yugoslavia and Hungary. Bulgarian casualties totalled more than 30,000 killed, wounded and missing.

The Soviet Union which had itself suffered so terribly from the fascist invasion again came to the aid of Bulgaria when her war-ravaged economy had to be put on its feet. It concluded a trade agreement with our country in March 1945 under which Bulgaria received raw materials, industrial plant and farm machinery.

In March 1948 a Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance was signed between our two countries for a 20-year period. Bulgaria signed similar treaties with the other European socialist countries, thereby ending completely her isolation on the international arena, and ensuring her national independence. These treaties and the existence of the socialist world system are sure guarantees of our national independence. Since the late forties Bulgarian-Soviet friendship has been

developing within the framework of friendship with all the socialist countries.

A most striking manifestation of Bulgarian-Soviet friendship is the aid of the Soviet Union in building our socialist industry and in reconstructing agriculture along socialist lines. This friendship is manifested, as in earlier years, also in science, art and culture. Here mention should be made of the particularly active part played by the All-Bulgaria Committee of Friendship with the Soviet Union. It is aptly called "all-Bulgaria" for it corresponds to the scale of the movement for friendship between our two peoples, which has gained momentum since the triumph of the socialist revolution in Bulgaria.

The history of nations knows of few such examples of sincere friendship as that between our two countries.

Our people highly appreciate and treasure this friendship. They are proud of it as they are of their friendship with the other socialist countries. The victory of socialism in Bulgaria was achieved by her working class, her working people. But it was made possible thanks primarily to cooperation with all the socialist countries and with the Soviet Union in the first place.

The building of the new Bulgaria and her progress are an example for all countries seeking to establish people's rule and where the working people are educated in the spirit of socialist patriotism and proletarian internationalism, in the spirit of the ideas of the October Revolution. In this respect the example of Bulgarian-Soviet friendship can be said to have not only a local significance, but also a general historical significance.

GHEORGHE UNC Communist Party of Rumania

THROUGHOUT THE WORLD, the 50th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution is being celebrated as an outstanding and inspiring occasion, as a landmark in world history.

In Rumania the jubilee is being marked by numerous public meetings and scientific and cultural gatherings arranged in accordance with a decision of the Communist Party Central Committee.

Prepared and carried out under the guidance of the Bolshevik Party and its leader, Lenin, the October Revolution established working-class power on one-sixth of the earth's surface. It signified the birth of a new,

socialist society. It opened a new era—the era of mankind's transition from capitalism to socialism, of the triumph of Marxism-Leninism on a world scale, of the realization of man's ideal of freedom. Scientific socialism, which for decades inspired the proletariat in its battle against exploitation, found practical confirmation in the October Revolution.

In the half-century since then the Soviet Union has been the scene of deep-going social change. A new, socialist system has been built; new economic levels have been reached, and today the Soviet Union is a great industrial power. The vitality of its new social system was most clearly manifested in the

Great Patriotic War, in the years when the Soviet Union bore the brunt of the struggle against the Hitler war machine and by its heroic effort won world-wide admiration and gratitude.

The ideas of the October Revolution engendered revolutionary enthusiasm in every part of the world; they were a clarion call to struggle for freedom and progress, for social and national emancipation.

The revolution opened a new page in the victorious advance of socialism. Workers and progressives everywhere demonstrated their sympathy and solidarity with the Russian proletariat, its Communist Party and Soviet government. Epitomized in this was the all-powerful feeling of proletarian internationalism.

In 1917, when the Russian proletariat carried out the socialist revolution, the Rumanian labor movement could look back on more than a half century of experience. It maintained international contacts and played a significant role in the country's social and political life.

Our Social-Democratic Labor Party, founded in 1893, fought for the general democratic demands of the workers and all working people, explaining the need to replace the bourgeois system by socialism. Firmly embodied in its program was the principle of proletarian internationalism, and the party was in constant touch with the world labor movement.

Rumanian Socialists maintained ties with the First International, a branch of which had been started in the town of Timisoara. Rumanians fought in defense of the Paris Commune, disseminated and popularized the works of Marx and Engels, were associated with revolutionaries in Russia, France, Bulgaria and other countries. This was indicative of the internationalist sentiment which, from the very outset, strongly influenced our Socialist movement. Rumanian Socialists helped to transport illegal Bolshevik literature to and from Russia.

At the turn of the century Rumania was still at the rudimentary stage of capitalist development. And though industry was developing at an accelerated rate, the overall economic level was still low. Moreover, the country was the scene of fierce market rivalry between foreign monopoly interests. More than half of the farmland was in the big estates. A considerable part of the country was still under foreign rule.

In the early 1900's, these factors combined to merge into a single stream the liberation struggle of the working class (which had begun much earlier), the peasants' fight for land, and the movement for national liberation in the foreign-ruled provinces. One of the high-

lights of the struggle was the 1907 peasant rising, supported by the working class.

Our workers were in full solidarity with the Russian proletariat in its fight against tsarism in 1905. They gave moral and material support to the crew of the revolutionary cruiser *Potemkin* which sought refuge in Constanza. They had an active share in the campaigns conducted by Socialists of neighboring countries in the period between the two Balkan wars.

In 1914, the Social-Democratic Party vigorously opposed the imperialist war, organizing anti-war campaigns which reached their culminating point in the June 1916 Galati demonstration, brutally suppressed by the government. The Rumanian Socialists initiated and organized the Inter-Balkan Socialist Anti-War Conference (Bucharest, July 1915) and took an active part in the Zimmerwald Conference. The Rumanian labor press published all its documents in full, together with articles on the Bolshevik's revolutionary struggle, Lenin and his writings, the activities of revolutionary leaders in Germany, France and other countries.

The reverberations of the October Revolution in Rumania should be seen against the general background of social ferment sharply aggravated by the world war.

In the exploiting classes and the monarchy the Revolution inspired fear; in the working people it inspired confidence, stimulated their struggle, held out the hope that they could emulate the example set by the Russian proletariat.

True to the spirit of internationalism, Rumanian workers were unanimous in voicing their solidarity with the victorious workers of Russia and contributing to the defense of Russia's revolutionary gains. This found its supreme expression in participation in the armed defense of the young socialist state.

Many Rumanian factories had been evacuated to Russia during the war and thousands of workers found themselves on Russian soil, in addition to the many thousands of prisoners of war from Transylvania who had served in the Austro-Hungarian army.

In the autumn of 1917, a strong Rumanian revolutionary center was set up in Odessa. These were many members of the Social-Democratic Party in Odessa, including some of its prominent leaders — M. G. Bujor, A. Nicolau, I. Dicescu-Dic, A. Zalic, and others — and they directed the activity of the thousands of Rumanians along revolutionary lines. The Rumanian Military-Revolutionary Committee formed armed detachments to fight in defense of the October Revolution.

In January and February 1918, Rumanian

revolutionary battalions fought side by side with the Red Guard to establish Soviet rule in Odessa and adjacent areas.

In 1918, many Transylvanian Rumanians joined with Rumanian evacuees to form new Red Army units, and many joined the International Brigade. A Red Army regiment formed in Astrakhan province had a unit commanded by the Rumanian Petre Constantinescu; elsewhere, in the Ukraine, a regiment was made up entirely of Rumanians.

There were many Rumanians also among the 2,800 soldiers who made up the international division formed in Odessa on May 5, 1919.

The October Revolution united the masses, under working-class leadership, in defense of the Soviet state, in which they saw the realization of their cherished ideals. In fact, defense of Soviet Russia became an element of their own fight against exploitation and oppression and stimulated their determination to establish the new order on Rumanian soil too.

The class struggle spread rapidly in 1918. The occupation regime and the state of siege became much harsher; the people were subjected to unbearable hardship. In this situation, the triumph of the Russian proletariat met with wide response and infused new strength in the movement for the workers' demands.

Taking advantage of the breakdown of the occupation regime—the result of unabating popular struggle and repeated reverses at the front—the workers went into action, notably in the capital and in the oilfields. In Bucharest, in the Prahova and Jiu valleys, and in other parts of the country the movement culminated in the emergence of Workers' Councils.

The victorious revolution in Russia and the collapse of the Hapsburg Empire were major factors in these mass actions for democratic rights and freedoms, which merged with the struggle for national liberation. The Transylvanian Rumanians were drawn into the movement, and this strengthened the national unity of the Rumanian people.

Economic dislocation and rapidly deteriorating living standards sharpened all the social and economic contradictions of the bourgeois-landlord regime. In 1920, all these factors were focussed in the new revolutionary upsurge and the heightened militancy of the workers.

The powerful demonstration in Bucharest on December 13, 1918, numerous strikes, meetings and outdoor rallies, in the course of which the people took possession of the streets, were conclusive evidence that this was an organized movement by a proletariat

determined to win democratic rights and freedoms and re-orient public and political life in a way that would accord with its interests.

The December 13 demonstration was suppressed, but this could not stem the revolutionary wave, which continued to spread, involving hundreds of thousands of people. According to official data, there were 250 major strikes in 1919, and two of them, the summer railway and oil stoppages, involved more than 50,000 workers.

The spirit of October could be felt in all sections of Rumanian society. Even spokesmen of the ruling class were obliged to admit that the social unrest was deeply rooted.

There is, for instance, this statement by the Prime Minister of the day about the 1918 demonstrations: "They are powerful demonstrations. Today I saw one on Victoria Street. The marchers carried red flags and there were shouts of 'Long Live the Russian Revolution!'"

These years of revolutionary upsurge brought big sections of the working people into the labor organizations. By 1920, the Socialist Party became a powerful mass organization with a membership of about 100,000; trade union membership was more than 200,000; many recruits were made for the Socialist youth organizations; more labor papers were published.

There was a parallel process of ideological and political struggle between diverse trends within the labor movement. The Left was gaining in strength. There was much more interest, both among the Socialist leadership and the rank and file, in Marxist-Leninist theory. In Rumania, as throughout the international labor movement, the October Revolution exerted a profound influence on the process of ideological differentiation. More works of Lenin analyzing the experience of the October Revolution were published.

A strong trend developed in the Socialist Party in 1919 for reorganization into a Communist Party and affiliation with the Third International.

The Socialist Party's Statement of Principles (December 1918) was fully in keeping with its internationalist policy. It proclaimed "solidarity with the Communist Party of Russia and with all the Socialist revolutionary parties of the world."

Meetings, demonstrations, strikes and other solidarity actions in support of Soviet Russia were reported from every part of the country. There was also a vocal demand to end Rumania's participation in the imperialist armed intervention against Soviet Hungary. The Red International Regiment formed in Budapest and composed of Russians, Czechs, Slovaks,

Serbs, Germans, Italians and Ukrainians, had a Rumanian battalion.

In response to an appeal of the Rumanian Socialist Party our workers took part in the worldwide political strike of July 21, 1919, called by the Communist International as a token of solidarity with Soviet Russia and the Hungarian proletarian revolution.

Labor's campaign for good-neighbor relations with Soviet Russia in the early part of 1920 was joined by a number of leading democratic-minded and pro-socialist intellectuals. They contributed articles to the press urging negotiations with the Soviet government.

The Democratic-Bloc Vaida government, which came to power in December 1919, found itself obliged to yield to public pressure and contact the Soviet government with a view to normalizing relations. Provision was made for a Rumanian-Soviet conference, but this was torpedoed by the new government that took over on March 30, 1920, and contacts were severed. The King and his conservative supporters brought General Averescu to power.

The position of Soviet Russia was becoming more and more difficult. It was attacked on April 25, 1920, by landlord and bourgeois-ridden Poland, assisted by the Entente imperialists, and in the South it had to beat back the whiteguard armies of Wrangel.

The Avarescu government carried through a number of reforms, mainly in agrarian relations, but pursued a policy of suppression towards the labor movement. The workers retaliated by a resolute counter-offensive, involving strikes and powerful demonstrations which, on October 20, developed into a general strike. This was the first time Rumania's entire working class rose in action against its exploiters.

This and other labor actions stressed the need for a revolutionary party capable of organizing and leading the proletariat in the fulfillment of its historic mission.

Meanwhile, the workers continued their Hands-Off-Soviet-Russia campaign through a series of public rallies and demonstrations, demanding peaceful and good-neighbor relations. Socialist and democratic-minded members of parliament took up the defense of the Soviet Republic.

Faced with this situation, the government announced that Rumania would remain neutral in the Soviet-Polish conflict. That statement, historian N. Igora told parliament

on August 18, 1920, was "received with a feeling of satisfaction by the entire nation."

* * *

Our Communist Party, founded in May 1921, has always been true to the cause of the Rumanian people and has always held aloft the banner of international working-class solidarity. The inaugural congress reorganized the Socialist Party into the Rumanian Communist Party and adopted a special resolution expressing "support and profound admiration for the (Russian) proletariat."

Throughout its history, the Rumanian Communist Party has combined patriotism with proletarian internationalism. It consistently urged solidarity with the workers of various countries, sent volunteers to defend Republican Spain, demonstrated its solidarity with Nazi-subjected peoples. Many Rumanian Communists and patriots fought in the ranks of guerrilla fighters in the Soviet Union, France, Czechoslovakia and Belgium.

The solidarity and sympathy shown us by fraternal parties were a powerful support and encouragement in the revolutionary struggle of our Party and working class.

When the country was under a military-fascist dictatorship, occupied by the German army and drawn into the war on Germany's side, the Communist Party, as the true spokesman of the people, made every effort to get Rumania to withdraw from the war and join sides with the USSR against Nazi Germany. We called on the masses to fight for a free, democratic and independent Rumania.

Having united all the anti-Hitler forces, the Communist party prepared and carried out the national anti-fascist rising of August 1944. This was an historic event; it signified Rumania's transition to a new social system.

Led by the Communist Party, the people are working devotedly to complete the building of socialism. At the same time, they are fulfilling their internationalist duty, thereby helping to strengthen the socialist world system and all the forces combating imperialism and working for peace. Our Communist Party has an active share in strengthening the unity of the international Communist and workers movement, which it considers a prime duty.

In this half-centenary year of the October Revolution the world revolutionary process is gaining in strength and scope; the ideas of communism are winning acceptance among millions. And in this we have a vivid demonstration of the grandeur and significance of the Great October Revolution.

October and the West European labor movement

JACQUES DUCLOS

Member of the Political Bureau,
Central Committee, Communist Party of France

THE FRENCH COMMUNIST Party is fully aware of what it and the French and international labor movement owe to the October Revolution. And we are proud to take part in this symposium dedicated to its 50th anniversary.

In my contribution, I propose to describe, in general outline, how the October Revolution—which we regarded as the workers' revenge for the defeat of the Paris Commune—became the starting point of a revival of the workers' movement, undermined by the Social-Democrat reformist leaders' "Holy Alliance" with the bourgeoisie.

I propose, also, to describe how the Revolution was received by the imperialist element in France, which feared for its Russian investments and was keenly alive to the danger implicit in the Russian example.

And, of course, I shall describe how the French workers welcomed the October Revolution and, later, the revolution in Germany and the Soviet revolution in Hungary.

These are all subjects that have held my interest since youth. I studied them anew recently in working on a book, "October and France," which I have dedicated to the memory of the great Lenin, the Bolshevik Party and all those who carried to victory the revolution that changed the world and ushered in a new era in human history.

I shall also deal briefly with the way the Revolution accentuated and sharpened the contradictions in the imperialist system and gave workers the world over confidence in their strength and future.

Lastly, I wish to recall some of the lessons of the October Revolution in the light of Marxism-Leninism, a doctrine that has stood the crucial test of time.

You will understand, I am sure why I emphasize that the astounding changes of the past few decades began with the October Revolution. And you will appreciate that if today we can foresee the transition to socialism by means other than those employed in October 1917, we owe that too to the men and women who carried out the Revolution.

They have earned our eternal gratitude. That is why people everywhere are celebrating the golden jubilee of this great revolution, carried through under Lenin's leadership. That is why all eyes are now fixed on the Soviet Union: its past should be seen in the context of the problems of today and the lessons that follow from the momentous events—by far the most significant of our age—of half a century ago.

The October Revolution was, without doubt, the workers' revenge for the defeat of the Paris Commune which, for 72 days in 1871, stood out as the embodiment of the hopes and aspirations of the forward-looking socialists in the working-class movement.

But the Paris Commune had only an isolated and besieged city in which to carry out its experiment. The October Revolution had an incomparably broader field of action—the world's biggest empire which, however, was the weakest link in the imperialist chain.

In those distant days many were inclined to prophesy a short life for the experiment started by Lenin, that greatest revolutionary of all times, in whom the scholar and the man of action were so harmoniously blended.

The revolution, the bourgeoisie maintained, would fall under the blows struck at it—they would make things unbearably difficult for the Russian working class and people.

The October Revolution made socialism a flesh-and-blood reality. And looking back at the magnitude of the victories won in this half century, we can well visualize the victories that lie ahead. They will open to emancipated mankind the heartening prospect of a Communist society.

In the early days of Soviet rule France's policy-makers pinned all their hopes on counter-revolution, and all the news from and about Russia was screened and doctored to support that hope.

But the Soviet government had come to stay. It gave the world a program of peace. This infuriated the rulers of France all the more since mutiny in the army, following the unsuccessful April 1917 offensive had plainly shown that the people were weary of the war.

Clemenceau, who became Prime Minister, initiated a harsher war policy. Every economic demand of the workers was treated as an obstacle to prosecution of the war.

A few days after publication of the Decree on Peace, drafted by Lenin and promulgated by the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets, Clemenceau summed up his policy in the formula: "I am waging war."

And in keeping with that formula, the Clemenceau government followed an anti-Soviet course, which, however, brought to the surface all the contradictions in the labor movement, which was committed to that policy.

In the closing weeks of 1917 the Allied governments and the big Socialist parties which dutifully supported them, made a special effort to prevent Russia from withdrawing from the war.

They wholly disregarded the fact that even prior to the October Revolution popular opposition to the war in Russia had reached menacing dimensions and found an outlet in wholesale desertions from the army, not to mention the general slackening of discipline.

And when, on November 8, the day after the Revolution, the Soviet government issued its famous Decree on Peace, it was responding to the hopes and longings of the mass of workers and peasants.

October consummated the bourgeois-democratic revolution and set the country on the road to socialism. In fact, the Soviet government accomplished much more in a few short weeks than the Cadets, Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries had in their eight months of power.

On November 11 the Soviet government issued its decree on the 8-hour day. On November 23 there was the decree abolishing all privileges, ranks and titles and establishing

a uniform status for the entire population — "citizen of the Russian Republic."

On November 27 the All-Russia Central Committee of Soviets instituted workers' control in industry to prevent sabotage closure of factories and unauthorized export of goods, raw materials and fuel, and to keep production going and safeguard valuable equipment.

For thousands of workers this was the first step towards socialism, for in controlling production they were learning to manage it.

Other decrees demolished the old reactionary machine of government. For instance, the decree of December 7 replaced the old judicial system by People's Courts. A Workers' Militia, accountable to the local Soviets, was organized to assure revolutionary order.

A decree issued on December 18 established the Supreme National Economic Council to direct industry in the face of capitalist resistance.

The proletarian state nationalized the railways, mercantile marine and all private banks, which were merged in the State Bank. This deprived the bourgeoisie of one of the main levers of economic supremacy.

The Soviet government also instituted a foreign trade monopoly and annulled all the loans contracted by the Tsarist and Provisional governments.

Under a decree of December 29, all authority in the Army was vested in the Soviets and the Soldiers' Committees.

Faced with these facts, the French reactionaries, then in the van of world reaction, made desperate efforts to throttle the young Soviet Republic.

