

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW

**CLASS APPROACH
AND INTERNATIONALISM**
By Z. KOMOCSIN



PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM

OCTOBER-NOVEMBER 1968

VOLUME 11 / NO. 10-11 / 35 CENTS



WORKERS OF ALL
COUNTRIES, UNITE!

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

Theoretical and
Information Journal
of Communist and
Workers' Parties

OCTOBER-
NOVEMBER, 1968
VOLUME 11
NUMBER 10-11

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.

Copyright © 1968 by
Progress Books, Canada.
All Rights Reserved.
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, or in the USA
from New Outlook
Publishers, 32 Union Sq.
East, Rm. 801, New York,
N.Y. 10003.

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



WMR

CONTENTS

- 3 **Communique on meetings of working
group and preparatory committee of the
International Conference of Communist
and Workers' Parties**
- I. NORLUND 4 **The Budapest meetings**
- 5 **International exchange of views**
- 6 **Current problems of world communist
movement**
LENINISM IN THE BATTLE FOR MAN
- T. PAVLOV
- 14 **From the experience of fraternal parties**
THE CLASS APPROACH AND INTERNATIONALISM
MESSAGES TO PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM
ON ITS TENTH ANNIVERSARY
- Z. KOMOCSIN
- 21 **Viewpoints on current problems**
ON THE PRESENT SITUATION IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA
From the Czechoslovak Communist press
THE IMPENDING U.S. ELECTIONS: AN ANALYSIS
VIETNAM: HARDER BLOWS AT THE AGGRESSOR
FOR UNITY OF THE ANTI-COLONIALIST FRONT
Assembly of heads of African states
LATIN AMERICAN CONTINENT IN FERMENT
- P.A.
- H. APTHEKER
J. PRAZSKY
A. BAKR
F. MIERES
- 37 **In the socialist world**
PEOPLE'S STATE—INSTRUMENT FOR
BUILDING SOCIALISM IN MONGOLIA
- T. GOTOV
- 42 **In the capitalist world**
ROOTS OF THE CRISIS
CAPITALIST DEVELOPMENT MORE UNEVEN
- V. PERLO
J. KUCZYNSKI
- 56 **Struggle for national and social freedom**
FOR BUILDING AND CONSOLIDATING
LEFT AND DEMOCRATIC UNITY
Political situation in Kerala state
AGRARIAN REFORM MOVEMENT IN CHILE
PROSPECTS OF AID TO DEVELOPING COUNTRIES
- U. RAJA
E. AVENDANO
I. COX
- 69 **In the communist and workers' parties**
STUDY AND PROPAGANDA OF LENIN'S IDEAS
Towards the Lenin Centenary
POLITICAL EDUCATION IN THE CPSU
PATRIOTIC CALL OF PORTUGUESE COMMUNISTS
IDEOLOGICAL WORK AMONG STUDENTS
Experience from Bulgaria
- M. GABDULIN
L. RIBEIRO
K. PETROV

(Continued on next page)

CONTENTS

(Continued)

P. G. ALBERDI	ANTI-IMPERIALIST STRUGGLE IN ARGENTINA AND THE COMMUNIST PARTY
F. SALFITI	THE SITUATION IN JORDAN AND COMMUNIST TACTICS
C. ALDANA L. BECERRA	HONDURAS: COMMUNIST PARTY POLICY

96 Pages from history

Z. FIERLINGER	SOME LESSONS OF MUNICH
---------------	------------------------

99 Our mailbag

H. FAGAN	PROBLEMS OF THE BRITISH LABOR MOVEMENT
S. B. RYERSON	MARX AND MODERN PHILOSOPHY
A. DELGADO	DREAD OF THE SPECTER OF REVOLUTION Letter from Bogota

108 Books and journals

S. G.	ECONOMIC INTEGRATION OF CMEA COUNTRIES Survey of Polish opinion
I. R. MENDIETA	PAGES FROM A HEROIC STRUGGLE
A. DROBAN	CLASS BATTLES ANALYZED
G. KRAUSE	SOCIALISM, THE TECHNOLOGICAL REVOLUTION AND DEMOCRACY

WANTED BACK ISSUES

The editors are in need of back issues of WORLD MARXIST REVIEW.

Vol. 1 (1958)	Nos. 1-4 incl.	Vol. 5 (1962)	Nos. 1-12 incl.
Vol. 2 (1959)	Nos. 1-12 incl.	Vol. 6 (1963)	Nos. 1-12 incl.
Vol. 3 (1960)	Nos. 1-12 incl.	Vol. 7 (1964)	Nos. 1 and 3
Vol. 4 (1961)	Nos. 1-12 incl.	Vol. 8 (1965)	Nos. 2 and 3

Please forward to Progress Books, 487 Adelaide St. West, Toronto 2B.

Communique

on meetings of working group and preparatory committee of the international conference of Communist and Workers' Parties.

The Working Group and the Preparatory Committee of the International Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties met in Budapest from 27 September to 1 October 1968.

The meetings were attended by representatives of the following Communist and Workers' Parties:

Socialist Vanguard Party of Algeria, Communist Party of the United States of America, Communist Party of Argentina, Communist Party of Australia, Communist Party of Austria, Communist Party of Belgium, Bulgarian Communist Party, Communist Party of Bolivia, Brazilian Communist Party, Communist Party of Chile, Progressive Party of the Working People of Cyprus, People's Vanguard Party of Costa Rica, Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, Communist Party of Denmark, South African Communist Party, Communist Party of Ecuador, Communist Party of Northern Ireland, Communist Party of Finland, French Communist Party, Communist Party of Greece, Communist Party of Guadeloupe, Guatemalan Party of Labor, Party of People's Unity of Haiti, Communist Party of Honduras, Communist Party of India, Irish Workers' Party, Iraqi Communist Party, People's Party of Iran, Communist Party of Israel, Communist Party of Colombia, Polish United Workers' Party, Lebanese Communist Party, Communist Party of Luxembourg, Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, Party of Liberation and Socialism (Morocco), Martinique Communist Party, Mexican Communist Party, Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, Communist Party of Great Britain, Communist Party of Germany, Socialist Unity Party of Germany, Socialist Unity Party of Germany—West Berlin, Italian Communist Party, Communist Party of Paraguay, Peruvian Communist Party, Reunion Communist Party,

Rumanian Communist Party, Communist Party of El Salvador, Communist Party of San-Marino, Communist Party of Spain, Swiss Party of Labor, Syrian Communist Party, Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Communist Party of Sudan, Communist Party of Turkey, Tunisian Communist Party, Communist Party of Uruguay, Communist Party of Venezuela.

A number of Parties, whose representatives were for different reasons unable to attend the meetings, addressed letters to the Preparatory Committee.

The Preparatory Committee approved the report on the preparations for the Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties. Matters relating to the International Conference were discussed. The Preparatory Committee unanimously reaffirmed the need for an International Conference to discuss the tasks of the struggle against imperialism in the present stage, and of united action by the Communist and Workers' Parties, and by all the anti-imperialist forces.

The Preparatory Committee have deemed it expedient to discuss again the question of the date for holding the International Conference and decided to seek the opinions of the Central Committees of their respective parties on this matter.

The Preparatory Committee agreed to convene the next session of the Preparatory Committee for November 17 this year in Budapest to consider the date for the Conference and the manner of its further preparation.

The meetings of the Working Group and the Preparatory Committee took place in an atmosphere of free comradely exchange of views and again demonstrated the desire of the fraternal parties to develop co-operation on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

Budapest, October 1, 1968.

The Budapest meetings

IB NORLUND

There has been wide interest in practically every part of the world in the meetings of the Working Group and the Preparatory Committee of the International Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties held, according to schedule, in Budapest from September 27 to October 1.

Communists and progressives welcomed the Budapest meetings as a continuation of the efforts to strengthen Communist unity and rally all the anti-imperialist forces.

The interest in the Budapest meetings is evident also from the fact that 58 parties took part (plus several which sent letters endorsing the meetings). Moreover, the parties represented at earlier stages by observers now sent full-fledged representatives.

Anti-Communists predicted that efforts towards unity of the Communist movement would end in a "sensational fiasco."

Commentators in the capitalist press waxed ironic over the Budapest communiqués, singling out the formula that the talks "proceeded in an atmosphere of a free, comradely exchange of views." Now many of them have dropped their ironic tone.

Having attended all the preparatory meetings, I can say that the communique formula, far from being a hollow phrase, is a precise reflection of what actually took place, both at this and at the preceding meetings. All the Conference preparations are the result of cooperation by equal parties, with the talks taking place in a genuinely democratic atmosphere and ending in mutually acceptable decisions. This was the case also at the latest Budapest meeting where, despite differences on some points, a just and responsible agreement was reach-

ed, to which all the parties contributed.

This, a gratifying development, is evidence of a continuous desire to promote unity of the Communist parties, and also of a keen feeling of responsibility to keep the Communist movement strong and united in difficult periods like the present one and to prevent any weakening of the Left and of all anti-imperialist movements in the fight against monopoly capital and world imperialism. As working-class parties, the Communists fully realize that closer unity in their own ranks, and unity with all the anti-imperialist forces, is an earnest of success in the fight against imperialism.

Perhaps the most important result of the Budapest deliberations was the unanimous re-affirmation of the need for an international conference with the agenda agreed upon earlier, namely, tasks in the struggle against imperialism in the present stage and united action by the Communist and Workers' parties and all anti-imperialist forces.

In fact, it was this that caused so much disappointment to the anti-Communists and produced a spate of speculative and mischief-making comment.

The unanimous decision taken in Budapest is of particular significance because, despite differences on one or another issue, we must concentrate on mutual understanding in order to advance active solidarity in the fight against imperialism. Heightened imperialist activity has aggravated the international situation. That being so, only one path remains open to the Communists: closer cohesion and joint action of all the anti-imperialist forces, especially the Communist parties and the socialist countries, and their united action with revolu-

tionary movements in capitalist and Third World countries.

Significant headway towards mutual understanding has already been made in the course of the Conference preparations. Common viewpoints and a spirit of practical cooperation have been achieved through collective efforts. The Budapest meetings approved a report on the preparatory work. The Preparatory Committee is to meet again on November 17 to set the date for the Conference and determine the procedure of its further preparation.

Anti-Communist propagandists had hoped that no agreement would be reached on a date for the Conference, and indeed on this point views differed. But in Budapest the question was approached and solved in the only possible democratic way — the Central Committees of the parties concerned will review the situation before November 17. Doubtlessly, they will use the time for thorough discussion and consultation with a view to reaching closer understanding and unity.

As at earlier meetings, the representatives of the parties expressed the hope that the International Conference would be held and emphasized the part it could and should play in generating fresh initiatives to intensify the fight of the socialist and anti-imperialist forces.

Many speakers emphasized that the tasks facing the movement brook no delay. U.S. imperialism is continuing its murderous war in Vietnam. The Middle East tension resulting from the Israeli extremists' aggression is fraught with new dangers.

The Danes, like other European nations, are justifiably concerned over the revanchist claims of West German imperialism and the growth of neo-Nazi tendencies in the

Federal Republic. West German imperialism is using NATO to further its ends; it wants to "infuse new life" into the alliance and assure its continuation after 1969 in order to prevent an effective European security system.

Growing imperialist aggressiveness and world events generally pose new problems for the international workers' movement and they can be solved only through close examination and discussion. But the discussion must be constructive, and experience has shown that this can best be achieved through active, effective and consistent cooperation on questions on which the parties are united.

The Budapest communique stresses that the problems of the anti-imperialist struggle can be solved, and continued development of the Communist movement assured, only through cooperation on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. It was this approach that determined the success of the meetings.

It might be objected that preparations for the Conference have been slow, are taking much time. That is true, but they are being conducted with great care and are leading to cooperation based on stringent observance of the principles of collectivism and equality. And when these principles are combined with proletarian internationalism—which from the very outset has been a fundamental tenet of the Marxist-Leninist parties and a cardinal factor in their ideological and political unity—the Communist movement marches from progress to progress in the battle for peace, democracy and socialism—progress so vitally needed today.

The Budapest meetings were an important and positive element of this process.

INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE OF VIEWS

An international exchange of views on the role of the working class in the developed capitalist countries in the era of the technological revolution was held in Berlin under the auspices of this journal over October 9-11. Researchers and journalists of the Communist and Workers' parties of 20 countries took part in the discussion, opened by Konstantin Zarodov, Editor-in-Chief of this journal: Austria (E. Zucker-Schilling), Brazil (A. Silva), Bulgaria (L. Georgiev), Czechoslovakia (P. Auersperg, M. Hirs), Denmark (I. Norlund), Federal Re-

public of Germany (F. Rische), Finland (G. Asplund, T. Koste), France (J. Fabre), German Democratic Republic (L. Mayer, M. Anders), Greece (P. Mavromatis), Hungary (G. Szanto), Iran (A. Avanesyan), Italy (A. Minucci), Mongolia (Daramvanchig), Poland (W. Wesolowski, Z. Chrupek), Rumania (G. Apostol, C. Petre), Soviet Union (A. Galkin, G. Dilighensky, V. Kulish), Spain (F. Anton), Sweden (G. Oehman), USA (H. Putz).

A survey of the discussion will appear in subsequent issues of the journal.

Leninism in the battle for man

TODOR PAVLOV

There are facts which no supporter, or "critic," of Leninism—the creative development of Marxism in our day—can afford to ignore or underestimate.

In 1835 the young Marx wrote in a *Gymnasium* graduation essay, "Reflections of a Youth on Choosing a Profession": "By choosing a profession that enables us to give of our best in the service of Man, we shall not be wearied by the burden, because any sacrifice involved will be a sacrifice for all, and the joy that we shall experience will not be a miserable, restricted, egoistic joy, but a happiness shared by the millions. . . ." The same thought occurs in the *Communist Manifesto*—in a Communist society the freedom of each is conditional on the freedom of all. Marx and Engels, and in later years Lenin, constantly emphasized that genuine freedom of the individual is impossible without the emancipation of the social group or class to which he belongs. In our times this thought is continued in the CPSU Program: "All for Man, for the benefit of Man."

It was this *real*, rather than *abstract humanism* that Marx, Engels and Lenin asserted and championed in all their theoretical and practical work as scientists and revolutionaries. But they were not revolutionaries and theoreticians in general; they were proletarian revolutionaries and theoreticians who created and developed dialectical materialism and formulated the fundamental thesis that it is not enough to explain the world—the job is to change it, remould it, in other words, to humanize it.

They and their true followers demonstrated that a materialist philosophy that is not at the same time dialectical, cannot be

consistently materialist and, conversely, a dialectical philosophy that is not materialist cannot be consistently dialectical.

Since the time of the first manifestations of Marx's genius up to the triumph of the Great Socialist Revolution the fifty-first anniversary of which we are now celebrating, and the building of communism in the USSR and in the other socialist countries—including the Bulgaria of Dimitr Blagoyev and Georgi Dimitrov—theoretical and practical revolutionary tasks of the utmost import have been tackled and completed; these tasks are of the very substance of our era and provide a blueprint of the limitless prospects for human progress.

Certain recent developments on the political, ideological and philosophical fronts prompt me to dwell on a number of problems that have become the subject of constructive theoretical and methodological research and discussion, and also on attempts to "criticize" and "refute" Leninism, which is contrasted to Marxism, indeed, replaced by new-fangled pseudo-scientific and pseudo-revolutionary theoretical and methodological concepts.

I.

Theories based on, or closely associated with, the concept of *alienation* have of late come to enjoy wide currency. In fact, many regard *alienation* as the fundamental law governing the development of human society in the past, present and future. In overcoming Hegelian idealism and Feuerbach's anthropological materialism, Marx devoted much attention to the concept or category of alienation, both in his early

works and in his more mature philosophical and economic studies.

That the problem is a complex one need hardly be demonstrated. Only now are new aspects and implications being brought to light. This is especially so in view of attempts to make alienation a basic concept of history, philosophy and esthetics. Space does not allow for an exhaustive examination of the historical and logical aspects of alienation, nor is that really necessary.

Money, for example, existed long before Aristotle, but it was only in Marx's time, in the era of capitalism, that its substance and forms were fully revealed. Similarly, alienation existed long before capitalism, and not only as a socio-political, but also as a philosophical and esthetic category. *But it was only in the era of capitalism that it acquired its classical form as alienation of human labor, alienation of the product of labor from the producer, materialization of the human effort in the process of capitalist exploitation, de-individualization and suppression of the worker, his conversion into a mere cog in the process of production, with no share whatever in determining its aim and organization.*

Alienation has its philosophic, sociological, economic, esthetic, ethical and other aspects. And on these the existentialists and other Western idealist philosophers, sociologists and students of esthetics and ethics are far from holding common views. Nor is there a consensus among ideological researchers in some of the socialist countries and in the Communist parties. They are still arguing whether alienation is a universal category that will apply in a Communist society too, or whether it is an historically concrete category which, in its classical form, has a special relevance to capitalism, notably in its imperialist, that is, highest and last, stage of development.

Any attempt to contrast the young to the mature Marx by invoking his references to alienation presupposes an unbridgeable gap between his early and later writings. But we know that Lenin demonstrated with the utmost clarity that Marx's early works should be regarded as part of the formative process of Marxism, as logical stages of its growth into a consistently scientific ideology of the proletariat. And it is in this conceptual framework that Marx's attitude to alienation should be considered.

No less important is the contention of Marxist writers that the organization of labor brought into being by capitalism, namely, the massing of large numbers of workers in big enterprises—their organiza-

tion, in other words, into large collectives by virtue of the capitalist process of production—tends to overcome alienation and all its economic, esthetic and ideological consequences. There is an element of truth in this, for it is a fact that with the organization and interaction of many workers there emerges, dialectically, a qualitatively new force that cannot be reduced to the arithmetical sum-total of the individual workers involved. However, that is only part of the truth, for in the early years of capitalism workers often wrecked the machines, and even now, in some countries, the majority have not matured to class consciousness, to an understanding of the proletarian dialectico-materialist philosophy, political economy and scientific Communism.

It required the immense fund of knowledge and analytical ability of Marx and Engels to create a revolutionary philosophy, political economy and scientific Communism and, consistently and methodologically, to inject a sense of class consciousness into the hitherto spontaneous labor movement. And only then did the possibility arise of combating alienation in all its concrete manifestations. And once revolutionary Marxism became the weapon of the proletariat, it acquired, in the words of Marx himself, a vast material power, enabling it to become the key factor in organizing and carrying out the proletarian socialist revolution and the subsequent building of socialist and communist society.

The development of proletarian revolutionary consciousness and activity in alliance with the toiling peasantry and the progressive intelligentsia made it possible for individual workers and collectives, alienated, de-individualized and dehumanized by capitalist production, to join together in revolutionary parties and other mass organizations, work out the program, strategy and tactics of proletarian revolution and proceed to carry it out. The beginning was made by the Great October Socialist Revolution, and also by the subsequent socialist revolutions, though not in the Soviet form, in a number of European and other countries. *In other words, the alienation process was attended with, and increasingly compensated by, a counter-process of humanization of the "de-individualized," who were transformed into a revolutionary-minded and revolutionary-active motive power, into fighters who have given us numberless examples of individual heroism and scientific and cultural endeavor, but also examples of mass heroism and mass*

creative endeavor unparalleled in all of history.

Once it has been established that the preconditions for overcoming alienation are formed under capitalism, we can safely predict that alienation will be completely ruled out in the higher stage of communism, for Man will have attained thorough and sufficiently full mastery of the laws of social development, and each will be working according to ability and receiving according to needs. From an onerous burden and de-individualizing factor, labor will become an inherent requirement, a matter of joy and pride for every member of communist society.

Many investigators of alienation overlook this aspect. In fact the existentialists, phenomenologists, axiologists and others take advantage of this to regard alienation as an absolute, proclaiming it the basic or transcendent essence of Man and social development. This is but another way of justifying belief in the hereafter, justifying fear, alarm and, in the end, death.

There is more than a tinge of irony in the efforts of some historians and theorists to prove that many Frenchmen were motivated by existentialism in joining the Resistance. This overlooks the fact that other existentialists, say, German followers of Heidegger, joined Hitler's SS units.

These facts are often obscured by the ideological pundits of capitalism. Their purpose is to conceal the real ideological role of seeing alienation as an absolute, of exaggerating and inflating the role of this phenomenon to which Marx devoted so many pages in his early writings. But in *Capital* and other works, the mature Marx proved, with classical clarity and conviction, that the capitalist socio-economic formation was doomed, and that the triumph of communism, and hence the overcoming of alienation, was an historical necessity.

Lenin, the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties have by their theoretical and practical activities corroborated the validity of Marx's prevision.

II.

Some "critics" of Marxism-Leninism counterpose the young to the mature Marx by advancing their own interpretation of alienation as the be all and end all of the historical process. But meeting with no success, they are now with no less zeal attacking the theoretical foundation of Marxist-Leninist gnosiology, logic and dialectics, namely, *Lenin's theory of reflection*. This

theory is "refuted" in numerous magazines, monographs, essays, lectures and research papers. I had occasion to discuss this in the columns of *World Marxist Review* (No. 4, 1968) and in *Kommunist* (No. 5, 1968).

In the past (and now, too) philosophers and philosophical schools have been at pains to prove that not only artistic, but also scientific creation cannot be explained by the theory of reflection as understood by Marx and Lenin, by their well-known postulate that *the ideal is simply the material reflected and transformed by the human mind, that ideas are simply subjective images of objective reality*.

Contributors to the Yugoslav magazine *Praxis* and some of their French, Italian and other colleagues, contend that creative work, merely because it is creative, does not require reflection, and that reflection is reflection precisely because it does not contain any element of creation. In support of their thesis they cite Lenin's thought that *the human mind not only reflects, but also creates objective reality*. But in quoting Lenin they distort his use of the term "create," which is simply meant to denote that the mind transforms, gives human meaning, humanizes, and in that sense "creates," objective natural and social reality.

For Lenin, as for Marx and Engels, the refashioning of the world, which entails the creation of new things, structures and forms, is possible only if man correctly appreciates objective reality, in other words, if it is reflected and scientifically transformed in the human mind, if his ideas are indeed subjective images of the objective, external world. Moon rockets, jet aircraft, locomotives, power generators, or the simple tools man uses, do not grow in fields or forests. They are the products of the creative labor of their inventor and constructor, of a definite society or state interested in their production and use.

All machines, all works of culture, social institutions, etc., are the work of men, of Man in general. But they would be impossible without a true knowledge of objective things, properties, forms, laws and relationships in society and nature.

The idea of seeing man's creative ability as something absolute is associated, in one way or another, either with the absolute and metaphysical equation of ideas and the objective things they reflect, or with the absolute and metaphysical conversion of ideas into symbols or hieroglyphs. In his *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, in the *Philosophical Notebooks* and in other

works, Lenin gives a consistent and detailed critique of the absolute and metaphysical equation of sensations and their objects by Bazarov, Rehmke and Schuppe, and of the retreat to symbolism and hieroglyphism of Helmholtz and Plekhanov, who separate sensations from their objects. Lenin has given us a clear solution of the problem, defining knowledge as a *dialectical process in which there is constant divergence and, at the same time, convergence, of ideas and their objects, but not in the absolute and metaphysical Helmholtzian understanding of separation, nor in Bazarov's absolute and metaphysical understanding of equation.*

In criticizing symbolism, Lenin remarks, in his *Philosophical Notebooks*, that symbols could have, and do have, epistemological value. Correctly understood, this thought of Lenin's explains the epistemological role and importance of symbols in, say, higher mathematics (one need only recall Marx's idea about the operative importance of symbols in differential and integral calculus), in logic generally and, more particularly, mathematical logic, semiotics, physics, etc. But that applies only if these symbols stem from basic ideas, that is, from subjective images of objective things and are subject to practical verification.

And so, Marxist-Leninist, i.e., dialecto-materialist, science while it accepts symbols as having a definite significance, rejects symbolism, it accepts form but rejects formalism, accepts subjectivity but rejects subjectivism, accepts relativity but rejects relativism, accepts individuality but rejects individualism, etc. And in this we have proof of the scientific and creative, hence revolutionary, role and implications of the Marxist-Leninist world outlook and method, dialectical and historical materialism, Marxist-Leninist political economy and scientific communism.

We know that even myths, in definite conditions and within definite bounds, were of epistemological value. However, if meaningful images are replaced by religious myths, or if socialist realism is replaced by a nebulous realism, abstractionism, cubism, etc., then in scientific research we might well degenerate (as has been the case more than once) into denying the role of pure and applied science and, in the end, "integrate" religious "truths" into Marxist theory and methodology.

But can this be described as the philosophy, sociology or aesthetics of the proletariat, the class that is most realistically-minded, revolutionary, disciplined, active

and, at the same time, dialectical by virtue of its material conditions and its developmental trends? Intimately linked with social and natural phenomena, with the material world and its processes, the proletariat is dialectical by its very nature, by its developmental trend and by its role in history. For by *abolishing the exploitation of its own class and the capitalist and imperialist oppression of nations, it eliminates — as Marx and Engels so brilliantly proved — all exploitation, all oppression and, consequently, itself as a special class and, in the long range, its specific class-political role and significance.*

The modern history of capitalism and socialism furnishes irrefutable evidence of the reactionary nature and absurdity of attempts to proclaim Marxism-Leninism "obsolete," and refutes the contention that *the proletariat is destined to be replaced by the technocracy of imperialist bourgeois society.*

III.

Some "critics" aver that technological progress, especially *cybernetics* and the *theory of information*, proves the absence of any essential difference between the socialist and capitalist societies, inferring therefrom that the two are *convergent* by reason of their similar technological, economic and general development. The purpose of this convergence theory could not be clearer. What is less clear is why some writers overlook the fact that even the most efficient cybernetic machines and information processes employed for modelling (physiological, psychological and logical modelling included) have no *subjective aspect* (moment, element). And this although the leading men of cybernetic theory and designing, such as Norbert Wiener and W. R. Ashby, emphasize that cognition of human consciousness is beyond the scope of their research because of its subjective aspect (moment, element). Some Marxist writers, among them Academician Berg of the Soviet Union, describe information as a *process of vast importance for the further growth of technology, automation, modelling machines and methods, but a process which is objective, that is, lacking the subjective aspect.*

Man's consciousness is a *subjective reflection of objectively real things*. As such, it does much more than simply photograph or copy; it reflects real things creatively, making use of cybernetic machines and information processes in scientific research and applied science.

However old and effective it may be in, say, mathematics, the *method of modelling* can, and should, be applied chiefly in relation to the aspects common to objects and processes, or even individual to the objects and processes subjected to modelling, but not in relation to separate and individual aspects, or to things that, *taken as a dialectical unity with the general and individual, are (precisely as a unity) non-repeatable and, consequently, not subject to modelling*. What can be modelled in the October Revolution, and other revolutions too, for example, are their general and individual features. Yet if taken as a dialectical unity of the general, individual and particular, none can be reproduced completely, consequently requiring creative treatment in each country, at each stage of growth from country to country and, accordingly, in each Party, when setting and fulfilling specific tasks.

The general and the individual exist outside the particular as mental abstractions. And the particular, too, if divorced from the individual and the general, is a mental abstraction. This applies to all revolutions and all concrete human activity in the history of nations and classes, and in man's development generally.

Our "critics" do not realize, or pretend not to realize this; they gaily break up the dialectical unity of the general, individual and the particular, solemnly opposing their theories to the thus "confuted" Marxism-Leninism.

The imperialists yearn for "confutation" of Marxism-Leninism. But what they want is one thing and objective reality is another. When the First International came into being the Communist parties had no more than a few dozen, perhaps a few hundred, members; now they have tens of millions, with hundreds of millions influenced by Marxist-Leninist ideas employed not only for elucidation, but also for the purpose of reconstructing society and nature along revolutionary lines.

This leads us to the only logical conclusion: like ordinary men, the outstanding personalities, too, though they act as custodians of the nature of their social whole, particularly their class, people or nation, *are or can be, real personalities only if the general in them (Marx referred to the "aggregate of all social relations") is dialectically wedded to the individual and the particular*. They are repeatable as the general and partly as the individual, but not as a unity of the general, individual and particular. Lenin, Dimitrov, Thaelmann, Thorez

and Gramsci, for example, have general features also observed in the "ordinary" individual, but they also possess individual features repeated solely in definite persons of the class or nation. At the same time, all of them are unrepeatable as the dialectical unity of the general, individual and particular.

In principle, this applies to nations and to national culture. Socialist nations possess features or elements common to any socialist nation and absent in nations of the bourgeois type. Yet a socialist nation also possesses some individual and particular features absent in any other. Thus, each nation (accordingly, each Marxist Communist party) pursuing and developing the elements of a particular and individual nature cannot be a truly socialist nation (or party) the moment it ceases to *pursue and develop that which is general for all socialist nations or that which is a general law for any Marxist Communist party, for any socialist revolution and for socialist growth*.

According to the laws of logic, therefore, if the national factor is in effect transformed into nationalism, or if the individual factor is in effect transformed into individualism, the internationalism of the nation concerned and the collectivism of the individual concerned become internationalism and collectivism in word only, that is, only a screen for typically nationalist, chauvinist and individualist views, aspirations and actions.

The motto of the *Communist Manifesto*, "Workers of all Countries, Unite!," refers to a feature general for the workers of all countries, deriving from the international nature of capitalism, capitalist exploitation and oppression. But workers are not isolated from their nation or from their national Communist Party. Not only have they the right to be, but should be, socialist patriots if they want to be real Communists, revolutionaries and makers of history. However, they cannot be genuine revolutionaries and makers of history if they do not think and act as proletarian socialist internationalists. The dialectical unity of socialist patriotism and socialist internationalism in the material form of friendship between socialist countries, and above all friendship with the Soviet people, is an essential precondition for the real (not abstract) existence and function of any socialist nation, any Communist Party, any individual Communist. And it follows logically not for any time-serving political, economic or other reasons, that unity of standpoints in the general, coupled

with unity of action by all socialist countries, Communist parties and individual Communists, is an absolute historical necessity ensuring the advance to the complete and final victory of our common communist, revolutionary, international and national cause.

Once we place the issue of freedom in this perspective, it becomes clear that for Marxist-Leninists, and for our parties, nations and states, the meaning of freedom differs from that implied by the "critics" of Marxism-Leninism. *Freedom that is not freedom of action, freedom of ideas only, is not real freedom. And freedom that is freedom of action only, not freedom of thought guiding our action, is not real freedom either.*

Freedom cannot be freedom in general, that is, it cannot be freedom for the exploited and the exploiter, for the fascist and his victim, for imperialist aggression and the socialist actions against it, in defense of the socialist system and culture, in defense of the world communist, national-liberation and revolutionary movement, for peace, democracy, international friendship and human progress.

It may be recalled that Georgi Dimitrov's proud words at the Leipzig trial that he was a son of the Bulgarian working class, of the Bulgarian people, are frequently quoted in isolation from what he said on the same occasion: *that he is a Communist and will remain one, that he is a proletarian internationalist, that the wheels of history will keep on turning whatever happens and that Communism will win in Germany, in Bulgaria and everywhere else.* And Comrade Todor Zhivkov pointed out in a recent address to the Youth League that patriotism and internationalism are inseparable components of the alloy known as communist education.

Comrade Zhivkov and the Bulgarian Communists stress that in weighing the relation between patriotism and internationalism, the latter tilts the scales as the leading and definitive. No truly proletarian Marxist policy is otherwise conceivable.

No one in our time could be a genuinely proletarian leader, unless he is a friend of the socialist camp, that chief gain of the international working class.

We shall not indulge here in any long-drawn discussion on whether the nation concept differs from the concept of a people, nor on the differences, if any, between them. Regardless of whether or not the elements of the nation existed in man's precapitalist history, and regardless of the

degree to which they existed, the classical type of nation appeared and existed in capitalist conditions, until after the socialist revolution the bourgeois-type nation began, in the environment of socialism, to develop into the socialist-type nation.

The unity of socialist patriotism and internationalism, which have common properties and regularities, possesses distinctive features from country to country. The same applies to historical personalities who, in the ideal, combine in mind and activity socialist patriotism and socialist internationalism. This is true of Lenin, Thorez, Thaelmann, Gramsci, Dimitrov, etc., who are not only national, but also international revolutionary leaders.

Unity of thought is a precondition for any real unity of action of the revolutionary communist forces, and internationalist unity of thought, that is, recognition of the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism, coupled with internationalist unity of action, that is, organizationally joint action for the communist ideal, is the historically conditioned demand of our times.

Imperialist aggressors and the "critics" of Marxism-Leninism have cause to abhor the dialectico-materialist theory of classes, nations and internationalism. Yet the working class the world over, the peoples of the socialist countries and all Communists, appreciate the impact of materialist dialectics. *Historical necessity is awakening interest in Marxist ideas among the newly-free peoples; though their industry is not developed and their working class is small, they opt for socialism, backed by the decisive and fraternal aid of the socialist countries.*

The unprecedentedly rapid economic, technological, political and cultural growth in the Soviet Union and in the other socialist countries is evoking alarm among the imperialist aggressors. They see how relentlessly history is replacing the capitalist socio-economic formation with the communist, just as in the past feudalism gave way to capitalism and earlier still the slave society yielded to feudal society.

IV.

Marx observed that *the idea of communism suffices to destroy the idea of private property; however, to destroy private property takes real communist action.* What Marx, Engels and, notably, Lenin wrote and did in their lifetime has put this concept into proper focus, most clearly formulated by Lenin in his postulate on prac-

tice being determinative in the dialectical unity of theory and practice and on a truly revolutionary party being inconceivable without revolutionary theory.

Eager to preserve and perpetuate the capitalist system, the "critics" of Marxism draw their own conclusions, which differ, depending on the phase of the struggle between the two social systems and ideologies.

After a fairly long period of ignoring Marxism, and after numerous dogmatic and revisionist attempts to repudiate or distort it, a distinctly anti-Marxist and anti-communist line has come into evidence in recent decades, assuming a dual form, one firm and the other flexible. Of late, these two tactical approaches either combine or alternate, depending on the situation.

Anti-Marxism and anti-communism are objects of critical examination, treatises and articles in the Soviet Union, in the other socialist countries and in the communist press in the capitalist states.

It would not serve any useful purpose to examine this voluminous criticism in the present article. Let us confine ourselves to the following.

The more clearly the anti-communist ideologists realize from experience that they cannot combat Marxism-Leninism and scientific communism by logical argument as effectively as they would wish, the more extensively they resort to psychological subterfuge. This was true of Germany at the time of Hitler, Goebbels and Rosenberg, and it is true of the present-day enemies of Marxism, who resort to typically psychological means and "methods" bordering on the irrational.

Anyone who has read *Mein Kampf* will recall that no two sentences in it contain logic, logical consistency or compatibility with the facts, with the objective course of history. However, we who follow Marx, Engels and Lenin all too often assume that if we are logically correct and if our train of thought, our conclusions, are in keeping with the course of history, this is ample to disarm the enemy and win the people. But that is not the case. Like Hitler and Mussolini, reactionary theorists in the United States, West Germany and in other countries employ various psychological methods (*individual and social*) to influence people.

Take the fight against the Stalin personality cult, which they exploited for their own ends, and the upsurge of chauvinist sentiment among definite groups in some countries, and the lip service to

internationalist solidarity, mutual aid and united action while scorning, even denying them, in practice.

The personality cult is not essentially inherent in the socialist system, the state, the party and culture. It was a malignant tumour to excise which the Communist Party, backed by the public, took determined and effective action in the Soviet Union (and elsewhere, too), while cautious to prevent any nihilistic repudiation of the economic, social, scientific, cultural and other socialist gains of the cult period.

Clearly, from the theoretico-logical and historical angle, the task today is to continue methodically, at an ever rising pace, the building of socialism and communism in our countries.

U.S. and other statesmen and ideologues have mounted a global anti-Soviet, anti-communist and anti-Marxist offensive, their purpose being not only to focus public attention in a direction favorable for the imperialist aggressors, but also to generate still greater international tension and bring back the cold war.

They oppose democracy to centralism, writing off the fact that in any socialist country, be it the Soviet Union, Bulgaria or any other, centralism is not simply centralism, but *democratic centralism*. None will deny that in the Soviet Union and in our country, Bulgaria, the people organized in various political, cultural, economic and other organizations and institutions participate increasingly in the new system of guiding and running the economy and the state, and public life in general. When our "critics" speak of democracy they imply *bourgeois democracy* or *democracy in general*, which is really non-existent. And they gloss over the fact that the proletarian dictatorship as the power of the vast majority is, as Lenin noted, a thousand times more democratic than any bourgeois democracy can be.

That is the logic of the facts. But facts and their logic are of little concern to the enemies of Marxism. They employ psychological methods, juggling with the concept of democracy in general and opposing centralism to democracy, as though the two ideas have nothing in common.

Last but not least, speaking of the democratization of the economic system in the Soviet Union, Bulgaria and in the other socialist countries, the logic of the facts, the arguments and conclusions, indicate that *without democratic centralization in planning and management and in control-*

ling the main proportions, replaced by pure "democracy from below," that is, by spontaneous competition between enterprises, the system of socialist economy is doomed, as we see it, to inevitable failure. The imperialist "critics" of our system would like nothing better. And since they can prove nothing by logical argument, they revert to psychological methods.

Should we apply the aforesaid to philosophy, to the world outlook and methodology, the conclusion would be the same: it is logically impossible to deny the dialectico-materialist, monistic character, role and significance of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, replacing it by either subjective or objectively-idealist philosophy or by any system of different philosophical views, that is, by *philosophical pluralism*, which is incompatible with the unity of thought and the unity of action of the contemporary Communist movement on a world scale. And in this field, too, our adversary engages in psychological methods (through different organizations, information centers, secret services, research institutes, symposia, congresses, etc.), on which the United States alone has spent billions of dollars in the past ten years.

Such are the facts, the logic of the scientific reflection of these facts in the minds of upright citizens. However, if despite the facts our adversary still succeeds in misleading people and prompting them to actions in the interests of imperialism, it is up to us to *step up our logical, scientific, objectively correct revolutionary cognitive and constructive activity, and to ask ourselves: could we not also avail ourselves for positive aims of the positive aspects of suitable individual and socio-psychological approaches and thereby make more effective our fight against anti-Marxism, anti-Communism, anti-Sovietism and all political, social and ideological aggression and reaction?*

As I see it, this must be done. And it is up to this journal to make the most of the experience of the Communist and Workers' parties, of other progressive organizations, and of the contributions from all countries, in order to pose and examine this problem, which will provide fresh possibilities for arguing our case and carrying forward the humanism of Marxism-Leninism and scientific communism.

The class approach and internationalism

ZOLTAN KOMOCSIN

I.

Of late, in the light of current developments in the international class struggle, Communists often ask themselves what were the lessons drawn from the 1956 counter-revolution in Hungary?

Obviously, it would be wrong to apply the Hungarian stereotype to the situation of today or to tomorrow. History does not repeat itself, at least not completely, not in every detail. No two revolutions are totally identical, nor are any two counter-revolutions. For Marxist-Leninists, mechanistic parallels are unacceptable. However, we think that the 1956 events (not recounting all the arguments and counter-arguments, I should like to state here the fundamental position of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party on this score), filled for our Party, our people and our socialist country with dramatic tensions and explosions, could be a lesson for tomorrow, as well as today.

For a long time, the counter-revolutionary flare-up in Hungary, its causes and premises, and all that followed, were not easily comprehensible to many at home and abroad. Only gradually could we clarify to the Hungarian Communists, to our people and our friends abroad, their class content and the purpose and sense of our struggle. Whereas it was clear to many West European Communists by virtue of their own experience that a counter-revolution had broken out in Hungary, a section of Hungarian Communists, ideologically and poli-

tically confused, was still partly in the dark as to the fact of counter-revolution. Judging by our case, by virtue of his experience of class struggle, geographical remoteness and the international perspective, unobscured by the intensive political turmoil, an outside observer may in some situations obtain a clearer grasp of the content and substance of a complicated condition than those directly involved.

Hungarian Communists still appreciate the international solidarity of the fraternal parties in 1956. Our comrades in the capitalist countries, targets of reactionary attacks for their solidarity with the Soviet Union and the Hungarian revolutionaries, did not flinch under the pressure. As we see it, their firmness, far from injuring, honorably represented and upheld the interests of their working class.

Marxist-Leninist principles, notably the class approach and internationalism, helped the Hungarian Communists grasp the content and causes of the 1956 counter-revolution, and draw the proper conclusions. A class approach and internationalism, we hold, is essential to understand the facts and processes of socio-political life, finding the right solutions, for then these facts and processes are related to the international class struggle, the assessment of the class struggle is not based on concepts of abstract "democracy," abstract "sovereignty" and abstract "humanism," and the concrete class content of these abstract slogans is denuded in the social collisions.

In his article on the experience of class

struggle in Hungary, which appeared in this journal (No. 2, 1959), Comrade Kadar wrote:

"The counter-revolutionaries knew that they could not count on success if they openly called for the restoration of capitalism. That is why they cloaked their real aims. In the initial stages at least they proclaimed 'democratic socialism', not capitalism, as their aim. 'Socialism without dictatorship'—this was their first tactical slogan . . . Their second tactical step was the proclamation of 'pure democracy', void of class content."

Between October 23 and November 4, 1956, it was brought home to us—though we had known it from Lenin's teaching—that, in effect, "socialism without dictatorship," the slogan of the Hungarian counter-revolution, amounts to overthrowing proletarian dictatorship and establishing counter-revolutionary dictatorship; that "pure democracy" amounts to freedom for those who oppose the working class outside, as well as inside the Party; that it amounts to intimidation, political and physical terror against those Communist internationalists loyal to socialism. In a country where the working class is in power, it can, exercising this power, develop socialist democracy and guarantee the socialist freedoms. Once this power is lost, no socialist democracy and no socialist freedoms are conceivable.

After November 4, 1956, we weighed the ideas of abstract "democracy" and abstract "sovereignty" against the Marxist class principle and proletarian internationalism, and thus determined in what way each interprets democracy and national independence, freedom and humanism, what he wishes to achieve, what aims, interests and powers he serves, what external and internal social forces he represents, and where he is going. In the question of national unity we determined: with whom and for what purpose? In the question of democracy and freedom: for what and against what, for whom and against whom? And in the question of independence: from whom and against whom; who championed sovereignty and who imperilled it? And all this in the aggregate: in the interests of what power and whose power? We answered these questions from the standpoint of the class principle and proletarian internationalism. As a result, our ranks thinned somewhat, but we became stronger. Subsequently, in the process of differentiation and polarization, we won over the decisive majority of the people and there emerged a

new national unity with a socialist content.

II.

Our Party defined the main causes of the counter-revolution: (a) the mistakes of the previous sectarian and dogmatic leadership; (b) revisionists in the Party; (c) hostile elements in the country; (d) the insidious efforts of world imperialism. It was these four mutually conditioned and interweaving causes that led up to the counter-revolutionary uprising. If at least one of them had been missing, matters would not have come to the point of counter-revolution. These four factors existed and operated long before October 23, 1956; they figured in the counter-revolutionary events and in the social struggles that followed.

The Hungarian Communists determined that the counter-revolution would not have imperilled the existence of the socialist system if the Party leadership had not made grave political mistakes prior to 1956. The gross violations of socialist legality, disregard for the Leninist principles of Party life, dogmatism and lack of principle, authoritarian, often subjective and arbitrary, decisions, the mistakes in economic policy and the depreciation of the role of activists and the Party rank and file, of the role of the masses—all this, cumulatively, brought on a crisis, undermined the trust of Party members in the leadership and impaired the bonds between the Party and the working class. Yet the Party leadership would not acknowledge its mistakes. Not only was it incapable of making amends and rectifying the consequences of the crimes; it also lacked the courage of honest self-criticism. Those were the reasons why it was impotent in face of the revisionist opposition, and the counter-revolutionary danger. The alternation of groundless, superficial measures and opportunist conciliation, the heap of half-measures and false solutions, and delays in rehabilitation—this demoralized and disarmed the Communists and enabled the Rightist "universal democracy" slogan, the slogan of supra-class abstract humanism and "national communism" to take root among Party members and among the people.

In aggregate, the mistakes of the old sectarian and dogmatic leadership undermined the vanguard role of the Party, its combat capability, fostering passivity among the champions of socialism and among the revolutionary forces, then dis-

organized them and thereby increased the influence of the class enemy.

The Rightist revisionist group in the Party did not begin its political career by asking for aid from the imperialist powers against the Soviet Union and the revolutionary forces at home. That it did towards the end of its career. Its leaders had no intention of restoring capitalism when they began organizing their faction. But their platform paved the way for counter-revolution by its slogans of "democratic socialism" instead of proletarian dictatorship; reconstitution of the Coalition Government that existed until 1948 instead of the vanguard role of the Party; and looser relations with the Soviet Union in the guise of "national independence" instead of friendship and alliance with the Soviet Union. The logic of its actions took that group to the end of its path, which culminated in treason. In the Hungary of 1956 the interval between proclamation of "pure democracy" and the physical assault on Communists was a brief one; the counter-revolution, however, did not begin with hanging Communists in the streets; that came later.

