

**IMPERIALIST
STRATEGY TODAY**

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW



PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM

1969

35 CENTS

WORKERS OF ALL
COUNTRIES, UNITE!

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

Theoretical and
Information Journal
of Communist and
Workers' Parties

MARCH, 1969
VOLUME 12
NUMBER 3

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 Fiftieth anniversary of the Communist International (new documents, letters, recollections)**
DECISION ON THE WAR DANGER, PRESIDUM, EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL LETTERS TO LENIN (from C. Zetkin, L. Stenved, T. Bell, R. Luxemburg)
THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL—SOME REFLECTIONS
J. KOPLINIG
- 16 Socialist internationalism — guideline in activity of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia on the international scene**
V. BILAK
- 23 Some lessons of the Hungarian Soviet Republic**
I. SZIRMAI
- 29 Austrian Party Congress**
F. MUHRI
- 34 Theory and practice of building socialism**
THROUGH COOPERATION TO PROGRESS. (Interview with representatives of international organizations of socialist countries)
SCIENCE SERVES THE PEOPLE. (Interview with MIRON NICOLESCU, President of the Academy of Science of the Socialist Republic of Rumania)
- 44 Viewpoints**
IMPERIALIST STRATEGY TODAY
I. INOZEMTSEV
- 52 In the communist and workers' parties**
GUATEMALAN PARTY OF LABOR: FOR UNITY AND AGAINST ERRONEOUS TENDENCIES
COMMUNIST PARTICIPATION IN THE GOVERNMENT AND SOME ASPECTS OF CLASS STRUGGLE IN FINLAND
In brief: CONDUCT DIALOGUE FROM STANDPOINT OF PRINCIPLE • FROM THE DRAFT POLICY STATEMENT OF THE GERMAN COMMUNIST PARTY • CONFERENCE OF URUGUAYAN COMMUNISTS • AGAINST MILITARY ALLIANCE WITH THE UNITED STATES
M. S. JONAMA
G. ASPLUND
- 66 Communications and comment**
THE PARIS TALKS AND WASHINGTON DANGERS OF ISRAELI POLICY
Z. BRONIAREK
S. KHAMIS
- 71 Readers' questions**
BACKGROUND TO EVENTS IN NORTHERN IRELAND
J. G.
- 75 Against the persecution of democrats**
INDONESIAN PATRIOTS FIGHT ON
ATROCITIES IN IRAN
BOLIVIAN "GORILLAS" IN DIFFICULTIES
UNCONQUERABLE WILL
NO TO TYRANNY!
A. HUSSEINI
V. K.
L. PADILLA
J. GONZALEZ
- 84 Books and journals**
BOOKS BY CHILEAN COMMUNISTS
AS A COMMUNIST SEES IT
W. ATIAS
G. P.
- 89 SUPPLEMENT**

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

Materials about the Communist International founded 50 years ago. A decision on the war danger by the Presidium of the Communist International Executive appears in print for the first time. So does a series of letters to V. I. Lenin by Communists of other countries. Recollections by the late J. Koplenig, prominent figure in the world Communist movement, appear under the same head.

Vasil BILAK, Presidium member, Central Committee secretary, Communist Party of Czechoslovakia:

A neutral Czechoslovakia is simply inconceivable in the present world rent by irreconcilable contradictions. The country can go on building socialism and achieve success only hand in hand with all the socialist countries, especially the Soviet Union.

Istvan SZIRMAI, Political Bureau member, Central Committee secretary, Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party:

The Hungarian Soviet Republic of 1919 proved not only the worldwide influence exerted by the October Revolution; it demonstrated also the universality of the basic concepts of socialist revolution, of Leninism.

Franz MUHRI, Chairman, Communist Party of Austria:

On the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of Austria.

Heads of the socialist countries' international bodies

describe the functions of the International Bank of Economic Cooperation, Intermetal, Organization for Cooperation in the Bearings Industry and the Joint Nuclear Research Institute. The second in a series of interviews with Presidents of the Academies of Science of the socialist countries features Miron Nicolescu, President of the Academy of Science of Rumania.

Viewpoints

This section features Academician Inozemtsev, Soviet scholar, writing about the basic features of contemporary imperialist strategy.

Mario Silva Jonama, Political Commission member, Central Committee secretary, Guatemalan Party of Labor:

The Party has its historical mission: to develop and guide the process of the Guatemalan revolution, the way for which—a people's revolutionary war—has already been defined.

Gunnar Asplund, Central Committee member, Communist Party of Finland:

On Communist participation in the Finnish government and the concomitant problems of the class struggle.

Communications and Comment

The section contains a survey of the Vietnam negotiations in Paris and a commentary on the dangerous policies of the Israeli militarists.

Readers' Questions:

Background to the events in Northern Ireland.

Against the persecution of democrats

Atrocities committed by reactionary regimes and the mounting resistance of the people.

Books and Journals

Works of Chilean Marxists and a book by Ib Norlund reviewed.

Fiftieth anniversary of the Communist International

Some Previously Unpublished Documents, Letters, Recollections

In March 1919, workers' representatives from many countries met in Moscow to found the Third Communist International. Our mission, the founders wrote, is to sum up the experience of the working class, purge the movement from the corrupting influence of opportunism, and unite the efforts of all truly revolutionary parties.

In the subsequent 25 years the Comintern helped to found, consolidate and unify Communist parties on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, and strengthen the unity of the working class in the fight against imperialism and fascism, for socialism.

An article in our previous issue by Boris Ponomarev analyzed the basic trends in the work of the Communist International, showing its historical significance.

Below, we print a hitherto unpublished document relating to the war danger in the thirties, adopted by the Presidium of the Comintern's Executive on April 1, 1936.

The decisions of the Comintern's 7th Congress (July-August, 1935) occupy a prominent place in the history of the International, setting out a clear strategic plan, defining flexible tactics in combating the fascist offensive and the danger of another world war, and pressing for the unity of all anti-fascist, anti-imperialist forces. Some months later, in the spring of 1936, a meeting of the Presidium, attended, among others, by such prominent leaders of the international Communist movement as Geor-

gi Dimitrov, D. Manuilsky, Maurice Thorez, Palmiro Togliatti, Klement Gottwald, Wilhelm Pieck, Harry Pollitt and Bela Kun, returned once more to the subject of the war danger. The document printed below, the outcome of the discussion, adds to our appreciation of the Comintern's efforts to combat fascist aggression and avert the danger of another world war.

The founding of the Comintern, its entire history, especially that of its earlier years, are most closely associated with Lenin whose revolutionary genius left its imprint on the work of the international organization. Lenin, a real man of the people, was closely associated with revolutionaries in many countries. Party leaders and rank-and-file Communists turned to Lenin for counsel. Letters (printed below) by Clara Zetkin (Germany), L. J. Stenved (Denmark), Thomas Bell (Great Britain), and a note by Rosa Luxembourg, a testimonial of sincere respect and deep trust, sent shortly before her death, are, therefore, not without interest.

Notes by Johann Koplenig (Austria) on the history of the Communist International, written shortly before his death, are printed for the first time.

Both the Comintern document (1936) and the letters to Lenin were prepared for publication by the Institute of Marxism-Leninism in Moscow. Koplenig's notes appear by courtesy of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Austria.

Decision on the war danger, Presidium, Executive Committee, Communist International

(April 1936)

1. Not since 1914 has the danger of war been as great as now.

Following upon the occupation of Manchuria by Japan and the attack on Abyssinia by the Italian fascists, the German fascists, the main architects of war on the continent of Europe, who have moved up their troops from the Rhine to the French border,¹ are creating thereby a direct threat to France and Belgium, are preparing to destroy Czechoslovakia as an independent state, to annex Austria and to occupy Memel and Lithuania, are trying to enmesh Poland in a war on their side, and to gain a staging area for an assault on the Soviet Union in the East.

In the Far East, nursing the ambition to be complete masters of Asia, the Japanese fascist militarists are seizing area after area in China, moving towards British colonial possessions (India), planning to seize the Philippines and Australia, and preparing for a decisive clash for supremacy in the Pacific. Working hand in glove with the German fascists and presenting an immediate threat to the frontiers of the Soviet Union, the Japanese militarists are also preparing for war against the United States and Great Britain.

There are, then, two seedbeds of the war danger.

And so we see that the warmongers in the West and in the East, reinforcing each other's aggression in every way, threaten to embroil the whole world in a ruthless and destructive war.

Maintained in power by waging an internal war against its own people, fascism is now a direct military danger to all countries. Having enslaved its own people, it

is carrying the torch of war and taking the offensive against other peoples. For this reason, *bridling the fascist architects of war and fighting for peace is now the main task* of the international working class. Success in combating fascism will depend on the scale of the popular movement against the fascist aggression. Working for peace, the working class safeguards not only the interests of the peoples, of mankind, it brings nearer the defeat of fascism and ensures its own final victory.

Acting on the decisions of the Seventh Congress of the Comintern, the Communist parties must display the maximum initiative and energy and, taking into consideration the concrete conditions and the state of the working-class movement in their countries, find the necessary ways and the means for successfully fulfilling this vital task of the international working class.

2. The danger of war, implicit in the sharpening of all the contradictions of the imperialist system, is now so threatening because no barriers were erected to German fascism on its way to power, because its war preparations (compulsory military service, air and naval rearming) were condoned by the capitalist powers and directly abetted by the British government, because the British imperialists give tacit support to German fascism's predatory claims, and because the passivity and dithering of the League of Nations in relation to the Japanese drive in China and to Italy's aggression in Abyssinia signifies encouragement to the aggressors.

But, the growing aggressiveness of German fascism and Japanese militarism

stems above all from the fact that the international working class has been unable to overcome the resistance of the reactionary section of the leaders of the Second International and of the Amsterdam Trade Union International to a united front against the warmakers.²

Yet the refusal of these leaders who support the imperialist policy of their bourgeoisie to take joint independent anti-war action, lulling the masses with the illusion that the League of Nations will do everything needed to safeguard peace, has weakened the working-class anti-war movement and its pressure on the capitalist governments.

3. The peoples do not want war. The peoples want peace. A united proletarian front against the warmakers accords with the aspirations of the masses. The experience of the French and Spanish workers who by uniting their forces won over other sections of the people for the fight against fascism, shows that it is possible to bar the road to fascism, and equally possible to bar the way to the warmakers, to preserve peace, provided the workers succeed in building up a powerful united peace front in every country and on an international scale.

"Today, the cause of peace is backed not only by the working class, the peasants and other working people, but also by the oppressed nations and the small nations, whose independence is imperilled by new wars. Even some of the biggest capitalist states, worried lest they should lose in any new re-division of the world, are interested at present in averting a war . . . Combating the war danger, the workers of the world have at their disposal not only the weapon of mass action as in 1914 . . . but also the state influence of the Soviet Union . . . Hence the possibility of a broad front, consisting of the working class, all working people and the entire nations, against the threat of an imperialist war . . . It will depend on the scale of the world-wide front and on its actions whether the fascists, the imperialist warmakers, succeed in igniting the flames of another imperialist war in the foreseeable future or whether their dirty hand is stayed by a powerful anti-war front" (Dimitrov at the Seventh Congress of the Communist International).

Only a united working class can organize this peace front, be its moving spirit and intensify the struggle for peace. By join-

ing forces the working class will impart to the mass actions against the warmongers and their agents and henchmen in the various countries a strength which will swamp the fascist aggressor and compel the capitalist governments to take measures to safeguard peace.

Today, a decisive step towards united action by the world proletariat would be for the Communist party in each country to *promote an active, unrelenting, all-embracing peace campaign* in all spheres of public and political life. The Communists should not put off this campaign until joint action pacts are concluded with the leadership of the Social-Democratic Party, though they should certainly link it with efforts to establish united action by the Communist and Social-Democratic parties. The Communists are working to overcome the reactionary Social-Democratic leaders' resistance to a united front and to strengthen the bonds of joint action against the common enemy at local levels between the Communist and Social-Democratic masses. Promoting closer relations between Communist and Social-Democratic workers, drawing the Social-Democratic masses into action for peace, this campaign will enliven and unite all the working-class forces not only nationally, but also on the international scale. This upsurge of a united working-class movement would help in a tangible way to draw into the movement other sections in town and country—the petty bourgeoisie, peasants and intellectuals and all peace supporters; this will accelerate the emergence of an invincible front of the people against the incendiaries of war.

4. For joint action for peace by the workers and the broad masses to be truly successful, the blows in every country must be aimed at the *direct warmakers* on the international scene and *those forces in the country* that aid them directly or indirectly. For this reason, the Communist Party in each country should have a specific tactical line in the action for peace. In Britain, for example, the Communists should firmly oppose the Government's policy of supporting the Hitler regime and its aggression (loans, the naval agreement and compromises). In France, fighting against the threat of a Hitler invasion, the communists should aim their fire against Hitler's agents and henchmen in the country, rally the masses against the government which is gravitating towards a deal with the German aggressor at the price of

betraying the interests and independence of the French and other peoples. In the *United States*, the Communists should expose the policy of what is, in effect, support for the warmakers under the guise of neutrality. They should demand government backing for all measures aimed against the architects of war in behalf of peace. In *Poland*, the Communist endeavor should be to secure annulment of the Polish-German military alliance, likely to embroil Poland in a war that could result in her partition and national enslavement;³ they should work for a security pact between Poland, Czechoslovakia and the USSR.

Meanwhile, the Communists in the countries directly threatened by the fascist war incendiaries should closely associate matters of national defense with demands for greater democratic rights for workers and peasants, working in defense of their vital interests, because only democratization, democratization of the army, purging the army of fascists and other reactionaries and meeting the vital demands of the workers and peasants, can reinforce the *defense capacity* of the people against fascist attack. As devoted advocates of defense of the country and the people against fascist enslavement, the Communists cannot be indifferent to matters of national defense against the aggressor. However, their stand on this issue should always be based on the interests of the workers and the interests of genuine defense. In each concrete situation the Communists must support proposals and measures offering the maximum opportunity for mass pressure on the foreign policy of the government and assuring effective public control over the government in matters of defense. Further, the Communists must work for all measures that hinder surrender to the fascist aggressor by the bourgeois government and prevent betrayal of the people's independence and freedom. While stressing constantly that only workers' rule can ensure reliable defense of the country and its independence, the Communists must, in face of the direct threat of fascist aggression, work for a popular front government which would take firm action against fascism and other reactionaries at home, against agents and abettors of the warmongers, secure control over the country's defense by the organized masses and thereby invigorate the people's capacity for defense against the fascist aggression. However, since power is held by bourgeois governments that offer no guarantee of any defense and use their armed

forces against the people, the Communists cannot undertake any political responsibility for the defense measures of those governments and should, therefore, take a public stand against the government's war policy and against the war budget in general. To be sure, in particular cases this does not rule out well-grounded abstention by Communists in voting on those separate defensive measures obstructing aggression (e.g., reinforcing the frontiers) any more than voting and speaking for measures designed to protect the people from the horrors of war (e.g., gas shelters, gas masks, medical aid, etc.).

In countries with fascist governments, the war incendiaries, the Communists must put the accent in the mass struggle against the fascist dictatorship on exposing chauvinist demagoguery and ideological preparations for war, rallying all forces for averting the military disaster into which fascism threatens to plunge the people.

It is the sacred duty of the workers of all countries and of all champions of peace to support the people in the fascist countries, especially the German people, in their fight for deliverance from fascist dictatorship, against fascist aggression. In combating fascist rule, fascist aggression, the workers and the masses in Germany, Italy and in the other fascist countries are acting not only for their own deliverance, but also in the interest of peace, in the interest of all peoples, all mankind.

5. In view of the military offensive launched by fascism, which is taking advantage of the disarray in the parties and organizations of the working class in some countries, the support given to the fascists by the reactionary Social-Democratic leaders on the hypocritical pretext of concern for "peace," the division among the workers cultivated by these leaders, sacrificing worldwide proletarian solidarity to the interests of their national bourgeoisie, the working-class movement in all countries must on all accounts carry forward *a single international working-class policy in the interests of peace*.

This single international working-class policy calls for:

a) restoring and strengthening genuine international proletarian solidarity on behalf of the masses; a resolute break by the Social-Democratic parties with the policy of supporting the imperialist interests of their bourgeoisie;

b) full support for the peace policy of the Soviet Union, the proletarian state championing international peace; this pre-

supposes above all resolute action by the working-class parties against counter-revolutionary attempts to identify Soviet foreign policy with the policy of the imperialist states, to identify with the imperialist armies the Red Army of the USSR which is a bulwark of peace—attempts which play into the hands of the fascist warmakers;

c) purposeful and concentrated blows at all times against the fascist aggressor, which presupposes denouncing all attempts to obscure the difference between fascist and non-fascist states and a differentiated approach to the aggressor, on the one hand, and his victims, on the other;

d) action for peace by the working class independent of the capitalist governments and of the League of Nations, ruling out subordination of the working-class movement to behind-the-scenes machinations of imperialist governments in the League of Nations.

6. Concerning the decisions reached by the London conference of the Second International and the Amsterdam Trade Union International,⁴ the Communists declare their readiness to work jointly for a universal mutual aid and security pact that would include the USSR, for arms reduction, for effective action against the instigators of war. However, the Communists cannot overlook the fact that this conference of the Second International and the Amsterdam Trade Union International, torn by internal contradictions and giving way to the pressure of the reactionary Right-wing, evaded the urgent issue of united working-class action on a national and international scale; instead of summoning the workers to act independently under their own slogans, it confined itself to an appeal to support the League of Nations; it took no stand in defense of China against the Japanese attack and did not condemn those Labor and Social-Democratic leaders who expressed themselves in favor of the aggressive policy of German fascism, camouflaging their obsequious stand vis-à-vis Hitler with talk about "safeguarding peace."

7. To succeed in building a united peace front nationally and internationally, we must take issue with those British Labor Party leaders and those Social-Democratic leaders in the Scandinavian and other countries who favor accepting the quasi-pacifist Hitler proposals for a pact with the Western countries, thereby vindicating the stationing of German troops along the French frontier and the other aggressive designs of the German fascists. The Communists

must show the masses that, like the German and Austrian Social-Democrats whose defeatist policy cleared the way for fascism, advocates of a pro-Hitler orientation are strengthening the hand of the German fascists on the grounds of a hypocritical pacifism in foreign policy, helping the Nazis in their aggressive aims and thus deceiving the masses, dulling their vigilance against the war danger.

8. The workers, above all Communist and Left Socialist workers, should be warned against possible attempts by the reactionary Social-Democratic leaders to pose the question of a redistribution of raw material sources, colonies and mandated territories in order to divert the attention of the peoples from the concrete fight against the instigators of war.

Behind these proposals lies the desire to allot colonies to the German fascists, thereby adding to the war-making potential of the Nazis. It is not for the proletariat to seek a redivision of colonies and mandates on behalf of the imperialists; its task is to support the struggle of the colonial peoples for their interests and rights, for final deliverance from the imperialist yoke. It is the task of the workers, of all working-class parties and first and foremost of the Communists—and this especially today—to take a resolute stand on behalf of the people of China, whose national defense against the Japanese invasion is not only a sacred duty in the name of their own liberation, but also a most important sector of the united worldwide front of the proletariat and all peoples against the architects of war, for the preservation of peace.

9. While drawing the broadest possible sections of the people into the peace movement, the Communists must at the same time conduct propaganda continuously among the masses in order to expose the false pacifism of those Right and "Left" reformists, etc., who, while generously bandying declarations about peace, are trying on various pretexts to impede the fight against the instigators of another world war. Every argument advanced by the quasi-pacifists must be analyzed in detail and defeated by clear and convincing arguments, patiently *elucidating* the substance of the matter to the masses. It is especially important to expose the following quasi-pacifist arguments:

a) Some support the Nazi government, saying that "no government wants war" (Attlee, leader of the Labor Party in Britain), while others (like the leaders of the British Independent Labor Party) say that

all governments are equally guilty of war preparations. The latter go so far as to invoke Lenin who, during the 1914-18 imperialist war, correctly rejected the argument of the social chauvinists, "we were attacked, we are defending ourselves." At that time the world was divided into two imperialist military coalitions, each straining for world supremacy, each preparing and provoking an imperialist war. There were no countries then where the workers had triumphed, nor were there any fascist dictatorships. Today, the situation is different. Now there are (1) a proletarian state, the main bulwark of peace; (2) definite fascist aggressors (Germany, Italy, Japan); (3) a number of countries directly threatened by fascist aggression, loss of statehood and national independence (Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Austria, etc.); (4) other capitalist states (France, USA, etc.), which at present have a definite stake in preserving peace. It would therefore be absolutely incorrect at present to consider all states as aggressors: only people who want to shield the actual aggressors can distort the facts to that extent.

(b) Some say: "Being champions of world peace we must come to terms about peace with Hitler Germany." But the Hitler government does not want peace. It is preparing frantically for war against some countries and wants to come to terms about war, not about peace, with the governments of other countries. To make peace secure it is necessary to stay the hand of the Hitler government, to *bridle* its aggressiveness, rather than enter into a deal with it, which helps it to become stronger and gives it a free hand for war.

(c) "We are for a pact with Hitler, we are against sanctions," some people say, "because sanctions add to the war danger and lead to war." On the contrary, it is *the impunity for the aggressors* that adds to the danger of war. The more countries, especially the big countries, join collective security pacts and the more unanimous and consistent they are under popular pressure in working for these measures, the less the German fascists will want to start a war, because its risks will be so much greater.

(d) Last but not least, there is the argument about "neutrality": "In any case we declare that we shall not participate either in a war or in sanctions, or in any kind of struggle against Germany's foreign policy, and thereby our country will insure itself against war." This inference, however, is incorrect. War threatens every

country, because due to the present sharpness of the imperialist contradictions, any war the fascist aggressors may start will not be a local war, it will escalate into a worldwide conflagration. Neutrality abets the aggressor, and any state that assumes neutrality will not thereby escape the war. No bowing to the warmongers, but a *militant international front of the peoples* against aggression can save the peace for every country. The peoples of all countries must declare firmly: "We shall always be on the side of the people attacked by fascists." It must be brought home to the fascist aggressor that in such an eventuality he will have to reckon with the proletariat and all the peoples of the world.

(10) The Communists are the most consistent champions of peace. As champions of peace, they support all measures promoting peace and thwarting aggression. Sanctions are an effective means against the aggressor, against those who want to break the peace. For this reason, while advocating independent action by the workers in the fight for peace, the Communists always support those measures of the League of Nations and of individual countries that are designed to preserve peace (non-aggression treaties, pacts of mutual aid against aggression, collective security pacts, economic and financial sanctions). But for the same reason the Communists must mercilessly expose to the people the vacillation of the League of Nations, aiming their struggle against those imperialist states which for egoistic reasons help the aggressor, undermine peace measures and sacrifice the interests of smaller nations to the interests of the big imperialist powers. In the interest of the people it is necessary to insist that the capitalist governments take effective measures for peace and to come out firmly against those forces at home that impede these measures.

He who wants peace must combat fascism. Strong economic and financial sanctions (no credits, no trade and no sale of raw materials) can make things difficult for the fascist regime and unquestionably help the German people throw off the yoke. Peace is fatal to fascism, because it adds to the difficulties at home and leads ultimately to the overthrow of the fascist regime; conversely, overthrow of the fascist regime will strengthen peace.

The German fascists are challenging the peoples of the world. They anticipate impunity, because sanctions have not been applied to Japan, because sanctions against Italy were disregarded by the capitalist

states, because when sending troops to the French and Belgian borders, the Nazis were convinced that sanctions against them would be disregarded by the British bourgeoisie.

11. The earliest establishment of trade union unity in each country and internationally would be of immense and decisive importance for international united working-class action. The Universal Labor League of Spain⁵ and especially the French General Confederation of Labor, could render the peoples a tremendous service by taking the initiative and mounting a large-scale campaign for international trade-union unity, the initiative of making contacts with the British trade unions and the unions in the Scandinavian countries, Belgium and Czechoslovakia, the initiative of rallying the trade unions of the world for joint action against the instigators of war.

12. As they mount their campaign against war, the Communist parties call on the masses:

—to combat the Hitler government, the warmakers in Europe, and give all-round aid to the people of Germany fighting for liberation;

—to work for the withdrawal of the Japanese occupation forces from China, for a democratic Japan;

—to work for the withdrawal of the Italian invaders from Abyssinia, for the liberation of the people of Italy from the fascist yoke;

—to work for a worldwide front of workers and peasants and of all champions of peace against the instigators of war.

* * *

"War can break out unexpectedly. Nowadays wars are not declared. They simply begin" (Stalin). And what this requires of Communists is, first and foremost, *a clear appreciation of the dimensions and nature of the war danger, orientation of all Party committees on the fight to preserve peace, elucidation of the basic propositions of this decision to the Party membership, rallying the Party from top to bottom for correct implementation of the instructions and guidelines contained in this decision; needed is the rallying of the non-Party activists, the conductors of our influence among the masses; needed is skilful agitation, leaving no enemy argument unanswered; needed, too, are all-out daily agitation, daily organizational work by Communists in the enterprises, in the trade unions and in all mass organizations; needed is daring initiative in the choice of forms of struggle best*

suited to the specific conditions of the working-class movement in each country. Every step taken by the warmakers and their agents must be exposed and fought in the parliaments and municipalities. The young generation and the women must be drawn into the movement against war. Each day, the Communist press must, on the basis of the facts, sharpen the vigilance of the masses, direct their indignation against the war profiteers, the merchants of death profiting from the military orders of the aggressors.

The campaign against war conducted by the Communists must be made as international as possible through mutual exchanges of workers' delegations and by sending speakers to people's assemblies. What is needed is general action by all international organizations fighting against fascism and war, for peace. Workers' attention should be focussed on questions of foreign policy, linking them up with vital issues of life and the working-class movement at home. This year, the First of May should be made a powerful demonstration of the masses for peace, freedom, bread, socialism.

NOTES

1. The Rhineland demilitarized zone consisted of German territory on both banks of the river; Germany was prohibited by the Versailles Peace from stationing troops in the area. A violation should have been seen as an act hostile to the signatories of the Versailles Treaty. Remilitarization of the Rhineland by the Hitler government on March 7, 1936, was part of its preparations for the Second World War.