The French Socialist movement was hopelessly entangled in its "Holy Alliance" with the bourgeoisie initiated by the Right-wing leaders at the outbreak of the war.

The trade union movement, though deeply involved in this policy, could not shy away from the economic problems. Moreover, in many unions there was a strong and growing trend—not without some contradictory features—toward anti-war action.

Early in 1917, trade union officials led a powerful strike movement that spread from Paris to the provinces and involved many industries, including munition plants. This brought to the forefront class issues and undermined the "Holy Alliance" with the bourgeoisie.

The Socialist Party leaders were insistently urging revolutionary Russia not to conclude a separate peace with Germany. They were wilfully oblivious to the importance and implications of the Decree on Peace. They ignored its invitation to "all belligerents and their

governments immediately to start negotiations for a just and democratic peace."

The young Soviet Republic entered into negotiations with Germany only after the Allies had rejected that overture. This was made the occasion for a fresh round of anti-Soviet propaganda.

The moment he arrived in Paris, Kerensky told the Socialist leaders that Soviet rule was the "greatest menace to socialism," adding that the German bourgeoisie would draw many advantages from the developments in Russia.

The leaders of the General Confederation of Labor took a similar attitude, accusing the Socialist minority of helping to discredit Kerensky. But within the General Confederation there was a clear trend towards solidarity with the young Soviet Republic, and it gained in strength as the menace of anti-Soviet intervention loomed bigger.

In July 1918, the metal workers' congress adopted a resolution which read in part: "This congress conveys its greetings and ardent wishes of success to the Russian revolution. It vigorously protests against the repugnant campaign in the press, instigated by certain suspicious elements with the explicit purpose of conditioning public opinion to Allied armed intervention in Russia. The congress further declares that such intervention would play into the hands of international counter-revolution and would infringe on the right of the Russian people to establish a government they believe best suited to their needs."

The congress of the Central Confederation of Labor adopted a resolution (by 908 votes to 253, with 46 abstentions), "condemning any armed intervention by the Allied Powers against the will of the Russian people."

This was a timely warning, for it was not long before the intervention began: on April 30, 1918, General Janin was sent to Russia.

In August 1918, *L'Humanite* reported that after the overthrow of Soviet rule in Archangel the new authorities asked the Allied forces to help re-establish order, and Allied troops occupied the city.

This was the starting point of the intervention against the first socialist government, an intervention that banded together all the reactionary forces of the world.

However, after the November 8, 1918 revolution in Germany, the objective situation favored new victories for socialism. With the inspiration provided by the October Revolution, there was every opportunity for socialism to triumph in Germany, too.

But the Social-Democratic majority, which dominated the new German government, was

steeped in opportunism. It actually entered into collusion with the German General Staff. Instead of exposing the Generals in the eyes of the people, it took up the defense of Field Marshal von Hindenburg who thus became the monopolies' reserve "strong man." Later on they were to use him to good effect: Hindenburg took over the presidency from Ebert and later, in 1933, made Hitler Chancellor of the German Reich.

The revolutionaries, who were anxious to continue the revolution, proposed organizing a Red Guard, but Ebert was against that; there was no need for it, he said. His real aim was revealed in a policy statement on November 14: "We must prevent a Bolshevik seizure of power in Germany."

That, too, was the policy of the Council of People's Representatives. On November 15, it decided against diplomatic relations with Soviet Russia in order not to antagonize the Allied Powers. The new German rulers borrowed some of the Soviet terminology. Their "People's Representatives" were supposed to be the same as the Soviet "People's Commissars," but in Germany the idea was to crush the revolution, not develop it.

The dastardly murder of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg on January 15, 1919, came as a terrible blow to the German revolutionary movement on the eve of the Constituent Assembly elections, which were held on January 19.

The Socialists polled 46 per cent of the vote (Social-Democrat majority 38 per cent and Independents eight per cent). The Catholic Center Party obtained 19.7 per cent and the Democratic Party 18.6 per cent. This prompted a reactionary French journalist to remark: "The moderate Left hold the balance. Their support can assure a majority either for the ruling Socialist Party or for the more conservative element."

The Social-Democrat policy of shoring up the capitalist system set Germany on the fatal path that was to lead to the Hitler dictatorship and the unleashing of World War II.

Encouraged by the defeat of the German revolution, the Allied governments intensified their military operations against Soviet Russia, which they had begun immediately after the armistice.

By coming out against the intervention the soldiers and sailors of the French Black Sea Fleet compelled the government to recall the ships and rendered a very valuable service to Soviet Russia.

The proclamation of the Soviet republic in Hungary, on March 21, 1919, was hailed by the French workers as the harbinger of a new

revolutionary upsurge after the defeat of the German revolution.

People of my generation remember the vile attacks levelled at Bela Kun and his friends, at Karl Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg and the great Lenin. And I remember with what sorrow and anguish we learned of the fall of the Hungarian Soviet Republic. Its defeat was a terrible blow to the workers of France, for they knew that this meant a fresh wave of reaction.

Though the Russian Soviet Republic had for 21 months withstood the attacks of its enemies all the frenzied attempts to destroy it, the defeat of the revolution in Budapest raised in workers' minds the question: Would Moscow be able to hold out?

During the campaign in defense of the Black Sea sailors, some of whom were standing for election in France, many of our intellectuals came out in vigorous support of the Soviet revolution. The feeling of international solidarity proved much stronger than all the pleas to promote the "national interest."

And as the Revolution continued its onward march, successfully repelling all enemy attacks, its aims and significance were better understood. It had survived more than the 72 days of the Paris Commune, and its achievements stood out in bolder relief.

But the Allied Powers persisted in their attempts to crush Soviet Russia. Armed intervention had failed; now the plan was to strangle it by blockade, with cynical disregard for the suffering and the hardship this would cause.

This was a policy founded on brutality, and it evoked loud protest not only from our workers, but also from many of our leading intellectuals.

A statement against the anti-Soviet blockade issued by 71 men of letters bore the signatures of Anatole France, Georges Duhamel, Jules Romains, Jean-Richard Bloch, Henri Barbusse and Paul Langevin.

Romain Rolland denounced the attack on Soviet Russia in an open letter, "It Shall Rise Again."

On August 14, 1920, *L'Humanite* carried Anatole France's appeal to the working people of France. It concluded with these words: "The salvation of France, of Europe and the world, is now in the hands of the proletariat. The appeal of the Soviets to the French working people shows the gravity of the peril. The situation is charged with danger. With deep emotion, animated by concern for the common weal, I say, with a voice enfeebled by old age: 'Frenchmen, save world peace!'"

Many other men of French culture joined

with our working class in expressions of fraternal solidarity with Soviet Russia and in protests against anti-Soviet attacks.

The importance of the October Revolution, the scope and depth of its reforms were, of course, not yet fully appreciated by all who rallied to its defense. But no one could remain indifferent to the example set by Moscow. It is right to say that the October Revolution inspired great hopes, but at the same time it inspired deep hatred among the reactionaries, and ill-intentioned scepticism among those who, though calling themselves Socialists, condemned the Revolution and hoped that their dark forebodings would come true.

In this situation, it was important to prevent confusion in the ranks of the world proletariat. The October Revolution called for a clear-cut stand and political differentiation on all major issues.

In March 1919 the Communist International was founded and held its second Congress in July 1920. The first congress adopted a program and a manifesto calling on the workers of the world to fight for the overthrow of bourgeois dictatorship and bring labor to power.

But there could be no progress towards that goal without a clear division between the vanguard of the working people and the jingoist Socialists and the centrist leaders who supported them. That is why the manifesto concluded with an appeal for unity under the banner of the International.

Addressing the Tours Congress at which the French Communist Party was founded, Marcel Cachin said: "... now, after our visit to Russia, in these days of worldwide proletarian social struggle, I sincerely urge my French comrades to take their place in the Moscow International. And to those who might object that at one time I sided with the majority in opposing affiliation to the Third International, I will say that that is no valid objection.

"... We must make it clear to the bourgeoisie that we are resolved to join the International and side with the great Russian revolution, which today is the main bulwark of the worldwide struggle against imperialism."

Opponents of affiliation posed the question thus: Is socialism to be, or not to be?

The controversy was resolved by life itself. Those who were for affiliation were translating socialism into reality, whereas those opposed to affiliation were content to have socialism remain a subject for speechifying.

And if today capitalism is no longer the only world system, if socialism has become a world system, if the national-liberation movement has demolished colonial empires replac-

ing them by new independent states, then the beginnings for that were laid by the October Revolution in 1917.

It aggravated all the antagonisms of imperialism—between victors and vanquished, between the victor powers, and accentuated the uneven development of the imperialist countries. United in their determination to divide up what had been captured from the vanquished countries, the victors could not agree on how the booty was to be divided, how much each was to get.

There were differences over the division of the colonies formerly held by the vanquished states, over the left bank of the Rhine, German reparations, and so on. French imperialism was anxious to capitalize on its victory, get as much as it could, assure for itself control of the resources on the other bank of the Rhine. This conflicted with British and U.S. imperialist interests.

Exploiting their dominant position and the huge French war debt, Washington and London simply blackmailed Paris. The Dawes plan, proclaimed in August 1924, only hardened the differences and strengthened the U.S. position.

But for all these differences, for all the antagonism, the imperialists were at one in their anti-Soviet policy and actions.

True, strong Soviet resistance and the spread of the solidarity movement compelled the imperialists to recognize Soviet Russia, but they did not abandon their anti-Soviet policy. Instead, they tried to smooth out their differences in face of the fundamental contradiction resulting from the October Revolution, namely, between the imperialist powers and socialism.

It was against this background that the Hitler aggression became possible and threatened to engulf the entire world. But it was stopped and, in the end, crushed thanks to the Soviet Union. This earned the USSR the gratitude of all peoples. In April 1944, when the Nazi monster was fatally wounded, Maurice Thorez had every justification in declaring: "The French people now realize that the (French) debacle and the Nazi invasion, as well as their other misfortunes, were due mainly to the insensate anti-Soviet policy of the privileged classes, Laval and the other men of Munich." And Thorez added: "French liberation and regeneration require a genuinely independent policy, rejection of any type of subjection, which was very nearly the rule before the war, and, lastly, constant effort to promote Soviet-French friendship and alliance."

Founded by Lenin, the Communist Interna-

tional helped the French Communist Party, as all other fraternal parties, to assimilate and apply Marxism-Leninism and the lessons of the October Revolution in the specific conditions obtaining in France. And one of the principal lessons is the need for the working class and its party tirelessly to work for peace. The record of the French Communist Party will show that it has always considered the prevention of war and promotion of international peace and friendship a central and vital task.

And our Party continues to follow that policy, combating the U.S. imperialist aggression against Vietnam and exerting every energy to extend the peace front and the campaign for unconditional cessation of the American bombing, the withdrawal of all U.S. and U.S. satellite forces from Vietnam, and negotiations based on the Geneva agreements.

By continuing its aggression against the Vietnamese, U.S. imperialism is demonstrating its inveterate hatred for peoples fighting for national liberation.

Developments in the Middle East furnish fresh confirmation that the U.S. imperialists used the Israeli leaders for an attack on the Arab states on the pretext of defending the State of Israel though, I believe, its existence has never been questioned.

The Tel Aviv government became an instrument in the hands of the U.S. imperialists, who were plotting a series of coups, patterned on the one in Greece last April, in Syria and in other Arab countries.

The Arabs are fully justified in demanding an Israeli withdrawal. To allow territorial expansion by Israel would be encouraging aggression and would rule out the possibility of a durable peace in the Middle East.

Our Party has learned the great lesson of the October Revolution that every people has the right to self-determination, the right to shape its destiny as it sees fit. This has been basic to the anti-colonial policy our Party has consistently followed from its very inception.

Similarly, our Party has set an example of genuine patriotism in which there is no trace of jingoism and which is inseparable from proletarian internationalism. The French Communist Party draws its inspiration from the October Revolution and the principles of Marxism-Leninism. It has shown by concrete action that the working class plays a national role and that its interests are identical with the genuine interests of the nation.

And still another lesson of the October Revolution that has guided our Party in all its work is the imperative need for unity of the

working class and alliance with the middle urban and rural strata.

I need not describe here the perseverance with which our Party has worked for unity of all the working-class and democratic forces. Now, too, it is working with unrelaxing energy, to build an alliance of workers and democratic forces against the regime of personal power, for genuine democracy. In this as in other matters we draw on the lessons of the October Revolution. Our Party has to a very great degree facilitated the change in relations between Communists and Socialists, bringing out many points of contact, many similarities between our Party program and the tasks of the non-Communist Left. Our efforts are now directed at drawing up a joint government program.

In this campaign for genuine democracy we are guided by the principles enunciated by Lenin. There can be no contradiction, no barrier, between the battle for democracy and the battle for peace.

Certainly, we know, as Lenin emphasized, that, "taken separately, no kind of democracy will bring socialism." But we also know that "in actual life democracy will never be 'taken separately'; it will be 'taken together' with other things, it will exert its influence on economic life as well, will stimulate its transformation; and in turn it will be influenced by economic development, and so on. This is the dialectic of living history."

That is why the French Communist Party's program speaks of genuine democracy, which is not limited simply to its political aspects. The program envisages refashioning the economy through nationalization of the big monopolies, democratic control of nationalized industry and planned economic and social development on a democratic basis.

Our Party's policy is predicated on the lessons of the October Revolution and their creative development in the light of the new alignment of forces in France and the world.

We want to create the objective conditions necessary for a peaceful transition from capitalism to socialism. We feel sure that, as Lenin pointed out, "all nations will arrive at socialism—this is inevitable, but all will do so in not exactly the same way . . ."

Whatever the forms of peaceful or non-peaceful transition, we believe, as Lenin taught us, that the transition will follow certain common laws.

The building of a socialist society requires more than the winning of political power by the working class and its allies. It requires also the transfer of the privately owned means of production to public ownership.

The law of maximum capitalist profit does not operate in a socialist society, and the sole object of production is to assure all its members high living standards and harmonious development.

And so, if today peaceful transition to socialism is possible, we owe that, above all, to the October Revolution and its influence. But such changes presuppose broad mass movements to prevent the monopoly bourgeoisie from even contemplating use of force to obstruct the transition to socialism. We must use every available means to prevent the use of force, should the bourgeoisie decide to have recourse to it.

I would like to add that in affirming that a plurality of political parties can share in building socialism, the French Communist Party is true to the principles set out by Lenin. We know that after winning power in October 1917, Lenin tried to form a "Soviet coalition government" with the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries. The political and historical conditions of the time prevented this. But what could not be accomplished then for a number of reasons can be accomplished in another set of conditions.

However, the victory of socialism must be prepared by a proletarian party guided by the principles of Marxism-Leninism. I can say from experience that, by creatively applying and developing the lessons of the October Revolution, the French Communist Party has won for itself wide influence and prestige among the working people. Our Party is striving for international unity of the Communist and workers' movement, and it knows that in doing so it is furthering the interests of the French people and all other peoples.

Today, 50 years after the October Revolution, the Soviet Union is building a communist society and exerts a decisive influence on the future of all countries.

In the course of these fifty years Marxism-Leninism, the ideas of the October Revolution have won a firm place in the hearts and minds of millions. I am firmly convinced of that, and in my book, "October and France," I write: "The October Revolution imparted a new meaning to our century, on which it has laid a deep, indelible imprint. Looking back to the campaign we conducted fifty years ago in aid of famine-stricken and blockaded Soviet Russia, the vanguard of the peoples, every one who wants a better world pays homage to the great Soviet people, who in October 1917, under Lenin's leadership, blazed the path to a brighter future for all mankind."

And now, half a century after October, we

have every right to say that the future belongs to communism.

The French Communist Party is working for unity of the international Communist movement, for unity is a decisive factor in the battle against imperialism.

It is in this spirit that we have always actively opposed divisive maneuvers against various Communist parties, maneuvers based entirely on an adventurist policy, the harmful results of which are all too well known.

The adventurist policy of the Mao Tse-tung group, which is aimed at splitting the Communist parties, is being conducted through slanderous attacks on every party that refuses to accept Mao's views. We in France are effectively combating this policy and are upholding the principles of Marxism-Leninism.

At the same time, we believe that the independence of every party in defining and carrying out its policy in no way clashes with internationalism, with the policy of united efforts by all parties, in particular on such vital issues for the future of our movement as support of the Vietnamese in their fight for freedom and independence and actions against imperialism in the Middle East.

That is why the French Communist Party,

now as in the past, feels that measures should be taken to strengthen the unity of the international Communist and workers' movement.

Our Party played an important part in preparing the Karlovy Vary conference which enabled practically all European fraternal parties to demonstrate their unanimity on such cardinal questions as a European collective security system, efforts to prevent prolongation or modification of the Atlantic Pact, solidarity with peoples fighting against reactionary regimes, promotion of trust and genuine détente in Europe.

The Karlovy Vary conference did not, however, confine itself to European problems. It urged all the anti-war forces to work in closer unity to halt the U.S. aggression in Vietnam.

What was possible on a European scale should be possible on an international scale. Our Party has long advocated an international meeting of Communist and Workers' parties and hopes that the conditions will be created as soon as possible, for the convocation of such a conference, which would strengthen the unity of the international Communist and workers' movement on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and the lessons of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

RODNY OEHMAN

Left Party—Communists, Sweden

SO GREAT HAS BEEN the impact of the October Revolution on Sweden and other countries that it is doubtful if it can be fully measured. The very fact of the existence of a socialist Soviet Union presently building communism, and of a number of socialist countries, lays its imprint on the entire process of world development, influencing the thoughts and actions of people everywhere.

Many nations can say that the Soviet Union has played a decisive role in shaping their destiny. We recall with gratitude that it was the Soviet Union that saved Sweden's traditional neutrality and peace for our people when Hitler wanted to occupy our country, as he had occupied Norway and Denmark.

The example of the October Revolution exerts a growing influence on the peoples. This influence persists through successes and setbacks alike. The theoretical and practical experience of the October Revolution is one of man's greatest assets.

Since the soundness of the general prin-

ciples of the theory of socialist revolution has been confirmed by history, the task now is not so much to defend it as to apply it in the conditions of today.

The question is, what policy should the Communists pursue in their countries to accelerate the transition from capitalism to socialism which history placed on the agenda way back in 1917? How should the leading and independent role of the working class be asserted in highly developed capitalist countries where Social Democracy is strong? How to build an alliance with the middle strata and the peasants? How to utilize, or modify, the existing organs of power, or to create new ones to ensure the transition to socialism? How to determine the prospects of development of the productive forces so as to meet the growing material and cultural requirements of people? What must our parties do in order really to become the vanguard of the working class?

The guide to solution of these problems has

been given us by the October Revolution, but we have to steer a course in our own changing mainstream.

The latest answer of Swedish Communists to the question of how the general and fundamental experience of the October Revolution should be applied in order to pave the way to socialist reconstruction is to be found in the program and platform adopted by our Twenty-First Congress last May. Before touching on some aspects of our new program, I would like to recall some episodes of the impact of the October Revolution on the struggle waged by the Swedish working class.

In 1917 Sweden was already an industrial country. Its working class had been distinguished by militancy since the eighteen-eighties, and especially at the beginning of this century. It had fought not only for higher wages and better conditions. As early as 1902 a general political strike was held to press for universal suffrage. For three days Stockholm was actually under workers' control. Two years later in 1905 the working class opposed reactionary plans for war against Norway, which wanted national independence and dissolution of the 1814 union treaty with Sweden. Swedish society was shaken to its foundations by a general strike in defense of the gains won by the workers. In 1914, by combating the royal court's conspiracy to embroil Sweden in the war on the side of Germany, the workers helped keep Sweden neutral.