The Rightist revisionists in the Party thus played a prominent role in the ideological and political spadework, undermining the Party and socialist society. At first they professed to be fighting to rectify errors, to air intra-party problems in public. That was something the class enemy could never have accomplished by himself. Their propaganda maintained that the decade before 1956 was a decade of slavery and want. They cast doubt, denied and derided the historical gains of the workingmen, obliterated the halo of heroism accompanying socialist construction, sowed among the people mistrust of their strength and abilities. At first, they turned the masses against the Party, government, public and economic leaders and activists, then declared political and moral terror against them, boycotting them and calling them "Stalinists" and "Rakosi-ites." Men who had devoted the best years of their life, their energy and knowledge to serving socialism, who had worked with devotion for the people's cause, were placed in an untenable position by this demagogy. This shows us that in rectifying the errors made in the course of building socialism, we must fight on two fronts — against those who, for whatever reason, evade public admission of mistakes, and against those eager to exploit these mistakes for the purpose of whipping up anti-socialist hysteria.

By political and moral pressure, the re-

visionists disorganized the security organs and the armed forces. In the summer of 1956, they had gained control over the information media. The instruments of ideological and political influence were securely in their hands. Possession of these media again proved an all-important factor in the class struggle. The working class, its Communist Party, lost control over most of the press in the summer of 1956. This section of the press and the political club known as Petoefi Circle were the main ideological and political instruments of the counter-revolution. Cultivating nationalist, anti-Soviet sentiment and then fanning it to a point of hysteria played an important role in the ideological preparations. This propaganda declared that "all Hungarians are brothers," that "ten million Hungarian hearts beat in unison," and tried to build up their leader Imre Nagy as one of the great men in Hungarian history, creating the impression that the entire nation was rallied round him.

The grave mistakes of the sectarian and dogmatic Party and government leadership, coupled with the activity of the Rightist revisionists in the autumn of 1956, produced a situation in which the hostile forces at home were able to come out into the open and opportunities appeared for the interference of world imperialism. Not rectifying old mistakes, not removing the Right danger, was the object of the day. And so the country was plunged into a bloody counter-revolution. It was not until after the uprising had been crushed with Soviet aid that Hungarian revolutionaries and the people were able to apply in deed, not just in words, the fundamental conclusions of the 20th Congress of the CPSU, to build a socialism cleansed of sectarian, dogmatic, and revisionist mistakes.

III.

We drew useful lessons from an analysis of the various stages of the 1956 counter-revolution and of the enemy tactics. Failure clearly to differentiate between the menace of counter-revolution and a bloody armed conflict can lead to grave delusions. It is not true that we cannot speak of the menace of counter-revolution with full confidence, only on the basis of abstract conjectures. For a principled class and internationalist approach to social problems enables us to establish, with accuracy and confidence, whether or not there is a menace of peaceful or armed counter-revolution. There was a danger of peaceful coun-

ter-revolution, gradual liquidation of the socialist system and stage-by-stage restoration of capitalism long before October 23, 1956, when the armed conflict flared up, though only a few were aware of that then.

The errors of the old pseudo-Left, and at the same time opportunist, leadership, coupled with persistent Right-wing revisionist efforts over several months, had by the autumn of 1956 created ideological and political confusion among the Party membership. There was the danger that the Party might find itself under revisionist leadership with a revisionist program and revisionist organizational principles. The bulk of the workers, peasants and intellectuals were forced into a state of political indifference and passivity. By the time counter-revolution had broken out, the enemy had managed to discredit a large part of the politically active Communists and for a time was able to undermine confidence in the Party. The Right-wing revisionists wanted to turn Hungary back to the pre-1948 situation, that is, to a coalition government in which the Communist Party—now subscribing to a revisionist program—would in all probability be in a minority. And so, in the autumn of 1956 there emerged the menace of peaceful counter-revolution.

That there was no peaceful counter-revolution was largely due to the impatience of our enemies at home and abroad. Witness this passage from a Rome radio broadcast of August 13, 1956:

"At the very worst, Hungarian national communism could be acceptable only as a brief transitory stage . . . If they manage to get the Russian troops out, Russian exploitation will have come to an end . . . National communism might last one or two months, but it will be swept away by the accumulated resentment . . . If they really adhere to national principles . . . they will make this sacrifice, too."

The internal and external counter-revolutionary forces wanted quick and full restoration of capitalism. Writing in the American journal *Reporter* (December 27, 1956), its European correspondent Edmond Taylor revealed some details of the contacts between Hungarian Foreign Ministry officials and the U.S. Embassy in Budapest at the time of the counter-revolution. The United States Charge d'Affaires in Budapest, he said, was obliged to call on Imre Nagy and urge him to show at least some signs of distrust in the West, at any rate until the Soviet troops had withdrawn from Hungary. This appeal to Nagy to show less

haste, in the present situation, in abolishing Communism, was perfectly correct, Taylor added, but unfortunately, it came too late and, besides, it carried little weight in view of mounting official and unofficial American pressure on Hungary for a clean and immediate break with communism.

The main conclusion drawn by the class enemy from the 1956 defeat was that haste must be avoided in favor of a stage-by-stage operation. In keeping with its "loosening-up" tactic, international imperialism now relies primarily on peaceful counter-revolutionary restoration. Our class enemy has drawn important lessons from 1956, and we would like to see all Communists learning not less than our common enemy from Hungary's experience of counter-revolution.

IV.

Mindful of the causes of the 1956 counter-revolution, the principal forces involved and the necessary conclusions to be drawn therefrom, our Party attaches much importance to the theory and practice of struggle on two fronts. That, in fact, has been a major factor in our progress over the past 12 years. And today, too, the struggle on two fronts is a cornerstone of our policy and method—a safeguard against repetition both of the old sectarian-dogmatic mistakes and of Right-wing revisionist deviations.

The struggle on two fronts enables us gradually to fortify the Party's ideological, political and organizational unity, its united action and leading role. The two-front struggle stimulates constructive discussion and activity and the continued development of democracy within and beyond Party ranks. It enables us also to anticipate and quickly eliminate the consequences of possible errors. And we believe that this policy, free of pseudo-Left or Right-wing deviations, is one of the most effective guarantees of continued advance towards our goals.

The 1956 counter-revolution and the subsequent work of overcoming its consequences have taught us that a principled policy, one in which the word is matched by the deed, is the best one. In October-November 1956, and also in the subsequent months, many people were still under the influence of nationalist and anti-Soviet sentiments. Every day furnished fresh proof that the Communists can win firm prestige and popularity for their Party only by combating nationalism and anti-Sovietism, not by seeking agreement with them. The Com-

munists cannot compete with the class enemy in nationalism, but if they openly and unambiguously uphold their principles, then, sooner or later, their efforts will meet with success.

After November 4, 1956, the Hungarian Communists were subjected to a veritable torrent of imperialist slander. They assumed responsibility for the resolute measures then introduced, and for the struggle against the passions kindled by nationalist demagoguery. They faced the charge of having demolished "national unity." Indeed we did demolish this nationalistic, anti-Soviet "national unity," which never included the major force of socialist revolution. During the counter-revolution, supporters of socialism were hurled back by a combination of reactionary pressure, betrayal and incessant calumny. But with the favorable conditions created by the aid of the Soviet Union, they became active again, and when the nationalist hysteria began to dispel, people who had been misled turned their backs on this false "national unity." Our progress over the past 12 years has brought into being a new national unity, with a socialist content and aims that accord with the Communist program. The chief method of strengthening this unity is democratic, open, comradely discussion, a free exchange of views on all problems of public interest.

A principled policy is the best policy also in dealing with the problems of socialist construction. The Right-wing revisionists of 1956 relied on unprincipled agreement with opposition-minded intellectual groups, bourgeois politicians and the imperialist enemy. Fortright discussion and clear, principled differentiation — though this was not to everyone's liking at first — soon produced satisfactory results. There never has been, nor is there likely to be for a long time to come a Communist Party that could on a class basis and over a long period attract to its side every citizen of a country without exception. But the Party and its leadership should always be able to attract — chiefly through conviction — the majority of the working people. And the main method of winning the working people for socialism is action that accords

with their interests and aspirations. Of course, we should debate with our political enemies, too. But in a country committed to the building of socialism we cannot, in our view, renounce the use of the instruments of power in relation to those who actively oppose socialism and the socialist system. This, too, is part of the concept of a consistently principled policy and accords with the requirements of socialist law. And socialist law has two aspects—we should never punish people for their political views, provided they do not violate socialist law; but every citizen is obliged to abide by the law and, should he violate it, bear the consequences.

In the past 12 years our Party, Government and State Assembly have adopted and implemented many decisions, laws and decrees which have evoked wide interest abroad. Our Party and Government will continue this work in a situation of unhampered sovereignty. This needs to be emphasized because, as we all know, Soviet troops are temporarily stationed on our territory. Their task is to assure the defense of the Warsaw Pact countries, and they are performing it without in any way restricting Hungary's sovereignty or interfering in her internal affairs. Besides fulfilling the noble task of upholding peace and security, the presence of Soviet troops makes it possible to educate our people in an internationalist spirit and promote closer Soviet-Hungarian friendship.

There is ample evidence to show that the building of socialism on the principles and in the spirit of the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU was endangered by the old leadership and its policy, by revisionist activity and the advance of counter-revolution. Once these obstacles were removed, the road to consolidation was opened and we tackled and solved social, economic and cultural problems and steadily extended democracy. What is more, we did this with the active support of the people, and we intend to continue along these lines. The policy we have been pursuing in these 12 years, and intend to pursue with even greater success in future, rests on class principles and internationalism.

Messages to "*Problems of Peace and Socialism*" on its tenth anniversary

The editors and staff of *Problems of Peace and Socialism* (*World Marxist Review*) have received messages of good wishes from a number of fraternal parties on the occasion of the magazine's tenth anniversary.

The Communist Party of Argentina says in its message that the magazine has played an important part in making available the experience of the Communist and workers' movement, in elucidating the fundamental problems of our time and in upholding, disseminating and developing the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, and in the struggle to unite the world Communist movement.

The Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party emphasizes in its letter that *Problems of Peace and Socialism* presents an international forum for an exchange of experience by Communist and Workers' parties and progressive forces in the battle against imperialism, national and class oppression, for peace, democracy, socialism and Marxism-Leninism.

The Bulgarian Communist Party Central Committee expresses its confidence that the magazine "will keep aloft the banner of proletarian internationalism and will continue the offensive against bourgeois ideology and its attempts to infiltrate our ranks, against modern revisionism and sectarianism, for the complete triumph of the great ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin."

A letter from the Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party says the magazine has helped to propagate the experience of the Communist parties and promote discussion of Marxist theory. The Hungarian message also notes the magazine's important role in upholding and creatively developing Marxism-Leninism and in strengthening Communist unity.

The Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany wishes the magazine "continued success in analyzing the complex problems, theoretical and practical, of the world Communist movement in combating diverse manifestations of bourgeois ideology, and in making its theoretical and information articles more effective weapons in rallying the Communist movement and all anti-imperialist forces in the fight for peace and socialism."

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Denmark says that in the ten years since its foundation, *Problems of Peace and Socialism* has been instrumental in fostering contacts and cooperation between the parties of the international Communist movement, and has rendered valuable services in championing the general principles of Marxism-Leninism and in keeping the movement informed of how they are applied in diverse national conditions.

A message from the Central Committee of the Israeli Communist Party says the magazine has always played an important part in the international Communist movement. It provides a forum for discussion of the theoretical and practical problems of our time and helps towards closer unity of the movement on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

A cable from the National Council of the Communist Party of India wishes the magazine continued and increasing success in its service to the world Communist movements and socialism. "During these ten years," the message says, "the journal has rendered a great service to the international working-class and Communist movement as a forum for exchange of experience,

elucidation of problems of Marxist-Leninist theory, socialist construction and a weapon in the struggle for peace, democracy, socialism, against imperialism and bourgeois ideology."

The Central Committee of the People's Party of Iran stresses the magazine's role as an effective theoretical organ of the international Communist and workers' movement.

The Central Committee of the Mongolian Revolutionary People's Party points to the great contribution *Problems of Peace and Socialism* is making for peace, national independence and against imperialism, and for the promotion of world Communist unity on the principles of proletarian internationalism.

The Central Committee of the People's Party of Panama conveys fraternal greetings "on the tenth anniversary of the magazine's valuable work in popularizing the principles of Marxism-Leninism and the experience of the international Communist movement, the struggle for anti-imperialist unity and for the triumph of socialism and peace."

In conveying warm congratulations to the editors and staff of *Problems of Peace and Socialism*, the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party wishes the magazine "continued success in discharging its responsible functions in the present situation, which calls for consistent effort for international unity of the workers' and Communist movement."

The message from the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union reads in part:

"The Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union warmly congratulates the Editorial Board and staff of *Problems of Peace and Socialism* and all the representatives of Communist and Workers' parties on the magazine, on its tenth anniversary.

"Guided by the principles of Marxism-

Leninism and proletarian internationalism, *Problems of Peace and Socialism* is making a valuable contribution to elaborating the pressing problems of Marxist-Leninist theory and to generalization of the experience of the Communist and Workers' parties in the fight for peace, democracy and socialism, against imperialism and all varieties of bourgeois and anti-socialist ideology."

The CPSU Central Committee, the message says, wishes the magazine continued progress in disseminating the ideas of Marxism-Leninism throughout the world and in strengthening the unity and cohesion of the international Communist movement on the basis of the inviolable principles of proletarian internationalism.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Finland writes: "We wish to express our profound gratitude to *Problems of Peace and Socialism* for the help and support it has given our Party in its ideological and educational work and in its practical political activities by popularizing and generalizing the experience of fraternal parties. . . . The magazine has been of great assistance to the international Communist movement by fostering proletarian internationalism and solidarity of the forces of peace, progress and socialism. The international seminars it has sponsored have done much to advance Marxist research and analysis of social processes in various countries.

The Central Committee of the French Communist Party conveys fraternal greetings and congratulations to the magazine and its Editorial Board.

* * *

The Editorial Board and staff of *Problems of Peace and Socialism* wish to thank the fraternal parties, their publications, publishing houses and individuals for their expressions of good wishes on the occasion of the magazine's tenth anniversary.

On the present situation in Czechoslovakia

(from the Czechoslovak Communist press)

The last issue of this journal (No. 9) carried documents relating to negotiations between the Communist and Workers' parties of the socialist countries: the joint communique on the meeting of the Political Bureau of the CC, CPSU and the Presidium of the CC, CPCz at Cierna nad Tisou, July 29--August 1; the statement on the results of the conference of representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties of Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, Poland, the USSR and Czechoslovakia at Bratislava, August 3; the communique on the Soviet-Czechoslovak negotiations in Moscow, August 23-26; and the resolution of the Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee of August 31, 1968, on the results of the Moscow talks.

Since then the Czechoslovak Communist press has been reporting the situation in the country, informing its readers of the measures taken by Party and government bodies and publishing statements by the country's leaders. A summary of information and comment appearing in the Czechoslovak Communist press is given on this and the following pages.

* * *

Main attention in the press is devoted to the central problem of Czechoslovak life today, namely, normalization of the situation on the basis of the decisions adopted at the Soviet-Czechoslovak talks in Moscow. The papers point out that the Moscow agreements represent a reality that offers opportunities for continued growth of activity in the Party and the country.

The press carried reports on the September and October meetings of the Central Committee Presidium. On September 6, the Presidium examined the draft of measures

to implement the decisions of the Central Committee meeting of August 31 (reported in No. 9 of this journal), and a report on measures taken by government bodies on the obligations arising from the Moscow talks. It also reviewed the political situation in the Party and the country and approved the text of a letter to all Party units. The main content of Party work after the Moscow agreements, the Presidium declared, is realization of the Central Committee's decisions of August 31.

Another Presidium meeting, on September 17, reviewed the development of the political situation, approved further measures and preparations for fresh bilateral political talks at an early date. It reaffirmed the policy of consistent implementation of the obligations and agreements and examined proposals for effectively surmounting the difficulties encountered in operating the policy, difficulties manifested chiefly in a desire to circumvent the unsolved and, in some cases, unpopular problems arising out of the present situation.

The Presidium also examined the Constitutional structure of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. Its guidelines on this fundamental issue served as a basis for the policy statement on federalization, which was submitted for public discussion. The statement outlines the general principles of the country's federal structure, emphasizing that the purpose is a socialist readjustment of constitutional relations between Czechs and Slovaks. The law on federation is to be adopted on the 50th anniversary (October 28) of the founding of the Czechoslovak Republic.

On October 2, the Party Presidium examined the first draft of a statement for a full Central Committee meeting, listing the

main tasks of the Party. It was decided to prepare a document that would enable the Central Committee clearly to define and integrate the basic tasks of the Party and all its organizations, and give members a clear perspective in their work.

The press published the communique on the Soviet-Czechoslovak talks in Moscow on October 3 and 4. Reviewed at these talks was fulfilment of the agreements and measures formulated in Moscow on August 23-26, which were reaffirmed as the basis for normalizing socio-political life in Czechoslovakia and promoting friendly relations with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. It was also agreed in Moscow that the two governments would consider and sign a treaty on the temporary stationing of allied troops in Czechoslovakia. On major problems of world peace and security, the communique reaffirms the resolve unswervingly to follow a joint foreign policy in the interests of strengthening the socialist community and successful struggle against the policy of the imperialist powers.

The papers carried the communique of the Presidium meeting of October 8. In it, the Presidium emphasized that the basic line of Party activity must be continued operation of the positive features of post-January policy in conformity with the Bratislava statement and the Moscow protocols. And foremost in this work must be the consolidation of socialism, stabilization of the political system, unity of the Party on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and its leading role in all areas of social life. The unity of Czechoslovak society, it was stressed, would be consolidated in accordance with the general laws governing the building of socialism, through a creative Marxist-Leninist approach to socialist construction in Czechoslovakia and active struggle against bourgeois ideology. The Presidium drew special attention to the problems involved in ideological work, which should be conducted in the internationalist spirit of Communist ideology.

The Presidium called for a clear formulation of the underlying principles of the country's political system based on the socialist platform of the National Front. This presupposes retaining all the positive features of the present policy (the Party's link with the people, participation in formulating and carrying out Party policy), action against possible anarchistic elements, and the rallying together of all social forces on the basis of democratic centralism.

At its meeting of October 15, the Presidium discussed a number of major ques-

tions, in particular a new draft of the policy statement — Main Current Tasks of the Party.

The communique on the signing of the USSR-Czechoslovak treaty on the temporary stationing of Soviet troops in Czechoslovakia was published on October 17 and ratified by the National Assembly on the following day, October 18.

The government statement submitted to the National Assembly on September 13 was seen by the press as a complex of domestic and foreign-policy measures aimed at carrying out the obligations arising from the Moscow talks. The comment emphasized the need to assure continued socialist development in an atmosphere of consolidation with the working class and the Communist Party playing the leading role.

Also reported were a number of legislative measures enacted by the National Assembly. In particular, on September 13-14, after pledging support for the government and its program, the Assembly approved a law on temporary measures to strengthen public order, procedures governing public meetings and activities of public organizations. Another law, on temporary measures in relation to the press and other communications media, envisages the organization of a government Press and Information Office, with a similar body appointed by the Slovak National Council, registration of all publications and responsibility of editors for safeguarding the interests of the state. The Assembly enacted a law on the National Front, reaffirming its dynamic role of chief vehicle of the socialist unity of Czechoslovak society. The new law was seen as an effective safeguard against extremist political forces that might constitute a menace to the socialist principles of Czechoslovak society and try to pursue their own policy outside the socialist and democratic concept of the National Front.

The international aspects of normalization are another feature of the discussion. The point is made that there can be no change in Czechoslovakia's foreign policy, its membership in the socialist community and the Warsaw Treaty Organization, and its determination to honor its international pledges.

Readers were given an account of the meetings in Budapest on September 27 - October 1 of the Working Group and the Preparatory Committee of the International Conference of Communist and Workers' parties. The Czechoslovak Communist Party representatives fully supported the con-

cluding communique. Commenting on the Budapest meetings, the press emphasized that unity of the world Communist movement was now more important than ever, and that Communists could not allow imperialism to exploit the present international situation in an attempt to retard the world revolutionary process and damage the cause of socialism, peace and social progress.

In commenting on statements by Party and government leaders, the press emphasizes continuation of the post-January policy of developing socialist society in Czechoslovakia, the need to strengthen unity of the people on the basis of socialism and around the Communist Party, and isolate the forces that might come out against socialism or try to endanger it, whether from dogmatic and sectarian or Rightist anti-socialist positions.

Speeches by government and Party leaders contain an analysis of the country's development in the pre-August days. Alongside the healthy and thoroughly socialist process begun by the Communist Party in January, the press notes, there had been an activization by anti-socialist forces whose class roots, persisting through the 20 years since February 1948, were making themselves felt, in old or new forms, in the life of the country. These forces were anxious to avenge themselves for their defeat in February 1948. Groups opposed to Czechoslovakia's socialist development appeared on the scene—Club-231, for instance, among whose members were men hostile to socialism. There were attempts to organize a political opposition, such as Kan (Club of Committed Non-Party People), and to set up a Right-wing Social Democratic Party. Their propaganda began to penetrate into the press.

The danger presented by the anti-socialist forces was discussed at the May plenum of the Central Committee, which character-

ized their activities as an attempt to discredit the Party, deprive it of its right to give leadership to the nation, destroy its links with the other socialist countries, discredit the socialist system, create a political opposition and make a bid for political power. Inconsistent fulfilment of Party decisions and inadequate responsibility on the part of some members aggravated this situation.

Czechoslovak Party and government leaders emphasized that the treaty on the temporary stationing of Soviet troops in Czechoslovakia is a guarantee to both countries that Czechoslovakia will continue its socialist development, abiding by the principles of Marxism-Leninism and its own revolutionary and democratic traditions, and continuing its progress in conditions of peace and friendly cooperation with the Soviet Union and other members of the socialist community.

Statements by Party and government leaders in the press draw attention to the key problems, in particular the need to strengthen the leading role of the Party. The main pre-condition for this is ideological and organizational unity and the quality and effectiveness of organizational work. The need is to reinforce the Leninist norms of Party life, democratic centralism and to inculcate a greater sense of responsibility and discipline among members as inseparable elements of inner-Party democracy. Party policy must be the policy of the people, of the broad masses of workers, peasants and intellectuals, the expression of their interests. And to be that, it must always be premised on the political, economic, social and cultural interests of the working class and endeavor to enhance its activity. At the same time, however, Party policy must be designed to sustain a high level of political and public activity by the peasantry and intelligentsia.

P.A.

The impending U.S. elections: an analysis

The two-party system in the United States is a brilliantly-conceived instrument of class rule; it operates on the basis of assumed strategic agreement and tolerated tactical divergencies. The structure of the social order—the private possession of the means of production and production having as its central purpose the realization of privately-appropriated profit—is beyond the scope of discussion. Normally, also, foreign policy is not a matter for politics.

The basic purpose of the two-party system is to prevent polarization in politics, to obscure significant issues; in a word, to keep important questions out of politics! The ruling-class goal has been to make politics a kind of game, to be indulged in by clowns, idiots, and thieves; hence, in every-day American speech, the very word “politics” means something shady and inconsequential, while a “politician” is, in plain American talk, a (more or less) “cheap crook.”

This system and these concepts were supposed to reflect, also the alleged “classlessness” of U.S. society; the most recent fully articulated expression of this outlook was the neo-Conservatism of the 1950's, when the world was told by well-heeled savants that American culture had gained Athenian heights, its economy had eliminated poverty, social questions in general had been resolved and so this Heaven had reached “the end of ideology,” as Professor Daniel Bell of Columbia University announced in the title of one of his books.

Alas, reality has a way of shattering mythology, no matter how elegant the latter's garb. In fact, the United States is dominated by a state-monopoly capitalist system in an advanced stage of crisis. The ideological and political servants of the ruling class are finding it more and more difficult to keep the two-party system intact and to sustain its effectiveness as a tool for obscuring decisive questions and ob-

structing their consideration, let alone their resolution.

This is the deepest meaning of the cry for “unity” voiced by both Humphrey and Nixon and on the altar of which President Johnson himself abandoned his career. These classical American politicians mean by this cry that they ardently seek a return to “normal” politics, i.e., heated argumentation about unimportant matters — both within and between the major parties. This also is the meaning of the remark by that other classical American politician, the Honorable George Wallace of Alabama, bringing up the extreme right flank for the minions of the ruling class, having reference to Humphrey and Nixon: “There's not a dime's worth of difference between what they're saying and what we're saying.”

The cry reflects desperation on the part of the ruling class — as does Wallace's candidacy—and this desperation stems from the crisis attacking the base of the U.S. social order. The crisis manifests itself both from within and without (and the two reinforce each other); hence the fundamental political instrument of that social order—the two-party system—is being torn asunder in all directions.

The compulsions of the ruling class mount as its monopolistic character intensifies. Year by year, especially since the end of World War II, monopolization has increased; the government's Federal Trade Commission reports that merger activity in 1967 “experienced the sharpest increase in modern industrial history”; there is no doubt that 1968 has seen the same. The nation's investment and commercial bankers are at the apex of their power; meanwhile, the top group of corporations — amounting to less than one-tenth of one per cent of all corporations — actually held 83 per cent of the assets of all manufacturing and mining corporations!

Vertical and horizontal trustification

having reached about their limit, the past decade has been witness to the creation of "conglomerates," i.e., acquisitions by huge monopolies of corporations having no rational connection with the acquiring giant. Approximately the same period has seen, also, trustification in industries hitherto relatively free of that characteristic—as in entertainment, publishing of books and magazines, textiles, and the food industry.

With this virtually complete trustification and cartelization of the economy has gone, of course, a colossal increase in the governmental agencies and by direct corporate investment. But this organic search for maximum profits has run head-on into the fact that a large segment of the earth is now socialist, that another large segment has achieved various degrees of liberation from colonialism, and that where investment has occurred in developed countries—as Canada, Japan, Great Britain, France and West Germany—this is now approaching saturation and, in any case, is meeting more and more indigenous resistance and even worldwide competition.

Meanwhile, growth domestically has been disappointing and most recently storm signals again have begun to darken economic skies. Thus, for the months of April, May and June, 1968, corporations reduced spending plans for new factories and equipment by a total of over two billion dollars, and while in 1966 industrial plants operated at over 90 per cent of capacity, they were down to less than 85 per cent during the first half of 1968. Complete joblessness remains high and chronic; tax increases at all levels of government have been drastic (and have perhaps reached a practical ceiling); and inflation is constant and serious so that for the first time in years, 1968 witnessed a significant *decline in real wages*.

The classical "solution" pursued by monopoly capitalism when faced by such accumulating contradictions—that is, reaction at home and aggression abroad—has determined basically the path of the American ruling circles. But aggressiveness abroad generally has floundered. It has met effective resistance in Cuba and monumental defeat in Vietnam. This overall failure and, especially, the Vietnam fiasco, boomeranged on the home front. It outraged large sectors of public opinion, particularly among youth, women, intellectuals, the university population and the Negro and Spanish-speaking millions; its downright failure aroused opposition from more pragmatic souls—as many businessmen and

public figures, including at least one-third of the U.S. Senate; its mounting cost of casualties—over 200,000 killed and wounded according to official figures—brought tragedy directly into the homes of villages and cities throughout the land. Above all, perhaps, its disastrous impact upon the diplomatic and moral position of the United States and upon the economy in terms of rising taxes and prices and falling appropriations for social needs helped make the Vietnam War without any doubt the most unpopular war ever waged by the U.S. government. The fact is that these objective factors, plus strenuous organizational and educational activities **by the Left, have produced an absolutely unprecedented situation in American history, namely, a clear majority of the American people are opposed—to one degree or another and for varying reasons—to a war currently being waged by "their" government.** This is a central reality in U.S. life—and politics—today.

Fundamentally related to this is the new level reached by the Negro liberation movement; here one has—quite literally—an explosive situation. Over twenty million people, vilely oppressed by racism, have made it clear in the land of "democracy," of "equality," of "freedom of opportunity," and of "justice," that the blatant denial of these blessings to them will meet and is meeting more and more militant—even insurrectionary—opposition. This also is a central reality in U.S. life—and politics—today. Increasingly, too, all concerned in both movements—for peace and for liberation—are seeing the basic relationship between the two; such consciousness and action based upon it represent fundamental challenges to the ruling class. Some years ago this writer warned that the very existence of the Republic hung in the balance in terms of this so-called Negro question, exactly as it did during the Civil War a century ago; and earlier this year the very distinguished historian of foreign affairs, Professor D. F. Fleming (author of the two-volume study, *The Cold War and Its Origins*), wrote that the present foreign policy of Washington "really threatened" "our continuity as a nation"; especially as that policy expressed itself in Vietnam, he declared, it "clearly threatens our entire future as a nation" (*The Nation*, April 15). The two together, foul offspring of imperialism and both permeated with racism, certainly represent the most dire threat to the real national interests of the

United States since the slavocracy attacked the Republic in 1861. *More and more of the American people understand this and are demanding effective changes in policy and practice; the two-party system cannot entertain such questions, let alone attempt real solutions.*

Hence the crisis in American politics, a politics more and more characterized by assassination, fantastic corruption, conventionalized deception, and "images," speeches and platforms provided by a public-relations industry that commands scores of millions of dollars for its scarcely camouflaged business of prevarication.

* * *

The political crisis shows itself most sharply in the splintering of the two major parties. What one observes now—splinters to the Right, as the Conservative Party in New York and George Wallace's movement nationally (and he will be on the ballot in all fifty States); and to the Left of Center as (originally) the Liberal Party in New York, the Americans for Democratic Action (ADA) nationally and other significant challenges regionally (especially in the Minnesota-Wisconsin area, in Oregon, in California, and in many sections of the South and Southwest)—is strikingly similar to developments over a century ago when another two-party system could not meet the test of basic socio-economic challenge. Then, too, the dominant parties—called the Whig and Democratic—split Right and Left, as the American Party and Constitutional Party, and the Liberty and Free Soil Parties; then, too, regional break-aways obscured causes more basic than geography (and one had a Southern and a Northern Democratic Party). Finally, after about a generation of gestation, a new mass party, largely under the hegemony of the then new, rising industrial bourgeoisie, appeared under the name Republican.

Serious questioning on the highest levels of the present two-party system also goes back at least a generation; Franklin Delano Roosevelt, for example, seriously considered creating a new party and running under its label, rather than the Democratic, in 1944, for he was increasingly distressed at the Dixiecratic stain in the Democratic fabric. Historically, Henry Wallace's 1948 Progressive Party effort is best understood in this light, as is, on the other hand, the Dixiecrat breakaway led the same year by Strom Thurmond of South Carolina (now a Republican and one of the leading forces behind Nixon at the 1968 Republican Party nominating convention).

The landslide victory in 1964 of Johnson as opposed to Goldwater, fundamentally based upon the sharply differentiated positions enunciated by them on the Vietnam war, and then Johnson's betrayal of his words and adoption of the Goldwater position of escalation—with Johnson's putrid record since—triggered the political revolution gathering force below. This produced the sensational candidacy and primary victories of McCarthy, the candidacy of Robert Kennedy and the withdrawal of Johnson.

Ruling-class response has been an all-out and often brutal effort to smother dissent within the two Parties, culminating in the Republican farce in Miami and the Gestapo-like steamroller in Chicago. But the splits remain very deep. In Republican ranks, people like Senator Javits of New York and Mayor Lindsay of New York City are hardly able to hide their disgust and concern over the Nixon-Agnew ticket; while on the Democratic side, the ADA refuses to endorse Humphrey; the Democratic candidate for Senator from New York, Paul O'Dwyer, also refuses and one of the most significant new faces in southern Democratic politics, Julian Bond—a Negro member of the Georgia House of Representatives—likewise announces his refusal to endorse the Humphrey ticket. In all these cases—and they are but examples—the reason given for failure to endorse was Humphrey's pro-war position.

Of course there is much disarray among those forces that sought an anti-war and anti-racist platform and candidates from the Democratic Party. Some groups have formed The New Party, already assured a ballot position in several States. Others—led by Allard Lowenstein, who won Democratic nomination for Congress from New York City but has refused to endorse Humphrey—have established a New Democratic Coalition with purposes not dissimilar to that of the New Party. Others, too—not least the Young Democrats—are seeking forms through which they may be able to express in the elections their opposition to the Chicago Gang and the ticket it concocted.

On the Right rants former Governor Wallace of Alabama, an American Streicher. His campaign kitty contains about twenty million dollars; included among his important backers are H. L. Hunt, the oil billionaire from Dallas, Texas, one of the principal backers of the late Joseph McCarthy, and Edward Ball, secretary-treasurer of the two-billion dollar Du Pont

Foundation, director of the Florida National Bank, and Chairman of the Florida East Coast Railway, the latter especially notorious—even in the South—for its anti-labor policies. Others prominent in the Wallace movement are notorious figures in the John Birch society, in the Klan and in other fanatically racist and anti-Semitic groups.

With the failure of the two major Parties to offer any alternative, with neither addressing itself to real issues, with racism endemic, with the AFL-CIO's leadership itself pro-war and mum on racism, it is no surprise that Wallace has made deep inroads even among trade unionists, not to mention other segments of the population—and not only in the South.

Nevertheless, that which is *new* in the organized trade union movement is evidence of increasing rank-and-file restlessness and rising militancy. This shows itself in the mounting numbers of strikes, involving more and more workers and for longer and longer periods of time. It has shown itself also in significant manifestations of anti-war feeling among union members and a growing awareness that the lack of spirit and organizational efforts are debilitating the movement as a whole.

Opposition to bureaucracy and inactivity as well as to the pro-Johnson foreign policy of Meany, Lovestone & Co. most flagrantly shown in the now publicly known fact that the AFL-CIO had been turned into an appendage of the CIA—was fundamental in the breakaway recently of the United Auto Workers (UAW) from the AFL-CIO. It is central also to the very significant Alliance for Labor Activity (ALA) dedicated to political independence by Labor, a renewed organizational drive—especially in the South—and a return in general to the militancy and spirit marking the birth of the CIO. Creating the ALA in late July, 1968 were the executive boards of the UAW and the International Brotherhood of Teamsters which together have three and a half million members. Though Meany threatened expulsion for any AFL-CIO union which joined ALA, the Chemical Workers Union with 100,000 members, did so in September, and soon after the United Rubber Workers—with close ties to the UAW—also joined. Several major independent unions, in addition to auto and teamsters, have officially indicated general agreement with and interest in the ALA; these include the United Electrical Workers, the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union of

the West Coast and the United Mine Workers.

At the moment there is no *direct* relationship between these labor developments and the election but the connection nevertheless is clear. One has here the potential of the organized labor movement entering into the radicalization of American life and thought—already plain in the case of large segments of youth, professionals, scholars, church people, the Negro movement and the anti-war movement in general. Simultaneously, there appears the potential of an addition of primary consequence to the developing political independence among the populace which is rocking the two-party professional politicians back on their heels.

A major weakness is the absence of unity among Left forces. As of this moment the New Party, and the New Democratic Coalition remain apart. Freedom & Peace parties, largely in the East, and Peace & Freedom parties, largely in the West, also have substantially similar outlooks but remain apart, largely due to persistent infantile Leftism and the fanatical sectarianism that so often characterizes that disease. In local elections it is likely that one or more of these groups may score significant results, not excluding victories.

For the first time in a generation the Communist Party has entered its own candidates for President and Vice President. At its pre-election Special Convention, held in July, the General Secretary, Gus Hall, placed in nomination for President the name of Charlene Mitchell, while William L. Patterson, chairman of the New York State Party, placed the name of Mike Zagarell before that Convention for Vice President. These nominations were received enthusiastically and adopted by acclamation.

Mrs. Mitchell, a resident of Los Angeles, is a 38-year-old Negro woman worker and veteran Party member and leader. She is widely known and universally respected, and in the first weeks of campaigning has made clear her effectiveness in presenting issues, analyzing causes, proposing the Party's program and arguing the case for political independence, a radical social transformation and the unification of all anti-war and anti-racist forces. Mike Zagarell, of New York City, is a 23-year old youth, the son of workers and one already very well known in youth, student, and Party circles. As one who has been in charge of youth work for the Party he has

a particularly clear grasp of this very significant and articulate section of the population (let it be remembered that a great majority of the U.S. population is below 30 years of age). In this candidacy-combination the Party has symbolized the working-class, young and anti-racist essence of its outlook and character.

Both Comrades Mitchell and Zagarell already have reached—via meetings, radio, television, and newspaper interviews—many millions of Americans with the message and image of the Party—a Party which, through fifteen years of fierce struggle, has achieved very nearly complete legality and so can, in its own name, present that message and image. All this will without doubt further increase the strength of the Party (its membership has almost doubled in the past decade) and further stimulate the already phenomenally growing interest in Marxism-Leninism.*

The present writer has rarely agreed with any statement made by the late President Woodrow Wilson. It is a fact, however, that when Wilson was President of Princeton University—early in his career—he did remark that all would know the United States was truly democratic when a Negro woman occupied the White House; with this I do agree, adding only a Negro woman worker. In Comrade Mitchell, the

*As but one indication of this growth, mention may be made of the fact that the sale of books by International Publishers has increased **six-fold** in the last five years! Of course, the historic re-appearance of a daily newspaper, the **Daily World**, this summer, confirms as it stimulates this growth.

Communist Party of the United States—for the first time in history—has actually proposed the consummation of such an event—to democratize both the Lily-White House and the nation.

Politically, the Party sees the need of continued work within the major parties—and especially the Democratic which still retains something of a mass base—to influence them as much as possible away from pro-war and pro-racist postures; the need of intensified work for political independence and for increasingly radical comprehension and program; and the need of the Party as such to function in its own name and to clearly present an anti-monopoly, anti-imperialist program, explaining and projecting a socialist alternative but by no means neglecting specific proposals to remedy most pressing immediate evils, as racism, slums, unemployment, poverty, inadequate educational and health facilities, high prices and taxes, agricultural policies favoring the big farmers and penalizing the small, and for an immediate termination of the U.S. aggression in Vietnam.

The Party has served as a mobilizing, initiating and analyzing instrument and a voice seeking constantly greater and greater unity of all anti-war and anti-racist groups and organizations. Such activity has served the highest ends of patriotism and international solidarity in the past; the Party believes that in the elections of 1968—and after—it must continue and expand these efforts.

Herbert APTHEKER

Vietnam: harder blows at the aggressor

For more than three years now, U.S. imperialism has been trying to bring the Vietnamese people to their knees. More than half a million U.S. troops, armed with all the means of mass destruction, are being used in a desperate attempt to crush a small nation valiantly fighting for its homeland.

ESCALATING LOSSES

Not long ago the U.S. command put out these figures: U.S. losses in killed and wounded since January 1, 1961, add up to more than 200,000, or more than in the Korean war.

And the aggressors have suffered even

more severely this year — 380,000 enemy soldiers, including 133,000 Americans and satellite troops, put out of action in the first six months of the year. Besides, the freedom fighters destroyed more than 4,400 planes and helicopters, 8,730 military vehicles, including 4,560 tanks and armored carriers, sank or damaged 580 naval and transport vessels, destroyed over 700 artillery pieces, nearly 500 munition and petrol dumps, blew up more than 500 bridges.

The nature of the war has changed sharply. The freedom fighters are on the offensive, forcing the enemy to passive defense. The war has been carried to the enemy's rear, with attacks on towns, provincial capitals and numerous smaller communities. There have been effective strikes on hundreds of U.S. and satellite bases, including such important ones as Saigon, Danang, Hue-Thuathienh, Tay Ninh, Quang Nam, Quang Tinh, Quinhon, Pleiku and Cong Tum. Everywhere NLF operations are supported by the urban and rural population which is united in the determination to repel the American aggression.

One of the biggest and most effective NLF attacks was on Saigon, where the battle raged in the center of the city, with rocket-shelling of a number of military and administrative targets.

Heavy fighting developed also at Khe Sanh, where a large American force was surrounded. The U.S. command claimed it could hold the Khe Sanh base indefinitely, but it was not long before it had to be abandoned after heavy losses.

Escalation has meant escalation of losses. The American people are paying with the blood and lives of their sons for the Pentagon's insensate venture in South Vietnam.

NEW TACTICS, SAME RESULTS

Washington has repeatedly altered its tactics, launching out on new "programs" and "campaigns," but the strategic goal has been one and the same—win this unpopular war, crush the national-liberation movement, and block Vietnam's road to social progress.

Not so long ago U.S. propaganda was publicizing the "search and destroy" tactic and the "rural pacification and development program." Both are now forgotten, though the Americans used airborne troops, marines, paratroops and other elite units, the 7th Fleet and all types of aircraft in a vain attempt to achieve their end. The "search and destroy" and "pacification" programs

have proved ineffective; all they did was to reveal that the aggressors could not "pacify" or "destroy" a people determined to fight through to victory.

The latest U.S. tactic is "clean-up and hold." The idea is to "clean up" liberated areas and hold them at any price.

The change in terminology has more than semantic connotations. At first the Americans were cocksure ("search and destroy"), then there were misgivings ("pacification") and now there is sheer pessimism ("clean-up and hold"). No longer is there talk of searching and destroying; the only hope is to hold on.

But they can't hold on. No sooner had the new tactic been proclaimed than its deficiencies became clear. If anyone was "cleaning up," it was the Liberation forces who this year liberated hundreds of villages and forced the Americans to withdraw from many of their bases. If the U.S. "holding" operation proceeds at the same pace it might well be that there will be nothing left to hold on to.

The Vietnamese are only too well acquainted with American clean-up methods—the use of artillery, bombs, napalm, poison gas. The aggressors are using B-52 bombers for attacks on 130 towns, provincial and district centers, including Saigon, Hue and Danang. Indiscriminate bombing has taken a heavy toll of life, destroying homes, fields and orchards.

Chemical warfare, now a favorite with the Americans, is designed to achieve a fourfold aim: destroying all foliage around military bases and installations; denude areas along highways and waterways; destroy forests, jungle and grasslands and, lastly, crops. An official U.S. instruction says that chemical spray destroys vegetation in a matter of three or four days and continues to prevent plant growth for months. True, this is followed by what is supposed to be a humanistic reservation: chemical spray does not affect people or animals.

But chemical warfare is turning fields into deserts. A London *Daily Telegraph* correspondent describes the results of the chemical "clean-up." Two years ago he travelled through the jungle near Danang and admired the rare birds and butterflies; wild orchids clung to the trees and grasshoppers were everywhere. The picture today is of a putrid mass of dead plants with charred trees protruding here and there. Chemical "clean-up" had destroyed all life.

American war crimes in recent months

surpass anything in the whole horrific history of the Vietnam war. A memorandum issued in July by the international war crimes information center says that the U.S. Army and the forces under its control *"have extended their policy of destruction and annihilation, formerly applied only in rural areas, to Saigon and other towns . . . Much of the country's cultural heritage has already been destroyed, an irreparable loss not only for Vietnam, but for world culture."* Indeed, U.S. crimes against the Vietnamese people have long since escalated into crimes against all mankind.

DIPLOMATIC CAMOUFLAGE

The official conversations between representatives of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the United States begun in Paris this spring on the initiative of the DRV, were seen as a prelude to substantive negotiations for a political settlement. Yielding to public pressure, the United States consented to the talks.

The world public had every right to expect the Paris meetings to produce an **unconditional** cessation of the U.S. bombing and all other acts of war against North Vietnam. Once this was achieved, the two sides could discuss other issues, and Washington officially accepted that. However, it was not long before Washington made it perfectly clear that it had no intention of conducting serious negotiations. Few now doubt that in agreeing to the Paris talks Washington simply wanted to camouflage its escalation.

And the war is being escalated. The U.S. Airforce is expanding its attacks on towns and villages. President Johnson's order to "restrict" the bombing has but led to continuous and intensified attacks on a sizeable part of the DRV, from Thanh Hoa to the Demilitarized Zone. The bombings in this area are three times more intensive than the "pre-restriction" attacks on the whole of North Vietnam.

Nor is it only a matter of more bombing missions. More targets are being attacked. In March, U.S. raids were aimed at 2,000 objectives throughout North Vietnam; in April the number was 2,300 in four provinces and the Vinh Linh area; in May the figure rose to 3,700 in three provinces and Vinh Linh; in June the number of targets was 3,900 and in July 4,200.

Blanket bombing by successive waves of B-52s, while other aircraft operate on a round-the-clock basis, has devastated densely populated areas, wrecked hydro-

power installations and destroyed rice crops, leaving the people without food or shelter. That is the background to the Paris talks.

U.S. spokesmen have blandly declared that there is no plan to stop the bombing completely. Speaking at the American Legion convention on September 10, Johnson reaffirmed that the bombing would continue. The aggressors are trying to tie a complete bombing halt to a "reciprocal gesture" by the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. One might think that it is not the U.S. which is attacking Vietnam, but Vietnam attacking the U.S. and that American, not Vietnamese towns and village are being razed.

The fact is that all the American talk about a "settlement," and the meetings in Paris, are meant to lull public opinion at home and abroad while continuing to build up American strength in South Vietnam. By mid-August, the U.S. had 543,000 men there, not counting the 35,000 complement of the 7th Fleet, 68,000 satellite troops and about 800,000 in the Saigon army.

But the Pentagon is demanding more; its sights are set on a 750,000 U.S. force by mid-1969 and increased satellite forces. America's biggest warship, the *New Jersey*, has been despatched to Vietnamese shores. Its 16-inch guns are shelling the coastal area, sowing death and destruction. In short, the bankrupt escalation policy continues behind the smokescreen of the Paris conversations. The result can only be more disappointment and more setbacks.