2. The leaders of the Socialist International (Second International) and the Amsterdam Trade Union International rejected the idea of a united front against the imperialist architects of war. On September 25, 1935, the Executive Committee of the Comintern addressed a letter to the Secretariat of the Socialist International, pointing to the danger of another world war and suggesting a joint meeting of the Comintern and Socialist International to discuss urgent peace moves.

When fascist Italy attacked Ethiopia, the Comintern again proposed that negotiations with the Socialist International should begin at once to work out united action against fascist aggression. The Executive Committee of the Socialist International, which convened in Brussels on October 12, 1935, rejected this proposal as well. Social-Democratic leaders relied totally on the League of Nations.

3. A ten-year Polish-German agreement was concluded in Berlin on January 26, 1934. The Soviet Union described this pact as disastrous for Poland and European peace. Hitler Germany benefited, shoring up its positions abroad and camouflaging preparations for aggression. Germany denounced the agreement in April 1939 and invaded Poland on September 1, 1939.

4. The reference is to a joint session of the Executive Committees of the Socialist International and the Amsterdam Trade-Union International, which convened in London, March 19-20, 1936, on the initiative of the British Labor Party and the British Trades Union Congress to discuss the implications of fascist troops stationed in the Rhineland demilitarized zone. A subsequent manifesto condemned this move of the Hitler government and indicated that the two international organizations favored the creation of a system of collective security. However, the manifesto did not define any concrete measures against fascism and war, placing its main hope in the League of Nations.

5. Spain's Universal People's League (founded in 1838) was a member of the Popular Front during the national-revolutionary war.

Letters to Lenin

Berlin, 2. XII 1920

Esteemed, dear friend Lenin,

The bearer of this letter to you and your dear wife, is my son Maxim accompanied by his wife. The lad has persuaded himself that he wants to be a doctor in Soviet Russia. I am letting him go, but with a heavy heart of course. And though I don't expatiate on my personal feelings, still I'm a mother, heart and soul, and a victim of all the feelings a mother experiences and which weigh heavily on her at such times. And so: work and struggle. My feelings and desires are embodied in one wish: I hope that my son will serve Soviet Russia, the revolution, faithfully. Besides German, he speaks Russian, has a good command of English, French and Italian, and is well grounded in a number of spheres.

His wife is an excellent typist-stenographer. She proved her calibre as my secretary at a very difficult time.

At present I have my hands full attending meetings from morning till night. The congress of the Party* opens tomorrow, and nothing is ready yet. Many unnecessary, empty speeches are made, but I hope everything will turn out right in the end.

We are having particular difficulties at the editorial end of things. The former leaders of the Independent Social-Democratic Party consider this a matter of pres-

*Reference is to the Unity Congress of the Communist Party of Germany and the Left "Independents," held in Berlin in December 1920, which decided to form the United Communist Party of Germany.

"From Zetkin"

"For archives. 12XI.1922"¹

Esteemed, dear Comrade Lenin,

The fact that I am to speak² on the Russian revolution after you have, is rather audacious, if not presumptuous. I would not have undertaken to do so were it not a question of submitting to Party discipline, as a good Communist should, and agreeing with the view that for the West it is better that somebody from there should

tige, and so does Daeumig, of course. Still, I hope we'll weather this difficulty as well, and thus prove that we are not such block-heads after all as to be obstinate.

The general situation has not changed; if anything it has become more acute.

The bankruptcy of democracy, of the state, is becoming increasingly evident not only in the financial, but also in the political and social spheres. Helplessness is the characteristic feature of the present situation. There is an ever stronger tendency among the capitalists towards a "reformed capitalism" through "socialization," which as a "highly developed form of economic organization," will adopt the outward appearance and forms of a socialist economy, but will retain private property and capitalist profit.

The power of the capitalist class state is growing monstrously and can lead to unprecedented exploitation and enslavement of the proletariat. Hilferding's and Scheidemann's juggling with "socialization" is the way to this. Our task with regard to all this is clear.

I shall write to you soon in greater detail.

Please convey my warmest greetings to your wife and your sisters. I shake your hand with profound respect and militant solidarity.

Yours,
Clara Zetkin

Written in German

Not previously published

Moscow (1922, November 12 the latest)

speak. Radek told me that he gave you the printed text of my "Anti-Levi"³ to show you my attitude to the Russian revolution and its basic problems. I would like to tell you about another concept of mine which I upheld during the discussion on the revisionism of Bernstein and David.

These gentlemen maintained that the proletariat can "undermine" capitalism with

the help of labor protection and similar measures, *before* the conquest of political power. In my opinion, however, everything understood as "social reforms" cannot do the job. As long as the bourgeoisie is in power, it needs social reforms as a means of ensuring its profits and class rule. With the conquest of political power, however, social reform acquires a different meaning in the powerful hands of the proletariat. It becomes a means of transforming the economy and society in the direction of Communism. And in this case the trade unions, cooperatives and other proletarian organizations play a big role with the backing of state power in the shape of the Soviet system.

A comparison of the state of affairs in Germany and Soviet Russia confirms this: in Soviet Russia you have socialization of large-scale industry, in Germany—"Stinnesation"; in Soviet Russia you have strict implementation of labor legislation, in Germany—curtailment and abolition of such legislation, and so on.

I should also like to amplify why proletarian dictatorship is necessary for carrying out the "new policy,"⁴ for consolidating Soviet power as the precondition of this policy. The "new policy" is inevitable not only in Russian conditions; it is essential for making the turn to communism. After the conquest of political power also in other countries, the proletariat **will be compelled, *mutatis mutandis***, to take the difficult path of the "new policy," in a more favorable situation, naturally, than your country.

A most important precondition for the dictatorship of the proletariat and steadfastly implementing the "new policy" is the relationship between the Party and the proletariat. The Party must remain the expression of the historical process of self-consciousness in its highest degree, the expression of the self-development and independent activity of the proletariat.

This is possible only given integrity of

Comrade Lenin, I am a convinced Communist, which the Left Socialist (Communist) Party could confirm. I ask your help to be allowed a free trip—there and back—to Moscow so as to see your great work. I was among those who a few years ago replied to the series of questions you addressed to revolutionary minded people throughout the world (I do not know whether you received it—I sent it to the

ideology and organization, and strict discipline. Of particular importance in this respect is the elaboration of a clear, profound communist ideology and its diffusion among the broad masses, promoting and developing public education as an additional and guiding element of the "new policy," essential for the economic and technical training of the masses and also for their communist education. To sum up. The Russian revolution, in my opinion, is the first worldwide historic attempt to turn Marxism from theory into practice, and, accordingly, "to make history."

Despite the "mistakes and stupidities"—which you have castigated repeatedly—I do not see in its line any accidental zigzags, but a consistently straight and firm line (take your Program of April 17, 1917). You have had to go further than the initial aim in order to prevent the Russian revolution being thrown back to the starting point.

In my view, there has been no revolution that has, like yours, advanced from the very first assault so far beyond the initial stage of realization.

My dear friend Lenin, I should be most grateful to you if you would let me know, even if briefly, what aspects and problems you would like me to pay particular attention to. I should not like to repeat what you have already said better than I ever could.

Warmest greetings to you, to Comrade Krupskaya and to your sisters.

Yours,
Clara Zetkin

Written in German.
Not previously published.

1. Lenin's remarks.
2. Clara Zetkin addressed the Fourth Congress of the Comintern on November 13, 1922, after Lenin's report: "Five Years of the Russian Revolution and the Prospects of the World Revolution."
3. Reference is to Clara Zetkin's pamphlet *Rosa Luxemburg and the Russian Revolution*, in which she takes issue with Levi's attitude.
4. Reference is to the New Economic Policy.

(1921)

ROSTA representative when he was here). I should like to get in touch with your engineers to discuss several inventions, particularly those concerning agricultural implements (for example, a milker patented here in Denmark). They are important in modern big farms to fully revolutionize work, and it is a matter of honor precisely for the Workers' Republic of Russia to do so. In our capitalist country this can only be done if you are a capitalist. . . .

I would be obliged to you if you would be good enough to let me know—in English

or in German—whether you accept my proposal.

Yours,
with revolutionary salute,
L. Stenved

Not previously published

"From Bell"¹
"For archives"¹

7/8/21

Dear Comrade Lenin,

In a conversation which I had today with two of our comrades who are delegates from the Fife Miners Association of Scotland to the Red Trade Union Congress, I gathered a few notes which are very interesting and I am sure will be instructive to you as to the progress of our movement in Great Britain.

You have probably noticed that the South Wales Miners Federation at its Annual Conference at Cardiff on July 24th, by a majority of 120 to 63 has decided to affiliate to the Third International. The following notes which I have gathered go far to supplement that decision and to indicate a very healthy movement in England.

1) The comrades were very enthusiastic on the work done in what they describe as Communal Kitchens. To begin with, the Funds of the Association were very low. There was only £6000 for 25000 members. This fund was divided among the local associations on the basis of 1/ per member per week. The following illustration is taken from the district of Methil and Buckhaven. Having discovered that under the Board of Health Act, there were certain powers given to local bodies they used these powers to the fullest. After registration:

(a) Two and a half pints of milk were secured for infants up to two years of age. From two years to five years sixpence a day was granted in foodstuffs. From five to fourteen years children could be fed at school.

(b) All sick and pregnant women could obtain beef and special wine.

(c) Women who were sick and unmarried were secured similar rations.

(d) In addition to soup which contained 4 lb. of beef to 25 gallons of soup, dry rations were served out to all workers who were registered as follows: half pound of bread, two ounce of tea, one pound of sugar, half pound of margarine and some syrup.

The funds for this latter work were raised by the efforts of the Sports Entertainments and Lectures Committee. An interesting sidelight was thrown on the attitude

of the chief labour fakir William Adamson, who was leader of the Labour Party group in the House of Commons last year. After the liquid resources of the Union were finished, the question of pawning the Union property was raised. Adamson lives in a house that belongs to the Union, and when it was proposed to mortgage it, he tried to get a number of individuals to sign the deed. (Keir Hardie it appears had an experience like that, and got his bed and chattels taken by the Bailiff). The rationing scheme was applied to all workers whether miners or not. To this Adamson objected and wanted to confine relief to the Miners. But he was defeated.

The effect of the demand for loans was to cause the petty bourgeois elements to withdraw their money from the local Co-operative stores.

Another interesting side to the strike was the attitude of the Defence Force. At first the Marines were drafted into the District. It became so common for the women to walk past the pickets and to carry away coal that it became a scandal and the Marines had to be removed. The policemen also were sympathetic, and, indeed, in many cases helped the women to fill their buckets, fraternized with the men, and wished them luck.

When the Marines were replaced by the soldiers things were no better for the bosses. Demonstrations were held as near the mines as possible and within the hearing of the soldiers. By means of gummed labels with "Don't shoot" appeals stuck all over the place; cartoons taken from the *Communist* pasted on the walls, and a free distribution of leaflets among the soldiers, good work was done to undermine the morale of men who were not too keen on their job. The soldiers were dissatisfied with being confined to their posts and demanded relief. When they were off duty the miners fraternised with them; arranged boxing competitions; entertainments and all kinds of sports and created an *esprit de corps* which so alarmed the officers that they took away vital parts of the rifles from some of the soldiers and kept others without ammunition.

One particular case of direct insubordination occurred at a place called Fallin in Stirlingshire. A number of scabs were working here and a mass demonstration was held to clear them out. When the strikers moved forward to shift the blacklegs the officer gave the command to fire. A soldier shouted to the crowd that they had no ammunition. Another held up a white flag. The officer's command was obviously a bluff, and the crowd broke through to the scabs.

The soldiers were singing and whistling the RED FLAG in the streets, and allowing the strikers all kinds of licence. Many of the militant miners had managed to join up in the Defence Corps and in conjunction

with the Sinn Fein elements played a good part in this demoralisation.

I pass these remarks on to you as given to me by two comrades who occupied official positions and were actively engaged in the strike throughout its duration. I hope you will find them of some interest to you in your estimation of the British movement.

With Communist Greetings
Thomas Bell

"Reply sent August 13"*
Written in English
Not previously published

1. Lenin's remarks. See Lenin's reply in *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, pp. 510-11.

Note from Rosa Luxemburg
December 20, 1918

Dear Vladimir,

Am availing myself of my uncle's¹ trip to send you warm greetings from our family², Karl³, Franz⁴ and others. Please God that our wishes come true in the coming year. Wishing you all the best. Uncle will

tell you all about us. In the meantime, handshakes and greetings.

Pravda, January 15, 1925

Rosa

1. Eduard Fuchs—member of the Spartacus League's Central Council. Was sent to Moscow to inform Lenin of the situation in Germany.

2. Spartacists
3. Karl Liebknecht.
4. Franz Mehring.

The Communist International— some reflections

JOHANN KOPLINIG

Anti-Communists, both bourgeois and Social-Democrat, who saw in the Communist International a "secret weapon" of Soviet diplomacy engaged in subversive activity on a global scale, could never comprehend that it was the biggest and most representative workers' organization in history. And today these same people assume in their short-sightedness that any coopera-

tion between Communist parties can but signify the establishment of another international.

They could not be more wrong. For in the 25 years since the dissolution of the Comintern the Communist movement has continued its growth, gaining ground in the new and different conditions.

It goes without saying that besides their own specific, national tasks, the parties

are faced, as before, with important common tasks.

The first of these, as I see it, is the fight for peace which has found concrete expression in the movement to halt the imperialist aggression against the people of Vietnam.

Closely linked with this is the fight against the world's most powerful imperialism, U.S. imperialism, against its crusade against the peoples of Latin America, its constant threats to socialist Cuba.

In this fight, the Communist parties of the respective countries pursue a common aim, guided by the immutable law of international solidarity.

The second, no less important task facing the parties is to carry forward Marxism-Leninism, critically to examine our theoretical weapons and how to make the best use of them in the present-day conditions of struggle. It would be incorrect to assume that this is the task of only the parties in power.

To assess the history of our International properly it is not enough to look back on its various decisions. These should be examined in the context of the actions waged by the Comintern at the time together with other organizations, among them the Profintern (Red International of Labor Unions which united numerous trade unions in different parts of the world and the revolutionary opposition in the reformist unions), and the three mass organizations that launched worldwide solidarity movements. These included:

International Workers' Relief, founded in 1921, to organize international aid to the population of the famine-stricken Volga area. This was a very difficult task, for the countries of Europe had not yet recovered from the ravages of the war. But it was successfully carried out, as Lenin noted. Later, IWR organized relief for strikers' families and produced the first revolutionary films abroad. Its publication *Arbeiterillustrierte*, designed by the German artist John Heartfield, was a powerful weapon in the anti-fascist struggle;

International Labor Defense, established a few years later on the initiative of Helen Stasova, a leading personality in the Bolshevik Party, rendered aid to political prisoners and persons persecuted for their political beliefs. It headed the worldwide solidarity actions, lasting six years, to save the lives of Sacco and Vanzetti sent to the electric chair by U.S. class justice. After the July 1927 battles in Vienna, Wil-

helm Pieck arrived in the city, to see what could be done for the victims.

The ILD also had a branch in Austria headed by Malke Schor. Its eminent lawyer Dr. Egon Schoenhof, defended Communists in many trials in Hungary, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia and Rumania;

The third mass organization of a special type was the Anti-Imperialist League, which served as a kind of bridge between the working-class movement of the capitalist countries and the liberation movement in the colonies. Its president was Henri Barbusse. It later joined with the Peace Movement, inaugurated in Amsterdam. This movement held congresses in Republican Madrid and in Paris.

I have drawn attention to these mass organizations without which any account of the Communist struggle would be incomplete.

We have often heard it said that Dimitrov's report to the Seventh Congress and its resolutions came as a surprise to the Communist parties. That is not so. Dimitrov brilliantly analyzed the experience of each party, extracting and synthesizing what was of general significance.

In the fight against fascism and the danger of war it became clear that this struggle called for joint actions not only by the working class, but that broad democratic forces could become the allies of the working class.

Thus, it was essential to explain that the alternative to fascist dictatorship was the establishment of a broad anti-fascist front in defense of bourgeois democracy.

In Germany and other European countries this signified returning to the partially forgotten principles of the Communist International outlined in its united front theses of 1922. In the case of the Communist parties of the colonial and dependent countries it signified a differentiated approach to the national bourgeoisie a large part of which could become the allies of the working class in the fight against colonial rule.

I should like in this connection to quote from Lenin's "*Left-Wing" Communism — an Infantile Disorder* which he wrote in 1920 as a text-book, to some extent, for the young Communist parties in the capitalist countries. In the chapter "No Compromises?" we read: "To carry on a war for the overthrow of the international bourgeoisie, a war which is a hundred times more difficult, protracted and complex than the most stubborn of ordinary

wars between states, and to renounce in advance any change of tack, or any utilization of a conflict of interests (even if temporary) among one's enemies, or any conciliation or compromise with possible allies (even if they are temporary, unstable, vacillating or conditional allies)—is that not ridiculous in the extreme? Is it not like making a difficult ascent of an unexplored and hitherto inaccessible mountain and refusing in advance to move in zig-zags, ever to retrace one's steps, or ever to abandon a course once selected, and to try others" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 72).

Here Lenin, the brilliant tactician, clearly says that each Communist Party should be flexible in its tactics, shaping them according to the conditions at the given moment and should seek allies prepared to go with the Communists at least part of the way.

This fundamental principle of Communist tactics was, regrettably, repeatedly ignored during the rise of fascism.

The rise of Hitler and the danger of a new war resulted in developments in Germany getting priority during discussion of international issues. This was, of course, correct and necessary as far as Europe was concerned. It should be added, however, that the Communist Party of Germany, in whose leadership Left sectarian elements had considerable influence at the time, did not always observe the above-mentioned Leninist principle, and did not do enough to win at least temporary allies in the fight against fascism.

Needless to say, these factors influenced the International's approach to Austrian problems. Thus, exceptionally great importance was attached to events in Austria in the belief that they were the forerunners of a revolutionary situation. Hence

the Comintern's criticism of the Party's failure in July 1927 to call for the establishment of workers' councils as revolutionary organs of power. Time was to show this was incorrect, since the conditions for taking power did not exist in the country at the time.

However, the fact that our Party jointly with the Communist Party of Germany stepped up the fight against fascism and reaction was historically imperative. It is true that the factional struggle started by the Left sectarians in the Communist Party of Germany had its repercussions also in our Party.

I would particularly like to warn against the following: dissociation from the Soviet Union as suggested by some of our comrades. Every Communist knows that in its advance towards communism the Soviet Union still has to grapple with many problems. This is not surprising. After all, it is moving along a road unexplored by any other country, and the difficulties are manifold, especially in the age of the rapid development of science and technology.

At present not only economic problems have to be tackled, but also the complex problem of human relationships. It is not only a question of overcoming survivals of capitalism in the economy, but also in the thinking of people. And this is something that cannot be solved on paper.

As Communists we must learn to understand the difficulties facing the fraternal parties in the socialist countries. We must learn to understand that the parties in power also have their problems.

Once we understand this, it will be easier to polemicize with the opponents of socialism. And knowledge of the history of the international communist movement can but benefit us.

Socialist internationalism — the guideline in the activity of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia on the international scene

VASIL BILAK

I.

Czechoslovakia's foreign policy has always been an active one by reason of her location in the heart of Europe and the threat of aggression constantly emanating from German imperialism. Economically, the country ranks among the more highly developed countries in Europe, notwithstanding her meagre raw materials resources. This circumstance necessitated fairly large-scale relations with the outside world and especially with her European neighbors.

After the defeat of Hitler and the expulsion of the nazi invaders, Czechoslovakia turned to socialism. In this new phase her international position acquired a much greater importance. To begin with, being the westernmost of the socialist countries she faces the armies of the aggressive Nato bloc as the socialist community's first line of defense and thus a key sector of its security system in Europe. Then there is the positive effect of Czechoslovakia's economic relations with the other socialist states.

Our country is one of those European states (the majority, in fact) that maintain their independence and capacity for defense, as well as their economic status and

the welfare of their people, through co-operation with other countries. The only variable factor is that of orientation. And that is where the experience of our pre-Munich bourgeois republic showed our peoples that reliance on the big capitalist powers is ineffective and undependable.

Drawing the practical conclusion from this sad experience, from this precarious prewar alignment with the West, we concluded a series of friendship and alliance agreements with the Soviet Union and other countries, chiefly the European socialist states, and this while the war was still on or shortly after it ended. What needs stressing is that this new orientation, consistent with the historical experience of both Czechs and Slovaks, based on the real situation of the country, was adopted and carried out in Czechoslovak foreign policy by, among others, no less a statesman of experience than Eduard Benes in 1943, that is, a few years before we finally opted for socialism.

Czechoslovakia's liberation from the Hitler occupation, for which mostly Soviet soldiers paid with their lives (Soviet dead in our territory alone exceeded 140,000), bore out and justified this new orientation on the Soviet Union, the first socialist power whose military strength, coupled

with the heroism and sacrifice of its people, contributed decisively to the world's deliverance from the fascist nightmare.

In the postwar we lived in a world filled with irreconcilable class contradictions and conflicts battling which our new socialist society emerged. Today, too, the all too real dangers implicit in the policy of the aggressive forces, the increasing tensions in different parts of the world, obtrude themselves on our political thinking. World imperialism works indefatigably in various ways, violent and "peaceful," to halt the forces of progress, democracy, peace and socialism. Proof of this is the increasing number of putsches and coups against progressive regimes, the interminable succession of imperialist aggressions in different parts of the world, and not least of all the far-flung ideological offensive aimed at evoking internal ideological erosion in the socialist countries. What these facts reveal is that the "neutrality" slogan bandied by the Rightist anti-socialist forces in our country in the summer months of 1968 was thoroughly false and anti-national. A neutral Czechoslovakia is simply inconceivable in the present world rent by irreconcilable contradictions. The country can go on building socialism and achieve success only hand in hand with all the socialist countries, especially the Soviet Union. It is self-evident, therefore, that being the country's guiding force and wishing to exercise the decisive influence on her orientation and foreign policy, the Communist Party must work for sincere friendship and alliance with the Soviet Union and the other socialist states in line with the principles of socialist internationalism. What we mean by this is ideological unity, unity of action and comprehensive cooperation by the socialist countries and their Communist and Workers' parties in the pursuit of common aims, cooperation based on the fullest respect for each other's independence.

In the specific historical conditions of the various countries and parties, socialist internationalism based on mutual respect, sovereignty, equality, international solidarity and mutual aid, is fusing of the national and international, the general and the specific in their foreign policy. This accords with the demands of the joint struggle against the common enemy and with the specific national interest of each nation. To divorce the one from the other is to depart from Marxism-Leninism, from proletarian internationalism.

II.

European postwar growth was marked by a sharpening of contradictions between the capitalist and socialist countries, many of which had been wartime allies. The formation of Nato, the cold war, the "positions of strength" policy and the re-emergence of militarist and revenge-seeking forces in the German Federal Republic showed that a political, economic and military community of most of the European socialist countries was urgently needed to safeguard the socialist system and European peace and security. The Warsaw Treaty Organization came into being as just this kind of defensive alignment of eight European socialist countries, able to cope with any aggressive attack of world imperialism and secure the essential peaceful environment for building socialism in its member-countries.

The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic was a charter member of the Warsaw Treaty Organization, and apart from our sense of international class solidarity with the other socialist countries, we were deeply convinced that in the existing situation nothing but mutual cooperation as defined in the Treaty could guarantee our security. Czechoslovakia became a member of the coalition for joint defense of the vital interests of our people, who had decided once and for all to follow the socialist way in alliance with the USSR and the other socialist countries. Motivated by their desire for peace in Europe, the signatories of the Warsaw Treaty indicated that once a collective security system had been achieved for all Europe, Nato and the Warsaw Treaty would become redundant and should be dissolved. That is one of the essential differences between the Warsaw Treaty and the Atlantic Pact.

For Czechoslovakia and the other socialist countries, the Warsaw Treaty crowns their system of mutual defense and friendship treaties concluded bilaterally between 1943 and 1950. The friendship, cooperation and mutual aid agreements we concluded with our socialist friends define our international commitments and, naturally, all the prerogatives in settling the practical issues of our relationships. At the same time, the agreements afford considerable scope for further activity not only in the framework of our relationship with our allies, but also as regards our part in world affairs. In the context of the Warsaw Treaty we can pursue our specific national

aims and interests consistent with our special international, economic, political and strategic position in Europe and concomitant with the further growth of our relations with the capitalist countries on the basis of active peaceful coexistence and mutually advantageous cooperation. Yet, certainly, coordinating joint action and the efforts of all the socialist countries in extending mutual cooperation in line with the principles of equality, sovereignty and national independence, territorial integrity, fraternal cooperation and solidarity, is one of the main factors.

Close economic relations with the socialist countries, which account for nearly two-thirds of Czechoslovakia's foreign trade, are essential for our socialist growth, and naturally, the biggest share of our trade with the socialist countries (approximately 35 per cent) is with the Soviet Union.

For Czechoslovakia, an industrially developed country with inadequate raw materials resources, the Soviet market offers splendid opportunities for an effective division of labor, and this is not only today but in the future. To be sure, the importance of the vast Soviet market is also appreciated by the big capitalist firms, competing furiously for Soviet trade. The following figures for 1956-68 are indicative of the scale of Czechoslovak-Soviet economic cooperation: besides other goods, the USSR provided Czechoslovakia with 17 million tons of grain, nearly 700,000 tons of cotton, about 70,000 tons of wool, 51 million tons of oil, 80 million tons of iron ore, 2 million tons of ferrous metal, 2.5 million tons of rolled stock, 285,000 tons of copper, over 200,000 tons of aluminum, over 200,000 tons of lead, nearly 3.5 million tons of dressed apatite, 170,000 tons of zinc, over 200,000 tons of asbestos, nearly 5 million cu. m. of timber, and machine tools and other equipment worth about 1,200 million convertible rubles.