Although our working class demonstrated a splendid fighting spirit and had many achievements to its credit, such demands as the eight-hour day and universal suffrage were won only in the hard class battles of 1917-1921.

While this "democratic break-through," as these reforms are termed in the Swedish political vocabulary, was undoubtedly due to the activity of the working class, it took place when a new factor had entered upon the political scene—the October Revolution. Not only had the workers found a new source of inspiration, the bourgeoisie had begun to fear lest there should occur not only a limited democratic, but also a consistently socialist break-through.

Why, it may be asked, did the Swedish working class, so militant in those days, fail to go ahead and win power? The main reason is that the working class led by the Social-Democratic Party trailed behind the liberal bourgeoisie and did not pursue an independent working-class policy based on Marxism-Leninism.

The Communist Party, founded in May 1917 as the Social-Democratic Left Party, came into

being in the struggle against reformism, but it was not mature enough and did not wield the political and ideological influence among the masses necessary for turning development in the direction of socialism.

However, the new party created a public opinion under pressure of which Sweden became one of the first countries to recognize the Soviet Government. A Swedish ship was the first to break the blockade in the Gulf of Finland established by capitalist states against the young Soviet Republic. We take pride in this practical example of internationalism. May I digress from the subject-matter of the symposium to tell you that this ship, *Eskilstuna III*, was skippered by the legendary Eufraim Ericsson, who took on a "deckhand" named Sven Lasse Linderut, future chairman of the Communist Party.

Indisputably, Leninism and the experience of the Russian Bolsheviks were important for the ideological development of the Swedish Communist Party. But the need for such a party had been felt long before 1917—for instance, after the 1909 strike, unsuccessful despite the magnificent solidarity displayed by the workers. In the course of the fight against class collaboration and civic peace there emerged in the Social-Democratic Party a left trend exponents of which were active in the Social-Democratic Youth League and in some of the unions. The Social-Democratic Left Party emerged from this trend and from the finest traditions of the Swedish working class.

Paying tribute to these traditions, our Twenty-First Congress, convened on the 50th anniversary of the Party, decided to rename it the Left Party—Communists. To be sure, besides the desire to honor the traditions there were other and more important reasons for changing the name of the Party, but I wish to stress that this was not due to any change in ideology. On the contrary, the new name of the Party is connected with the development of new Left trends in Swedish political life, especially in the labor movement and among intellectuals, trends which need our support and cooperation.

These trends have an objective basis in the new factors in world development—the growing strength of the socialist community, the liberation struggle in the third world, the mounting anti-imperialist struggle of the masses and the ever insistent demand to preserve peace, a demand voiced particularly strongly in Sweden in connection with the events in Vietnam. The pressure for genuine democracy and equality at home and in international relations is increasing as factory and

office workers and small businessmen are becoming more and more conscious of their role in production and in society.

Wage-earners comprise 70 per cent of the population of Sweden. Farmers, who grow more than the country can consume, account for a mere seven to eight per cent. Other middle strata make up 15 per cent. But the dominant positions in the economy are held by fifteen families of the big monopolies. Rapid monopolization and concentration of capital is taking place. People are migrating from the sparsely inhabited areas to the central regions.

The injustice of the domination by the fifteen families stands out against the background of the increasingly evident effects of the scientific and technological revolution. The demand is voiced ever more loudly for planning to meet the needs of people and hence for socialization to make this possible.

The example of socialism influences the evolution of the capitalist economy. The people will not accept again the hardships of the unemployment suffered during the crisis of the thirties. Their response to the crisis in those days was to elect a Riksdag which made it possible to form a Social-Democratic government. The workers have kept the SPD in power for 35 years, for its rule has been associated with improvements in many areas.

But the reforms, the measures to ensure full employment and the policy of geographical allocation of industry with which the Social Democrats had a certain measure of success, especially after the Second World War, will not help to solve the problem of today.

Working for labor unity, the Communists supported all the positive reforms initiated by the SDP, but our policy was not sufficiently oriented on the long-range perspective of changed correlation of class forces.

As a result, the workers increasingly tended to regard us, not as a real alternative, but rather as a party which in matters of real politics had to occupy a place assigned it by the SDP. To change this state of things, to elaborate a policy which the masses would accept as a genuinely socialist alternative is essential if the Swedish working class is to play the leading role about which Lenin wrote in his *The Development of Capitalism in Russia* and *Two Tactics of Social Democracy in the Democratic Revolution*.

Naturally, in these works Lenin addressed himself to the conditions in Russia at the time.

The new Party program and our policy today are directed both against Right opportunism, which would like the Party to rest con-

tent with the place the reformist SDP wishes to assign it, and against the extremist, essentially petty-bourgeois revolutionaries who equate their own readiness for revolution with that of the masses.

Our new program points out that the policy of the ruling Social-Democratic Party envisages no basic change in the relations of production and the correlation of forces. It leaves the present pattern of income distribution and fortunes in the class society virtually intact and orients itself on continuing to administer a capitalist society. Most key posts in society are held by representatives of the privileged minority. The influence of the workers on labor relations is insignificant. The cultural and ideological environment is created on the basis of a class society in which biased information and preconceived ideas are spread. The correlation of forces and the property relations typical of capitalism strongly influence decisive aspects of legislative activity.

The program states that although Riksdag deputies are elected by the people, the state safeguards a class society in which executive power is not subject to democratic control.

We are searching for ways to change this state of things. I want to stress here that the Swedish Communist Party proceeds from the possibility of influencing the machinery of state through political struggle both within and outside it. We believe that this political struggle demands greater attention in view of the growing role played by the state. And we regard this struggle, waged in cooperation with big public organizations, as a pre-condition for the peaceful transition to socialism, which, as we see it, is quite feasible in our country.

Our program points not only to the defects of capitalism. One-sided denunciation would only isolate us from the masses and would be basically erroneous. We show what the masses have won by their activity. But above all we show what they *can* achieve with the help of a new policy, that of the socialist alternative emerging from the day-to-day struggles for the vital interests in all areas of the life of society.

Much attention is paid to the task of improving the conditions of wage laborers by giving them a bigger say in the enterprises, in establishing genuine industrial democracy, ending the growing alienation and imparting meaning and importance to labor.

We consider that the public sector, which is carrying out the tasks of economic policy and geographical allocation which private capitalism cannot or does not want to tackle, should be systematically used to facilitate

breaking through the capitalist framework. A natural condition for this is that the public sector should cease to be a mere appendage to monopoly capital.

As for the forms of changing the relations of production, we consider, for one thing, that the workers themselves should manage their enterprises within the framework of active centralized planning dovetailed with local development plans.

The program holds that free exchange of views, open discussion and bold criticism are indispensable both for the development of the present progressive trends and for future socialist development. A society that has freed itself from the class contradictions of anachronistic monopoly capitalism should not be regarded as something quiescent and free from conflict.

On the contrary, we have every reason to turn the exchange of views into a conscious motive force of socialist development.

The socialist arrangement that would make this possible calls, in our view, for the following:

- a democratic state system envisaging freedom to form parties; a representative body elected by the people and a government elected by this body;

- the right and the opportunity to obtain comprehensive information through a self-ad-

ministered press, radio and television owned by the public and the mass organizations;

- the freedom of organization, assembly and the press;

- an educational system designed to demolish the barrier between physical and mental labor.

The program sets forth the general strategy of a united, socialist-conscious working-class movement allied with other forces opposed to the existing class structure. It is couched in language the masses can understand without years of study of the specific terminology that has developed in the Communist movement and which sometimes unnecessarily complicates efforts to forge working-class unity.

Ours is a forward-looking, revolutionary program. It is our attempt to indicate a way towards a non-violent revolution. It is our attempt to offer, in the creative spirit of Marx and Lenin, solutions to the problems of the new times. Practice alone can prove the correctness of these solutions. The maxim that every step in actual struggle is worth a hundred programs is as valid today as in the days of Marx and Lenin. Our ability to activate the masses through such vigorous political initiative in all spheres of their life which the government and the authorities would be unable to ignore—that is what will move the revolution forward.

PAULI MARTINMAKI

Communist Party of Finland

AN AUTONOMOUS Grand Duchy of the Russian Empire for over 100 years, Finland was directly affected by developments in Russia, especially by alternating periods of reaction and progress. This was perhaps best exemplified at the turn of the century when imperialism was taking root in Russian policy. The Tsarist government tried to annul Finland's constitutional autonomy, curtail the freedoms (much broader than anything known in Russia proper) enjoyed by her people, and to bind her to the Tsarist power structure.

The first Russian Revolution of 1905-07 generated a wave of national sentiment and action. The labor movement, which had an active share in the revolution, insisted on national independence, a demand no bourgeois party ventured to advance or even support.

Pressed by revolutionary events, Nicolas II

was obliged to rescind some of the more draconic laws, restore Finland's autonomy and basic civil rights. In fact, the Tsar even consented to another labor demand, radical reform of parliament. For a certain time Finland had the world's most democratic parliamentary system—a single-chamber Diet elected by universal and equal suffrage—and was the first European country to give women the vote. But, on the other hand, the system of government was one of the most reactionary: ministers were accountable only to the Tsar (in his capacity of Grand Duke of Finland) and parliament was entirely dependent on his whim—he could dissolve it and revoke its decisions.

The defeat of the revolution was also a defeat for Finland. In 1907 the country was plunged into a fresh period of despotism which lasted right up to 1917.

The February Revolution brought to the sur-

face two opposite trends. The more influential section of the bourgeoisie, disquieted by the dissolution of the Tsarist police and the emergence of a workers' militia, followed a reactionary course. It had been accustomed to rely on the Tsarist government for help: whenever parliament adopted radical decisions it appealed to the Tsar and he would promptly use his veto. The position was complicated by the fact that the Social Democrats had but a slight majority in parliament, 103 seats out of a total of 200.

The bourgeoisie had no choice but to seek good relations with the Provisional Government, which had assumed all the powers formerly invested in the Tsar. True, the bourgeois parties insisted on the restoration of Finland's traditional freedoms, but they did not go beyond that, and were especially careful not to demand independence. The Provisional Government's Manifesto of March 20 satisfied the bourgeoisie, but not the labor movement.

The latter wanted an extended autonomy and radical social reform.

Labor's position differed fundamentally from that of the bourgeois parties.

Its argument was that now, with the overthrow of the monarchy, the question of Finland's political status would have to be reconsidered; the Provisional Government in Petrograd had no legal right to supreme authority, which now could be delegated only to parliament.

This brought the labor movement into a head-on clash with the Finnish bourgeoisie and the Provisional Government.

The Finnish workers counted on the support of their Russian comrades. They knew that, way back in 1898, the inaugural congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party in Minsk proclaimed the right of all nations to self-determination. This was confirmed by subsequent party congresses and by Lenin, who repeatedly stressed the right of all nations, and specifically Finland, to shape their own destiny. Lenin forcefully put the case for Finnish self-determination in a detailed article, "The Protest of the Finnish People," published in *Iskra* in 1901. In later years Lenin was to find political refuge in Finland where he was helped by the Social Democrats. He had firsthand knowledge of the country's labor movement and frequently discussed its problems in his writings, always emphasizing that the situation was ripe for national independence.

"The struggle in Finland is a struggle for the freedom of all Russia," he wrote in November 1909, and later, in May 1910: "The time will come when the Russian proletariat will rise for the freedom of Finland, for a demo-

cratic republic in Russia." And later still, in a resolution on Finland drafted for the 1912 Prague Party Conference; "Only as a result of the joint efforts of the workers of Russia and of Finland will Tsarism be overthrown and the Russian and Finnish people attain freedom."

After the February Revolution, in one of his famous "Letters From Afar," Lenin wrote: "The Russian proletariat will guarantee the Finnish Republic complete freedom, including freedom to secede . . . and precisely in this way will win the complete confidence and comradely assistance of the Finnish workers for the all-Russia proletarian cause."

Lenin vigorously supported that view at the Party's April 1917 conference, at which some delegates opposed the self-determination slogan. He told the conference: "Any Russian Socialist who does not recognize Finland's and the Ukraine's right to freedom will degenerate into chauvinism." The conference resolution on the national question drafted by Lenin contains this passage in reference to the difference between Finland and the Provisional Government: "The right of all nations forming part of Russia freely to secede and form independent states must be recognized. To deny them this right, or to fail to take measures guaranteeing its practical realization, is equivalent to supporting a policy of seizure or annexation."

The Finnish Social Democrats justifiably believed that the Russian labor movement would support Finland's demand for independence. Several appeals on the question were addressed to the Socialist parties in Russia. The first was handed to Kerensky when he visited Finland in his capacity of Minister of Justice; Kerensky flatly rejected independence.

The attitude of the various Socialist groups fully crystallized in June-July 1917. Both the Mensheviks and the Bolsheviks were represented at the Finnish Social-Democratic Party Congress in June. Martov, the Menshevik leader, supported independence, but very cautiously and with the proviso that final decision would have to await the Russian Constituent Assembly. The Finnish people, of course, did not take to this idea of independence being granted — or denied — by a Russian Constituent Assembly.

The Bolshevik attitude was explained by Alexandra Kollontai who trenchantly condemned the Provisional Government's imperialist policy and stated emphatically that Russia's Revolutionary Social Democrats would work for Finland's independence up to and including secession.

The controversy flared up at the First All-Russian Congress of Soviets which met in Petrograd on June 3. The Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries were dead set against the complete independence advocated by the Bolsheviks. The Bolshevik policy prevailed, but not completely, for the Congress resolution called for "internal independence" for Finland.

This encouraged the Finnish Social Democrats and their Congress adopted a resolution challenging the right of the Provisional Government to exercise supreme rule over Finland and demanding full and unconditional independence.

In July, parliament promulgated a Law on Supreme State Power, which henceforth was to be vested in parliament, with exceptions made for the armed forces and foreign affairs. The law was passed by the votes of the Social Democrats and one of the bourgeois parties, the Agrarian Union.

The bourgeoisie and, of course, the Provisional Government considered this much too radical a step. The conservatives appealed to the Provisional Government, in which now, after the suppression of the July demonstrations, the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries had a majority. It dissolved the Finnish parliament, in which the Socialists had a majority.

In the new elections the combined forces of the bourgeoisie managed to scrape up a slight majority, 108 seats out of 200.

However, by the time the newly-elected parliament met the Provisional Government in Petrograd had very little effective power. This was a short while before the October Revolution, which transformed the whole situation, including policy towards Finland.

The Finnish Right-wing forces were preparing for elections to a State Council endowed with sweeping powers. The Social Democrats countered this by their program of demands, which called for far-reaching social reforms, full independence and agreement with Russia for a constituent assembly to work out Finland's future status.

These demands were backed by a general strike in the second half of November, which virtually placed government power in the hands of the labor movement. Parliament reacted by proclaiming itself the supreme authority. It also introduced the 8-hour day and restored the rights of the municipal councils.

The situation that developed after the October Revolution made things extremely difficult for the bourgeoisie, especially since it could no longer look to Petrograd for support

in its fight against the workers. Separation from Russia, now ruled by a Socialist government, became a vital and urgent issue. The bourgeoisie made overtures to Germany. The idea was to obtain German support for a reactionary solution, to be enforced by a "strong-arm" government.

December 1917 became Finnish independence month. On December 6, parliament was presented with two draft proclamations of independence. They differed sharply on policy towards the Soviet government and on the procedure of formalizing independence.

The bourgeoisie avoided all contact with the Soviet government and proposed appealing to the Western Powers. In contrast, the Social Democrats declared that independence could only be the result of negotiations with the Soviet government, which was ready and willing to grant it. Parliament, however, rejected that, though, in the end, independence was obtained in the way the Social Democrats had suggested.

Svinhufund government appointed by parliament at first simply ignored the existence of the Soviet government. It sent envoys to other capitals to obtain recognition of Finland's independence. A special effort was made to enlist the support of Germany and Sweden. The German government, then negotiating peace with Soviet Russia at Brest-Litovsk, intimated that Finland would first have to be recognized by Soviet Russia. The bourgeois government thus found itself obliged to recognize Soviet Russia and enter into contact with its workers' and peasants' government.

The Social Democrats continued to exert a strong influence on settlement of the independence issue. On December 27, a Finnish labor delegation asked the Bolshevik Central Committee to endorse Finnish independence. Four days later, on December 31, the delegation of the Finnish government received an official statement that the Soviet government recognized Finland as an independent republic, and on January 4, this was confirmed by the All-Russia Central Executive Committee of Soviets.

The October Revolution was the starting point of a socialist foreign policy and of progress towards liberation of all the oppressed nations, which has been a distinguishing feature of the recent decades. It was Finland's good fortune to be the first to benefit from the foreign policy principles proclaimed by the Bolshevik Party.

The bourgeoisie, however, was singularly ungrateful. Having crushed the workers' struggle in 1918 with German military assistance, it adopted a hostile policy toward Soviet

Russia. Time and again the big capitalist powers used Finland in attempts to overthrow the Soviet government.

The position changed fundamentally after the defeat of Hitler in World War II. In these postwar years relations between bourgeois Finland and the socialist Soviet Union stand out as an example of peaceful coexistence. Before the war advocacy of friendship between our two countries was punished by long terms of imprisonment; now it is considered a key feature of Finland's policy. In

fact, the policy consistently advocated by the Communist Party over the years is now official policy.

We in Finland welcome the more realistic and sound attitude toward the Soviet Union of the other big workers' party, the Social Democrats. It is to be hoped that this is evidence of a revival of socialist ideas among the Social Democrats and of better opportunities for united action in home and foreign policy for the benefit of the Finnish people.

The October Revolution and the fight for national and social emancipation

GEORGOS SAVVIDES

Member of the Central Committee

Progressive Party of Cypriot Working People—AKEL

THE PEOPLE OF CYPRUS, together with the peoples of the Soviet Union and with millions of people on all continents, are celebrating the 50th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. In the ex-colonies, which made up 70 per cent of the earth's population, the Communists and the class-conscious workers are today joined in the celebrations of the anniversary of the October Revolution by masses of patriots who see the Soviet Union as a consistent and disinterested supporter of the national independence of the peoples, as a devoted fighter against imperialist slavery, as the champion of equality, brotherhood and cooperation among the peoples of the world.

The October Revolution, which ushered in a new era for mankind, by delivering a heavy blow against world imperialism, had a direct effect on the destiny of the colonial and dependent peoples, who, until then, had been waging an unequal and hopeless struggle against a most powerful enemy.

Lenin had clearly foreseen that the socialist

and national-liberation movements would fuse into a mighty anti-imperialist current, which would eradicate colonial slavery and exploitation.

In 1919, stressing the anti-imperialist nature of the October Revolution and the natural unity of the socialist and national-liberation revolutions Lenin said: "... the socialist revolution 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 imperialism-oppressed colonies and countries, of all dependent countries, against international imperialism" (*Collected Works*, Eng. ed., Vol. 30, p. 159).

The victory of the October Revolution and the establishment of Soviet rule acted as a very influential practical example, which was easier to understand and more convincing for millions of enslaved people at a time when scientific socialism had not yet taken hold in their countries.

The liberation of the peoples who had been

oppressed by Tsarism, and recognition of the equality and the sovereign rights of these peoples was a new revolutionary message from the socialist revolution to the enslaved peoples of the world.

The declaration of a new foreign policy the day after the revolution, a policy based on peace, equality, freedom and brotherly cooperation among all peoples, in contrast with the policy of war, enslavement and racial discrimination, which had for centuries been ruthlessly enforced in the colonies, had a tremendous revolutionary impact.