The key to a political settlement is immediate and unconditional cessation of the bombing and of all other acts of war against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. That simple truth is steadily gaining acceptance among the American people. Symptomatic in this respect was this recent comment in the *New York Times*: "The war has gone badly; Washington has, of necessity, turned to seeking a political settlement. To conclude this drama, a decision to stop all bombing of the North . . . now would redeem much in what has proved a tragic national adventure."

America's policy-makers would do well to heed this advice. All the more so, since the newspaper draws this significant conclusion: "Some American die-hards still believe that a military victory could be won, but their arguments . . . have lost all power to convince the public . . . the American people have withdrawn their confidence from those who recommend a still more resolute prosecution of the war."

The United States is entangled in a venture that has brought it dishonor and isolation. Its victory plans are crumbling one after another and the bombing has failed to paralyze North Vietnam. *The number of American planes brought down over North Vietnam has already topped the 3,000 mark.*

Surmounting formidable difficulties, the people are repairing the damage caused by the air attacks and are continuing their persevering effort in supplying the country everything needed for the population and the army.

There is a successful emulation drive for overfulfilment of the 1968 production plan, expansion in agriculture, uninterrupted operation of industry and progress in education and the medical services. The country is now concentrating on developing local industries, improving economic management and public administration in all the provinces and towns and gradually raising efficiency and productivity standards. In face of the numerous difficulties created by the American aggression, the socialist system in the Democratic Republic of Vietnam has proved its viability and its virtually inexhaustive potentialities.

PROGRESSIVE SUPPORT

The movement to halt the aggression is gaining momentum in every continent. Millions throughout the world, men and women from all walks of life, are coming to see the true character and implications of the war. They can see that the United States is waging an aggressive, criminal war that runs counter to all the accepted rules of right and morality, and that the Vietnamese are fighting a patriotic war for freedom, peace and social progress. That understanding is behind the constantly mounting support for the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the South Vietnam National Liberation Front.

In the forefront of this struggle for an end to the war are the socialist countries. True to their internationalist duty, they are helping Vietnam by giving it military, material and moral support. Weapons and munitions, food and clothing, transport and assistance in training cadres—such are the concrete expressions of solidarity from the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. And this is highly appreciated by the Vietnamese. DRV Prime Minister Van Dong told a rally held on the 23rd anniversary of the Democratic Republic:

"Our people are keenly aware that their

victory is inseparable from the support and invaluable assistance of the socialist countries. And the bigger our victory, the deeper is our sincere gratitude to the peoples of fraternal socialist countries. It is gratifying to know that standing by our side in the battle for victory over the U.S. imperialists are the more than 1,000 million people of the socialist countries. They are fulfilling their internationalist duty to our people, who stand on the front-line defense of the socialist camp and are resolved to discharge their internationalist obligations."

The socialist countries will continue to increase their assistance to embattled Vietnam. An agreement on Soviet economic and military aid was recently concluded. Commenting on it, *Nhan Dan*, organ of the Vietnam Working People's Party wrote:

"This is a fresh manifestation of the steadily broadening comradeship and solidarity of the Vietnamese and Soviet peoples. The new agreement is added evidence that the Communist Party, the government and people of the Soviet Union are determined to increase their support in our fight against U.S. aggression, for national salvation and complete victory."

Many international organizations have urged an end to the war. The problem is discussed at numerous national and international conferences. The findings and deliberations of the international tribunal investigating American war crimes in Vietnam have had wide reverberations.

The international lawyers' conference on Vietnam, held in Grenoble, France, brought together eminent jurists and public personalities from a number of countries. Its resolution condemns the U.S. war in Vietnam "as an aggressive war, a crime against the independence of Vietnam, a threat to the very existence of its people, an attempt to impose neo-colonialist subjugation."

The inseparable tie between the Afro-Asian national-liberation movement and the struggle of all revolutionary forces on the one hand, and the heroic fight of the Vietnamese patriots on the other, was demonstrated anew at the emergency conference in Cairo of the Afro-Asian Solidarity Organization in support of Vietnam. It stressed the importance of Vietnam for the world national-liberation movement and pledged united solidarity actions.

There is a rising tide of protest in the United States itself. Popular discontent with President Johnson's policy has found expression in the widespread demand for

a genuine settlement and an immediate end to the aggression. Vietnam is today the focal issue in American political life, the central issue of the current presidential campaign.

The fact that more and more people throughout the world are joining in the

Vietnam solidarity movement is a feature of our time, one that highlights the intensifying struggle against imperialist aggression, for national independence, peace, democracy and social progress.

Jan PRAZSKY

For the unity of the anti-imperialist front

(Assembly of the heads of African states)

The Assembly of the Organization of African Unity held recently in Algiers was attended by representatives of 39 of its 40 members, including nearly 30 heads of state or government.

The impact of the gathering was felt far beyond the confines of Africa, for it formulated a basic common African political line in international affairs, highlighted by anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism.

One could say that the concept of African unity, the groundwork for which was laid at the Addis Ababa conference of African heads of state and government in 1963, has emerged victorious.

Consolidation of anti-colonialist forces at state level and the greater unity of the African peoples add to the political weight of the African countries as active participants in world politics. The united African anti-colonialist front, whose formative period is not yet over, is causing alarm among the colonialists. Nearly one-third of the United Nations seats belong to Africa, so that the votes of OAU member-countries strongly influence the content and tenor of U.N. documents. The partial nuclear test ban treaty concluded in Moscow in 1963 would have no claim to universality without the African countries signing it, for every third signature is theirs. African countries were prominent in the Group of 75 at the 1964 U.N. Conference for Trade and Development in Geneva and at the

second conference of non-aligned countries that year, at which two out of every three participating countries were African.

Examples of Africa's growing role in world affairs are increasing in number.

Imperialist tactics in Africa are now two-pronged, being aimed at undermining continental unity, on the one hand, and seeking to undermine from within the social system of individual African countries and subvert the burgeoning national democratic unity, on the other.

The latter trend seems to be gaining priority, and this for two reasons. Firstly, the efforts to subvert all-African unity have proved futile. Secondly, in most African countries internal class antagonisms are not overly acute at present and take a back seat in the joint struggle against imperialism and colonialism.

Hence the colonialists have conceived a flanking movement for subverting the statehood of African countries by means of economic, military and political levers.

To suit imperialist interests, Western investigators are picking on the slightest signs of friction between African states, encouraging and magnifying tribalism, regionalism and national strife.

The imperialist camp, making the most of the acute dearth of funds experienced by the African countries for their development projects, is imposing various economic, political and other conditions for the "aid."

It was not without imperialist influence, for example, that a number of African leaders offered support and comfort, for a time, to such divisive anti-people's groups as the Pan-African Congress in the South African Republic and the so-called Provisional Government of Angola in Exile.

Imperialism's strategic line vis-à-vis Africa is best illustrated by the policy of the Nato countries. Yet this combined neo-colonialist pressure is being repulsed. African resistance is reducing to nought Nato efforts to make of Angola, the South African Republic, Rhodesia and Mozambique a "white barrier" against the spread of the national-liberation movement and to build up a colonialist and racist stronghold in the south of Africa.

The OAU Assembly censured Nato countries for their military and economic aid to the Portuguese colonialists and the racist regimes in Rhodesia and the SAR. A resolution was passed in support of the freedom fighters of Angola, Mozambique, "Portuguese" Guinea and the Cape Verde Islands, accompanied by a call for determined counteraction against the witches' Sabbath of racism in South Africa, Rhodesia and elsewhere.

The cause of freedom and peace, like the anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist struggle, is indivisible. Not surprisingly, therefore, African leaders dwelt on the vital problems of the Vietnam war and the Israeli aggression in the Middle East. The Assembly expressed solidarity with the Vietnamese people and passed a resolution demanding the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the Arab territory seized in 1967.

This is an indication that the imperialists are no longer able to neutralize the African solidarity movement and have to contend with it as a serious and organized force, playing an important role in the continent's decolonization process.

The OAU Assembly revealed the identity of the basic interests of the African peoples and was marked by a search for realistic ways of consolidating African unity, as reflected in the resolutions. The majority of African leaders showed a realistic approach to the controversial issues, many of which are a legacy from the deliberate and artificial division of the continent among the colonialists.

Attention was devoted to the problem of Nigeria, fighting for more than a year for its territorial integrity against attempts to pry away the eastern province which its separatist leaders have named Biafra.

The OAU Assembly resolution on this score urged a cease-fire and appealed to the Biafrans "to cooperate with the federal authorities for the sake of restoring peace and the unity of Nigeria." It called on "all U.N. and OAU member-countries to refrain from any actions liable to injure the unity, territorial integrity and peace of Nigeria" and recommended the specially-formed OAU consultative committee to continue the search for ways and means of ending the war.

In effect, the African states have eliminated the imperialist-engineered obstacles to unity, such as the idea of a French- and an English-speaking Africa or Africa south of the Sahara as distinct from Africa north of the Sahara. Peaceful settlement of conflicts is now the accepted method of resolving controversial issues between neighboring states. The OAU mechanism helped end border conflicts between Algeria and Morocco and, later, between Ethiopia and Somali, and coped successfully with other disputes.

The Assembly showed that many of Africa's politicians and statesmen realize that the political, social, economic and cultural renovation of the African countries cannot be dissociated from the world situation which is highlighted by the confrontation of the two world systems, by the increased anti-imperialist and democratic activity, and the strengthening of the national-liberation movement on one side of the scales, with imperialist military, economic and ideological escalation aimed at preserving, even expanding, positions in various parts of the world, on the other.

Clearly, with mankind passing from capitalism to socialism and the African continent throwing off the remnants of colonialism, the anti-imperialist content of African unity cannot but acquire new socio-political facets aimed not only against imperialism as the main external enemy of political and economic independence, but also against capitalism as an economic alternative. That anti-capitalist tendencies are growing is due, among other things, to the fact that outright colonial domination is giving way to neo-colonialism, tantamount to implanting the capitalist way of development.

The Algiers Assembly served notice that the concept of African unity on an anti-imperialist basis is accepted in general terms by the vast majority of African leaders. Nor does this conflict with the fact that it has not—and naturally could not—

remove all the controversial issues and the economic and political differences between OAU members.

The existence of the OAU shows that the idea of African unity is a tangible re-

ality and a serious factor of the African anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist movement, despite the complications artificially created by the imperialists.

Abou BAKR

Latin American continent in ferment

The ceremonial opening of the Olympic Games, the official speeches and fireworks could not dispel the atmosphere of tension, anger and distrust that enveloped Mexico City following the brutal police reprisals against the students, and the massacre on October 2 of the participants in the student rally on the Plaza de las Tres Culturas, when many students were killed, hundreds wounded and several thousand arrested and brutally manhandled.

The bloody orgy in which five thousand soldiers and police, and hundreds of tanks and armored cars were pitted against unarmed boys and girls, followed the campaign of repressions unleashed by the Government of President Diaz Ordaz against the rising tide of protests by students and other sections of the population. As part of these repressions, police and troops invaded the campus and the Polytechnical Institute, raided the premises of the Mexican Communist Party and that of its newspaper *La Voz Mexico*, and also the National Center of Democratic Students, arresting students, teachers and Communists, hoping in this way to seize the leaders of the protest movement and behead it. But even though firearms were used against the demonstrators, their numbers grew. Witness the many demonstrations, ten in all, held between July 26 and October 2, in which hundreds of thousands of people participated.

The repressions have been condemned by world public opinion. Many who had arrived for the Olympic Games and happened to witness the events were struck by the contrast between the colorful posters carrying the legend "Peace and Fraternity" and the brutal attack on the people. Witnesses

of the events were all the more astounded considering that the Mexican government had the reputation of being among the few "civilized governments in Latin America," and a model of bourgeois democracy on the continent. But the moment the students dared to express their views Mexican "democracy" displayed a brutality that would be the envy of even the most naked dictatorship of the "gorillas."

This was not the first protest movement against the alliance of internal reactionary forces with foreign capital and against the anti-democratic evolution of the hierarchy of the ruling Institutional Revolutionary Party. Nine years ago the strike movement of the workers gave impetus to the people's revolutionary and socialist trend in Mexico. It was during these strikes that the Communists David Siqueiros, Valentin Campa and Demetrio Vallejo were arrested. (The latter two are still in prison.) In recent years this trend has spread and taken root among the peasants, agricultural laborers, students and intellectuals. It is gaining ground despite the blows struck by the military and the police. During the recent peasant actions Ramon Danzos Palomino, leader of the Independent Peasant Center and member of the Communist Party, was arrested together with Gerardo Unzueta and Fernando Cortez, both members of the Party leadership, and several other Communists.

Delegates to the Party congress last year noted that the brutality of the regime mounted in ratio to the resistance of the people, and to the degree of economic and political polarization. The congress resolutions confirmed the readiness of the Communists to participate in the movement in

defense of democratic liberties. It called for the unity of all forces capable of carrying out a *new revolution*. In this sense the recent events mark a qualitative leap, the biggest united front of the masses in thirty years. Even trade unions which for years have been under government control are voicing their dissatisfaction.

The action program of the students and the masses calls for broader social freedoms such as respect for university autonomy and the inviolability of other educational establishments, release of political prisoners, annulment of the repressive laws on "safeguarding public order," removal from their posts of officers directly responsible for the repressions, disbandment of the riot police, etc. Significantly enough, after the massacre of October 2, the student leaders declared that they would no longer confine themselves to peaceful means of struggle. The government has launched a veritable witch-hunt against the "intransigent." Government myths about "democracy" are being given the lie, the gulf between Government and Opposition, existing even in the government party and supported by the youth and peasant leaders, is widening.

The bloody events in Mexico are not something unusual in the Latin-American political arena. Shortly before, developments in Uruguay—the "American Switzerland" and traditional model of "representative democracy" on the continent — showed that there, too, the military have the final say. Seeking to halt the protest movement against the freezing of wages and against other economic measures designed to "solve" the crisis at the expense of the workers, the government resorted to "emergency measures" and declared a state of siege. In answer to this, the National Trade Union called for strike action which ended in victory for the workers. When the protest movement was joined by students, police were dispatched to the campus. As a result of this intervention by "representatives of public order" four people were killed, many were wounded and many more arrested. The university and secondary schools were closed indefinitely on President Pacheco's orders. And the Uruguayan authorities and their military henchmen thought it very much to their credit that their country was the first in Latin America where U.S.-made shrapnel bombs, like those used in Vietnam, had also been used against demonstrators. A truly eloquent example of one of the "practical" aspects of the "cooperation between

Western Hemisphere countries."

But it is the armed forces of Peru and Panama that indisputably qualify for first prize at the "Olympiad" of the Latin American armed forces. As the "new" Peruvian government's term of office was drawing to a close, a government which believed it could carry out "transformations" — and this in conditions of uncontrolled corruption, political scandals and demagoguery — General Alvarado decided to save "law and order," "efficiency" and "national dignity" by staging a coup in the traditionally Latin American fashion. As a result, President Belaunde now finds himself in exile. The people of Peru, however, are vigorously resisting the dictatorship. Hundreds have been arrested and political persecution stepped up.

And a week later in Panama the National Guard repeated the "exploit" of the Peruvian junta, overthrowing President Arnulfo Arias at dawn on October 12, that is, only a short 12 days after he took office. With Colonel Pinilla in the saddle Washington no longer need have any fears. As for the Panamanian people they no longer believe that their country will regain its sovereignty over the Canal.

Some seven days before the coup in Peru, representatives of the continent's armed forces met in Rio de Janeiro under the chairmanship of U.S. General Westmoreland. It could, of course, be a coincidence, that the head of the Peruvian delegation happens to be the country's Prime Minister. . . . And so, the experience of U.S. intervention in Vietnam is being transferred also to Latin America. A new wave of "gorillization" is spreading and now threatens Ecuador where Velazco Ibarra, deposed by the military, has become president for the fifth time. Chile is surrounded by countries where the "gorillas" hold sway, and it too, in all likelihood, will be affected by the "epidemic."

The same can be said of Venezuela and Colombia, where the military have virtually taken over. This is particularly the case in Venezuela where the situation is aggravated by anti-guerrilla campaigns and by uncertainty about the coming elections.

Central America is no exception. It is expected to sacrifice on the altar of regional integration the interests of the working class of the respective countries, in compensation for U.S. "aid" as President Johnson recently bluntly demanded. The unpopular U.S. measures will be imposed by fire and sword, if need be. Which is precisely what is happening in Honduras where a

state of siege was declared and tax increases announced following a strike for higher wages. Colonel Lopez Arellano imposed censorship of press and radio, started a witch hunt against labor and student leaders, teachers and intellectuals, in a word, against all "suspected of progressive ideas." It is not fortuitous that the leaders of the Central American armed forces met in Managua on October 1, and announced that they would jointly intervene in the internal affairs of any one of the countries in the area at the least sign of "internal disorders" or of "subversive activity."

As we see, integration of the Latin American economy, as understood by the gauleiters of monopoly capital, necessitates hard-fisted regimes that cut short the latest reformist, or more correctly speaking pseudo-reformist, attempts of some middle social sections, enable the Latin American bourgeoisie to continue their alliance with their North American counterparts, and make certain that the people "recognize" the need for "strict economic and political discipline."

But the people are more and more emphatically saying "no" to the military offensive. The continent has been swept by

a wave of solidarity actions, particularly powerful in Santiago, Santo Domingo and Caracas where demonstrations were held outside the diplomatic representations of Peru, Mexico and the United States. The protest movement against the Peace Corps' representatives in Colombia, against the preparations to stage a coup and for elections in Venezuela, is gaining momentum. The same holds true of the workers' and student movements in Argentina, Brazil and Bolivia. Throughout the continent students, faculty members and workers marked the anniversary of the assassination of Che Guevara by diverse actions.

All this is indicative of the economic and political crisis that today besets the continent and of the puerility of the reformist formulas espoused by the supporters of so-called representative democracy. Revolutionary struggle remains the only solution for the Latin American peoples. However, the violence and repressions unleashed by the ruling classes against our people eloquently show that there can be no room for illusions regarding the bitterness of the struggle ahead on our continent.

Francisco MIERES

People's state—instrument for building socialism in Mongolia

TSEDENDAMBYN GOTOV

The Marxist-Leninist teaching on the state ranks high among the achievements of thought. Its basic postulates have stood the test of practice in the fight for socialism in many countries. The ideas of Marx and Lenin on the socio-economic fundamentals of statehood, the class character of the state, the demolition of the old machinery of state, the role of the state in building socialism, and the substance and forms, functions and perspectives of the state under socialism, are all part of the vital equipment for the fight for a just and scientifically-grounded reconstruction of society.

The facts expose as untrue the anti-communist concept of the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the state as a stereotype precluding creativity and flaunting the concrete historical and other specifics of the various countries. It is refuted, among other things, by the evolution of the people's state in Mongolia, which in an historically brief space of time overcame feudalism and colonialism and now follows the socialist path. This success is due largely to the fact that the People's Revolutionary Party was equipped with the Marxist-Leninist idea concerning the ways and means whereby the people could wrest power from their oppressors, with Marxist-Leninist guidelines as to the aims and functions of the state in the successive stages of the fight for socialism. Experience shows how important it is to differentiate between the qualitative features of the specific stages in order to cope with the difficulties, avoid breakneck "leaps" over the objectively essential stages in building socialism and se-

cure a consistent step by step growth of society.

Basic for us is the Marxist-Leninist postulate that the state is the main instrument in building socialism. This does not mean that we depreciate the role of public, economic, cultural and other associations of the people, the role of individual collectives. On the contrary, as we see it the state must assure the material and other conditions necessary for well-organized, effective and coordinated activity by the various groups, strata and collectives that are helping to build socialism under the guidance of the Marxist-Leninist party.

The socialist state should not be identified with the machinery of state, just as the two concepts cannot be wholly dissociated. The socialist state is a political organization embracing the entire people. The machinery of state, on the other hand, consisting of the personnel of the various bodies of government, is an inalienable part of the socialist state entrusted by the people and the Party with the essential functions of administration. Practice has borne out the Marxist-Leninist concept that any depreciation of the role of the state and of its machinery at a time when state guidance is still objectively necessary, could injure socialist democracy, the economy and the building of socialism. Moreover, the state and its competent bodies are charged with applying compulsion by rule of law to anyone impinging on the rights and freedoms of citizens or on public or personal property, or committing other violations of the socialist legal code. Socialism cannot tolerate anarchy and dis-

organization. Yet these are implicit, in one way or another, in the attacks on the socialist "Right" and the "Left."

Fidelity to the Marxist-Leninist state doctrine is vitally important in the fight for socialism, in coping with the difficulties and overcoming the obstacles. The People's Revolutionary Party and the people of our country have learned this from their own experience.

I.

After it had abolished the colonial regime and founded an independent people's state, after it had got rid of the imperialist yoke, Mongolia joined the new, socialist world. Backed chiefly by the poor and middle herdsmen, deep-going revolutionary changes were effected against a background of acute class struggle, eradicating the feudal relationships, democratizing society and building a new economy and culture. The measures that put an end to feudalism also ended the premises for the existence of a feudal class. The arats (herdsmen), liberated from feudal bondage, became equal citizens.

The dictatorship of arats led by the People's Revolutionary Party, aided by the Soviet people and the world Communist movement, tackled the tasks of the general democratic stage of the revolution.

A Mongolian working class and a people's intelligentsia emerged. The alliance of workers and arats provided the basis for the people's democratic system. The new revolutionary-democratic state, a form of the revolutionary-democratic worker-peasant dictatorship, grew by stages into the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Building socialism became the foremost task. In the socialist stage of the revolution the accent was on organizing the economy, on education and culture. State and cooperative property, which had begun to appear in the democratic stage, expanded. The foundations were laid for new branches of industry. By the end of the second five-year plan (1953-1957) industry accounted for 41 per cent of aggregate production, turning agrarian Mongolia into an agrarian-industrial state.

In agriculture, too, radical changes occurred. The Party and the government set the sights on developing cooperative farming. While helping arats to increase their herds, they imposed restrictions on the exploiting elements, whom they thereby gradually pushed out of the economy, setting the stage for the victory of socialism in

the countryside. The socialist reconstruction of agriculture was completed towards the end of the 1950s, by which time all arats had united voluntarily in cooperatives.

Variety in production relations was thus eliminated and supplanted by a single socialist economic system. Socialist relations of production held undivided sway in all branches of our economy.

The alliance of the working class and the cooperated arats entered a new, higher stage, based on the essential identity of the two forms of socialist property (state and cooperative), forging the moral and political unity of the nation.

The remoulding of production relations along socialist lines eliminated once and for all the socio-economic possibility of restoration, for it removed the basic premises for the exploitation of man by man.

Welcome changes also occurred in culture, public health, living conditions and in all aspects of life. The cultural revolution put an end to the cultural backwardness, to adult illiteracy, and secured primary education for children in the countryside and seven-year education in the towns. Today, every sixth citizen attends either a school, a secondary technical or a higher educational establishment. We have 97 university students per 10,000 of the population.

The health service and the steady rise in the standard of living and in culture have greatly reduced the incidence of disease, resulting in growth of population and longer life expectancy. With as much as 11 per cent of the state budget allocated to the health service, we have 91 hospital beds per 10,000 population, much more than in Turkey, Iran or Iraq.

At present our country is completing the building of socialism. Industrialization continues. Farming is being mechanized. We are driving for a higher machine-to-worker ratio in all branches of our economy. The contours of the country are changing. New towns are rising, and the cinema, electricity, telephone and telegraph communications, radio, television and the printed word are rapidly becoming part of our way of life.

Our efforts receive the all-round support and fraternal aid of the Soviet Union, and draw on its rich experience. Soviet aid and that of the other socialist countries enables us successfully to resolve the tasks of socialist construction.

By virtue of the sound leadership of our Party, the constructive policy of the people's state and the devotion of the peo-

ple, Mongolia has accomplished the transition from feudalism to socialism in what is an historically very short time. This achievement is reflected in our 1960 Constitution, which defined our People's Republic as a "socialist state of workers, cooperated arats (herdsmen and crop-growers) and the people's intelligentsia based on the worker-peasant alliance."

The Constitution, Comrade Y. Tsedenbal noted, "recorded and legislatively affirmed everything our people have gained, everything they have achieved in their glorious effort to put into practice the great ideas of V. I. Lenin about the possibility of the immediate transition to socialism by formerly backward peoples with the aid of the proletariat of advanced countries."

II.

Power in our country is vested in the people. Socialist democracy ensures for all working people participation in government and in decision-making.

The draft of our new Constitution was discussed at numerous meetings attended by more than 200,000 people. Approving the draft in principle, many have suggested amendments to some of its articles. The drafts of the new criminal and civil codes, the labor law, etc., were likewise discussed by the public. This democratic procedure is evidence of the truly popular essence of our state.

The will of the people is enacted through khurals (assemblies) of people's deputies, our representative bodies of state. The Party keeps the khurals constantly within the field of vision, working to improve their activity. The Party's concern enhances the role of our central and local khurals, which participate more extensively these days in all administrative, economic and cultural matters.

The Grand Khural and its presidium deal with all the important matters of state and policy, endorse economic plans and the state budget, and deliberate the reports of ministries, boards and local administrations. The supreme representative body has an important bearing on better government guidance of various branches of the economy and culture and promotes the principles of democratic centralism.

The local khurals, too, play a prominent part in the life of the nation. Aimak (regional), town, somon (village) and khoron (district) khurals and their executives handle economic and cultural matters in the territory within their jurisdiction, en-

dorse economic plans and local budgets, supervise their fulfilment, exercise guidance of the local councils and control economic and cooperative enterprises. Take the khural of the Selenga Somon. The state farm in its territory is a highly-developed grain-producing and cattle-breeding enterprise. Its incomes are high and its people prosperous. The Somon khural and its executive seeking to improve living and working conditions, deserve much of the credit for the state farm's achievements.

Extension of the competence of ministries, boards and the executives of local administrations, enacted on the initiative of the Party's Political Bureau, has effectively improved the work of the government, enhancing economic and cultural guidance by central and local organs, injecting dynamism into their work and promoting initiative. They have been given greater powers to utilize local resources and possibilities, effect specialization and exercise scientific guidance in the various economic and cultural areas.

From election to election, as educated and better trained people of considerable experience in industry, agriculture, education and various other fields are elected to the khurals, the latter become more effective. And the citizens of our Republic can legitimately say that the state is their state, that its policy is their policy. Deputies are elected to the Grand Khural and to the local khurals on truly democratic principles, expressive of the will and aspirations of the entire nation. Among those elected to the supreme legislative body in 1966, workers constitute 21.6 per cent, members of farming cooperatives 28.6 per cent, and professional people 49.8 per cent.

As a rule, deputies are closely linked with their electorate, expressing and carrying out their will, their recommendations and suggestions. More than 13,000 deputies of local khurals are members of standing committees. The ten committees of the Grand Khural are functioning successfully, each entrusted with a branch of the economy, or with culture, health or education, exercising control over the respective ministries and boards, and submitting recommendations to sessions of the Grand Khural or to its presidium. The powers of the standing committees, both central and local, are being extended, thus broadening the sphere of their influence. New opportunities are thereby provided for larger sections of people to exercise initiative and to participate in public affairs.

More than 8,000 volunteers help deputies

in the sub-committees at local level. Thousands more do useful work in street and house committees, administrative bodies, juvenile commissions, helping the militia, assisting Party and state control, as public assessors in courts of law and in other democratic organizations functioning under the khurals. These people are a powerful force, helping to improve the machinery of state. By their participation they promote the education of people in the spirit of the socialist ideology, moulding the man of socialist society.

III.

The outlines of future growth are contained in the decisions of the Party.

The resolution of its 15th Congress in 1966 and the new Party program indicate the necessity for enhancing the role of the socialist state in economic and cultural matters, and set the task of consolidating socialist democracy. Among other things, the resolution says:

"Congress notes that as socialist building progresses, the economico-organizational functions of government bodies increase. The khurals should, on the basis of the continuously expanding socialist democracy, enlist the people in government, exercise active guidance of economic and cultural growth and enhance the controlling function of the khurals by public verification of the work of the executive bodies."

As we see it, the socialist state is a powerful vehicle of the main political line set by the Party, focussed on completing the building of socialism. The scale and tempo of socialist construction requires the people's state to play a bigger role in society. Parallel to building the material and technical base of socialism, the state centers its efforts on improving social relationships, controlling the measure of labor and consumption, raising the standard of living, protecting the rights of the people, enforcing socialist legality and protecting socialist property, cultivating conscious discipline and a socialist attitude to labor, combating the surviving prejudices and superstitions, strengthening the country's defenses and assuring its security.

The Mongolian People's Republic has won many friends abroad by its progress in building socialism and its policy of peace. We have diplomatic relations with nearly 40 foreign states, and note with satisfaction that our fraternal ties and cooperation with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries are growing stronger.

This is in keeping with our Constitution, which stresses that the MPR follows a policy aimed at consolidating fraternal relations, unbreakable friendship, close cooperation and mutual aid with the countries of the socialist world system on the unshakeable basis of proletarian internationalism. As we see it, all-round close cooperation among countries of the socialist community is a sacred duty and an important factor in consolidating the socialist system as a whole.

Our country favors good relations with all countries on the principles of equality, mutual respect, sovereignty and non-interference.

The essential purpose of our foreign policy is to secure peaceful conditions for building socialism, to strengthen unity, friendship and cooperation with countries of the socialist world system, to support the national-liberation movement and the revolutionary struggle of the workers in capitalist countries, to encourage the cohesion of all revolutionary forces, and to promote world peace and security.

Our state exercises its functions with the participation of workers, cooperated arats and the intelligentsia. Our social and political make-up affords every opportunity for encouraging their active participation in government. That is an inexhaustible source of strength.

At present, as we complete the building of socialism, the role of the khurals as bodies of state power is greater than ever. Participation by deputies in government work and in guiding the socialist construction adds immensely to their experience and enables them to act as a model of civic duty. Many functions previously performed by executive bodies have now been transferred to the standing committees and individual deputies. This illustrates the expanding participation of people in government affairs. Continuous extension of their forms and methods of work is another means of improving the khurals as representative bodies. They employ methods of persuasion rather than administrative measures, and make the most of the power of public influence. We have learned from experience that collective handling of government, trade-union, Youth League and other matters is the most effective. What is particularly important is joint public control of the machinery of state.

Expanding democracy is an important factor in socialist progress. Far from contradicting socialist democracy, discipline in work and unqualified fulfilment of the

existing legislation extends the conditions for its consolidation.

The organization of society along socialist lines in the interest of every man, coupled with socialist discipline by each in the interest of society, is the essence of our socialist democracy.

* * *

The socialist state is the principal vehicle

of economic and cultural development. Scientifically grounded planned guidance is the guarantee for our completing the building of socialism. Success is based on the guiding role of the Party, on the diligence, socialist consciousness and creative initiative of the people, and their friendship and cooperation with the peoples of the fraternal socialist countries.

Roots of the crisis

VICTOR PERLO

Capitalist governments seek to use the expansion of state economic regulation for stimulating economic growth and smoothing out the business cycle. These methods have achieved certain results, but at the cost of accumulating various contradictions which create conditions for economic crises. These might differ in form from traditional crises of overproduction. Because of the unprecedented overextension of credit, domestically and internationally, the capitalist countries become particularly vulnerable to financial crises, which could have far-reaching social and political consequences.

The present crisis of the capitalist world monetary system coincides with and is intimately connected with a profound crisis of the political, military, financial and social policies of U.S. imperialism. The immediate cause is the defeat of the U.S. expansionist drive in Vietnam. But, of course, conditions for the crisis have been maturing for many years, and reflect the changing balance of the world forces. Thus, the all-round crisis of U.S. imperialism's policy, and the crisis of the capitalist world monetary system, are the most conspicuous expressions of the general crisis of capitalism in the present stage.

CONTRADICTIONS OF THE CAPITALIST MONETARY SYSTEM

Balances of transactions between nationals of different countries are settled by payments in gold or dollars, and to a limited extent British pounds. These two are called reserve currencies. Their position arose out of the financial domination of the U.S. and British banks and corporations in the interwar period, and the even strong-

er supremacy of U.S. financial power after World War II.

Emerging from that conflict with 75% of the world's gold supply, the Wall Street bankers were able to dictate capitalist world financial arrangements. They decided to maintain the price of gold at the 1934 level of \$35 per ounce, despite the fact that dollar commodity prices generally had already doubled.

There were several motives for this. The U.S. was still getting gold from other countries, and wanted to pay as few dollars as possible for it. U.S. imperialism used the fixed valuation of the dollar as a basis from which to attack other countries financially, forcing them to devalue their currencies. This cheapened the dollar cost of property and labor, raising the rate of profit for U.S. monopolies investing there. Later, as these motives lost their force, other motives became decisive. Any devaluation relative to gold would undermine confidence in the dollar, and U.S. financial leadership. Perhaps most of all, the U.S. wished to keep the price of gold artificially low as a form of economic warfare against the USSR, the world's second largest producer and exporter of gold.

However, for the last ten years, evidence has been mounting that the fixed dollar price of gold was below its real exchange value as a commodity. To keep the price from rising, the U.S. had to sell many billions of dollars worth of the metal from its huge stores. Unable to get a normal price, gold mining companies gradually reduced output or went out of business. For a while this was offset by increasing production in new deep South African mines profitable despite the low price because of the semi-forced labor conditions imposed

on the Africans. But finally production has turned downwards even in South Africa.

The supply of gold increased much more slowly than the need for gold as a money commodity in international trade. Industrial consumption of gold increased rapidly, spurred by new uses and by the metal's cheapness. Central reserves of gold, available for international settlements, increased more and more slowly, and finally turned downwards in 1967.

Salient statistics are shown in the following table.

Capitalist World Trade and Central Gold Reserves

1928-1967, billions of dollars,
at \$35 per ounce of gold.

Year	Imports cif ¹	Gold Reserves	Ratio of Imports to:	
			Gold Reserves	Gold and Foreign Currency Reserves
1928	60.4	20.5	2.9	2.2
1938	23.7	26.0	0.9	0.9
1948	59.8	32.8	1.8	1.3
1953	76.4	36.2	2.1	1.5
1957	108.4	38.8	2.8	1.9
1960	119.3	40.5	2.9	2.0
1965	174.6	43.3	4.0	2.5
1967 ²	203.0	42.3	4.8	2.9

¹cif—including cost of insurance and freight.

²preliminary.

In 1938 capitalist world trade was less than the total of gold reserves. But by 1960 capitalist world trade was equal to 2.9 times the gold reserves. This was the same ratio as in 1928, on the eve of the great economic crisis, in which the shortage of reserves played a significant role. By 1967 world trade approached five times the gold reserves. Instead of having enough gold on hand to pay for a year's imports, as in 1938, the capitalist countries, as a whole, now have enough to pay for only 10 weeks' imports. The supplementary reserves, mainly in dollars and pounds, are no longer regarded as secure stores of value. Thus even a temporary imbalance in international payments can rapidly exhaust a country's reserves.

The worsening shortage of reserves plays havoc with contra-cyclical and growth-stimulating government regulation. Capitalists determine their international transactions so as to maximize profits, without regard to the balance of payments. When economic growth speeds up, they import more, and are less interested in exporting,

in view of booming domestic markets. Hence a government which succeeds in stimulating faster economic growth tends simultaneously to incur a balance of payments deficit, especially when major trading partners fall into an economic slump and curtail imports.

Capitalist governments faced with a serious decline in monetary reserves reverse course and act to slow down their economies. Often they deliberately provoke a recession so as to reduce imports and to stimulate order-hungry capitalists to compete more vigorously on foreign markets. Such a braking policy coincides with the class objectives of monopoly capital. Increasing unemployment, it reduces the bargaining power of workers. Selectively increasing taxes and curtailing credits, it suppresses workers' consumption under the slogan of "austerity." Through "tight money" it speeds the swallowing of the weaker capitalists by the strongest combines. Fiscal policy is reversed to discourage capital investment, interest rates are raised and bank lending restricted. Public works spending is reduced to slow activity in construction and supplier industries.

The bourgeoisie thereby anticipates crises towards which the mounting contradictions are heading. It forestalls "spontaneous" crises with artificial ones, easier to keep within bounds. But this shows that state regulation cannot overcome the crisis-breeding contradictions of capitalism. And it thwarts the strategic objectives of state regulation—to achieve relative social stability domestically and to hold the capitalists' ground in economic competition with socialist countries.

Since 1960 the Italian, West German, and French governments have all gone through such phases. The Japanese have engaged in artificial slow-downs twice. The British economy has been almost continually stagnant under the government's vain attempts to balance its payments.

International bankers dictate the details of "austerity" policies to governments seeking loans to get out of balance of payments crises. The Wall Street bankers have been the most ruthless in this respect. But up until now, the U.S. imperialists have tried to exempt themselves from such medicine. They have tried, since 1961, to continuously stimulate the economy, while absorbing big annual deficits in international payments.

But now the European bankers are demanding similar austerity measures from the Americans. Obedient to these demands,

the U.S. Government strives to put over its own austerity program, against the resistance of the working people.

The monetary crisis has slowed down economic growth in the capitalist world, and contributed to bringing about something close to a general recession of capitalist world economy.

Industrial production in capitalist Europe increased only 1 per cent, and in the United States only 1.1 per cent, in 1967. Production actually declined in West Germany and the United Kingdom. The Comecon countries, with an average increase of 9.5 per cent in industrial production, took a long stride forward in economic competition with the imperialist powers.

SCALE AND CAUSES OF THE DOLLAR CRISIS

The crisis of the dollar is the most crucial aspect of the capitalist world monetary crisis. Beginning with 1950, there has been a deficit in the U.S. balance of payments every year except one. The combined deficit for the 18-year period was \$37.5 billion, or over \$2 billion per year. U.S. gold reserves declined from a peak of \$24.6 billion to \$12.1 billion at the end of 1967 and to \$10.4 billion in March 1968. Liquid dollar liabilities to foreigners have mounted to \$34 billion, including \$14 billion held by foreign central banks. Under U.S. regulations, central banks can present this all to the U.S. Treasury in exchange for gold, exhausting the U.S. supply.

Congress has just repealed the law requiring a gold backing for the internal currency, freeing the remaining store for foreign payments. But, despite the fact that money is not convertible into gold domestically, the shrinking gold reserve does undermine the stability of the dollar. Normally, under the gold standard, the U.S. gold supply equalled about 10 per cent of the money supply, including bank deposits as well as currency. Now the gold reserves are down to 2½ per cent of the money supply.

The chronic deficits in the U.S. balance of payments are due to the following causes:

1. The New Kind of U.S. Imperialist Parasitism.

The U.S. draws more and more raw materials from those countries of the "third world" where they do not monopolize markets, and must make substantial dollar payments, which may be converted into claims on U.S. gold.

Having penetrated into the industrialized capitalist countries under pressure of military bases and treaties and corresponding economic pacts, American manufacturing corporations have carried to an unprecedented extent the substitution of the export of capital for the export of goods. In one industry after another, they abandon trying to sell on world markets from U.S. factories, using their networks of foreign plants instead. Increasingly they depend on low-wage foreign factories they own for supplies of basic materials, components, and finished goods to be imported into the United States for sale on the U.S. market.

Highly profitable to the monopolies, this practice drastically worsens the U.S. balance of payments, tending to raise imports continuously while reducing exports. Even the large and rising repatriation of profits from foreign investments cannot overbalance the fresh export of capital and the negative effect of existing foreign investments on the balance of trade.

2. The Changing Competitive Balance in World Trade.

Imperialist rivals have gained on the U.S. in world markets. During the first 15 years after World War II, the currencies of all rivals of the U.S. were devalued at least once, often under U.S. pressure. With their industrial capacity restored, modernized, and expanded, with the combined competitive advantages of cheaper wage rates and cheaper currencies, they are able to undersell U.S. manufacturers.

The U.S. imperialists have further reduced their share of world markets by their policy of economic discrimination against socialist countries. Despite the fact that the United States always had a markedly favorable trade balance with the USSR, it has essentially cut itself off from this entire market through its economic warfare. The attempt to organize a collective boycott of trade with socialist countries has collapsed in complete fiasco, as East-West trade has surpassed the volume of \$20 billion per year. Now only the Americans are losers from it, but enmeshed in their own propaganda, especially in view of the Vietnam war, they are unable to make a basic policy turn.

3. The Foreign Currency Cost of Conquest.

Gone is the day when colonialists could make their victims pay occupation costs. The U.S. must pay in dollars for the services of local employees, for commodities and contracting work at their foreign

bases. In the developing countries, big bribes have to be paid to landlord-militarist cliques, on which the U.S. relies for support. Ever since the Korean War, the convertible currency costs of U.S. overseas military activities have run about \$3 billion yearly.

Thus the cost of striving to conquer and hold the U.S. neo-colonialist empire has more than accounted for the cumulative deficit in the U.S. balance of payments during the past two decades.

The Vietnam War has greatly aggravated this, as foreign dollar military expenditures increased to \$4.3 billion in 1967. Big bribes are paid to Vietnamese puppets, South Korean and Thai purveyors of cannon fodder and air bases. Larke sums are paid to Japanese capitalists for supplies and arms needed in South Vietnam, and to some extent as a bribe to win the political support of the Japanese imperialists.

The Vietnam War has worsened the balance of payments also by increasing the imports of strategic materials for war production, and through its inflationary impact on the domestic economy. As the situation of U.S. imperialism in Vietnam becomes more dangerous, and its financial difficulties multiply, there is an increasing flight of money capital from the United States.

In 1965 and 1966 the deficit was held down to about \$1.3 billion per year. But in 1967 the deficit jumped up again to \$3.6 billion, the third highest on record. And in the fourth quarter of 1967 the deficit reached an all-time quarterly high of \$1.9 billion.

U.S. MONETARY POLICY

Since 1959 the U.S. Government has been trying to correct the deficit in its international payments and to stop the loss of gold. But it has refused to consider a change in the expansionist policies which are at the root of its financial difficulties. Instead it has concentrated on trying to get other imperialist governments to help finance U.S. aggressions, and to shore up the dollar by loans, currency swap arrangements, and agreeing not to exchange dollars for gold.

Through the London gold pool, initiated in 1961, seven imperialist countries joined the United States in selling enough gold on the private market to keep the price at \$35 per ounce. Since the U.S. share in the pool was 50 per cent, this meant that the U.S. only had to use half as much gold as it would have to use in a single-handed

fight against a higher price. Furthermore, South African supplies were all made available to the pool through the Bank of England, at the fixed price of \$35 per ounce.

West Germany, Japan, Italy, and other governments which subordinated their foreign policy to Washington agreed to strictly limit their conversion of dollar balances into gold. They also bought medium-term U.S. non-saleable bonds, which provided credits to the U.S. for foreign adventures, and appeared as a plus in the U.S. balance of payments accounting. Other allies repaid debt instalments to the United States ahead of time. The West German revanchists and other governments cooperated with the Pentagon and American arms merchants' drive by buying munitions to the tune of well over a billion dollars a year.

But all these aids proved far from sufficient. The U.S. balance of payments continued markedly negative, and the gold outflow continued. Chase Manhattan Bank and the Bank of America, representing the most aggressive global-expansionist sections of U.S. imperialism, launched a campaign for the demonetization of gold. This would be replaced by so-called "paper gold," under which countries with deficits would settle their accounts through blocks of currencies of allied governments. These would be issued through the International Monetary Fund, controlled by the United States. Thus the U.S. imperialists hoped to get automatic access to an indefinite line of credit from their capitalist allies. But they met with strong opposition.

For several years France has converted the bulk of dollar balances becoming available into gold. In mid-1967 it dropped out of the London gold pool, forcing the United States to increase its share of gold contributions to 59 per cent. France accumulated the largest central gold reserves in the capitalist world, next to the United States, and in addition, many of its citizens saved gold. The French government has fought for an increase in the price of gold, for the abolition of the privileged position of the dollar by a return to the gold standard, and against the "paper gold" created as an international reserve currency, along with the dollar and pound sterling, at the Stockholm conference of bankers, from 10 countries.

The French approach is supported by significant elements within the other imperialist countries. Even those governments generally supporting U.S. policy have gradually increased the proportion of their

gold holdings at the expense of dollars.

Italy and Belgium have been showing increasing vacillation, reflecting internal pressures to break away from United States domination. Britain, Canada and Japan have their own financial troubles, and must be shored up by the United States, instead of helping it.

The closest supporters of U.S. policy have been the West German imperialists. This is connected, of course, with their militarist and revanchist aims, and the political price exacted from Washington tends to increase as Washington's financial troubles deepen. Moreover, even the West Germans have curtailed their financial assistance to the United States, and with increasing boldness dictate fiscal and budgetary terms for future cooperation.

Regardless of the position of governments, the dollar has lost the confidence of the world's capitalists, including those of the U.S. Thus the capitalists sabotage regulations designed to shore up the situation. They run for gold or "strong currencies," out of dollars, pounds, and yen.

Marx wrote of capitalist monetary crises:

"On the eve of the crisis, the bourgeois, with the self-sufficiency that springs from intoxicating prosperity, declares money to be a vain imagination. Commodities alone are money. But now the cry is everywhere: money alone is a commodity! As the hart pants after fresh water, so pants his soul after money, the only wealth." (*Capital*, Vol. 1, Modern Library ed., p. 155).

That, with some exaggeration, describes the attitude of capitalists today. Far more gold goes into hoards than is produced. The prices of other precious metals, silver for instance, have more than doubled. Prices of gold mining shares have soared to new peaks.