All these imports are paid for chiefly with commodities produced by our engineering, textile, shoe, clothing, haberdashery and other industries. Needless to say, sales of many of these products in Western markets are lower than they could be, because of discrimination and competition. To sum up, our economic relations with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries enable us to cope with many vital problems of economic growth, especially the problem of extensive exchange of our manufactured commodities for raw materials and food products, the problem of structural change

in our fuel and power balance, and the grain problem.

Obviously, in view of keen competition in world markets, cooperation with the socialist countries accords with the basic interests of our country. That is why Czechoslovakia has a stake in the Council for Mutual Economic Aid. Our economic orientation mainly on the socialist countries must prevail also in the interest of the economic reform, which poses many difficult problems. The other CMEA countries are also in the midst of reform, generating many valuable impulses and posing demands for deeper international economic cooperation in the CMEA framework.

Effective dynamic economic growth is absolutely inconceivable without international bonds in science and technology, particularly participation at a qualitatively higher level in CMEA's scientific-technological cooperation scheme. And that calls for a considerably improved organization and for more effective use of the advantages offered by the socialist international division of labor. All progress in the area is unquestionably consistent with the requirements of building socialism in our republic. That is the reason why Czechoslovakia supports all measures designed to deepen the division of labor among the socialist countries and submits for discussion its own conceptions and proposals aimed at enlivening the CMEA.

It could not be more obvious that the politico-ideological differences due to which some socialist countries opted out of collective cooperation and withdrew from the Warsaw Treaty Organization or CMEA or both, are anything but beneficial. As we see it, the different views held by socialist countries on different issues are not reason enough for dramatic conflicts and certainly not reason enough for refusing to search for ways of restoring or improving mutual relations. On the contrary, our Party holds that the views of others should be respected and understood, and that joint efforts should be made to secure favorable and acceptable solutions. That is why, in conformity with socialist internationalism, the Party makes the most of all opportunities of consultation on urgent problems of common interest and pursues effective bilateral cooperation in every sphere.

As our Party sees it, expansion of mutual economic and other relations, coupled with joint action with the other European socialist countries accords with the common interests of socialism, the interests of all the

democratic and progressive forces on the European continent. The imperialist acts of aggression and persistent attempts to re-pattern post-war Europe in keeping with the concepts of West German revenge-seeking and militarist groups supported by the United States, require joint counter-action by the peaceful and democratic forces. This applies doubly to the Communist and Workers' parties of those socialist and capitalist countries which suffered nazi occupation during the Second World War and have to face up to the neo-nazi provocations in the FRG.

III.

Czechoslovak Communists associate the German question and recognition of the postwar situation in Europe with the general issues of European security. Our Party is aware that as long as the commanding heights in the FRG are held by the monopolies, a basis remains for continuous reproduction of the traditional interests and aims of aggressive German imperialism, imperilling the peaceful growth and security of the European countries. The discontent and disagreement over the status quo in Europe, the craving for change publicly avowed by official West German spokesmen, are a constant, unmistakable threat, a threat redoubled by Bonn's ambitious foreign policy, its growing military strength and the continued support of revenge-seeking and neo-nazi organizations. To cope with this danger, the various West German democratic organizations opposed to the official aggressive line whose true aims are camouflaged by the so-called new eastern policy, must act in common and coordinate their efforts.

Every step towards eliminating the recklessness in the political strategy of former West German governments and the present "grand coalition" deserves our fullest support and solidarity. We are convinced that this accords with the vital interests of our country and of the other European states, helps the efforts of the peaceful democratic forces in the FRG and the unity of all anti-fascist forces. A steady improvement of our relations with the FRG could be an important element in normalizing mutual relations, provided Bonn draws the right conclusions from the existing European situation, abandons its claim to be sole representative of Germany and recognizes that Munich was unlawful from the very outset. No one need doubt that we shall render every possible support in our for-

eign policy to the German Democratic Republic, and work on for its recognition internationally.

As we see it, recognition of the two German states and mutual relations between them is the only way the German question can be solved. We hold that a realistic premise appeared in the GDR for the first time in Europe's history for making future Germany a democratic, peaceful socialist state and a dependable partner of all the other European nations in their striving to assure security and expand peaceful cooperation irrespective of differences in the social system.

IV.

As before, our Party sees the problem of European security and cooperation between countries with different social systems as a key factor of world, as well as European, politics. We hold that the vital interests of all European nations are centered in this issue and, hence, by reason of their economic and political relations with the rest of the world, also the interests of mankind. Progressives will recall that in the past the European policies of the imperialist powers created a breeding ground for conflicts leading ultimately to the two world wars.

The Communist Party and the Czechoslovak Government are convinced that our country must play an active part in improving the atmosphere for resolving the main European problems, promoting conditions necessary for a dependable European security system and all-European economic, scientific and technological cooperation. And in our foreign policy we have always acted on this belief. Our efforts on that score concentrate first and foremost on normalizing conditions in Central Europe. We are trying to make the most of all the positive factors—historical, cultural and geographical—linking the Central European countries, promoting greater mutual understanding and cooperation among the European nations in accordance with the aims expressed at the Karlovy Vary Conference of European Communist and Workers' parties.

Czechoslovakia's foreign policy in Europe, we hold, benefits the growth of socialism in our country and the world over, especially since we associate peaceful cooperation in Europe with the progressive political movement of the anti-monopoly and democratic forces that aspire to change the political and social structure, to the

democratic and socialist perspective in the European capitalist countries. The policy of active peaceful coexistence proclaimed at the Conference of European Communist and Workers' parties on European security and the decisions of the conference of six Communist and Workers' parties in Bratislava, will always be the guideline for Czechoslovak foreign policy. And these efforts are part of our general line, aimed at assisting to the greatest possible extent the formation of a broad anti-imperialist front of all progressive, democratic and socialist forces in the world.

Our Party has stressed time and again that the accent in our foreign policy, our orientation in Europe, is on our relations with the socialist countries. However, Czechoslovakia is also initiating steps to extend active contacts with countries on other continents. We show a special interest in the developing countries which by their emergence on the international scene exert an extraordinary influence on the modern world. Yet we must try not to overstep our possibilities in global problems related to the Middle East, Southeast Asia, Africa, Latin America, etc. On the other hand, we must do everything we can in line with international efforts to remove the unfair economic, political and social disparities in countries of other continents. Our Party and Government have pointed out repeatedly that in our relations with countries delivered from colonial rule we should adhere more consistently to a realistic assessment of their social growth and aggregate role. As we see it, despite various specific difficulties and temporary setbacks, these countries are in the midst of an historical turn the consequences of which will inevitably affect the entire course of world development.

We act on this, too, in our foreign policy, striving to extend international solidarity with the national liberation movement in the common struggle against imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism, to strengthen the sovereignty and national independence of the newly-free countries, to back up their independent economic growth. We will continue to render political and material aid to the heroic Vietnamese people until final victory, and will work for a political solution to the dangerous crisis in the Middle East.

In all countries and regions of the Third World, Czechoslovakia's foreign policy is designed to support the progressive forces, to cooperate with them in resolving various problems of growth and broader problems

of international relations. In line with our efforts to integrate our economy in a broader international division of labor, we shall promote to the extent of our ability and need, equal, mutually advantageous trade and economic cooperation with the Third World countries, and in doing so are eager to find non-traditional ways, new forms of cooperation with the other socialist and the non-socialist countries that could help resolve the complicated problems of the underdeveloped economies in the shortest possible time and with the desired effect. In brief, it is our wish to help with our experience and resources to develop the domestic productive forces there as the main factor of equalization in rights with the peoples of the developed capitalist and socialist countries. That, to our mind, is the main content of our international solidarity, coupled with active support for their direct confrontation with imperialism.

V.

Striving to apply Marxist-Leninist theory creatively to Czechoslovak conditions, we also consider it necessary to avail ourselves of the experience and views of other Communist and Workers' parties, of the world Communist movement in our handling of the complicated new problems of socialist growth. As we see it, the strength of socialism lies primarily in bringing out the intrinsic possibilities of each socialist state, its ties with the people, and the greater international prestige and influence of the socialist world community. Harmonious politico-economic growth in the socialist countries and conditions for the development of Marxist-Leninist theory and socialist practice are decisive for the spread of socialist and communist ideas. We therefore consider the further growth of socialism in Czechoslovakia, the materialization of the general regularities in building socialist society and consideration for the historical, social, economic, political and cultural specifics of our country, as our basic international responsibility, our contribution to world socialism, to the unity of the world Communist movement.

Convinced of this, we aim at finding more effective ways for advancing our society and rectifying past mistakes and defects. Most important, we hold, is to carry forward all the positive results achieved in the years of building socialism, secure effective growth of the economy, carry through the economic reform, develop effective forms of socialist democracy, in-

vigorate the democratic features of our political system on the basis of the National Front, enhance by democratic means the leading role of the Party, and strengthen the bonds between the Party and people in working out and implementing policy. The radical changes introduced by the January 1968 meeting of our Central Committee, expressed in the general political concept set out in our Action Program, expressed in everything we call the positive values of post-January policy, helped restore these principles and consolidate them by democratic means. That is the basis on which we continue to pursue our foreign policy, conscientiously meet our commitments to the socialist community, uphold the principles of proletarian internationalism and strengthen our relations with the Communist and Workers' parties. At our November and December meetings and the January 1969 meeting, the Central Committee stressed that we would not allow forces seeking to distract the country from building socialism to take ascendancy, that we would combat Right-opportunist, anti-socialist and anti-Soviet forces that try to create anarchy and unrest by demagogic slogans. Nor shall we overlook sectarianism and dogmatism.

The Resolution of the November (1968) Central Committee meeting says: "For us there never has been any alternative to allegiance to the socialist system, the Warsaw Treaty and active participation in the Council for Mutual Economic Aid . . . All attempts to undermine our cooperation with the socialist countries, like the irresponsible attempts of some individuals to proclaim the slogan of neutrality, will today and in the future encounter determined resistance by the Party."

Our Party faces difficult problems, their solution undoubtedly entailing considerable strain, much statesmanship and Communist firmness. We know, too, that we shall not solve our domestic problems unless we draw on the experience and international solidarity of the CPSU and all the other Communist and Workers' parties. To apply Marxist-Leninist theory correctly, we must study and analyze the experience of other parties; that, in all circumstances, is a precondition for drawing the right conclusions concerning the growth of society and the most effective solutions to the current problems.

VI.

We are convinced that fraternal cooperation and mutual aid are in the national as

well as the international interests of the socialist countries and fraternal parties. Further growth of the socialist system and the international working-class movement depends on the degree to which the common principles of proletarian internationalism are observed in relations between the parties. None of us are deluded into thinking these are easy things to achieve. The difficult problems facing the Communist and Workers' parties and the disparities in objective conditions provide soil for differences of opinion as to their solution. Yet we hold that given Communist mutual understanding, differences over specific issues should not lead to any lasting disruptions and that comradely exchanges and an essential measure of tolerance offer a good basis for gradually defining the differences and putting them out of the way.

For this reason (and our Party has emphasized this more than once) we shall continue to extend our contacts with all fraternal parties in the socialist and capitalist worlds. We want to continue comparing notes and experiences in bilateral contacts, especially on concrete matters concerning the principles and methods of Party guidance in the economic, political and cultural spheres of life in the socialist countries.

We shall continue to work for closer relations not only at Central Committee level, that is, through mutual visits by Party delegations, but also through closer contacts between Party institutions and bodies that had cooperated fruitfully in the past.

We must look to relationships that accord more harmoniously with the present needs and enable us to verify our views and attitudes to the maximum degree, agreeing on ways of solving problems and coordinating action.

Just as we consider it a permanent principle for our country to orientate on the USSR and on the other socialist states, a principle on which our foreign policy will doubtless continue to rest, we proceed from working class and international positions in our relations with the other Communist and Workers' parties.

Apart from bilateral relationships, our Party favors multilateral ties between Marxist-Leninist parties. Accordingly, it has taken part in all important conferences of Communist and Workers' parties. As we see it, international consultations are extremely important in face of the continuing imperialist provocations that imperil peace and the security of the peoples.

To counter the imperialists, the Communist and Workers' Parties are taking

joint action for peace, national independence, democracy and socialism, supporting the fight of the peoples against imperialist abuse and paving the way to anti-imperialist unity.

At these meetings, the Marxist-Leninist parties make joint studies of the current problems, exchange experience and views on specific problems, coordinating their actions and working out a common strategic and tactical conception. That is why our Party welcomes joint forms of international contacts, for they cast light on the objective social processes in the world of today and contribute to the solutions.

Active participation in the fight for greater unity with all progressive, democratic and peace-loving forces, a purposeful, thoroughly weighed policy of spreading and improving different forms of cooperation and coordination, is the cornerstone of our internationalist policy. For this reason, the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia acclaims every action designed to invigorate the Communist movement and the progressive forces.

Our Party encourages the work of mass organizations on the international scene, so long as these organizations follow concrete anti-imperialist concepts. A big role in this is played by the Czechoslovak trade unions, which are charter members of the Anti-Monopoly Committee of the World Federation of Trade Unions and therefore cooperate with the trade unions in other socialist countries, in the developed capitalist countries and in the developing countries in the fight against imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism.

We attach special importance to unity of the world Communist movement. We know that common views and actions consistent with the general tendency are hammered out in continuous confrontations of ideas, often in sharp clashes of the old with the new. However, we are deeply disturbed by some aspects in the relations between Communist and Workers' parties, particularly as regards coordinating action against imperialism. As we see it, it is the duty of all our parties to do their utmost in overcoming the differences, especially in areas related to the main interests of the revolutionary working class and the progressive movement.

We firmly believe that the comradely atmosphere, the mutual understanding and the tolerance which prevail at our international conferences and gatherings provide ample opportunity for a free exchange of views and for achieving unity in resolv-

ing concrete urgent matters. As we see it, this spirit of comradeship enables the parties to find a common approach and reach effective agreement, helping to resolve these issues.

Our Party made a positive contribution to the international meetings of Communist and Workers' parties in 1957 and 1960. Fraternal parties in Europe entrusted us with organizing the Karlovy Vary Conference in 1967. We have taken part in all the consultative and preparatory meetings devoted to the forthcoming world Communist conference. Our views, opinions and experience were invariably well received. Our delegation met half-way all constructive proposals aimed at achieving common attitudes and promoting joint action.

Our internationalist traditions and sense of responsibility are a constant reminder that we must do our utmost to help resolve the current problems of the Communist movement.

As we see it, this should be our main positive contribution to the preparations for the forthcoming world conference in Moscow. Together with the other parties, we shall apply our experience and assist in working out the new tasks of our international movement.

On the other hand, in view of the current situation in our country and the problems encountered in developing our socialist society, our Party needs the support of the other contingents of the revolutionary movement. This applies particularly to our implementing the decisions of our latest Central Committee meetings. We need comradely support for all our measures aimed at stabilizing on socialist lines the political situation in our country.

We want firmer relations with the other Communist and Workers' parties. We are grateful to them for their understanding. And we shall continue to supply them with objective information relating to the concrete issues of our home and foreign policy, and the key aspects of the situation in our country.

Since August 1968 imperialist propaganda has redoubled its attacks on the socialist system in our country. We shall therefore be grateful to the fraternal parties in the capitalist countries for intensifying their fight against this propaganda, exposing the imperialist attempts to slow down the consolidation in the CSSR and carrying on the fight against distortions of particular aspects in our internal political development. That would make our work easier,

it would help us normalize the situation more quickly, and reinforce socialist relations in Czechoslovakia.

The main object of our present efforts on the international scene is to achieve unity of action by the fraternal socialist countries and the entire world Communist movement, a unity necessary for going on

the offensive against all the reactionary forces, a policy fusing the broad movement of all revolutionary, progressive and democratic forces of the world. As before, the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia will apply every effort in behalf of unity and will work actively for it at the forthcoming conference of the fraternal parties.

Some lessons of the Hungarian Soviet Republic

ISTVAN SZIRMAI

I.

THE HUNGARIAN Communist movement, proud of its revolutionary traditions, constantly turns to the lessons of its past, applying the experience in the new conditions.

In the half-century since the proclamation of the Hungarian Soviet Republic the balance of forces in the world has changed in favor of socialism, peace and social progress, but imperialism is still a powerful aggressive force, and there are still divisions in the international labor movement. The class betrayal by Right-wing Social Democracy and the absence of revolutionary working-class unity greatly facilitated the rise of fascism and the unleashing of the Second World War. And now once again, we witness dangerous manifestations of both reformism, conciliation with the bourgeoisie, disregard of the class struggle, and petty-bourgeois anarchistic pseudo-radicalism gnawing away at unity—the decisive condition for the victory of the working class.

The conditions in the world today are not what they were half a century ago, but the fight for the new world of communism remains on the order of the day. It will not be out of place, therefore, to recall some of the universally significant lessons of the Hungarian Soviet Republic,

the more so as the passage of five decades provides a vantage point from which to appraise its objective importance.

Ten years after the first proletarian dictatorship in Hungary the memory of it signified only a hope, the possibility of a future victory. Study of the causes and circumstances of the defeat stimulated a search for new methods of struggle. Cherishing this hope in the conditions of enforced isolation, the Hungarian Communists sometimes tended to see the road to victory as being too short and easy.

Twenty years later, when our Party, inspired by the ideas of the Seventh Congress of the Comintern, set about organizing the anti-fascist struggle, the democratic and emancipatory traditions of our people were advanced to the foreground. The traditions of the 1919 Soviet Republic naturally retained their honored place, but, with the Horthy terror rampant and Hitler aggression underway, a popular-democratic unity presented itself as the sole way out of the sectarian isolation to the Leninist policy of broad alliance.

Thirty years later we recalled 1919 when power was in the hands of the working class. And although the Party did much at the time to cleanse the memory of the Soviet Republic from the filth and slander which the fascist counter-revolution had poured on it for twenty-five years, we, due

to mistakes of the then leadership of the Party, remained very much in debt to this memory; we failed to resurrect it and to use it in the way revolutionary duty commanded. Largely responsible for this were violation of law, which included among its victims many leading figures and fighters of the 1919 days, the Rakosi cult with its distortion of historical truth, and the opportunist pragmatism of the Party leadership, which neglected ideological struggle, inevitable if the traditions of 1919 were to be maintained and, acting on a one-sided understanding of the democratic fight for independence, ignored the socialist national traditions, above all the major importance of 1919, and the Marxist view of the interrelationships of the socialist and democratic traditions.

By 1959, on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the first Hungarian Soviet Republic, wise with the experience of the fights against the counter-revolution and for socialist consolidation, we had made good the wasted time and had restored the truth about 1919; we did this in the fight against Right revisionism and "Left" sectarianism. This experience made it clear to us that even the eminently progressive democratic and national-liberation traditions can be turned against socialism when a class approach and an historically-critical objectivity are overlooked. We realized too the price to be paid for a voluntarism which injects the venom of nationalism into the portrayal of the past of our nation and of our movement.

He who invokes real, or imaginary, transient tactical interests, to engage in a selective refashioning of the past, is guilty of a non-Marxist subjectivism. True to the Party spirit and objectivity of historical materialism, we see the Hungarian Soviet Republic as a stage in a revolutionary process, a process which reaches down to our times. The vantage point of fifty years later enables us to appreciate in all its fullness the significance of 1919: the second — irrevocably victorious — socialist revolution in Hungary shows that its predecessor, which suffered a temporary defeat, was not a brief interlude in Hungarian history, not something accidental, and not an alien body in the organism of our nation, but an immanent necessity of international class struggle and of the class struggle in Hungary itself. The 1919 Soviet Republic was truly a radically new phenomenon in the life of Hungarian society, one which heralded the dawn of the new history of the country, of its socialist re-

naissance. Though drowned in blood, the proletarian revolution proved stronger and more viable than the victory-intoxicated counter-revolution.

II.

The revolutionary events of 1918-19 in Hungary bore the direct imprint of the October Revolution in Russia. Even the Russian revolution of 1905 had its reverberations in Hungary; but at that time the class struggle in our country, in many respects similar to the class struggle in Russia, reached only the level of a revolutionary possibility. In December 1905 Endre Ady, Hungarian revolutionary democrat, thinker and poet, discerned the class essence of the revolutionary movement in Russia and its prospects, whereas the pundits of Social-Democratic reformism, clinging to their non-Marxist dogmas, held that the working class can play only the subordinate role of ally and assistant of the bourgeoisie in the bourgeois-democratic revolution. "This awesome upheaval will be the pride of history," Ady wrote. "The pride, a lesson and a justification. Hitherto the people were spoken of only in empty, obscure phraseology. Even the most inspired apostles never expected conscious action from them. But now the proletariat has returned the people to the people. The people have risen to their feet and are remaking the world." The Russian revolution of 1905 suffered defeat, but after October 1917 the conviction that the proletariat can return the people to the people began to take root in Hungary.

The bourgeois-democratic revolution of 1918, of which the working class was the principal motive force, was one of the tidal waves set in motion by the October Revolution. The Hungarian Soviet Republic of 1919 demonstrated not only the international impact of October but also the universal validity of the truths of the socialist revolution, of Leninism. Both the positive and the negative experience of our 1919 testify to the international character of Leninism: the gains of the Hungarian proletarian revolution accrued from the assimilation and application of Leninism, while its mistakes and its weaknesses resulted from departure from the Leninist teaching.

In the course of a few months, from its founding in November 1918 up to the proclamation of the Soviet Republic on March 21, 1919, the Communist Party won the political support of the working class and the confidence of the other strata of the

working people. What explains this rapid spread of Leninism? Why did the war-weary, poverty-stricken masses opt for the road of the October Revolution? Why did the example of Soviet Russia, bleeding as it was from the thousand wounds inflicted by the foreign intervention and civil war, signify the only possible way out for the Hungarian working people? The similarity of social structures in pre-revolutionary Russia and Hungary, while it facilitated the spread of Leninism, does not explain it. The Hungarian workers, peasants and intellectuals who followed the Communist Party aligned themselves with the ideas and practice of October. And not only because they had had enough of the capitalist-landlord system of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, but also because they had become disillusioned with the bourgeois "freedom" which left exploitation intact and upheld it, could not cure the ills that were plaguing the country and did not measure up even to the classical demands of bourgeois-democratic revolution. Leninism found fertile soil in Hungary because the Hungarian workers and peasants saw that it offered solutions to their own problems. For them Leninism was not an article of ideological import but a theory and strategy making possible a solution of the country's social contradictions in a revolutionary way. Affirmation of the international character of Leninism is one of the most important lessons of the Hungarian Soviet Republic. Leninism owed its influence in Hungary to the universality of its ideas. Tactical details pertaining to conditions specifically Russian had a lesser impact; the Hungarian Communists did not know much about them. What attracted and inspired them was an experience which demonstrated the possibility and the necessity of revolutionary action. They were attracted and inspired by the rebirth and further development of the revolutionary spirit of Marxism, by the idea of proletarian dictatorship, by the break with reformism, by the program of a united revolutionary workers' party with its call to action.

In the later history of Hungarian reformism its struggle against Leninism merged with vilification of the Hungarian Soviet Republic and of the Soviet Union. Anti-Sovietism dates from the birth of the Soviet state; in a thousand ways it suits the book of capitalism. The hoary reformist dogma that at the time of the 1914-18 World War feudalism prevailed in both Russia and Hungary and that therefore

only a bourgeois revolution under the leadership of the bourgeoisie was possible there, while a socialist revolution was ruled out—this dogma was directed at once against the memory of the Hungarian Soviet Republic and against the Soviet Union. "Russia signifies revolution — the Great French Revolution. But Russia does not signify socialism, and there is no task more important for us than to separate the cause of socialism from Russia, to prevent the two from ever being associated with each other," so declared a leading ideologue of Right-wing Social Democracy in Hungary in 1937. The same striving is evident today, fifty years after the Hungarian Soviet Republic, in the imperialist tactic of "softening up," in the revisionist denial of the historical truths of the past half-century, in the petty-bourgeois and nationalistic magnification of national features. Hungarian Communists have always associated socialism with the Soviet Union; this stems from our communist awareness, our Leninist convictions, our traditions and the past fifty years experience of our people. And whatever some may say to the contrary, we hold that this experience has not only Hungarian but also international significance.

Leninism provided the basis on which the Hungarian Communist and Social-Democratic parties fused in 1919. The Left Social-Democrats accepted the proletarian dictatorship in good faith and consistently upheld the cause of revolutionary socialism. But recognition of communism by the out and out Right and Center Social-Democrats proved, in most cases, to be formal, being a reluctant admission rather than acceptance of the socialist revolution. The Communist leaders, and in the first place Bela Kun, realized that any dissolution of the Communist organizations in the Social-Democratic Party and in the trade unions would be contrary to the interest of the proletarian dictatorship, of the working class. Some weeks after the proclamation of the Soviet Republic Bela Kun said: "It is necessary to purge the Party, to make it solid, united and disciplined . . . The Party organizations should be active in the working-class movement as principled and theoretically mature leaders; they should be principled and theoretically mature leaders of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which is the crowning point of the entire workers' movement." The imperialist intervention prevented the Communists from carrying out this task, but what Bela Kun said about the unity and

the leading role of the Party remains a topical lesson of the Hungarian Soviet Republic.

At the moment of taking power in 1919 the two parties merged; in 1948, in the process of establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat, a united revolutionary party of the working class was formed, becoming the foundation of working-class rule. The union was prepared by the struggle against Right Social Democracy, by discussions in which the working people actively participated. Unfortunately, the political rallying of the Communists and former Social-Democrats was complicated by the mistakes made after 1949, by the distortions, such as mistrust of former Social-Democrats and disregard of the need to wage a principled struggle against reformism. In 1956 the Rights who had been expelled from the SDP at the time of the merger reconstituted the party as a counter-revolutionary force and tried to destroy the unity of the working class. But working-class unity stood the test and gained strength in the fight against the counter-revolution and reformism disguised as "national communism." In 1956, for the first time since 1945, international reaction attempted, by rallying the forces of the Right, including a revived Social-Democratic Party, to pave the way to capitalist restoration. It wanted the Social-Democratic Party only for its name, using it to unite the anti-Communist, anti-Soviet reactionaries thirsting for revenge. This experience brought home to our Party the importance of the behest of 1919: to safeguard and strengthen the revolutionary unity of the working class.