The victory of the young Soviet state over the combined forces of the imperialists, the defeat of the aggressors' armies, showed in practice that the supremacy of imperialism over all the world could be shaken and that the freeing of the colonies from the colonial yoke was feasible in the new historical conditions.

Under the influence of October, the working-class movement in the colonial and dependent countries developed for the first time into an independent political force, and Communist parties were founded—conscious revolutionary contingents armed with the theory of scientific socialism, the invaluable experience of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the victorious socialist revolution.

These parties contributed decisively to the development of the national-liberation movement, to its correct anti-imperialist orientation, to freeing it from chauvinism and from the tendency to isolate itself.

In Cyprus, under the direct influence of the October Revolution the first Communist groups were formed in 1920, and in 1926 the Communist Party of Cyprus was established, the only party of the working class in our island.

Under conditions of continuous persecution and illegality the Communist Party organized the first workers' and farmers' unions and instructed the working people in the spirit of consistent anti-imperialist struggle based on international solidarity.

Guided by Leninist principles, the young Communist Party paid particular attention to the alliance between the workers and the peasants.

After the spontaneous uprising of the people against British rule in 1931 and the imposition of stark dictatorship the bourgeoisie, which until then had been leading the national movement, fell into inactivity and apathy. The Communist Party, however, continued its illegal activities with heroism and self-sacrifice, and laid the foundations of a new anti-imperialist national-liberation movement based, mainly, on the working people.

As the construction of socialism advanced in the USSR, its power, and prestige grew, too, while imperialism suffered from its inherent contradictions, and entered into a deeper crisis.

The first socialist state became a mighty force for progress, a factor which accelerated the course of world history, the hope of the peoples during the black years of imperialist reaction in Europe.

The peoples' anti-imperialist front, which was founded thanks to the Leninist policy of the Soviet Union and the Communist parties, developed and gained in strength during the anti-fascist war.

With the participation of the Soviet Union, the Second World War assumed a liberating character. The peoples' belief in victory, the belief in the fulfilment of their wishes for freedom, peace, democracy and progress, became stronger because of the participation in the war of the socialist state. Thus, a new stage in the national-liberation struggle began during the Second World War.

The Cypriot people fought might and main for the victory of the anti-fascist forces. At their head was the party of the working class which, as from the end of 1941, had been organized into a legal party taking the name Progressive Party of Cypriot Working People (AKEL). At the same time a militant national-liberation movement developed based, mainly, on the organized forces of the workers, the peasants and the middle urban strata. The main characteristic of this movement was that it was consciously orientated towards the international anti-imperialist front, towards active solidarity with the Soviet Union, the world working-class movement and the national-liberation forces of the world.

In these favorable international circumstances the national-liberation movement greatly expanded in all continents; so began the disintegration of the colonial system.

The process of the liberation of the peoples from imperialism, which began with the October Revolution, reached its climax with the emergence of the socialist world system and with the supremacy of the forces of socialism over those of imperialism in the international field.

The correct evaluation of the decisive role played by the socialist system as a factor of the world anti-imperialist front is of paramount importance for the struggle of the peoples of the world for national liberation and complete independence from imperialist oppression and exploitation.

The peoples' national-liberation movement cannot defeat imperialism which is still strong enough on its own, without the all-round

support and help of the socialist world system and of the working-class movement of the capitalist countries.

By stressing the decisive role of the Soviet Union and of the socialist world system, we do not suggest that we do not fully appreciate the contribution and role of the national-liberation movement or of the working-class movement of the capitalist countries.

But the victorious socialist revolution and the building of socialism have given the working people of the socialist countries tremendous economic, political, technical and military power. These tremendous means, as well as the remarkable experience which the socialist countries possess in all fields, are made available for the world anti-imperialist camp, in the struggle for the freedom and progress of all peoples.

Unfortunately, in recent years the anti-Soviet propaganda of the leadership of the Communist Party of China has been trying to convince the peoples that the Soviet Union has betrayed its international mission. What is peculiar is that in its slanderous campaign the Chinese leadership has surpassed even the propaganda of the imperialists, who have a direct and real interest in splitting the anti-imperialist camp.

Life, however, daily proves the slanderers wrong. The peoples who are fighting for their freedom, for their complete independence, for the social reconstruction of their countries, receive all possible aid from the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. This aid is all-round and decisive. According to the situation it takes the form of moral support, political and diplomatic backing in UNO and in the international field generally, and, more often, the form of technical, economic and military aid.

The counter-attacks of imperialism, in a vain attempt to subvert the present international balance of forces through aggression, the overthrow of progressive governments, through conspiracies, blackmail and pressures of all sorts, should not be permitted to cause disappointment and pessimism among the fighters for freedom. We know that the nature of imperialism has not changed, that it still possesses considerable strength in all continents, and that the peoples have yet to fight hard for complete independence. Only if they rally all their forces and merge them into one mighty and united anti-imperialist camp will their struggle demand less sacrifice and their victory come earlier.

Cyprus, one of the smallest countries, experiences all the grave problems of the newly-independent countries, mainly because of imperialist aggression. Only four years

after it had achieved a limited political independence, in 1963, it found itself faced with a well-organized conspiracy of the Anglo-American imperialists, which aimed at completely destroying its independence, partitioning the island and turning it into a NATO base, into an imperialist springboard against our brother Arab peoples.

Recent developments in the Eastern Mediterranean, the military fascist coup in Greece, and the criminal Israeli aggression against the Arab countries, are part of the imperialist plans in this area.

Cyprus has so far been able to repel and frustrate the NATO conspiracy thanks to the united and vigorous resistance of all the patriotic forces of its people and thanks to the international support of the anti-imperialist forces, especially thanks to the decisive support of the Soviet Union, thanks to the diplomatic and military aid it has offered to the Republic of Cyprus.

Our Party, on the basis of the teaching of Marxism-Leninism and of the rich experience of the international Communist movement, has devoted its powers to the promotion of patriotic unity and to the correct anti-imperialist orientation of the people of Cyprus.

Our people believe that, through the unity of their fighting forces and with the solidarity of the anti-imperialist camp, they will achieve complete independence and the abolition of the foreign military bases, so that they will, on the basis of the principle of self-determination, become the master of their own future.

It is only through the development of all-round cooperation and mutual support among all anti-imperialist forces, only through the further strengthening of the world anti-imperialist camp, that the new imperialist adventures and conspiracies against the peoples can be frustrated. Only international solidarity and aid will crush the aggressive forces in Vietnam, the Middle East and elsewhere.

One of the lessons drawn from the Great October Revolution is that the world socialist and national-liberation fronts can face and defeat world imperialism, thus foiling its criminal plans for the subjugation of the peoples of the world.

The wheel of history cannot be reversed. Imperialism cannot change the international balance of forces and become again a decisive factor in international development, as it used to be before the October Revolution.

The invincible united anti-imperialist current of the socialist and national-liberation movements which first came into being with the October Revolution, has today, with the creation of the socialist world system, with the liberation of one and a half thousand million

colonial people, with the vigorous growth of the world working-class movement, become the most powerful force the world has ever known, incomparably stronger than the warlike and

inhuman imperialism. For this reason it is possible in our time for imperialism to be defeated decisively and eradicated from the face of the earth.

KHALIS OKAN

Communist Party of Turkey

FOR TURKEY, for her people and her revolutionaries the October Revolution has a special historical significance. The socialist worker-peasant state born of it has been for Turkey a dependable material and moral support, a sincere and loyal friend in the anti-imperialist struggle, a selfless helper and a source of energy and inspiration.

The October Revolution evoked a surge of revolutionary sentiment among Istanbul workers and stimulated the peasant movement in Anatolia. Mass actions laid the foundations for a national-liberation movement.

Early in 1920 workers in the industrial centers founded their Communist Party, which later, at a unity congress, merged with the Communist Party founded by Turkish Communists in Soviet Azerbaijan. Ever since, the Party has played a beneficial role in the country's political and economic life.

The Party has steadfastly adhered to the militant ideas of the October Revolution, working unremittingly along internationalist lines to promote the national-liberation and anti-imperialist struggle. Writing about the Turkish Communists' dedication, the newspaper *Ulus* observed: "The Communist Party has struck deep roots. Communists are in the forefront of the fight for freedom and democracy."

The influence of the October Revolution, its historical results, its help to the revolutionary movements of the Eastern peoples, is very great and varied. Mustafa Subhi, the founder of our Party, described it in the following words:

"The October Revolution evoked a powerful response among the workers and the oppressed peoples. It was a ray of hope. Russia is the first country where the socialist revolution has won. The peoples of Soviet Russia, extending their hand to save oppressed peoples, offer us fraternity and friendship."

The international impact of the October Revolution is seen, above all, in its influence on world events, the events of the epoch of revolution, in the help and support it has

given the national-liberation movement and in what it has done to stimulate the fight against imperialism, for peace, freedom and democracy. One who is hostile to the Soviet Union cannot therefore be a true internationalist.

Revolutionaries from all over the world helped in the fight for the October Revolution. International units fought shoulder to shoulder with the Bolsheviks when the new-born Soviet power had to be defended. A Turkish regiment commanded by Mustafa Subhi saw action in Turkmenia and the Caucasus, upholding October as its own revolution and the Soviet country as its own homeland.

The Turkish national-liberation movement (1919-1923), headed by the national bourgeoisie, never went beyond the anti-imperialist phase. It failed to resolve the tasks of the bourgeois revolution, least of all the land problem. But the first stage of national liberation was brought to a successful conclusion: the imperialists were driven out, the Sultanate, their chief support, collapsed, and a republic was proclaimed.

The October Revolution won the minds of soldiers, workers, peasants and intellectuals. In Eastern Anatolia the word Bolshevik stood for freedom. Prisoners of war returning from Russia helped spread socialist ideas. They had seen that the state founded by Lenin was a state of the people. They had seen the Russian workers and peasants, the Bolsheviks, depose Tsarism and end the rule of the landed gentry. Many had even taken part in the struggle. They came home with a store of revolutionary experience and told their people about it.

Turkish-Soviet friendship, cooperation and mutual aid originated at the time of the arduous battles against imperialist aggressors in both countries. In September 1919, in a message to Turkish workers and peasants, the Soviet government said: "The worker-peasant government of Russia backs all oppressed peoples in their fight for independence against the oppression of world capital and denies recognition to secret treaties generally, and

those concerning Persia and Turkey in particular."

Mustafa Kemal Ataturk was quick to appreciate what the October Revolution meant for Turkey's independence and subsequent reconstruction. He appreciated Soviet Russia's help. Acting on a decision of the Great National Assembly, Ataturk in a letter to Lenin on April 26, 1920, offered to establish Soviet-Turkish diplomatic relations. The Soviet government acquiesced. "Unswervingly loyal to every nation's right to self-determination," its reply read, "the Soviet Government offers friendship to all peoples of the world. It follows with lively interest the heroic struggle of the Turkish nation for independence and sovereignty and is happy to lay an enduring foundation of friendship which will bring closer the Turkish and Russian peoples in this hour of trial for Turkey."

The Treaty of Friendship concluded in Moscow on March 16, 1921, laid the cornerstone of Turko-Soviet friendship. When in 1921 Ataturk spoke in the National Assembly of the benefits of this treaty, the deputies applauded. "We and Russia are friends," he said, "because Russia was the first country to recognize our national rights and to respect us. In the circumstances Russia can depend on Turkey's friendship today, tomorrow and always."

The Soviet Union helped our national-liberation movement financially, providing 10 million gold rubles. Another 1,100,000 gold rubles were sent in 1921 for relief to victims of the Greek attack. An interest-free loan was granted in 1932. With the help of Soviet specialists and machinery this enabled us to build the country's biggest textile factories in Nazilli and Kayseri.

During the Second World War much against the will of her people Turkey had close relations with Hitler Germany, while Soviet-Turkish relations declined.

After the war, the country's rulers oriented their economic policy on the U.S. and West German monopolies. The economic and political links with the imperialist powers did untold harm. The arms race imposed on us by the imperialists deepened the crisis in our industry and agriculture, impairing foreign trade and the balance of payments. With the years Turkey became more and more entangled in the meshes of imperialist "aid." Gradually, she lost her economic independence. Foreign monopoly capital penetrated into all the key branches of our economy and seized the commanding heights in our industry.

The constitution proclaimed after the coup

of May 27, 1960, which overthrew the Menderes dictatorship, is designed to democratize political life. But the coup has failed to drive out imperialism and reaction. Nor has it prevented foreign capital from tightening its grip on the key branches of our economy. Turkey has become an imperialist staging area, while feudalism still retains its grip on the countryside. The peasant has not been given land and has not been delivered from the landowner. No just and radical land reform has been carried out. Neither has Turkey withdrawn from NATO and CENTO.

Awake to the gravity of the situation, progressives are calling for closer relations, for renewed friendship, economic cooperation and mutual aid, with the Soviet Union, the great neighbor whom Ataturk called our friend in need.

Good Soviet-Turkish relations are a guarantee of Turkey's independence, economic progress, peaceful coexistence with her neighbors, democracy, and a worthy place in the family of nations.

The Communist Party is pleased to note the livening up of Soviet-Turkish political and economic relations. Under pressure of the people, the changed state of international affairs and the economic stresses at home, the Turkish government has taken what a Turkish Communist Party statement described as "some positive steps." Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko's visit, the joint Soviet-Turkish statement which crowned ex-Premier Urguplu's visit to the Soviet Union in August 1965, the visit of a Soviet delegation headed by N. V. Podgorny, Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, and the recent visit of Prime Minister Kosygin were all fruitful steps designed to normalize and improve relations between our two countries. Always a friend of the Turks, the Soviet Union, which throughout the past fifty years has shown an understanding of Turkey's problems, is ready once more to extend a helping hand to our country.

Under a recently concluded agreement the USSR will give Turkey 15-year credits at 2.5 per cent interest for seven projects of importance for our economic progress, which will stand as a symbol of Soviet-Turkish friendship and a contribution to our economic independence.

The workers' movement is gaining momentum. Turkey has 2,500,000 industrial workers, of whom 800,000 are trade union members. The Party of Labor which champions working-class interests and the country's non-capitalist development is a broad democratic organization with 15 seats in the National Assembly.

Our Party is working for a peaceful democratic Turkey, for her non-capitalist development. We call on all progressive, democratic and anti-imperialist forces to form a united national democratic front, and never fail to reaffirm our loyalty to the ideas of the October Revolution.

Other socialist trends gravitating towards these ideas, have appeared in the country,

particularly in our science, art and culture and among political and public leaders.

The Communists are calling for a national democratic front of people of all political views, of all forces opposed to imperialism, to fight for radical democratic reconstruction, for a free, independent and democratic Turkey.

ERNESTO CINTRA

Candidate Member, CC Executive Commission,
Communist Party of Brazil

THE ERA OF transition from capitalism to socialism was inaugurated by the Great October Revolution.

The modern Communist movement, brought into being as a result of that revolution and of the practical confirmation of Leninism as Marxism of the era of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, has spread to every part of the world. It has become the vanguard, strong in its foresight and experience, of the international struggle of the workers and the oppressed peoples. It is the champion of the great cause of world peace and the guiding force of the progressive and revolutionary movements of our time.

The idea of proletarian hegemony in bourgeois revolutions in the imperialist era was first enunciated by Lenin in the early years of the century and carried to realization by the Bolshevik party in the revolutionary struggle that culminated in the events of October 1917. Now it has acquired international significance: hegemony of the proletariat in anti-feudal, agrarian and anti-imperialist, national and democratic revolutions.

More and more ex-colonies are taking the non-capitalist path. Their social and economic progress is supported by the socialist countries and protected by the militant solidarity of the proletariat in the developed capitalist countries. Such is their road of transition to socialism.

The magnificent achievements of the past 50 years should leave no doubt in any one's mind that equally magnificent prospects will open to laboring mankind in the years ahead.

The aggravation of all the processes of the general crisis of capitalism finds clearest expression in the aggravation of the fundamental contradiction of our age, between the two mutually-opposed world systems.

We have to reckon with a wide range of new international problems. They stem, on the one hand, from the continued advance of the world socialist revolution and the prospect of its further development and, on the other, from the new ways in which the imperialist bourgeoisie and its servitors pursue their old tactic of combining violence with demagoguery. These problems can be solved, but only through organized and coordinated mass actions on a world scale. Obviously, this can only be achieved by the Communist and Workers' parties following a correct policy based on Marxism-Leninism. And this, in turn, is inseparably linked with the necessary strengthening of world Communist unity now impaired by the divisive activities of the Mao Tse-tung group, which its anti-Marxist and anti-Leninist policy and its personality cult.

That is why the Communist Party of Brazil so emphatically supports a world conference of Communist and Workers' parties and is prepared to facilitate, to the best of its ability, its effective preparation. And we believe that, because of the urgency and gravity of the problems the conference will have to discuss, it should be convened at the earliest possible date.

Pending its convocation, our Party's independent position in the world Communist movement, based on its Communist and proletarian international duty, is to conduct all its activities in accordance with the policy and tactical principles adopted at the 1957 and 1960 meetings, in the elaboration of which it shared and which, in common with all the other parties, it freely approved.

These principles, the result of theoretical interpretation of the experience accumulated by our movement, can, and should, be enriched, amended and generally developed be-

cause their validity has been, in the main, corroborated by practical experience over the past ten years.

This applies, above all, to the policy of peaceful coexistence. That has to be emphasized all the more because of late some people in the anti-imperialist movement — who never miss the opportunity to parade as Marxists and “true revolutionaries” — have been battling against the Leninist concept of peaceful coexistence and refuse to support it in practice. Their contention, put with the utmost vehemence, is that peaceful coexistence is a wrong, counter-revolutionary policy that hampers full development of the class struggle and victory of the national-liberation movement. There is also the more subtle argument that peaceful coexistence concerns only the socialist countries and has no relevance whatever to the labor and national-liberation movements in the rest of the world.

In Brazil, such arguments come from leaders of radical petty-bourgeois nationalist groups and ultra-Lefts frustrated and upset by the temporary difficulties and setbacks. These, of course, are inevitable in one or another area or country; they are the concomitant of the general advance of the world revolutionary movement.

That is the type of argument used by these pseudo-Marxists in their essentially anti-communist, anti-Soviet and anti-internationalist propaganda. Their slogans are ultra-revolutionary, but the purpose behind them is reactionary: to isolate the socialist countries from the rest of the world and impose an adventurist policy that could lead to a military clash between the socialist and capitalist worlds. What we get, in effect, is sheer opportunism — leaders incapable of overcoming the difficulties attending revolutionary activity want the socialist countries to “make” the revolution for them, “crush” imperialism and “help” them “win” power.

Though the whole concept is fallacious, it is used for attacks on peaceful coexistence. Their narrow bourgeois-nationalist and idealist outlook prevents these men from grasping the simple fact that peaceful coexistence is a ceaseless struggle in defense of its underlying principles; it is a clear expression of revolutionary working-class internationalist policy in the era of the transition from capitalism to socialism. Consequently, it facilitates the struggle of the working class and its allies for socialism in the developed capitalist countries, and the struggle for national liberation in the subjected countries. Nor do they realize that coexistence provides favorable conditions for solidarity with, and multiform aid to, the

socialist lands by the workers of capitalist countries.

Peaceful coexistence is predicated on the conviction—for which there is ample scientific substantiation—that in our age the class struggle will result in the capitalist system ceding its place in history to the new social system, socialism. It should also be borne in mind that economic and social ties between the two systems are an objective necessity, an imperative of history, and further the current and ultimate interests of socialism.