Americans are forbidden by law to own gold. But the American capitalists, individually and through corporations, using Canadian and Swiss accounts, participations in gold mining operations and other devices, flout their government's law. According to the estimates of currency expert Franz Pick, between one-third and one-half of all gold bought in Europe during November 1967 was purchased by Americans. Doubtless many of them were publicly proclaiming their "patriotic" support of the Johnson Administration's efforts to "save the dollar."

EVENTS OF THE CRISIS

The weakest ally in U.S. imperialism,

financially and economically, is the United Kingdom. The present crisis erupted with the forced revaluation of the British pound and a number of associated currencies in November 1967. This led to a veritable gold hemorrhage, as everybody who could rushed to get his liquid wealth out of pounds, dollars, etc., into gold. The U.S. lost nearly a billion dollars of gold in the month of December. After a temporary lull, the hemorrhage resumed in February and March, with another \$1.7 billion of gold leaving the United States.

Leading European bankers, American financial columnists and stock market advisory services, all predicted devaluation of the dollar. Even the Chairman of the First National City Bank, George S. Moore, has indicated his belief that devaluation might be necessary and even desirable.

Under these conditions, repeated desperate attempts of the Johnson Administration to rectify the crisis have failed. In December U.S. representatives tried to get the European bankers to place their gold reserves at Washington's disposal. This was refused. In January President Johnson announced a series of emergency measures to try to rectify the U.S. balance of payments, including restriction of capital exports and tourist travels, taxation to encourage exports and restrict imports, and help from allies in meeting overseas military expenses.

Within two months it became evident that these measures would fail. The capital export restrictions were shot full of loopholes under the pressures of hundreds of giant corporations getting special exemptions, and from the assurance on the part of big business that it could continue doing exactly what it wanted without fear of Administration reprisal. Congress refused to pass legislation seriously restricting tourism. Proposed assistance to the trade balance was checkmated by threats of reprisals on the part of European countries and Japan. Above all, the attempt of U.S. imperialism to hold on following the hammer blows of the National Liberation Front forces in South Vietnam presaged a sharp jump in overseas military spending, worsening the U.S. balance of payments deficit.

The Canadian dollar and the British pound fell into fresh crises. Finally, as private gold purchasing soared, the gold pool central bankers met in Washington and agreed on an emergency interim program:

1. The gold pool was abandoned, and the central bankers no longer supply gold to private buyers. Thus, the price of gold is no longer held down to \$35 an ounce on the free market.

2. The central banks continue to trade gold among themselves at \$35 an ounce, but the United States threatens to refuse to sell gold to central bankers to replace gold they sell on the free market. The participating bankers agree not to make such sales.

3. A big emergency loan was given Britain, which agreed to impose an extremely tough austerity program on its people.

4. Increased currency swap limits were established, to give Washington more leeway in supporting the price of the dollar on foreign exchange markets.

5. The continental West European governments agreed to stimulate their economies, with the idea of increasing imports from the U.S. and Britain.

While not in the public agreement, the United States undertook to impose an austerity program on the American people, especially to sharply increase mass taxes and to cut welfare-oriented government spending. But the U.S. refused to comply with the urgings of its European partners to refrain from further escalation in Vietnam, and the relief tendered by these partners was correspondingly limited and cautious.

In effect, the United States has taken the first step towards defaulting on its commitment to pay gold for dollars held by foreigners. Simultaneously, the rise in the free market price of gold is a defeat for U.S. economic warfare.

Ostensibly, the situation is much like that prevailing before the gold pool was established in 1961. But there are salient differences. The U.S. has 40 per cent less gold, and only a fraction of that needed to meet its short-term dollar debts. The dollar is no longer a strong currency, but a weak currency, lacking international confidence. South Africa, the world's largest gold producer, no longer markets all its gold through the Bank of England at the \$35 per ounce price but will sell a large part directly at the higher price, thus keeping it out of control of the U.S. and its allies.

U.S. imperialism has certain reserves still at its disposal. Its "most loyal allies," who keep most of their central reserves in dollars, face the biggest bookkeeping loss in the event of a dollar devaluation, and hence have a certain incentive to preserve

the status quo, if possible. Also, the U.S. holds in physical custody "under earmark" \$13 billion of gold belonging to foreign governments that wish to have it in a safe place should revolutions displace them. Those governments which cross the wishes of the U.S. imperialists face the danger that the Americans might refuse to release their ear-marked gold. There is ample precedent for that in the U.S. stealing, still holding and trying to use for political blackmail, gold reserves belonging to countries which went socialist after World War II. And the U.S. may yet get some financial help from other governments in exchange for military-political concessions.

Thus, there remains a period of struggle over the future of the dollar and gold, but the outlook is not favorable to U.S. imperialism. The rise of the free market price of gold above \$35 an ounce signifies the first step towards a formal devaluation of the dollar, or, in the alternative of its refusing to do so and attempting to set up a dollar bloc, the practical discounting of the dollar in world trade. At the beginning of 1968, opinions were widely publicized that devaluation of the dollar would be most likely in 1969, after the U.S. presidential election. However, the deepening of the crisis in the first months of 1968 makes it seem less likely that the interim emergency measures will last that long.

CONSEQUENCES OF A RISE IN THE PRICE OF GOLD

Devaluation of the dollar relative to gold will be a major event in world economics and politics. It will probably lead to the end of the favored position of the dollar in international settlements, expressed in the gold exchange standard. It will reduce the role of U.S. bankers in international finance, curtail the ability of U.S. industrial concerns to buy up other countries' productive assets and labor power. It will dislocate the international monetary system, and for a time have a negative impact on international trade and capitalist world production.

The crisis of the dollar is leading to an intensification of the class struggle within the United States, as the bourgeoisie tries to put the entire cost of its defeats on the backs of the workers. During the last two years of the Vietnam War, there have been officially admitted declines in real wages. But that is just the beginning.

Earlier, mention was made of the restric-

tive domestic economic policies followed by imperialist states seeking to rectify balance of payments deficits. The American imperialists are now using the dollar crisis as an excuse to put over such measures, sharply directed against labor. The Administration has blitzed through Congress a tax increase of 10 per cent, mainly on working people. It has agreed to reduce by some \$10 billion civilian government spending, almost all of which would come out of those sections of the budget which provide some relief to the unemployed and poverty stricken, especially among the Negro people.

It wants these measures basically to finance the further escalation of the Vietnam War, while maintaining and increasing corporate profits. The defeats suffered by the invaders have forced Johnson to give up the pretense of a "guns-and-butter" policy, and to substitute, publicly, an "austerity" policy.

However, until the dollar crisis erupted in full fever, Johnson could not get Congressional approval of these measures. The dollar crisis served as the needed propaganda device. The attacks on peoples' living standards are presented as necessary to save the dollar, obscuring their connection with the Vietnam War.

Johnson has turned to the standard "austerity" argument, that by curtailing consumption, the tax will reduce imports and help the balance of payments. As even the Washington pundits admit, this is like "hitting a fly with a sledgehammer." Only a fraction of the peoples' consumption uses imports, and the fraction here is lower than in most countries. Thus a \$10 billion sacrifice of workers' living standards might reduce imports and improve the balance of payments by a few hundred million dollars. Meanwhile, the next stage of the Vietnam escalation will worsen the balance of payments deficit by a billion dollars in comparison with 1967, according to estimates of *Fortune* magazine.

Thus, as in the case of England, the austerity program, even if enacted in full, will not seriously help the U.S. balance of payments, nor significantly affect the timing of devaluation.

In addition to measures being actively promoted, the Administration is angling for an opportunity to put over a freeze on wages and a prohibition on strikes. Troops are openly being trained to attack the Negroes in the ghettos. All of these assaults on the American people will certainly mean

an intensification of the class struggle.

The long, bitter copper workers' strike which finally won even larger economic concessions than last year's strikes, foreshadows severe struggles of millions of workers in other industries, whose contracts come up for renewal shortly. Millions of workers in a wide variety of industries and services, from school teachers to farm laborers, are entering labor struggles for the first time.

The dollar crisis has its special impact on the conditions of the 34 million Negro, Spanish speaking, and Indian working people. They are hardest hit by inflation. Their housing, public services and medical facilities are deteriorating most rapidly under the blows of racist exploiters and the domestic budget restrictions imposed in connection with the Vietnam War.

Even the partial going off the gold standard already announced will speed the rise in living costs, further raising tension within the country. The momentous labor struggles of the 1930's really got underway after the United States went off the gold standard in 1933 and set the dollar at a lower value after some months. Another intensification of struggle is to be expected as the United States goes off gold again. Of course, it will not be in the same pattern and with the same objectives as 35 years ago.

The *Worker* has carried this suggested program for coping with the dollar crisis.

"Working people should refuse to sacrifice, and strive instead to:

"Defeat Johnson's 'voluntary' ceiling on wage rises.

"Include in all union contracts a wage reopener in the event of devaluation, and complete cost-of-living escalators. There is no excuse for being taken by surprise. Responsible steel union leaders and others negotiating this year will insist on firm anti-devaluation defenses for their members.

"Call a conference now of all unions stuck with long-term contracts, such as the UAW, to agree on joint protective action. Devaluation represents, in effect, a collective breach of contract by all employers, who start using a cheaper medium of payment. Workers should collectively insist that in such an event contract wage levels must be raised to offset the cheapening of the dollar.

"Win immediate and automatic upward adjustment of all social security and welfare payments, and all union pension and

benefit payments, in the event of devaluation.

"Freeze all prices, with no increase permitted except after hearings proving higher costs of imported components, and limited to the direct effect of such higher costs."

* * *

Most significant in global terms, the defeat of the dollar stems from the defeats inflicted on U.S. imperialism by the heroic people of Vietnam, and by the socialist and national liberation forces of the whole

world. It reflects and contributes to the increasing isolation of rampant U.S. imperialism from all decent humanity.

Moreover, the crisis of the dollar, and the aggressive, anti-labor attempts of the Administration to cope with it, contribute to the strengthening of the ever-broadening front against the Vietnam War, for forcing a significant turn in U.S. foreign policy that could diminish the danger of thermonuclear war and increase the possibilities of less painful world progress towards socialism and national liberation.

Capitalist development more uneven

1. LENIN'S POSTULATE

In his 1915 controversy with the advocates of a United States of Europe, Lenin described the balance of strength in 19th century Europe as follows: "Strength changes with the course of economic development. Following 1871, the rate of Germany's accession of strength was three or four times as rapid as that of Britain and France, and Japan's about ten times as rapid as Russia's" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 341). He drew the following conclusion: "Uneven economic and political development is an absolute law of capitalism" (*Ibid.*, p. 342).

This article lays no claim to an exhaustive analysis of how the law of the uneven economic and political development of capitalism discovered by Lenin operates in the imperialist epoch. Our interest is focussed mainly on some new aspects in the unevenness of the economic growth of modern capitalism. Neither do we intend to delve into the problems of how the leap-like growth of the imperialist states affects the countries of the third world or into the problem of the influence exercised by the socialist world system on the conditions and forms in which the law of unevenness operates, or the influence of the uneven growth of modern capitalism on the stra-

tegy and tactics of the world Communist movement. Those are complicated problems not to be treated lightly, and require special study. Economically, the uneven development of capitalism is amply illustrated by industrial output figures:

Share in World Industrial Output,
1870-1913 (%%)

	Germany	Britain	France	USA	Russia
1870	13	32	10	23	4
1880	13	28	9	28	3
1890	14	22	8	31	3
1900	16	18	7	31	6
1910	16	14	7	35	5
1913	16	14	6	36	6

Between 1870 and 1913 Britain's share in world industrial output shrank by more than half and France's nearly by half, while that of the United States and Russia increased approximately 50 per cent. Germany's share, too, grew to well over double that of France.

That development of capitalism is uneven from country to country is due to various reasons; it occurs in different ways and gives rise to different phenomena.

The classics of Marxism-Leninism saw the causes of this unevenness even in

simple commodity production. Lenin, for one, described as an inevitable feature of capitalist commodity production the uneven and spasmodic development of individual enterprises, individual branches of industry and individual countries.

He pinpointed colonial expansion, which itself was "extremely uneven," as an especially active factor and, to a certain extent, a catalyst of unevenness.

Lenin's following pointer is also important: "Capitalism is growing with the greatest rapidity in the colonies and in overseas countries. Among the latter, new imperialist powers are emerging (e.g., Japan)" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 274). By borrowing technical experience and production techniques from highly-developed states, new industrial countries, even agrarian ones only beginning to industrialize, were in certain favorable circumstances able to develop at a higher tempo than the old industrial states.

Lenin, as we see, inferred the law of uneven economic and political development from the capitalist relations of production. To illustrate his point, he referred sometimes to 1870-71, sometimes to the mid-19th century and sometimes even to the inception of British capitalism in the 17th century.

We should not lose sight of this when we ask ourselves why Lenin, engrossed in studying imperialism, attached so much importance after the outbreak of the First World War to this law of capitalist development. As we see it, he did so far three reasons:

1) War, he pointed out, is the only means for gauging the relative strength of the principal capitalist states, on the one hand, but also an extraordinary and quick-working means for changing this relative strength, on the other. Wartime economic change may be illustrated by prolonging the previous table:

**Share in World Industrial Output,
1913 and 1920 (%%)**

	Germany	Britain	France	USA
1913	16	14	6	36
1920	9	14	5	47

2) His reflections on the uneven development of capitalism led Lenin to the "irrefutable conclusion," and this in September 1916, that "socialism cannot achieve victory simultaneously in all countries. It will achieve victory first in one or several

countries, while the others will for some time remain bourgeois or pre-bourgeois" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 79).

This makes the law of uneven development strategically important for the revolutionary working-class movement. The October Revolution and the subsequent course of events have borne out Lenin's conclusions.

3) Imperialism accentuates the unevenness of capitalist economic and political development. The evolution of monopolies and world wars accelerate unevenness, which in turn accelerates the evolution of monopolies and generates extreme tensions in the capitalist world.

Those, we hold, are the main reasons why Lenin, who discovered essentially new features in the law of unevenness, attached such extraordinary importance to it in relation to the imperialist epoch.

2. LATEST EXPERIENCE

The half-century since the discovery of the law of the increasing unevenness of economic and political development has fully borne out its validity. What is more, new factors, non-existent in Lenin's lifetime, have appeared. They intensify unevenness and should, therefore, come in for a thorough study. Trends working in the opposite direction to the law of unevenness, leading to still sharper contradictions in the capitalist world, are in evidence too, on which we shall dwell at greater length further when looking into the causes of the sharpening of capitalism's general crisis.

The tendency to smooth out the most glaring economic inequality and the attendant sharpening of political contradictions.

Let us examine the relative industrial potentials of some of the principal capitalist countries in the context of world capitalist production:

**Share in World Capitalist Production,
1913-1965 (%%)**

	Germany	Britain	France	USA	Japan	Others
1913	16	14	6	36	1	27
1920	9	14	5	47	2	23
1929	12	12	6	44	3	23
1937	12 ¹	11	5	42	3	27
1948	4 ²	11	4	54	1	26
1965	9 ²	8	5	45	6	27

1. 8 per cent in what is now the FRG.

2. FRG.

When the world wars created acute eco-

conomic imbalances, a strong postwar tendency appeared to eliminate them. The German economy, for example, contracted disastrously after the First World War, accounting for but six per cent of the world output in 1919. The United States economy, on the other hand, rose considerably above its prewar level, producing about 50 per cent of the world industrial output in 1919. However, Germany's production mark doubled by 1937, exceeding somewhat Britain's share just as before the First World War, and more than doubling that of France while the United States figure dropped again.

During the Second World War German and Japanese imperialism took a bad beating and finally suffered total collapse. Then, after the war, aided by U.S. imperialism, they began to climb up again. Japan's economy is now much firmer than prewar, while that of the United States, though riding the crest in wartime, has fallen back to the 1937 and 1929 levels.

This appears to indicate that a tendency is in operation to balance off glaring economic differences in the capitalist world of the epoch of imperialism and world wars.

However, this balancing of economic growth only renews the old unevenness that led up to the explosion of contradictions and the outbreak of a world war.

Remedying the "glaring economic disparities" of growth that arise as a result of world wars is tantamount in the imperialist environment to a postwar sharpening of political contradictions, paving the way for new explosions, new world wars.

However, in the last quarter of a century there appeared another factor greatly complicating our analysis.

The increasing unevenness of technological growth.

At the time when Lenin analyzed the international scene, the trend for decades had been towards evening out technological levels from country to country. This enabled Japan, for example, to grow rapidly from a feudal agrarian state into an imperialist industrial power. In the 1920s, this prompted some to conclude that the balancing of technological levels cancelled out Lenin's law of uneven economic development. What they did not see was that the evening out of technological levels, as Japan's example attests, only stimulated the

law of uneven economic and political growth.

Today, however, it is more proper to speak of an opposite tendency in technological growth: a rapidly increasing unevenness, as illustrated by the example of the United States.

To demonstrate the limitations of the purely economic analysis (which had caused Lenin to name war the only criterion in gauging the relative imperialist balance of strength), let us again examine the relative economic position of the United States.

U.S. Share in Capitalist World Industry

Percentage		Percentage	
1913	36	1937	42
1919	about 50	1946	about 60
1929	44	1965	45

Between the two wars the economic position of the United States was similar to before World War I. It would be entirely wrong, however, to draw conclusions therefrom concerning the country's political position. In 1913 it was still open to doubt which of the two, Britain and her empire or the United States, was the bigger political power (even astute politicians were inclined to prefer Britain and could hardly be persuaded that the reverse was true), whereas the Second World War proved beyond question that the United States had grown into the dominant force in the capitalist world.

On the face of it, in 1965 the United States economy declined to its level of 1937 or 1929. But considering the unevenness of technological growth witnessed since the rapid progress of modern technology began, this is at variance with the facts. As compared with 1937 or 1929, the U.S. position today is still preferable, and for two reasons:

1) These days, by reason of their high cost, some of the bigger technical projects are, with the exception of the USSR, within reach of only a big, economically powerful capitalist state like the United States, e.g., the space programs or the development of large effective electronic units.

2) Those trends in technical progress as can be ventured upon by other countries, are followed up far more rapidly and on a far grander scale by the United States because of its superior resources than, say, in Western Europe.

Typical are the facts cited in the *Economist* of July 13, 1968: "Europe's engineer-

ing industries employ almost twice as many workers as North America's (with more than double the number of plants) . . . but they deliver only half the volume of goods. Output per man is less than one third that in North America. Labor productivity in Europe is now also trailing badly behind Japan, whereas in the mid-fifties it was twice as high."

Not only does uneven technological development complicate the problem of the correlation of strength between capitalist countries; it also generates a tendency to create a new correlation through integration.

The tendency towards the integration and disintegration of capitalist blocs.

The two world wars were instrumental in producing capitalist politico-military blocs which, in effect, fell apart shortly after the respective wars ended.

The attempts at regional integration were more intensive after World War II, accompanied by efforts to consolidate economically the new blocs formed in the context of the monopolies' global strategy under U.S. leadership against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

This striving to integrate was expressed most tangibly in Europe through the inauguration on January 1, 1958, of the European Economic Community, consisting of France, the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium and Luxembourg. Its architects intended it to secure a political alliance and to provide for Nato an economic base in Europe.

To begin with, let us examine the evolution of the economic potentials of the EEC member-countries.

Common Share of EEC Countries in Capitalist World Industrial Production (%%)

1937 — 21	1958 — 20
1948 — 13	1965 — 20

As we see, in 1958 the share in the capitalist world's industrial output of what are now EEC countries was lower than prewar. Despite all efforts, the EEC has failed to secure for its members a greater portion of the capitalist industrial product up to and including 1965.

Moreover, it would be essentially wrong to consider the Common Market as a purely

European community, because U.S. monopoly capital holds key positions in the EEC countries, with many of the best-equipped enterprises, precisely in the most modern industries, being either wholly or partly owned by U.S. monopoly capital.

As for EEC attempts to set targets and enforce regulation, it may be of interest to dwell on the following figures illustrating the state of affairs in the Coal and Steel Community, where state-monopoly methods of regulation are most strongly in evidence:

1957 EEC coal forecast for 1965	325 million tons
Actual 1965 output	213 million tons
1957 EEC power forecast for 1965	570 million tons (conventional fuel)
Actual 1965 demand	626 million tons (conventional fuel)
1962 EEC steel forecast for 1966	93-100 million tons
Actual 1966 output	85 million tons

The structure of production is now more progressive in technico-economic terms, but forecasting, control and regulation have, in substance, turned out to be ineffective.

Lastly, it should be borne in mind that in time a growing impact was made on the EEC by the following factor: France and the Federal Republic endeavored to use the resources of the West European monopolies concentrated in the EEC to close by means of joint projects the "technical gap" between the West European countries and the United States. This may have substantially modified the nature of that community, but, as we have shown with respect to engineering, the effort has been fruitless.

This means that the EEC has fallen down in some of its functions.

1) Instead of accounting for a greater portion of the capitalist world's industrial product, the EEC countries occupy a relatively weaker position than pre-war.

2) Despite attempts to control and regulate production internationally, economic anarchy is felt more strongly (precisely in recent years).

3) Despite attempts to close the "technological gap" between Western Europe and the United States, it has grown wider.

The consequences of the increased unevenness in the economic and technological growth of the EEC and USA influence

explosively the political development both in the United States and in the EEC countries. The contradictions between France and the United States, for example, have grown so sharp that French integration in the Nato military set-up is weaker and the French economy is no longer unreservedly qualifiable as a part of Nato's economic base.

In the complete absence of any definitive stand, West Germany vacillates politically between the United States and France, the disparity between its economic and political positions increasing accordingly. At the same time, West German monopoly capital has split into groups, some gravitating towards the United States, some towards French monopoly capital, and others (with neo-nazis as their spokesmen) stressing the need for an "absolutely German policy."

What this boils down to is that though we may view the EEC as an act of integration aimed at mitigating the unevenness of growth, the above shows the EEC to be rather an instrument of the political disintegration of "Western imperialism" laying bare new contradictions.

We must not lose sight of the fact, however, that this unevenness of growth often tends to accentuate the aggressiveness of monopoly capital, as the example of U.S. and FRG monopoly capital of the past five years bears out. Neither can we afford to ignore the fact that international concentration and centralization of capital in the EEC framework continues unceasingly, making imperialism still more dangerous to peace and progress.

Japan: A special case?

Take the following statistics:

Share in Capitalist World's Industrial Output (%%)

	Japan	Britain	France	FRG
1937	3	11	5	8 (12) *
1948	1	11	4	4
1967	7	8	5	8

*All Germany.

By 1967 Japan had practically caught up with Britain and the Federal Republic. Nearly half the tonnage built in capitalist shipyards is delivered by Japan. And Japan stands at the top for cine-cameras, photo-cameras, radio sets and looms. In the capi-

talist world, it is second only to the United States in output of steel, power, automobiles, cement, aluminum, plastics, wool and synthetic textiles, sulphuric acid and many other important industrial commodities. Yet her population is half that of the United States and approximately double that of Britain, France or the Federal Republic. Technically, Japan probably ranks alongside Britain, the Federal Republic and the United States, and is even ahead of them in some fields.

The Japanese worker's real wage, however, is lower than in most other countries. Though, according to Japanese estimates, efficiency in Japan's manufacturing industries is nearly twice as high as in Britain's, the worker's average wage is no more than 80 per cent of the British worker's. According to the same set of estimates, Japan is but 20 per cent behind the United States in efficiency and as much as 73 percent behind in wages. This shows that the main stimulus of Japan's rapid economic growth, that is, capitalist profit, is secured there by a considerably higher degree of exploitation of hired labor than in Western Europe and America.

Japan is, indeed, a special case, a special case as regards exploitation of workers, while on the other hand, its development tends to aggravate the contradictions in the capitalist world.

ECONOMY, TECHNOLOGY AND POLITICS IN 1965-1967

We are accustomed to attributing many of the contradictions between the imperialist countries chiefly to the relative unevenness of their economic and political growth and the unbalanced development of the economy and of politics in each country. The latter was observed most tangibly in Germany. None will deny that Germany's political role in the capitalist system was smaller than the economic both in 1913 and in 1938. And this is doubly true of the Federal Republic of 1968, and also true of Japan. Besides, after the Second World War we are also faced with the imbalances between technological development, on the one hand, and economic and political development, on the other.

Last but not least, we must take into account the extreme instability of the capitalist world system, evidenced in the past three years by the strikingly rapid change in the relative strength of the various countries. It is quite obvious, for instance, that

the political position of the United States has deteriorated greatly in the past three years by reason of the Vietnam war. Its economic position, too, has deteriorated. But U.S. technological superiority is more marked.

The U.S. war in Vietnam shows clearly the extent to which U.S. monopoly capital has lost its grip on power due to the general crisis of capitalism and the existence of the socialist states, especially the Soviet Union. In the midst of the sharpening of the general crisis of capitalism, and given the existence of the Soviet Union and the other socialist states, the Vietnam war has revealed the relative impotence of the United States. Despite its economic, technical, political and military strength U.S. monopoly capital is unable to achieve its aggressive aims, which is indicative of the relative impotence of monopoly capital, the capitalist world as a whole, vis-a-vis socialism and the progressive forces.

None will deny, too, that Britain's relative economic position has deteriorated considerably over the past three years, and that her political position is weaker, whereas her relative technological level is no lower today than ten years ago.

And the economic position of French monopoly capital is weaker today as a result of the May 1968 general strike, than at any time in the past ten years; its political position in the world monopoly system has deteriorated as well, while its technological position remains unaltered.

It would probably be in order to note that no regularity has revealed itself in the relatively rapid rate at which the positions of political and economic power change. Before the First World War, for example, the decline in Britain's economic power was more rapid than that of her political power. After 1965 America's political position, however, appears to be deteriorating more rapidly—or at least as rapidly—as its economic position. And, as we see it, the deterioration of its technological position will be slower, despite the rapid negative political and economic changes. In the 19th century, on the other hand, the decline of Britain's technological position was preceded by political deterioration. Thus, the changes in the correlation of strength among the capitalist countries occurred by reason of the changed role of the technical factor.

Unevenness in technological growth predominates over the tendency towards bal-

ance, with the result that contradictions between different countries, particularly the imperialist, and likewise contradictions in each country, are supplemented by a number of contradictions other than those witnessed heretofore in the economy and politics.

This instability of conditions, this rapid change and the fluidity in the relations of strength seen in recent years is unprecedented in peacetime capitalism.

3. SOCIALISM AND CAPITALISM

As we know, the breaching of the imperialist front and the emergence of the world socialist system has been the principal consequence of the operation of the law of capitalism's uneven economic and political development in the imperialist epoch. A new area of the international class struggle came into being: the peaceful economic conditions may be in the capitalist us dwell briefly on some of the results of this competition.

However different the political and economic conditions may be in the capitalist and socialist worlds, certain common criteria exist for comparing their positions.

The most important one is what we call the man in the street. Despite differences of upbringing and ideological tempering, the man of the capitalist and socialist worlds is much alike in some respects. If we were to ask him whether, for example, he wants peace and disarmament or remilitarization and war, he will opt for the former wherever he may be. And since the socialist countries stand for peace and disarmament, while the monopoly-dominated capitalist countries are pushing remilitarization and waging wars, this alone affords an immense political advantage to the socialist camp.

And what about the economy? Here are some statistics:

The Socialist World (%%)

	Territory	Population	Share in World Industrial Output
1917	16	8	3
1937	17	8	10
1950	26	35	about 20
1965	26	36	about 38

What this table reveals is that the share of the socialist camp in world industrial

output has grown steadily, regardless of territory or population.

Now, let us examine the influence of this growing production on world capitalist output:

Share In Production (%%)

	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA		
	Capitalist World in World Production	In Capitalist World Production	in Aggregate World Production
1880	100	28	28
1913	100	36	36
1937	90	42	38
1950 about	80	53	42
1965 about	62	45	28

In the capitalist world the 1965 share of the United States was more than 50 per cent higher than in 1880, yet if we take the world as a whole the U.S. share was the same.

The share of the capitalist world as a whole, and of the individual capitalist countries, too, is shrinking.

Share In World Industrial Production (%%)

	1880	1967
Germany	13	5 ¹
Britain	28	5
France	9	3
United States	28	28
Russia and other countries now socialist	5	38

1. FRG.

This is indicative of the main trend in contemporary world development. All the imperialist powers have fallen behind considerably in relative economic strength. The United States alone has retained the level of nearly 100 years ago, and that is not saying much for the leading capitalist power.

This means that in addition to instability and to growing contradictions in still more areas of social growth, the capitalist world is undergoing a process which tends to reduce the role and importance of capital as a whole.

Juergen KUCZYNSKI

For building and consolidating left and democratic unity

(The political situation in Kerala State)

The Eighth Congress of the Communist Party of India, held in February 1968, stressed in its political resolution that it is "an urgent national necessity for the Left and democratic forces in the country to come closer together, strengthen unity in action and take steps to evolve a *common democratic platform as an alternative to Congress policies, to serve as a basis for a joint political battle* against the counter-offensive of reaction and the policies of the Congress Government." In this context, the resolution also stressed the role of the popular non-Congress government in the states, based on coalitions of Left and democratic parties and pledged to implement a commonly worked-out democratic program. Such governments "can not only give some amount of relief to the working classes, but also serve as instruments of building up the mass movement as well as Left and democratic unity for removal of the Congress from power at the center."

The fourth general elections, held in February 1967, were a landmark in the post-Independence history of our country; for, in the elections the Left and democratic parties, including the Communist Party of India and the breakaway Communist Party (Marxist), won major victories and non-Congress democratic governments were formed in five states, based on coalitions of Left and democratic parties. Communists held major portfolios in all these five state governments. The five states were West Bengal, Bihar, Uthar Pradesh, Punjab and Kerala, in which nearly 40 per cent of the population of India live.

But this development was not at all to the liking of the leadership of the Indian National Congress Party, the party of the

Indian bourgeoisie, or to other reactionary forces and mainly to imperialists. They gradually mounted a counteroffensive against the democratic gains of the people. By anti-Communist propaganda, by exerting all kinds of pressure, they succeeded in creating disruption in the democratic coalitions, making use of weak and vacillating elements; they even used the powers of the Central government to dismiss the state governments and dissolve elected legislative assemblies in a most undemocratic manner. Thus, four out of five of the democratic state governments were toppled within one year. Now the only state government in power in which the Left parties, and especially the two Communist parties, are in a leading position is in Kerala.

The small state of Kerala with a population of nearly twenty million, situated on the South West coastal tip of India, created history more than a decade ago when in 1957 the people there elected for the first time in India a non-Congress democratic government led by the Communist Party. At that time it was only the Communist Party and some progressive individuals who together won a narrow majority in the Legislative Assembly. All other parties joined together into an anti-Communist alliance to organize a reactionary "mass upsurge" which was used by the Central Government unconstitutionally to intervene and dismiss the Communist-led state government, which, during its 28 months in power, had initiated a number of radical measures like the Agrarian Relations Act.

Now, however, the situation in Kerala is quite different. The balance of forces has

basically changed. All the political parties, except the two factions of the Indian National Congress, forged a United Front and won 117 out of 133 seats in the State Legislative Assembly, the two Communist parties together winning an absolute majority of 74 seats.

This United Front consists of the Communist Party of India, Communist Party (Marxist), the Samyuktha Socialist Party of Kerala and the Revolutionary Socialist Party—the major Left parties. Then there is a small group called the Kerala Socialist Party. In addition, there are two other political parties in the United Front: the Muslim League which enjoys the support of the Muslim minority in Kerala; and the Peasants and Workers Party (KTP) with considerable influence among the Catholic masses.

That the Muslim League and the KTP joined hands with the Communist and Socialist parties to fight the anti-people policies of the ruling Indian National Congress and to form a democratic Coalition Government, based on a common program, was a significant development in Kerala. The KTP was formed out of the Anti-Communist Front organization, formed and led by a Catholic priest, to combat the Communist Party in the name of religion and democracy. The Muslim League leadership had always been anti-Communist. But the bitter experience of the masses, especially the peasants, belonging to these two religious minorities, who constitute nearly one-third of the population of Kerala, together with the persistent efforts of the Communist Party to build unity in action in the various common mass movements, brought about this change in the attitude of the leaderships of the Muslim League and KTP.

The United Front in Kerala was formed not just on the eve of the general election or after the election when the people voted the ruling Congress Party out of power. It was forged in the course of mass movements and popular struggles for the economic demands of the workers, peasants and middle classes, for democratic rights and against the policies of discrimination and negligence pursued by the Central Congress rulers towards the national aspirations of the people of Kerala. In August 1965, the Left parties and various mass organizations formed a "United Action Committee" to organize and conduct mass campaigns and struggles. This Committee led big mass actions. The Muslim League

began to support these mass movements, and the KTP joined the United Action Committee.

The United Front, thus formed, was able in September 1966 to work out a common program of relief for the people and minimum democratic reforms and in this way won the support and confidence of vast sections of people, thereby paving the way to its victory in the general election.

Because of its overwhelming majority in the Legislative Assembly, the United Front Government, headed by the Communist Party (Marxist) leader Nambudiripad and with two leading representatives of the Communist Party of India holding the Ministries of Agriculture, Power and Industries, became the most stable of the post-election Democratic Coalition state governments in India.

The Indian National Congress Party was reduced to such a miserable minority in the State Legislative Assembly that it was not possible to use the method of buying over members and organizing "defections" with a view to toppling the United Front government. Hence they resorted to other methods.

Kerala being a chronically deficit state to the extent of nearly half of its food needs, no government in the State can successfully tackle the food problem without the active and sympathetic cooperation of the government of India. This is especially so in the present context when each state is a single food zone and every deficit state has to depend on the Central Government for meeting its requirements in food-grains. But the Central Government failed to supply Kerala with anything more than half the usual and guaranteed supply of rice during the first year of the United Front Government. Moreover, the Central Government, on the pretext of economy, also withdrew the subsidy on food-grains supplied to the state. This imposed an additional heavy financial burden on the revenues of the Kerala Government, forcing it to raise the price of rice supplied to the consumers. This was nothing short of political discrimination.

Shortage of supplies and rising prices were the result. Naturally discontent spread among the people. The state leadership of the Indian National Congress tried to utilize this discontent to whip up an agitation, not against the discriminating policies of the Central government, but against the United Front and its government in Kerala. They also raised the usual hue and cry

about an alleged "breakdown of law and order" in the state, since the working people in the state were conducting innumerable strikes and struggles for their demands, quite peacefully, in the favorable conditions created by the United Front Government which refused to use the repressive state machinery in favor of the vested interests.

The aim of the leadership of the Indian National Congress and other reactionary forces was clear: to create a situation in the state that would provide an alibi for the Central Congress rulers to intervene and dismiss the United Front government also in Kerala.

How to meet this situation There is only one way to defeat the nefarious game of the reactionaries: i.e., to win over and rally the masses still more closely behind the United Front and its Government. For this, the most important thing is to implement with speed and determination the commonly accepted election program of the United Front, so that the people are able to get some relief, however limited, from the U.F. Government, and feel that this government is something different from and better than Congress rule.

The program of the United Front includes: amending the existing Land Reform Act in the interest of the peasant masses; distribution of uncultivated land to landless and poor cultivators; rehabilitation and resettlement of land-hungry peasants numbering many thousands who have "illegally" occupied forest lands and areas reserved for hydroelectric projects; legislation for recognition of trade unions, collective bargaining and other trade union rights; administrative reforms to extend the powers of the local government bodies; effective measures against black-marketing and profiteering, especially in food-grains, and against corruption, etc.

The United Front Government took certain initial steps in this direction. Then difficulties arose, not from the Muslim League or KTP, but from the side of the Communist Party (Marxist) leadership. This Party, the major force in the United Front, has the responsibility to strengthen unity and cooperation among the constituent parties of the United Front as well as to initiate measures to implement the program of the Front. But from the very beginning its leadership has been more interested in trying to isolate and discredit the Communist Party of India. They did not evince any serious interest in implementing the election program of the Front. On

the other hand, they began putting forth spurious arguments to create the impression that nothing much can be done by the United Front Government to improve the conditions of the masses.

The leaders of the Communist Party (Marxist) seem to think that, by such a posture, they can strengthen their partisan position among the people and curb the influence of the extremist trend in their own party. This extremist trend with ultra-revolutionary adventurist slogans is openly attacking the leadership of the Communist Party (Marxist) as "neo-revisionist." They have characterized participation in elections and in United Front Governments as being harmful to revolution. Instead of fighting and isolating this disruptive and objectively reactionary trend, the leadership of the Communist Party (Marxist), trying to prove their "revolutionary" bona fide, attack the Communist Party of India and even the other partners in the United Front.

Their latest slander against the Communist Party of India is the allegation that its leaders in Kerala had tried to isolate the Communist Party (Marxist) and to form a government in Kerala without that party and with the support of the Indian National Congress. Some other partners of the United Front were also implicated in this campaign. Such allegations and unwarranted attacks against the Communist Party of India and other parties of the United Front was their method of "political struggle against revisionism."

The Communist Party of India had to reply and defend its position. Other parties like the SSP, RSP and the Muslim League also were forced to criticize certain actions and attitudes of the Communist Party (Marxist) and their Ministers in the United Front. The Communist Party of India in its statements inside as well as outside the United Front emphasized two things: one, maximum unity should be maintained between the parties of the United Front, by putting a stop to open polemics and by strictly observing the unanimous decisions of the United Front; two, the United Front Government must prove itself to be a government radically different from Congress governments and become an effective weapon of struggle in the hands of the working people against the vested interests and against the anti-people policies of the Indian National Congress.

The failure of the United Front to live up to the expectations of the people on these two points was clearly seen in the

results of the municipal elections last April. There are 25 Municipal Councils and two Municipal Corporations in Kerala. Elections took place in 25 of them. Of these 11 were previously held by the parties of the United Front, mainly by the two Communist parties and the Independents. On the whole 75 per cent of the 660,000 voters went to the polls. The United Front obtained a majority in only three of the 11 Municipal Councils previously held by the constituent parties. The two factions of the Indian National Congress together with some Independents retained all the Councils held by them previously, and won another five Councils from the United Front. This was a clear defeat for the Front.

The reactionaries, naturally, gloated over these results. The Communist Party of India pointed out that the municipal elections were a serious warning and challenge to the United Front; that the parties should self-critically review their performance during the past year, and that the election results showed that the people were dissatisfied with the public controversies and wrangling among the parties of the United Front and also with the failure of the United Front Government to take serious steps to implement its election program.

Other parties in the Front agreed with this evaluation of the Communist Party of India. But not the leadership of the Communist Party (Marxist). They said that because the United Front had failed to conduct a consistent struggle against the discriminatory and anti-people policies of the Central Congress Government, it lost

the municipal elections. They announced a struggle of their own against the Central Government, and launched a new offensive against the Communist Party of India. Both turned out to be damp squibs.

When the United Front Coordination Committee in Kerala met in the last week of June, the representatives of the Communist Party of India made concrete proposals for strengthening the Front and for implementing its election program. These proposals were accepted.

Thus experience of the United Front clearly shows that for building and strengthening Left and democratic unity, it is necessary:

- to win over large sections of the politically uncommitted people who voted for the United Front in the general election. These voters wanted a change of government. They were dissatisfied with the 20 years of Congress rule. The United Front can consolidate and stabilize its influence over these sections only on the basis of actual performance by its government;

- to reject and combat the sectarian, dogmatic view that non-Congress democratic state governments can achieve little under the present set-up in India. A program of structural reforms, possible within the limited powers of State governments, should be worked out and speedily implemented.

- to awaken and rally the masses for united direct action to get this program implemented, while pressing for it inside the United Front.

C. Unni RAJA

Agarian reform movement in Chile

Chile's economic crisis is clearly the result of the semi-feudal pattern of agriculture: a tiny group of big landowners control about 80 per cent of the country's farmland.

Agricultural output is not keeping pace with growth of population—an average of two per cent in 1939-65 compared with a 2.6 per cent annual population rise. This has meant spending more foreign exchange on imports, though the country is in a

position to meet all its farm-produce requirements.

The big landowners have been steadily raising farm prices on the pretext of stimulating output. And using the same excuse they have been demanding, and getting, generous credits, which in many instances are used for travel abroad, new villas, speculation and other purposes wholly unrelated to agriculture.

Agriculture accounts for 35.6 per cent

of all development credits, but, as the statistics show, the credits are granted strictly on a class basis. For instance, 2,480 big landowners averaged 57,286 escudos each, 10,198 middle landowners 7,040 escudos, 24,965 small landowners only 577 escudos, **while 80,000 smallholders received no credits at all.**

Despite these and other privileges for the latifundists, agriculture is in a state of decline. This is apparent from the fact that in 1964 Chile spent more than \$160 million on agricultural imports and earned only \$39 million from agricultural exports, leaving the treasury with a deficit of \$120 million. Agricultural imports over the past 14 years add up to more than \$1,000 million.

LAND TENURE

Of Chile's 74 million hectares (exclusive of the Antarctic zone) only 30 million are suitable for farming and 21 million are forest. Of the 30 million, only 11 million are productive land, of which only 6 million are classed as fertile, and slightly more than one-third is actually cultivated.

These figures, too, are part of the semi-feudal land-tenure system, with large areas concentrated in the hands of a tiny group, while thousands of peasant families have very small plots or none at all.

Of the 350,000 rural families, 185,000 are tenant farmers, sharecroppers or farm laborers. About 53 per cent of the peasant population is landless.

Census figures show that out of 165,000 land-owning families, 127,000 have either subsistence or smaller plots. This poses the problem of minifundia, that is, plots too small to provide food for the family cultivating them. In most cases these minifundia are in the poor-soil areas on the mountainous coastal strip or in the Andes foothills.

Then there are these figures: of the 38,000 landowners with farms larger than **subsistence plots**, 6,326 own 40 per cent of all the land, or nearly 75 per cent of the cropland and pasturage, including the most fertile and irrigated lands.

This land-tenure system is a major obstacle to Chile's economic, political and social development.

RURAL LIVING STANDARDS

The peasants, who make up nearly a third of Chile's population, are concentrated in the 17 predominantly farming central and northern provinces, which,

however, account for only eight per cent of the national income.

To say that the peasants have no access to the benefits of civilization would be a gross understatement. A survey conducted by the Ministry of Agriculture and the Catholic University of Chile revealed that most of the rural population has work only 180-200 days a year and earns less than the minimum cost of living. About 36 per cent of the adult population is illiterate. Housing conditions are spelled out in the following figures: in 90 per cent of the houses covered by the survey, there were 2-6 people to a room and 4 people to a bed; 75 per cent of all the houses lacked electricity and elementary sanitation. In most rural areas there is a shortage of drinking water and only 1.5 hospital beds per 1,000 of the population. Rural Chile has the highest infantile mortality rate, and 40 per cent of the population suffer from chronic malnutrition.

Rural poverty is aggravated by gross mishandling of social insurance funds. Most are appropriated by the latifundists who, incidentally, make no contribution to the fund. Peasants and farm laborers are thus deprived of medical care and sick benefits. Farm owners are supposed to pay social insurance benefits to their tenants and workers, but in most cases they use the money to pay wages or for speculation. The net result is that an increasing number of pension-age farm workers are compelled to continue to work in the hope of eventually getting a pension.

AGRARIAN REFORM AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

For more than 40 years our Party has been fighting for transfer of the land to those who till it and for economic and social rights for the peasants. Many Party members have been murdered by latifundists when they tried to organize the peasants.

We Communists feel that liquidation of the present semi-feudal structure would go a long way towards victory in the fight against Chile's other enemies, American imperialism and the monopoly oligarchy.

A few years ago the Communist Party was the only organization campaigning for agrarian reform. Now it is a national issue, one that is causing anxiety among every section of the population. There have been demonstrations, conferences, discussions in the press, on the radio and television. And there is a growing realization that the solution of Chile's economic problems lies

through liquidation of the latifundia.

There is also mounting condemnation of the harsh exploitation of our peasants. Apart from everything else, this drastically reduces effective demand and, consequently, holds up industrial and trade development. The South has only a few factories employing more than 100 workers, yet the picture could be quite different for the 3,500,000 people who live in these agricultural provinces. There has been a steady flow of manpower from these to more industrialized provinces: in 1950-60 more than 500,000 migrated to the towns to swell the jobless and homeless. The government's policy of looking after the latifundists has helped to spread the poverty from the villages to the towns.

PEASANT STRUGGLE

Peasants and farm laborers use traditional proletarian methods of struggle to back their economic and social demands. Petition campaigns play a big part. Everywhere there has been an eager response to the appeal of the United Trade Union Center for a nationwide petition campaign. Last year there were successful joint peasant actions in the central provinces of O'Higgins, Colchagua, Curico, Talca and Linares in support of demands set out in more than 600 petitions.

But the struggle assumes other forms too — strikes, seizure of latifundia, protest marches to provincial capitals, and so on. In Molina province, for instance, the more than 40-day peasant strike was widely supported and striker families were supplied with food. One thousand five hundred strikers marched to Santiago, the capital, to demand government intervention to settle the conflict. They covered more than 200 kilometres, held solidarity meetings in the towns enroute and were supplied with food. The United Trade Union Center organized a mass meeting in Santiago and arranged for the marchers to stay in one of the trade-union halls. This is one example of close alliance of workers and peasants, and it is actions like these that will speed up introduction of radical agrarian reform.

The recently enacted agrarian reform bill does not meet the widespread demand for abolition of the latifundia and a radical change in the system of land tenure. It contains a multitude of reservations which the government has been exploiting to postpone expropriation of abandoned or inadequately used land. Furthermore, the latifun-

dists are allowed a three-year period to cultivate such land.