III.

The 1919 proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat were not replicas of their Russian counterparts. Lenin pointed out on many occasions that the revolution in Hungary had confirmed the universal character of the aims of the October Revolution precisely because conditions in Hungary differed in many respects from those in Russia and the Hungarian revolution differed in form from the October Revolution. In Hungary the working class accounted for a greater share of the population; the Social-Democratic Party and the trade unions were legal, though under close political control; there were differences in the character of the national contradictions. More important, the Hungarian proletarian revolution, although

in essence akin to the October Revolution, was carried out in a different way. "The form of transition to the dictatorship of the proletariat in Hungary," wrote Lenin, "is altogether different from that in Russia—voluntary resignation of the bourgeois government, instantaneous restoration of working-class unity, socialist unity on a communist program. The nature of Soviet power is now all the clearer . . .—the dictatorship of the proletariat" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 29, pp. 388).

The 1919 revolution triumphed in a peaceful way, without an armed uprising. The revolutionary masses compelled the bourgeois government to cede power to the working class. Our experience proved the possibility of the proletarian revolution winning without armed violence. The roads to victory are many, but social conflict is unavoidable no matter which road is taken. Any form of proletarian dictatorship necessitates prompt consolidation of power and the use of means of power against the class enemy. Firm power must be established and used by the working class in keeping with the concrete conditions. Ultimately our working class won power in bitter class struggle. It could not choose the parliamentary way, for the parliament, in which not even the Social Democrats were represented due to discriminatory restrictions, had lost the confidence of the masses.

The birth of our Soviet Republic was not attended by violence, but international imperialism, acting hand in hand with the home reactionaries, embarked on war against the Republic and overthrew Hungary's first workers' government. This experience cannot be disregarded.

The lessons of our Soviet Republic, while demonstrating the possibility of non-violent revolution, at the same time warn against reformist and pacifist illusions. In March 1919, our working class performed a revolution—it took over power peacefully. But counter-revolution, relying on the forces of international reaction, unhesitatingly unleashed armed violence and terror. Then came defeat and the Trianon *diktat* of the imperialists.

The people's democratic revolution carried out following the liberation differed from the 1919 revolution. But from the vantage point of present-day development, we can see the essential similarities: what triumphed in the peoples democratic form was the same socialist revolution for which our working class had fought in 1919; both in 1919 and 1947-48, the dictatorship of

the proletariat was established and it turned the factories and banks into public property, organized the economy and defense of the country, crushed the resistance of the exploiting classes and effected a cultural revolution. In both cases, i.e., in 1919 and after 1945, the socialist revolution triumphed peacefully.

Regrettably, after 1948-49 the Party leadership failed to use the advantages and to avert the dangers inherent in the peaceful form of revolution. International and home reaction, aided by Right revisionism, turned the criticism of the mistakes of the leadership, the disillusionment and dissatisfaction of the masses, against the proletarian dictatorship, against the socialist system. The 1956 counter-revolution was made easier by the fact that the bourgeoisie had preserved much of its political strength, whereas resistance to its demagoguery was weakened by the failure of part of the Party membership to see the fundamental difference between communism and bourgeois democracy. The 1956 armed struggle against the international and Hungarian bourgeoisie was provoked by the counter-revolution. The Hungarian Communists, the Revolutionary Workers' and Peasants' Government turned for military help to the Soviet Union. In the new situation arising as a result of Soviet assistance the superior forces of the socialist revolution, which had been forced to retreat under the pressure of reaction and betrayal, reformed and struck back. The military and political victory over the counter-revolutionaries made possible the further peaceful development of the socialist revolution.

IV.

From the distance of half a century the Hungarian Soviet Republic appears before us in all its historical grandeur: our first workers' government was an organic component of the international proletarian revolution and national history, a continuation of the class and national-liberation struggles in Hungary. By means of the Entente's armed intervention the landlords and capitalists crushed the proletarian dictatorship, which, in defending the revolution, also defended national independence. The policy of the first workers' government was internationalist as well as national because it accorded with the interests of the overwhelming majority of the nation and first and foremost of the working class, because it applied the international theory of Leninism in Hungarian

conditions, and because it associated the cause of national independence with that of social emancipation.

The leaders of the Hungarian Soviet Republic committed no few mistakes, but of these mistakes they themselves were the severest critics. But the Republic did not perish because of its mistakes, it was crushed by the superior military power of imperialism. Home and foreign reaction which attacked the Republic openly called itself counter-revolution and flaunted its white banner. It combined ruthless terror with social and nationalistic demagoguery, declaring that the Communists were traitors to the country, that the dictatorship of the proletariat was a crime and friendship with the Soviet Union a national catastrophe.

The Republic was subverted also from within, by the Right and Centrist Social-Democratic leaders who held top posts in the government. Assessing the role of the Right Social-Democrats and Centrists in 1919, Lenin wrote: "As far as the individual is concerned, there is a very great difference between a man whose weakness of character makes him a traitor and one who is a deliberate, calculating traitor; but in politics there is no such difference, because politics involves the actual fate of millions of people, and it makes no difference whether the millions of workers and poor peasants are betrayed by those who are traitors from weakness of character or by those whose treachery pursues selfish aims." (*Collected Works*, Vol. 30, pp. 354-55.)

The counter-revolutionary terror that followed August 1919 inaugurated the right of freedom to kill. Wholesale executions took place—with and without trial—and not only of Communists, but also of sympathizers and even non-sympathizers who happened to stand in the way of one of the counter-revolutionary gangs. The anti-Communist witch-hunt was accompanied by anti-Semitic campaigns and pogroms.

The transition to this counter-revolutionary terror, the abolition of the gains of the proletarian dictatorship were the work of the so-called trade union government of Right-wing Social-Democrats which lasted in office six days. Their belief that after the dictatorship of the proletariat and in its stead they were installing "democracy" and that by abolishing workers' rule they would forestall extreme reaction, was an opportunistic illusion as common and natural as was the collapse of all such illusions.

After the Hungarian Soviet Republic had been drowned in blood, even those who had anticipated progress and rejected the counter-revolutionary regime, wrongly believed that the defeat of the proletarian dictatorship signified the end of the historical mission of the Hungarian working class, that henceforth leadership would belong to the peasantry or the intelligentsia, that the problems of national life demanded now an ethnic, "racial", and not a class approach. The Communists adhered, as before, to class principles. They pinned their hopes first and foremost on the working class, and ultimately were proved correct.

We know now the worth of all the abstract declarations concerning the leading role of the working class and the Communist Party. This role must be won, and winning it calls for studying, from the standpoint of the working class, from the standpoint of its scientific ideology, not only the class enemy, but also the conditions, specific problems, potential and psychology of the other classes and other strata of the working people. Only in this way can the Communist Party build the basis for its policy of alliances, which is indispensable for gaining and retaining victory. At the time of our Soviet Republic Lenin wrote in a letter to the Hungarian workers: "Classes can be abolished only by the dictatorship of that oppressed class which has been schooled, united, trained

and steeled by decades of the strike and political struggle against capital—of that class alone which has assimilated all the urban, industrial, big-capitalist culture... of that class alone which will be able to bear all the hardships, trials, privations and great sacrifices which history inevitably imposes upon those who break with the past and boldly hew a road for themselves to a new future . . ." (*Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 390.) The practice of the international and Hungarian working-class movement has borne out Lenin's words.

Today, too, our movement has its problems; but difficulties, temporary setbacks and vacillations cannot obscure the historical trend of the advance of the socialist revolution. The Twentieth Congress of the CPSU, the 1957 and 1960 world Communist forums, basing themselves on the rich experience of the world movement, reformulated, in the Leninist spirit, the principles of this advance, which will be the faster the more correctly we interpret and apply these principles. Viewed in perspective, the temporary setbacks and retreats are of a transient character, whereas the consolidation and advance of socialism are permanent factors. Our revolutionary optimism, which springs from the experience of success and trial, of advance and setback, is one of the cardinal lessons of the Hungarian Soviet Republic and of all the battles of the past fifty years.

The Austrian Party Congress

FRANZ MUHRI

The importance of the Austrian Communist Party's 20th Congress (Vienna, January 3-6) can be summed up as follows:

1. In the complex inner-Party situation following months of discussion, which continued at the congress and revealed fundamental differences on vital political and ideological issues, the congress was able to formulate and adopt a clear politi-

cal program. There was near unanimity on the main resolution and unanimous approval of the Central Committee's political report. The two documents furnished answers to the numerous questions posed in the discussion and charted the Party's future course. We reaffirmed, developed and concretized the decisions of the previous (19th) congress held in 1965.

2. The Congress adopted new Party Rules amplifying the principles of inner-party democracy and stressing the need for discipline and joint fulfilment of party decisions.

3. It elected a new Central Committee which includes many younger men from industry, trade union and youth organizations.

INTERNATIONAL SITUATION

The Central Committee report and the congress resolution highlight the fundamental difference between the world role of imperialism, notably U.S. imperialism, and that of the socialist countries, particularly the Soviet Union.

U.S. imperialism has throughout the past years been escalating its war of aggression in Vietnam, supporting the venal dictatorial regime in Saigon and many similar regimes in different parts of the world and has had a hand in the Middle East crisis. West German imperialism, persisting in its claim to speak for all Germany, is the chief menace to European peace and security. Colonialism and neo-colonialism disclose the reactionary and inhuman nature of imperialism.

In contrast, the Soviet Union and the socialist countries have—and this is emphasized in the congress resolution—worked towards democratic and humanistic aims; they are, in fact, the bulwark of Vietnam's liberation struggle and of all peoples striving for freedom and independence; they are the chief international force working for peace, democracy and socialism.

The roots of this fundamental difference in the role played by the imperialist and the socialist states should be sought in their internal social structures. The distinguishing feature of the imperialist countries is an unparalleled concentration of economic and political power. Monopoly capital, waxing rich on war and armaments, has a vital stake in exploiting its own and other peoples, exerts a dominant influence. Growing economic and political instability, sharper contradictions and greater insecurity coupled with a tendency to resort to authoritarian rule—these are the hallmarks of capitalism.

In contrast to this is the socialist structure and basic development trend in the Soviet Union and in the other socialist countries, where the means of production are owned by society and exploitation has

been abolished. There are no classes or social groups that profit from war and its preparation or from the exploitation of other nations. On the contrary, military expenditure necessitated by the existence of aggressive imperialism is a heavy burden on the USSR and the other socialist countries.

We affirmed anew the proposition enunciated by the 19th congress that the socialist revolution is inevitably associated with far-reaching democratic changes. It inaugurates a cultural revolution, which, for the first time, guarantees genuine development of the personality, and it enables the workers to take over the management of industry.

The attitude to the Soviet Union and the socialist countries generally was a main topic of discussion both before and during the congress. And the congress gave a clear-cut answer, declaring that the principles of autonomy and solidarity must be correctly combined.

The building of socialism in the Soviet Union and in the other socialist countries has not always been a straight and smooth road. There is no automatic guarantee against mistakes, nor of unhampered success in building up the economy or in establishing socialist democracy. Everything depends on the constructive activity of the working class and the people, on a correct policy by the Communist Party.

Austria borders on the socialist world and, as in no other West European country, every development in the socialist lands immediately becomes a factor of internal policy in Austria. Hence every economic advance and every new development in socialist democracy help the Austrian Communists. Conversely, every difficulty encountered and every mistake made in building socialist society complicates matters.

The Congress decisions clearly and emphatically state that solidarity with the Soviet Union and the socialist countries is an inviolable principle for our party. While discussing our differences in a businesslike and comradely manner, we are anxious to pursue our joint fight against imperialism. He who forsakes solidarity with the Soviet Union, the Central Committee report says, cannot be considered a Communist.

In reviewing the international situation, the congress resolution noted that imperialism has not relinquished its designs against the socialist states and in some areas has actually launched successful attacks. The resolution also noted the continuation of the arms drive, the increased economic

and military capability of West German imperialism and the heightened menace of local wars and of a third world war. However, the congress was able to record that in recent years imperialism had failed to achieve its aim in any crucial area (Vietnam, the Middle East, Europe). The forces of socialism, democracy and peace have grown and are playing an active role. This is especially noticeable in the steadfast solidarity movement with Vietnam. Indeed, international solidarity helped in getting the bombing of North Vietnam stopped and in starting the Paris negotiations.

In Western Europe, and not least in West Germany, there is a rising movement for European security. Powerful mass movements in France and Italy have an important relevance to the socialist perspective in Europe.

In short, the congress reaffirmed the possibility of averting both local conflict and a world nuclear war and rejected the erroneous views on peaceful coexistence expressed by some people in the party. Overcoming these views is a necessary prelude to intensifying the fight for peace. We rejected any underestimation of the consequences of a nuclear war and the view that a third world war would be the prelude to world revolution. Nor can we accept the tendency to underestimate the aggressive character of imperialism and the sharp struggle taking place between the forces of socialism and capitalism. Peaceful coexistence rests on the principle that all issues can be resolved without resort to war. All nations long for peace, and for them peaceful coexistence of countries with differing social systems is a matter of life and death. Nor should peaceful coexistence be seen as a matter purely for diplomacy, concerning the relations between the great powers. Above all peaceful coexistence calls for resolute mass action against aggressive imperialism; it rules out any retention of colonial and neo-colonial positions and compromise with capitalism. It implies the right to national liberation and sovereignty, and also the right to opt for socialism without any outside interference. Without eliminating colonialism and neo-colonialism, without forcing imperialism to yield its positions of power, there can be no enduring peace on earth.

Taking these principles as its starting point, the Congress declared in its resolution: "The Communist Party of Austria considers the fight for peace, disarmament, detente, solidarity with heroic Vietnam and all national liberation movements, with

the Communists and democrats of Greece, Spain, Portugal, Indonesia and other countries locked in battle against tyrannical dictatorships, to be one of its chief tasks. Preservation of Austrian neutrality is a decisive contribution to peace and international detente. We call upon the Austrian Government, parliament, the political parties and the trade unions to support, in the spirit of genuine neutrality, and to work by means of various initiatives towards the following goals:

Peace in Vietnam on the basis of its peoples' freedom and right to self-determination in keeping with the proposals of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam; recognition of the latter as the legitimate spokesman of South Vietnam; complete withdrawal of U.S. forces;

Support of all initiatives towards disarmament, a nuclear weapons ban, reduction in military expenditure and use of the money thus released for economic, scientific and cultural development and aid to third-world nations;

A political settlement in the Middle East by Israeli withdrawal from occupied territories and Arab recognition of Israel's right to existence;

Recognition of the right of all nations to self-determination, abolition of all forms of colonialism and neo-colonialism;

Simultaneous dissolution of European military alliances and withdrawal of all troops from foreign territories; acceptance of the 1945 European boundaries and of the existence of the two German states, i.e., recognition of the GDR; economic, cultural and political cooperation between the countries of Europe and especially the Danube countries; establishment of a European security system."

WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

Questions of the world Communist movement had a prominent place in the pre-congress and congress discussions. The congress favored closer contacts between the parties, bilateral, multilateral and regional meetings and also the preparation and holding of an international conference. If this conference of the parties is to contribute to the unity of the world movement, it must ensure free and comradely discussion of political and ideological issues. The Congress unanimously declared for preservation, creative development and consistent implementation of the principles worked out since the 20th Congress of the Soviet

Communist Party and embodied in the numerous documents and decisions of the international Communist movement and of our own party.

In our judgment, working-class power and socialist democracy represent an integral whole, and the same goes for proletarian internationalism, sovereignty and non-interference. Any one-sided emphasis—let alone counterposing—of these principles would be wrong and harmful. Accordingly, we hold that there are not only common basic laws of socialism, but also national features and traditions that must be carefully observed, together with Austria's new opportunities for transition to socialism created by the existence of the Soviet Union and the socialist countries.

In our view, there can be no socialist revolution and no building of socialism without revolutionary leadership by the working class and without a strong Communist Party. However, the methods of applying this principle of the party's leading role are determined by national conditions, by the existence of a one-party or multi-party system.

On Czechoslovakia, the congress reaffirmed the stand taken by the Party's Central Committee at its plenary sessions in August and September last year.

THE HOME FRONT

Austria's internal problems and the party's tasks, the congress declared, should be in the center of all our work.

After 20 years of coalition with the Socialists, the general election of March 1966 returned the People's Party to power. The picture is one of sharpening economic and political contradictions, rising prices, higher rents and taxes for the working population and tax privileges for the capitalists. Nor have things been made any better by the country's obsolescent industrial structure, growing economic insecurity, the crisis in education, especially in the universities and research centers (Austria allocates a mere 0.35 per cent of its national income for research). Government policy has been oriented on contraction of the nationalized sector and more scope for Austrian and foreign, notably West German, capital, and numerous privileges for the propertied minority. This is coupled with a monopoly in conditioning public opinion through the mass media which, incidentally, are subject to increasing West German influence. Such is a brief list of recent developments on the home front. The Federation of

Industry, which speaks for the country's two thousand big capitalists, dominates economic and political life. There are growing symptoms that economic and political reaction is steadily gaining ground in our profit-stimulated capitalist society.

This has been made possible because the Socialist Party, which has much influence in the working class and in the trade unions, has been hard at work to prevent workers from entering the fight against Big Business and reaction. Though in opposition, the Socialists have veered sharply to the right. Their leaders are dead set against extra-parliamentary struggle in any shape or form, and are doing everything to obstruct militant action. This policy is laced with anti-communism and lavish praise of West German and U.S. imperialism. Unlike other West European Social-Democratic parties, the leaders of the Austrian Socialists are against solidarity with Vietnam. Their economic program frankly advocates more power to Austrian and foreign capital and shuns anything resembling an anti-capitalist policy. It would be true to say that the Socialist Party has been the basic factor in shoring up Austrian capitalism. That is why our Congress declared that without a change in policy a Socialist victory in the next general election would not be a step forward. It could but lead to another coalition government similar to that in West Germany or patterned on the Wilson Government in Britain.

In the past few years the Communist attitude to the Socialist Party has been the subject of much discussion and controversy among party members. And at times our 19th Congress decisions on this issue were given a one-sided or patently wrong interpretation. We have had to contend both with sectarian and Right-opportunist tendencies. That is why this congress reaffirmed the Party's position vis-a-vis the Socialists but backed it with more effective and concrete arguments. Our view is that there can be no democratic renewal and no advance to socialism without the support of the Socialist rank and file, that is why contacts and discussions with Socialist Party members remain a major task. In recent years criticism of Socialist Party policy has at times been manifestly inadequate, Congress declared. The conclusion that the People's Party and the Freedom Party, the political arm of Big Business, are the main enemy of the working class is, of course, fully justified. That, however, should not induce us to relax our struggle against the incorrect policies of the Socialist lead-

ership, as has too often been the case.

The 19th Congress conclusion that united working-class action and unity of all democratic forces are decisive for democratic renewal and the advance to socialism retains its validity. However, there is no immediate prospect of sustained and firm united action, but there is room for temporary joint initiatives and joint action in support of concrete economic and political demands at factory, trade union and community levels. That correct policy, however, has tended to weaken our criticism of the Socialist Party line. Yet principled and consistent ideological struggle against that opportunist line in no way conflicts with united action. On the contrary: by raising the level of class consciousness it helps promote united action.

Our 19th Congress declared that Austria's transition to socialism would proceed within the framework of a multi-party system. But this presupposes a differentiation process and internal change in the existing parties. That view, fully justified, has in practice led to a tendency to tone down the need for a Communist Party and its role. Yet principled ideological work in this direction, though difficult, is especially important for a small Party like ours. Accordingly, the 20th Congress keenly discussed the role of the Party, emphasizing that it should not confine its work to securing a change in the Socialist Party, and that the strengthening of the Communist Party is decisive for Austria's democratic and socialist development.

The Congress also advanced a democratic and socialist alternative to the present economic and political system and defined our central tasks and aims in this context:

1. An active industrial policy to re-invigorate the nationalized industry and considerably extend the finished-product industries.

2. Higher living standards through an active social policy, particularly in regard to wages, and effective measures to halt price rises.

3. Radical reform of the education system, repeal of all privileges, democratization of higher education and more generous appropriations for science and research.

4. More low-rent housing.

5. Democratization of the federal army to prevent it becoming an instrument of reaction; democratization of the entire machinery of state.

6. Democratization and control of the

mass media. Electoral reform to guarantee every vote equal weight, and repeal of all privileges.

7. Restriction of Big Business and big landownership, worker control and participation in management, politics and education.

8. Austria needs a government of democratic renewal backed by all the democratic and patriotic forces.

THE PARTY

The Party's new Rules approved by the congress set forth our tasks and aims and examine in detail the norms of Party life. They define the Party's organizational principles as democratic centralism, collective work and personal responsibility. All decisions must be preceded by a democratic discussion and a democratic exchange of views. Full-time officials are accountable to the elected bodies and in no circumstances can they supersede them. Each member has the right to criticize all leading committees and individual leaders irrespective of their position. Comprehensive information from the Party center is a necessary condition for active rank-and-file participation in framing and implementing policy. The Party Rules also oblige each member to uphold the Party Program and Party policy in all his work. Majority decisions are binding on all. Democratic discussion and discipline in carrying out decisions are an integral whole.

The Congress stressed the need for greater ideological work initiated by the leadership. The members now have more opportunities for appearing on public platforms, taking part in debates, forums and dialogues.

Austria has a rising student Left, though on a lesser scale than in other countries of Western Europe. Both in terms of membership and quality of activity our Party is lagging behind the opportunities and demands. Hence, more and better ideological work, specifically in Marxist education, is a major task. We are concentrating on work among young people in industry.

Ideological, political and organizational unity of the Party is a precondition for attaining our goals.

Before the Congress some of the Party organizations had degenerated into discussion clubs. Congress found that the fight against sectarian and revisionist trends has been inadequate. Nor is it merely a matter of securing unity at any cost, but rather of

forging political, ideological and organizational unity on the basis of the Congress decisions.

Congress had to hold a second election to the Central Committee. This was an extreme measure in an exceptionally dangerous situation. It averted a split, but did not

remove the difficulties confronting the Party. But the way has been cleared for constructive activity, for political and ideological Party unity. Congress decisions, obliging us to exert every effort to achieve our goals, are supported by a large majority of the Party.

Through cooperation to progress

Interview with Representatives of International Organizations of Socialist Countries

The trend towards internationalization of the productive forces, indicated long ago by Marx, has become much more pronounced with the onset of the scientific and technological revolution. Nowadays no country, no matter how big, can effectively develop its industry and achieve a high technological level by relying solely on its own resources and requirements. The international division of labor has become a demand of the times.

Capitalism created the world market, uniting producers in the different countries and continents in a system of international division of labor. But capitalist economic integration takes place in conditions of acute class contradictions, fierce competition and economic and political inequality of states, thus imparting a deformed character to it and hindering maximum utilization of the advantages of the international division of labor. Socialism alone provides full scope for a rational organization of the economy on a world scale, making possible harmonious development of each sovereign state and fruitful international specialization and cooperation.

The international socialist division of labor is realized on a qualitatively new basis which is the exact antithesis of that of capitalism: socialist ownership of the means of production by sovereign socialist states of the working people. Accordingly, economic cooperation between the socialist countries is characterized by voluntary participation; equality of all countries, regardless of size or level of economic development; harmony of national and international interests; mutual benefit; mutual aid; the granting of privileges and aid to the less developed countries.

The rapid development of this new type of international division of labor requires, naturally, corresponding organizational forms. Hence the ever-increasing number of bilateral and multilateral organizations uniting the efforts of the countries concerned.

In the 20 years since the establishment of the Council for Mutual Economic Aid, the first multilateral economic organization of the socialist countries, there have appeared dozens of others, many set up on the initiative of the CMEA and working in close contact with it.

These organizations have accumulated ample experience of cooperation in all spheres of the international socialist division of labor and have created prerequisites for the further development of integration processes in the socialist world.

To be sure, by far not all the possibilities have been utilized in promoting the socialist division of labor. There are still great reserves for deepening specialization and cooperation in industry, in science and technology, in the financial and monetary spheres and in foreign trade. Recognizing this, the 22nd Session of the CMEA Council, held last January, instructed its agencies to accelerate the drafting of recommendations for specialization and cooperation in the manufacture of important types of machines, equipment and instruments and the solution of the relevant general economic as well as monetary, financial and commercial problems. Without doubt, the experience accumulated by the international economic organizations of the socialist countries will facilitate realization of these tasks.

Believing that acquaintance with their work might help the reader better to under-

stand the problems and prospects of the international socialist division of labor, the editorial board of our journal instructed its correspondents to interview representatives of four of them—the International Bank of

Economic Cooperation, Intermetal, the Organization for Cooperation in the Bearings Industry, and the Joint Nuclear Research Institute. Below we print summaries of the interviews.

THE INTERNATIONAL BANK OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION

Konstantin Nazarkin (USSR), President of the Bank, pointed to the direct connection between the growth of the international socialist division of labor and the emergence of an international payments system. The economic cooperation of the CMEA countries has passed through a series of stages. In the fifties, when the European People's Democracies were laying the foundations of a socialist economy and the international socialist division of labor was taking its first steps, bilateral clearing between national banks was the most expedient and acceptable form of international payments. It ensured a balanced two-way trade and simplified accounting, made for more efficient planning of foreign trade and helped consolidate economic cooperation.

In the sixties the economic development of the socialist countries and the division of labor between them reached a level at which the bilateral clearing system had outlived itself. It had become a hindrance to extending economic relations, especially in the matter of foreign trade. Growth of bilateral trade began to depend on the country with the least export possibilities. It became necessary to devise a system corresponding to the new level of development of the CMEA countries and to help deepen the division of labor among them.

In 1963, the CMEA countries agreed on a system of multilateral clearances in transferable roubles and established the International Bank of Economic Cooperation.

Guidelines for the Bank, which commenced operations on January 1, 1964 were:

- to further the international socialist division of labor, inter-country trade and other forms of economic cooperation;

- to help ensure, by monetary-financial means, the carrying out of mutual commitments;

- to improve the system of clearances between CMEA countries.