Developing the thoughts of Marx and Engels, Lenin demonstrated that the working class can acquire political consciousness, play its vanguard role and win power only on condition that it fights on all the fronts of the class struggle, takes a concrete and active stand in relation to all classes and social strata and is in touch with every facet of social life, upon which it must exert a revolutionary influence. It should therefore be perfectly clear that the winning of political power by one or another proletarian vanguard creates a qualitatively new situation, one of the utmost potential significance for promoting multiform revolutionary activity, primarily and chiefly by this vanguard, now in possession of power, but also by the international proletariat.

The first fruitful example, and at the same time a splendid expression of proletarian internationalism, was set by the Soviet government fifty years ago, when it called on all nations and governments immediately to conclude peace.

Since then peaceful coexistence has played a major, in many cases decisive, part in the positive revolution of the world alignment of class forces. And when coexistence was shattered by the Hitler attack on the USSR, it was immediately re-established on a higher plane in the effective military alliance of the socialist Soviet Union and capitalist Britain, the USA and other countries. Soviet tactical moves within the framework of coexistence determined the course and outcome of the war which saved the world from Nazi terror.

Coexistence of states with differing social systems is an expression of the class independence of the proletariat in power, and a specific form of the revolutionary class struggle of the world proletariat in the transition period. Furthermore, coexistence is inseparable from heightened class vigilance and constant preparation to repel imperialist aggression. This presupposes strengthening the international unity of the working class and organizing it to fight on every sector of the class struggle, and also expansion of the national-liberation movement. Peaceful coex-

tence can help us to achieve that.

In imperialist-dominated countries the democratic and progressive demand for good relations with the socialist countries is an integral part of the fight for national emancipation. That is why U.S. imperialism, working through Latin American reactionaries, has been at such pains to prevent, or at least complicate, relations with the socialist countries.

The U.S. State Department pressured the dictatorship that came to power in April 1964 to break off relations with socialist Cuba. The progressive, democratic and revolutionary forces in Brazil—the entire Brazilian people—denounce this as a blow to our country's sovereignty and to the supreme interests of our liberation struggle. But U.S. imperialism and its agents have not succeeded in forcing the dictatorial regime to break off relations

with the USSR and the other European socialist countries; in fact, contacts in the economic, scientific, cultural and other fields, are being extended. This is bound to stimulate the liberation struggle.

The program our Party has suggested for joint struggle of all patriotic forces to replace the military dictatorship by a democratic government envisages sovereign relations with all countries, and, especially, resumption of relations with Cuba, the pioneer of socialism in the Western Hemisphere.

Our Party is proud to associate its origin with the October Revolution. And we believe that the best way to celebrate its 50th anniversary is for the Sixth Party Congress to take a further step towards making the Party the Marxist-Leninist vanguard of the Brazilian proletariat.

ROQUE DALTON

Communist Party of Salvador

THE CONQUEST OF POWER in Russia by the working people led by the Bolshevik Party and Lenin had deep reverberations in Salvador. First from the bourgeois press, which hastened to anathemize the Soviet Communists, and then owing to whatever explanatory work the international revolutionary and working-class movement managed to conduct in the country, our people learned about the Russian revolution and the countless battles of those days; they heard the names of Lenin and his comrades, which sounded like the names of legendary heroes. To the young organizations of Salvador workers, it was the tidings of a new world rising in gunpowder smoke and blood despite all dangers, in defiance of the monstrous might of the international order of oppression.

Ever since 1917 our working-class movement has had a reference point which enabled it to plot—first empirically and then consciously—a proletarian course which in the struggle against anarchist, anarcho-syndicalist and “economism” trends assumed an increasingly scientific, Marxist orientation.

The early nineteen-twenties were marked in our country by a rise of the organized movement of the proletariat and the broad masses. In 1923 the Regional Federation of Working People was organized and affiliated to the Central American Workers' Confederation. It was in this Confederation that a politi-

cal line inspired by the example of the Russian Bolsheviks began to assert itself.

After a hard struggle leadership of the organized labor movement was assumed by people who stood on Communist positions. The anarcho-syndicalists and reformists were routed. The trade union movement began to spread to the countryside, where joint unions of farm laborers and poor peasants were set up.

Contacts began to be established with the international revolutionary and working-class movement through the Latin American Trade Union Federation, the Caribbean Bureau of the Comintern, the International Labor Defense and other organizations. The international movement, for its part, helped our working class to train cadres and familiarize itself with the organizational experience of the working people of the young Soviet Union, Europe and Latin America.

In March 1930 the founding conference of the Communist Party was held. The first central committee consisted of the most progressive and experienced leaders of the trade union and revolutionary movement. Then followed the establishment of the Communist Youth League and the Salvador section of the International Labor Defense.

The world economic crisis hit Salvador with particular force. Mass unemployment aggravated to the extreme the traditional misery

of the peasants and the urban toilers. The ruling classes made no secret of their intention to force through their solutions of the national problems by violence and terror. The general features of a revolutionary situation began to take shape. The masses clamored for action.

The Communists realized that they were still unable to lead the people in the struggle for power, to win in a direct clash with the bourgeoisie and its state and military machine. Neither a mass organization nor a military organization was in existence, and the general concept of the struggle had not been worked out. But the ruling classes deliberately accelerated the development of events, resulting in a situation where the masses spontaneously rose in revolt. The Communist Party did not desert the people. It foresaw the outcome, but it headed the insurgent people and together with them was subjected to brutal repressions.

Thirty thousand workers, peasants and intellectuals were killed within a few days. The Party organizations were smashed. Almost all the Communist leaders were killed without trial or investigation. Our people have not forgotten those tragic days; they remember not only the crimes and terror of the bourgeoisie, but also the staunchness and self-sacrifice of Communists. Farabundo Marti, Luna and Mario Zapata, Communist and ILD leaders who fell among the first, are a shining example and a symbol of struggle for the new generations of Salvador revolutionaries.

But the Communist Party lived on, though its recovery was slow and painful. In 1958, after a long period of isolation from the masses, after more repressions and an exhausting internal struggle, the Party became the organizational center of the popular struggle that erupted during a new revolutionary upsurge. That upsurge was due to both internal and international factors which intensified the action of its main source—a new economic crisis. The principal international factors were the victory and consolidation of the Cuban revolution, the first socialist revolution in Latin America. The revolutionary process was accelerated also by the Soviet Union's resolute support of the Cuban revolution which was—and still is—threatened with imperialist aggression. This support carried forward the internationalist traditions of the October Revolution. Later, Fidel Castro thus characterized the historical link between the two revolutions: the full development of the socialist revolution in Cuba would have been unthinkable had it not been for October 1917, when the Russian people won power and proceeded to build up the might of its country—today the chief obstacle to the predatory

designs of the imperialist exploiters.

By the end of 1961 the Communist Party of Salvador had assumed leadership of the entire struggle against the military tyranny, and the movement headed by the Party had become a formidable mass force. A similar situation obtains today, when, after the long ebb, the tide is on the turn.

The Central Committee's report to the 5th Party Congress in 1964 pointed out that the central task now in the current phase of gathering forces is to establish links with the industrial and agricultural proletariat.

Jose Sanchez, our General Secretary, writes in one of his articles "Social Developments in El Salvador and the Policy of the Communist Party": "The more than thirty years' existence of a military tyranny with its ruthless repression and terror, which has robbed our people of elementary freedoms and brazenly turned elections into a means of prolonging its rule, has convinced our Party and the other democratic forces that our people cannot in the foreseeable future win power by peaceful means. The people, we believe, will have to engage in armed struggle if they want to conquer political power and solve the problems of their democratic, anti-feudal and anti-imperialist revolution."

Although at present the Party and the masses rely chiefly on non-violent (legal, semi-legal and illegal) forms of struggle, preparation for employment of other forms is also on the order of the day. But whatever means are used in the struggle for power, victory is unthinkable without the participation of the masses. Our objectives are organization of the masses and struggle for their immediate demands as a means of bringing the masses to a comprehension of the revolutionary tasks.

"All the objective conditions for our revolution exist," writes our General Secretary. "The task of our Party is to provide the subjective conditions for the growth of the revolutionary struggle. We know that there is no need to wait for the maturing of a *maximum* of subjective conditions to accomplish the revolution. But we also know that the people must create a *minimum* of subjective conditions if they want the revolution to triumph. We must provide this indispensable minimum of organization and preparation."

Today Salvador is faced with another economic crisis and its inevitable political consequences. The democratic movement has considerably improved its organization and enhanced its influence. All opportunities have been used, including the recent presidential elections, to consolidate these successes. In recent months a wave of strikes swept the country, culminating in a highly successful

general strike of solidarity. The people's organizations have grown stronger. All this opens up good prospects for our revolutionary movement, for our Party, and at the same time places a greater responsibility on us.

We Communists are aware of the new political conditions which the Cuban revolution has created in Latin America. We know that imperialism's global aggressive policy is particularly brazen and dangerous on our continent, as the tragic epic of Santo Domingo has shown. We also know that as the revolutionary struggle of the peoples gains momentum the possibility of direct confrontation with the chief enemy on an ever bigger scale will arise ever more frequently. We hold that in these objective conditions victory can be ensured only by the unity of the revolutionary forces. Regardless of the inevitable tactical or strategic differences between revolutionary groups over problems of a revolution which is at once of a continental and national character; regardless of the differences in views on the ways of the revolution and the forms of struggle, the practical needs stemming from the existence of a common enemy and from the common aims of struggle objectively make *struggle for the unity of the Latin American revolutionaries* top priority.

What the Latin American revolutionary movement needs is not an artificial contraposition of strategic lines, not declarations on the incompatibility of difficult ways of winning power, but a *common strategy* against the continental strategy of imperialism, the mastery of the art of correctly combining all forms of struggle. This concept will not necessarily be confined within national boundaries. It can be operative on a regional and even continental scale, but it should be borne in mind that in the given instance "continental" is a dialectical category presupposing the existence of and due regard for national peculiarities.

Today, on the eve of the 50th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution,

which helped the birth of the revolutionary movement in our country, Salvadoran Communists, strong in the unity of their ranks, are in the van of the nationwide struggle against imperialism and its local henchmen. Conscious of our internationalist duty, we declare our active solidarity with the valiant people of Vietnam whose exploit has become the loftiest symbol of anti-imperialist struggle, and with revolutionary Cuba, against which imperialism is again intriguing in the Organization of American States. We Communists and the people of our country are at one with the heroes waging an armed struggle against imperialism and its puppets in the mountains of Guatemala, Bolivia, Venezuela and Colombia, and with the revolutionaries throughout Latin America who are active in the cities, trade unions, parliaments and universities. It gives us revolutionary joy to see the historic successes of the Soviet people headed by their Communist Party, successes which have truly changed the face of the earth. The fruits of the revolution that Lenin headed are now the possession of all mankind, a solid guarantee of the continuity of the great revolutionary wave of our century. Despite the sacrifices and despite the losses the enemy may inflict upon us, this wave is carrying mankind to the glorious future of communism.

We, the new generation of Communists, are warmed by the fire that burned in the hearts of the workers of Petrograd and Moscow, the workers who stormed the Winter Palace and were prepared to storm the heavens. Their example, as many examples from the international history of the contemporary revolution, imparts a profound moral sense and moral loftiness to our political views. Under the banner of our invincible revolutionary theory, always renewing itself and always creative, and in the name of this moral sense and moral loftiness, we will fight to bring nearer yet another victory in man's struggle for liberation—the Latin American revolution.

AMAT DANSOKO

Member, Secretariat of the Central Committee
of the African Independence Party (Senegal)

PAPERS HAVE BEEN read at this conference showing the immense historical and political influence (direct and indirect) exerted by the October Revolution on the world revolutionary process. I should like, on behalf of the

African Independence Party, to touch on two aspects of this influence on the national-liberation movement in Africa, on two questions, namely, October and proletarian internationalism, and the impact of the ideas of October

on the evolution of the African countries.

The October Revolution imparted a new meaning to proletarian internationalism. In this respect it represented a decisive victory of the revolutionary working-class movement over social democracy which was saddled with ultra-reactionary colonialist prejudices. At the Stuttgart congress of the Second International the colonial question, it will be remembered, was one of the main questions on the agenda on which the revolutionaries and the Right Social Democrats, advocates of colonialism, clashed.

Lenin and the internationalist wing of the Second International firmly and consistently combated the attempts to hitch the European working-class movement to the colonialist policy of the ruling classes. Lenin upheld the idea of unity of the revolutionary working-class movement and national-liberation movement in the colonies. Taking issue with Van Kol and the German, British and French Right Social Democrats who supported him and advocated "subordinating the proletariat to bourgeois ideology, to bourgeois imperialism," Lenin defined the basis of the alliance between the international working-class movement and the national-liberation movement.

The October revolution was the embodiment in practice of Lenin's internationalist ideas regarding the colonies and dependent countries, that is, regarding the liberation of the oppressed peoples of the former Tsarist empire and active solidarity with the struggle of the colonial peoples. This, undoubtedly, is one of the most important aspects of the influence of October. By orienting the revolutionary working-class movement and ideologically equipping its vanguard organizations against the poison of imperialism, the October Revolution made possible the birth and development of an internationalist movement in the metropolitan countries.

This factor accelerated the emergence and organizational crystallization of the national-liberation movement. Suffice to mention as regards our countries the work done by the France Communist Party and the General Confederation of Labor to promote the national and class consciousness of the peoples of the former French colonies. This was the big contribution made by the internationalist working-class movement to the liberation of our peoples. It is precisely since the October Revolution that proletarian internationalism has become for our peoples not just a scientific concept but a guide to action.

It goes without saying that now, too, 50 years after the October Revolution, we hold that unity of the national-liberation and the international working-class movement remains

one of the immutable principles of the world revolutionary process. Yet vague, frequently deliberately confused notions concerning this unity are current in the liberation movement. Not to speak of the agents of neo-colonialism, even some African leaders, genuine patriots, sometimes incorrectly understand or underestimate the need and the importance of a close union between the working-class movement and the movement for national liberation.

At present insidious campaigns are under way to undermine the unity of the three principal forces of the world revolutionary process. Attempts are even being made to replace the Leninist concept of proletarian internationalism by a pattern of struggle divided according to geographical and racial principles, to oppose the countryside to the town, the underdeveloped countries to the developed (without making any distinction between the latter), and so on. It is owing to theories of this kind which, incidentally, are widely spread by imperialism as well, that we are witnessing a revival of nationalist prejudices, an underestimation of the need for a close alliance between the national-liberation movement and the socialist camp.

The complex and tense international situation which makes it difficult sometimes to perceive the change in the world balance of forces in favor of the forces of socialism, national liberation and peace frequently inclines some contingents of the liberation movement to make hasty assessments which, in turn, border on anti-Sovietism. There is no doubt, however, that these negative tendencies supported by those who, "in the name of the revolution," are adding grist to the mill of imperialism, are transitory, for our peoples are rapidly maturing. But for the moment these tendencies are creating difficulties for the world revolutionary process.

Imperialism, and especially Left extremists level all kinds of allegations against the camp of socialism, and against the Soviet Union, in the first place. Their purpose is to destroy or undermine the growing confidence of the countries of the third world in the socialist camp which is rendering the national-liberation movement every support. In the face of these maneuvers, the principal task of all politically conscious and responsible contingents of the national-liberation movement is to seek, through joint anti-imperialist action, a new and more solid basis for uniting the three main revolutionary forces of our time.

We should always bear in mind the Leninist concept of unity, particularly so when tackling the issues of today. At the Second Congress of the Communist International Lenin

emphatically opposed the hasty and doctrinaire generalizations made by Roy, the Indian representative, which contained the germ of some of the current deviations from the correct line of the Communist and democratic world movement.

In his amendments to the theses on the national and colonial questions, Roy declared that the super-profits received in the colonies was modern capitalism's principal source of income. From this he drew the conclusion that the East would henceforth be the main seed-bed of the revolution. Replying to Roy, Lenin stressed the importance of the liberation movement for world revolutionary strategy and the paramount importance of a close alliance between the movement for national liberation and the international working-class movement. And today, 47 years later, Point 4 of the congress resolution on this question retains its validity. It says: "The main accent of the Communist International's policy on the national and colonial questions should be on a closer union of the proletariat and the working masses of all nations and countries for joint revolutionary struggle to overthrow the landowners and the bourgeoisie. For this union alone will guarantee victory over capitalism, without which the abolition of national oppression and inequality is impossible."

Internationalism today is no longer the property of only the revolutionary working-class movement. It has become an essential factor in the relations between entire nations and states. In Africa it has become the slogan not only of the trade union movement but also of national-democratic governments. The experience of Tropical Africa in recent years shows that the awakening and affirmation of a patriotic consciousness organically accords with internationalist aspirations. This is explained by a number of factors, internal and external. The African countries represent rather loose state structures. Because of their motley ethnic composition the conditions in which the national question has to be solved are more complex than on other continents. Any nationalist narrowness holds the danger of tribal conflict and disastrous centrifugal consequences. This is why in their ideological work the progressive African states are putting the accent on developing an internationalist outlook. The external reasons relate to the new balance of world forces and the consequent favorable conditions for accelerated and independent development of the African states.

Here it is pertinent to examine in general outline the influence of the October Revolution, of the achievements of the Soviet Union

and the entire socialist camp on our countries. The existence of the Soviet Union, the emergence of the socialist camp, the growth of the economic might of the socialist world system have demonstrated to our young states the possibility of harmonious economic and social development. This most important fact of our time has completely changed the perspective of the fight against backwardness. Of very great importance for our young states is the fact that a world sphere of production and exchange exists where the basic laws of capitalism no longer operate.

The rapid progress in all spheres of activity in the former colonies of Tsarist Russia that are now part of the Soviet Union show the vast possibilities socialism offers for overcoming socio-economic backwardness. That is why the ideas of socialism in our countries, even before crystallizing into a policy based on Marxism-Leninism, are regarded as synonymous with accelerated and independent development. We are already witnessing the gradual merging of the national revolution with the social revolution. True, by no means all leaders of the liberation movement see this profound process of our times. But for all that, the fact remains that it is confirmation that the socialist world system has become an essential factor in the evolution of human society. This is one of the most important aspects of the influence exerted by the October Revolution on the national-liberation movement.

The African countries are borrowing from the socialist system, the foundation of which was laid by the October Revolution, such ideas as planning, industrialization, agrarian reform, cooperation of small producers and nationalization of the basic means of production. It does not follow from this, however, that we can say that the states using these diverse methods, characteristic of socialism, are identical in levels of development, let alone with the developed socialist countries where socialism has been built in the main.

Mere professions of adherence to socialism are not enough to guarantee against caricature or mystification. But it is noteworthy that only a few leaders of the young states venture to speak openly of their preference for a system of free enterprise.

The all important thing is that in the course of the day-to-day struggle and thanks to the successes of the socialist world, to the unity of action of the world forces of liberation, progress and peace, ever broader sections of the people are coming to realize the imperative need of combining the national revolution and the social revolution. This is consonant with the requirements of the present era of

the transition from capitalism to socialism; it is the only way of smashing the vicious circle,

of putting an end to backwardness and big monopoly domination.

LARBI BUKHALI

Algerian Communist

THROUGHOUT THESE FIFTY eventful years revolutionaries have been inspired by the ideas of the October Revolution and guided by its experience. Neither has been blemished by the ill-intentioned propaganda of the revolution's enemies. In one way or another, the revolution has influenced every major event in this half-century, every significant action for peace, national independence and social progress.

That view is shared by many in Algeria, which today ranks among the most progressive Arab and African countries. In fact, it was the first of this group officially to choose the socialist path, and its choice has been given legislative embodiment in the Algerian Charter and in the Constitution. We believe that Algeria's experience has influenced the socialist orientation of some other Arab and African countries.