The reform law, however, does contain provisions that could be incorporated into an action program of immediate demands. For instance, it provides that a farm shall be declared abandoned if 95 per cent of irrigated land and 80 per cent of non-irrigated land are not sown to crops or used for pasture. It also provides for profit sharing, sets a minimum wage, family grants and contributions to the social insurance scheme. The latifundists are also supposed to provide proper housing, medical care and school facilities. None of these provisions, of course, is being carried out, and there are wide opportunities for united action on all these demands.

The main Communist demand is expropriation of abandoned or inadequately cultivated land, and the struggle to achieve that has now spread to every part of the country. How it is being waged can be judged from the events at the huge Santa Marta farm (26,000 hectares) in Aconcagua province. The events triggered off a solidarity movement throughout the country, but they also led to strong and united opposition against reform. After years of struggle the peasants finally forced the Agrarian Reform Corporation to expropriate Santa Marta. Its owners, supported by latifundist organizations in other provinces, used every conceivable means, from legal technicalities to political trickery, to reverse the decision. They managed to induce some of their former workers and brought in men from other areas to resist expropriation. Finally they secured a Supreme Court decision returning the farm to its former owners.

But the struggle did not end with that. Most of the peasants who had carved out plots from the Santa Marta farm set up a cooperative, an *asentamiento*, and told the owners and authorities: "Come what may we will not surrender our homes and fields." They were actively supported by neighboring peasants and by workers and progressives throughout the country and, in the end, the Agrarian Reform Corporation had no choice but to re-expropriate Santa Marta. The battle was won.

This heightened activity, plus strong and unfailing support from city workers have brought the peasant movement out of its isolation and sharply increased its militancy. How sharply can be seen from the events at the La Primera farm in Linares Province. Its owners resisted expropriation, but the peasants, after patiently waiting for

the government to act, decided to take direct action. They were joined by hundreds of peasants from other parts of the province who gathered at the farm to press the demand that it be handed over to those who have been tilling it for years.

In the South, populated largely by Mapuche Indians, there has been a long and hard struggle for the return of illegally appropriated tribal lands. In February, Indians from Lumaco village in Malleco Province took over one of the bigger farms (7,000 hectares). The government sent in police to evict the squatters and there were clashes with casualties on both sides. In the end, the government had to give in and issue an expropriation order.

PEASANT TRADE UNIONS

The need for organization is keenly felt by the peasants. But the new law on peasant trade unions tends to disunite rather than unite them in their fight against the big estate owners. For it envisages the organization of "parallel" unions along political and ideological lines, which obviously, is detrimental to unity of the movement.

Chile has two peasant union centers. One is controlled by the Christian-Democrats and the other, based on class positions, by men who have been active in the movement for years. This is the National Federation of Peasants and Indians, more widely known as Ranquil, in honor of the village of Ranquil, the scene, in 1934, of a courageous battle with the police in which many peasants were killed. The Communists are working to bring the peasants together in mass organizations regardless of religion and politics.

For all its reservations and handicaps, the trade union law (as the agrarian reform law) contains provisions that can be used to form genuine peasant unions. For one thing, it allows community-wide unions open to all irrespective of place of employment or social status — farm laborers, tenant farmers, share-croppers, smallholders, etc. Each such union must have a membership of at least 100 and its officials must be above the age of 18. Farms with more than 10 hired workers must provide union premises. Union funds are made up of membership dues (two per cent of wages) and another two per cent contributed by the employer. Part of the money is used to finance provincial union federations and national confederations.

Our Party, which has devoted much attention to organizing the peasants, has

made significant progress since the adoption of the new law. Communists now head more than 50 community unions and 12 provincial union councils.

The Party is also helping Ranquil, which now has 82 community unions with 480 functionaries and 600 farm delegates. The law prohibits victimization of union officials.

The 250 community unions started this year have a membership of 70,000. Ranquil is preparing a petition setting out its demands. With a membership of more than 25,000 in all farm areas, it can exert a strong influence on the peasant masses.

COOPERATIVE FARMING

The question that arises immediately after expropriation of a farm is: What next? How to use the land?

The agrarian reform law permits the organization of cooperative farms with the Agrarian Reform Corporation sharing in their management. All work on these *asentamiento* is conducted on a joint basis. The farm is managed by a five-member board elected by secret ballot and two officials of the Agrarian Reform Corporation. The latter supplies technical assistance, funds for the purchase of cattle, machinery, seed, fertilizer, and credits repayable at harvest time.

The Corporation is entitled to from 10 to 25 per cent of the farm's income for further investment, the rest being divided among the members according to the number of days worked.

This arrangement is to operate for a period of from three to five years. The law also envisages distribution of the land among members of the cooperative. So far, 253 latifundia have been expropriated, and in many of them the Communists are at the head of the boards.

There is still much the Party can and should do. We have already come up against difficulties, particularly in organizing cooperative farming. As a rule the peasant prefers to have his own plot and it is our duty to bring home to him the benefits of collective agriculture. All the more so since experience has shown that cooperative farming on the expropriated lands produces bigger harvests and, naturally, gives the farmer better conditions and higher earnings. This is helping to power the movement for continued expropriation and fuller operation of the agrarian reform. Experience has shown also that there is an increasing interest in cooperative farming,

and this is bound to diminish the trend towards a return to individual plots.

As was only to be expected, the agrarian reform has met with sharp reactions from estate owners and their organizations. They have launched a campaign of intimidation, telling the peasants: "We will not be evicted, and blood will flow in the fields." And that is not a mere threat—there have been clashes in several provinces ending, in practically all cases, in victory for the peasants.

Our Party is exerting every effort in support of the peasants. A new development is the recent organization of a United Front

in Defense of the Agrarian Reform, which has been joined by peasant organizations, the United Trade Union Center and the Student Federation. Its purpose is to assure that the agrarian reform is consistently carried out in every part of the country.

Rural Chile is today the scene of tense struggle. The enemy is still strong, but our Party, jointly with the working class and all progressive forces, will perform its historic mission of abolishing all the latifundia and transferring the land to those who till it.

Enrique AVENDANO

Prospects of aid to developing countries

IDRIS COX

The discussions and declarations at the second United Nations Conference for Trade and Development (UNCTAD) held at New Delhi during January-March revealed quite clearly that the problem of world hunger is as acute as ever. The first part of the draft declaration on the world food problem put the position in these words:

"Half of mankind is undernourished or badly fed, because the world production of energy-giving and protective foods is insufficient to satisfy nutritional requirements. The millions of people suffering from hunger and malnutrition live in developing countries.

"In nearly all the developing countries, a backward agricultural sector has in recent years been unable to increase food output fast enough to match the increase in the demand for food resulting from population growth and rising incomes. For this reason, these countries are obliged, even for maintaining present low levels of nutrition, to import food in ever-increasing amounts, to the detriment of their capacity to import capital goods essential for accelerating their economic development. . . . In most developing countries there exists at the

same time a deep social and human problem which arises, like the world food problem, from the insufficient dynamism of the agricultural sector — namely, the chronic unemployment and the low incomes of the rural population. . . ."

The gravity of this situation is making an increasing impact on the United Nations and its members, and even in important circles associated with international monopoly capital.

Some months ago, during the early days of the New Delhi conference, the *Business Supplement* editorial of *The Times* (London) made this significant comment:

"If the developed world does not wish to sow the seeds of a far more destructive whirlwind than anything which is likely to develop out of the mild breezes of change at present blowing upon the international monetary system, it will have to stop making its own aches and pains an excuse for ignoring the fact that over half the world is dying of malnutrition, in many cases literally." (22 January, 1968.)

From the standpoint of big business and financial interests their concept of measures to change this situation is to increase

overseas private investment (and the big profits which accrue from them) and to provide a screen for this robbery by schemes for "economic aid," roads, harbors, irrigation, electric power—all the "public services" which make it easier for them to get bigger profits.

THE REAL PROBLEM

This evades the real problem which is that the "developing" countries are faced with this situation mainly due to imperialist exploitation. This was perhaps more evident when these countries were still under direct colonial rule, but in many respects it persists even more strongly after they gained political independence.

They were left with the economic and political heritage of colonial rule, with backward, one-sided and deformed economies. In their attempts to change this and create a modern and balanced economy, they are hampered not only by the stranglehold of foreign capital investment, but also by the grip of the imperialist powers on the world market, expressed in a steady decline in the prices for primary products and raw materials exported by the new states, and in the rising prices for the capital and manufactured goods which they import.

During the past decade this trend has presented a formidable obstacle to all the efforts of the countries described as the "third world," to narrow the gap between their economic levels and those of the developed capitalist countries.

Confronted with this situation the United Nations launched its "Development Decade" for the 1960s, and formed UNCTAD to devise measures which would at least narrow the gap. The first UNCTAD conference, held in Geneva during March/June 1964, adopted a number of constructive resolutions, supported by the countries of the third world and by the socialist countries; they were opposed by the imperialist powers—chiefly the United States, Britain, France and West Germany. The operation of these resolutions was optional, and few were put into practice by the imperialist countries.

In preparation for the second UNCTAD conference at New Delhi, the countries of the third world (known as the "77 Group," but later increased to 86), met in Algiers in October 1967 to work out a common program, which came to be known as the "Algiers Charter." The points in this char-

ter provided the battleground for most of the discussions at New Delhi.

But, while the Algiers Group had prepared its program the delegates of the imperialist world mustered to resist it. Din-esh Singh (India), President of the Conference, regretted that "it had not fulfilled the hopes put into it." Raul Prebisch, Secretary-General of UNCTAD, said that "a great vacuum had been left in our task."

The *Financial Times* (London) (1 April, 1968) stated "its concrete results were few" and the "victories gained for the developing countries . . . were victories only on paper," while the *Guardian* (28 March, 1968) declared "the conference has practically failed."

RISING MONOPOLY PROFITS

What was the situation confronting the Delhi UNCTAD from the standpoint of the "developing countries"? Their share of world capitalist trade dropped from 31.2 per cent in 1950 to 20 per cent in 1967. If their oil exports are excluded (as the main oil trusts are in the ownership and control of international monopoly capital) the drop was from 24.4 per cent to just over 10 per cent.

Based on United Nations reports, the contrast between the countries of the third world, the capitalist world, and the socialist countries, is given below for 1966:

	Growth in gross national product	Growth in population	Growth in average per capita income
"Third World"	4.6%	2.5%	2.0%
Capitalist world	5.0%	1.2%	3.8%
Socialist world	7.0%	1.6%	6.0%

Even accepting these estimates it will be seen that growth of the gross national product was lower in the third world and highest in the socialist world, and that per capita income growth was three times greater in the socialist world.

This gap in economic levels arises mainly from underdevelopment of the productive forces, a product of imperialist exploitation, which persists even after the third world countries have gained political independence. They still suffer from their colonial heritage through economic dependence on the imperialist states by reason of their one-sided economies and orientation on the capitalist world market, which claims a considerable part of their national income.

Imperialist appropriation depresses the weight of the accumulation fund in the national incomes of the developing countries to a far lower level than in the developed states.

This is intensified by the capitalist world's market system which pushes down the prices of their exports, while forcing the developing countries to pay more for their imports.

During 1961-66, due to the declining prices for their exports and the higher prices for imports, the countries of the third world lost some £6,000 million, an annual average of about £1,200 million. This situation forced them to contract huge loans with the capitalist countries, often at high rates of interest, so that their total indebtedness in 1966 reached the colossal figure of £18,000 million. Annual rate of repayment is over £1,000 million, which is more than 20 per cent of their annual export earnings.

Export of capital is an important aspect of the exploitation of the countries of the third world. Earlier in the century the capitalist governments took no part in exporting capital, whereas now state capital export, coupled with private investment, has become for the imperialists an important lever of political and economic pressure on the third world. True, United States overseas investments, for example, are not restricted to these countries, for a large proportion goes to Canada, Australia, Japan, Britain and Western Europe; but a substantial share also goes to the developing countries.

In a report on total foreign investments of the United States and the profits derived from them, the National Industrial Conference Board stated in 1966 that "profits repatriated from direct foreign investments have exceeded the new capital outflows in every year since 1950."

In 1964, foreign investments returned \$3,600 million as compared with a new capital outflow of \$2,300 million — a net gain of \$1,300 million. In 1965, preliminary Administration figures indicated that the profit derived from direct investments was slightly over \$4,000 million, compared to about \$3,000 million of fresh capital sent abroad.

This enables international monopoly capital to make gigantic profits from the exploitation of these countries. The major single share goes to the United States, but British monopoly capital also gets a big slice. Direct private overseas investment is

now over £10,000 million, of which about half is within the new states of the Commonwealth. Annual direct profits are in the neighborhood of £1,000 million. In assessing this situation, the *Financial Times* (19 December, 1966) made this comment:

"Overseas profits amounted to only seven per cent of visible exports in 1952, but the ratio has risen to 13 per cent in 1965. . . It is seldom realized that income earned abroad by United Kingdom companies has now reached two-fifths of the profits earned at home."

Even this figure is only a small proportion of what is termed the "invisible earnings" which come to Britain from British shipping services abroad, merchanting, brokerage, banking, insurance, and other channels. In a special supplement on invisible earnings, *The Times* (19 March, 1968) pointed out that ". . . while her (Britain's) visible exporters were bringing in something like £5,000 million a year, her invisible exporters were producing not less than £2,800 million."

The gap in prices on the world market provides a wide channel of revenue for the imperialist countries. Newspapers catering mainly for financial circles can afford to be frank in this matter, as in the case of the *Financial Times* which commented that the broad position is that since 1957 alone—and the primary producing countries as a whole were losing ground on the terms of the trade front for several years before that—the industrial countries have derived a saving of the order of \$7,000 million per annum from the decline of their import prices. The rise in their export prices, it continued, has added some \$3,000 million to \$4,000 million in their own foreign exchange earnings over the same period. So they can be said to have enjoyed a bonus of some \$10,000 million to \$12,000 million per annum at the expense of the rest of the world—a bonus they have done nothing to earn.

ECONOMIC "AID"

All the capitalist countries, through the medium of official government "aid" schemes, strive to conceal this vast robbery. The schemes are coordinated through the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) which comprises 15 capitalist countries, including those of Western Europe, together with the United States, Canada and Japan. However, in the two years 1963-65, overseas private invest-

ment by these countries had increased by 50 per cent—from £1,000 million to £1,450 million—but the total “aid” had increased by only two per cent, from £1,280 million to £1,334 million.

The volume of United States “economic aid” (as distinct from military aid) has steadily declined in recent years, and this year is likely to be the lowest on record. In Britain, it dropped in 1965 from £225 million to £205 million, and remains at that level. In reality it is even less, for the proportion of loans (as distinct from outright grants), rose from 40 per cent in 1963 to 77 per cent in 1966. At present interest-free loans are being granted, but the British Government still insists upon repayment of past loans advanced at high interest rates.

The result is that Britain gets £60 million a year from repayments on past loans, while the actual monetary outflow of economic “aid” is only £70 million a year. At the same time, more than two-thirds of this aid is used to purchase goods and services in Britain. There is certainly little or no evidence that this kind of economic aid is of any real value to the countries exploited by the British overseas firms.

Except for the countries of the third world and the socialist countries, the grave economic problems facing the underdeveloped world were largely ignored at the UNCTAD conference in New Delhi. True, it adopted something like 40 resolutions and declarations, ranging from the world food problem, land-locked countries, the need to stabilize commodity prices, preferences, the flow of private capital, trade expansion (especially east-west trade), to raising the total amount of economic aid.

Some of the resolutions and declarations were, undoubtedly, of a positive character, but it is largely optional whether the capitalist governments represented will put them into operation. No final agreement was reached regarding stabilization of prices on the world market; the most positive step was in relation to trade between the developing countries and the socialist world.

True, it was agreed that the scale of economic aid schemes should be raised to the level of one per cent of the gross national product, as against the previous theoretical level of one per cent of the national income. But most countries with economic aid schemes are well below the former level—Britain is only 0.6 per cent of its national income—and as the decision to raise

it to one per cent of the gross national product is entirely optional, it is somewhat meaningless.

SOCIALIST WORLD

The really positive aspect of the situation is the growing contribution of the socialist countries to assist economic development in the third world. This aid and the growing influence of the socialist world system among the newly-independent countries compel the imperialist states to concessions.

Trade with the socialist states, based on the principle of mutual benefit, is an important factor in the developing countries’ efforts to secure economic independence.

In its report to the New Delhi conference the UNCTAD Secretariat placed on record an annual increase for the socialist world as a whole of 12 per cent since 1964, and this was likely to be doubled by 1970, with the import of finished and half-finished products from the third world increased by at least 2½ times.

Nikolai Patolichev, chief Soviet delegate, was able to report that Soviet trade with the third world had risen by 35 per cent between 1963 and 1967, compared with a general rise of 25.6 per cent in Soviet trade.

Patolichev urged that really drastic measures should be taken by UNCTAD. Referring to the opportunities for expanding trade between the Soviet Union and the developing countries, he went on:

“We fully appreciate the profound concern of the developing countries for the present state of their economies and their foreign trade. The Soviet Union shares and supports the aspirations of these countries, set forth in the Algiers Charter, for the establishment of a new, fair international division of labor and the liquidation without delay of the aftermath of the colonial past, and for the development of an independent diversified national economy. We agree that the main responsibility for ensuring economic progress in the developing countries rests, as the Charter underscores, with those countries themselves. This is indisputable.

“The winning of political independence has not resolved all the important problems facing the peoples of the developing countries. Much effort is needed to safeguard and consolidate their independence. The struggle for real economic independence and progress of these countries is only starting. To ensure its success far-reaching socio-economic reforms are needed. There

are many instances of nations covering, on this basis, the road from backwardness to progress in a brief historical period. While speaking of the specific problems of present-day economic relations, we need to underline that the raw material markets—a very important field of commerce—remain unregulated.

"The situation on most markets is still determined in many respects by the policies of international monopolies; there are sharp fluctuations of prices which are damaging to the exporting countries. The export of raw materials from the developing countries comes up against obstacles in the form of tariffs and the like. We support the proposals that these be removed."

This statement was not only important, it was also timely, in view of the failure in one part of the Algiers Charter to make a distinction between the socialist and capitalist countries, by placing them all in a common group of "rich" countries who derived benefit from the exploitation of the "poor" countries. Patolichev pointed out that the Soviet Union was not responsible for the plunder of the colonies and their backward colonial economy; nor was the Soviet Union seeking to exploit them as did the big capitalist monopolies who strove to conceal this robbery behind dubious schemes of "economic aid."

SOCIALIST AID

Socialist economic aid to the developing countries, oriented on expediting their progressive growth, has vastly increased in recent years. Economic and technical aid is now being extended to many Asian and African countries. The Soviet Union alone is helping to build 600 industrial and other projects, including 25 iron and steel plants, 40 engineering and metal-working factories, 28 power stations, 19 chemical plants, over 100 agricultural projects and more than 100 educational, health and scientific research centers.

In 1965, long-term credits from the socialist world reached the level of \$4,400 million, of which \$3,500 million came from the Soviet Union. Loans and credits are given at low rates of interest—2-2½ per cent (compared with five to seven per cent from the capitalist countries and the World Bank), with long periods for repayment, varying from 12 to 30 years. Soviet credits accounted for nearly half the capital investments in Afghanistan under its 1962-67 plan, for 12 per cent of total in-

dustrial investments in India under its 1961-65 plan, and for about 20 per cent of capital expenditure in Mali under its 1961-66 plan.

The economic aid extended to India, and to the UAR for the construction of the Aswan Dam, is common knowledge. And it is not only aid in the form of materials and construction, but aid in training skilled personnel to assist in raising the economic level of the underdeveloped countries. Over 17,000 students from more than 80 African, Asian and Latin American countries have been trained or are undergoing training in the Soviet Union.

In addition to industrial building, training centers have been opened and in this way 18,000 skilled workers were trained in India, more than 11,000 in the UAR, and about 30,000 in Afghanistan. The number of skilled workers trained in this way now amounts to over 120,000.

It should be added that none of the socialist countries is engaged in private investment for profit in the underdeveloped countries. Investment is devoted entirely to the public sector, and to expanding public and social services, such as education, health, and technical training.

Even before the UNCTAD conference in New Delhi, representatives from India, Pakistan, the UAR and other countries were, not surprisingly, praising the socialist countries for having fulfilled the obligations laid down by the previous UNCTAD conference in 1964. And at the final session in New Delhi, it was Dinesh Singh, Indian Minister of Commerce and president of the conference, who declared "the socialist countries have fulfilled our expectations" (*The Times*, 30 March 1968).

The socialist world was first to insist on the need to ensure favorable conditions for expanding the trade of the underdeveloped countries and to propose that the United Nations should convene a world conference to discuss trade and development, and the result was the 1964 Geneva conference. At Geneva, the Soviet Union declared it was in a position to increase its trade with the underdeveloped countries seven- or eight-fold by 1980.

At first the imperialist countries were against the idea of an UNCTAD conference, but later they participated, primarily because they feared that their absence might destroy their "image" in the eyes of the underdeveloped countries. However, once they attended, Britain and the USA opposed nearly all the positive resolutions put for-

ward by the developing countries and the socialist world and have since refused in practice to carry out its main decisions.

CONCEALED DISCRIMINATION

The countries of the third world had no illusions about the Kennedy Round of tariffs which started in 1963, whose directors acknowledged (U.N. Document, 7 December 1966) that "even if completely successful it could not meet the developing countries' requirements." It was widely understood as a process to make the imperialist countries richer and to widen the gap between them and the "poor" countries. U Thant, Secretary-General of the United Nations, declared (11 July 1967) that the benefit for them would be much less than for the developed capitalist countries.

U.S. imperialism is trying to strengthen its position vis-a-vis the Common Market countries; each of the latter is striving to penetrate into rival markets and secure the maximum supply of cheap primary goods and raw materials from the countries of the third world, especially those of Africa. The 18 African countries which are associate members of the Common Market have gained little or no benefit, and last year, Amani Diory (head of the Afro-Malagasy Group) complained that the association has not promoted a growth of African exports to the Common Market.

SOVIET STATEMENT

It was in this situation that in December 1967 the Soviet Union submitted a Memorandum to the 22nd General Assembly of the United Nations, giving an outline of the essential and necessary steps to be taken for the "second Decade of Development" (1970-80). In essence it declared:

1. The consequences of colonialism and neo-colonialism hamper the peoples of the developing countries in their efforts to create an independent balanced economy.

2. This situation is at variance with the provision of the United Nations Charter and the principles of mutually beneficial international economic cooperation based on equal rights, expressed by:

- 'a) exploitation of the developing countries by artificially keeping raw materials prices low and inflating the price of industrial goods;
- 'b) removal of substantial funds from the developing countries through the unrestricted export of profits of foreign companies as a result of the

intensive exploitation of their natural wealth and human resources;

- (c) taking advantage of the need of developing countries for foreign capital by intervening in their internal affairs and imposing unequal political and economic treaties and agreements.

After this indictment of the impact of imperialist exploitation upon the developing countries, the Memorandum proposed:

1. States which have won political independence should be entitled to compensation from the former colonial powers for the damage inflicted upon their economy during the period of colonial rule.

2. Foreign public and private investments in the developing countries should be used in their own interests, in accordance with the plans and programs which these countries adopt, and with their domestic legislation.

3. Treaties and agreements imposed on the developing countries before independence, or after independence by the use of military, political or economic pressure, should be revised or annulled by them if they are incompatible with their sovereignty.

The emphasis in the Memorandum was on the connection between the problem of economic development in the countries of the third world and the need to strive for universal peace and conditions of peaceful coexistence. Such an effort would deliver mankind from wars and the need to squander money on more armaments. If this were done, the 1970's would become a real "Decade of Development."

With this aim in mind the Soviet delegation made a number of specific proposals at New Delhi for long-term agreements on commodity purchases, abolition or reduction on a preferential basis of tariffs on manufactured or semi-manufactured goods from the developing countries, stable prices for raw materials and primary products, and more, genuine, economic aid.

* * *

However, it seems clear that the New Delhi decisions are not likely to be put into operation, or at least will only be carried out in part, as far as the capitalist countries are concerned. The socialist countries will do their utmost to extend increasing aid, but this will also depend upon what steps are taken by the developing countries to transform their backward economies and thus weaken the grip of imperialism and international monopoly.

Study and propaganda of Lenin's ideas

Towards the Lenin centenary

The Communist Party, all the people of the Soviet Union, Communists and progressives throughout the world, are preparing for the 100th anniversary of the birth of Lenin. In this interview with **World Marxist Review**, Academician P. N. Fedoseyev, director of the CC CPSU Marxism-Leninism Institute, discusses publication and dissemination of Lenin's works.

What is the significance of the Lenin centenary?

Lenin's name, teaching and immortal work are known the world over. They are inseparable from the revolutionary movements of our century. For Leninism, having absorbed the vast experience of the class struggle for the socialist reconstruction of society, provides answers to the fundamental questions of our era and indicates mankind's path to the future.

The Communist Party and all the peoples of the Soviet Union are sharing in the preparations for the centenary celebrations.

The greatness of Lenin, the strength of his teaching, the tasks of the Party and Soviet people in connection with the centenary, are all clearly set forth in the CPSU Statement on Preparations for the 100th Anniversary of Lenin's Birth (a summary of which appeared in the September issue of *World Marxist Review*).

The centenary preparations should be seen against the background of tense ideological struggle and the stepped-up imperialist onslaught on communism, the teaching of Marx, Engels and Lenin. Lenin-

ism is the target of attacks by capitalist propaganda and by revisionist and nationalist elements which depict it as a purely Russian phenomenon and belittle its international relevance and historic role in the world revolutionary movement.

Generalized in Leninism is the experience of the international working-class movement and its objective requirements. Leninism has become the battle standard of this era of the decline of capitalism and mankind's transition to socialism and communism.

Vladimir Ilyich Lenin entered the political scene in the 1890's. He made a close study of the Russian labor movement and analyzed the development of the worldwide revolutionary struggle. He was the leader not only of the Russian proletariat and the founder of its revolutionary party, but an outstanding figure in the international movement. He led the struggle against Right and "Left" opportunism and won recognition as the teacher and leader of the world proletariat. In his books *What Is To Be Done?* and *Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution*, based mainly on a comparison of Russian and European experience, he elevated to a new plane the Marxist strategy and tactics of class struggle. In his widely known *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky*, "Left-Wing Communism—an Infantile Disorder", and a number of other works, he developed Marxist strategy and tactics in accordance with the experience of the international workers' movement.

Lenin demonstrated that Russia, having taken the capitalist path, was subject to

the general laws of capitalism. In *The Development of Capitalism in Russia* and other studies, he analyzed the contradictions of Russian reality which, in their basic features, were also characteristic of world capitalism. And in his classical study, *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Lenin disclosed the economic relationships of the new era and gave a generalization of world development.

Lenin had a close and penetrating knowledge of agrarian relations in Russia, but he also studied the problem in other countries to formulate an integral theory and program on the agrarian question.

As a true internationalist, Lenin responded to the national movements in tsarist Russia and supported all forms of struggle against national oppression. His writings on the national and colonial question, the result of much study and analysis, are widely recognized as an outstanding contribution to Marxism.

After Marx and Engels, Lenin made the biggest contribution to the elaboration of revolutionary theory, generalizing the experience of the world movement, the conditions of the Russian proletariat and the rapid advance of science in the twentieth century. He carried forward the method of Marxism, materialist dialectics, in the light of the new discoveries in the natural sciences and the new experience of history. He enriched all the components of Marxism, philosophy, political economy, scientific communism. Marxism is now the possession not of one country, but of the worldwide liberation movement.

How widely are Lenin's works disseminated?

The Soviet Communist Party and its Central Committee have done much to collect and publish the works of Lenin which they regard as their internationalist duty.

The Marxism-Leninism Institute and its Central Party Archives are the repository for Lenin documents. We now have more than 30,000 manuscripts — articles, notes, letters, documents signed by Lenin, etc. This is the scientific basis for a study of Lenin's works.

In the Soviet Union they enjoy a vast readership—more than 400 million copies have already been put out. The Collected Works are now in their fifth edition. The first 20-volume edition was started in 1920 in pursuance of a decision of the Ninth Party Congress and in honor of Lenin's

50th birthday. The second and third editions were put out in 30 volumes and the fourth in 45 volumes. The present fifth edition (55 volumes) was quickly sold out and our Institute and the Publishing House of Political Literature are preparing an additional printing.

Lenin's works enjoy popularity in other countries, too, and have been translated into more than 100 languages. According to UNESCO data, they hold first place in number of translations, proof that Lenin is read and studied in all parts of the world.

What work is being done on hitherto unpublished Lenin documents?

Our Institute is concentrating on publishing several additional volumes to the Collected Works. For the most part they will contain preparatory materials on the agrarian question, notes for *The Development of Capitalism in Russia* and marginal notes on books, among them Rosa Luxemburg's *Accumulation of Capital* and Eugene Varga's *Economic Policy Problems Under Proletarian Dictatorship*. We have just published Lenin's notes on the Marx-Engels correspondence, 1844-83.

Work is progressing on a full index of the Collected Works and other reference materials. The two-volume index will appear in 1970 and should be of immense value to all students of Lenin.

For the centenary we are putting out the 37th Lenin Miscellany which will contain hitherto unpublished documents, some of them only recently discovered.

What is the Institute doing to popularize Lenin's works, his life and activity?

In addition to the Collected Works, our Institute is responsible for the publication of collections of Lenin articles, separate works, etc. We are also working on a biography, and on a complete biographical chronicle recording Lenin's multiform activities. The first volume is scheduled for publication next year.

Our centenary program includes also publication of a number of monographs on fundamental problems of Leninism, with emphasis on Lenin's theory of the socialist reconstruction of society. Some of the books on our publication list are: *Lenin and the Problems of Scientific Communism*, *Lenin's Theory of Socialist Revolution and Our Time*, *Leninism and the National Question*, *Lenin's Socialist Industrialization Plan and the Party's Struggle for its Implemen-*

tation, The CPSU at the Head of the Cultural Revolution, Lenin's Cooperative Plan in Practice, Lenin as the Leader of the October Revolution, Lenin as the Founder of the Soviet State, Lenin and the Communist International.

Another continuing project is a multi-volume history of the CPSU generalizing the experience and achievements in building the new society in the USSR and other socialist countries. Three volumes have already appeared.

Together with the Publishing House of Political Literature, the Institute is preparing five volumes of memoirs by Lenin's relatives, intimate friends and associates, among them men prominent in the Soviet Communist Party and government and in the international Communist and workers' movement. We are choosing the most valuable and authentic reminiscences, many of which were written in the twenties and thirties when important details of Lenin's revolutionary work were still fresh in peoples' minds. The five volumes will include items published many years ago and now out of print, and some that will appear in print for the first time.

Lastly, the Institute is holding a series of research conferences on some topical problems of Leninism.

Is the search continuing for new Lenin documents? And can the fraternal parties and progressives generally help in this?

In pursuance of a Central Committee decision, the Institute has intensified its search for Lenin documents. And we are receiving documents from Party central committees, research institutions, museums, archives, publishing houses, libraries and individuals in many countries.

Where are new documents likely to be found? First of all, the archives of the Soviet Union and among veteran Party workers. There is still probably quite a number in other countries, mainly in those where Lenin had lived.

For instance, we have received documents from Britain, Belgium, Bulgaria, Hungary, the German Democratic Republic, Italy, the Chinese People's Republic, Poland, Rumania, the United States, France, Czechoslovakia, Switzerland and Japan.

I would like to give details of some of these finds.

In June 1912, Lenin left Paris for Poland, where he settled in Poronin, a village near Cracow. The Foreign Bureau of the RSDLP

Central Committee was set up in Cracow and maintained close ties with Party organizations in Russia. In the two years he spent here Lenin was in close touch with Party organizations in Russia, wrote regularly for *Pravda*, *Prosvescheniye* magazine and other publications, and kept up a regular correspondence with socialist leaders in other countries. Party conferences, some of them attended by the Bolshevik members of the State Duma, were held in Cracow and Poronin.

Thus there accumulated extensive archives and a library — books, newspapers, letters, manuscripts, etc., which remained in Poland when Lenin moved to Switzerland at the outbreak of World War I. Lenin made several efforts to retrieve the archives, especially after the Revolution when he was head of the Soviet government. Part of the archives reached Moscow in the twenties; the rest were believed to have been lost. Later, however, some of the material was found and in 1951-54 delivered to the Marxism-Leninism Institute by the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party. Altogether, we received from Poland 1,070 items, including 250 (579 pages) of Lenin manuscripts.

Among the materials in the Cracow-Poronin archives are unpublished articles, "The Cadet Election Platform," "Worker Unity and the Elections," "After the American Elections," "Excessive Zeal," also notes, letters, drafts of Party decisions and numerous marginal notes on books and documents. They furnish added evidence of the struggle Lenin and the Party Central Committee waged against all manner of Liquidators and opportunists in 1912-14, for re-establishment and consolidation of the Bolshevik Party and extension of its international ties. The documents bring out the immense amount of work performed by the Party Central Committee under Lenin's direction in preparing the Party Congress scheduled for August 1914 which, however, had to be called off because of the world war.

The archives also contain Lenin's correspondence with the International Socialist Bureau concerning Bolshevik participation in a conference the Bureau was arranging for July 1914. The Polish "finds" also confirm Lenin's authorship of a number of *Pravda* articles, in particular "Eugene Potier."

The Polish documents are of both scientific and political value for they show the extent of Bolshevik contacts with European

parties and organizations during the revolutionary upsurge on the eve of and during World War I.

Of great interest, too, are the Lenin documents received from Switzerland in 1959-60. They include more than 40 letters dated between June and September 1915, which cast light on a little known but important period of Party history.

Under an exchange agreement with the Amsterdam Social History Institute concluded in 1964, we received the Zimmerwald and Kienthal conference minutes. This has enabled us to publish, for the first time, in Volume 54 of the Collected Works, Lenin's speech on the Manifesto and draft resolution on the war and the tasks of the Social-Democrats, delivered on September 7, 1915 at the Zimmerwald conference, and his speech at Kienthal of April 28, 1916 on the

convocation of the International Socialist Bureau.

In 1960, the Central Committee of the Rumanian Communist Party presented to the Central Committee of the CPSU a record of one of the first interviews Lenin gave after the Revolution (before November 23, 1917) to the Rumanian journalist N. D. Kocha.

A number of Lenin letters have come from Belgium, among them mention should be made of several sent by the late Camille Huysmans, the veteran Socialist leader. In 1963, our Institute received from France 15 Lenin documents under an exchange arrangement.

The Marxism-Leninism Institute asks readers of *World Marxist Review* to help in the search for Lenin documents and thereby augment Lenin's ideological legacy.

Political education in the CPSU

The Marxist-Leninist education and ideological steeling of its members is an object of special concern for the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. A new system of party education was introduced three years ago, under which members study in a course of several years all the components of Marxism-Leninism, that is, philosophy, political economy and the fundamentals of scientific communism, and learn the history of the Soviet Communist Party, mastering the use of revolutionary theory in their work.

Party branches take into account the educational background and political training of individual members and help draw up a course of study for each several years ahead. Three levels have been established—primary, secondary and higher.

Reorganizing Party education was not easy. The matter concerned millions of members, and non-members too, and involved much organizational effort. Looking back at what has been done, it can be said that the reorganization has, on the whole, proved a success. Party education has become more purposeful and its ideological standard has improved, thanks to which the Party membership made a profound study of the Twenty-Third Party Congress resolutions, the CC CPSU Theses on the 50th

Anniversary of the October Revolution and related materials, and of the documents pertaining to the 150th anniversary of Marx's birth. Nearly five million factory and office workers and peasants have finished primary political schools in recent years.

Preparations under way for the Lenin Centennial are a new phase in our popularizing of the ideological riches of Marxism-Leninism. In the coming year the accent will be on a profound study of Lenin's life and revolutionary work, and of his theoretical legacy, from the standpoint of how the CPSU and the Soviet people are carrying out his teaching.

The new academic year has got off to a good start. Some 15 million members of the Party and the YCL, and non-members attend Party studies. Nearly two million go to primary political schools and some six million learn the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism at schools of a higher level. About 400,000 Party officials, factory managers, administrators and specialists are enrolled in the more than 2,000 district and town schools for the Party activists and in the 320 Marxism-Leninism universities.

In accordance with the curricula, this year attention at all levels of Party education is centered on the works of Lenin.

Political schools have listed the minimum of Lenin's works that students are obliged to study independently. Consultants are helping them acquire the knack of home study. Special lectures are held for this purpose.

Party organizations devote attention to the ideological steeling of the leading personnel, who, above all, have to be knowledgeable Marxist-Leninists, and whose ideological maturity is measured by their skill in carrying out Party policy, running enterprises, assessing achievements critically, dealing with people and setting a high moral and political standard.

The scientific, professional and general interests of intellectuals are taken into account. What we want is for researchers, writers, artists and teachers to master the Marxist-Leninist methodology and use it in their work. They attend evening universities of Marxism-Leninism, schools for the Party economic activists, and methodological seminars, of which some 150,000 are planned for the academic year.

The Education Department of the Central Committee has listed the key topical problems of Leninism to be studied at seminars, including Lenin's *"Left Wing" Communism—an Infantile Disorder*, the present strategy and tactics of the world Communist movement, and Lenin's *State and Revolution*, in relation to our times. Current scientific, technical and ideological problems are also listed.

Importance is attached to problems pertaining to the building of communism in the Soviet Union, improving economic guidance, raising the effectiveness of the economy, advancing social relations, extending socialist democracy and assuring communist education of the people. Party organizations are preparing theoretical conferences, which are coming into their own

as a regular and effective form of political education. As in the past, students will also be encouraged to write and discuss papers on topical Leninist problems.

Considerable effort has gone into drawing up the curricula and producing textbooks and study aids for the various levels of Party education. Books have been published especially on the history of the CPSU, political economy, philosophy and scientific communism, supplemented by anthologies of the classics of Marxism-Leninism. Lenin's works have been put out in large editions. The press, radio and television are carrying material on the more difficult problems of theory and on some of Lenin's works.

The main thing about the political education is its ideological content, its scientific standard, which, as Lenin pointed out, depends entirely on the instructors. More than a million instructors, of whom nearly 90 per cent have had a higher education, have been given educational assignments.

The summer was turned to good account in training instructors for the new year. Ten to fifteen day courses were held in all the republics, territories and regions, attended by the vast majority of instructors. Seminars and methodological conferences were a great help too. Leaders of republican and regional Party organizations, heads of ministries and boards and prominent scientists were invited to speak at them. Lectures were read on Lenin's main works and methods of study.

As we see it, persevering political study and a profound knowledge of Marxism-Leninism are a precondition for the political awareness and dedication of Party members, of all Soviet people, and an earnest of progress in building communism.

M. GABDULIN

Patriotic call of Portuguese communists

Last September the police and armed forces of Portugal were alerted for action, and U.S. secret agents were brought in at the request of the government. The formal pretext for these panic measures was the grave illness of the aged dictator Salazar. "Dr. Antonio Salazar, dictator of Portugal for 40 years," wrote the British newspaper *Guardian* on September 18, "seems to be relinquishing power . . . the dictator who held on so long to the reins of power and who maintained the lowest per capita income in Western Europe among his people and the longest surviving medieval aristocracy."

Of course, the dictator's relinquishment of power (Marcelo Caetano, former Minister of State, has been appointed to succeed Salazar as Prime Minister), does not signify the end of the fascist dictatorship in the country. In its statement broadcast by "Free Portugal" on September 22, the Portuguese Communist Party says: "With the withdrawal of Salazar from political life the regime has entered upon a serious and immediate political crisis. However, this should not give rise to any illusions. Salazar's ultimate inability to exercise power does not signify the end of fascism. Fascists will not yield power of their own free will . . . Fascism will try to save itself by every means and every maneuver."

These means include terror which the fascist dictatorship directs, first and foremost, against the Communist Party, which is undaunted by the heavy odds it has to contend with. The Party is the most consistent fighter for the interests of the working people, for their liberation from the yoke of the dictatorship. Its influence among the working class, rural proletariat, student body and intelligentsia is indicative of its ever growing prestige, of the fact that it constitutes an important part of the anti-fascist forces fighting to overthrow

the fascist regime and build a truly free Portugal.

Small wonder, therefore, that the authorities should hound the Party, for they see in it a serious threat to their regime. Last September the police seized several of the Party's activists, among them Canais Roja, Maria Rosalia Pabaredas, de Oliveira and Lobato. Languishing in the terrible prisons of Caxias, Peniche and Tarrafal for many years now are Octavio Pato, Jose Bernardino, Pires Jorge, Afonso Gregorio, Blanqui Teixeira, not to mention thousands of other valiant fighters.

Prisoners are subjected to fiendish torture in an attempt to break the will of the patriots. Under the Security Legislation of 1949 and 1956 anybody accused of "crimes" against the security of the country can be thrown into prison "from six months up to three years and even longer if considered to be still dangerous."

The dictatorship is able to remain in the saddle thanks largely to the system of political terror and repressions established by the all-powerful secret police (PIDE) with its ramified network of agents, informers and provocateurs.

But the working class and the people generally are continuing the fight for freedom and for their rights, despite the terror. Witness the strikes of the dockers and the transport workers in Lisbon, the actions of the shipbuilders, bank clerks and cannery workers. The resistance shows that in all these years the dictatorship has not been able to crush the militant spirit of the working people.

"New perspectives have now opened," states the Communist Party document of September 22, "for broadening the struggle and winning further success, for continuing the battle to put an end to fascism. We must try to make the fullest use of the new situation, of the sudden political crisis

facing the dictatorship as a result of Salazar's withdrawal from the political arena." In this document the party advances a broad program calling on the masses to fight fascism and restore freedom and democracy in the country.

The Party calls for the formation of a government that would guarantee inviolability of the person, the right of all people actively to participate in the nation's political life, and respect for constitutional civil rights and liberties; for a government that would vigorously combat all abuses of power, create the conditions making for legality and security. This, notes the Communist Party, would enable the Portuguese people freely to determine their political future.

The Party demands an end to the political repressions, the release of all political prisoners and the dissolution of the secret police.

In the said document the Party stresses that realization of these measures is essential if the nation is to acquire a normal constitutional system.

Also the Patriotic Front of National Liberation uniting broad sections of the anti-

fascist opposition, including Communists, Socialists, Catholics, independents and republicans, has stepped up its activity. This organization recently sent out a call to all anti-fascist forces to begin immediate talks to establish a national anti-fascist council.

The dictatorship has unleashed a new wave of terror against the mounting resistance, hoping thereby to stave off its inevitable collapse. Portuguese patriots realize that the supporters of this dictatorship might, in an attempt to preserve the regime, resort to other, less brutal means disguised as "liberalization" of the dictatorship. But as the document of the Portuguese Communists rightly notes "only the people, only the masses, only the united and organized actions of the Portuguese democrats, only the launching of a powerful national movement for freedom will make it possible to remove the fascists from the government and establish a democratic regime in Portugal. Only the Portuguese people by their determined, courageous, and tireless struggle can bury the dictator together with the dictatorship."

L. RIBEIRO

Ideological work among students

From experience of the Sofia organization, Bulgarian Communist Party

In the 24 years of peoples' rule the number of higher educational institutions has increased from seven to 26 and the number of students from about 9,000 in 1939-40 to more than 80,000 at the present time. Most of our universities and colleges have evening and extension courses, which bring higher education within the reach of young people working in industry and agriculture. Sofia, the capital, now has 16 colleges with a total enrollment of over 40,000.

Our colleges are training able, thinking specialists capable of applying their knowledge in building up the country and promoting its prosperity. The crucial factor in this is training specialists prepared to devote all their energies to the building of socialism and communism.

This raises specific problems for Party organizations.

The rapid development of higher education over the past 20 years and the need for competent leadership of Party and political work in this area, led the Central Committee to set up a special district committee to direct Party work in Sofia's higher educational establishments.

The committee was established in 1962 and the six years since then have fully confirmed its need and efficacy. It supervises the work of 75 Party units, four of which, in the bigger schools, have been given certain district committee functions, such as admission of new members, etc. At present, the district organization has a total membership of 4,500, of which 2,800 are

faculty members and 1,500 undergraduates and postgraduates.

Communist Party work extends to every sector of student life and study. This applies both to the complex problems of class studies and research, and to such matters as the supply of teaching aids, laboratory equipment and organizational structure.

To be effective, Party work must be concrete, that is, carried out in specific forms that vary with the conditions and aims of one or another school. This allows ample room for diversified creative work.

Most of the work, naturally, is ideological. Our object is to train the future specialists in the spirit of devotion to the working class and peasantry.

We rely chiefly on the teaching staff, particularly on its Communist members, through whom Party organizations are able politically to orient the student body.

But to exert a positive influence on student political thinking, one has to be thoroughly grounded in theoretical and political issues. These are discussed at the theoretical seminars for faculty members held in our higher schools. They deal with methodological and ideological problems and draw up recommendations, or guidelines, for the teaching staff. For instance, a seminar on the fundamental problems of biology was instrumental in reshaping curricula and teaching methods in the biology department of Sofia University and medical and other schools. Communist teachers actively participated in these seminars.

Another method is theoretical and research conferences, which likewise draw up practical recommendations. How this is done can be judged from the conference held at the Karl Marx School of Economics. Papers were read by economists, and representatives from all the country's economic schools took part in the discussion. The conference formulated the principles for reorganizing curricula and teaching methods. These conferences play a conspicuous part in improving the quality of instruction in our higher educational establishments.