These functions, based on socialist internationalism, are carried out with strict respect for the equality of the partners and the principle of unanimity in adopting decisions. Regardless of the scale of the con-

tributions to the authorized capital,* members of the Council of the Bank were accorded equal rights—a fact not to be observed in the capitalist world.

Thus there appeared an international financial center which constitutes part of the socialist monetary system and opens up good prospects for the cooperation of the CMEA countries in the financial sphere.

The founders of the Bank intended it to serve the economic interests of the member countries. This requirement is strictly adhered to. The clearance system practised by the Bank is based on mutual trust and is not influenced by the stronger members as is the case in the capitalist world.

It is stable and free from the defects of capitalist monetary relations characterized by periodic crises and upheavals. Among other things, this facilitates the Bank's relations with the banks of non-member countries.

Our Bank is not a closed organization. Subject to the approval of all its members, it can be joined by other countries which share its aims and principles and assume the respective obligations. Moreover, the Bank can conduct operations for non-member countries.

Another feature of the multilateral clearance system is that the Bank carries out CMEA recommendations pertaining to financial cooperation, thereby contributing to the consolidation of the international socialist monetary and financial system.

In a nutshell, the main functions of the Bank are as follows:

- multilateral settling of accounts in transferable roubles in commercial and other operations;

- credits for foreign trade and other operations by the member-countries;

- deposits in transferable roubles;

- financing and crediting, on instructions from the countries concerned and with the means provided by them, of joint construction projects and the reconstruction and

*The authorized capital of the Bank was fixed at 300 million transferable roubles (the gold content of the transferable rouble is 0.987 grams of fine gold) with the Soviet Union contributing the biggest share—116 million roubles.

operation of industrial enterprises and other installations;

—other banking operations, including those in convertible currency.

Since the Bank caters to planned economies, credit, whether to finance foreign trade or special projects, is based on plans worked out jointly with the banks of the countries concerned. The Bank's credit policy is not geared to obtaining a high rate of profit. Interest rates are much lower than in the capitalist market, and furthermore are stable, assuring a high degree of stability in foreign-trade planning.

However, some aspects of the functioning of the Bank call for improvement. For instance, the issue of special-purpose credit and fixing the terms of payment is not always economically grounded. Interest policy should be defined more precisely. The sphere of application of the transferable rouble is still limited to member-countries, whereas the Charter of the Bank authorizes its use in settling accounts with non-mem-

bers. There is room for improvement also in clearance arrangements.

We are also studying possibilities for promoting international specialization and cooperation in industry based on medium- and long-term credit.

Part of the authorized capital of the bank consists of gold and convertible currency, which enables us to carry out currency operations on international monetary markets. Owing to the success of these operations the international prestige of the Bank is rising.

We intend to continue our cooperation with all financial organizations interested in doing business with us. This applies also to non-CMEA countries and international and national financial institutions. The primary purpose of the Bank is to contribute to the development and deepening of the international socialist division of labor and the expansion of trade both in the CMEA system and with other countries.

INTERMETAL — ORGANIZATION FOR COOPERATION IN THE IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRY

The idea of setting up an international center to organize cooperation in this vital branch of modern industry was suggested by the CMEA, said *Mihaly Osztatni* (Hungary), Director of Intermetal. Not that the CMEA could not have coped with this work itself. But its functions are broader, more general. In addition, it was becoming increasingly obvious that without an efficient, flexibly operating international organization the solving of the constantly arising problems would be very difficult.

In July 1964 Hungary, Poland and Czechoslovakia reached agreement on founding Intermetal. The same year it was joined by the Soviet Union, the GDR and Bulgaria. Its office is located in Budapest.

The Intermetal agreement provides for coordination and cooperation in the manufacture of rolled metal, steel pipe and other items according to agreed nomenclatures. As the agreement got under way, experience prompted new forms, methods and directions of work, and new tasks emerged. The range of these has broadened out, having finally evolved into a concrete program of action.

Now, what does Intermetal actually do? What benefits accrue to its partners?

Our chief concern today is to organize, on short notice, deliveries of rolled metal. Trade between CMEA countries is based

on bilateral inter-government agreements concerning mutual deliveries. These agreements are taken into account in the national-economic plans and are of a long-term nature.

But what if the situation in, say, the national iron and steel industries changes, leading to the emergence of new, non-planned import needs and export possibilities? That is when Intermetal comes to the aid of foreign trade agencies, acting as broker on what might be described as a socialist steel exchange.

Once in every three months foreign trade representatives, production and marketing organizations get together to exchange information on surpluses and shortages of rolled metal and to agree on deliveries. Not infrequently one country happens to have a surplus of a particular item and a shortage of others, while the situation in another country may be the reverse. The countries agree on an exchange of the items needed. Very often this exchange is multilateral. Thus, Intermetal, firstly, helps to balance possibilities and requirements as far as rolled metal is concerned and, secondly, promotes exchanges in various assortments, doing all this promptly and flexibly. The quantities of rolled metal exchanged through our agency keep growing. Deliveries within the Intermetal framework in-

creased from 0.8 million tons in 1964 to double that figure in 1968: 1.6 million tons, which equals the annual output in Hungary and is approximately 2.5 times more than is produced in Bulgaria.

In 1967 trade began in bolts, nuts, wire netting and similar items, and next on the list are pig-iron, ferro-alloys and scrap metal. Intermetal also acts as a go-between in utilizing rolling capacities. Kept informed about existing capacities and the degree of their utilization, Intermetal enables its members promptly to agree on their most rational utilization. For instance, in 1967 Intermetal secured orders for 355,000-ton blooming mill capacities and 395,000-ton cogging capacities, which had been temporarily idle.

Another function, and one which in the future may be even more important than the exchange of rolled metal, is that of drafting proposals for joint investments. Given the present level of technological development it is sometimes not worth while for a country to launch production of a particular item of rolled metal calculated only for its own requirements. For example, consumption of transformer steel in any of the European socialist countries varies between 10,000 and 20,000 tons a year, while the minimum profitable volume of transformer steel production with utilization of **modern technology** is 60,000 tons. Understandably, the way out for the CMEA countries is to build a joint enterprise turning out low-priced and high-quality transformer steel. That is where Intermetal comes in, placing orders with the biggest design organizations in the socialist countries. Currently we are also drafting proposals on joint investment in zinc-coated sheet production.

Another area in which Intermetal is busy is specialization in the manufacture of rolled stock. Last year specialization was extended to 53 rare sections and sizes. That is not much, of course, but proposals have now been prepared and electronically computed on specialization in the production of 2,000,000 tons of rolled stock. Specialization involves many problems — prices, currency convertibility, versatility in specialization, to mention but a few. No new undertaking is easy. This year we shall examine these problems and outline ways of specialization in the iron and steel industry.

Intermetal also engages in coordinating joint actions on capitalist markets. As a rule, socialist countries purchase limited amounts of rolled stock there, for rolled

stock production in the CMEA community is making good progress. These purchases concern only rare items, and for these high prices are usually charged. By coordinating their purchases the Intermetal countries obtain considerable price reductions.

Another important aspect of Intermetal's work is the publishing of technical reference books. Not long ago, for instance, it issued a unique catalogue of more than 3,000 rolled items with the computered technical characteristics of each. This catalogue is invaluable to the engineer and designer.

Just as the Council for Mutual Economic Aid, Intermetal operates on a strictly voluntary basis. Each partner has one vote on its Council, and chairmen alternate. The Council holds sessions twice a year, approving annual and long-term plans and checking on fulfilment. It discusses both matters of general concern and those in which only two countries are interested.

Intermetal has a permanent Executive Bureau the director of which is appointed by the Council for a term of three years. Member countries are represented on the Bureau by vice-directors and experts.

Intermetal is open for membership or cooperation to other countries. For instance, this year cooperation contacts have been established with the association of Yugoslav iron and steel mills.

The Intermetal agreement stipulates that the Council "reaches decisions or recommendations only with the consent of the heads of the delegations of all the Contracting Parties." The principle of unanimity, while not new, is characteristic of all the international organizations of the socialist countries. But there are definite differences between some of these organizations and the CMEA.

CMEA and its organs adopt only *recommendations*, whereas Intermetal also makes *decisions*. In other words, its functions are, to a certain degree, of a directive nature. Its decisions need not be approved by the member-countries. This, however, does not involve any violation of sovereignty or imposition of decisions, for Intermetal is guided by the principles of the international socialist division of labor and organizes cooperation on a basis of equality, mutual benefit and mutual aid. Its decisions are not binding on those countries which are not interested in them. For instance, the proposal on joint investments for the production of transformer steel does not apply to the Soviet Union, which, however,

is contributing in every way to its realization. The binding nature of decisions stems, not from a desire to impose a decision on any one, but from the fact that the organs represented in Intermetal are competent enough for its decisions to be final, needing no subsequent approval in the countries concerned. Finally, Comrade Osztatni pointed out, the current worldwide scientific and technological revolution calls for bold and resolute measures to intensify integration processes in the socialist community.

This does not mean, of course, that these processes should cut across national interests and sovereignty. Our aim is to adapt ourselves more flexibly to the demands of scientific and technological progress, to find new, more effective forms of cooperation conforming to the interests of both individual countries and the community as a whole.

Intermetal, having passed a test of life, has grown, has proved its worth and is expanding its activities.

ORGANIZATION FOR COOPERATION IN THE BEARINGS INDUSTRY

The journal's questions were answered by Henryk Pochrzest (Poland), head of the OCBI Secretariat.

Rolling friction bearings, without which the existence of a modern economy is unthinkable, belong to the most universal types of engineering output. Their production in the world is counted in thousands of millions. CMEA countries manufacture annually upwards of 1,000 million friction bearings of about 3,000 types and sizes, with the series ranging from several dozen to several millions.

Understandably, no country, especially a small one, can profitably produce the entire nomenclature of top-quality bearings. Duplication here would be an unpardonable waste of social labor. In addition, bearings production is new for most CMEA countries, having been developed there practically from scratch. In the recent past they experienced a shortage of bearings and had to make up for it with costly imports from capitalist states. Moreover, the shortage tended to grow, for the engineering industry in the CMEA countries is developing at the fastest rate in the world* and its demand for bearings is constantly growing. Therefore, back in the fifties, the Council for Mutual Economic Aid adopted recommendations on expanding and specializing the manufacture of bearings. These recommendations helped to develop bearings production and more rationally to utilize the existing and newly-built capacities. Output grew rapidly, and imports were cut.

This confirmed the effectiveness of international cooperation in this area and created conditions for going over to forms of cooperation that would ensure a fuller and speedier utilization of the advantages of the

international socialist division of labor and thus fully satisfy the current and long-range requirements.

In April 1964 six CMEA countries—Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, Poland, the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia—agreed on establishing what is now known as the Organization for Cooperation in the Bearings Industry, with its head office in Warsaw. The OCBI is an open organization. It can be joined by other countries.

The functions of OCBI are to further specialization in the manufacture of rolling friction bearings, to coordinate annual and long-term production and delivery plans, and harmonize research and development.

The OCBI Board, composed of permanent representatives of the member-countries, meets at least twice a year. Decisions are adopted with the consent of all the countries concerned, which guarantees voluntary participation, rules out violations of sovereignty, and ensures mutual benefit. All expenditure is shared equally.

The Secretariat of the Board, its permanent working committee, consists of specialists from all member countries and functions on a day-to-day basis.

The four years of OCBI have shown that on the whole the organization has coped with its tasks. This year's output of rolling friction bearings in the member countries will be 50 per cent above 1965—the first year of OCBI. In 1964 domestic production and mutual deliveries covered 80 per cent of the demand. Last year the figure rose to 97.5 per cent. Importing from the capitalist countries is minimal, and is resorted to only when the small amount of the type of bearings needed makes organization of home production unprofitable.

The biggest increase in bearings production is observed in Bulgaria, whose economic level is being brought up, with the

*Between 1960 and 1967 engineering output in the CMEA countries increased by 120 per cent, as against 35 per cent in the Common Market countries.

help of her friends, to that of the industrially developed states. This year Bulgaria will manufacture approximately 75 per cent more bearings than in 1965. Production specialization is growing, as is the volume of reciprocal deliveries. Since the establishment of the OCBI it has increased by more than 150 per cent. The higher rate of deliveries growth, compared to growth of production, testifies to a considerable deepening of the international socialist division of labor in this area.

Specialization and a more rational distribution of production programs have brought about an improvement in the utilization of production capacities, a 30 per cent increase in average serialization and a reduction in production costs.

Of great economic effect has been the establishment of centralized emergency stocks. The point is that in conditions of a single country it is not possible to provide for such emergency demand and, besides, duplication of stocks in individual countries involves large expenditures. Formerly the usual way out was to resort to emergency purchases on the capitalist market, which involved large expenditures of hard currency and slowed down repairs and resumption of operation. Now this problem has been eliminated. Beginning with 1968, emergency demand for bearings of all types and sizes is met from the centralized OCBI stock.

OCBI has helped, its members agree, to improve the quality of bearings. The range of production has likewise been broadened. Bearings of complex design account today for about half the total nomenclature.

However, we have problems too. Not everything is going as well as the partners expected. The level of specialization and cooperation is, in the opinion of experts, not high enough. The quality of some types of bearings does not measure up to world standards. Considerable improvements are needed in the mechanism of incentives to specialization, especially where prices are concerned. Direct contacts between the producers still have to be properly organized. Cooperation in research is not effective enough. There is also the problem of cooperation on the markets of third countries. In short, a great deal of work still remains to be done.

The stress now is on higher quality,

THE JOINT NUCLEAR RESEARCH INSTITUTE

The work of the Institute was described by its director, Academician N. Bogolyubov (USSR), and vice-directors Prof. N. Sod-

profitability, effectiveness of capital investments, and foreign trade.

Coordination of long-term production and specialization plans is also being raised to a higher stage. The OCBI is planning production and consumption for 1971-80 and the capital investments this will require. Forecasting of this kind will make it possible to coordinate plans at a much higher level, outline and agree on the most effective trends in specialization, and obtain maximum returns on investments. The partners will have a better basis for long-term bilateral and multilateral specialization agreements.

Agreements of this kind are a novel feature in CMEA practice. The necessary experience is still lacking. Therefore OCBI has prepared and despatched to the member-countries, by way of recommendation, model long-term agreements determining volume of deliveries, quality standards, pricing and payments, guarantees and sanctions, also research and development arrangements.

Special attention is paid to scientific and technological cooperation. At present proposals are being drafted designed to make the cooperation more effective. The idea is to concentrate research and development on pivotal problems, especially those connected with accelerating the rise of labor productivity in the national industries. We also want to ensure clear-cut specialization of research organizations and a system of economic stimulation of research.

Quality is constantly in the center of our attention. In October 1967 the OCBI held an international technico-economic conference devoted to this matter. The participants included representatives of our client industries. Consumers' demands became the basis for determining tasks in the matter of improving the quality of bearings.

The OCBI also arranges exchange of views in improving the technology, economics and organization of production. Proposals are being prepared on coordinating the purchase of licences, and steps are being taken to pool efforts on the world market.

Thanks to concerted work, the bearings industry of the six CMEA countries is becoming one of the most integrated branches in the socialist world economy.

nom (Mongolia) and Prof. K. Khristov (Bulgaria).

In March 1956 representatives of the

governments of socialist countries* signed an agreement on establishing the Joint Nuclear Research Institute. The same year physicists from the member-countries arrived in Dubna, a town on the Volga, which houses two large institutes of the USSR Academy of Science and which the Soviet Government turned over to the new international organization.

The Institute pursues, as its charter stipulates, strictly peaceful purposes. Its tasks include joint theoretical and experimental research, promoting the development of nuclear physics and training specialists for the member-countries.

Each country contributes to financing the Institute and its construction projects. The scale of the contributions varies from 0.05 to 47 per cent of total expenditure, depending on the economic possibilities of the countries. Irrespective of this, however, all have equal rights as regards participation in research and management.

The scientists working in the Institute have not a few achievements to their credit. They were first, for example, to explore some of the vital areas of nuclear research, experimentally to verify fundamental principles of physical theories, discover new physical phenomena, synthesize the elements 102, 104 and 105, obtain new isotopes of the element 103 and elucidate the properties of many isotopes of transuranic elements. A new type of nuclear fission has been found. Problems of neutron spectroscopy are being solved. Work is conducted on fundamental problems of the theory of the field, the structure of "elementary" particles, the theory of their interaction, the theory of the nucleus, and others.

Participation in joint research has benefited the professional growth of many specialists now working successfully in national scientific establishments, and often heading them.

Among the brilliant theoreticians who have matured and who continue to work in Dubna, mention can be made of Ivan Todorov, Bulgarian, and the Vietnamese physicist Nguen Van Hieu. Both were young beginners when they came to the Institute. Here they prepared and submitted their Master's and Doctor's theses. Now their

works are widely known among physicists throughout the world.

This international cooperation of scientists working for peace and socialism is producing remarkable results. Exceptional possibilities have presented themselves, in particular, with the starting of the world's biggest accelerator at Serpukhov, on which members of the Institute have been invited to work with scientists of the Soviet Institute of High-Energy Physics. Under an agreement between the two institutes, scientists from the socialist countries are taking part in a broad program of highly interesting research projects made possible by this unique accelerator.

The Institute's new Laboratory of Computer Technology and Automation, equipped with the highest-class computers, is the biggest computer center serving physicists in the socialist countries.

The staff of the Institute stands out for its spirit of teamwork, broad range of interests and knowledge of the achievements of colleagues all over the world. Several times a year Dubna becomes the venue of conferences of scientists from socialist and capitalist countries. Physicists in many countries follow the work of the Institute. Dubna scientists fruitfully participate in international conferences devoted to nuclear research.

Each year the Institute organizes more than 200 research projects with the participation of the national institutes of socialist countries.

Scientists are exchanged both with socialist countries and with a number of research centers in the capitalist world. Contacts have been established, in particular, with the European Nuclear Research Center in Geneva, the Niels Bohr Institute in Copenhagen and scientific establishments in France, Sweden and other countries.

An active exchange of scientific material is maintained. Our publications are sent to more than a thousand addresses in 36 countries.

We also supply our colleagues abroad with radioactive isotopes, produced by the most advanced methods developed in Dubna.

Speaking of prospects, mention can be made of the plans to build a new impulse reactor. Programs of work for this reactor have been suggested by scientists from Hungary, the GDR, Poland, Rumania and the Soviet Union. This year a special inter-

*Founding members of the Institute, which was set up on the proposal of the Soviet Union, were Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, the German Democratic Republic, the Korean People's Democratic Republic, the People's Republic of China, Mongolia, Poland, Rumania, the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia. In the autumn of 1956 they were joined by the Democratic Republic of Vietnam.

national commission of experts will meet to discuss these proposals.

Life in the Dubna Institute is characterized by the constantly growing activity of its personnel. Plans, proposals and projects often overshoot the possibilities, which is testimony to the creative initiative and active concern for the progress of a common cause.

Fundamental problems of physics are studied in Dubna with the participation of small countries for whom it would be difficult or impossible to build their own nuclear research complexes. For small

countries Dubna has become a university where nuclear physicists are trained. For instance, almost all Bulgarian scientists now engaged in nuclear research have worked in Dubna. The Institute also grants 15 scholarships annually to representatives of developing and other non-member countries.

Physicists from the countries represented in the Institute feel at home in Dubna where the strictly impartial scientific atmosphere is complemented by the warmth of internationalist mutual aid and friendship.

Science serves the people

This is the second in our series of interviews with presidents of the Academies of Science of the socialist countries

MIRON NICOLESCU, President of the Academy of Science of the Socialist Republic of Rumania

1. Question: *What are the achievements with which scientists in your country ushered in the new year?*

Answer: To begin with, I should like to define the limits of my answer, which I shall confine to the work of the various institutions of our Academy. I make this reservation because, on the one hand, the Academy's work epitomizes the entire scientific movement in our country and, on the other, because I prefer to deal with a familiar round of problems, problems I am directly concerned with by virtue of my office.

What highlighted 1968 was that it was the 20th anniversary of the reorganization of the country's academic life along new, socialist lines. This reorganization, made under the auspices of the Communist Party and carried forward through improvements in research, especially after the 9th Congress of the RCP and, generally speaking, through the strict enforcement of the

Party's guiding role in science as elsewhere, provided the basis for the positive results.

The 9th Congress adopted a series of important decisions to advance science. Since then the improvement of research in the framework of the Academy, in the higher educational establishments and in the various specialized research institutes has been closely followed by the Party leadership. Scientific progress and better working conditions in research institutes was discussed at many Central Committee meetings and in talks between Party leaders and our scientists.

The Party holds that the growth of socialist society hinges on scientific growth, on an expansion of fundamental and applied research in all areas. Research, it holds, must meet the requirements of the productive forces, the need for expanded production, finding the most desirable models and utilizing the available natural resources.

That is why the Party intervened with concrete measures to improve the organization of scientific work, concentrating personnel and funds on problems securing the greatest effect through a harmonious combination of fundamental and applied research. A National Council for Scientific Research was formed under the Council of Ministers with the specific assignment of drafting a centralized program coordinating the work of various research institutions in order to avoid duplication.

It may be interesting to note that 1968 saw many scientific functions organized by the Academy and attended by prominent scientists from other countries. For example, we held 25 conferences on various aspects of mathematics, natural and social science. Let me name just a few: the colloquium on algebraic geometry and algebraic topology; the international conference on magnetic oxides; the republican conferences on macro-molecular chemistry and on general and applied physical chemistry; the international colloquium on speleology marking the centenary of Emil Rocovita, the founder of biospeleology; the symposium on enzymes and isoenzymes in pathology; the 11th National Psychology Conference, and the colloquium on the modality of cognition.

We attach special importance to our "Marxism and Modernity" symposium, held under the joint auspices of the Academy and other ideological institutions on the 150th anniversary of the birth of Karl Marx, which was attended by many scientists from abroad. Its papers were recently published in book form. A favorable response was evoked by our international colloquium on the archaeological sources of European culture, highlighted by a lively exchange of opinion in a field where the abundance of accumulated data and the variety of interpretations sparked a fruitful debate. We are also happy to note that Bucharest was the venue last year of the 12th International Congress of Romance Linguistics and Philology attended by more than 600 foreign scholars.

Our international prestige rose visibly in 1968, as attested by the election of a number of our Academy members and other Rumanian scientists to various foreign academies and scientific societies, and to the governing bodies of international science forums.

It is difficult to pick out the most significant achievements in the highly ramified activity of our Academy. I shall therefore

endeavor to point to just those achievements of the past year that seemed to be the most fruitful.

Good results were registered in *mathematics*, specifically differential geometry, abstract and applied algebra, the mechanics of deformed solids and the mechanics of liquids. These were recorded in a large number of papers and articles in home and foreign journals.

In *natural science*, that is, physics, chemistry and biology, imposing results were recorded in the physics of plasma, research of new or insufficiently studied semi-conductors, the study of "elementary" particles, the earth's magnetism, the structure of smelted salts, some specific reactions in organic chemistry, in obtaining polymers with specific properties by polymerizing plasma, in the study of plant diseases caused not as was heretofore thought by viruses but by mycoplasma, in vegetative citophysiology, the study of the effects of the magnetic field on animal organisms, etc.

In *technical science* I might single out research in energetics aimed at optimizing the future plan for fuel supply and energy and investigations introducing original figurative concepts directly used in electronic computers and, among other things, in solving certain problems of research and design in the power industry. Research in the mechanics of solids resulted in an original contribution to the theory of mechanisms, thin shells, the mechanics of structural media and in stochastic vibrations. The results of this research are being applied in various industries. A theoretical and experimental investigation was made of the effects of compression on the lubrication of special air bearings in the mechanics of liquids, producing a method also applicable in manufacturing bearings.

Medical investigations were conducted very extensively in keeping with the country's long-standing tradition, yielding a considerable contribution to public health and international medicine.

The Central Committee meeting last October made a special study of health problems and of how to improve medical research, resulting in a decision establishing an Academy of Medical Science.

Social science, philosophy, sociology, economics, history and philology made considerable progress. Researchers followed Party guidelines in applying and elaborating on Marxism-Leninism in keeping with the realities in our country, spreading the

ideas of scientific socialism among all the social groups, and in carrying forward scientific cognition. Problems related to the modern man and the development of socialist ethics were a particular topic of research in philosophy.

Economic research was highlighted by an investigation defining the economic effectiveness of capital investments, a study of the modelling of economic processes, of the system of information in the economy, and of how to improve the organization of work in factories.

Sociologists concentrated on studying the influence of socialist industrialization on social stratification and mobility, the sociology of mass culture and on the mathematical modelling of social processes.

In *history*, researchers studied social development in the territory of our country since antiquity, the history of the medieval Rumanian states and the emergence of the Rumanian national state, as well as our modern history. The 50th anniversary of the unification of Transylvania with old Rumania was marked by a number of valuable papers.

In this brief survey, I repeat, it is quite impossible even to enumerate the many useful investigations made by the various institutes of our Academy.

In conclusion, I should like to add that we held two general meetings of the Academy last year, both devoted to modern methods of research.

2. Question: How do you envisage the growth of science into an immediate productive force and how would you describe its specific features under socialism?

Answer: In our time, highlighted by the technico-scientific revolution, science has become a powerful stimulant of economic and social progress; more precisely, it has become a productive force in its own right. Since this process stems from the objective tendency of modern social growth, a tendency that is indisputable, I think scientists, especially those standing at the helm of research, those responsible for scientific policy, cannot afford to be indifferent to this objective development. The organic bond between science and industry, between theory and practice, requires an active approach. We have to determine the priorities in research and secure the advance of specific branches of science according to plan. Muddling through, that is, spontaneous growth depending on the pref-

erence of individual scientists or of the public, and this especially in socialist society, will not secure the best of conditions for scientific development and for its effects to benefit the economy and public life.

In our country, the Party and the Government have taken steps to ensure comprehensive integration of research in the context of national economic and cultural growth. Naturally, this integration is not confined to a mechanical study of the relationship between science and production, envisaging a dialectical investigation of the various connections in science between fundamental research as a continuous source of self-development for scientific thought, on the one hand, and applied investigation and investigation aimed at securing further growth, on the other, this being a necessary element to make research as a whole fully effective. As I see it, effective organization of scientific research depends on the necessary balance between different types of research and on all the factors involved in solving this task: planning of research institutions, allocation of personnel and financing.