Some petty-bourgeois ideologists maintain that a number of Arab countries are building socialism, that their choice of socialism is merely the logical sequel to centuries of struggle for freedom and social justice and is in no way connected with external factors. Both contentions are, in our view, subjective and have no basis in fact.

Arab Marxist-Leninists are not inclined to underestimate post-independence economic and social reforms, which, in fact, they helped to bring about. But such reforms should not be equated with building socialism. For the latter presupposes certain other conditions which do not as yet exist in these countries. I refer, in particular, to participation of the working class, in alliance with the rural and urban masses, in running the state.

Building socialism is, of course, the culmination of a long and hard struggle by the people of a particular country. But that struggle cannot be sealed off from the struggle in other countries, from the spread of revolutionary ideas. Just as the experience of the Paris Commune was of the utmost value for the Russian revolutionaries, notably Lenin and the Bolsheviks, so the experience of the October Revolution has, over the course of these fifty years, been an inexhaustible source of guidance for every revolutionary, for every-

one who subscribes to scientific socialism. And in this respect Algeria is no exception.

Having pierced the imperialist front, weakened imperialism and created the first workers' and peasants' state, the October Revolution indicated to all the oppressed peoples the road to liberation. It did more than provide an example; it provided tangible assistance to peoples battling for freedom. In its initial stage, the anti-imperialist Kemalist revolution in Turkey benefited immensely from the political and material assistance of the young Soviet Republic. This was the time when national-liberation organizations were taking shape in the Near and Middle East. Despite a certain alienation, artificially cultivated by the colonialists, we Algerians were in close touch with other parts of the Arab and Islamic world, and followed with keen interest the Arab anti-imperialist movement. All this greatly influenced our own freedom effort.

But there was also another important factor. Algeria had been colonized by French settlers and this led to close links with France. It was through France, through the French workers' movement, that the ideas of Marxism-Leninism and the October Revolution penetrated to Algeria.

Moreover, many Algerian workers emigrated to France and came into direct contact with her working-class and revolutionary movement. This led to a clearer understanding of Marxism-Leninism, its class concepts, organizational principles, its tactics in the fight for the social emancipation of the working class. Our people thus learned to organize for successful battle against their exploiters. Most migrant workers would return after two or three years, bringing back knowledge of the revolutionary struggle, experience in organization, and thus helping to promote the movement for freedom. But they also brought back revolutionary ideas, and understanding of the need for fundamental social change. Much the same applied to Algerian students in France.

During the war, many migrant workers joined the Resistance and its clandestine combat groups, thereby making their own modest contribution to the liberation of France.

For many years the toiling people of Algeria waged an intensive social and political battle in defense of their rights, for solidarity with the Soviet Union and other nations, against fascism and war, for peace and international friendship.

And many of these actions were inspired and stimulated by the magnificent achievements of the Soviet Union. In combination, all this contributed to the growth of political awareness among our workers and inculcated a feeling of proletarian internationalism. The latter found expression in solidarity with the Soviet Union, the Arab people and the French working class. I would like to mention two facts which epitomize this internationalist sentiment. In 1936 several hundred Algerian workers joined the International Brigades to defend Republican Spain against Franco. Very few returned. Or this example: under the leadership of the Algerian Communist Party, our people actively opposed the colonial war waged by French imperialism against the people of Vietnam. I need only recall the resolution of our dockers' congress in June 1949 not to service ships carrying cargo to Vietnam. This meant the loss of millions of working hours, but the boycott was scrupulously observed right up to the end of the war in July 1954. Our active solidarity with the heroic Vietnamese in their fight against U.S. imperialism should be seen as the logical continuation of that struggle.

Everyone knows that the French Communist Party has always pursued an unswerving anti-colonialist policy, and Algeria benefited from this more than any other colonial country. The French Communists fought the colonial regime and the war against the Algerian people. Notwithstanding shortcomings and even inevitable errors in its approach to certain aspects of the complex Algerian problem, the fact remains that the Communist Party of France was largely responsible for the emergence in Algeria of workers' organizations, which for decades were the sole transmitter of the victorious ideas of the October Revolution. That is a fact of history and one which no amount of hostile propaganda can obscure or discount. And I take this occasion to express our gratitude to the French Communist Party.

The Communist Party of Algeria was founded in October 1936, at the height of the Popular Front in France, when political, economic and social conditions made the formation of a working-class party in our country not only possible, but necessary. And ever since, guided by Marxism-Leninism, our Party has worked to direct and organize the struggle of the working class and the people in the

spirit of the October Revolution and in solidarity with the Soviet Union. During World War II ours was the only organization to combat the colonial fascist regime established by Hitler's henchmen. The Nazi defeat at the hands of the Soviet Army came as a fresh stimulus to our own movement for national independence. For ten years, from 1944 to 1954, our people waged a political, economic and social struggle for their demands, for national independence. And in this struggle the Communist Party, often side by side with other national organizations, was the principal organizer of strikes, demonstrations and other actions, notably during election campaigns, for peace, against colonial oppression and the colonial war. It was this policy of mass action, systematically conducted over the entire ten-year period, plus the example of the heroic Vietnamese that prepared our people for the national rising of November 1, 1954 and the long and costly war of liberation.

Many factors—and they were always taken into account—contributed to our ability to hold out for seven-and-a-half years and to defeat what was then the world's strongest colonial army. One factor was the relatively favorable international situation in which the progressive forces of the world could give our people valuable and effective political and material assistance.

The severity of the war, its mass character, the involvement of the rural and urban poor, were largely responsible for the fact that liberation was not only national, but also social. But there were other contributing circumstances. Our guerrilla fighters insisted on the Tripoli program envisaging far-reaching economic and social reforms and rejection of the capitalist path. They had before them the example of the USSR and other socialist countries. Immediately after independence — when the peasants had taken over the settler estates and the workers some of the foreign-owned industries — the new leaders were compelled to proclaim, in the Algerian Charter, socialism as the ultimate goal, though some of them were not at all convinced that socialism was desirable or inevitable.

And so, our people's choice of socialism was the result not only of century-long struggle, nor the realization of the Islamic social doctrine, as some petty-bourgeois spokesmen would have us believe. It was the result of a concerted effort of the masses powerfully influenced by revolutionary ideas, above all the triumphant ideas of the October Revolution, which inaugurated a new era in human history.

If the progressive governments of Syria and the United Arab Republic were able to

withstand the recent Israeli aggression, it was only because of the decisive action of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in demanding a cease-fire before the imperialists had achieved their strategic aims. It should be perfectly clear that the national-liberation movement to a very considerable degree owes its confidence in victory to the Soviet Union and the socialist camp has changed the world balance of forces and is an important economic, technical, diplomatic and military factor in the advance of the national-liberation movement.

Some Arab leaders do not accept the cease-fire ordered by the Security Council, though it has been accepted by the countries most directly involved in the conflict, the United Arab Republic, Syria and Jordan. That attitude, we think, is wrong. It does not help to coordinate action by the Arab and progressive forces to compel Israel and its imperialist backers to recognize and respect the legitimate rights of the Palestine and other Arab peoples. If the struggle is to be continued in new forms, then the Arab countries should draw the necessary conclusions from the military defeat and revise some aspects of their anti-imperialist strategy and tactics.

That some progressive leaders in the Arab and African countries have come out in favor of socialism, indeed, even claim that they are building socialism, is, of course, a positive development. It is evidence of the growing popularity of socialist ideas among different sections of the population. The progressive Arab and African countries, effectively combating imperialism, are implementing far-reaching economic and social reforms, and they are entitled to more support from the

international Communist and workers' movement. But there is no ignoring the fact that erroneous views, which have their roots in petty-bourgeois ideology, are being disseminated among the masses. It is the duty of Marxist-Leninists, I think, to criticize these views in the interests of our common cause.

Let me cite examples. Some have sought to counterpose the peasantry to the working class, or the peoples of the third world to the proletariat of industrial countries. There is even the contention that the underdeveloped countries are being exploited by the advanced countries, by all of them, and that peaceful coexistence is at the expense of these underdeveloped countries. The Communist and Workers' parties concerned should work out a uniform attitude on these issues as the prelude to a determined ideological campaign against all distortions, deliberate or unwitting, of scientific socialism. At the same time we believe that it is the international duty of the Communist and Workers' parties to promote closer solidarity with the more consistent revolutionaries in order to facilitate the rise of genuine vanguard parties.

Effective struggle against imperialism imperatively demands the unity and solidarity of the entire international revolutionary and workers' movement. That is why we welcome the support given here for an international conference that would discuss, among other things, the problems posed by the national-liberation movement. This would go a long way towards merging the socialist world system, the international workers' movement and the national liberation movement, in a single anti-imperialist front for peace, national independence, democracy and socialism.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

TOWARDS THE END of October 1917 the general crisis in Russia reached its peak. The Central Committee of the Party directed the work of preparing for revolution. It became the staff of the revolution. Its work during those days was a splendid example of collective leadership: more than 30 meetings of the CC were held, including two plenary and two enlarged meetings, in the three months that preceded the October Revolution. A Revolutionary Military Committee of the Petrograd Soviet was set up to direct the uprising in the capital. John Reed wrote at the time: "... In the factories the committee-rooms were filled with stacks of rifles, couriers came and went, the Red Guard

drilled. . . In all the barracks meetings every night, and all day long interminable hot arguments. On the streets the crowds thickened toward gloomy evening, pouring in slow voluble tides up and down the Nevsky . . ."

The insurrection was launched on October 24 (November 6). The Revolutionary Military Committee called on the Petrograd garrison, Red Guard detachments, on all garrisons situated on the approaches to Petrograd and on the Baltic Fleet to alert the armed forces of the revolution for action.

In the afternoon of October 24 there was fighting for possession of the capital's bridges, which were of strategic importance. But the

main attack was still to be launched. Lenin wrote to the Central Committee: "I am writing these lines on the evening of the 24th: the situation is critical in the extreme. In fact it is now absolutely clear that to delay the insurrection would be fatal." That evening Lenin arrived at the Smolny.

By the morning of October 25 (November 7) all the principal strategic points in the capital were in the hands of the revolutionary forces. The Provisional Government was deposed.

"The Provisional Government has been deposed," stated the Manifesto of the Revolutionary Military Committee. "State power has passed into the hands of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies—the Revolutionary Military Committee which heads the

Petrograd proletariat and the garrison.

"The cause for which the people have fought, namely, the immediate offer of a democratic peace, the abolition of landlord proprietorship, workers' control over production, and the establishment of Soviet power—this cause has been secured."

On the night of October 25-26 (November 7-8) the Winter Palace was stormed; the ministers of the Provisional Government were placed under arrest.

At 10.40 p.m. on October 25, the Second Congress of Soviets opened in the Smolny. The Congress proclaimed Soviet power, adopted Lenin's Decrees on Peace and Land, and elected the first Soviet Government, headed by Lenin.

The first OLAS conference

(delegates' notes)

THE FIRST CONFERENCE of the Organization of Latin-American Solidarity (OLAS) opened in the Havana Libre Hotel on July 31. The delegates from 27 countries—Latin American republics, ex-British colonies and colonial territories—were welcomed by President Dorticos.

The agenda consisted of four items, all of them relating to vital problems of the Latin American revolution:

1. Basic aspects of the Latin American anti-imperialist revolutionary struggle;
2. Joint struggle against imperialist military and political intervention and economic and ideological penetration;
3. Latin American solidarity with liberation movements in other areas;
4. Constitution of the Organization of Latin American Solidarity.

The conference attracted considerable attention. That was only natural considering the tense situation in Latin America and the latter's role in the world revolutionary struggle of the sixties.

Latin America is a continent at the crossroads. Traditional social structures are disintegrating and the anti-imperialist and anti-oligarchic movement is entering a new stage.

In this situation, the imperialists are making desperate efforts to halt or, failing that, to channel the maturing process of social development in their favor. Their counter-offensive is being waged in many forms, from lavish promises of reforms and "aid," to coups d'état to install reactionary dictatorships, and repressive campaigns on a continental scale, including direct military intervention.

For the revolutionary movement this signifies more complex problems. And one of the most essential of these is deeper *theoretical understanding* of the tasks, for theoretical backwardness has always been a drawback of the movement. Another problem is how to *increase the effectiveness* of revolutionary action on a national and continental scale. And still another problem, and one of the utmost urgency, we believe, is how to achieve the revolutionary *unity* of the continent's anti-imperialist forces.

It is no secret, of course, that on all these questions there are varying viewpoints among

Latin American revolutionaries. The differences are both of an objective and subjective nature. They should be seen in the context of the entry of new strata and groups into the revolutionary movement, of the experience of the Cuban revolution, in many ways novel and variously interpreted. But the overriding factor is the rapidly changing situation. This has given a new dimension to some old problems and has posed many new ones. Both require immediate solution. In these circumstances, with the abrupt turn we now witness in Latin American development, and considering the difficulties presented by the tempestuous growth of the movement, there are bound to be different answers to these questions, depending on the specific conditions of the given country and its revolutionary movement, tradition and experience, ideological and political attitude and, lastly, ability quickly to react to volatile situations.

However, we know that in some of the countries these differences are hurting the revolutionary movement, especially where they are inflated by sectarians and professional splitters of the Trotskyite and other brands.

Whatever the differences, even when they have legitimate social roots, they should not be an insuperable barrier to uniting all revolutionaries to fight the unholy alliance of the oligarchy and imperialism.

For Latin America revolutionary unity is an essential condition of victory; without it victory will at best be postponed for a very long time. And it is not by chance that the imperialists are showing such a keen interest in dividing the movement. Unfortunately, instances of the revolutionary forces retreating as a result of division are all too numerous. In some cases, division is the *consequence* of our setbacks, only to become a major *cause* of fresh setbacks. That was exemplified in Brazil, the Dominican Republic and in other countries.

Latterly the danger of a split has loomed large, and this was immediately seized upon by the enemy. Before and during the Havana conference the imperialist press made the "forthcoming split" the axis of its propaganda. Even if there were no other arguments in favor of unity, this alone—this bland, impatient reac-

tionary longing for a wide-open split—should have prompted the revolutionaries to draw the necessary conclusions.

* * *

The conference met for ten days. The plenary sessions were devoted to speeches by delegation heads. Four working panels were appointed to go into the agenda items on the basis of reports prepared by the OLAS organizing committee. In these panels each delegation had one vote and resolutions were adopted by a simple majority; the panel decisions were final. The concluding plenary session approved the General Declaration and the resolutions drawn up by the working panels.

The speeches at the plenary meetings set out in general outline the views of the various delegations on the points under discussion.

The keynote in all cases was the need to work out a revolutionary strategy for the whole of Latin America as a counterweight to the global strategy of imperialism. The accent was on *unity*, on *coordination* of the revolutionary struggle. That was stressed by Rodney Arismendi, the head of the Uruguayan delegation. "The Organization of Latin American Solidarity," he said, "has to face two fundamental problems: 1. coordinating solidarity on a continental scale, primarily with those locked in armed battle with imperialism and reaction, also those fighting in the underground and subjected to persecution, and, in general, with all the multiform actions of our peoples in their difficult struggle. 2. Uniting around a common strategy, and with a view to unity, all organizations and parties campaigning for Latin American liberation."

Some delegates examined in detail the requisite and substance of such a common strategy. Comrade Handall, head of the Salvador delegation, declared: "In Latin America we have definite objective factors, common to the entire continent, which make the shaping of a continental strategy not only possible, but necessary and urgent. For, first, he explained, the revolutionary movement in every Latin American country faces a *common foe*, U.S. imperialism. Second, "all our countries are following the *capitalist path of development*, and are economically and politically dependent on U.S. imperialism. The revolution, therefore, must develop as a process of demolishing this pattern." Last, but not least, there is also this objective factor: "The flow and ebb of the revolutionary movement more or less *coincides* in every part of the continent."

U.S. imperialism is fully alive to the all-continent character of the struggle, and, as Arismendi remarked, "is prepared to take over control of the continent, despite existing frontiers, and turn all the popular liberation struggles into one big fight . . . The present maneuvers against Bolivia and other countries hold out the danger of armed intervention on the model of Santo Domingo. And as this process moves ahead, every country on our continent will be faced with the dilemma: will it become

a *base of aggression* or a *field of battle*? That is the touchstone of solidarity."

At the same time a number of speakers emphasized the need to take into account national peculiarities, especially in devising tactics, in choosing the moment of transition from one tactical phase to another.

Many of the speakers, including all the Communist speakers, declared that the revolutionary forces should concentrate on questions on which views coincide and work for a step-by-step solution of outstanding issues. The representative of the Colombian Communist Party and Revolutionary Armed Forces told the conference: "We shall strive for joint solution of problems that have been long debated in the Latin American movement." The head of the Bolivian delegation said that notwithstanding the differences, his party "would always support everything that brings Latin American revolutionaries closer together." Other delegates, among them the Chilean representative and the head of the Martinique delegation, insisted "on unity in diversity."

Solidarity with national-liberation movements, particularly in areas of armed struggle, was strongly stressed, and the debate centered on concrete forms of such solidarity. Special attention was paid to the problem of solidarity with the Cuban revolution, which acquires a greater importance in view of the forthcoming conference of the Organization of American States. This was discussed in detail by representatives from Chile, Uruguay, Colombia, Costa Rica and the prominent Puerto Rican leader Mari Bras.

What path should the Latin American revolution follow? The discussion produced a common opinion, namely, that in most countries it would entail armed struggle. In some countries armed revolutionary struggle is developing (or will develop) parallel with the build-up of revolutionary forces, while in others there would be non-armed forms of struggle during the build-up period. But here, too, at one or another stage in the development of the revolutionary situation, at the beginning of the revolution, or in retaliation against armed attack by reaction (or imperialist intervention), armed struggle, in one form or another, would, as a rule, become the decisive factor. In other words, given the conditions obtaining in our continent in the present phase of its development, the question of winning power will, in most countries, be solved by resort to arms. That conclusion is embodied in the conference resolution.

A number of delegations laid special stress on guerrilla warfare as the chief form of struggle. Other speakers, however, pointed out that armed struggle could not be separated from mass political struggle, still less contrasted to it. Both forms are inter-connected and do not preclude each other. The conference was reluctant to accept schematic formulas which would condemn, or confine to a very narrow framework, specific methods and tactics. Some dele-

gations had serious reservations on this point, pleading that the situation in their countries did not favor armed struggle at this stage.

Underlying many of the speeches was the idea that the revolutionaries in each country must *themselves carry out the revolution* and thereby make their contribution to Latin American liberation. There was applause for the statement of Armando Hart, head of the Cuban delegation, that "revolutions are not directed from outside; they are carried out by the people of each country and led by its revolutionaries. The prime duty of revolutionaries is to carry out the revolution in their country and lead it to victory."

Discussing the responsibility of revolutionaries, the Bolivian delegate said: "Our people do not shirk their duty to carry out their revolution. But we Bolivians have a duty to the Latin American peoples—to carry out our revolution as part of the continental revolution."

These problems and a number of others—the role and character of the revolutionary vanguard, the alignment of class forces in the various countries, etc. — were the subject of lively debate in the working panels. And though some of the views expressed were controversial, it was, right and proper, to think, that they were discussed. In general the debate revolved around the crucial problems of the revolutionary movement.

The conference also discussed ways and means of eradicating colonialism, solidarity with the Negro people of the United States and the Arab peoples attacked by the Israeli aggressors.