Young Communist League activity is of exceptional importance in the ideological training of our youth. Work among the youth was discussed by the Party Central Committee last December. Todor Zhivkov's report and the Central Committee resolution set the pattern for improving YCL work among students. In fact, these two documents represent a comprehensive program of patriotic, internationalist, labor

and aesthetic education of our younger generation. Their basic premise is that all activity among the youth must take into account not only present, but also future requirements. Our district committee and all Party units studied these documents, making them the basis for a concrete plan to help the YCL intensify its political and educational role on the campus.

Another aspect of our work is bringing the students into touch with the labor of the people. This is done through visits to building sites, cooperative farms, etc. There are also excursions to places associated with Bulgaria's revolutionary and independence movements. It is our aim to instil in every student a feeling of patriotism and kinship with the working people.

Much is being done also in the internationalist education of students. University curricula include a course on the international Communist and workers' movement which gives the student a better understanding of the class struggle in the capitalist world, and a course on the history of the Soviet Communist Party. Another element in internationalist education is the links we maintain with universities and colleges in the Soviet Union and in the other socialist countries. To this might be added that many of our students visit these countries for practical work.

There are, of course, difficulties in this complex educational work. One is the apolitical attitude and apathy of some students. There have been cases also of students falling under the influence of bourgeois ideology, admiring everything foreign and taking a nihilist attitude towards the great achievements of their own people. Party organizations are countering the spread of bourgeois influence and are carrying out specific programs to help the students gain a closer understanding of our people's heroic past, its folk art, and so on. And this is bearing fruit, especially when combined with amateur art activities.

Students learn much from meetings with Party, government and public leaders. Todor Zhivkov and other leaders address campus audiences, bringing to the student direct and authoritative information on cardinal political issues.

Ideological work among students constantly poses new problems. The Ninth Communist Party congress called for a new approach in this work, bringing it closer to the requirements of the present stage in the country's social, economic and political

development and the changes taking place among the youth.

One of the problems is how to re-direct ideological work to accord with the technological revolution. Scientific and technological progress and the application of acquired knowledge to practical activity—these are all factors that necessitate a new look at teaching methods. A socialist university or college must train experts not only with a view to the requirements of today; it must take into account development trends and provide training that will be applicable years hence. There is a keen interest among faculty members and students in what is required of the technician of the future, and this has led to a movement for educational reform. The district committee made a close study of the problem, consulted government departments and public organizations and drew up certain recommendations.

We realize, of course, that a special district Party committee in charge of work among students might tend to isolate the student mass from the bigger, national is-

ues that are resolved primarily in the process of production. To avoid this, we make it a point to bring students into closer touch with production. For instance, we encourage higher schools to conclude scientific and technical assistance contracts with factories. The city Party committee has helped us establish close contacts with Party organizations and factories in the Kolarov District, where much of Sofia's industry is concentrated. Under this arrangement higher schools will provide technical and research assistance to 16 major enterprises in Sofia and a number of cooperative farms in its environs.

Voluntary groups of research workers are working on 110 projects, all of them of practical value to industry. But that is only a beginning, and we intend to enlist many more researchers and students. Such close, direct contact between higher education and industry is not only a contribution to accelerated economic development, but also a valuable form of political training of both instructors and students.

Kyrill PETROV

Anti-imperialist struggle in Argentina and the Communist Party

PAULINO GONZALES ALBERDI

The struggle of the working class of the country and of all democratic sections of the population against the military dictatorship installed after the coup of June 28, 1966, is gaining momentum. The coup, it will be recalled, was masterminded by fascist-like Army generals subservient to the Pentagon, who had the full backing of the latifundist oligarchy and big capitalists, not to mention the head of the Catholic church and other clerical dignitaries.

In his report to the Seventh National Conference of the Communist Party, Victorio Codovilla, Chairman of the Party, described the situation as follows: "At the

time of the coup the objective conditions had matured in the country for effecting deep-going changes in its socio-economic structure, and also in its political superstructure, towards an agrarian, democratic and anti-imperialist revolution. Also the subjective conditions were maturing which would have made these changes possible: the struggle of the workers and of the masses was mounting, there was a broader united action by the working class and all democratic sections pressing for profound changes in the social, economic, political and cultural life of the country."

The success of the coup in these con-

ditions, followed by the establishment of a dictatorship headed by General Onganía, was due, on the one hand, to the fact that Dr. Illia's government of the Civil Radical Union, instead of relying on the support of the workers and the popular masses, and taking measures against the putschists, yielded to the pressure of the latter, and, on the other, to the support given by the Peronist and "Independent" leaders of the CGT (General Confederation of Labor) and by Peron himself.

Shortly before the coup, on May 1, 1966, the CGT leaders, under mass pressure and on the insistence of the Communists and the Movement for Trade Union Unity and Coordination (MUCS), had signed a program-document aimed at promoting united working-class action. The CGT leadership was reorganized accordingly to include Peronists, "Independents" and Communists. Uniting most of the working people, this organization was on the way to becoming a real center coordinating the mass struggle and anti-imperialist actions. Its leaders, however — with the exception of Communist and some other officials — had meanwhile been busy contacting the military, the architects of the coup, and subsequently supported it.

As for the leaders of the various bourgeois and petty-bourgeois political parties, they adopted a wait-and-see attitude, preferring not to come out openly against the military dictatorship.

The Communist Party found itself isolated, the masses in a state of confusion because of the Peronist leaders' policy. In these conditions the Party decided not to expose its vanguard, not to throw it alone into battle, but to intensify its work among the people, explaining the character of the coup and the military dictatorship set up as a result. This dictatorship, the Party explained, would pursue a reactionary anti-labor policy, a policy in the interests of the oligarchy and imperialism; the Party called on the people to prevent, through unity and struggle, consolidation of the dictatorship. It outlined its attitude in a statement published 24 hours after the coup.

THE FIGHT AGAINST THE PRO-AMERICAN DICTATORSHIP

Although the Onganía dictatorship chose to keep quiet about its program and its intentions, the facts soon spoke for themselves. Complying with the demand of the Big Banks, the dictatorship immediately took measures against the cooperatives,

which embrace more than a million small manufacturers, merchants and farmers. It interfered in university affairs with a view, naturally, to curbing the democratic activities of faculty members and students, who, for instance, had condemned the imperialist aggression in the Dominican Republic and in Vietnam. The political parties were dissolved and their property confiscated. A similar fate befell many other democratic and patriotic organizations. The land-rent law, which ensured the tenant farmer a certain stability, was repealed.

Onganía lost no time mounting an offensive against the working class. Charges for municipal services were raised and the peso was devalued. Coupled with other factors, this sent up the cost of living. Wages were frozen, and the laws governing the social rights won by the workers annulled. Those of the trade unions which took a stand against the dictatorship became the target of the authorities. Labor conditions in the docks were revised to the disadvantage of the dockers, and the protest strike sparked by these measures was brutally suppressed.

In Tucumán province the government closed down 10 sugar refineries, leaving 50,000 workers without a livelihood and the peasants cultivating sugar cane without a market. The people replied with widespread strikes and a movement to protect the province's economy.

In these conditions the Communists called upon the working class peasantry and other working people, and also on a large part of the national bourgeoisie, to unite against the dictatorship. Playing for time, Onganía dismissed Army commander Lieutenant-General Pistarini who, together with the Navy and Air Force commanders, had led the coup. He also dismissed the Minister of the Economy and other top officials. Meanwhile, however, he continued his policy of helping U.S. monopolies to colonize the country. He sought to protect the monopolies and the landed oligarchy and the big capitalists from the consequences of the deepening structural crisis, and this, of course, at the expense of the working class, peasantry, small and middle bourgeoisie. In a speech made on November 7, 1966, Onganía said: "We Argentinians have not been living according to our means," adding: "Our policy henceforth will be to export everything possible and consume just what remains."

On March 13, 1967, the new Minister of the Economy, Vasena, and the President of the Central Bank sent a letter to the Inter-

national Monetary Fund informing it of labor retrenchments in the state sector, where wage increases would not exceed 15 per cent (while the increase in the cost of living was much higher), of increased charges for municipal services and transport rates (train fares went up 66 per cent). The state-owned enterprises would be turned over to the private sector. The letter also mentioned that a new law would be enacted allowing for private investment in the oil industry, and announced that the government had reduced the import tax from the maximum 325 per cent to 140 per cent. Ongania noted that the economic recovery plan would entail sacrifices on the part of the poorer sections of the population. In short, the military dictatorship gave the imperialist monopolies, and the U.S. monopolies in the first place, full control over the country's economy.

The pressure of the masses, led by the Communist Party, compelled the CGT leaders, who in the early phase had supported the military dictatorship, to change their attitude. A 24-hour general strike was called in December 1966 to protest the government's social, political and economic measures and to demand the settlement of various labor issues. The strike of four million was joined by students and small traders.

It was also mass pressure that compelled the CGT leaders to support a number of actions in February 1967 against the dictatorship's policy; these culminated in a 48-hour general strike at the beginning of March. However, the strike was betrayed by the majority of the Peronist and "Independent" CGT leaders who ordered the strikers back to work and declared for a "dialogue" with the dictatorship. The government, represented by the Secretary of Labor, initiated talks with these leaders and secured their collaboration.

Although the masses were disoriented and stunned by this treachery, they soon took up the struggle again. At the CGT congress convened last March the government supporters were defeated by the joint actions of the Communist delegates and those of the Peronists and "Independents" opposed to collaboration with the government. The defeated CGT leaders thereupon began, with the blessing of the dictatorship, divisive activities and formed a new trade union center.

Although opposed to the government, the new CGT leadership is a timid leadership as evidenced by the removal from office of Communists and the expulsion of the

unions affiliated to the MUCS. For their part the Communists, while they give the present CGT leadership the necessary backing, are nevertheless critical of it and seek to influence it through mass pressure. Despite the government ban, the CGT, supported by all democratic sections, sponsored May Day meetings throughout the country.

On June 15, big demonstrations were held all over the country to mark the 50th anniversary of the beginning of the movement for university reform, again despite a government ban and the attempts of some leaders of the University Federation to turn them into sectarian gatherings.

On June 28, the second anniversary of the coup, the fight against the military dictatorship flared up with renewed force. The CGT, student and other democratic organizations and various political parties, including the Communist Party, urged holding demonstrations and sent out a joint call. In Cordoba the demonstration was led, among others, by Dr. Illia, the lawful President of the Republic ousted by the coup, and by Ongaro, General Secretary of the CGT. Numerous anti-government movements are under way in the country. Small and middle merchants and manufacturers, supported by other groups of the population, have launched a campaign protesting against the annulment of the law against evictions.

Secondary school pupils and university students are also protesting against the government's measures. Organizations representing 50,000 peasants have started a movement for agrarian reform and other demands.

Catholics are participating in most of these campaigns. Priests have been arrested, and some who are not Argentinian subjects, have been deported.

On the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the Russian Revolution and the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Communist Party, Communists held big demonstrations which came under attack from the police. Together with the Communist Youth Federation the Party also sponsored many actions in solidarity with the people of Vietnam, such as fund collections, the publication of appeals carrying hundreds of signatures, rallies in support of Vietnam, and so on. To promote this solidarity an Aid Vietnam Movement was launched. It helped mount a wide protest campaign when a group of top Army officers was sent to Vietnam, when Argentinian wheat was shipped to the South Vietnam puppet government, and when it was rumored that troops would be dispatched there. Delega-

tions of soldiers' mothers visited the barracks where they handed their protests to the officers.

The Movement for the Protection of the National Wealth, organized by a group of public personalities, plans to hold a congress in defense of the national economy and the natural resources which the dictatorship is handing over to the imperialists. Active in this Movement are one-time government ministers and MPs from different political parties, retired officers, trade union leaders, scholars, among them the economist Jaime Fuchs, a Communist, and other personalities. Mention should also be made of the movements in defense of civil liberties. Many people in the judiciary are opposed to enactment of an anti-communist "law" whereby persons engaging in communist propaganda can be sentenced to eight years' imprisonment, and to other measures of the dictatorship. Bar associations throughout the country protested the government's interference in the affairs of the judiciary in the province of Santa Fe when the latter defended the right of students to demonstrate.

Strikes are a daily occurrence. In many cases the workers occupy the factories and resist the attempts of the police to interfere.

Hundreds of families in Buenos Aires and elsewhere live in shanty towns. The authorities are trying to evict the residents but are meeting with resistance.

The General Economic Confederation, which includes leading organizations of manufacturers, comes out strongly against the dictatorship. The Rolled Metal Association, for example, has declared that the policy imposed on the state-owned SOMISA iron and steel plant is prejudicial to the national interest and can only benefit foreign capital. As a result of this policy the enterprise has now been made dependent on U.S. capital.

The facts confirm that the Communist Party acted correctly in June 1966 when it decided not to throw its vanguard into battle against the dictatorship. This Leninist position enabled the Party to regroup broad sections of the population and direct them in a struggle which in the present conditions is more and more closely related to the problem of the conquest of power. The Communist Party is working for labor unity and, more particularly, for a broad front of struggle against the dictatorship, and for the fundamental changes sorely needed by the country and which ever broader sections of the population are de-

manding. We have in mind an anti-imperialist, democratic and anti-latifundia front, a front of struggle for peace which would unite diverse forces, ranging from the working class to the national bourgeoisie. This front would make it possible to end the dictatorship and form a broad democratic coalition government which would include also the Communist Party and democratic-minded patriotic military.

This coalition could resolve the urgent problems of the day and convene a constituent assembly based on proportional representation, that is to say that every party or group would be represented in accordance with its weight in society. The constituent assembly would begin to effect the fundamental changes needed in the economic, political, social and cultural life of the country. The Communists would participate in such a government with their program for agrarian reform, expropriation of monopoly-owned enterprises, etc. Basing themselves on this program, the Communists would support a constitution under which a one-chamber parliament as the principal organ of administration would appoint the President, the Council of Ministers and the Supreme Court. A multi-party system would be envisaged.

The Communist Party is preparing for all conditions of struggle—for those which will not necessitate insurrection and those that might call for armed action. The Party realizes that this will depend on the concrete conditions, that in Argentina it is a question of mass action or gamble, and not of armed or unarmed struggle. The Party is guided by the slogan advanced by its Twelfth Congress: "Through mass action to conquest of power."

The Communist Party is winning support thanks to its decisive role in the struggle, to its propaganda and political education of the working people. It is working to free the masses from the paralyzing influence of bourgeois nationalism, expressed mainly in the ideology of Peronism. Bourgeois nationalism acts from Right positions, but even more so from those of the ultra-Left groups which direct their fire against the Communist Party, against the Soviet Union, and which try to oppose the so-called third world to the socialist camp.

Peron quotes Mao Tse-tung and others to hamper fraternal unity and joint actions by Peronist and Communist workers. In his book *Latin America Now or Never*, Peron writes: "To the calamities befalling

Argentina there is now added another and no less dangerous one—communism.” In another place he writes: “In the first half of September 1964 a new stage in our history apparently began: the great Mao let the Soviet Union know that People’s China will not participate in the meeting called in Moscow, since it does not share the view that socialism should help support Soviet imperialism . . .” He goes on: “Various ideologies have been overcome and the dilemma: Communism or capitalism, no longer exists. It has now been replaced by another dilemma: national liberation or neo-colonialism.”

FAILURE OF THE PRO-AMERICAN DICTATORSHIP

The Communist Party has achieved the aim set forth in its document of June 29, 1966, namely to prevent consolidation of the pro-imperialist dictatorship. *The dictatorship has failed in its attempt to crush the labor and other movements.* Commenting on the demonstration of the Ika-Renault automobile workers in Cordoba, *Analisis*, a leading bourgeois journal, wrote on June 17: “On Friday, June 7, millions of TV viewers saw for themselves how the national peace, extolled by the President in a speech only the day before, was shattered. They saw the bitter clashes that took place on June 5 in Cordoba between the Ika-Renault workers and students, on the one hand, and the police on the other . . .” The workers, supported by students, were demanding that the wholesale dismissals be stopped. After this, the Onganía government clamped down on the radio and TV.

The Communist Party is calling for the establishment of a centre to coordinate the fight of the workers and the people generally, in which the General Confederation of Labor would play the leading role. Unlike the former CGT leaders who opposed this, the present leadership stated in their May Day message: “The CGT calls on all sections of the population (excluding the corrupt leaders and the minority that has adopted a defeatist attitude), to rally in all parts of the country for a frontal blow at imperialism and the monopolies, and to combat hunger.”

The idea of anti-imperialist, anti-oligarchy and democratic unity, which the Communist Party has always upheld, is winning more and more support among the people, and also among bourgeois and

petty-bourgeois parties. The leadership of the Civil Radical Union—the ruling party before the coup—stated in this connection: “The conditions essential for unity exist, and all that is needed is to stimulate the trends favoring the holding of a unity meeting . . . The time has come to realize this and stop playing at division.”

A leading Peronist group has advanced a program containing the following aims: 1) struggle against the dictatorship; 2) unity and organization of all sections of the people so as to form a civil resistance center against the dictatorship and government measures prejudicial to national sovereignty and the interests of the people; 3) the working class to head this struggle to ensure the people’s advent to power.

On May 6, 1968 the Social-Democratic Party stated: “The different parties should try to bring their positions into line in the search for a democratic and just solution of the problems.”

Although the dictatorship proclaimed the dissolution of all political parties the latter are continuing to function clandestinely, and our Party’s slogans of unity are meeting with increasing recognition. As a result, some parties have been compelled to stop making anti-communist statements. It is now a question of passing from declarations about unity to practical steps to organize a broad united front. The Right forces in the various parties and people’s organizations are, of course, maneuvering in every possible way to prevent unity.

THE DICTATORSHIP’S ECONOMIC FIASCO

The yes-men of the dictatorship had hoped that complete subordination to the imperialists, and the U.S. imperialists in the first place, would ensure them wide support and economic aid. However, the imperialist monopolies are themselves trying to get Argentina to shoulder part of their difficulties.

The dictatorship counted on increasing exports at the expense of the home market. However, industry and not agriculture and stock-raising accounts for the greater share in the gross national income. Nearly 75 per cent of the population live in cities. Thirty per cent of the cash value of farm produce is accounted for by sugar cane, cotton, grapes, Paraguay tea, rice and other crops which go mainly to the home market. The export of grains, oil bearing crops and animal produce bring in approximately 95 per

cent of the currency needed to finance imports, to pay for the loans and interest on them and to pay for patents, licences and technical documentation. The interests of part of the latifundist oligarchy and monopolies are essentially connected with exports. Even so, the dictatorship has not been able to find a bigger market for Argentinian goods; if anything, its markets are shrinking.

In 1967 the cash value of Argentinian exports in dollars decreased by 8.1 per cent. In the first five months of this year it decreased by another 17.7 per cent compared with the same period last year. This was due to a fall in prices for our exports, but even more so to the deterioration in the economic and financial position of the imperialist states which buy Argentinian goods. The Common Market countries, which take approximately 40 per cent of Argentina's exports, are resorting to more restrictive measures.

The United States, which has the strongest foothold in Argentina, sells it much more than it imports, and this, naturally, most adversely affects the country's trade balance. What is more, U.S. agricultural products compete with Argentinian products on many markets, the U.S. even resorting to dumping in some cases.

Things are going from bad to worse, despite the appeals of the dictatorship to help remedy matters. At a banquet last July at the Argentino-American Chamber of Commerce, Krieger Vasena, Minister of the Economy said: "Our favorable trade balance with the countries of Western Europe averaged \$500 million annually (for the three years 1965-67), while the deficit in trade with the United States and Canada totalled approximately \$170,000 annually. For the same period our trade with the countries of the East showed a favorable trade balance of approximately \$100,000 annually."

The capitalist countries of Europe make it a condition that Argentina should buy more goods from them if it wants to increase its exports. This often leads to measures prejudicial to the country's industry, as was the case when a number of merchant ships were built in European shipyards while those of the Argentine remained idle.

As earlier noted, the dictatorship reckoned that by pursuing a policy of subordination to imperialism it would receive big loans and investments. However, the loans were very small and in many cases merely a renewal of old ones. As for investments, the U.S. monopolies are using part of their own profits which they are reinvesting, or

drawing on Argentina's own accumulations, particularly now with the devaluation of sterling, the peseta and other currencies, and the difficulties experienced by the dollar. All this has told on Argentina's currency reserves which consist, in large part, of dollars and sterling, not gold. Matters are complicated by the fact that part of these reserves are abroad.

Much of Argentina's private capital is in the USA and other imperialist countries. The present Argentinian ambassador to the United States recently told journalists: "Deposits made by Argentina in 1967 in U.S. banks are contributing, true, on a modest scale, to improving America's payments balance." So are the profits and loan payments siphoned out of the country, not to speak of the brain drain to the United States.

To be able to compete on the world market Argentina has had to cut production costs. The last ten years have seen a growth in mechanized agriculture accompanied by a growth in investments. This was achieved through direct exploitation of the peasants by the latifundists (the so-called "Prussian way" of reinforcing the stratum of rich farmers), and the buying up of land by big foreign agricultural enterprises, or through investments made by Argentinian capitalists in medium-sized farms. This has resulted in mass unemployment among agricultural workers, in peasants being driven off the land and impoverishment of the middle and poor peasant.

The military dictatorship is in every possible way stimulating the process of capitalist concentration in agriculture, Raggio, Secretary for Agriculture (later removed from the government) tried to justify these measures on the grounds that "family farms" were unprofitable and that only big agricultural enterprises could hold their own on the world market, and should therefore be promoted.

The monopolies enjoy all kinds of government privileges, particularly with regard to taxes, enabling them to build big warehouses, supermarkets, and much else along these lines.

Concentration in industry, primarily benefiting the monopolies, is proceeding apace. Acting through Chase Manhattan and First National City Bank, the monopolies are stretching their tentacles to Argentina's private banks and planning also to abolish the state banking system and the National Bank in the first place.

In his report to a Central Committee meeting on June 2, Comrade Alvarez, Gene-

ral Secretary of the Party, characterized the struggle being waged as "a plebiscite in which public opinion has qualified the government of the dictatorship as the enemy of the nation." "The opposition's weakness," he noted, "is fundamentally that its actions are still scattered, and that it lacks a coordinating center."

The government sees a threat to itself in united action by the progressive forces, for which the Communists are working. Onganía, anxious to broaden his base, is using the treachery of some trade union leaders (Peronists and "Independents" alike). He has, however, to contend with certain groups of the military who want to get rid of him, claiming that he is responsible for the dictatorship's failures. These groups favor elections similar to those rigged in Brazil. The main clash is between Onganía and Alsogaray, i.e., between the "president" and the man who until recently was Commander-in-Chief of the Army.

Comrade Alvarez said in this connection: "As regards the Alsogaray group, which is quite incorrectly designated 'liberal', it consists of reactionary and manifestly anti-Peronist and anti-Communist elements. Its anti-Peronism springs mainly from its hatred of the working class since the Peronists are mainly workers. Politically, this mass has clearly advanced, and the facts show that the Right can no longer lead them at will. Such is the big problem facing the two groups of the dictatorship. . . As for Onganía, he is maneuvering to secure the Peronists' support, since he wants mass backing in his fight against Alsogaray. Clearly, Onganía's main objective is to use these masses with the help of certain corrupt union leaders to hamper the struggle of the working people."

Other military and civilian groups are looking for a "solution" of the political crisis "from above," and have no intention of allowing the people to have a say in the matter. General Aramburu, the former dictator, is playing a certain role in these maneuvers.

The political crisis has entered a new, more acute phase as a result of Onganía's demand for the resignation of Alsogaray and the Air and Naval commanders, although it was precisely these men who deposed President Illia and put Onganía in the saddle.

The working class plays the decisive role in the agrarian, democratic and anti-imperialist revolution. According to the National Development Council, in 1960 wage and salary workers totalled 5,259,747, or

69.22 per cent of the gainfully employed population. Of these more than two million were engaged in industry, 555,600 in transport, warehousing and communications, and 434,900 in construction. To this should be added approximately one million agricultural workers. Industrial concentration is fairly high, with 50 per cent of the labor force employed, according to the 1965 industrial census, in three per cent of the country's enterprises, and accounting for 50 per cent of industrial output. This big proportion of the working class in a population of 22 million is a factor making for rapid realization of the tasks of the agrarian, democratic and anti-imperialist revolution and its subsequent transformation into a socialist revolution.

But before this can be achieved it is essential to free the masses from the influence of reformist and bourgeois-nationalist ideology which preaches class conciliation. The Communist Party has made considerable headway in this respect. Speaking of Peron, the aforementioned *Analysis* quoted a member of the iron and steel workers' union as saying: "Peron in his time did a lot for us. But that was long ago. His historical cycle is over. He spoke a lot about handing over the land to those who till it, but never did. In his way of thinking and in his makeup Peron remains the purely military man. And the working-class movement of Argentina is now sufficiently adult to dispense with military leadership."

These sentiments are shared by many Peronist followers who, thanks to their own experience and our Party's activity, are inclining to class struggle and beginning to realize that Marxism-Leninism is the only true teaching. Despite vacillations, they are drawing closer to the Communist Party.

The Party is pointing to the need to overcome the lag in enrolling new members and educating them in the spirit of communism, the need to secure a bigger circulation for the Party press and literature, although the illegal Party publications have a big readership. The Party aims at broadening its educational network and stresses the importance of stepping up work among young workers, students and peasants, and rendering more active assistance to the Communist Youth Federation. Communists are stepping up their propaganda among the military, and they are extending their contacts with progressive Catholics.

The defeat of the military dictatorship would benefit not only our country, but the entire national-liberation movement as

well. In a May 1967 dispatch Associated Press reported Nixon, former U.S. vice-president and currently Republican candidate for the presidency, as saying during his Rio de Janeiro visit that he thinks the principal South American countries, and particularly Argentina and Brazil, should take upon themselves the policeman's role hitherto played by the United States, and that these countries should show a greater interest in the war in Vietnam.

The dictatorship provokes incidents on the border with Chile with the connivance of the anti-democratic groups in that country, backs reactionary measures in Uruguay, and hopes that its Pentagon masters will assign it a major role in Vietnam. The widespread actions of the Argentinian people, sparked by the Communist Party's efforts, are, in effect, a struggle for freedom, sovereignty and the well-being of the people, an expression of solidarity with the people

of Vietnam, the Cuban revolution, and the peoples of Latin America.

The Party is working for unity of the international Communist movement, for solidarity between the Communist parties and the revolutionary movement in Latin America. Recently it had bilateral meetings with the fraternal parties of Brazil, Colombia, Paraguay, Peru and Uruguay, and a meeting with the parties of Bolivia and Chile. A delegation of Argentinian Communists attended the recent congress of the Communist Party of Ecuador and before that, the congress of the Mexican Communist Party.

Striving for close contacts with all the Communist parties of the continent, the Communist Party of Argentina realizes that in cementing unity and promoting the mass struggle to put an end to the pro-imperialist dictatorship, it is acting in the spirit of the principles of proletarian internationalism.

The situation in Jordan and communist tactics

The continuing Israeli aggression against Jordan is having political, economic and social repercussions. The aggression and the subsequent occupation of Jordanian territory affects the thinking of the different classes and social groups, preoccupied mainly now with the ways and means of overcoming the consequences of the June war.

The occupation has hurt national feeling and has resulted in national oppression. The Israelis aim at driving the Arab population out of the invaded areas and resettling them with Jews. In some areas, the occupation authorities are building new settlements for this purpose, and exerting political, economic and military pressures to compel Arabs to leave. So far, more than 400,000 Jordanians have left their homes on the western bank of the Jordan, adding to the many economic and social complications in the unoccupied areas.

Israel has seized Jordan's most fertile land, her most developed territory with 48 per cent of the country's industry and with 44 per cent of her working class. Some-

thing like 80 per cent of her tourist income is gone and just as much of her income from fruit-growing, while grain output has dropped 30 per cent. The loss of part of the home market has pushed down production in the unoccupied areas and increased unemployment. Prices have risen and commodities formerly produced in the western regions have now to be imported.

In the occupied areas conditions have deteriorated. Most of the factories are idle, with the result that unemployment has soared. Furthermore, the occupation authority has given over commerce to Israeli traders, while Jordanians are prohibited from purchasing goods in the unoccupied part of Jordan.

What is obvious from the general economic and social situation is that the workers and peasants are feeling the effects of the occupation more than any other class or group. But though the economic consequences strike hardest at the workers and peasants, they are not the only ones to suffer. Landowners in the occupied areas are badly affected, and so are holders of

the fertile land on the east bank of the Jordan, notably at Al-Agwar, exposed to Israeli raids. Agricultural production has fallen as a result.

Other effects of the occupation are forcible evictions and confiscation of land, which makes holders hostile to the occupation, for the sad experience of the Arabs who had lived in what became Israel after 1948 is still vivid in their memory. The industrial bourgeoisie, too, have sustained losses due to the closure of factories west of the Jordan and the consequent reduction of the home market east of it.

The nation is solidly opposing the occupation, with the exception of the big bureaucratic bourgeoisie connected with imperialism and benefitting from neo-colonialist policy. But the struggle assumes different forms by reason of the different class interests. Though opposed to the occupation, the big landholders and the big bourgeoisie, for example, seek a solution in a deal with U.S. imperialism and are trying to win its favor and support. Their range of vacillation and choice of means depends largely on the scale, scope and influence of the general national movement, especially that of the workers, poor peasants and the petty bourgeoisie in town and countryside.

The Jordanian Communists took cognizance of this situation and the attitude of the various classes and social groups when drawing up their emergency program. The program contains an analysis of the situation and draws the appropriate conclusions. Prominent among the tasks it lists the aim of a national bloc of classes and groups affected by the aggression as a counterweight to the gravitation of some groups towards U.S. imperialism, seeking to create the conditions for their participation in the common struggle against the occupation.

The program does not overly stress problems of current economic and social growth. Instead, it outlines the advantages in the present contingency of a united national government embracing, among others, representatives of the big bourgeoisie and landowners opposed to the occupation. It calls for a peace settlement and condemns the reckless post-defeat tendency, reaffirming allegiance to peaceful co-existence. Explicitly, it states that the correlation of forces has not changed in favor of imperialism, the scales being tilted for peace and socialism.

Defeatist sentiment west of the Jordan has been largely dispelled, but vestiges of

it remain. We hold that it will disappear altogether, depending on the scale of the popular struggle under the National Front Charter, on the firmness of our Party, on its prestige and influence, on common sense and flexibility in politics in keeping with the situation in Jordan, in the other Arab countries and in the rest of the world. Success depends also on the policy of the government, on whether it is oriented on a peaceful accommodation, a policy that would increase Israel's isolation in the world. Also important is the deepening hatred of U.S. imperialism, which supports Israel and impedes a peaceful solution in keeping with the Security Council Resolution of November 22, 1967.

Our Party has repeatedly voiced its support of this resolution and demands its implementation. The bulk of our people support the resolution, and we are pleased that influential Arab leaders, and President Gamal Abdel Nasser for one, have displayed understanding, are ready to adhere to the resolution and to work for a peaceful solution of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

The Jordanian government has also taken a positive attitude, oriented on fulfilling the Security Council resolution, though it is somewhat contradictory, hesitant and influenced by differing factors. Compliant to popular pressure at home and in other Arab countries, on the one hand, it dreads any growth of the mass movement for what it may do to its class interests and refuses to sever the ties with imperialism, on the other. It is far removed from the idea of cooperating with the masses and the anti-imperialist forces at home, in other Arab countries and in the rest of the world for fulfilment of the Security Council resolution.

This is clearly reflected in Jordan's home and foreign policy. Some influential statesmen (such as the Prime Minister) favor solidarity with Egypt, better relations with Syria and coordinated action. Other forces, however, call for better relations with the United States and go out of their way, overtly and covertly, to obstruct rapprochement with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. They want to prevent the masses from becoming more active, their policy being aimed at suppressing democratic freedoms. Moreover they object to Soviet arms for the army and oppose mobilization and arming of the people.

The government's attitude to resistance in the occupied areas and to preparing the people and the army in the unoccupied

part of the country for struggle against the consequences of the aggression, is contradictory, at least in the class context. It supports those who have related interests, and its methods discourage growth of the mass movement, for it fears that the influence of working-class and peasant representatives may grow. It is cool to the mass organizations west of the Jordan, refuses to recognize the associations of teachers and students, and all but ignores people's organizations in its radio propaganda. Yet it supports financially the bureaucracy on the western bank and members of the upper classes, with the purpose of shoring up their future positions after the occupation.

However, these contradictions between different groups and classes are overshadowed by the now main contradiction between the people, on the one hand, and imperialism, Zionism and the reactionary elements connected with imperialism, on the other.

The existence of this contradiction offers opportunities for influencing the ruling group, particularly the King, and prevailing on them to repudiate imperialism. After all, the King has a vested interest in retaining his throne and regaining a grip on both banks of the Jordan, while the United States and Israel wish to dispossess him of part of his kingdom. We are also aware, however, that the King would not like the mass movement to grow to proportions imperilling his throne. That is why the Party opposes Left extremists campaigning for the overthrow of the present system, on the one hand, and the defeatist trend, on the other, whose exponents declare that what is done is done and cannot be undone.

In reference to forms of struggle in the National Front and among the masses, our Party is conscious of the need to deepen the contradictions between the men in power and imperialism. It seeks to paralyze the efforts of the pro-imperialist elements among the ruling circles and those who try to guide their hand by warning them against the growth of the mass movement and prevailing on them to cooperate with imperialism.

The persecutions of the past ten years have weakened the national-democratic movement and its various bodies organizationally and politically. With the sole exception of the Communist Party, the political organizations have become less active and their role has diminished. Subversive neo-colonialist activities and the

isolation from the realities of life of some people in the national forces, coupled with an inability to comprehend the changes in the country, have but spurred on this process.

The above applies to the pre-aggression period of over a year ago, whereas the past twelve months have been a time of reorganization. Our Party has done its best to help these people to find their bearings and to persuade them to abandon unrealistic slogans at variance with the present task. They have accepted the National Front Charter calling for the elimination of the consequences of the aggression by political means, not short of armed action. However, we have no illusions about the reckless and unrealistic trends having been outlived. They are still current, surfacing from time to time in a situation where the possibilities of a peaceful settlement are still unclear. In a way, these trends are a reaction to the provocative Israeli declarations and violence in the occupied areas. The only way to neutralize them is to promote mass action and draw the people in question into the struggle for liberation. In doing so, we must take into account the existing regime, the possibilities of the national movement and the thinking of the masses. The reckless trend represented by the fedayeen* has a negative effect on efforts to rally the masses in support of the political aims proclaimed in the Charter of the National Front and strengthens the tendency to spurn political struggle, hampering our Party's efforts to enliven the National Front in unoccupied areas with active fedayeen organizations.

Little has been achieved since the establishment of the National Front. Its activity is still limited, despite continuous efforts on our part to find and apply new forms of guidance. The influence exerted by the Front could be far greater, because it embraces parties, trade unions and personalities of considerable weight, capable of putting pressure on the government. The Jerusalem Liberation Committee, for example, has among its members people aligned with the National Front, including influential ministers, notably the Minister of Foreign Affairs. Our Party, too, is represented on the executive body. The Committee has called on the Afro-Asian Solidarity Organization, the Soviet-Arab Friendship Society, the World Council of Peace, the World Federation of Trade Unions, the Women's

*Fedayeen—members of armed resistance organizations.

International Democratic Federation and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam to participate in the demonstration in Amman organized jointly with the National Front.

Contacts with fraternal Communist parties, international democratic organizations and mass organizations in the socialist countries help change the outlook of our political and social bodies and show that, gradually, the need for organized contact between our own forces and the various contingents of the world revolutionary movement is appreciated.

Special mention might be made of the Federation of Workers' Unions which, at the prompting of our Party, has extended its relationships abroad, establishing close ties with the WFTU and trade unions in the socialist countries.

While extending foreign ties, the organizations are also inclined to strengthen their contacts with the people. National Front committees have appeared in towns along the eastern bank of the Jordan. Our comrades are working for interaction and solid ties between the leadership of the Federation and the various trade unions, and between the trade unions and the masses. The opportunities for this are good, because our Party wields influence in some of the bigger trade unions, as well as in the Federation. The Federation was the second important force, after our Party, that prepared and effected the mass demonstration on June 5.

Our Party is working to consolidate the mass organizations. We are active in the National Front, the Jerusalem Liberation Committee and in the trade unions, and initiated the Women's League, in which our woman members play a leading role. The League has good relations with the Women's International Democratic Federation and with women's organizations in the socialist countries. Delegations from some of these organizations have visited Amman. The Women's League is active in political life, and is a member of the National Front and the Jerusalem Liberation Committee. At present, we and our friends are trying to set up a teachers' association on the east bank of the Jordan, and to organize the refugees. Our comrades are helping reorganize the unions of workers employed under the auspices of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency, and have founded a Refugees Welfare Society.

The Party's efforts to found a Jordan-

Soviet Friendship Society are yielding results, and the initiators have applied for an official licence.

In the unoccupied part of the country we are working in the trade unions, refugee camps, villages and town neighborhoods. The accent is on the central problem of the day: marshalling the people for the fight against imperialist and Zionist pressure and the threat of a new aggression. We have a central newspaper, and Party statements on various issues are widely circulated.

In the border areas, Party members help train people in the use of arms; this gives impetus to the campaign for arming the people in other parts of the country. Wherever the people are active, our mass base expands. This is true also of the refugee camps, which have changed their locations several times due to the continuing Israeli raids. Despite difficulties, instability, ideological confusion and the spread of extremist ideas, the Party has gained numerically in most of the unoccupied areas. Now, it is concerned mainly with strengthening the bonds between the Party organizations at different levels in order to improve coordination. Among Party members it cultivates an understanding of present needs, equipping them for the fight against the extremist and defeatist tendencies.

This does not mean, however, that our work has been flawless. Many opportunities for work among the masses are still untapped. Additional possibilities are available to improve our educational and organizational work and forge stronger ties between the Party and the masses.

Our Party has retained its organizational unity in the occupied and non-occupied parts of the country. In the occupied western part of Jordan it puts out the underground newspaper *Al-Watan* (Fatherland), the only Arab daily appearing there at present, and we are happy to note that its circulation is increasing and that our membership in the occupied areas has doubled over the past six months. Our Party is the principal organizing force there. We assumed this responsibility from the beginning, and are working to unite the forces opposed to the occupation in national committees on which other political trends, like the Baath Party and the Arab nationalists (with only a limited influence), heads of municipalities, trade unionists, teachers, doctors and other professions, are represented alongside the Communist Party. Our Party was

the moving spirit in re-establishing some of the trade unions dissolved by the government before the aggression, and worked hard to establish women's organizations. National committees have been set up in many of the occupied towns and in the bigger villages. They are represented on the Higher Coordinating Committee, which provides guidance to the masses opposed to the occupation.

The national committees have sparked a series of strikes, organized the boycott of Israelis and the campaign for better conditions west of the Jordan. And they stood at the head of the strikes and mass demonstrations of June 5 in the occupied towns. Their guidance has the effect of rallying the people. All these aspects are followed closely by our leadership, which devises various forms of struggle to suit the situation.

Our thoroughly considered policy, far removed from petty bourgeois extremism, has enabled us to preserve our cadres in the occupation period, and to attain the present high level of consciousness among the people. We have withstood pressures from sources which wanted to involve us in various undertakings for which the situation is as yet unsuited.

What I should like to stress is that our Party plays an extremely important role in the occupied areas. The success or failure of our mission there will inevitably affect our future and the Communist movement in the other Arab countries.

The defeatist trend, which came into being instantly after the occupation, has made little headway. Its exponents want to evade the issue of struggle west of the Jordan. For us, on the other hand, the prospects of this struggle are vital. We lay the accent not on Israel's illegal conduct, not on its attempts to evict people, and not on the confiscations of property or the persecutions which also affect our own comrades. Our accent is on Jordan's future, the future when the now occupied territories are recovered. The occupation affects the attitude of Jordan's rulers. Pro-imperialist elements among them seek closer bonds with imperialism, they are writing off the Palestine problem and encourage Israel's expansionist aims.

Organizational work west of the Jordan, such as the establishment of new trade unions and of associations of teachers and students, tends to encourage similar efforts in the unoccupied areas. Nor can the authorities interfere openly, notably be-

cause these organizations do most of their work under the slogan of national unity and participate in the resistance movement. Furthermore, among other things, our work in the occupied areas has compelled the Amman authorities to ease up on the Communist Party. No longer is the anti-Communist line as brazen as before. The authorities refrain from applying anti-communist legislation and (within certain limits) tolerate democratic freedoms.

The ruling circles realize our Party's important role in the occupied areas, and some have gone so far as to admit it publicly.

The Communist Party of Israel is winning increasing respect among Arabs not only in the occupied areas. This respect is traceable to the active efforts of its deputies in the Knesset, its demands for the rule of law, and to its printed word in the occupied areas. The Communist press there is semi-legal, because the Israeli authorities apply there the Jordanian anti-communist regulations. Our understanding with the Israeli comrades is complete and we cooperate with them wherever we can.

We also cooperate with the national front in the Ghaza sector, where Marxist elements play a visible role. Our contacts are proving useful and should be broadened.

We have outlined here the main areas of our work and our assessment of the situation in the occupied and non-occupied parts of Jordan. To round out this account we should now examine the guerrilla organizations, which are receiving considerable publicity in the radio and press abroad. The masses look upon them with sympathy, and so do the governments of the Arab countries.

The feeling of the masses is understandable. The military defeat and subsequent eviction of hundreds of thousands of people, the material and moral losses, the sense of national humiliation, especially among the petty bourgeoisie, the absence of a unitarian national government in Jordan that would modify home and foreign policy in a positive sense, the slowing down of reconstruction by the progressive regimes and the unfulfilled expectations pinned on them and their military potential—all this has evoked a strong public reaction. The masses gravitate towards movements that call for armed action instead of seeking a peaceful political solution.

The masses attach a cardinal role to the resistance organizations, for they think that guerrilla action can restore our honor

and avenge the national humiliation. This sympathy for the guerrillas is not at variance with the Party's attitude and its slogans, although any accent on armed action tends to depress the political activity of the masses.

However, the masses do not treat the matter as an alternative (either guerrillas or Communists), although some people, notably in the guerrilla organizations, try to distort Communist policy as concerns forms of struggle in the present period.

It should be borne in mind that the guerrilla organizations are politically heterogeneous and that many of their members are influenced by extremist ideas. Some leaders, especially of Al-Fatah,* come from the reactionary Muslim Brotherhood and are still under its influence. Most members, by the way, are not Jordanians. The bulk are Palestinians. This limits the actual scope, producing aims that are, in effect, impracticable. That, too, is a threat to our Party and the national movement in Jordan.

We should neither exaggerate nor ignore the dangers stemming from the above factors. There are also some influential patriotic elements in the guerrilla organizations, with whom our Party maintains contacts and conducts a dialogue, striving to prevail on them that they should participate in political activity and join the National Front, coordinating their efforts with the other patriotic forces in fighting to eliminate the consequences of the aggression in the context of the prevailing balance of strength and with an eye on local, all-Arab and international conditions. Acting on this logic, our Party holds that the guerrilla organizations should participate in the National Front. However, our appeals have evoked no response so far.

We have described our attitude to the membership of these organizations, our contacts with them, and our assessment of the different elements in their leadership. Our stand is based on the following:

Neither in Jordan nor in any other Arab country are conditions ripe for guerrilla activity in or outside the occupied territories;

2. The guerrilla organizations are based outside the occupied areas and their activity, therefore, is usually the same as that of the regular Arab army commandoes;

3. Fedayeen activity differs from the armed struggle waged by the people in the occupied areas. Supporting fedayeen organizations means supporting unrealistic political aims, aims that we reject. Their method of struggle is at variance with the objective conditions and strongly colored by extremism. They tend to dissociate the resistance movement from the facts of life in Jordan and the rest of the Arab world, and from the world anti-imperialist movement. What is more, they ignore mass and political activity, and object to the existence of political parties in the present period;

4. The progressive Arab countries, such as Egypt and Syria, appreciate the correlation of strength in the region and the dangerous consequences of provoking the enemy. Therefore, they object to actions in the immediate proximity of the ceasefire line. Their support of the guerrilla organizations is given on tactical grounds, for they desire to win sympathy among the masses and, possibly, conceal weaknesses they are reluctant to discard. On the other hand, the support of the fedayeen by Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, the collections of funds by Saudi princes and influential figures in Kuwait, and the support of Al-Fatah (especially by Saudi Arabia), are a clear indication of the ties that some of the Al-Fatah leaders maintain with those two countries and of why Saudi Arabia and Kuwait encourage the fedayeen. As we see it, those two countries want to divert the public from their ties with imperialism and surreptitiously reduce participation in the all-Arab effort, while prodding Jordan to extremism. This would supply the other side with fresh arguments justifying acts of aggression to the benefit of U.S. imperialism;

5. In most cases guerrilla actions evoke disapproval. Though they do a certain amount of damage to the enemy and receive a certain amount of publicity, their price runs into too many casualties, and precipitates evictions of Arabs from the most fertile areas.

Despite our view of the fedayeen, we do not write off armed struggle. It may be entirely justified, depending on the scale and scope of the general movement in the occupied areas and on the readiness of the masses to repulse the aggressor.