The 9th Party Congress, as I have said, laid down the guidelines: harmonious combination of fundamental and applied research and expansion of research. Acting on this principle, the 1967 National Conference of the Party framed a program carrying forward the directives and securing a further improvement in the organization, planning and financing of scientific work.

Speaking at a recent Party conference in Bucharest, Comrade Nicolae Ceausescu called for closer bonds between science and industry. "It is indeed essential," he said, "that a qualitative leap take place in research, securing its greater involvement in the material growth of our society, our production. We must make the most of our scientific potential in working the available material resources, creating new types of materials useful in production and developing productive strains of plants and animals. That is the only way science can perform its role as a material productive force in our society."

3. Question: Do international contacts between scientists of the fraternal socialist countries benefit scientific growth?

Answer: We attach great importance to cooperation with the research institutions of the fraternal socialist countries.

Through its various branches and insti-

tutes, the Academy cooperates science-wise with the other socialist countries and the Council for Mutual Economic Aid. Most of the subjects of joint research are of top priority for scientific progress, such as earth satellites, study of semi-conductors, investigation of computer problems, chemistry and biochemistry of nucleic acids, biology of viruses, cells and cell systems, structural composition of plastics, cold-pressure welding, corrosion and protection of metals, and the physics of low temperatures. Joint research has yielded valuable theoretical and practical results, enabling us to obtain economically and socially beneficial solutions.

Along with the Academies of the other socialist countries, we are taking part in elaborating on the history of the Great October Socialist Revolution.

At the same time, our Academy is expanding its contacts and cooperation with academies and research institutes in all countries.

We are convinced that the success achieved so far, which we note with satisfaction, has not exhausted the possibilities of advancing science by joint efforts. Our experience shows that there are different ways and means of stimulating cooperation among scientists of the fraternal countries. Beyond question these potential possibilities will ultimately serve to increase the contribution science can make to the building of socialism and communism, the harmonious progress of our respective countries brought together by their common system, their common Marxist-Leninist ideology and the lofty principles of socialist internationalism.

VIEWPOINTS

Imperialist strategy today

NIKOLAI INOZEMTSEV

Among the phenomena generated and nurtured by present-day imperialism are the U.S. intervention in Vietnam and the Israeli aggression in the Middle East; we see, too, a reinvigoration of imperialism's military blocs and intensified ideological diversions, economic integration of some of the capitalist countries and their combined designs against the unity of the anti-imperialist forces; also observed are state monopoly measures to accelerate production and a much greater expenditure on research; in some capitalist countries we see variations of the stick-and-carrot policy; and in countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America we observe a combination of counter-revolutionary coups and the modern "peaceful" methods of neo-colonialism.

In these seemingly unrelated facts we can see the depth, complexity and diversity of the social processes now taking place throughout the capitalist world; they are the logical manifestations of the current imperialist strategy, a strategy which calls for close study by the anti-imperialist forces.

Marx, Engels and Lenin always concerned themselves with the strategy of the working class and its adversary, the bourgeoisie. Now that progressive mankind is preparing to commemorate the Lenin centenary, Marxists turn to Lenin's ideas again and again as they examine imperialist policy, strategy and tactics.

Lenin's analysis of imperialism, his assessment of its motive forces and contra-

dictions, and above all his method of investigating the phenomena of life are powerful weapons of social theory and practice. And a vital requirement of creative Marxism-Leninism is the application of materialist dialectics in analyzing specific realities.

In investigating political concepts and categories reflecting social processes, and especially such a complex concept as strategy, very great importance attaches to the profoundly dialectical universal interconnection of phenomena and inter-relation of the components of the particular concepts and categories.

There is military strategy and political strategy. And with full justification we can speak also of the strategy of economic growth and of the strategy of the ideological struggle. Political strategy, based on objective class interests, is a broad concept. With due regard to the main objectives of the particular class, the internal situation and the situation abroad and the forces involved, this strategy plans and determines the more general lines, the decisive areas of the conflict and its forms (including also replacement of some forms by others and their combination), the methods of defense and attack, the cooperation with allies and the deploying of reserves.

Political strategy, as experience shows, manifests itself in a series of operations carried out by a particular country acting on its own, by a particular class in the given country, or by a coalition or system of states acting in common, or by one class acting on an international scale. For example, "workers of all countries, unite" is the classical formulation of working-class strategy.

Imperialist strategy, that is, the strategy of the world system of monopoly capitalism and not that of separate capitalist countries, has taken shape gradually. Elements of it appeared long ago in the shape of, say, joint action to crush the Paris Commune or, on a much greater scale, combined military operations against the October Revolution. But at the turn of the present century we still had a period when a few "world empires" could rule the roost, when the rival imperialist power blocs could engage in a "coalition strategy."

The really decisive changes in the international strategic situation set in after World War II, due primarily to the rise of the socialist world system and the aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism. It was then that all the antagonisms notwith-

standing, a common class strategy of imperialism began to emerge.

If politics are the concentrated expression of economics, then strategy can be described as concentrated politics and economics. Imperialist strategy includes every form of struggle — political, economic, military and ideological. It links up all the class fronts and conflict areas in each capitalist country and on a world scale, and by doing so encompasses the entire arena of socialist-capitalist confrontation.

A key problem facing the analyst of the current imperialist strategy is that of the interrelation and the interdependence of common and particular interests.

In his time Lenin made a careful study of the imperialist bourgeoisie in the different countries and of the divergences in their policies. On the other hand, he always had in mind that the monopoly bourgeoisie in these countries have common class objectives. He pointed, for example, to the tendency to form an imperialist alliance in defense of capital, which recognizes no homeland. And he urged united action by the working class against the concerted effort of a capitalism linked by international ties.

Worldwide unity of action of the working class and other anti-imperialist forces is of truly vital importance today. This unity is objectively necessitated and made possible, first of all, by the deeply internationalist world revolutionary process itself. Revolutionary unity is essential also because world imperialism as the aggregate of national imperialisms has never been in need of such joint action as it is now. There are a number of reasons for this.

First, the world political factors impelling the imperialist countries to pool efforts in the class struggle are much stronger. Capitalism is no longer the sole, all-embracing system. The competition between the two social systems is growing. The international working-class movement, too, is growing, and so are the internal contradictions in the main capitalist countries. The fight for national liberation is spreading. In these circumstances, a common class strategy is a matter of life or death for imperialism.

Second, the economic prerequisites of concerted action by the imperialists are in many respects more favorable. The rapid progress in science and technology, the expanding of productive forces for which the national boundaries have become too circumscribed, make for a greater inter-

penetration of capital, and for greater specialization and cooperation between the monopolies and industries of imperialist countries. The net result is an unprecedented extension of international monopoly and economic integration, processes stimulated by state monopoly measures. Another result is closer political and military cooperation.

Third, big changes have taken place in the balance of imperialist forces, resulting in the United States becoming an economic, scientific, technological and military power center, the core of the system of military political blocs — NATO, SEATO, CENTO and others — and bilateral treaties commanding a worldwide network of military bases.

True, West Germany, France and other Common Market countries have greatly strengthened their economic and political stance in recent years. Japan, developing apace, is likely to move by the early seventies into second place in the capitalist world for basic economic indices. Still, the United States remains the basic economic, political and military force of world capitalism. It is Washington—with its immense economic potential and the innumerable channels through which U.S. capital flows into other countries — that has the decisive say in formulating the military and political doctrines which influence virtually the entire imperialist camp.

The existence of the military-political bloc dominated by U.S. imperialism and comprising the main capitalist countries and some of their allies in one form or another is an objective reality. The very existence of this bloc and its activity suggest that centripetal trends have gained ground in the capitalist world.

It would be wrong, however, to overlook the existence of centrifugal trends in the imperialist camp. And ability to disclose and take into account specific manifestations of the unity and struggle of opposites and their concrete relationship is a postulate of politics as well as philosophy.

Capitalism would not be capitalism if it had rid itself of the greed engendered by the domination of private property, if the discord between the monopoly interests of various countries had vanished, if the monopolies now supported by the state in the respective countries had not been bickering among themselves for markets and raw materials, investment spheres and influence in one or another area of the globe.

Today, when science, technology and the economy are advancing rapidly and when

far-reaching social changes are taking place in an historically brief space of time, the law of uneven economic and political development of the capitalist countries is operating as forcefully as ever, aggravating the contradictions between the imperialist countries. This applies in equal measure to the relations between the United States and the West European powers and Japan, the fight for supremacy in Western Europe, the relations between the Common Market and Britain and the situation in the Common Market.

Undoubtedly, antagonisms between the big imperialist powers and other capitalist countries such as, say, Sweden or Switzerland — the traditional neutrals — or those which refuse to take Washington or NATO orders, exist and are often exacerbated, especially by the more acute international crises.

Lastly, imperialist strategy and tactics are manifestly affected by the internal contradictions in every imperialist country between the monopoly bourgeoisie and the people, between the bellicose and moderate factions of the ruling camp.

But nowadays these contradictions, above all those between imperialist countries, make themselves felt in new conditions, namely, within the military-political alliance of the imperialist powers, at a time when these powers have a vital interest in not weakening their common front against world socialism and all anti-imperialist forces by engaging in internecine strife.

The task, as Lenin always stressed, is to discern and use all contradictions between imperialist powers and the interests of the revolutionary forces, while never forgetting the danger with which the formation of a military-political alliance of these powers is fraught.

If one were asked what is the main objective of the current imperialist strategy, the briefest answer would be: to maintain and, if possible, strengthen and expand the positions of capitalism, a system which has outlived its time.

Now it is not only the shattering effects of the inner contradictions that capitalism constantly feels. Its fortunes are determined by such factors as the rise of the socialist world system, the upsurge in the working-class movement, the heightened activity of all the democratic forces in the developed capitalist countries and the sustained national liberation movement of the people in the one-time colonies and dependent countries. This is why imperialist strategy

envisages, among other things, action against each of these three main revolutionary streams.

The basic contradiction of our times is that between the two world systems — capitalism and socialism. And it is primarily in the sphere of the coexistence, competition and conflict of the socialist and capitalist worlds, as repeatedly stressed in the documents of the Communist and Workers' parties, that the destinies of these systems and the scale and rate of revolutionary changes are being decided. This explains why the fight against the Soviet Union — the first country of socialism — and against the socialist world system as a whole is central to imperialist strategy.

Postwar developments have shown that the fight against the socialist countries is the essence of the foreign policy of imperialism, particularly U.S. imperialism. Highlights of this policy stand out — the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan, nuclear diplomacy, intervention against People's China and the war in Korea, the formation of NATO and other military blocs, rebuilding West German militarism, counter-revolutionary subversion in the socialist countries of Europe, hostile moves against Cuba and the war in Vietnam.

Typical of this imperialist strategy is the range of forms and methods and combinations used, and the effort to make the most of favorable circumstances. And while imperialism still has ample room for maneuver, the facts show that it has little to boast about in the contest with socialism, and if anything, its freedom of choice has become more restricted. It is compelled to adapt itself to the changes caused by socialism, to bring its economic, political, military and other methods into line with these changes. This is a reflection of the objective historical process, of the doom of the capitalist system.

Imperialist politics are based on the "positions of strength" policy, which presupposes stockpiling weapons, deploying powerful armed forces and forming military-political coalitions.

The object of imperialist strategy is to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. Hence the nuclear and conventional arms race, which between 1949 and 1967 cost the NATO countries \$1,153,000 million. This staggering sum is almost six times the total spent on World War I and exceeds the capitalist countries' outlays during World War II. This bid for military superiority

buttressed the U.S. foreign-policy doctrine of "rolling back" communism and the closely related doctrine of "massive retaliation." It helped also the remilitarization of West Germany.

But the traditional imperialist principle of pitting military strength against the socialist countries came up against a formidable reality—the defense potential of the Soviet Union. This resulted in a striking paradox: imperialism built up a war machine of unprecedented strength but, the use of this machine to start another world war would be tantamount to suicide.

The "positions of strength" policy, above all its military aspect, is stuck in a blind alley. Nevertheless, the dangers it generates are only too evident—from the doctrine of the so-called "flexible" reaction, from the "brush-fire" wars touched off by the imperialists here and there, from the stepping up of war preparations by NATO.

To combat this imperialist aggression and prevent imperialism from unleashing a nuclear war is a pressing task of the Soviet Union, other socialist countries and of all the anti-imperialist forces. For the socialist countries, primarily the Soviet Union, a most important and, frankly, a very costly aspect of this effort is to build up a defense potential as the most reliable safeguard of their security and a durable peace.

Although imperialism has discovered that its global military schemes are unlikely to materialize, it has not relinquished the idea of armed struggle. True, it is now devoting greater attention to the economic, scientific, technological and other areas, all the more since here, too, it is faced with a challenge from socialism.

The socialist countries' share in world industrial production has risen to 38 per cent compared with 27 per cent in 1955 and 10 per cent in 1937; the Soviet Union now accounts for 20 per cent of world industrial output as against 10 per cent before the war. In the late fifties U.S. observers described the Soviet economic progress as a challenge to the American way of life that could not be ignored, and the launching of the first sputnik was described as a second Pearl Harbor.

President Eisenhower, and to an even greater extent Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, approached economic growth rates as an acute political problem and came to regard economic progress as an essential component of the political strategy of imperialism. Much the same applies to the

other big capitalist countries, which consider growth rates also in terms of competition on the capitalist world market, in particular with the United States.

In view of intensified economic competition with socialism, the capitalist world is resorting to new measures to stimulate economic growth.

State monopoly regulation of the economy has gone much farther in recent years. The state now plays a bigger role in investment, allocation of the national income and in framing technological policy. Many countries now engage in economic forecasting and programming.

State monopoly capitalism is making efforts in the spheres of science and technology, using these as a means of accelerating renewal of fixed production assets. U.S. spending on science has risen from \$3,000m. in 1950 to \$25,000m. in 1968, or more than eightfold. In the national income, the share of appropriations for education, indispensable to scientific and technological progress, almost doubled in the same period.

Much as science and technology stimulate production, their advance under capitalism is one-sided, being largely geared to militarization of the economy. In the United States at least two-thirds of the expenditure on research serve military purposes.

The accelerated scientific and technological progress and the increased state regulation have resulted in raising the average annual growth rates in the developed capitalist countries. At the same time the economy retains its uneven and cyclical character, there are mounting inflationary processes in a number of countries and the whole of modern capitalism is caught up in an acute currency and financial crisis. From 1950 to 1967, the growth rate of capitalist production averaged 5.4 per cent a year—roughly 2.5 times less than in the socialist countries, but still greatly in excess of the capitalist growth rate in the interwar years, (average annual growth for 1920-37 was 3.9 per cent). In the United States, Japan, West Germany and some other capitalist countries, production efficiency showed a marked rise.

These facts reveal the economic and political importance of further progress in the economy, science and technology, to which the Communist and Workers' parties in the socialist countries are committed.

The economic reforms in these countries are designed to improve centralized planning, to encourage initiative at enterprise

level and to ensure better functioning of all economic levers, competent management, more effective national-economic structures and better quality. These measures are needed not only to solve internal problems facing the socialist countries, primarily that of securing a rapid rise in the standard of living, but also to draw more fully on the advantages of the socialist system to win the economic competition with capitalism.

Lenin's point that labor productivity is, ultimately, the basic condition for the triumph of the new social system is particularly relevant today. For rapid and effective economic progress in the socialist countries is indispensable if the entire strategy of modern imperialism is to be decisively defeated.

Political and ideological struggle against the socialist countries is, as we have pointed out, a salient feature of imperialist strategy. And here, too, imperialism has not achieved its aim.

Ever since the Soviet state came into being, and particularly after the war when the socialist world system emerged, imperialism has spared no effort to discredit socialist ideas and to defame socialist reality. It has even described socialism as something accidental. Its ideological defeat is obvious from the fact that theories denying socialism the very right to existence have given way to entirely different theories, one of which is the theory of "convergence."

Advocates of the latter admit the "presence" of socialism as an objective reality of the world of today and, moreover, acknowledge its gains, especially in the matter of planning, meeting the development needs of what they describe as the industrial and post-industrial society. But, conceding this, the ideologues of imperialism refuse to draw the logical conclusion that socialism is superior to capitalism and that capitalism is doomed by history. Instead, they envisage a gradual merger of the two opposed systems, the eventual fusion of the best qualities of socialism, which they generally restrict to planning, and capitalism, in which they stress private initiative and the freedom of the individual allegedly guaranteed under capitalist rule.

So much for the theoretical aspect of the matter. In practice, the concept of "convergence," a variety of the theory of capitalist "reconstruction," is designed to smear the social, economic and political achievements of the socialist countries, to "dis-

solve" socialism in capitalism and inject more reformist poison among the working people in the capitalist countries. Behind the "convergence" every manner of subversion and propaganda is carried on against the leading role of the Communist and Workers' parties in the socialist countries and the cohesion of their peoples. Our adversaries would like nothing better in the socialist countries than to set the working class against the intellectual community, to set generation against generation, the working people of one nationality against those of another.

Imperialism is becoming more active ideologically as it realizes the futility of its plans for gaining military superiority over the socialist countries and as difficulties crop up in its economic contest with socialism.

It follows that an important condition for the socialist countries to defeat modern imperialist strategy is to frustrate the ideological intrigues of imperialism, promote socialist democracy, strengthen the moral and political unity of socialist society, and for the Communist and Workers' parties to follow a correct policy based on Marxism-Leninism.

The imperialists, understandably, would like to undermine every socialist country from within and are doing everything they can to divide these countries, encouraging nationalist trends in the socialist countries and raising obstacles to their political and economic cooperation.

Hence the imperialist emphasis on so-called bridge building. The idea is to establish links with a given socialist country with a view to extracting it from the socialist commonwealth and opposing it to the other socialist countries. Needless to say, this activity is contrary to the interests of any socialist country and the elementary requirements of international security.

In these circumstances, it is particularly important to consolidate the socialist commonwealth and expand cooperation on the principle of proletarian, socialist internationalism.

The contest between the two world systems and the processes taking place in the main capitalist countries under the impact of the scientific and technological revolution and the development of state monopoly capitalism have had a telling effect on such an aspect of imperialist strategy as the fight against the working class movement and all the anti-monopoly forces in these countries. Here, too, imperialism is forced

to adapt itself to the new situation. It does not at all give up frankly terrorist methods—witness the reactionary coups in Greece and elsewhere, the numerous coups in Latin America, the emergency laws in West Germany and the brutal repression of the embattled Negro people in the USA.

There are, however, two reasons why imperialism cannot always use such methods. One is that the extreme reactionary forces, whose supreme embodiment was the fascist regimes defeated in World War II, are thoroughly discredited. (This is not to say, of course, that the danger of fascism is over. On the contrary, neo-fascism, militarism and nuclear armament have plainly been on the rise in recent years, particularly in West Germany.) The other reason is the radical changes that have taken place in the alignment of class forces in the world and, specifically, in the big capitalist countries produced by the numerical growth and better organization of the working class, the turn to the Left of the masses, the upsurge in the fight for democracy and the gradual shaping of broad anti-monopoly coalitions.

This situation compels the monopoly bourgeoisie to maneuver on the social scene. It is forced to make concessions to the working people, first of all in the economic field, which it subsequently tries to take back through inflation, higher taxes and in other ways.

Bourgeois countries today are at pains to veil the exploitive nature of capitalism. But the growth of state monopoly capitalism, the enormous concentration of monopoly power and the fusion of monopoly and state make it increasingly clear to the masses that they can win only by combining economic and political demands, by opposing the political system dominated by monopoly interests. Hence imperialist strategy signifies concerted action by the monopolies and the state to divide the working class, undermine Communist influence, the progressive trade unions and other Left-wing forces, to "de-ideologize" the masses by dulling their class consciousness and dampening their activity, to "sell" them the idea of a spurious social partnership.

The scientific and technological revolution has led to a rapid increase in the numbers of intellectuals and has posed the problem of education in a new way. The monopoly bourgeoisie tries hard to block united action by the workers and intellectuals, to foil the cooperation of labor and youth organizations and prevent the power-

ful if spontaneous student movement that has engulfed the capitalist countries from assuming a consciously anti-imperialist character.

It is in the best interests of the working-class movement and the democratic movement generally to counter the concerted strategy of imperialism with working-class unity, a solid alliance of the workers, peasants and intellectuals and united action by the masses. The logic of the struggle calls for a democratic alternative in the form of economic, social and political demands of the masses led by the working class against the anti-democratic policy of the monopolies. It is of vital importance to counter the growing militarism in the capitalist countries with mass action against war, against the more reckless imperialist forces, for peace and international security. Life demands that the democratic forces unite to thwart the designs of a resurgent fascism and neo-fascism.

The Communist parties in the imperialist countries are doing much to this end. They have evolved anti-monopoly programs with due regard to the interests of both the working class and its allies. They champion united action by all working-class parties and cooperation of the entire Left, and fight for radical democratic reforms and for socialism.

The flexible strategy and tactics used by imperialism require discernment and flexibility on the part of the anti-monopoly forces, first of all the revolutionary parties. The Communist and Workers' parties plan their activity accordingly. Lenin stressed that Marxist political strategy and tactics should consist in combining different ways and means of struggle — peaceful and non-peaceful, legal and illegal, offensive and defensive — in skillfully alternating them according to the situation, in steadily heightening the political consciousness of the masses and extending their united action in keeping with the perspectives and goals of the proletariat.

Modern imperialist strategy shows certain peculiarities also in combating the national liberation movement. In this sphere as in those discussed earlier, it combines the "classical" imperialist policy of the past—above all colonialism in its traditional form—with various modifications of the same, that is, diverse aspects of neo-colonialism.

Imperialist use of the traditional methods of colonial policy today is exemplified by the series of colonial wars in the postwar, such as those of the Portuguese colonialists

or the racist regimes of Smith and Vorster. Other actions of this nature were the British-French-Israeli war against Egypt in 1956, the landing of Anglo-American troops in Jordan and Lebanon to strike at the Iraqi revolution, the combined imperialist intervention against the Congo, the Israeli war against the Arab countries, the U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic, British and American military support for the Yemeni counter-revolutionaries. Counter-revolutionary coups in one-time colonies and dependent countries and support for monarchist cliques and regimes are still among the favorite instruments of imperialist policy. So are attempts to embroil new national states on the divide-and-rule principle.

Neo-colonialism was called into life by the imperialists' inability to restore the old and discredited colonial system. Their main strategic objective in this area now is to keep Asian, African and Latin American countries in the capitalist fold.

A variety of methods is used to achieve this objective. There is the fact that imperialist monopolies take advantage of the economic and social difficulties of the new independent states to seize key positions in their economy in the guise of "aid." There is the monopolies' "willingness" to develop certain industries and train manpower in former colonies, which enables the monopolies to exploit the resources of these regions. There is the price gap (the U.N. estimates that deteriorating trade terms alone lost these countries \$4,000m. a year compared with the average price level of the early fifties). There is the outflow of profit (set by the U.N. at \$5,000m. a year) on foreign investments in these countries. There is the meddling in the internal affairs of the former colonies and dependent countries, and the dragging of Asian, African and Latin American countries into military blocs that impose on them political and military commitments detrimental to their interests.

A feature of neo-colonialism is combined action by imperialist powers, the use of numerous international foundations, banks, associations and other agencies, and the extension of integration processes to the developing countries by, say, linking associated African countries with the European Common Market.

Most active in neo-colonialist politics is U.S. imperialism. Originally it anticipated taking over much of the heritage of the European powers whose colonial empires

disintegrated. But the national liberation movement proved so strong and the positions of world imperialism were undermined to such a degree that the American capitalists had to join up with West European powers and Japan in trying to keep "third world" countries in the imperialist sphere.

It follows that unity against imperialism, resolute joint resistance by the new independent countries to the colonialist and neo-colonialist moves of imperialism are imperative for the national liberation movement as well.

* * *

Imperialist strategy uses different ways in fighting each of the main revolutionary forces. But that is just one side of the matter. The other, no less important, is that in spite of the differentiation in ways, the fight against the socialist world is tied up with the fight against the working-class in the capitalist countries and the national-liberation movement.

Take, for example, the war in Vietnam, in which U.S. foreign policy has suffered what is perhaps its greatest setback since World War II. This is a war against a socialist country, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, a war affecting the interests of that country's allies, and the interests of the socialist world system as a whole. At the same time it is a war against the entire Vietnamese people, and also against Laos, Cambodia and the other new states in the area and is designed to bring confusion into the national liberation movement. Although it is a "local" war, its escalation by the USA threatened an extension of the conflict and alarmed the democratic forces throughout the world, the United States included. That country's "hawks," who tried to use the Vietnam war as a pretext to foment chauvinism and to crack down on the Negroes fighting for

civil rights, on progressive intellectuals, students and trade unions, were firmly resisted by the progressives, who took a stand against the Vietnam war and against reactionary aspects of the home and foreign policy.

The rulers of America and of other capitalist powers realize that their strategy, calculated to reverse the course of history or at least consolidate the positions still held by capitalism, will stand or fall to the extent that the forces opposed to imperialism act jointly or stay apart. Hence the imperialists' special effort to divide these forces and set them against each other.

There is no denying that division in its ranks, disagreement between some of its contingents and any disregard of internationalist interests is harmful to the revolutionary movement. Such phenomena hit hardest at those who are responsible for them, but they also injure the interests of everyone else. That is why every revolutionary force wants to do its best by combating imperialism in its own area of activity and at the same time contributing its effort to that of other revolutionary forces so as to bring into being a single anti-imperialist strategy.

The Communists—the most energetic and most consistent fighters against imperialism, who are equipped with the theory of scientific socialism and are unexcelled in organization—have a very big role to play in unifying the anti-imperialist front and achieving fruitful cooperation of the revolutionary forces.

Marxist-Leninists see Communist unity and united action by the Communist and Workers' parties and all the anti-imperialist forces as an imperative of the day, an earnest of the fulfilment of the great mission assigned to them by history. The coming world Communist meeting should be an important step towards this unity.