The duty of all revolutionaries to intensify the solidarity movement with Vietnam was strongly emphasized. Delegates and guests gave a standing ovation to the representatives of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and of the South Vietnam National Liberation Front who described the achievements in the war against the common enemy, U.S. imperialism. They were due, they said, to the heroism, revolutionary consciousness and internationalism of the Vietnamese people, the far-seeing policy of the Vietnamese Working People's Party and the National Liberation Front, and to the mounting solidarity and support of the socialist countries, the international working class, all the peoples striving for peace and justice. Speaking for his people, the Vietnamese delegate conveyed a message of gratitude to the socialist countries and to the progressives of the world, including the progressive forces in the USA, "for having rendered such vast and valuable aid in our struggle against American imperialism, for national salvation."

There were difficult moments at the conference, and tendencies that were exploited by capitalist propaganda to spread all manner of insinuation. But thanks to the feeling of responsibility, the maturity and tolerance of the representatives of the Communist parties and other revolutionary organizations, the "inevi-

table split" which international reaction had hoped for and expected, was averted.

* * *

The debate on points 1 and 2 of the agenda ended with the adoption of general resolutions. The conference also approved a message of greetings on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, resolutions on solidarity with peoples and movements waging revolutionary armed struggle, a resolution on the abolition of colonialism, and others. A resolution on the OLAS Constitution was also approved, thus creating a mechanism that will play a big part in coordinating continental solidarity.

All the conference resolutions merit detailed study.

The conference showed that the wide discussion of the basic problems of the Latin American revolutionary movement, which has been conducted on the pages of this journal, meets an urgent need. It is developing at a time of "great expectations" when, more than ever before, we must find the answers to cardinal questions and, what is especially important, carefully analyze and correctly indicate the paths to victory of the Latin American peoples' liberation struggle. History has given us a great example: the development by Lenin of the theory of revolution and its practical application half a century ago.

True, in the final analysis, the validity of concepts advanced in the Latin American movement will be shown—is already being shown—by the development of the revolutionary struggle and its results.

This does not mean that the theory of revolution can and should be formulated *a posteriori*, confining ourselves, at the present stage, to set formulas worked out decades or months ago.

The first OLAS conference, we believe, was a step forward in examining the root problems of the Latin American revolution. In particular, it reaffirmed some of the general conclusions now being drawn by the continent's liberation movement. This applies to such problems as the continental character of the Latin American revolution, defining the basic ways of its development, the need for a common strategy based on the common nature of the revolution, in all the countries. The conference resolution says: "The substance of the Latin American revolution is determined by its orientation against imperialism and the capitalist-landlord oligarchy . . . ; the revolution is a struggle for national independence, liberation from the oligarchy, for a socialist path that will assure our peoples complete economic and social development."

Participation in the conference of Communist parties was, in our opinion, very fruitful. It helped towards a keener appreciation of the urgent need for an objective and profound analysis of reality and towards a clearer vision of the ways and prospects of the revolution. There is also a much closer understanding of the need to strengthen continental Communist

unity and, at the same time, to rally together all genuine revolutionary and anti-imperialist forces. Division would only play into the hands of the enemy. Mindful of that, the Communist parties displayed flexibility and a keen sense of responsibility, and this enabled them to neutralize many of the dangers that beset the conference. They were firm and united in upholding their principles and consistent in advocating a common policy. They convincingly demonstrated their readiness to join with other revolutionary forces in working out such a common policy, one that would make for rapid mobilization of Latin America's vast revolutionary potential.

The unity we are striving for cannot be based on a compromise on principles, on a patchwork of widely different attitudes tied together by general formulas binding on no-one. Still less can it be based on concepts imposed by one trend upon another, or on proclamation of "relentless ideological war" *within* the revolutionary camp. We must reckon both with objective reality and with the fact that, in the great battle against imperialism and reaction, differing viewpoints are bound to persist. What is needed, we think, is, first, urgent efforts to work out a common denominator that will enable all the revolutionaries of the continent, already now, to march in the same direction and with the greatest possible following. This would be the preparation for an attack on the enemy's fortress. On the other hand, there are problems for which the revolutionaries do not as yet have "ripe," crystallized solutions, problems over which there are still differences and which require continued study and discussion. And the discussion must be frank and open. To produce constructive results it must be conducted in an objective, fraternal manner, in a

way that will facilitate unity of revolutionary action — it must not be a substitute for, and certainly not a hindrance to, such action. To ignore this necessity, to believe that "everything is now clear" (or "everything has always been clear"), would result in complacent passivity in matters of principle. And this, in turn, could lead either to voluntarism or to inertia at a time when the situation poses such urgent tasks and demands.

Lastly, there are problems on which the positions are obviously diametrically opposed. As matters stand, the wisest thing, in our opinion, would be to relegate these problems to the background and await the judgment of life itself.

* * *

The clear, united position of the Communist parties at the Havana conference is added proof of their deep sense of responsibility for the destinies of the Latin American revolution. Somehow there comes to mind the Biblical tale of Solomon's judgment on the two women claiming the same child. Not in the sense, of course, that the Communists are prepared to forfeit their responsibility for leadership of the mass struggle in order to save the "child," i.e., the revolution. That will never be. But the Communists are determinedly opposed to sectarianism, to those who are prepared to sacrifice the revolution if they can retain its lifeless, but "pure," half. No, the "child" must live, grow, become strong and victorious. And that depends, first and foremost, on whether the revolutionary forces of the continent are able to preserve and strengthen their unity.

R. OTERO

R. CASTELLANOS

The "New Order" in Indonesia

(letter from Jakarta)

With pain and anger progressive people all over the world have been following the terror campaign conducted over the past two years on an unheard-of scale against Communists and democrats in Indonesia. Internationalists in all countries have denounced the outrages and demanded an end to the abuses against the country's patriots. They are calling for restoration of democratic rights, and expressing fraternal solidarity with the Communists and all Indonesian patriots who, despite all the difficulties created by reaction and the military dictatorship, are carrying on their courageous struggle against imperialism on behalf of their people, for the gains of the Indonesian revolution.

Below is a letter from Jakarta describing the tragic events in Indonesia and the current situation.

* * *

Nearly two years have passed at this writing since the day of Indonesia's national tragedy—September 30, 1965. Nine months later, in June 1966, *Time* magazine said of the developments in our country that they were "for the West the best news" out of Asia in many years.

The so-called September 30 Movement was an abortive counter-action against the conspiracy of the Council of Generals. Its failure engendered the third and biggest wave of terror in Indonesia's history. The estimated figure of 400,000 dead reported in the world press is obviously minimized if all victims, up to the present time, are taken into account. On Bali alone the number of victims exceeded 100,000, and there were many more on Java, Sumatra and in other parts of Indonesia. A figure approaching 600,000 would be closer to the truth.

The first stage of the Rightist coup began on March 11, 1966, when President Sukarno was presented with an ultimatum requesting him to surrender his executive powers to General Suharto. On that day strategic points in Jakarta were occupied by the enemy. Units of the Siliwangi Division (formerly commanded by General Nasution) were rushed in from Western Java as a support force. The Merdeka Palace was surrounded by paratroops, supported by tanks and armored cars. This was the atmosphere in which the ultimatum was presented, leading up to President Sukarno's signing of an "order" instructing General Suharto "in the name of the President, Supreme Commander and Great Leader of the Revolution to take all measures deemed necessary to ensure the security, order and stability of the administration of the state."

This "order" enabled General Suharto to effect a swift maneuver strengthening the hand of his followers and bringing the putsch to completion. Next day, acting in the President's name, Suharto dissolved the Communist Party and its mass organizations, and banned all Communist activities. On March 18, again in the name of the President and on the pretext of "security" and "stabilizing the administration of the state," he arrested the 14 Cabinet Ministers who supported Sukarno.

In the meantime, the persecution and slaughter of Communists and other progressives was prosecuted with the utmost savagery. Identification as a Communist was tantamount to a death warrant. Party premises and property were looted. Marxist literature was banned and Marxist books consigned to bonfires. The property of the National Party and the Indonesian Party (Partindo) suffered the same fate. Progressive Muslims, among them Hadji Siradjuddin Abbas, member of the Indonesian Peace Committee, were arrested. Reactionary newspapers resumed publication.

But reaction needed "public support" and "legalization" of its actions. For this purpose it had to gain control of the People's Consultative Assembly. The first step was to expel from it all Communists and progressives, and all those suspected of direct or indirect participation in the September events. Similar steps were taken in Parliament. The resulting vacancies were filled with members of the Rightist military clique, with additional seats accorded to army officers, securing an overwhelming majority in the Assembly for the armed forces.

The "order" of March 11 was thus superseded

by a "mandate" issued to General Suharto by the People's Consultative Assembly. The ban on the Communist Party and on Marxism-Leninism was given the form of an Assembly decision. Sukarno was deprived of his presidency for life. No longer was he the Great Leader of the Revolution. His teaching was pronounced subject to revision. The Consultative Assembly, headed by General Nasution, furnished the regime with what it needed — "legalization" of Suharto's past actions and a "legal basis" for anything he might undertake in the future.

The Rightist military clique now began to clamor for Sukarno's dismissal; they organized demonstrations of students and school pupils, and manifestations of political parties and trade unions. The call now was for Sukarno's removal and his trial by an extraordinary military tribunal.

The regime felt that it could give Sukarno the "friendly advice" to step down voluntarily. On February 20, 1967, Sukarno delegated all executive power to General Suharto, with the sole proviso that the general should from time to time, when necessary, report to Sukarno, nominally still the President. These changes were "formalized" by the Consultative Assembly on March 12, 1967. Sukarno was legislatively stripped of the presidency, with Suharto appointed acting president pending a general election. But no matter how vaguely worded the decision was which removed Sukarno, he had in fact long ceased to be President. The Rightist putsch was thus fully consummated.

* * *

The people of Indonesia, who have in their history made heavy sacrifices in the fight against colonialism and imperialism, were not to be easily prevailed upon to accept a shift to the Right. And the Nasution-Suharto group were well aware of this. From the first day of the putsch, therefore, they "assured" the people that the destruction of the Communist Party and Sukarno's removal did not imply a turn to the Right. At the end of 1965 Suharto published a photostatic copy of a document he had signed jointly with Sukarno, ostensibly to reaffirm the course of the Indonesian revolution. The document characterized the revolution as a Left, socialist revolution, anti-imperialist, anti-capitalist, anti-feudal and anti-racist.

To foreign and Indonesian newsmen Foreign Minister Malik said that Rightist trends were strong and had the backing of reactionaries at home and abroad, although, he added, most of the people did not want any shift to the Right.

Here Malik was right, as is borne out by the people's resistance in the present trying situation. But it is just as true that under the "new order" the state is shifting distinctly to the Right.

The ban on Marxism-Leninism is more total than it was in colonial times. Even under Dutch colonial rule one could come across the works of Marx and Lenin in the libraries.

The policy of the present regime is leading undeniably to neo-colonialism. During recent

Dutch-Indonesian economic negotiations, the Netherlands asked for 4,000 million guildens in "compensation" for confiscated property. Though ultimately reduced to 600 million, the demand was outrageous, but was accepted.

The regime is easing through Parliament reactionary legislation, including a law envisaging a variety of privileges for foreign investors. *Duta Masjarakat*, the organ of the Nahdlatul Ulama, the Islamic party backing the regime, has urged the authorities to protect the interests of the national bourgeoisie which, it said, was being treated as a foster-child in its own country. Foreign capitalists are getting back their enterprises, whose nationalization had cost the people so much effort.

The same *Duta Masjarakat* reported that Dutch, French, Japanese and American investors had agreed to develop Indonesia's nickel, copper and oil deposits.

This news was soon followed by a BBC report that the United States had obtained permission to work the copper mines in West Irian, in which it could invest up to \$100 million.

U.S. willingness to "aid" Indonesia both directly and through third countries indicates that the regime has agreed to political conditions. What these are may be inferred from President Johnson's blunt statement to the effect that Indonesia would not get any aid until it puts its house in order, affords favorable terms to foreign creditors and investors, and refrains from international gambles.

The connection between foreign aid and political restrictions is clear. Having fallen into the clutches of neo-colonialism economically, Indonesia is gradually falling into political dependence.

Although Malik declared some time ago that the regime did not intend to establish diplomatic relations with South Korea, a South Korean consul has opened an office in Jakarta.

Malik displayed extraordinary energy in organizing a pro-imperialist bloc of Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand, the Philippines and Singapore. The bloc, known as the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, was formally inaugurated at the beginning of August. Most of the member-states have links with other aggressive blocs—Seato, the Southeast Asia Association or the Asian and Pacific Council—or bilateral military agreements with the United States and other imperialist powers. By joining the Association, Indonesia with its population of 110 million which considerably exceeds that of all other Southeast Asian countries, is likely to become a new link in the chain of military alliances built up by the United States and other imperialist powers in this area. Membership of ASEAN involves it in the reckless military designs and aggressive actions of the United States and its Southeast Asian allies.

The blackout of democracy is making the existence of the political parties increasingly precarious. Militarization is spreading to all areas. Military men are being appointed governors, ambassadors, regional chiefs, chairmen of

provincial councils and even village elders. Their control of the economy is having disastrous effects. The widespread smuggling and corruption are traceable chiefly to the military, because smuggling could never have reached its present proportions without the army's collusion.

* * *

The "new order" is an out and out military dictatorship. It has trampled on the 1945 Constitution, turned Parliament and the People's Consultative Assembly into tools of reaction and sold Indonesia as a prize to imperialism and neo-colonialism.

The Indonesian reactionaries made the most of the September 30 events, which they blamed on the CPI, using this as an excuse for the inhuman treatment meted out to Communists, for outlawing the Communist Party and the teaching of Marx and Lenin. They fanned the anti-Communist hysteria to a scale which *Time* magazine has described as an orgy of flashing steel and volleys of rifle fire. And, as always, anti-communism as a pretext for suppressing progressive elements was backed by the imperialists. Anti-communism is in practice either a dirty war like that in Vietnam, or subversion and provocation against sovereign nations, as in Indonesia.

For Indonesian reaction the September 30 events presented a long-awaited opportunity to lash out at the CPI, its chief adversary. But to blame the CPI for these events and, much more, to identify them with Marxism-Leninism, is absurd. Marxism-Leninism, the theoretical basis of all CPI activity, categorically rejects political gambles and putsches. Marxism-Leninism, and hence the CPI, maintains that all actions must have mass support.

The facts, including those that came to light at the tribunals, show that the September 30 Movement was initiated by units of the armed forces, chiefly the ground troops, which had a large element of progressive servicemen. The movement was touched off in Jakarta in the hope of its spreading and winning support throughout the country. Its purpose was to frustrate the conspiracy of the Council of Generals and to purge the army of members of that Council, and to establish a Revolutionary Council in which nationalists, Muslims and Communists (Nasakom) would work together as a preliminary to People's Democracy.

No connection exists between the September 30 Movement and the program of the CPI, let alone Marxist-Leninist teaching. The Indonesian Communist Party has its own rules and a program, for which it bears full responsibility. These documents are not the creation of one man. They were discussed and adopted by the supreme Party body, a congress, after being

approved at thousands of Party meetings at all levels. The preamble to the rules says that all Party activities are based on the Marxist-Leninist teaching. To head what the preamble describes as a long and complex revolution, the CPI must follow patient and cautious tactics designed to promote the revolutionary struggle, while combating tendencies towards capitulation and adventurism, trends stemming from petty-bourgeois instability. The ten general propositions and the 50 demands of the program, worked out on the basis of the concerted action of the Indonesian people over fourteen years, define the aims of the CPI and the methods with which it intends to achieve them. In substance, these aims have nothing in common with the nature and spirit of the September 30 events.

The fact that some members of the Party participated in the September 30 movement is no reason for the CPI to be held responsible as an organization for their conduct; participation by a few could certainly not be a reason for slaughtering hundreds of thousands of guiltless Communists and for jailing hundreds of thousands more just because they are members of the Communist Party.

Among the murdered were the CPI leaders Comrades Aidit, Lucman and Nyoto. Hundreds of thousands are languishing in concentration camps and prisons, among them Anwar Sanusi, Alternate Member of the Political Bureau, and Jokosujono and Karel Supit, members of the Secretariat of the Central Committee, and many other comrades. As always, the Indonesian Communists and other progressives have the internationalist support of the fraternal parties and progressive people everywhere. This support is deeply appreciated by the people of Indonesia. Never have the prisoners in concentration camps and jails needed their solidarity more than now, for it may prevent more bloodshed. It may also improve the maintenance of prisoners and gain them permission to see their families and lawyers. That the international working class, the Communist and Workers' parties of the world, all revolutionary people, true to their duty, will always display their internationalist solidarity, is beyond question. At times of trial their help has always been a comfort and inspiration to Indonesia's revolutionary forces.

In the name of the hundreds of thousands of Communists and Communist sympathizers massacred in our country, responding to international solidarity and support, we shall advance undaunted along the Marxist-Leninist path, the only correct path, towards the final victory of the national-democratic revolution in Indonesia.

SUCHAHYO

Anti-Communist law in Argentina

ON AUGUST 25, President Onganía of Argentina signed a law earlier approved by the National Security Council. It prescribes imprisonment for persons accused of "Communist activity," forbids employment of Communists in the government service and the teaching profession, envisages deprivation of citizenship for foreign-born Communists and deportation of foreign Communists.

Obviously inspired by Washington, the aim of the new law is to suppress all recalcitrants; the method is inquisitional thought control.

Though spearheaded against the Communists, it holds out a clear danger to every supporter of democracy, freedom and progress. Nor is this the first time a reactionary dictatorship begins its career of total terror with a crusade against the Communists. "The simplest thing," writes the Argentine Communist *Nuestra Palabra*, "is to tack the Communist label on everyone opposed to imperialism, the Pentagon, the dictatorship, everyone who speaks out against social oppression and political strangulation."

That is just what the new law sets out to do—stifle the discontent. And the reasons for the discontent are many. Since the advent of the regime prices have risen steadily; according to official statistics the minimum cost of living is up 29.8 per cent over the second half of 1966. The number of fully unemployed now exceeds 700,000. The government is affording the big capitalists and landowners every conceivable advantage, making concessions to foreign monopolies, handing over the country's natural resources and economy to the International Monetary Fund and foreign corporate interests.

The people are learning the hard way that

anti-communism is a screen for national betrayal, for an onslaught on living standards and rights, for a desperate attempt to safeguard and expand the interests of the privileged minority.

Many citizens prominent in public life, trade unions and other organizations and newspapers have protested against the law. Ex-President Illia has denounced it as "inquisitional." Protests have come from the General Confederation of Labor, and the Trade Union Coordination Movement. A statement issued on August 14, says the dictatorship has launched a "frontal attack on human rights and the elementary concepts of democracy."

Argentine Communists have called on all progressives to unite in a concerted campaign against the law and the regime that promulgated it. The Party's Central Committee statement says: "Not only communists, but all democrats and patriots, all men and women who believe in economic, social and cultural progress, who want peace and national independence, will unite to protest against this monstrous piece of legislation."

The Communist Party will be celebrating its 50th anniversary in January. Its half-century record of struggle for freedom, democracy and social progress has won it the respect and support of the working people.

The gorillas who have seized power thought that the new law would put an end to the Communist Party. "A hopeless attempt," writes *Nuestra Palabra*, "no amount of McCarthyism can prevent the Communist Party from fulfilling its mission of leading our people to victory over the fascist dictatorship, for democracy, peace and socialism."

A. BELIDO

Kaethe Kollwitz— a pioneer of revolutionary art

THIS YEAR THE WORLD Peace Council is celebrating the centenary of Kaethe Kollwitz, eminent German artist and pioneer of revolutionary art whose name is held in deep respect in the German Democratic Republic.