Yet when the premises for armed action appear, the character of the fedayeen organization and the lack of realism in their

*Al-Fatah—Palestine national-liberation movement.

program limit their possibilities for effective participation in the resistance. Also, areas and have no bases there. And where they manage to penetrate they fail to integrate with the local population because, in effect, they are strangers.

It is farthest from our minds to attack the fedayeen organizations. All we want is to present an objective picture. We appreciate the national sentiment of the members of the resistance movement fighting courageously against our opponents. But we cannot afford to ignore their defects.

We have contacts with their leaders and endeavor to deepen and develop their system of views, so that they should carry on the fight correctly. We also have contacts with the rank-and-file and do our best to develop their political consciousness to prevent anyone from using their sincere national convictions for selfish ends contrary to the interests of the people and country, far removed, in effect, from the struggle to end the nightmare of occupation.

Fahmi SALFITI

Honduras: Communist Party policy

CARLOS ALDANA and LONGINO BECERRA

POLITICAL SITUATION

The military dictatorship that rules over this Central American republic came to power after the coup d'état of October 3, 1963, engineered by the U.S. State Department with the direct participation of the banana companies that have been operating in the country for over 50 years. And to maintain itself in power and carry out U.S. imperialist plans, the regime held fraudulent elections in February 1965 to install Osvaldo Lopez Arellano as head of state.

The purpose of the coup was to arrest the democratization process which started in 1957 after years of popular struggle, of which the 1954 plantation strike was one of the highlights. The U.S. imperialists were worried: the country was in a militant mood and legal organizations — trade unions, peasant and student associations — were being formed.

The new dictatorship started its career with a systematic campaign of repression against the progressive forces. Many labor organizations were banned and persecuted, others were "reorganized" along anti-democratic lines. Laws that reflected the hard-won gains of the people were revoked or drastically revised. For example, secular

education, one of the great gains of the 19th century revolution led by Francisco Morazan, was not included in the 1965 Constitution.

The repression continues. Last September, the Communist party paper *Trabajo* wrote: "The Arellano government has no intention of abiding by the people's rights and freedoms. All progressive activity is suppressed or branded subversive . . ." The government's reactionary policy was demonstrated anew in the March 31 municipal elections. They were held in an atmosphere of virtual terror, with the ultra-reactionaries banding together in the "Black Army" and using every method, including murder, to assure election of government-backed candidates.

Despite official denials, the prisons are filled to capacity. Some political detainees are being held without any specific charges preferred against them. Two outstanding democrats, Agapito Robledo Castro and Mario Jesus Membreno, have been in the San Pedro Sula prison for more than two years and the government refuses to abide by a court ruling ordering their release.

The government claims that every citizen is guaranteed personal freedom. But many exiles cannot return because they have

been black-listed and are denied travel papers.

These are not fortuitous developments. The military coup was a calculated move, part of the iron-heel strategy of keeping our countries under reactionary regimes. In Honduras this is being done by a military dictatorship using all the known techniques to prevent the spread of the popular movement. With U.S. support it is modernizing the army to fulfil that function.

CLASS STRUGGLE CONTINUES

Repression has considerably complicated, but by no means stopped, the development of people's struggle. It continues to grow, though the movement has been driven into clandestinity. For no amount of repression can change, let alone break, the people's resolve to stand up for their rights. The progressive forces continue to expand their activity on every sector of the front and are acquiring influence within the broad anti-regime opposition.

It can be confidently said that the lineup of forces is developing increasingly in favor of democratic change. Despite repeated attempts to enlarge it, the regime's social base is rapidly contracting, the result of an ultra-reactionary policy and demonstrated inability to cope with vital problems. Latterly, more and more collaborationist groups representing diverse social strata and political parties have withdrawn support from the government. More, they are gradually shifting to open opposition or, at any rate, adopting a neutralist stance. In fact, the leadership of the Liberal Party, the country's biggest and most influential, which a short while ago unreservedly supported the government, now, after the municipal elections, finds itself obliged to bring its policy more into keeping with resistance sentiments among the rank and file. As a result, the regime is limited to the ultra-reactionary army clique, made up mostly of discredited senior officers, and ultra-conservative politicians prepared to cooperate with Prime Minister Ricardo Zuniga Agustinus. Needless to say, it can maintain itself in power only with the support of U.S. imperialism.

Political polarization was graphically demonstrated last December when a group of prominent political leaders and businessmen founded the National Orientation Front. Its purpose, according to a policy statement, is "to orient the people in a way that will give them a clear goal and

the will to force the country's leaders to work towards it."

The Communist Party regards this as a development, and not because it believes that the Orientation Front can carry out much needed radical changes, but because its emergence is a fresh manifestation of the widespread public discontent. Indeed, the Front was brought into being (though its leaders will not admit this) by the need to coordinate action against the onslaught of the U.S. monopolies which are stifling our economy, and by the crying need for democratic government. Its objective significance is that new economic forces are beginning to feel the pressure of dictatorship and are working towards changes that could facilitate short-term and long-term economic development.

GROWTH OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

Ever since its foundation on April 10, 1954, the Communist Party has had to face and solve the many difficult and complex problems posed by the class struggle and the successive anti-democratic regimes imposed by U.S. imperialism. Throughout these 14 years the Party has had to work in conditions of harsh illegality, confronted by an enemy who flouts the elementary political principles that have become traditional in other countries. This has required supreme devotion and self-sacrifice from Party members. Many have given their lives in the struggle, but they have written a glorious page in the history of our revolutionary movement. Among these heroes our people especially remember and revere Lorenzo Zelaya and Manuel Rodriguez Reyes, foully murdered by the regime.

Yet the Party is growing, both in terms of numerical strength and political stature of its members. There was a mass influx of new members on the 50th anniversary of the October Revolution and this did much to strengthen the Party ideologically. Our growth can be traced to the plain fact that the Communist Party, despite all assertions to the contrary, is a natural and logical product of our society and cannot be destroyed.

In these difficult conditions, the Party has made a number of errors. The most serious, perhaps, was violation of the Leninist principles of party life, and specifically democratic centralism and collective leadership. This led to manifestations of Right-wing and Left-wing opportunism. For instance, in 1960-63 the Party overestimated

ed the country's political stability, with the result that it could not play a vanguard role in the crisis precipitated by the October 3 coup. Later, during the February 1965 elections, the Party veered to a position of outright adventurism and this, of course, was bound to have grave repercussions.

In mid-1965 the Party leadership began a full-dress discussion of ways and means of rectifying the situation. Unfortunately, the discussion later assumed undesirable forms—it went beyond the Party, lost its effectiveness, with resultant manifestations of factional struggle. Party unity was imperilled and the regime took advantage of this to crack down on Communist-influenced labor and student organizations.

The discussion centered on ideological questions, and from the very start we could discern a tendency among certain comrades to continue the adventuristic policy the leadership had adopted in the 1965 election campaign.

In recent months, however, there has been a stronger effort to improve our methods and work out a clear-cut political line. A Party conference was held in the Central Region and an emergency conference at San Pedro Sula. The Central Committee held its fifth plenum in October 1967, concentrating chiefly on the problems involved in mapping out a correct course. And though much has been done towards restoring Party unity and overcoming past mistakes, several problems have still to be solved. They will be discussed at the Party's Second Congress now being prepared by the Central Committee. It will consummate the work of uniting the Party, in which all its members are deeply interested.

OBJECTIVE BASIS

Honduras is one of Latin America's most backward countries. American monopoly infiltration at the turn of the century cut short the process of free capitalist development. U.S. companies seized extensive tracts of land on the northern coast and turned them into banana plantations. Before that they used to buy up the crop of local growers, so that large sums of money remained in the country. Now all the money goes into American banks. Besides, United Fruit, Standard Fruit and Steamship and several other U.S. firms directly or indirectly control a large number of enterprises that could otherwise have served the national interest. Air and maritime transport,

tele-communications, the manufacture of shoes, tobacco, beer—in short, most essentials—have been monopolized by the Americans. This virtually amounts to economic bondage to U.S. concerns, which are thus able to control the country's development. And their "control" has been to retard liquidation of feudal survivals and keep Honduras a purveyor of cheap raw materials and cheap labor power. What we have is an alliance of foreign capital and the feudal structure.

The country's economy, such as it is, is based on small farming and artisan or semi-artisan production. The preliminary returns of the 1966 agricultural census show that 82.7 per cent of farms have less than 19 manzanas,* or 22.8 per cent of the total area. In contrast, 17.3 per cent of farms, each with up to 2,500 manzanas, account for 77.2 per cent. Spelled out in these figures is our economic backwardness and low productivity of agriculture. Marx was right in remarking that for the small farmer the land is a simple tool of production, for "the more the division (of land) increases, the more does the parcel of land with its utterly wretched inventory form the entire capital of the small allotment peasant, the more does investment of capital in the land diminish, the more does the cotter lack land, money and education for making use of the progress in agronomy, and the more does the cultivation of the soil retrogress." (Marx-Engels, *Selected Works*, Engl. ed., Vol. 1, pp. 215-16.)

According to the 1966 census, 269 latifundia (of 1,000-2,500 manzanas), comprising 0.1 per cent of all the farms, cultivate more than 600,000 manzanas, or 19.6 per cent of the country's farmland. Run by local owners, they make up the foundation of the semi-feudal relations that still dominate rural Honduras. Capitalist development in agriculture is very slow and so far extends only to a few regions. The low level of capitalist development is evident also from the limited use of machinery and fertilizers.

Industry is mainly of the artisan type. A recent statistical survey reveals that in 1960 the country had 616 industrial enterprises with a total output value of \$57.5 million, but 29 enterprises (4.7 per cent) had an output of \$7.8 million, or 32.5 per cent of the total. The figures are indicative of the low productivity of most of our industries. Per capita power consumption,

*A manzana is roughly 1.7 acres.

one of the lowest in Latin America, is still another indication of the rudimentary level of industry: 68 kwh in 1965 compared with 800 kwh in Venezuela.

Agriculture remains the cornerstone of our economy. It accounts for 80.2 per cent of the gainfully employed population and for 47.6 per cent of the gross national product, compared with 18.3 per cent from industry, 11.4 per cent from trade, and 22.7 per cent from the service industries. The figures speak for themselves, and the situation has not changed in the decade 1956-66.

This predominantly semi-feudal structure, in which progressive change is woefully slow owing to American monopoly control, sets the pattern of social conflicts. Nor could it be otherwise, for class collisions and the very existence of classes "are conditioned by the degree of development of their economic position, by the mode of their production and of their exchange determined by it." (*Ibid.*, p. 246.)

In Honduras, many factors tend to hamper the class struggle. Our proletariat is small in numbers and is scattered over a multitude of small enterprises. To all practical purposes, there is no national bourgeoisie either in the economic or political meaning of the term, inasmuch as all capital created in the country is dependent on the U.S. monopolies, with which it can not even hope to compete. Class differentiation is therefore basically confined to the peasants, who make up 66.1 per cent of the population.

These young classes lack political experience and, hence, a clear vision of the ultimate aims of the struggle, and U.S. imperialist propaganda has been quick to exploit that to sow ideological confusion. But the people clearly see its immediate aims, and their actions in times of political or economic crisis are determined by very concrete factors. This makes it possible to carry out broader action.

STRATEGY

Our strategic aim is the vitally-needed democratic, anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution. Honduras' fundamental problems can only be solved by first resolving the basic antagonism, between semi-feudal relationships forcibly maintained by U.S. imperialism, and the new economic forces now trying to hew a way for themselves. The slow, lopsided client development, now legalized by the Central

American Common Market, must give way to rapid progressive development that would rescue the country from backwardness and improve living standards. However, that goal can be attained only through thorough reconstruction of the economy and liberation from the economic fetters of imperialism. Any other way—for example, capital accumulation within the Common Market as suggested by some nationalist groups—can only prolong the oppression and exploitation.

In charting this strategy, the Communist Party was not oblivious to the transitional stages of the struggle. The vital immediate task today is to rid the country of a venal regime which, helped by reactionary army circles and U.S. imperialism, is keeping it in a state of unmitigated terror. And the facts will show that the people are keenly aware of the need for a democratic government that would assure the political forces freedom of action. The Communists support that movement and favor a broad front embracing all progressive forces objectively interested in giving the country a democratic structure. Needless to say, the Party has no illusions and makes it a point to explain to the people the concrete implications of its policy.

However, this policy of a broad front and support of all the gains of the people, no matter how small, is not always correctly understood by certain Left groups. Supporting movements for immediate goals, they argue, is "reformism," even "betrayal of the revolutionary struggle." These Trotskyite doctrinaires claim that the time is ripe for an all-out battle for our ultimate goals. In fact, the immediate task for Honduras, they would have us believe, is socialist revolution. Of course, they do not go to the trouble of analyzing realities to determine whether or not the alignment of forces and the level of public consciousness justify that slogan. The inevitable result of that policy is isolation, and there is conclusive evidence that the Francisco Morazan Movement and the Honduras Revolutionary Party, which subscribe to that concept, are making no headway whatever.

TACTICS

The fifth Central Committee Plenum (October 1967) declared that the revolutionary movement was undergoing a period of "accumulation of forces." That conclusion is based on a close analysis of political and economic realities. A backward

economic structure is bound to exert an adverse influence on the movement for the fundamental refashioning of society. And there are ample facts to bear that out. Mention might be made of the following: 1) a small and practically unorganized working class (in 1964, the country's 81 trade unions had an aggregate membership of only 19,581); 2) the progressive middle-class elements have no legal organization capable of adding strength to a popular front; 3) there is no peasant mass organization strong enough consistently to press peasant demands; 4) the student movement has for several years been in a state of crisis, with the result that the reactionaries have seized control of its main organization, the Federation of University Students.

The present situation calls for a series of immediate concrete steps to counter internal reaction and U.S. imperialism. And common sense should make it perfectly clear that, in this situation, it would be the height of folly to call for the seizure of power or actions bordering on that. What we should do is concentrate on forming closer links with the masses, organize the progressive forces and intensify ideological work to explain the nature of our national problems. In other words, we must "build up forces" in anticipation of the time when decisive action will become necessary and possible. And that time, let it be added, does not depend on the wish of the Communists, or on the will of other revolutionaries. It depends entirely on the objective development of the class struggle, and in this context it is relevant to quote Lenin: "We possess great revolutionary experience, which has taught us that it is essential to employ the tactics of merciless attack when objective conditions permit, when the experience of compromising has shown that the people's indignation has been aroused, and that attack will express this change. *But we have to resort to temporizing tactics, to a slow gathering of forces when objective circumstances do not favor a call for a general merciless repulse.*" (Works, Vol. 27, p. 377. Italics added.)

The Communist Party, unlike some extremist groups, does not consider the process of "gathering forces" as a conspiracy. Nor does it believe that the purpose of our illegal work should be to train our cadres for violent action based on a subjective appraisal of the situation, nor that our mass work should aim at some abstract rather than concrete goal. No, we understand the "gathering of forces" as orienting the class

struggle on the winning of immediate demands so that the struggle itself will be the inevitable result of class collisions. Strengthening popular organizations, ideological training of revolutionary cadres to prepare them for higher, sharper forms of struggle—in present conditions this can be achieved only through day-to-day campaigns for immediate goals.

The forces build-up will prepare the vanguard for sudden aggravation of the general crisis which set in several years ago. Lenin taught us that in the class struggle there are moments equal in significance to decades. We revolutionaries should never lose sight of such possible moments. The very fact that capitalist accumulation in Honduras proceeds against a background of open conflict with the semi-feudal survivals that still dominate our economy makes for more or less sharp periodical political crises. A correctly conceived and skillfully applied "forces build-up" tactic fully accords with the realities of Honduras. And the Communist Party closely follows all the vicissitudes of the class struggle in order to advance, in good time, slogans to meet changing situations. We always remember Lenin's words that a small party can vanquish the people's enemies only if it is capable of foreseeing all aspects of the struggle and offering a correct policy at a time when the majority of the people are prepared for self-sacrificing and resolute action.

Our policy has met with vehement criticism from the extremists. Without bothering to analyze the facts, they call for an immediate onslaught on the regime. They denounce the forces build-up as a waste of time and sheer opportunism. For, according to their theory, organization of the masses, the growth of class consciousness and acceptance of the supreme forms of struggle come only as a result of decisive battle. Accordingly, they maintain that, at all times and under all circumstances, the revolutionary movement in Honduras should be oriented on armed struggle by small groups. There is no need to prove that that attitude is based on *petty-bourgeois voluntarism*, disregards the objective laws of the class struggle and reduces the problem of the forms and means of struggle to subjective assessments. And in keeping with that defective theory, they concentrate on organizing shock groups (guerrilla centers) in the hope that this will detonate a general rising. Their methods are patently conspiratorial; organizational work and revo-

lutionary education through day-to-day actions are relegated to the background. In 1850, Marx and Engels wrote of men who followed a more or less similar line: "It stands to reason that these conspirators are not satisfied with organizing the revolutionary proletariat. They want to run ahead of the process of revolutionary development, artificially prod it towards a crisis, precipitate revolution, though the conditions for it do not exist. For them, the sole condition for revolution is proper organization of their conspiracy."

All these attacks notwithstanding, the Communist Party firmly abides by its principled policy in the belief that it fully accords with the realities of the class struggle. Careful study of our, and other, revolutionary experience shows that disdain for objective factors and scientific principles can only result in major setbacks that will greatly weaken the movement. That is why our Communist Party rejects all these un-

realistic, subjectivist statements of petty-bourgeois spokesmen and endeavors to apply, in the concrete conditions of Honduras, the principles of Marxism-Leninism, the only truly scientific revolutionary doctrine. The Communists have to work in difficult conditions, but they are steadily advancing to their ultimate goal, a democratic liberation revolution. And those who want us to shift to higher forms of struggle in total disregard of real possibilities, will never induce us to abandon our program, worked out by the Party in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism and with due regard to realities. We prefer to remain true to Lenin, who stressed that the real task of the revolutionary party is not to devise plans for social reorganization, nor to indulge in conspiracies, but to organize and lead the class struggle of the proletariat, the ultimate goal of which is the winning of political power by the proletariat and the organization of a socialist society.

Some lessons of Munich

ZDENEK FIERLINGER

The 30th anniversary of Munich is a date that impels one to reflect on the numerous problems that even thirty years after are still topical. There is no point in delving into the roots of the Western policy of appeasement, which began with the 1925 Locarno Treaty between France, Britain, Germany and Italy. Locarno was presented to the public as a victory for peace. Actually it was a blow to France's friendship with Czechoslovakia and Poland, and cleared the way for another German *Drang nach Osten*, this time against the Soviet Union.

The facts are well known and need not be recounted here. Fascist expansionism was defeated. But the inherent contradictions of capitalism, whose economic equilibrium is maintained chiefly by the arms drive, still exist and create an ever-present menace to peace.

For Czechoslovakia, the Munich betrayal was one of the most tragic chapters in her history. It led to the seizure of our border areas, then dismemberment of the country and, finally, to the Hitler occupation. Bourgeois-democratic Czechoslovakia, a highly developed country, was forced under pressure from the Western Powers to surrender to Hitler. She became the victim of an imperialist plot. And it would not be an exaggeration to say that, like the defeat in 1620 at the White Mountain which brought the Czech people under the rule of feudal Vienna, Munich could have been a fatal tragedy for the Czechs and Slovaks. It was only the destruction of the Hitler war machine, the total defeat of fascism, the joint victory of the allied powers, and first and foremost the heroic struggle of the Soviet people and their heavy sacrifice,

that brought the Czechs and Slovaks freedom and independence. What is more, the Soviet Union's victory liberated Europe from fascist bondage and enabled Czechoslovakia, in the early post-war years, to lay the political and economic foundations of people's democracy based on a broad National Front of which the Communist Party was the leading force.

In those eventful days of 1938, the Communist Party's stand against the Munich surrender and its call to defend the country won for it the undivided confidence of the working people. The Communist Party alone urged resistance to Hitler.

The Western policy-makers of those days—Daladier and Bonnet in France and Chamberlain in Britain—aided and abetted Hitler's aggressive designs. They did everything to conceal from the European public that the Soviet Union was ready to respond to a Czechoslovak request for help.

The Soviet Union, it will be recalled, was pledged to come to the help of Czechoslovakia in the event of France honoring her obligations under the 1924 treaty; and when France went back on her obligations, the Soviet Union declared that it would stand by Czechoslovakia nevertheless. There can be no doubt that it would have found ways and means of doing that.

Diplomatic and military circles in the West tried to conceal the truth about the considerable forces mustered by the USSR in September 1938: the Byelorussian and Kiev military areas were fully mobilized; 30 infantry divisions and tank, cavalry and air force units were held in combat readiness on the boundaries with Poland and Rumania.

Czechoslovakia had about 40 combat-ready divisions, and a German attack could, and would, have been held up by the

The author was Czechoslovak ambassador to the USSR before and during World War II, and one of the initiators of the merger of the Social-Democratic and Communist parties after the war.

strong frontier fortifications. In the opinion of General Krejcy, the then Czechoslovak Chief-of-Staff, the Germans could have been held for three months. In other words, Hitler could not count on an easy victory in the event of Czechoslovak resistance. That, in fact, was admitted by Field-Marshal Keitel, who said at the Nuremberg trial that Germany would under no circumstances have risked military action—she simply did not have the forces to pierce the Czechoslovak fortification system, and had no troops on the western frontier.

The Czechoslovak government could wholly rely on the readiness of the people to make every sacrifice, for the people knew that the fate of their country was at stake. The destiny of Czechoslovakia might have been altogether different had the Czechoslovak government taken a resolute stand against Hitler. There is documentary proof that had this been done Hitler would not have risked defeat.

And had the government resisted it would in all probability have had the support also of the French people, angered by the perfidy of their own government. When France decided on partial mobilization and talks took place in London, Prime Minister Daladier intimated that Czechoslovakia could be defended even without British assistance. But next day Chamberlain held up a cable from Prague stating that the Czechoslovak Prime Minister, General Syrový, a reactionary in politics, had already given in.

It is not my purpose to recount what took place in Prague Castle during those crucial days, or in the private office of Prime Minister Hodza, or to deal with the inconclusive negotiations with the British and French diplomatic representatives who counselled unconditional surrender. But one thing should be clear, namely, that the powerful financial, industrial and landed interests, which from the very inception of the Republic controlled our democratic institutions, were able to suppress the will of the people. This powerful oligarchy, in effect, shaped our internal and foreign policy.

And so, why were the Czechoslovak people unable to defend their country at a time of supreme menace? First, because their leaders, animated solely by the class interests of the bourgeoisie, adopted a passive attitude and, under Western pressure, yielded one position after another. Second, because the deflationary policy of finance capital had plunged the country into eco-

nomics crisis and had generated dangerous national discord. Third, because of the fateful conflict between the Social-Democrats and Communists—even in the face of outright Hitler aggression they could not agree on a common platform.

The problem that faced us, Left-wing Social-Democrats, after the liberation was how to promote close cooperation between the two parties with a view to their eventual fusion. This would assure the working class the decisive and leading role within a broad National Front and give it a truly socialist and democratic orientation, in conformity with our long-standing popular and democratic traditions.

Today, we fully appreciate that we are living in a divided world with its deep-rooted social conflicts. Actually, there are two worlds, the world of capitalism where for the most part monopoly capital holds sway, and our world of socialism which lives by the progressive laws of socialism, by the teaching of Marxism-Leninism.

Nor are we likely to forget a basic lesson of Munich. We know that in West Germany revanchism is seeking to revise the outcome of World War II. This is evident from the actions of the West German government which to this day refuses to declare the Munich pact invalid from the very start, refuses to draw the necessary political and legal conclusions therefrom. On this issue the Bonn government virtually supports the demands of neo-Nazi and revanchist organizations grouped in the so-called Sudeten Fraternity, whose leaders acted as Hitler's fifth column before and during Munich. The 30th anniversary of Munich should therefore serve as a stern warning that the forces responsible for Munich are still active, and that we must always be prepared to rebuff every tendency and every attempt to keep the Munich spirit alive. Czechoslovakia's membership in the socialist world community, her active share in its policy of European peace and security, her Warsaw Treaty membership, all are guarantees that there will never be another Munich.

In pre-Munich the vast majority of our people—not only the working class, but also wide sections of the middle class and progressive intellectuals—were firmly united in defense of the country. But the country's leaders, guided by the class interests of capital, pursued a passive and isolated policy least of all calculated to mobilize our people and progressive opinion in the West.

Today, in the new and much more favorable conditions of our socialist society, our people are united in a spirit of patriotism, loyalty to our friends and the sincere socialist internationalism bequeathed to us by Lenin. And we shall continue to build our socialist economy and our socialist society in close cooperation with all the members of the socialist camp.

In present-day conditions, it is important correctly to appraise the leading role of the Communist Party, widely apply inner-party democracy and uphold the Party's authority and prestige. The Party must be the leading force of a wider unity embracing, within the framework of the National

Front, other political parties and public organizations which accept the inviolable principles of socialist democracy.

Our economic policy and our economic reform, which basically does not differ from the reforms in other socialist countries, are designed to promote still closer economic relations with the USSR and other socialist countries.

The history of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and its position in the center of Europe should always remind us of the need to avoid anything that might detract from our friendship and undermine our alliance with other members of the socialist camp.

Problems of the British labor movement

This year the TUC meeting at Blackpool in the 1st week of September, celebrated the 100th year of its existence, for it was founded in Manchester in 1868 by a handful of trade union delegates.

The 1,050 delegates representing 8,700,000 trade unionists celebrated the occasion by administering a severe rebuff to the Labor Government for its anti-working class prices and incomes policy. The delegates rejected the incomes policy and demanded its repeal by an overwhelming majority of 6,724,000 votes.

One significant fact which emerged from the 1968 Congress, one of the best that has taken place for very many years, was that the last thing the Right-wing leaders of the General Council wanted was a fight against Government wages policy. Knowing the hostile mood of the delegates, the one concern of the General Council was to avoid certain defeat.

In particular the General Council did not want Congress to express its feelings on (1) support for the Labor Government and its policies and (2) support for the General Council's pet scheme, a voluntary wage restraint policy to be run by the TUC.

In the event, despite considerable pressure, the two resolutions remained on the Agenda, and both narrowly escaped defeat.

By a show of hands Congress reaffirmed its confidence in the Labor Government.

Recognizing the "continued distressing elements of frustration experienced in national and international affairs" by the Government, said the resolution, nevertheless Congress had faith that "the complete realization of policies contained within the Labor Manifesto will be honored."

Mr. Frank Cousins, General Secretary of the Transport and General Workers Union, was scornful about this. The motion, he asserted, was pure whitewash. (Cousins resigned from the Cabinet in protest over the Government's anti-working class poli-

cies, particularly its prices and incomes policies).

Other delegates followed in the same way, and it was fortunate for the General Council that no card vote was called for, otherwise this motion would certainly have been defeated. But by calling for a show of hands, the rift was skilfully avoided.

The resolution, tabled by the National Union of Dyers and Bleachers, calling for support of the TUC's "voluntary incomes policy" escaped defeat by a derisory 34,000 votes. This placed the General Council in a most embarrassing position by exposing how narrow was the support of the unions for its policy.

In February 1968 at a special conference of the unions, the General Council managed to scrape home with a majority of 536,000. Now only a few months later, this had fallen to a mere 34,000. The vote was a moral defeat for the General Council.

Congress has moved well to the Left. Not since the days of the Second World War has it been so militant. For the first time in years the right wing encountered a massive hostility. This was expressed in the voting for the General Council. Militant lefts were elected to replace six Right-wingers who had retired. Today there is not a single outstanding right-wing spokesman on the TUC. The talent now rests with the Left, with such men as Frank Cousins of the T & GWU and Hugh Scanlon, president of the AEF.

Congress showed its militancy on almost every issue. It even supported a resolution against the advice of the platform—which called for industrial action should equal pay for women not be achieved within two years.

In the 418 resolutions originally tabled for debate at the Labor Party Conference every aspect of the government's policies was criticized, with most of the criticism falling on its foreign and economic policies.

Dealing with the government's economic policy, no fewer than 30 out of a total of 35 resolutions on this subject condemned the Prices and Incomes Act.*

The resolution from the National Society of Metal Mechanics summed up the feelings of the organized masses towards the Labor Government: "This Conference," it says, "strongly condemns the anti-working class policy of this so-called Labor government both in domestic and foreign policies and demands that it return immediately to the original program of socialism on which it was voted to power."

The theory and practice of Right-wing Labor which has a monopoly grip over the broad Labor Movement has resulted in creating two entirely divergent attitudes in the Movement.

Amongst a very large section it has created a mood of pessimism and frustration, and a strong sense of having again been betrayed by a Labor government "which is behaving the same as the Tories." As a consequence there is a growing disillusionment with all politics and political parties "since they are all alike," and "no politician can be trusted."

So widespread has this mood become that at the municipal elections held in May and at some later parliamentary by-elections, millions of Labor supporters abstained from voting. They voted with their feet by staying at home. They could not bring themselves to vote for a government which was launching vicious attacks on their living standards and on their trade unions, in the interests of monopoly capitalism.

Nor is that all. For the first time in many years trade unionists are refusing to pay the contribution known as the political levy. This is the money which goes to the Labor Party. It makes those who pay the levy associate members of the Labor Party. Moreover, one minor union has disaffiliated from the Labor Party, while another two are hinting that they will follow suit, a step which the Communist Party strongly opposes.

Another dangerous form which disillusionment with the Labor government is taking is that a number of influential Left-wing intellectuals appear to be moving towards the formation of a new and more radical organization as an alternative to the Labor Party. Amongst these are the "New Left" groups which are supported

*On the first day of the Labor Party's annual conference, September 30, the delegates by a five-to-one majority declared their opposition to the Wilson Government's Prices and Incomes Policy.

by many University lecturers, students, writers, etc.

Rightly angered by the fact that Prime Minister Harold Wilson is attempting to transform the Labor Party from a class party to a "National" party in order to avoid class conflict and, at the same time is trying to weaken militant trade unionism through the punitive Prices and Incomes Act, many Left Socialists are thinking of leaving the Labor Party and are seeking some other form of organizational means through which Socialism can be achieved in Britain.

Whilst their criticism of the Labor government and of Britain's crisis provides a good basis for discussion, the weakest part of their case is precisely the central problem facing the Labor and progressive movement which is how, in British circumstances and in the world of today, political power can be won by the working class and people. This is all the more pertinent, since they are also critical of the Communist Party and of the Socialist world, standing aloof from it.

In the last analysis the idea of abandoning the Labor Party signifies a surrendering to pessimism and despair. The strength of the British Labor Movement is its unity which must be maintained at all costs. Through historical development the trade unions in Britain are an integral part of the Labor Party, since it was the trade unions, together with some small Socialist societies, which laid the foundation of the Labor Party as a means of "securing a better representation of the interests of Labor in the House of Commons," at a meeting held in London on February 27, 1900.

Since that time the trade unions have been the bastion and strength of the Labor Party. They supply most of its funds, through the political levy, so that in 1967 the trade unions contributed £273,716 to the Labor Party, whose total income for the year was £386,945.

It is the same with the membership of the Labor Party. Out of a total membership of 6,335,612, the affiliated trade unions provide 5,538,744 members, so that at Labor Party Conferences the trade unions cast five-sixths of the total vote. Moreover, until recently trade union votes controlled the election of two-thirds of the members of the National Executive Committee.

It is therefore no exaggeration to say that it is the trade unions which, in a sense, control the Labor Party, and that if any

change is to be forced through it must be with the active consent of the unions.

In effect, however, the picture is more complex. Another powerful group in the Labor Party is what is known as the Parliamentary Party, which by various devious arguments considers itself free of control of Annual Conference and not bound by its decisions. The Parliamentary Party also elects its leader, who becomes the leader of the Labor Party, as well as Prime Minister when Labor is elected to power.

But here too the unions have a powerful hold. There are approximately one hundred Labor members of parliament out of a total of 363 who are either directly sponsored by trade unions (the Transport and General Workers Union alone has 27 such MPs) or else are financially supported by trade unions. It is to this extent that the trade unions dominate the Labor Party both in the country and in the House of Commons. Thus it will be seen that any attempt to cut off the trade unions from the Labor Party, or to try to form an alternative political organization separate from the unions would lead to a weakening of the struggle against capitalism.

It is only the unity of the broad Labor Movement that can in the long run bring about the doom of monopoly capitalism. But it must be a real, not a spurious unity; a unity which includes the Communist Party, for without it the struggle of the Left against the monopoly control of the Right-wing leadership cannot be successful. This, incidentally, is the theme of the "British Road to Socialism," the basic program of the British Communist Party, which maintains that the fight against the Right wing and its dominant social-democratic theories must be conducted within the broad movement, not outside it.

But the question might well be posed: if the trade unions hold such a position of power in the movement, how is it that the Labor government is able to impose Right-wing policies which not only attack and lower the living standards of the masses, but passes legislation which actually threatens with fines and imprisonment trade unionists carrying out legitimate trade union activity. If this is due to the domination of the Right wing how is this grip of the Right wing to be broken?

The government's attack on trade unionism through its Prices and Incomes Act and its deliberate policy of undermining the strength of the trade unions in the interests of the employers have roused the

deep anger of the organized masses. They are no longer passively acquiescent, accepting the blows of the Right wing without striking back. If the anger and the frustration roused by the policies of the Wilson government have created a mood of pessimism amongst one section of the movement, they have aroused a different spirit, one of militancy and struggle, amongst the widest sections of the rank and file. There is a strong determination to make a stand against these anti-working class policies in order to prevent a collapse similar to that which followed the Labor government of 1945-1951; because of its anti-working class policies that Labor government was defeated, after which the Tories held power for 13 years.

Today there is developing a decisive confrontation of the government and the trade unions, with the prospect of mass industrial action. Because of this, for the first time since 1926, when the Right wing seized and consolidated its hold over the trade unions and the Labor Party, there is the possibility that this grip will at last be loosened, if not broken. This is illustrated by the following: on July 2 this year, the Transport and General Workers' Union, the largest union in Britain with a membership of about one and a half million, took a decision to end the ban on Communists holding office in the union which was imposed in 1949.

This and some of the other powerful unions in the country, unions which in the past have been the mainstay of the Right-wing leadership, have moved in direct opposition to the Wilson government. At the 1967 Trade Union Congress these unions were responsible for the defeat of a number of resolutions supporting government policy, just as they were instrumental in defeating similar resolutions at the Labor Party Conference which followed. And their opposition to the government's policies was expressed even more emphatically in the decisions of the 1968 Trades Union Congress.

The balance of power in the trade unions is today slowly coming down on the side of the more militant elements, while the Right wing is gradually being replaced by such Left leaders as Mr. Hugh Scanlon. A further sign of the growing militancy of the union rank and file is that more Communists are being elected not only as shop stewards and minor officials, but to higher posts of greater authority. Thus the possibility of significant advances by the

Left in the coming struggles are opening up.

In his evidence to the Royal Commission on Trade Unions and Employers' Associations sponsored by the Labor Government, Mr. John Hughes, Tutor in Economics and Industrial Relations at Ruskin College, Oxford, sweeps aside the slanders which the Right wing has heaped upon the work of Communists in the unions.

"One must dismiss the crude approach that would talk of Communist 'infiltration'; a trade union is something that people join not infiltrate, but in any case it is more likely to be active 'militant' trade unionists that join the Communist Party (especially in the factory trades) rather than Communist non-unionists who join trade unions. The distinguished service to the trade unions of many individual Communists is not in doubt either. . . ." (Research Papers 5, Part 2, p. 73).

Another significant fact in the changing balance of forces in the trade union movement is the impact of the non-manual unions, that is the "white-collar" unions, whose members and leaders are often more militant than the unions catering for the manual workers. Such men as Clive Jenkins, leader of the Association of Scientific, Technical and Managerial Staffs, a "white collar" union, are outstanding in opposing the government's Right wing policies in both the economic and political field, nor do such leaders hesitate to bring their members out on strike should the occasion demand it.

The non-manual unions have had a startling growth in the past few years. In 1967 there were 44 such unions affiliated to the TUC, which, together with a further 14 which claim to have a proportion of non-manual workers, had a membership of 1,944,700 compared with 1,866,000 in 1965. Seeing that the total membership of the TUC in 1967 was 8,787,000, the non-manual union membership represents 22 per cent. And most of these unions support the progressive trends.

Nor are these white-collar unions as tolerant with the Right-wing attitudes of many of the Labor members of parliament which they have sponsored. Thus the Executive Committee of the Draughtsmen's and Allied Technicians Association recently circulated a resolution to its branches which urged the E.C. to review the sponsorship of those MPs who consistently support policies which are not in the interests

of the union's members and are contrary to its policy.

Such a move is essential if the unity of the movement is to be maintained and the Right wing grip removed. The trade union group of members of parliament, with a few notable exceptions, are solidly Right wing. Until his promotion to the rank of minister, the Right-winger Mr. George Brown, was the chairman of this group.

With the growing opposition to the Prices and Incomes Act certain moves are being made to discipline these trade union MPs. The Transport and General Workers Union, like DATA, is also considering what steps shall be taken to bring their sponsored MPs more into line with union policy.

At its 1968 annual conference the T & GWU decided unanimously that the 27 members of parliament sponsored by the union should have their voting record examined by the national executive of the union at regular intervals. It was strongly hinted that those MPs who opposed the policies of the union, particularly its opposition to the Prices and Incomes Act, might lose the union's financial support. They would no longer sponsor MPs who followed policies contrary to the interests of the union.

Over and above this, with the growing drive in the unions that Labor MPs should support the policy of the unions sponsoring them, the Right-wing views of those union MPs in the Parliamentary Labor Party might well change. This may strengthen the hand of the Left group of Labor MPs numbering approximately forty, and have a very significant effect on government policy.

At the same time the unions might also now pay more attention to the type of parliamentary candidates they select for sponsorship. Until now the selection has been haphazard, with the unions not particularly concerned with the politics of the selected candidate. With the experience they are now gaining in the fight against the prices and incomes policy, union members are becoming more aware of the role which politics plays in the economic life of the country and the impact a hostile Parliament can have on the unions. Those trade unionists who hitherto have had a somewhat syndicalist approach to politics might well change their views and see that union activities are not enough and that attention must also be paid to the political wing of the movement.

Given that the Left acts responsibly and utilizes its growing power with good effect,

a new perspective can open up for the British working class. The concept of a Left majority in the House of Commons, as a direct result of the Left replacing the Right-wing leadership in the TUC and in the Labor Party, is not so distant as to render this concept derisory. Moreover, with the new more tolerant attitude towards the Communists in the trade unions, although only a beginning, a new relationship between the C.P. and the Left in the trade unions and the Labor Party might well develop. Hitherto the greatest weakness in the Left wing of the Labor Movement has been its hostility to and its ignoring of the Communist Party, thereby breaking the unity of the movement, for the Communist Party is an essential part of the broad movement and cannot be ignored.

Should this new relationship develop, and there is no reason why it should not, since it was the Right wing which imposed the bans and proscriptions of Communists in the trade unions and expelled any who worked with the Communist Party, then the case developed in the "British Road to Socialism" for a Left-wing Labor-Communist majority in the House of Commons comes into the realm of the possible. The opposition to the present Right-wing leadership and the policies of the Labor government is such and is sweeping ahead at such increasing speed that these changes might be nearer than is realized.

Of course opposition to this by all the Rights in the TUC and in the Labor Party will steadily mount. Right-wing leaders like Mr. Roy Jenkins, Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Tony Crosland, President of the Board of Trade, Mr. Denis Healey, Minister for Defense, and others, are likely to take up the struggle against the Lefts as they have done in the past, and of course, so will the Prime Minister, Mr. Harold Wilson. These men are very powerful for they control the apparatus and the funds. Moreover they are up to every political trick of the trade. They hold the powerful weapon of patronage and can offer posts of position and influence to the ambitious and self-seekers, those who pay more attention to their own advance rather than the advance of the masses.

But all this can be met and overcome if the will is there. Much water has flowed under the bridge since the 1945-61 Labor Government: Today some of the most powerful trade unions in the country, because of the anti-working class and anti-trade union policies of the Wilson government are opposed to it and are determined to make a stand on the very issues which have for so long been championed by the militant rank and file. And it is this which raises such hopes amongst those fighting for Socialism in Britain.

H. FAGAN

Marx and modern philosophy

It was surely fitting that in this year of the 150th anniversary of Marx's birth there has taken place what in all likelihood is the largest-scale dialogue and debate ever to be held between representatives of Marxism and those of all other contemporary philosophical conceptions. The organizers of the XIVth International Congress of Philosophy (Vienna, Sept. 2-9) — a gathering of some 3,000 philosophers from all the continents—had provided in the program for substantial discussions on Marx and present-day philosophy but they can hardly have anticipated the degree to which this would become the impassioned leitmotif of the entire Congress. That this did occur, testifies to the greatly heighten-

ed interest in Marxism both in the academic and intellectual world and among the general public

Major theses of the Congress agenda were: "Marx and Contemporary Philosophy;" "Mind, World and History;" "Freedom, Responsibility and Decision;" "Language, Semantics and Philosophy;" "Philosophy and Ideology;" "Philosophy and the Natural Sciences." At the ceremonial opening in the State Opera House, Congress President Leo Gabriel cited the "Thesis on Feuerbach" — "Philosophers hitherto have but interpreted the world . . ." Thereafter one kept hearing it at one session after another, in all four languages of the Congress, as delegates debated the implica-

tions, for world politics and man's fate, of the momentous words: "... the point however is to change it."

The work of the Congress began with a colloquium on "Marx and Contemporary Philosophy"; it closed several colloquia and many work sessions later, with one on the Marxist Christian Dialogue (initiated by the progressive U.S. "Society for the Philosophical Study of Dialectical Materialism").

The present note attempts no more than to touch fleetingly on a very few of the themes around which serious discussion and at times heated argument developed.

* * *

Determinism and freedom: As against existentialism, the effort to absolutize freedom (and responsibility), several discussants emphasized the concept of interdependence (Frankena, U.S.; Ricoeur, France). Absolute freedom is as a concept just as untenable as absolute unfreedom: only the view of a finite, limited freedom offers an approach that is fruitful, because it situates the problem in a context of relationship of the individual to others, wherein also freedom cannot consist of any arbitrary willfulness (Strasser, Holland). Transcending this rather abstract-individual approach, Steininger (GDR) situated the problem of individual freedom in its actual context of social interrelationships and social structure.

While the Jesuit professor Adelman (USA) argued that Marxist determinism precludes spontaneity and creativity, and hence in the name of an absolute necessity renders real freedom impossible (a freedom whose source he located in the Deity)—Glezerman (USSR) and other Marxist philosophers put forward the Marxist-Leninist view on necessity, consciousness, freedom. The former dealt with the ever-growing role of consciousness in history. He pointed to the way in which the subjective factor acquires heightened significance and scope as social man realizes his own potential in the framework of existing, objective conditions (material, technical, socio-economic). The exploitative, coercive conditions of class society engender the revolt against it, the revolutionary assertion of the will to freedom on the part of the oppressed. Not resignation to an ineluctable necessity, but action to overcome oppression is the hallmark of a genuine (as against an abstract) humanism.

Marxism and humanism: A. Cornu (GDR), Somerville (USA) and Parsons (USA) —

the latter in opening the colloquium on Marxist-Christian dialogue — brought out important aspects of Marx's revolutionary enrichment and development of humanism. His posing of the problem and working out the terms of the solution of man's alienation, through practice, collective action and struggle to abolish the system of private ownership of the productive plane of society, opened the way to the free development of the individual and community.

The importance of the Marxian concept of humanism for the understanding of the key problems of our time and for the search for effective solutions—above all of the problem of peace—was demonstrated in the paper by Fedoseyev, head of the Soviet delegation to the Congress.

Kline (USA) countered this position with the claim that while Marxism may be considered a future-oriented "humanism of ideals," it is not a "humanism of principles," the latter considering man as a value in the present, as opposed to any instrumental approach whose criterion is some future social goal. Kline urged a return to Kierkegaard "who is concerned about the present individual, and rejects the claims of future community." As correspondent Wimmer of the Vienna *Volksstimme* justly commented on this controversy, the question here arises, who is anti-humanist: he who calls the people to sacrifice, or he who does not credit the people with capacity for sacrifice for the sake of a humanizing of the world. Kline undialectically counterposes given condition and projected "aim," in contrast to Marx who envisaged the emancipation of man as a long-drawn process in which the "total man" is impossible so long as an inhuman world continues, though in struggling against inhumanity man becomes himself more human.

And the young Soviet philosopher Vogeler is quoted as arguing that Kline's "true humanism" is in fact directed to the maintenance of the status quo, and thus is organically bound up with conformism; whereas Marxism, which comes to grips with existent evil, and creates the conditions for a humanely ordered society, is the genuine humanism of our time.

Ideology and "de-ideologization": The claim that all ideology is "false consciousness" and incompatible with a truthful or scientific view of the world was advanced by De George (USA), Bubner (FRG) and others. G. Wetter, S. J. (Austria) attributed this position to Marxism, with the addition of a distinction between "conditionally false" and "essentially false" conscious-

ness: the former comprising those areas (e.g. culture) in which social revolution is expected to create conditions for true consciousness to emerge, whereas religion is seen as wholly false. . . And Wetter voiced the hope for a "rehabilitation" of religion by Marxists, in the interests of the dialogue.

Somerville (USA) traced the changes in the meaning given to the term "ideology" and emphasized that Marx and Engels had for the first time laid bare the interconnection between forms of social consciousness and the class conflicts born of property relationships. All social views, all philosophy, whether true or false, are part of ideology. Such also was Lenin's view and use of the term.