Guatemalan Party of Labor: for unity and against erroneous tendencies

MARIO SILVA JONAMA

In March 1968 the Central Committee of the Guatemalan Party of Labor stated that "the revolutionary process in Guatemala is at one of the most crucial stages of its development." This conclusion holds true today as well, for one of the reasons for the crisis is the split that took place in the revolutionary ranks some time ago. In our view, this split should be examined in the light of the difficulties with which the Party had to grapple when elaborating and carrying out its political line of orienting the revolution towards what we call the "revolutionary war of the people." The split began as a clash of views in the revolutionary movement and the Party; it led to disorganization and confusion which has still not been fully overcome.

It was to be expected, of course, that the Party's adversaries would strike their hardest blows just when it was calling on the masses to take the road of armed struggle. However, with the experience it has gained the Party hopes to weather the storm and to reinforce its positions, organizationally and ideologically.

The roots of the crisis should be sought in the Party's failure to measure up to the historical task of the Guatemalan revolutionary movement. In other words, it did not realize in time the need to take the path of armed struggle and, consequently, was slow in charting a firm and clear line—the correct application of which could have led to a *revolutionary war of the*

people—in tackling the ensuing political, organizational and military tasks.

The clash of views imperilled the unity and the very existence of the Party. Many comrades were demoralized by the terror and counter-offensive mounted by the enemy towards the end of 1966 and during 1967. The inevitable outcome was a split in the Rebel Armed Forces (FAR) and the withdrawal in 1967 from the Party of a group of comrades, who had been elected to the Central Committee as full members or candidate members at the 1966 National Conference. The Rebel Armed Forces are the military instrument of the Guatemalan revolutionary movement and the Party has played a leading role in these forces. The members of the aforementioned group, whose subsequent behavior showed that they had joined the Party only formally, aligned themselves with the anti-Party leaders of the FAR. Their intention was to gain control of the Rebel Armed Forces and oppose them to the Party. Their original plan had been to seize the Party leadership and clear the way for applying their military-political ideas. When this fell through, they decided to smash the Party. Such is the background to the split. For a better appreciation of this we will recall the National Conference resolution which states that if in the past conservative and dogmatic views were "the greatest danger to the Party and the revolutionary movement, since they ignored the new and the

changes in the country, in the future Left attitudes and views may be the greatest danger."

"Had the Party not combated the conservative tendencies," the resolution goes on, "it would have been in serious danger of isolating itself from the revolutionary struggle and deviating from the revolutionary path, thus dooming itself to an auxiliary force in the armed struggle. The result would have been a smaller influx of members, and the Party itself would have become a narrow, dogmatic organization, clinging to general principles, an organization based on old formulas regarding the forms of struggle and organization. This would have hampered the Party in playing its leading role in the revolutionary movement, in the armed struggle, would have prevented drawing the country's best revolutionary forces into the Party. Conservative and dogmatic views usually express themselves in an abstract and schematic understanding of Party tasks, in assertions that any change in the forms of struggle and organization is a departure from Leninist principles. Such views are indicative of an underestimation of the armed struggle, or of an attitude which regards it as merely one of the forms of struggle."

Describing the Left tendencies in the Party, the National Conference stressed: "When the class struggle grows sharper, there is a tendency, as we have seen, to skip stages, to rely solely on the more advanced forces, to forget about consolidating the united front; a tendency to be carried away by military forms of organization and struggle, to underestimate the role of the Party and the mass struggle or, conversely, to overestimate the peasantry at the present stage of the Guatemalan revolution, thus placing the working class and, consequently, its vanguard—the Party—in a position of a secondary, and not leading, force."

Underestimation of the Guatemalan working class and overestimation of the enthusiasm of the peasants who have joined the revolutionary struggle could result in an incorrect assessment of the role of the Party, in excessive importance being attached to the broad revolutionary movement where the organizational contours become obliterated, and the Party loses its political and organizational independence." The resolution refers specifically to Trotskyism as "a grave threat from the outside because of its provocative, divisive essence, causing confusion, as a theory embraced

by the enemy and therefore to be countered by revolutionary vigilance."

Let us now analyze the reasons for and the class roots of these tendencies in the concrete historical context of Guatemala so as to get a better picture of the Party's fight for unity, and draw some conclusions from the experience gained in recent years.

In our Party conservative views evolved mainly in the period following the grim years of counter-revolutionary repressions, when the democratic and revolutionary movement was slowly and with difficulty getting back onto its feet, when the Party was reorganizing itself in conditions of illegality, when its contacts with the masses were weak and indirect. It was during that period (1960) that the Party held its Third Congress, and although its decisions were, by and large, correct, they were not analytical enough. Despite the fact that in preparation for the congress the Party had critically analyzed the 1954 events, the congress did not draw the necessary conclusions, did not give enough thought to the need for armed struggle and did not take measures to forestall errors of a Rightist complexion. This was due to the *dogmatism* in elaborating the program and political line. Even though certain points were formulated correctly, such important questions as the character of the revolution, its motive forces, were mechanically copied from the experience of the Chinese revolution and from the programs of other fraternal parties. This dogmatism manifested itself also in the tendency to regard as an absolute the thesis concerning the possibility of the peaceful transition to socialism, formulated in its time with respect to certain capitalist countries, in the tendency to regard armed insurrection along the lines of the Russian revolution—as the only non-peaceful way to revolution. (At the same time the radical Left took an over-simplified approach to the Cuban revolution, qualifying it as a blitz guerrilla war.)

These views undoubtedly contained certain features of *reformism* which took the form of Right opportunism in Guatemala. In the political struggle it evinced itself in overestimating the "political game," electoral alliances and electoral tactics and, consequently, in underestimating initiative in developing the armed struggle. Right opportunism also manifested itself in a kind of "economism" and in a narrow use of legal forms of mass work. This tendency found supporters among the Guatemalan emigres in Mexico, who published a docu-

ment outlining their views.

Conservative views became widespread in the Party. They strongly affected the Central Committee's work, particularly before 1965, made it difficult for the Party to elaborate a correct general line and hampered its practical work. In particular, the conservative element employed primitive, bureaucratic and outdated methods of work, preventing comrades from taking issue with these methods, or criticizing the shortcomings and mistakes, characteristic of that period.

These views were effectively combated in the ideological sphere after the Central Committee formulated the Party's line more correctly (1965), and the proponents of conservatism desisted from their factional activities and attempts to influence the lower Party organizations, pledging to observe the norms of democratic centralism. Those of the Party members and leaders who were influenced by these views, which only made Party work all the more difficult, were for the most part comrades who were behind the times in their thinking.

Conservatism has its class roots in and is most widespread among the petty bourgeoisie, artisans, clerical workers, intellectuals and professionals, that is, among the middle sections of the population who are economically in a more stable and favorable position. It is also prevalent among a section of the working class who even in our dependent country with its low standard of living can be regarded as the "labor aristocracy." Conformism is the reflection of an objective economic factor: with the enrichment of the bourgeoisie and the growth of imperialist investments, there is a certain upswing in employment and improvement in the living standards of some sections of the population who have the possibility of earning directly in the factory or indirectly in the so-called services which are disproportionately large.

The Leftist views which did not have time to spread during the counter-revolutionary terror that set in after 1954, manifested themselves sharply after the upsurge of the mass struggle in 1962. These views gained currency among students, especially in the spring of 1962 when the revolutionary movement almost took the form of insurrection in the capital and in other cities, i.e., in the period when the hopes of a general uprising were dashed to the ground. No small role was played by the Trotskyites who managed to entrench themselves in the "November 13 Revolutionary Move-

ment," and by the latest Leftist theories which were able to gain ground because of the differences in the international Communist movement.

Let us examine the nature of these views, their specific features and class roots.

Initially, the Leftist tendency that developed both inside and outside the Party contained elements of revolutionary romanticism, giving it added popularity among the youth and juveniles. Leftist views practically dominated the Patriotic Youth of Labor (Communist youth), due partly to the power of attraction of the Cuban revolution, which is an inspiration to the entire revolutionary movement in Latin America. As might have been expected, the supporters of the new trend strongly opposed—from subjectivist and voluntarist positions—the conservative views then prevalent in the Party. They not only dissociated themselves from the traditions of the revolutionary struggle of the past, from what could be called the school of the Party; they also disregarded the fundamentals of Marxism, the principles and concepts of Marxism-Leninism when tackling the vital problems of our day, relying solely on a passionate belief in their ideals.

Unlike the erroneous or weak aspects of the Party's line, the Leftist tendencies manifest themselves in the form of petty-bourgeois "revolutionism." Their supporters want the revolution to be a socialist one right away. They make no distinction between the different sections of the bourgeoisie, do not take into account the balance of forces, reject the idea of different stages in developing the revolutionary movement, disregard the importance of organization, of building up an underground organization. They engage in an abstract agitation and the establishment of separate groups of their supporters.

Furthermore, they favor organizational plans (despite their professed rejection of all plans) patterned on a military concept of struggle, organization and methods, but which in reality have nothing in common with military actions, let alone guerrilla warfare, and do not envisage the kind of organization that would act and make the most of its actions to reinforce itself. It all boils down to carrying out orders, and not only at times of military operations, when personal authority and discipline are essential, but also when resolving political problems. Organizational matters are treated as purely administrative, the apparatus

supersedes the organization, or totally replaces it.

Cult of the "leader," a sectarian interpretation of the movement's "core," a monopoly of guerrilla operations, idealization of the peasantry as the mass allegedly ready for action at any time—such is the essence of Leftism. In the concrete conditions of our countries, Left opportunism is an attempt on the part of petty bourgeois elements to usurp the historic role of the working class, to seize, or lay claim in advance, to leadership of the revolution and of its main force, the peasantry, in particular.

There is no denying, of course, that this trend stems from certain objective conditions. Revolutionism of this kind reflects the mood of the radical sections of the petty bourgeoisie: the youth, students and intelligentsia, that is, the sections which are more and more feeling the pinch of the chronic economic crisis. They are more keenly aware of the need (although not very firmly) to fight imperialism. At the same time, Leftism also reflects the hopeless, desperate position of the poor peasantry deprived of land, earnings, and civil rights, and also of some urban sections of the population suffering from unemployment and insecurity.

Because of their social origin and their objectives, the representatives of the Left both outside and inside the Party, are inherently in opposition to the Party. Hence their cooperation with it or participation in inner-Party activity is only temporary. Even when unity was at its best, that is, from the February National Conference in 1966 up to the Central Committee meeting in July 1967, when the representatives of this trend comprised nearly 50 per cent of the Central Committee, they did not act as genuine Party members conscious of their rights and duties. They disregarded the norms of democratic centralism, shirked responsibility for leadership, and tried, instead, to gain absolute control of the leadership, or simply denied the need for the existence of the Party. Thus, as Lenin said about Martov's faction after the Second Congress, they became like those people "who are not averse to making use of the Party title but are conscious that this title of theirs *does not accord* with the interests and will of the Party." Realizing that "they could not convince the Party, they tried to gain their ends by *disorganizing* the Party. . . ." (*Collected Works*, Vol. 7, p. 357).

It is therefore not surprising that at the

beginning of 1967 these Leftist elements published their platform* abroad, aimed at splitting the revolutionary movement and repudiating the party. And only a year before they had spoken for unity. At that time they still thought that they would succeed at the National Conference in gaining full control of the Party leadership. And although at first they failed to win a following they eventually achieved their aim at the end of 1967, hastening to announce this in January 1968, when they published two versions of the same document in which they tried to justify their withdrawal from the Party.**

FOR UNITY OF THE PARTY AND THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT

The Party spared no effort to preserve the unity of its ranks and to promote at the same time the unity of the revolutionary movement generally and the armed struggle in particular. In the situation that had taken shape at the beginning of 1965 as a result of the clash of views in the Party, and particularly under the influence of the "revolutionary" sentiments in the Patriotic Youth of Labor, there was every danger of the split in the revolutionary movement deepening and bringing an aftermath of grave consequences. The Party sought unity on a principled basis. The first step was to define its political line more clearly, raise its combat spirit, all the more so since its work in the military sphere was weak. It was necessary to generalize all that was positive in the respective trends. For example, the conservative trend consistently defended, although from sectarian positions, the independence of the Party and the leading role of the working class. The radical Left advocated violent forms of struggle and the renovation of all revolutionary activity, although it had not yet evolved a correct platform and the corresponding methods of struggle. The Party adopted a flexible attitude on

*"Situation and perspectives of the Guatemalan revolutionary movement," draft document dated March 7, 1967 and published as an article signed by Orlando Fernandez, in April 1968.

**The two versions of the document signed by Major Camilo Sanchez and others were: (a) "The Guatemalan Party of Labor has capitulated, and the revolutionary forces are disengaging themselves from the petty-bourgeois leadership, and are intensifying their life and death struggle against the puppet regime of the bourgeoisie, landowners and North American imperialism." Sierra de las Minas, January 10, 1968. (Mimeographed in Guatemala); (b) "The revolutionary process in Guatemala shows us that it is essential to fundamentally revise the strategic concept of war." Sierra de las Minas, January 10, 1968. (Published abroad on February 25, 1968.)

the question of strengthening the unity of the Rebel Armed Forces and coordinating their actions with other forces. It even considered it possible to make a number of concessions, for it held that a broad united front of forces was essential for a political revolutionary peoples' war.

We have already written about the steps taken by the Central Committee to rectify its political line, promote a broader discussion of ideological issues, critically assess its work and reorganize its structure.* The Party overcame its dogmatic mistakes in a number of important questions. Proceeding, for example, from the concept of the Guatemalan revolution as formulated in the report to the Third Congress (1960), viz., that in our country "the national democratic and socialist revolution are two different indissolubly connected stages of one revolutionary movement," the Party defined more precisely the first stage of the revolutionary movement as a people's anti-imperialist and agrarian revolution, excluding the national bourgeoisie as one of the motive forces.

The Party discarded the conventional formulations about the use of all forms of struggle and indicated as the way to revolution in Guatemala, a revolutionary peoples' war which "should be regarded as a long war in the sense that it passes through various stages necessary for changing the correlation of forces, and creates conditions for vanquishing the enemy. It must be a peoples' war, based on the people and waged by the people. And in the fire of this war will be forged the military might of the revolution, the revolutionary army of the people, closely linked with the masses." At the same time the Party declared: "The working class is designed to play the leading role. To this end it must form a firm alliance with the peasantry which is, thanks to its size, the principal force, and also with other sections of the population. This will necessitate rallying, uniting, and organizing the people in the course of the struggle, and, particularly, the peasantry in the course of the guerrilla struggle which constitutes an essential element in developing the revolutionary war in the conditions of Guatemala."**

Subsequently, sectarian views were over-

*"Some Problems of the Guatemalan Revolution," Bernardo Alvarado Monson. *World Marxist Review*, No. 10, 1966.

**"To Organize and Develop the Revolutionary War of the Guatemalan People." Resolution of the Central Committee of the Guatemalan Party of Labor. Guatemala, March 13, 1965.

come also on organizational matters, a more flexible Party structure was evolved on Leninist principles, the importance of creating revolutionary armed forces was substantiated and measures were taken to eliminate primitive methods of work. However, as a result of certain outside influences, there was a tendency to belittle the role of the Party in practical work, to employ adventurist methods, even to abolish the Party.

As was later recognized, the Party did not firmly enough tackle such important tasks as preparing and developing the guerrilla zones. The leadership was more concerned with preserving the unity of its ranks than resolving these problems. As regards the so-called old guard, their role in military activity continued to be underestimated, as a result of which this work was entrusted in many cases to people insufficiently grounded politically. One of the Central Committee reports (March 1968) noted that "we retreated in the face of despair and the calls for immediate insurrection made by some comrades. Not all our actions were politically correct. We did not oppose the slogan "terror just for the sake of terror!" advocated by some comrades. The guerrilla struggle in the mountains lacked a correct line (responsibility for this, of course, rests mostly with the comrades from the "Edgar Ibarra" brigade), which would have helped to extend the struggle and orient it more definitely on creating a people's army."

However, it should be said that the Party acted correctly in trying to preserve its own unity and the unity of the Rebel Armed Forces. In the course of the internal struggle the Party drew new strength, overcame the old mistakes. It succeeded in uniting around the Central Committee the vast majority of the lower organizations and in retaining its allies, particularly in the countryside. This enabled it to reinforce the Revolutionary Armed Forces with most of the Party membership. Besides, as we have repeatedly said, we shall continue to work for unity of action with other revolutionary detachments, and particularly with the Rebel Armed Forces in which the combat groups of the "Edgar Ibarra" guerrilla brigade and the November 13 Revolutionary Movement have merged.

Not everybody abroad knows that in April 1968, after the split in the Rebel Armed Forces and the withdrawal of several comrades from the Central Committee of the Party, most of the provincial commit-

tees of the Rebel Armed Forces held their Fourth National Conference which decided to create a new organization, the Revolutionary Armed Forces. The latter adopted the military-political line of the Guatemalan Party of Labor. Hence the existence of two parallel organizations: the Rebel Armed Forces and the Revolutionary Armed Forces.

ONCE MORE ABOUT LEFTISM

Generalizing the experience of the Bolshevik Party, gained in the struggle against the more characteristic manifestations of petty-bourgeois revolutionism (the so-called Socialist-Revolutionaries), Lenin indicated the three main directions along which this struggle should be waged: against reluctance objectively to reckon with the class forces and take into account the relationships between these forces before undertaking any action; against the tendency to individual terror (which is different from revolutionary terror in times of revolution, at a definite stage of revolutionary development); against the tendency to deride mistakes, even though not serious ones—in this case Right-wing mistakes—made by Communists.

With respect to Guatemala, it should be borne in mind that the trends qualified as Leftist range from the sincerely revolutionary romantic to adherents of Trotskyism, whose aim is to denigrate the Communist Party. However, it is to the credit of the best revolutionaries who, despite their Leftism and mistaken views resolutely and boldly developed the revolutionary armed struggle. They practised what they preached. The long list of our losses carries the names of many personalities who displayed the qualities of true revolutionaries and whose words tallied with their deeds. Che Guevara and those who followed his example, are among them.

But among those holding Leftist views we also meet people who are more concerned with arguing with anybody ready to do so, than with formulating a program of action. Whenever it was really necessary seriously to examine the problems of the Guatemalan revolution, a new approach to them, and to chart the basic lines of policy, the Guatemalan Party of Labor was always willing—with the same sense of responsibility it displays towards self-criticism—to discuss these issues, and to recognize that their opponents may be right or partly right. What is more, when

many of these comrades were still in its ranks, or in the leadership, the Party fully appreciated the qualities and the services of the best of them. In some cases the Party benefited from their views, concrete actions and methods of developing the struggle.

And there are also people—and not necessarily in the mountains or in the cities of Guatemala—who, as Marx said in 1846 when taking issue with sectarianism, have no positive doctrine, who can do nothing and have done nothing but make a lot of noise, trigger dangerous explosions and ruin the cause they started, and who, to justify their political zigzags confuse dialectics, to quote Lenin, “with the vulgar habit of lumping together particular statements, and particular developmental factors, belonging to different stages of a single process.” (*Collected Works*, Vol. 7, p. 412.)

THE PARTY WILL PROVE ITSELF RIGHT IN STRUGGLE

Now that the Party is gradually emerging from the crisis caused by the clash of trends in its ranks, it is concentrating on overcoming its weaknesses. Shortcomings in its work could at a given moment play into the hands of the Right opportunists who expose the proletariat to the influence of the bourgeoisie, or into the hands of the Left opportunists who are anxious to remove the proletariat from the leadership of the revolution and place the latter in the hands of the petty bourgeoisie.

In the case of the Guatemalan Party of Labor, its shortcomings spring from the weakness of the proletariat itself: it is numerically small, poorly organized, only recently formed and still politically immature. But it is the Party that should mould the proletariat's class consciousness. Its internal weakness stems from its social composition (a large percentage of workers of non-proletarian origin, of peasants and petty bourgeoisie), from the fact that such being the case it did not make the necessary effort to proletarianize its ranks and educate its members in a communist spirit, from its weak contacts with the masses, particularly in the factories, from its insufficiently comprehensive knowledge of Guatemalan reality and, last but not least, from inadequate efforts to elaborate its own theoretical problems.

No matter what is said to the contrary, the Party's historical mission is to develop and direct the process of the Guatemalan

revolution, which, as it has already defined, lies through the revolutionary peoples' war, towards which we are advancing. "Determining this path is the fundamental strategic question for us. But we must combine all forms of organization and struggle as we advance along this path. While consistently developing the armed struggle, we must display the greatest political flexibility to win . . . as many forces as possible to the camp of the revolution, to neutralize the vacillating intermediate forces, aggravate the internal contradictions of the enemy and demoralize him," states a Central Committee report made in March 1968.

The sectarian elements in Guatemala, both the ultra Left and the Right, fail to understand this. But reality is bearing out the truth of Lenin's words, words which the working class fully appreciate: "The more powerful enemy can be vanquished only by exerting the utmost effort, and by the most thorough, careful, attentive, skilful and *obligatory* use of any, even the smallest, rift between the enemies, any conflict of interests among the bourgeoisie of the various countries and among the various groups or types of bourgeoisie within the various countries, and also by taking advantage of any, even the smallest, opportunity of winning a mass ally, even though this ally is temporary, vacillating, unstable, unreliable and conditional. Those who do not understand this reveal a failure to understand even the smallest grain of Marxism, of modern scientific socialism *in general*. Those who have not proved *in practice*, over a fairly considerable period of time and in fairly varied political situations, their ability to apply this truth in practice have not yet learned to help the revolutionary class in its struggle to emancipate all toiling humanity from the exploiters. And this applies equally to the period *before* and *after* the proletariat has won political power." (*Collected Works*, Vol. 31, pp. 70-71.)

The Party must display its ability to advance in the present situation, when the revolutionary movement in the country is passing through a crucial phase, when the offensive of the enemy—imperialism—has left its mark. It has disorganized the guerrilla movement, inflicted telling blows on our forces and is trying to neutralize the mass struggle through terror. It is clear that in these conditions the Party must show its ability to pursue its strategic line, the ultimate object of which is the triumph of the revolution. At the same time, while

working to preserve the continuity of the struggle it must do so with due consideration to the concrete situation. It must find the most suitable forms of directing the popular struggle, in every possible case combining the political and social struggle with military operations in such a way as to add to the strength of the revolutionary forces and secure their success.

That is why the Party of Labor is not interested in competing with anybody in spectacular actions which can only imperil the further progress of the struggle and the job of strengthening the Revolutionary Armed Forces. Engels noted in his time that every party leadership of course wants to be successful, which is very good. But there are times when one must have the courage to sacrifice *immediate* success for more important things. In this connection he quoted Hegel as saying that the party shows its viability not by avoiding a *split*, but facing up to it. The proletarian movement, he went on, passes through various stages in its development and at each stage a section of people falls back. It is this that explains why "proletarian solidarity" in reality takes the form of different party groups that come to grips with each other in a fight to the death.

As for the campaign of lies and slander conducted against our Party by those who preferred to split the Guatemalan revolutionary movement, the Central Committee fittingly rebuffed them in its document of March 1968, earlier mentioned. Although "the picture seems to show a difficult and complex situation, it should not be regarded as static," the document notes, and it goes on: "The situation should be seen in the light of its internal contradictions, its development and perspectives. No revolution has triumphed without sacrifices, easily and swiftly. The blows struck at us should be seen as part of a long and difficult road on which our enemies, as they have already demonstrated, will resort to the most brutal methods. But they will be defeated in the end. Those who do not understand this process and dream of an easy victory in the near future might lose heart and abandon the struggle."

Our Party has drawn conclusions not only from the negative aspects of the split. It has taken cognizance of the positive actions of a number of comrades after they left the Party. This is reflected in the aforementioned document which states that the Party is ready to cooperate, to work for unity with the Rebel Armed Forces, and

with all revolutionary organizations in the country fighting the oppressor—imperialism.

Time will prove that the Party is able to take the most difficult hurdles and emerge the stronger as a result of the split. And the cheap "solidarity" displayed by those

groups attacking the Party will but reinforce its determination to prove in the revolutionary struggle how wrong are those floundering in the bog of liquidationism, who wrote: "What is left of the Guatemalan Party of Labor no longer comes within the historical category of a Communist party."

Communist participation in the government and some aspects of the class struggle in Finland

For nearly three years now Communists have been part of the coalition government. We have, of course, gained some experience from this which still needs to be analyzed.

Participation in the government of a capitalist country undoubtedly confronts the Party with many problems connected with the class struggle, and leadership of this struggle in the totally new conditions.

In their work in the government the Communists proceed from the premise that the coalition government supports Finland's present foreign policy, an essential aspect of which is the preservation and promotion of friendly relations with the Soviet Union. This cooperation in the government, which led to the partial isolation of the Right and the parties of monopoly capital, became possible only after the Social-Democratic Party began to pursue a new policy in its relations with the Soviet Union, thanks largely to the painstaking work of the Communist Party and the country's peace forces, and to the fact that the Social-Democratic Party's anti-Communist and hostile policy towards the Soviet Union ran aground causing a crisis in the party. The leadership has now adopted a more reasonable position also as regards the German question, admitting the threat to European security engendered by West Germany and favoring recognition of the two German states.

Communist participation in the government also has as its aim cooperation between the Communists and the Social-Democrats and thus clear the way to working-

class unity. This would indeed be a victory for the Finnish working class the beneficial results of which would be very great indeed.

Cooperation between the two parties would also help to achieve unity between the old, traditional sections of the working class and the new, rapidly growing strata of clerical workers, officials and the technical intelligentsia (to the extent that these categories belong to the working class).

The Communist Party's main support is among the traditional working class whereas that of the Social-Democratic Party is among also the new sections composed largely of the youth. It can therefore be said that the Social-Democrats' dissociation from the Right forces and their turn to the Left is prompted by the objective development to be observed among the new working-class sections.

They are joining unions and adopting the traditional methods of struggle. Recent years have seen big strikes by bank and postal workers, pharmacutists and hospital nurses. Formerly, the Right-wing bourgeois parties were in a better position to secure the support of these categories since the Social-Democratic Party in competing for them likewise occupied Right-wing positions. Today the situation is changing, for the developments in the new sections of the working class are laying their imprint also on the Social-Democratic Party.