In one of her last letters Kollwitz put down ideas that could well serve as her epitaph. "War has accompanied me to my dying day," she wrote, "but a new ideal will arise, and with it will come an end to war . . . I die with this conviction. Much will have to be done for this, and done it will be . . . This, new ideal, is the ideal of fraternity among men."

Kaethe Kollwitz was born into a bourgeois family in which liberal ideas were interlaced with the ideology of German Social Democracy. Theologian and philosopher Julius Rupp, her grandfather on the distaff side, a convinced champion of the 1848 revolution, was engaged all his life in conflict with religious orthodoxy and the reactionary Prussian state. Her father, Karl Schmidt, resigned from the civil service because he did not wish to be an instrument of the reactionary government. Her brother, Konrad, was a prominent social-democratic economist and, subsequently, as editor of *Vorwaerts*, powerfully influenced his sister.

The enlightened atmosphere in the parental home and a keen interest in social problems prompted her to make the workers the central theme of her art.

Her husband Karl Kollwitz was a physician. His patients were mostly workers in the neighborhood, and Kaethe often assisted him on his visits to the sick. This gave her a first-hand knowledge of working-class life. Until then working men made on her a purely aesthetic impression, with just a grain of the ethical. Now, having had direct contact with their problems, often with total destitution and despair, the stress shifted to the social aspect. This prepared her for one of the events of her artistic life — the premiere of Hauptmann's *Weavers*, in Berlin's *Freie Buehne* on February 26, 1893. Her artistic interpretation of both her own impressions and the ideas of the play placed Kaethe Kollwitz among the foremost German artists of her time. Her exciting sketches, "The Weavers' Rebellion," which she completed in 1897-1898, recorded the fate of the

Silesian weavers, their misery, their revolt and its ruthless suppression.

In 1898 when her set of sketches was shown at a Berlin exhibition it was recommended for the Gold Medal. But Kaiser Wilhelm spurned the recommendation because, he said, the 31-year-old artist's cycle was part of what he called rebellious "gutter art." But this did not daunt Kaethe Kollwitz. She was too deeply convinced in art's social mission; public recognition meant much more to her than the Kaiser's contempt. In 1899 she began a new cycle, "The Peasant War," which she completed in 1908. The most cogent element in this phase of her art is its revolutionary thrust. The weavers in the fourth sheet of her previous cycle were only rising to the assault, whereas the passion of the crowd in the fifth sheet of "The Peasant War" veritably erupts. The accusatory Black Anne in the background, summoning the people to battle, can be identified as Kaethe Kollwitz herself. Reminiscing, she wrote: "Barricade battles in which Father and Konrad took part, me loading rifles for them, were part of my childhood fantasies."

In the subsequent period up to the end of the First World War, this revolutionary thrust vanished. Thereafter an *accuse* spirit dominated most of her work. Her placards and sketches of posters bore titles such as "Death," "Unemployment" and "Child Destitution."

The lack of revolutionary content in this phase can be traced to the demoralizing effect of the reformism of the day, which had made headway in the social-democratic movement. That it afflicted Kaethe Kollwitz is probably due to her initially total incomprehension of the imperialist nature of the First World War.

The war visited intense suffering on the Kollwitz family. Her younger son Peter, who had volunteered, fell in Flanders in October 1914. For a long time Kaethe would not grasp the futility of his death. She banished her early doubts, which she thought a betrayal of her son's sacrifice, and proposed to perpetuate Peter's memory in a sculpture embodying this idea of sacrifice for an ideal. Then, at last, she perceived the slaughter in the trenches for what it really was. "We are being deceived," she wrote. "Peter would probably be alive if not

for this monstrous deception. Peter and millions, many millions—all were deceived."

The monument to her son, completed in 1932 and placed in a military cemetery in Belgium, portrays the figures of two parents kneeling in mourning, the woman bent and the man upright. Like Barlach's *Funeral Feast* in Magdeburg Cathedral, removed by the Nazis and now returned to its place, Kaethe Kollwitz's sculpture is not a martial monument in the accepted sense, but rather a warning against war. This distinguishes it from the countless monuments erected in Germany at the time, in which death was depicted as a pseudo-patriotic mystically-conceived sacrifice.

Her grief and growing doubts paralyzed Kaethe's creativity. But her painful comprehension of the true nature of the war put an end to her illusions. She made a public stand against the call, issued by the writer Richard Dehmel to "fight on," which appeared in *Vorwaerts*. Denouncing Dehmel's ill-conceived notion of honor and his blind nationalism, she concluded her protest with a line from Goethe: "The harvest must not be destroyed."

The October Revolution gave Kaethe Kollwitz fresh hope. On December 31, 1917, she said:

"Something new has now come into the world, and I feel that it is good."

She expected much from the November 1918 revolution in Germany, but later wrote disappointedly:

"The child did not become a prodigy for it is too close an image of its parents." Later, she wrote: "Compared to what was expected, the Social Democrats produced a wretched thing. Communism is on the march and doubtless contains ideas that are attracting people."

Kaethe Kollwitz was shocked by the brutal murder of Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht. She responded to the request of the Liebknecht family to portray the workers' leader and produced one of her best known and most forceful creations—a graphic work inscribed: From the living to the dead, in commemoration of January 15, 1919.

After the November revolution Kaethe Kollwitz was showered with honors long overdue. She was made a member of the Prussian Academy of Art, a professor and, finally, in 1929, was awarded the Order of Merit, a decoration conferred for achievement in science and in the arts. For Kaethe fame meant new political obligations. "It is true that my art has definite aims," she wrote in 1922. "I want to be active." She made it clear that she was siding with the realistic popular art. "Pure art created in studios," she said, "is barren and senseless. Why should we want something that has no living roots? . . . I believe in mutual understanding between the artist and the people, which always existed in better times." Her later works brought this principle to fruition. In 1920 a lithogravure, "Vienna is Dying! Save Its Children!," and three leaflets against usury, were her first blows at the postwar impoverishment. In 1921 she produced a poster, "Help Russia!,"

for International Workers' Relief, an organization founded in response to Lenin's call for solidarity, and the following year another poster, "Survivors, Declare War on War," ordered by the Red International of Labor Unions for anti-war day on September 21, 1924. This was followed by seven woodcuts for a folder entitled "War," and in 1924 by an engraving, "Give Us Bread," to a series, "Hunger," for International Workers' Relief, and a stirring poster, "May War Never Recur," for a Central-German youth congress in Leipzig.

Kaethe also contributed to various fund-raising campaigns, the proceeds from which went to action funds and persecuted workers. She dedicated not only her art, but also her considerable public weight to the workers' struggle. In 1921 she joined the Aid Russia Committee, in 1927 signed a public protest against the projected destruction of Heinrich Vogeler's frescos, and contributed an article to *Arbeiter-Illustrierte-Zeitung* on the tenth anniversary of the October Revolution. Though not a Communist, she said that "the events of the past ten years in Russia are comparable in grandeur and importance only to the French Revolution." In 1928 she signed an appeal drawn up by prominent German intellectuals against building battleships, and the following year joined Hans Baluschek in defending the Zille memorial film, "Mother Krausen's Travels to Happiness." In 1932, along with Albert Einstein, Heinrich Mann and Arnold Zweig, she put her signature beneath a call for workers' unity against the Nazi party in the coming elections. Her signature beneath this appeal and another one for a united front signed in February 1933, was used by the fascists as a pretext for banishing her from the Academy on February 15, days after they seized power.

By this time Kaethe Kollwitz's fame had spread far beyond Germany. Particularly, she was acclaimed in the Soviet Union. Among the exhibits at the first German art show in Moscow, Leningrad and Saratov in 1924-1925, were many of her works, and the following year more of her works were shown in Moscow at an international exhibition. Her wish to see the Soviet Union came true in 1927. On the invitation of Russian artists, she and her husband paid a fortnight's visit to Moscow during an exhibition of her works in the Soviet capital and in Kazan.

On her 65th birthday in 1932, a Kollwitz exhibition was held in Moscow and Leningrad. For the 15th anniversary of the revolution Kaethe produced a lithogravure, "We are Defending the Soviet Union." Together with "Demonstration," (1930), which she produced for the May First issue of *Arbeiter-Illustrierte Zeitung*, it presents a new image of the working class. No longer is the worker a tormented creature in despair, but a conscious and organized fighter.

In her search for truth, the artist drew closer to the workers. Their problems became her problems. She did not extend or consummate

bourgeois art traditions. It is more proper to say that she overcame them. Themes drawn from the life of the workers, the artist's bonds with the labor movement—this was the source of her humanist realistic art. Her works acted as a stimulus to the development of a revolutionary working-class art in Germany.

During the fascist nightmare, Kaethe Kollwitz was one of the persecuted. She scorned the Nazi authorities and turned down the offer to be re-accepted "with honor."

"I want to be, and must be, among the persecuted," she said. In autumn 1933 she moved from her academic studio to a studio in Klosterstrasse, where she found support among her friends who helped her overcome the feeling of being abandoned. In her new studio, between 1934 and 1938, she made eight prints for a series entitled "Death," in which the aging artist's weariness and disappointment produced the impact of an indictment. She held to her political and artistic convictions, and was among the few who attended the funeral of Max Liebermann, at the Jewish cemetery in Schoenhauser Allee in February 1935. In 1938 she attended the memorial service in Guestrow for Ernst Barlach, another of the persecuted artists. Two years previously the Gestapo had questioned her about the identity of the third person present at an interview she had given to *Izvestia*. Despite threats she refused to di-

vulge the name of the man, Otto Nagel, and was determined to escape the threatened arrest through suicide. Though happily she was not driven to this extreme, her old age was clouded by the Second World War. Karl Kollwitz, her faithful companion of many years, died in 1940. Once more Kaethe took her stand against war in an engraving, "The Harvest Must Not be Destroyed." That year her grandson Peter was killed in battle.

Many but not all her works, letters and sketches of that period have been preserved. In the summer of 1944 her health declined, her eye-sight deteriorated and a gradual collapse presaged approaching death. She died at 77 in Moritzburg on April 22, 1945.

Her works are the treasured possession of the international working-class. She dedicated many of them to proletarian internationalism, aiming them against the workers' poverty and against war. Many of them championed the cause of the Soviet Union. Her influence on revolutionary art, especially in Europe, is marked. Her heritage is studied everywhere, especially in this, the centennial year, which is convincing evidence that Kaethe Kollwitz saw the workers and their revolutionary struggle in broad perspective and in the context of their many inter-related problems, treating them correctly through the medium of her art.

W. GEISMAIER

Books listed here are in the language of the country of publication.

- MARX, K., ENGELS, F. *Stchineniya*. (Works.) Vol. 19, Sofia, BKP, 1967, 680 pp.
- LENIN, V. I. *Briefe*. (Letters.) Band II. 1905-November 1910. Institut fuer Marxismus-Leninismus beim ZK der SED. Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1967. 413 pp.
- A. *reform: eszkoz—A Dolgozok jobb élete: cél*. Az országgyűlés 1967. július 12-14. I. ülészakának anyagából. (Reform — the Means, Higher Living Standard — the Goal. Materials of the State Assembly Session of July 12-14, 1967.) Budapest, Kossuth Könyvkiadó, 47 pp.
- ANGELOV, R. *Finansi i finansova organizatsiya na predpriyatiyata pri noviya nachin na planirane i rkovodstvo na narodnoto stopanstva*. (Finances and Financial Procedures at Enterprises under the New System of Planning and Economic Management.) Varna, DI, 1967, 116 pp.
- "Capitalu" lui Marx si contemporaneitatea. 100 de ani de la aparitia "Capitalului." (Marx's "Capital" and Contemporaneity. 100th Anniversary of the Publication of "Capital.") Bucharest, Editura politica, 1967. 288 pp.
- JABLONSKI, H., KRUCZKOWSKI, A. *Wielka Socjalistyczna Rewolucja Pazdziernikowa a Polska*. (The Great October Socialist Revolution and Poland.) Warsaw, KiW, 1967, 93 pp.
- KRASIN, Y. A. *Lenin, revolutsiya, sovremennost. Problemy leninskoy teorii sotsialisticheskoy revolutsii*. (Lenin, Revolution and Modernity. Problems of Lenin's Theory of Socialist Revolution.) Moscow, Nauka, 1967, 563 pp.
- MEHRING, F. *Gesammelte Schriften*. Band 8. Zur Kriegsgeschichte und Militäerfrage. (Collected Works. Vol. 8. History of the War and the Military Question.) Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1967, 502 pp.
- OUZOULIAS, A. *Les bataillons de la jeunesse*. (Youth Battalions.) Paris, Editions Sociales, 1967, 495 pp.
- PASTUSIAK, L. *Polityka Stanow Zjednoczonych w Niemczech 1945-1949*. (United States Policy in Germany 1945-1949.) Wrocław, Zakład Narod. im. Ossol, 1967, 799 pp.
- RIPP, G. *A gazdasági növekedés szakaszai és az ipari társadalom elmélete*. (The Phases of Economic Growth and the Theory of Industrial Society.) Budapest, Kossuth Könyvkiadó, 1967, 316 pp.
- Sovremenniy burzhuanizmiye ucheniya o kapitalisticheskoy gosudarstve*. Kriticheskiye ocherky. (Modern Bourgeois Doctrines on the Capitalist State. Critical Essays.) Moscow, Nauka, 1967, 295 pp.
- Sociologia dezvoltarii. Contributii romanesti la al VI-lea Congres international de sociologie de la Evian 1966*. (Sociology of Development. Collection. Papers of Rumanian Delegation at 6th International Congress of Sociologists in Evian, 1966.) Bucharest, Editura politica, 1967, 252 pp.
- SRONAL, J. a kolektiv. *Otazky struktury a koncepcie marxistické filosofie v CSSR*. Sbornik prací z celostátní porady cs marxistických filosofů 8-10 února 1966. (The Problems of Structure and the Conception of Marxist Philosophy in Czechoslovakia. Collection of Papers Presented at the Conference of Czechoslovak Marxist Philosophers, February 8-10, 1966.) Prague, Academica, 1967, 120 pp.
- Svremenni antikrizisni teorii*. Kritika na zapadnoevropejski burzhuanizmi kontseptsii za ikonomicheskaya tsikl. Pod redaktsiyata na chl.-kor. T. Vladigerov. (Modern Anti-Crisis Theories. Critique of West European Bourgeois Conceptions of the Economic Cycle. Ed. by Corresponding Member of Academy T. Vladigerov.) Sofia, BAN, 1967, 268 pp.
- SAMALIK, F. *Clovek a instituce*. (Man and the Institutions.) Prague, Svoboda, 1967, 354 pp.
- TUNKIN, G. I. *Ideologicheskaya borba i mezhdunarodnoye pravo*. (The Ideological Struggle and International Law.) Moscow, Mezhdunarodniye otnosheniya, 1967, 174 pp.
- ZELT, I. REISSIG, K. *Es ist immer noch Oktober*. (It Is Still October.) Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1967, 175 pp.

50 Years After:

NEW BOOKS about the RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

CANADA AND THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION by Tim Buck.

The impact of the world's first socialist revolution on political life and the labor movement in Canada. **\$1.00**

HISTORY OF THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION by Academy of Sciences of the USSR. Covers the period from early 1917 to autumn of 1918. **\$3.00.**

TEN DAYS THAT SHOOK THE WORLD by John Reed. New edition with introduction by John Howard Lawson. Classic of American reportage. **\$2.35 paper; \$6.95 cloth.**

THE BOLSHEVIK REVOLUTION. Its Impact on American Radicals, Liberals and Labor by P. S. Foner. Documentary account. **\$3.45 paper; \$7.95 cloth.**

FROM TSARIST GENERAL TO RED ARMY COMMANDER by M. Bonch-Buryevich. Fascinating memoir of an historic period. **\$2.50.**

THROUGH THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION by Albert Rhys Williams. New edition by a celebrated eyewitness of the storming of the Winter Palace. **\$2.00.**

In Canada order from:

PROGRESS BOOKS

487 Adelaide St. West., Toronto 2B. Phone: 368-5336

Write for new 1968 catalogue

In U.S.A. order from:

JEFFERSON BOOKS

100 East 16th St., New York 3, N.Y.

*All prices Canadian

For the first time in English . . . the complete text of

LENIN'S collected works

This authoritative edition will run to 40 volumes,
and contains much material never before translated.

Volumes 1 to 38 (incl.) have now appeared

SINGLE VOLUMES: \$1.50 EACH

COMPLETE SET: \$40.00

PROGRESS BOOKS

487 Adelaide St. West, Toronto 2B, Ont. (in Canada)

JEFFERSON BOOKS

100 East 16th St., New York 3, N.Y. (in USA)

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

.....

..... Enclosed \$

JUST OUT:

Canada and the Russian Revolution

By TIM BUCK

The impact of the world's first socialist revolution on political life and the labor movement in Canada during the period and the years following 1917. A documented account of the responses, resolutions passed and solidarity of the trade union and early socialist movements. The story of the Winnipeg General Strike, the role of Mackenzie King and the collapse of the attempt to send Canadian troops into Siberia against the October Revolution is told in these pages.

ONE DOLLAR

In Toronto: Progress Books, 487 Adelaide St. W.; Book World, 72 Gerrard St. W.

In Vancouver: Cooperative Bookstore, 341 West Pender St.

In Edmonton: Universal Gift & Bookstore, 10601—97th St.

In Montreal: Les Editions Progressives, C.P. 175 Station E.

In Regina: New Times Book Service, 100 Northern Crown Bldg.

**The world outlook
embodied in
Marx's major work
continues to inspire
social movements
that are
transforming the world**

One hundred years after **CAPITAL** first appeared, it remains the most incisive critique of capitalism ever published. For a century advocates of the free enterprise system have attempted, time and again, to refute it. Today a vast portion of mankind accepts it as authoritative.

The publication of the full three volumes of this germinal work in a scholarly and handsome edition is a landmark in book publishing. No one who is seriously interested in social change can be without it.

CAPITAL by Karl Marx (Unabridged)

1. The Process of Capitalist Production (820 pages)
2. The Process of Circulation of Capital (558 pages)
3. The Process of Capitalist Production as a Whole (960 pages)

The most scientifically accurate edition available, it is the result of years of painstaking labor by specialists at the Institutes of Marxism-Leninism in Berlin and Moscow. Many inaccuracies that appeared in earlier editions are corrected. Each volume has biographical sketches of the personalities mentioned, a list of sources, and indexes.

**A NEW SCHOLARLY EDITION
OF ALL THREE VOLUMES**

Complete and Unabridged, in Paperback

The superb complete edition of **CAPITAL** is printed on good book paper, in legible type, sturdily bound in a soft cover and boxed, to withstand years of use.

Paperback, Three Volumes, 2,338 pages, boxed, \$9.95.

The same set, Hardback, Library Binding, \$22.50.

CAPITAL by Karl Marx

In Canada order from:

PROGRESS BOOKS

487 Adelaide St. W., Toronto 2B, Ont.

In the U.S.A. order from:

JEFFERSON BOOKS

100 East 16th St., New York 3, N.Y.

o-
e
n-
s-
o
d

es
d
k
r-

is

n
i-
i-
s-
n
e
i-
i-

x
L
e
d

,,

,,

■

▼

▲

■

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,
487 Adelaide St. West,
Toronto 2B, Ontario,
Canada

FRENCH EDITIONS
(La Nouvelle Revue Internationale)
Société d'Édition 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 rozšírování 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 Sinhalese)
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 1, 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 xuất nhập khẩu sách bao 32,
Hai Ba trung, Hà-nôi