Mshvenieradze (USSR) and Hollitscher (Austria) countered the demand of some Western thinkers that "ideology be banished" from philosophy. Thus Calogero (Italy) argued that, thanks to advances in science and technology, East and West could well join hands to form one world community—were it not that ideological conflict interposes itself and prevents reconciliation. The Marxist speakers showed that the long-fashionable appeal for "de-ideologization" was in fact just one more attempt to exorcise Marxism-Leninism. It either naively ignores class realities or, in the case of inveterate opponents of socialism, pretends to ignore them so as to further the attack on working-class positions. Hahn (GDR) as well as the above men-

tioned speakers, dealt with the question of criteria of truth, the grounds of difference between scientific and false ideologies, the relation between individual and collective, social apprehension of reality in conditions of class conflict and its revolutionary overcoming.

The philosophical aspects of natural science, logics and the theory of knowledge occupied a prominent place in the discussion. Considerable interest was evoked by Soviet Academician V. A. Ambartsumyan's exposition of the importance of dialectical materialism for the natural sciences.

Attempts by Rightist elements to disrupt the philosophical debate by turning it into a political meeting, in particular on the events in Czechoslovakia, were rejected by the majority of Congress delegates.

This, then, was a colossal confrontation of Marxism and its opponents. It could not, by its very nature, "decide" any question; but it did signal the growing influence of the world outlook whose founder was born 150 years ago. It was no accident that in the first colloquium K. Loewith (FRG) voiced anxiety lest the impression remain that philosophy consists only of various interpretations of Marxism. And at the close of the Congress president Gabriel, on the same note of defensiveness, found it necessary to remind his hearers that there are other philosophies besides Marxism! In any event, as U.S. philosopher Barrows Dunham remarked at one point, Marxism is surely "where the action is" these days!"

Dread of the specter of revolution

Letter from Bogota

The 39th World Eucharistic Congress, which convened in Bogota last August, afforded ample evidence of the dread of revolution gripping the Catholic church in Latin America. The Pope and top-ranking prelates went out of their way to shore up the positions of outspokenly reactionary and conservative groups. However, the rift between church rich and poor has so widened that

nothing can impede the advance of the democratic forces.

In different parts of the continent clergy advocating renovation had been chafing long before the Congress. In April priests in Botucatu (Sao Paulo state) rose against the new Archbishop appointed by Pope Paul VI. In July, a gathering of bishops of Brazil, though censuring violence in the fight for

social change, declared, obviously in reference to Artur da Costa e Silva's military regime, that they "cannot reconcile themselves with the contempt shown for the basic human rights, primarily those of assembly and freedom of speech, and the right to a fair wage." A conference of the bishops of Colombia, though dominated by conservatives, had to acknowledge "conflicts between the priests and the church hierarchy."

Chile is where the democratic trend in the church is the most distinct. Members of the "young church" movement there interpreted the Pope's visit to Colombia as a gesture of support for the reactionary rule of the Latin American capitalists. They occupied the cathedral in Santiago and issued a manifesto denouncing "the exploitation of man by the money-making system," "the international imperialism of money" and "the deceit of false democracy manipulated by a handful." The manifesto demanded that the church, closely associated with "the authorities and wealth" give place to a more audacious new church participating in the fight for the true emancipation of the people.

In Colombia the church is a powerful capitalist enterprise. Some parishes are richer than the municipalities in which they are located. According to *El Siglo* of March 16, 1965, the church then owned 3,200 buildings and other real estate valued at 2,500 million pesos, owned stocks and shares and had large sums invested in industry and commerce. Considering that church property is not taxable, one can readily imagine the magnitude of this opulence. In other Latin American countries the church is still more powerful. Yet its tragedy is that it must either give up its wealth and privilege and win the trust of the people aspiring to social change, or lose that trust and keep its worldly goods. At least that is how matters appear to stand. Actually, the situation is more complicated: the task is to preserve the church as an instrument of political power.

What is now called the "young church" is the source of a movement for innovation by bishops and priests sympathizing with the people. The "young" of the Latin American church (not necessarily young in age) are those who took exception to the new postulates of the Ecumenical Council. Often we revolutionaries have them on our side. They are joining the ranks of the revolution, indicating their profound appreciation of what Archbishop Tulio Botero

(Colombia) expressed as follows in connection with the Eucharistic Congress: "Obviously, in Latin America changes must take place, be it with us, without us or against us."

Some champions of the new church are searching for ways to stimulate the fight for social change and aid the freedom fighters. Some, those who attended the Congress, observed that the "alternatives are not the status quo and change." As they saw it, the option was between violent change and peaceful change. Unlike the former, the latter was subterfuge proposed by pseudo-reformists such as Eduardo Frei, Lleras Restrepo and Leoni. And small wonder that the prelates espied in this context the spectre of "revolutionary violence."

Clearly, they were not over-troubled about theological questions. What really troubled them was new and inescapable: the people of Latin America. Pope Paul as much as acknowledged this when he told a gathering of Colombia peasants that since the appearance of his "Populorum Progressio" encyclical "the problem has grown more acute because you have become more aware of your needs and sufferings and, like many others in this world, refuse to tolerate such conditions endlessly."

Yet admitting this is a risk which the church leaders of the continent wish to avoid, for it would be tantamount to admitting (at least by implication) that the ruling classes are no longer able to "make" a social revolution based on a sense of justice, and admitting, too, that if the church wishes to forestall disaster it must face the masses. Hence the political inconsistency of the Pope and of the moderates accompanying him. The Supreme Pontiff denounced the appalling condition of millions of people in the capitalist world, yet entrusted their executioners, the "men ruling the world," to make amends.

The 39th Congress witnessed a departure from the liberal stance taken by Vatican Council II. This was evident in the restrained and conciliatory, at times frankly reactionary, tenor of the Pope's public addresses, notably that made on his arrival at the eucharistic camp and his opening speech to the Second Latin American Episcopal Conference.

The Pontiff's statements about intensifying the fight for universal disarmament, and those of Cardinal Giacomo Lercaro, Papal Nuncio, about the imperialist genocide in Vietnam, were dampened by the conservative mood. The spirit of "Populorum Pro-

gressio," admitting of "revolutionary risings . . . in the event of manifest and long-standing tyranny threatening the basic rights of man and causing grave harm to the country's general welfare"—in Bogota this spirit gave way to a forthright denial of revolutionary violence as a form of political struggle.

In the eucharistic field, before a congregation of half a million, Pope Paul declared that Latin America was in the throes of a "profound crisis." But, he said, "we must stress again and again that violence is contrary to the Christian spirit, that sharp or violent change of structures is deceptive and ineffective."

In his address to the Latin American Episcopal Conference the Pontiff gave the impression that he wanted to dispel all illusions about the liberal "Populorum Progressio" postulates being projected into practice in the framework of the church, at least in the foreseeable future. Again, he spoke out against revolutionary ideas and "atheistic Marxism," pleading for "peace between the social classes in conditions of justice and cooperation."

The Pope's reaction to his first-hand contact with Latin American Catholicism was not an isolated matter. When the preparations began for the 39th Congress (and especially after the progressive views expressed by some of the bishops), the Rights launched a campaign of protest, endeavoring to discredit those bishops and priests who urged a renovation of the church. Nor was the U.S. government loath to join that campaign. Linowitz, U.S. Ambassador to the OAS, told newsmen in April that his government was worried by the appearance of potentially dangerous trouble spots. In every out-of-the-way village and town quarter, he said, the flames of disobedience are gradually catching on. It should be clearly understood, he went on, that U.S. aid to the Latin American countries is aimed at bolstering domestic security and combatting the guerrillas.

The retreat by Pope Paul in Bogota had the effect of over-ruling the original liberal conclusions discussed at the Episcopal Conference by the advocates of renovation. They were forced to curb their fervor. Preaching "non-violence" was the most prominent aspect of the congress. But by and large, the episcopal warning will scarcely contain the trends that sincerely aspire to radical change.

However, the "ultras" have taken heart. And the Latin American bourgeoisie will

smugly exploit the Pope's utterances against the demands of the people. That is where the church may come a cropper, for every conservative or conciliatory step it makes identifies it with the hated oligarchy. For example, Archbishop Geraldo Proenca Sigaud (Brazil) declared in Bogota that he disagreed with Helder Camara's radicalism. "In Latin America we have sound pillars," said Sigaud cynically. "Many shortcomings need to be remedied, but no complete change of the basic structures must be ventured. What we need is evolution, not revolution." He describes as "very dangerous" the idea that the church should work for "the universal growth of consciousness leading to politicalization and syndicalization and to large groups of the people acquiring insight."

The President of Colombia, too, showered praise on the pseudo-reformism which he personifies and which the U.S. government holds in high esteem. In a television address on August 17, Lleras Restrepo declared: "Social and economic changes must proceed within the law. The reconstruction of society must be gradual . . . That is why, far from troubling us, the voice of the church fills us with joy as it calls for social change, because it preaches what we preach."

What the Pope did in Latin America has not been fully assessed. The first to react was the independent and opposition press in Brazil. It observed that the Pope's speeches to the peasants and at the opening of the Episcopal Conference "were surprising for their conservative tenor." It added that the Pope had arrogated to himself the right to dictate policy to the church, telling the bishops and priests about it in no uncertain terms. The *Folha de Sao Paulo* commented that the Pope had disappointed liberal church quarters. The Pope, it said, "preferred to take a cautious stand and showed his determination to avoid all statements likely to justify extremist or radical positions." UPI reported that the Pope's addresses seemed to stimulate the conservatives in the Latin American church. The agency added his address at the opening of the Episcopal Conference was taken as a warning against excessive freedom in carrying forward the postulates of Vatican Council II. Some think, the agency went on, that the Conference document should be amended, because it lays an overly strong accent on capitalism's guilt in relation to the social problems, while in the opinion of others,

it goes to the length of justifying certain forms of violence.

Further collisions are inevitable in the near future between the conservative and democratic trends in the Latin American church. The World Eucharistic Congress served notice that internal strife in the

church is on the upgrade. Rising on the wave of the social battles in Latin America, increasing numbers of Catholics are joining those who are fighting for radical changes in the social structure.

Alvaro DELGADO

BOOKS AND JOURNALS

Economic integration of CMEA countries

Survey of Polish opinion

Polish economists are showing a lively interest in problems of economic integration in CMEA, the Council of Mutual Economic Aid. Books and articles have been written on this subject, focussed chiefly on the effectiveness of the international specialization of production, the mechanics of cooperation between the fraternal countries, international monetary and financial relations, price formation in trade between the socialist countries, the relation of home to world prices, currency exchange rates and international criteria for establishing national economic levels.

Heightened interest in socialist economic integration stems from the relation that the CMEA economic cooperation mechanism has to be expanded and perfected to accord with the changes in economic planning and management now being carried out in the CMEA countries.

This survey confines itself to just four books.

In their *Cooperation of CMEA Countries and Economic Computation** authors Sta-

nislaw Gora and Zygmunt Knyziak examine (on the strength of the economic cooperation of CMEA countries) the premises and purposes of the international socialist division of labor, criteria for selecting objects of international specialization, the effectiveness of specialization, joint investments by several countries, and, last but not least, coordination of national economic planning by the CMEA countries.

The book looks at the criteria for selecting objects for international specialization and elaborates on appropriate formulas to compute efficiency. It suggests dividing international specialization into structural and neutral. Looking for criteria in differentiating international specialization, it proceeds from the thesis that the existing division into inter-industry and intra-industry specialization is not quite adequate by reason of the statistico-administrative character of the branches of industry. This division, the authors hold, is insufficiently accurate, therefore, for determining the advantages of specialization and composing appropriate computing formulas of

*Stanislaw Gora, Zygmunt Knyziak. *Wspolpraca krajow RWPG a rachunek ekonomiczny*. PWE, Warszawa, 1966.

economic efficiency. As they see it, dividing international specialization into structural and neutral amounts to differentiating the advantages of the specialization. The authors point to two groups: advantages implicit in adapting the structure of specialized production to the structure of the resources of each cooperating country (structural specialization) and advantages derived from growth of production. The latter type is described as neutral specialization, because it is neutral to the structure of the demand for various means of production and manpower, and neutral, too, to the balance of payments in relation to third countries.

CMEA cooperation also extends to joint investments. The book presents formulas for computing the effectiveness of joint investments for the countries receiving long-term credits and for the countries granting the credits, and closes with a study of the mechanism coordinating national planning and the system of international settlements.

* * *

Marian Guzek's *The Principle of Comparative Costs and CMEA Problems*,* looks into the question of computing the effectiveness of international specialization and the mechanism of ties between the CMEA countries. It examines the criteria for improving international specialization of production and the established exchanges between CMEA countries. As Guzek sees it, the principle of comparative cost of production is the best criterion in selecting objects and spheres of international specialization, and relates this principle to the mechanism of exchanges between the socialist countries.

He proceeds from the simple model of computing comparative costs of production described by Ricardo, the classical bourgeois political economist, and arrives at a more extended model accentuating the greater dynamics of some elements of the calculation and covering the international mobility of the factors of production and restraints on their mobility at home. Just as Ricardo, his analysis is based on a study of two countries and two products. Regarding labor productivity as a dynamic element, the author is able to show that specialization in one or another product may be desirable for a country lacking at the outset any relative advantages

for producing that product, but assured of long-range advantages.

In other chapters, Guzek draws interesting conclusions from the models of unlimited exchange and limited exchange. He examines the problems of balancing payments, the system of home and international prices, redistribution of the advantages implicit in the international specialization of production.

* * *

Adam Zwass examines some aspects of the system of cooperation between the CMEA countries in his *The Money of Two Markets*.* Zwass studies monetary relations in the capitalist world (before and after the Second World War), and examines money relations in the socialist economy against the setting of the economic integration of CMEA countries and the functions of the International Bank for Economic Cooperation.

Of interest from the standpoint of the theory and practice of socialist economic integration is that part of the book which describes and analyzes the distinctive features of monetary relations, the formation of the international socialist market and its instruments of exchange, the expanding division of labor among the CMEA countries and the consolidation of the trend towards multilateral commodity turnover, the convertibility of moneys circulating in the socialist market into gold or freely convertible currencies, exchange rates and money as the measure of international value in the socialist market.

The increasing function and material form of money in the socialist economy is described in relation to the evolution of economic management in the Soviet Union and the other European socialist countries, with the accent on the role of money in the current phase of this evolution. Relatively more space is devoted to the problem of monetary and financial relations in the socialist world market.

Zwass examines the functions of the International Bank for Economic Cooperation, its system of credits and multilateral settlements in the context of measures taken to secure multilateral trade relations between the socialist countries. He relates the problem of foreign trade effectiveness and greater economic accountability to the convertibility of socialist currencies, and analyzes the economic and organizational premises for solving the problem.

*Marian Guzek. *Zasada kosztów komparatywnych a problemy RWGP*. Warszawa, 1967.

*Adam Zwass. *Pieniądz dwóch rynków*. PWN, Warszawa, 1968.

The section on exchange rates is of special interest. It studies the significance of exchange rates for the existing monetary relations in the socialist countries and the modern capitalist economy. Zwass takes a critical view of the now current theories of exchange rates and offers criteria for fixing more justified rates, distinguishing between domestic and foreign scales. He holds that the exchange rates should depend on whether it is exclusively for domestic or for external purposes. As he sees it, to establish an adequate rate of exchange, one should begin by establishing a rate exclusively for domestic purposes, because the transition to convertible currency entails considerable difficulties.

The problem of money as a measure of international value in the socialist market is examined in relation to the system of prices in trade between socialist countries and the methodology of the international correlation of values.

* * *

Wieslaw Iskra's *Industrial Growth of CMEA Countries** differs from the other three books, being a comparative investigation of the levels and rates of industrial growth in the six European socialist members of CMEA. He devotes considerable space to Soviet economic relations with the other European socialist countries and accentuates the special role of the USSR in their industrial development. Iskra is chiefly concerned with the differences in

*Wieslaw Iskra. *Rozwoj przemysłowy krajów RWPG, PWE*, Warszawa, 1967.

levels of industrialization and the possibilities of a gradual narrowing of the gaps.

Of special interest is his study of the methods of international comparisons of production. A survey is offered, particularly of the Clark and Gilbert methods and the method employed by CMEA. The study leads up to the conclusion that "in the original version none of them is applicable in our computations." In view of the incomplete information about the structure of production and prices in the various countries, Iskra suggests a simplified method, which he describes as price-representative. In substance, he chooses sufficiently representative groups of commodities produced by the main industries in the countries concerned and expresses their value in Polish prices, comparing the magnitudes obtained thereby. The general correlation of the levels of industrialization is defined on the basis of partial magnitudes representing full magnitudes. The computations are based on representation comprising 30-40 per cent of the aggregate industrial products of the countries concerned.

The book traces the factors that brought about the differences in industrial levels. Attention is devoted to the role in industrial growth of manpower, investments, international economic relations, and the significance of foreign trade in coping with the investment and raw materials difficulties of the individual CMEA countries. The book examines some elements of the economic cooperation between CMEA countries.

S. G

Pages from a heroic struggle

For more than thirty years Spain has remained a topical subject. The Spain of today and of yesterday, the Spain of the morrow, are not just random years in the life of a people. They form the links of an uninterrupted chain in the history of a country and a people whose experience, and particularly the experience of the heroic struggle for freedom and democracy and against fascism, retain their significance.

The truth of this is evident in Dolores

Ibarruri's *In Struggle*,* the first volume of which was recently published in Spanish by the Moscow Publishing House, "Progress," and which will shortly appear in Russian. The volume contains the speeches, reports and article written or made by the chairman of the Communist Party of Spain in the period from March 2, 1936 to January 8, 1939, that is, beginning with

*Dolores Ibarruri. *En la Lucha*. Vol. I. Palabras y Hechos. 1936-1939. Moscu. Editorial Progreso, 1968. 368 pp.

the months preceding the Franco revolt and up to the last days of the national revolutionary war of the Spanish people against the combined forces of international fascism. This crucial period in the history of Spain—which reactionary journalists, writers, historians and politicians are assiduously trying to falsify—yielded a treasury of experience which is valid to this day and of importance not only to the Spanish people but also to the people of other countries.

It would be difficult to single out in a few words the main significant aspects of this volume of Pasionaria's articles and speeches. Is it in the truth it tells about our anti-fascist war? In the reaffirmation of its democratic and national character and the justice of its aims? In its vindication of the consequences for the destinies of Europe? Or, lastly, in its testimony to the selflessness of a people, described on pages "that still retain the astringent flavor of the battles fought on the fronts and behind the lines"?

Yes. But even more so in the fact that it gives a clear-cut, documented exposition of the democratic and national policy of unity, consistently pursued by the Communist Party of Spain through the years. Unity is the underlying theme of the contents of the volume, sustained in the author's articulate, terse style. The language of Dolores Ibarruri is the language of the fighter and journalist of the Leninist type who is able to spell out the most complex social and political problems, to bring the decisions of the party to the broad masses: worker and peasant, intellectual and student, young and old. The author does this with a laconism and an expressiveness that transform impassioned feelings into slogans of struggle and action, slogans that will ever symbolize the attitude of the entire people in those crucial days of their history:

"They shall not pass!"

"The Spanish people prefer to die standing rather than live on their knees!"

"Better to be the widow of a hero than the wife of a coward!"

The book substantiates the policy pursued by the Communist Party during the 32 months of the deepgoing social revolutionary and democratic transformations in the Spanish Republic and the heroic struggle at the front; it shows, on the basis of documents, the Spanish Communists' attitude to the pressing issues posed by the revolution and the war, specifically, the question of unity of the democratic, progressive

forces in the fight against fascism, the formation of a people's army, organization of a wartime industry, agrarian reform—the key problem in Spain's development—equality for the nationalities, the cultural revolution, democratic rights and liberties for the working people, and so on. The book reveals the firmness and dedication of the Communist Party throughout the national-revolutionary war, which was the prelude to the Second World War.

It is not by chance that we mention the dates of the documents which open and close the volume. One is the speech made by Dolores in Madrid on March 2, 1936 at a meeting dedicated to the revolutionary proletariat of the Asturias and to the victims of the 1934 October repressions, the other the call of January 8, 1939 to save Catalonia, which was threatened by fascist troops. The two documents are landmarks in the struggle of the Communist Party to unite the country's patriotic forces. The first speaks of the need to preserve and cement the anti-fascist unity embodied in the People's Front if the program of democratic measures is to be realized—a program which two weeks previously had ensured the People's Front its victory in the elections. The second document contains the impassioned call for the unity of the entire Spanish people to defend Catalonia, one of the national regions, which at that time signified saving the whole of Spain.

Thus, in the course of the war the Communist Party advanced from the policy of anti-fascist unity in the People's Front—and trade union and political unity of the proletariat as the basic element in this front with the object of effecting democratic transformations—to a policy of unity of the entire people, of all the nationalities inhabiting the country, in the name of preserving national independence and ensuring the country's free and democratic future. "Across the barriers of hatred, across the trenches which separate and divide our country," said Dolores in a speech in Paris on July 26, 1938, "we call to fight in defense of Spain, to preserve Spain as a free and independent country."

This was the beginning of the consistent policy of unity, subsequently to be enriched with new content and new forms, pursued by the Spanish Communists in the post-war. When, during the Second World War the Party fought for national unity and to prevent Spain being involved in the war on the side of Hitler, it was continuing its traditional policy of unity in new con-

ditions. The same holds true when it later came out in favor of a policy of national harmony which enabled it gradually to overcome the artificial division of the country into "victors" and "vanquished," and to put an end to the spirit of civil war cultivated by Franco. The same holds true today when it supports and stimulates the new working-class movement embodied in the workers' commissions, theoretically substantiates the possibility of and the need for an alliance of the forces of labor and culture, headed and led by the working class, to win political and social democracy and, eventually, to ensure Spain's transition from capitalism to socialism.

Another underlying theme is Pasionaria's work is the international significance of the Spanish war, its contribution to uniting the democratic and anti-fascist forces on a world scale. Dolores stresses that the Spanish people fought not only for the freedom and independence of their own country, but also for the preservation of world peace, the democratic gains which fascism, encouraged by the myopic "apostles of non-intervention," wanted to crush by terror. "Should our people be vanquished," she wrote on July 17, 1937 in a message to the women and mothers of the world, "a world war, a war which not a single nation will be able to avoid, will soon become a terrible reality." These prophetic words proved bitterly true: a short six months after the end of the Spanish war fascist Germany unleashed the Second World War.

The actions of anti-fascist forces in any country, every step towards their unity are

a contribution to the fight of the Spanish people and, consequently, to the defense of world peace. Republican Spain was then the country to whose aid the anti-fascist forces rallied. On November 1, 1938 in a moving farewell message to the volunteers of the glorious International Brigade, to "the soldiers of the great cause of the liberation of the peoples" as she called them, Dolores said: "Communists, socialists, anarchists, republicans, people of different races, of different ideologies and religions, but all infinitely loving freedom and justice, offered us their help . . . They came to our country like knights of freedom to fight and die for the freedom and independence of Spain which was threatened by German and Italian fascism."

This battle for the freedom, democracy and independence of Spain did not end in 1939, when the Spanish Republic was stabbed in the back. It continued in the difficult conditions of illegality throughout the black night of fascism in Spain. This fight, which aroused then and arouses now the admiration and pride of all progressive mankind, continues, but in a different world and in a different situation. It continues under the leadership of the Communist Party which today, like yesterday, is charting the true way that will end the Franco dictatorship and open before Spain new horizons of freedom, democracy and socialism. In this it is helped by the rich experience of the struggle acquired in the past thirty years and reflected in the selection of articles and speeches here reviewed.

Isidro R. MENDIETA

Class battles analyzed

A survey of "Economie et politique"

The powerful upsurge of class struggle in France last May and June attracted the attention of Communists everywhere.

No matter how social and national conditions may differ from country to country, the theoretical and practical experience of

the working class is invaluable for all Communist Parties, serving as an object of study and as a premise for conclusions of general significance for the fight for socialism. This is also true of the May-June experience, which confirmed the vanguard

position of the workers and the people of France in the fight for the democratic and socialist perspective in developed capitalist states. And as such it is being closely studied by the fraternal parties.

Documents of the July meeting of the Central Committee of the French Communist Party contain an analysis of the events and of its attitude during May-June 1968.

Party journals are now weighing the implications of the class battles. Among the many materials published so far special interest is evoked—precisely because of its concentration on theoretical principles—by the double (July-August) number of *Economie et politique*.*

Attention is attracted by the articles on the general topic: "Conditions and Perspectives of Present Struggles: From State-Monopoly Capitalism to New Democracy, Paving the Way to Socialism," the heading of a brief note by Paul Boccara, the eminent economist.

Boccara defines the objective economic and political content of the class struggle, stressing that in May-June the popular discontent had turned against the regime in general. This raised the unprecedented mass movement to a new level of consciousness. The fight for immediate and political demands involved students, teachers and all categories of mental workers. Nine million factory workers and other wage-earners took part in the unusually long strikes, projecting the immediate into socio-political demands.

However, Boccara noted, "the general conditions in which the battle is fought are not always properly appreciated, and the perspectives and actual alternatives not always correctly expressed." This judgment, at once a rebuke levelled at himself as a Communist theorist (for, after all, who but a Communist should express the perspectives of struggle correctly?), helps the writer explain why "the desire to end de Gaulle's regime and establish a new democracy" did not bring about the logical conclusion in the battle and, subsequently, in the results of the parliamentary election.

The basic choice for the masses, which did not entirely sink in—partly due to the influence of bourgeois ideology—was: either a refurbished regime of the monopolies ruling through an anti-democratic state, or a new economic and political democracy with a people's government in which the Communists and other Left par-

ties carry forward a common program of genuine social progress. Yet though the former gained a temporary victory, any impartial analysis will show the insuperable impact and inevitability of the latter.

Boccara demonstrates that the difficulties facing France and its people are rooted in the continuing rule of state-monopoly capitalism, which, he notes, is strongly developed in France where methodical intervention by the capitalist state in the economy is more widely employed than anywhere else. Yet scientific and technical progress, he adds, "not only makes possible, but increasingly necessitates, the orientation of the economy henceforth on the welfare of the nation, not on the advantage of a handful of billionaires."

State intervention was necessary to preserve the capitalist pillars of society, notably during the drawn-out depression of the 'thirties', when it became clear that the classical exploitation mechanism was no longer sufficient (for large enough profit, even if it grew) to ensure a sufficient rate of profit in relation to advanced capital. At present, the capitalist state props up big private capital with public funds, replacing it in the least profitable sectors of the economy and using nationalized enterprises in the interest of the monopolies. The state's economic and financial mechanism operates for the monopolies, against the people.

However, the technological leap is generating a crisis of the capitalist state-monopoly system. Despite all efforts, the rate of profit is again about to fall. "The new structural crisis of capitalism," Boccara observes, "is the result of the compulsive, new and extremely high expenditures by the capitalist enterprises and for social needs. Hence the dilemma, now more acute, of inflation or retarded growth facing even the United States in the midst of a dollar crisis, which will not be resolved until very profound structural reforms are initiated."

The Gaullists cannot take this progressive path. On the contrary, they are immersed still more deeply in the chase after monopoly profit, intensifying the capitalist system of exploitation. It was against this monopoly and state pressure that the people mounted their counter-offensive in May and June. The strikes and the political battles have yielded considerable material gains to the people, which the capitalist rulers are now seeking to annul.

Boccara denounces the demagoguery of the

*Les luttes de mai-juin 1968 et le capitalisme monopoliste d'Etat. *Economie et politique*, No. 168-169, 176 pp.

Gaullist regime, which, shaken to its foundations, is now trying to beguile the masses with promises. The anti-democratic nature of the capitalist system, he writes, cannot change its spots no matter what new signboards it hangs out. Nothing but a radical reconstruction of the socio-political system, a genuine economic and political democracy, "will make possible the elimination of the dictatorship of the rate of monopoly profit" by nationalizing banks, insurance companies, and gradually nationalizing the key industries, which are growing more concentrated, and expand ties with the state sector. Some industries, commerce, agriculture and the services, the writer says, will not be nationalized. However, they too will experience the leverage exercised by the national enterprises, and will be subject to democratic planning.

Setting forth the Communist Party's program for the immediate future, Boccara shows that nationalization, though essential, is insufficient. The state must be made democratic; it must be headed by a people's government of democratic alliance, including the Communists, a government responsible to a parliament in which the democratic parties collaborate and maintain close bonds with the people on the basis of a common government program. What is needed, he adds, is not only a democratic administration of nationalized enterprises, but a genuinely broad participation of all people in administration and planning.

Such participation will not materialize until nationalization attains sufficient momentum and the nature of the state is altered. "Then the creative initiative of the masses and individuals," the writer continues, "will begin to develop to the desired extent. Then information and discussion at all levels will elucidate for the masses the democratic option. By dint of the new economic structure and the growing role of the public sector, real democracy can begin to exist before the abolition of capitalism."

This perspective will, in due course, pave the way to socialism, a socialism, the writer says, "in harmony with the conditions of our country and the creative genius of our people; and, as we see it, this socialism will come into being in the subsequent stage through the free democratic choice of the people. During the new economic and political democracy that we envisage, the people will gain a knowledge of the economic and social contradictions and see how they are gradually resolved. Undoubtedly, they will appreciate the need to go the whole

way in abolishing the exploitation of man by man."

The fight against the capitalist oligarchy, which will resist this, will be a hard one, and the masses will have to be rallied for severe class struggle. The democratic gains of the people and the tilting of the scales in class relations in favor of democracy and socialism will assure victory and, what is more, a victory by peaceful means.

This forecast of developments is not just wishful thinking or the subjective preference of the Communists. It is fortified by a close study of the situation, primarily the development of the classes. Boccara notes that in the capitalist state-monopoly environment "the workers, and the mass of wage-earners converging more and more with them, are now sufficiently strong; the objective conditions produced by the new role of the public sector in the economy are sufficiently favorable to make possible (which, however, does not mean certain) revolutionary political mass struggle without resort to an armed uprising. With the support of the bulk of the people, the capitalist oligarchy and the police and military machinery of suppression will thereby be isolated the moment the transition to the new democracy takes place, in order to assure its development, and doubly so in the subsequent period, for the transition to socialism."

In another article, "State Monopoly Capitalism, Democracy and Socialism," Louis Perceval emphasizes that under state-monopoly capitalism the basic class contradiction of capitalist society tends to accentuate social polarization and differentiation within the two opposing classes. The working class attracts new sections of the population, whereas the capitalist class produces a dominant top crust—the financial oligarchy.

And in this context it is important to note that this top crust stands out as the exploiter, and also adversary, of the whole of society. Its dominance—and this, too, is accentuated with time—is based not only on the privilege of property, but also on the privilege of rule, which, though a specific category, merges with the former to control the property of others, the means of production and the results of the social labor. Understanding of this fundamental fact powers the democratic movement for abolition of the privilege of rule and the growth of specific demands towards that end. However, the self-preservation instinct shows the ruling class the source of

the growing menace to its domination. This, incidentally, explains why the monopoly bourgeoisie and its ideologists are now at such pains to mislead the masses by talk about "participation" and similar slogans.

Analyzing the origins and development of state monopoly capitalism, Perceval writes: "What we have is the merger of two parallel processes: concentration of economic power in major sectors of production, i.e., monopolization of society's material and economic base, and concentration of political power, i.e., of part of the social superstructure. The two are merged under the control of the financial oligarchy which, directly or through trusted servants, runs the state to suit its purpose.

"The result is a new politico-economic entity with its distinctive features (albeit changeable), but deeply and dialectically contradictory and belonging both to superstructure and base of society."

The author goes on to discuss the role of the state under state-monopoly capitalism, regarding it as a "virtually collective exploitive superstructure" and, at the same time, by virtue of its increased economic function, "the central element of the economic basis of society, of the sum-total of production relations at the given level of productive forces." The state, he writes, "even shares in the latter and in the material base of society."

Consequently, Perceval continues, "the antagonistic contradiction between the social character of production and the private form of appropriation is further accentuated and finds expression, at state level, as a contradiction between the state's economic role—objectively justified now, even if favoring the monopolies—and its growing role as an oppressive force serving the financial oligarchy." This is an antagonistic contradiction that can be resolved only through socialization of the means of production; it can be removed only by socialism.

Without going into the dialectics of state and society under socialism, the author points to the importance of the relationship between the two in the process of altering the relation of economics and politics after the capitalist antagonisms have been eliminated. For after socialization, "the state will gradually wither away as a superstructure, as a coercive force, though it will continue to be a fundamental element of the material and economic base of

society right up to the ultimate stage of communism."

Needless to say, these concepts and their forms of expression require further study and more precise formulation.

The Marxist-Leninist method is also present in Perceval's treatment of the contradictions of social development, notably under state-monopoly capitalism, to which he devotes much of his article. The chief contradiction of state-monopoly capitalism is manifested in a variety of forms and from this he concludes that social development has its source in a complex system of contradictions. This, doubtlessly one of the most interesting passages in the article, merits closer attention.

Theoretical analysis leads Perceval to the conclusion that the objective and subjective factors of state-monopoly capitalism in the developed capitalist countries offer new ways of transition to socialism. "This is especially so in France and Europe generally," he writes, "where specific conditions of history, internal and external, make these countries one of the weakest links of the imperialist system."

He demonstrates the profoundly democratic nature of socialist reconstruction, stressing that the full development of democracy (as formulated by Lenin), "acquires a fundamentally revolutionary character in our day and in our country."

In common with Boccara, Perceval reminds the reader that in May-June the menace of violent suppression of the democratic will of the masses (by holding up the bogey of civil war, etc.) did not emanate from the Left, certainly not from the Communists, but from the ruling class. In this context he cites the Marxist-Leninist definition of bourgeois dictatorship, a very tangible reality in every bourgeois democratic republic which the experience of May and June, with its threats of armed reaction, should teach us never to overlook. Perceval also cites the Marxist-Leninist definition of proletarian dictatorship as opposed to that of the bourgeoisie.

In present-day French conditions, he notes, "the very scope of an alliance of classes (centered on the working class—A.D.), allows for the hope that the coercion a people's government might use against the exploiters, notably the financial oligarchy, could be restricted to a small minority." History has proved the "necessity—now more than ever before—of majority coercion against the minority in order to establish and maintain the new foundations

of society." The relation of class forces on a world scale is a major positive factor in the rise and development of the "new form of transition to socialism in conditions of state-monopoly capitalism," i.e., genuine anti-monopoly democracy. And the advance from anti-monopoly struggle to socialism will be facilitated and accelerated by the existence of a material base for socialism. The path will be through development and extension of democracy, free expression for the masses, retention of the broad class alliance, and continuation of the class struggle.

Marxism-Leninism regards proletarian dictatorship as implying "the broadest democracy the people have ever known," and Perceval remarks that "in our day the dictatorship of the monopoly bourgeoisie could be opposed by 'the power of the working class and the entire people' . . . It is safe to say that the transition to socialism in our conditions implies the broadest conceivable democracy, both in form and in terms of the social strata involved—genuine democracy always relying on the initiative and experience of the masses in a continuous process of renewal."

Several theoretical problems are posed by Jacques Servant in his article "Wages, Productivity, Competitiveness and Democratic Control," and by Alexis Cousin in "Democratic Nationalization and Structural Reforms." Servant dissects the mechanism which enables the exploiters to appropriate the results of higher productivity. Even from the standpoint of capitalist economics, he writes, the French ruling class has little to show by way of achievement: "productivity of capital" (the investment-sales ratio) in engineering and electronics is half that of the United States, and the principal reason for France's economic difficulties should be sought not in partial factors, which the financial oligarchy uses to explain (or rather confuse) the issue. It should be sought in the capitalist nature of production, the absence of an overall investment plan, the anarchy of competition.

With the expansion of production it becomes ever more imperative to give the producers, the workers and their collectives, a wide share in management. The Gaullist disquisitions about "participation" in no way alter the basic fact that the capitalist or his representative remains at the helm and gears production to the drive for profits. The people have no say whatever. As Servant remarks: "Even the best managed capitalism is a gigantic squandering of in-

tellect, talent, initiative and responsibility . . . The heirs of the Communards will, together with all democrats, build a system in which freedom and socialism are inseparable and economic management, at all levels, effectuated in the interests of man."

Servant also deals with the important problems of how satisfaction of the workers' demands affects small and medium enterprises and their owners. For we know that the monopoly bourgeoisie exploits their difficulties—the result of its own predatory policies—to redirect their discontent against the working class. This tactic succeeded at the time of the Popular Front (1936-38) and seriously weakened unity of the democratic forces.

The author explains the implications of the Communist demands for nationalization, rational allocation of productive forces and democratic planning, which, in the long range, are the only means of solving the problems confronting the monopoly-robbled small entrepreneur.

Lastly, Servant dwells on democratic control at factory level which, he suggests, can be exercised, given definite conditions, through the Factory Committees set up in the early postwar years when the Communist Party was in the government. Wider opportunities for the working class will depend on further extension of the struggle that led to their emergence.

Cousin examines the problems involved in nationalization which, he says, is "the modern democratic form of industrial concentration." The upsurge of the democratic struggle following World War II led to far-reaching measures in nationalization and democratic and social rights far beyond any the worker had hitherto enjoyed under capitalism. However, the role of nationalized industry and the conditions of its workers depend to a decisive degree on the nature of the state. Bureaucratic obstacles, the dead-weight of the authoritarian state, orientation of nationalized industry on the needs of monopoly capital, all combine to prevent steady and balanced economic development.

Hence, the author argues, the progressive orientation of nationalization, in the past as well as in the future, is closely linked with and dependent upon democratic social development. "There is a growing and vital need to direct the current struggle towards the far-reaching political and economic structural reforms" spelled out in the Communist Party's nationalization pro-

gram, which Cousin explains at some length.

Other articles (by Claude Vernay, Henri Nolleau and Jean Magniadas, Guy Baron, Jean Launay and Claude Vernay, and Robert Pirolli) discuss the strike struggle and the government's anti-labor and promonopoly economic policy.

Jacques Kahn has two articles. In the first, he examines the "participation formula, the Gaullist propaganda cover for state-monopoly capitalism. These new-fangled theories about worker "participation" in profits, management, etc., are not really new at all. They date back to the early 19th century utopias about "association of labor and capital," the purpose of which, in the words of one of their advocates, was to "write finis to the old system of class struggle." The author measures these "participation" catchwords against the class realities of capitalism which the Gaullist regime is trying so hard to embellish or disguise. The French workers reject this "participation" humbug and are fighting for real rights, for democratic solutions achievable in full measure only with the advent of socialism.

Kahn's second article is devoted to the international monetary crisis. Launay and Bourdet take as their theme major aspects of French economic development and the ideological struggle generated by the May-June events.

* * *

This special number of *Economie et politique* is not the result of long meditation by ivory tower scholars. Most of the contributions, as the introduction points out, were born "in the crucible of the May-June struggle" and appeared as pamphlets for the Communist election campaign. Our French comrades have rendered a distinct service in posing and discussing these important theoretical and practical problems. The discussion, in this and other French Communist publications, of the social implications of the May-June events will be read with interest not only by French fighters for democracy and socialism but by representatives of other detachments of the international workers' and Communist movement.

A. DROBAN

Socialism, the technical revolution and democracy

This is the title of an article in a recent issue of *Einheit* (No. 8, 1968), theoretical journal of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany.*

Its author, Hans Schaul, regards socialism, the technological revolution and democracy as three aspects of a single process in which the present and future of the German Democratic Republic are being shaped.

The worldwide technological revolution, Schaul says, is a form of development of the productive forces, but only in a socialist society does this benefit the people. In fact, the technological revolution presents

immense opportunities for socialist progress.

The industrial revolution gave us the capitalist system which transformed man into an appendage of the machine, into a link in the production process. The modern technological revolution, the author emphasizes, is part of an opposite process: man can be the maker and the master of the new productive forces, but only if the technological revolution is combined with socialism. Of course, under socialism, too, the technological revolution poses complex problems. But they can be resolved in the interests of social progress, and the guarantee of this is socialism, its revolutionary practice, humanism, democracy, the talents

*Hans Schaul, *Sozialismus, wissenschaftlich-technische Revolution und Demokratie. Einheit*, No. 8, pp. 931-944.

and the devotion of the members of socialist society.

The author deals in detail with implementation of the GDR socialist Constitution and the mechanism of socialist democracy which, he says, is concrete and real democracy. And the Socialist Unity Party is directing all its efforts towards its maximum development. In this it can rely on the high level of consciousness and initiative of the people and their keen interest in heightening technical and productivity levels.

The GDR has a highly-developed industry and agriculture and has attained a high degree of economic specialization, cooperation and concentration; this must be matched by a correspondingly high level of consciousness and discipline by the people.

The author analyzes the factors determining the development of democracy. Under the new Constitution of April 8, 1968, all power is exercised by the people. Man is in the center of all the efforts of socialist society and of the socialist state. Schaul writes: "A closer understanding of the socialist system, an understanding of socialist society as a relatively independent socio-economic formation in which social and economic laws are realized through human activity, make it necessary to con-

centrate on moulding the man of socialist society and on teaching him to tackle and solve increasingly complex problems."

The process of building a developed socialist society in the GDR accentuated the unity and interdependence of the community and the individual and has enlarged the latter's sphere of freedom and activity.

The article discusses the underlying principle of political growth in the GDR—democratic centralism. Centralized planning and supervision are combined with independence for the socialist collectives and the initiative of the people, so that all problems are approached in a way that assures purposive, competent and effective solutions.

In discussing economic progress in the GDR, the author denounces the ideological sallies of bourgeois propaganda, with its appeals to "decentralize" the economy and "denationalize" industry. The present level of the productive forces, he emphasizes, objectively necessitates breaking out of the framework of capitalism and changing over to economic planning.

As Schaul sees it, the strength of socialism lies primarily in the strength of the people, led by the revolutionary working class and its Marxist-Leninist party and united in building a socialist society.

G. KRAUSE

Books listed here are in the language of the country of publication

MARX K., ENGELS, F. *Sychineniya* (Works), Vol. XXIV. Sofia, BKP, 1968. 640 pp.

MARX, K. *Mathematicheskiye rukopisi* (Mathematical Manuscripts). Moscow, Politizdat, 1968. 640 pp.

BALKHAAZHAY, Ts. *Orchin ueiyn Mongol orny tuukhen khogzhliyn dialektik* (The Developmental Dialectics of Modern Mongolia). Socio-philosophical survey. Ulan-Bator, Ulsyn Kheveliyn Khereg Erkhlekh Khoroo, 1968. 144 pp.

Die Wissenschaft von der Wissenschaft. Philosophische Probleme der Wissenschaftstheorie (The Science of Science. Philosophical Problems of the Theory of Science). By a group of researchers from the Institute of Philosophy of Karl Marx University in Leipzig. Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1968. 339 pp.

DOBROWOLSKI, S. W. *Socjaldemocracja europejska a rozbrojenie w latach 1945-1964* (European Social Democracy and Disarmament in 1945-64). Wroclaw, Ossolineum, 1968. 235 pp.

HYVONEN A. *Suomen Kommunistisen puolueen 50-vuotistaival* (The 50th Anniversary of the Communist Party of Finland). Tampere, Sanan Tie, 1968. 44 pp.

KENDE, J. *Nyolcvannyolc haboru. 1945-1967* (Eighty-Eight Wars. 1945-67). Budapest, Kossuth Konyvkiado, 1968. 152 pp.

KLUGMAN, J. *History of the Communist Party of Great Britain. Formation and Early Years. Volume 1, 1919-1924*. London, Lawrence & Wishart Ltd., 1968. 381 pp.

MARCHLEWSKI, J. *Materialy sesji naukowej z okazji 100 rocznicy urodzin* (Transactions of Session on the Centenary of Marchlewski's birth). Warsaw, PWN, 1968. 282 pp.

MATERN, H. *Im Kamp fuer Frieden, Demokratie und Sozialismus*. (In the Struggle for Peace, Democracy and Socialism). Selected articles and speeches. Vol. III, 1963-68. Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1968. 784 pp.

OBRETENOV, Al. *Kulturnata revolutsia v Bylgariya* (The Cultural Revolution in Bulgaria). Sofia, BKP, 1968. 150 pp.

Problemy sovremennogo imperializma (Problems of Modern Imperialism). Moscow, Politizdat, 1968. 295 pp.

ZHIVKOV, T. *Osnovi nasoki za po-natytshnoto razvitiye na sistemata na upravleniye na nasheto obshchestvo* (The Main Trends in the Guidance of Our Society). Report to a plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party, July 24, 1968. Sofia, BKP, 1968. 184 pp.

ULLE, D. *Technik und Kultur im Imperialismus* (Technology and Culture under Imperialism). Criticism of the West German bourgeois philosophy of culture. Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1968. 238 pp.

Ekonomicheskiye osnovy mirovoi sotsialisticheskoi sistemy (The Economic Foundation of the Socialist World System). Moscow, Mysl, 1968. 214 pp.

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 I, D.F.

Empresa Editora Austral
San Francisco 36,
Casilla 13201
Santiago, Chile
Editorial "Anteo,"
Entre Rios 1033,
Buenos Aires,
Argentina

SWEDISH EDITION
Arbetarkultur, Kungsgt 84,
Stockholm K, Sweden

VIETNAMESE EDITION
So'o xuất nhập khẩu sách bao 32,
Hai Ba trung, Hà-noi