The cooperation achieved does not mean,

of course, that the Communist Party no longer has to work for the support of the new sections. On the contrary, the stronger our support among them, the more effectively will we be able to influence their class consciousness, to compel the Social-Democratic Party to move still further to the Left.

Most encouraging as regards the future of this cooperation is that the youth of the Social-Democratic Party now take the cooperation for granted; furthermore, a lively discussion has started in this party on the practically forgotten subject of socialism.

The Finnish Communists consider participation in the government and the fight for democracy as an integral part of the fight for socialism. Our participation has contributed to a more democratic home policy. There are now fewer attempts to edge out the Communist Party from the political arena. Progress can be recorded in the socio-political and cultural spheres. Thus, Parliament has passed a law on education according to which nine-year schooling will become obligatory within the next few years. State grants for needy university students have been considerably increased. A law has been passed establishing a family pension system, while old-age pensions have been increased. In addition to these major improvements many lesser ones have been introduced.

In this connection, the government's economic policy and its effect on the class struggle acquires special importance.

Of the parties in the coalition government, the Center Party represents the rural bourgeoisie and capitalist interests in the producer cooperatives, while the Social-Democrats represent, as before, a semi-bourgeois course. Hence, in essence the government's economic measures cannot but be capitalist in nature. For all that, Communist participation enables the working class partly to eliminate the more reactionary aspects of this policy, to protect its interests more effectively than was the case in governments which did not include Communists. Of course, the working people still have a hard time, and many of them would like to see this "bad" government out, not realizing that it might be replaced by something worse.

Thus, there are difficulties in broadening the class struggle. We are partly to blame for this. We over-simplified matters and created the impression that the government in office at the time was responsible for

the economic difficulties encountered, although the main cause is rooted in the capitalist system itself. We did not fully realize before the extent to which the existing system dictates economic policy and what basic changes have to be made before there can be any fundamental change of policy. This is to a considerable degree explained by Finland's dependence on her so-called free trade with the capitalist world. If Finland is to carry out a progressive economic policy she will either have to break away from the trade alliance of the West, or change the trade and political principles underlying these alliances. But it should be noted at the same time, that we attach considerable importance to cooperation and joint struggle with the progressive forces of the member-countries of these alliances.

Any effective change of economic policy calls for measures which the other government parties are not prepared to carry out as yet. The task of the Communists is, therefore, to so act that these parties will be forced to carry out such measures. This means painstaking, persistent mass work, it means combining the parliamentary struggle with extra-parliamentary struggle.

Naturally, the formation of a government which included Communists gave rise to hopes that many of the vital working-class issues would now be resolved at the top. When this did not happen disillusionment began to spread among the masses.

It is quite obvious that when only two of the 16-member government are Communists and only one a People's Democrat, these three representatives must have the unfailing support of the working people, otherwise there would be little chance of achieving any substantial success. The erroneous notion that the Communists in the government have considerable opportunities can be overcome only through explanatory work among the masses. However, certain subjective factors connected with the internal situation in the Party, and which began to tell even before Communists entered the government, are the main reason why we have not been able to carry on mass work as effectively as the situation required.

The new problems arising from the Party's changed position can be resolved provided we change our tactics and raise the class struggle to a higher level.

In the government the Communists should balance compromises with constructive criticism of their partners and realistic alternatives. The emphasis in mass work

should be on defense of the coalition government against attacks from the Right, and on organizing work among the masses against the Right and the monopolies.

This should be linked with work among the masses to support the government, encouraging them to submit their proposals on issues of vital concern to them, with active agitation. Lenin noted in his time that in some situations agitation can even become the main form of revolutionary activity. We believe that in some respects this applies to us. We should explain to the people that the government's economic policy differs from the Communists' program, that we have better solutions to offer. We should use the dissatisfaction to back our proposals, bring pressure to bear on the other government parties to take more progressive economic measures. We should explain to the masses that in cooperation with the Communists the Social-Democrats have a more realistic possibility of honoring their election promises. If we carry out this work effectively, we shall be able to retain the following of those dissatisfied with the government's policy and win the support of those members of the other parties who are of a like opinion.

In the light of the October 1968 municipal election returns it would seem that we suffered a big defeat, losing approximately one-sixth of our former constituents while the other government parties retained their positions, by and large, and the Rights increased theirs. For the latter it was the long-awaited balsam on the wounds inflicted when the Social Democratic Party withdrew from their front. The election results could be regarded, partly, as consolidation of the Right.

I, personally, think that Communist participation in the government was not the main reason for our electoral defeat, that this defeat was due to certain subjective factors, earlier mentioned.

Marxists note that certain trends in modern capitalism look like forerunners of fascism. This danger is not a very real one in Finland at present. It is true, some signs have appeared in the country's political life which could spell the beginnings of a fascist movement. The continued growth of monopoly and automation, the structural changes in the economy, the crisis in agriculture and the resultant unemployment, not to mention many other anomalies, have strongly affected some sections of the traditional working class and small manufacturers. The Rights were quick to hold the present government responsible for these difficulties, exacerbated by the crisis trends in world capitalism. This demagoguery affected some people, especially since the Communists had not conducted a sufficiently effective explanatory campaign.

As a result, the Right forces were able to exploit the dissatisfaction that spread among a large segment of the population. This found expression in Vennamo's new Small Farmers' Party which received seven per cent of the total vote, polling many votes also in the urban areas. Although it proclaimed essentially "Left" slogans in its propaganda, such as "Defense of the forgotten people," it betrays fascist-like features. The success of this party shows the need critically to review our activity and step up work "in defense of the forgotten people," the need to win more stable positions among the new sections of the working class and among the youth.

We must tackle this problem if we want to advance. The Central Committee has already charted the guide lines for improving mass work and information. The Fifteenth Congress, to be held at the beginning of April, will undoubtedly play an important role in this respect.

Gunnar ASPLUND

Conduct the dialogue from standpoint of principle

At the beginning of the year the journal *Politique aujourd'hui* was launched in Paris. Its aim, according to its founders, is "exploration" in the domain of theory and dialogue between the Left forces.

In connection with the publication of this journal, the Political Bureau of the French Communist Party declared that the members who launched the journal had acted contrary to the wishes of the Party, and drew attention to the fact that some of those collaborating with the venture were avowed opponents of the Party.

"It is therefore not surprising," the Party statement went on, "that the very first issue of the journal contained articles that encroach on the unity of the Party. The vanguard role of the Communist Party and the theoretical, political and organizational principles underlying its activity, are called in question. The welter of criticism and attacks against the Soviet Union in many of the articles is, in effect, the expression of an anti-Soviet line which can but weaken the solidarity needed by the Communist parties in the fight against imperialism."

The statement underlines that the Communist Party is all for a real dialogue. "But the dialogue should be based on a clear confrontation of views, which presupposes that the Communist view should be presented by Communists who approve and voice their Party's policy. In this way a dialogue can be started which will not be an aim in itself, but which will help to unite the democratic forces in an effort to arrive at common aims at each new stage."

The Political Bureau states that the Party supports constant theoretical research so as to be better equipped to grapple with the new problems as they arise and make a constructive contribution to Marxist-Leninist theory. "In particular, in the light of the scientific-technological revolution which is sharpening the contradictions of capital-

ism, the Party holds that participation by the intelligentsia in the political and social struggle in alliance with the working class is fundamental to building the democratic and socialist future."

All the more inadmissible, therefore, is the position of *Politique aujourd'hui* which, as the Political Bureau statement points out, proposes, in the final analysis, a Right revisionist line running counter to the policy which was approved and enriched in the Manifesto recently adopted by the Central Committee.

The Political Bureau, concludes the statement, regards the participation of Communist activists in this journal as running counter to the general efforts of the Party to unite all progressive forces. It calls on all members to combat both Right and Left revisionism, and to acquaint the masses with the answers advanced by the Party to meet the aspirations of the workers of manual and mental labor, and in particular, to ensure a wide circulation for the ideas contained in the Manifesto of the Central Committee.

In this way they will contribute to the unity of the working class and to rallying the democratic forces, which must find expression in Communist Party cooperation with all the democratic parties and other organizations in the fight for an advanced democracy and a socialist France.

Roland Leroy, Political Bureau member, also touched on this question at a seminar on the work of Communists among engineers, technicians and technical personnel. Noting the fruitful results of the joint work in organizing the seminar, Leroy said that this work effectively refutes those who charge that the Communist Party is stricken with sclerosis and incapable of coping with the new problems, that the Party's explorations in theory are sterile and that a confrontation of ideas is impossible. "It

is with such arguments that the founders of *Politique aujourd'hui* try to justify collaboration with avowed enemies of the Party, among whom are Trotskyites and persons expelled from the Party, and a number of intellectuals, among them some Communists. Some of the latter know what they are doing. In May and June last year they attacked Party policy from the Left, and for years previously they had espoused revisionist views of a Left or Right coloring, depending on the circumstances. Now they are again participating in a Right revisionist venture directed against the Party's unity, calling in question its theoretical, ideological, political and organizational principles. I think that their local branches will remind these Communists, who are few in number, that we have never forced anybody to be a Party member, and that if they want freedom to fight the Party and to be completely independent of it, we shall give them this freedom and this independence."

Some comrades, Leroy added, may have

agreed to collaborate on the journal with a view to initiating a dialogue and theoretical exploration. "But before a dialogue can take place the conditions for this must exist. Confrontation of the Party's policy and theory with other opinions quite obviously implies expressing, first and foremost, the policy of the Party. If the possibility existed we would have no objection as a Party to founding, together with other partners, a journal-dialogue designed to promote the constant exploration of common aims. All Communist intellectuals can actively participate in free theoretical debate, which the Party encourages and stimulates."

The document of the Party's Political Bureau and Leroy's speech underscore the need to engage in a dialogue from the principled positions of Marxism-Leninism, flexibly and creatively applying the wealth of ideas of scientific socialism to the new and diverse problems of our time.

A.D.

From draft policy statement of German Communist Party

The following extracts are in response to readers' requests for information about the reconstituted German Communist Party in the FRG.

* * *

At a press conference in Duesseldorf last January, the Federal Committee of the Party submitted for public discussion the draft of its policy statement. The draft will be considered and adopted at a congress, scheduled for April 12-13 in Essen.

"The German Communist Party," states the draft document, "is the Marxist party of the working class in Federal Germany. This is its homeland. In its work it is guided by the teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin—the critical science of the working class aimed at changing the world. The Party is working to secure the working people's leading role in the state and society. It stands foursquare for unity of the workers and all progressive forces. It is acting as a force moulding the class consciousness of the workers and the youth. The Communist Party wants our country

to advance along the road indicated by the times—the road of socialism."

The draft notes that the Party has imbibed the revolutionary traditions of the labor movement, that, proceeding from the present and future interests of the working class in the Federal Republic, it will be closely associated with the working class in the German Democratic Republic and its party—the Socialist Unity Party of Germany.

Stressing that the Party is part of the working class in West Germany and of the international labor movement, the authors of the document observe: "While on the one hand we uphold the interests of the working class and, consequently, the true interests of the German nation, on the other, we are internationalists working for fraternal cooperation between the workers of all lands. Together with the Communists of the Soviet Union and of the other socialist countries, and with the Communists of the capitalist countries, we are on the side of the worldwide movement to

which the future belongs. We are in solidarity with all peoples fighting against imperialist oppression and colonial dependence, for their national independence, democracy, progress and socialism."

The Communist Party offers as its alternative to the present developments in the FRG, the democratic renovation of the state and society. The draft underscores in this connection: "The only way to resolve the issues of vital concern to our people is through developing the political activity and initiative of the working masses, through the democratic renovation of the state and society. Democratic renovation means turning the FRG into a genuinely democratic state, means restricting the power of monopoly capital and putting an end to neo-nazism and the militarist great-power policy. Democratic renovation means a policy of peace and security, recognition of the GDR, defense of democratic rights, broader democracy, the right for workers to participate in factory management; it means social security and a better life, a progressive policy in culture and education."

"This democratic renovation," the draft statement goes on, "is not something that can be won for the people, they must achieve it themselves—in social and political struggle, in vigorous trade union activity, non-parliamentary actions and actions for progressive representation in parliament. The Communist Party is anxious to secure these transformations on the basis of the democratic principles and rights inscribed in the Constitution."

The draft stresses: "The principal task in the struggle is to change the political alignment of forces in favor of the working

class and all sections of the people oppressed by monopoly capital. This is also an essential condition for democratic and social progress, changing the composition of parliament and turning it into a body representing the interests of the people. It is the precondition for forming a government prepared to pursue a new policy."

The Party's aim is the socialist reconstruction of society, we read in the draft, which goes on to say: "The German Communist Party is convinced that the vast majority of the country's working class and people generally will realize, in the course of the struggle for their social rights and democratic change, the historical need for higher forms of social life, for a socialist society."

Observing that a socialist social system means the conquest of political power by the working class in alliance with other sections of the working people, the authors of the draft state: "The German Communist Party wants the working people of the FRG to achieve socialism in the most favorable way, without civil war. The reactionary ruling classes, on the contrary, anxious to preserve their power and privileges, have always resorted to violence against the people. It is only in a stubborn class and popular struggle against the inevitable resistance of the big capitalist groups that the socialist and anti-monopoly popular movement can gain the strength needed to prevent reactionary violence."

The draft states that in the fight for socialist transformations, the German Communist Party wants to cooperate with all socialist and anti-monopoly forces in non-parliamentary actions, and in the fight for broad parliamentary representation of the working people.

Conference of Uruguayan communists

The recent Conference of the Communist Party of Uruguay in Montevideo took place against a setting of public discontent over the government's policy of repressions, wage freeze and attacks on civil rights and freedoms.

The last six months of 1968 saw the introduction of emergency measures and a visible

sharpening of the political atmosphere. Grave trials fell to the lot of the Communists, from which they emerged more steel-ed than ever. Defying the government repressions, new members joined the Party—over 1,100 in December alone.

Touching on the drive to expand the Party, *Popular*, the Party newspaper, said

in an editorial: "Building a powerful Communist Party is the cardinal problem of the Uruguay revolution."

The report by Comrade Alberto Suarez, Secretary of the Party, dealt with efforts to strengthen the Party, with the guidelines for the new Party-building plan for 1970, the year highlighted by the centennial of Lenin's birth and the 50th anniversary of the Uruguay Party.

Disappointed in the bourgeois political parties, which are in the throes of a crisis, the masses are turning to the Communists.

The political awareness of the people is rising. However, Comrade Suarez observed, the numerical strength of the Party is still incommensurate with the mass of people siding with the Party.

Attended by 368 delegates, the Conference adopted a new Party-building plan to be realized in fighting for radical change in the country. The aim is to increase the membership by 80 per cent before 1970. The circulation of *Popular* is to be increased to 40,000 and of *Estudios* (the Party's theoretical organ) to 10,000 copies.

Against military alliance with the United States

The Japanese-American military treaty expires on June 22, 1970, and the public in Japan wonders whether it will be annulled, whether the U.S. military presence in Okinawa will continue or whether the island will be returned to Japan. The number of opponents to Japan's military alliance with the United States is increasing visibly. The newspaper *Asahi* estimates on the strength of an opinion poll last December, that 70 per cent of the nation wants the military treaty scrapped or at least modified.

Under the treaty, *Akahata*, the Communist Party paper, reported on January 17, the government placed at the disposal of the U.S. Armed Forces territory for 148 military bases and 23 offshore testing areas. In addition, the U.S. has free use of 74 sea-ports and 24 civilian airfields, most of which, especially on Okinawa, are exploited for the war against the people of Vietnam.

In his report to the Tenth Congress of the Japanese Communist Party in October 1966, Kenji Miyamoto, General Secretary, said: "The fight for the annulment of the Japanese-American 'security treaty' and against the revival and invigoration of Japanese militarism in conditions of subjugation to the United States is entering a most acute phase. The aims of the struggle are: evacuation of U.S. military bases, return of Okinawa and Ogasawara, ban on entry of U.S. atomic submarines and aircraft carriers into Japanese ports, etc."

The Communist Party has repeatedly

stated its stand on the so-called revision of the "security treaty" in 1970. The matter was discussed at length at a recent Central Committee meeting, culminating in a document which said: "A united front of all democratic forces is urgently needed to press for the abolition of the Japanese-American military alliance and to build an independent, peaceful, neutral Japan." The alternatives, the document continued, are as follows:

1) Either tolerate what will in effect become a Japanese-American nuclear alliance and an Asiatic anti-Communist military pact based on prolongation and consolidation of the "security treaty" and the return to Japan of Okinawa with U.S. nuclear bases, use of which by the United States will be free, or

2) scrap the Japanese-American military alliance and gain genuine independence and peace.

The Central Committee pointed out that the nation should work for annulment of the treaty and the unconditional and complete return of Okinawa, advancing towards an independent, democratic, peaceful, neutral and prosperous Japan.

It defined the concrete objectives in this campaign. What is needed, it said, is a democratic coalition government based on a united front of all democratic forces which would, on the strength of clause 10 of the treaty, give the U.S. Government "notice of expiry." The Central Committee suggested that the coalition government

should see to it that U.S. troops and bases are removed from Japanese territory within a year, annulling the treaty, the agreement for stationing U.S. troops and bases, and other pertinent agreements.

The Japanese Communists oppose the Sato Cabinet's policy of cooperation with the USA and Japan being made a U.S. war base, especially a base for the aggression in Vietnam.

They demand a ban on importation of nuclear weapons and equipping Japanese self-defense units with atomic arms, a ban

on entry of U.S. warships into Japanese ports, on the use, testing, production and stock-piling of nuclear arms in Japan, and call for a world treaty to ban the use of nuclear weapons.

The Central Committee decision stresses that scrapping the treaty and regaining Okinawa would radically alter the role of Japan, in the postwar a support base of U.S. imperialist aggression, and visibly change the political climate in Asia.

M. D.

WMR

communications and comment

The Paris talks and Washington

The political journalist on the Washington beat must have been somewhat perplexed when, early in 1968, the then occupant of the White House announced to a startled public at home and abroad that he would not seek the Democratic Party nomination for a second full term. For here was a most ambitious politician, a man whose whole life had been a preparation for that high office, a man who hated more than anything else the word abdication; and here he was relinquishing—evidently of his own free will—the opportunity of another four years in that most coveted of offices.

And yet there was a deep logic to his decision. It was the logic of an indomitable fight in a far away country by a small but heroic nation for its independence and future. It was the logic of the solidarity of the socialist world aiding the people of Vietnam in their just struggle for freedom and independence. It was, lastly, the logic of the mounting opposition in the United States itself to an immoral and senseless war.

In assessing the Johnson Administration and President Johnson himself, *Newsweek*

(January 20, 1969) commented:

"If the Johnson Presidency had a tragic fall, was Vietnam its major stumbling block? A strong case can be made for that view . . . It was certainly Vietnam that unlocked the furies among America's youth, intelligentsia, and ultimately its voters—and that drove Mr. Johnson from office. It was Vietnam that drained away the money so desperately needed by the fledgling domestic programs of the Great Society. . . .

"Clinton Rossiter of Cornell, a long time student of the Presidency, is among those who believe that Vietnam brought Lyndon Johnson down. 'When you have a war on you can't win and you can't lose, it saps your time, your energy, your prestige—and eventually it destroys you. Vietnam is not our biggest problem, but it is the one that destroyed this man'."

The announcement, on March 31, 1968 of a partial halt to the bombing of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam was a victory for both North and South Vietnam. It was the proof that the *concept* of trying to force a nation to its knees by an utterly

ruthless bombing of its towns and villages was powerless to break the will of a people fighting for the homeland.

The DRV government's initiative and Johnson's decision of March 31 paved the way to the bilateral talks which opened in Paris in May 1968. The talks which aroused hopes all over the world were not, however, moving forward because of the duplicity of the United States Government in seeking to extract from the Democratic Republic of Vietnam what actually amounted to surrender. U.S. diplomatic maneuvers in Paris were coupled with an intensified bombing of a large part of the territory of the DRV and with a brutalization—if it was at all possible—of the war in the South. The feeling of world public opinion was that the American side was trying to redouble the pressure on the Vietnamese patriots. But these tactics failed.

Another victory for the Vietnamese came, when on October 31, 1968 President Johnson felt constrained to announce complete cessation of the bombing in the North and agreement to hold four-sided talks in Paris—with the inclusion of the National Liberation Front.

It would seem logical that the U.S. Government should have abandoned by that time the idea of *forcing* anything on the Democratic Republic of Vietnam or on the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam, that it should have been prepared to enter into genuinely serious negotiations on the substance of the issue. But again for a considerable period no such conclusions were drawn by the American side. The excuses were numerous, and two of them were particularly outstanding: "everyone" apparently was waiting for the inauguration of the new President, but all of a sudden—the Saigon puppets, totally dependent on the Americans, "came to life" and refused to send a delegation to Paris until the issue of the NLF representation was settled. Settled—of course—according to their wishes based on denial of an independent role for the National Liberation Front.

Much was written about the "wranglings" between the American delegation in Paris headed by Ambassador Averell Harriman, the Johnson Administration in Washington and the South Vietnamese regime in Saigon. There was the unmistakable intention of creating the impression that the Americans, at least the Americans in Paris, were "good" and willing to begin negotiations, whereas the Saigon regime raising

all kinds of obstacles was "bad." Be that as it may, it is perfectly obvious that the Saigon regime could not possibly have taken its stand without very powerful forces in Washington and its military establishment in South Vietnam giving it maximum support and encouragement. According to Murray Marder, writing in the *Washington Post* (January 20, 1969) Secretary Rusk was "convinced that nothing of consequence could be expected to emerge from the Paris talks." The U.S. military establishment in Saigon was, according to Marder, dead set against any substantive negotiations in Paris, although Gen. Creighton W. Abrams, commander-in-chief of U.S. forces in South Vietnam, was reported by President Johnson to have given his assent to the halt in the bombing. At any rate there is this incontestable fact that the four-sided talks announced for November 6, 1968 did not *materialize* until almost ten weeks later.

The Saigon regime, advancing absurd demands, flatly declined to send a delegation to Paris. Its refusal, it seems, was motivated by the following factors:

The first was that the U.S. military establishment—contrary to all the indications—began again to comfort itself that it could "sell" the idea of military victory to the American people. The idea was to convince the American public that the "reorganization" and re-equipment of the Saigon army had progressed so far that it could play a considerable if not the decisive role in the fight against the Vietnamese patriots. Hence—the need to show Saigon as being "tough" and "uncompromising" and its professions of wanting to fight "unto complete victory."

The second factor was the fear of the Saigon regime to sit with representatives of the National Liberation Front in the glare of the world press and of world public opinion. They feared that the talks would expose their negative attitude to peace. After all, to many in Paris and not only in Paris they seemed what they were—"politicians" acting against the interest of their people on behalf of the USA and the "upper crust" in South Vietnam.

And finally, there was the war-weariness of a large part of the American people, who long to see an end to the Vietnam war. Many in the American power structure and in the Establishment now realize that this is a hopeless war which has lessened the possibilities of the United States playing its former world role. The Saigon

regime thought that by sabotaging the Paris talks with the help of the U.S. military it would prevent the development in the U.S. of a trend towards a settlement.

It is again due to the patriots in Vietnam and the indomitable and yet flexible stand of the representatives of the DRV and the NLF that those calculations have gone awry. In the face of worldwide indignation and considering the general situation in Vietnam, the American side simply could not afford to sabotage the talks or to let them be sabotaged by their Saigon puppets. On Saturday, January 25, 1969 the four delegations met in the Hotel Majestic in Paris to try to resolve questions of substance.

The first substantive session of the Paris Conference coincided with the Nixon inauguration; this necessitated a change in the American team in Paris. Averell Harriman was replaced by Henry Cabot Lodge Jr.

Cabot Lodge's record as U.S. Ambassador in Saigon opens up rather dim perspectives. He is one of the most outspoken anti-Communists in Washington. *Newsweek* (January 20, 1969) carried this comment:

"The South Vietnamese made no effort to conceal their pleasure over the appointment (of Cabot Lodge). Indeed they were openly referring to Lodge as 'our man in Paris'. . . . During his two tours of duty as Ambassador to South Vietnam he got on well with the nation's powerful military men. In 1963 Lodge bestowed his tacit blessing on the coup-makers who engineered the overthrow of President Ngo Dinh Diem. And when he returned to Saigon in 1965, he lent his personal and political support to the military regime of Premier Nguyen Cao Ky. In those days Lodge's attitude toward negotiation was compatible with Saigon's present outlook. Upon leaving South Vietnam in 1967, Lodge, who later became ambassador to West Germany, predicted that the war would not end with a peace conference, but with a quiet military 'fade-out' by the Communists.

"'There is no hope at all,' he had said, 'that public activities having to do with peace will accomplish results'."

There are still more ominous signs. U. Alexis Johnson, newly appointed Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs and a former deputy ambassador in Saigon, declared on January 21, 1969 that he would not recommend to President Nixon any changes in the U.S. "commitment" to South Vietnam. Asked if he would propose con-

tinuing "exactly the same American policy," he replied: "I think our policy here is paying dividends and I think it is going in the right direction, yes."

Alexis Johnson's words should be coupled with what he had heard from Gen. Abrams and U.S. Ambassador to Saigon Ellsworth Bunker — as reported by the *Washington Post* on January 22. The essence of their report is summed up in the following paragraph:

"The South Vietnamese Army's build up, with belated re-equipping by the United States will be more or less complete by June 30, when a new U.S. look at its capabilities (and the tactical situation) will be in order."

What on earth do the words mean? What, in the light of the Paris talks, is their portent? Clearly it must be that the United States still entertains hopes of a military victory, and that until June 30 at least some people in Washington are not worrying about results in Paris.

That this interpretation is the likely one can be gleaned from an editorial in the *New York Times* (January 18) which directly accuses the U.S. military establishment in Saigon of "footdragging."

"The new spurt towards peace in Paris," the editorial says, "has been accompanied by all-too-familiar foot-dragging on the part of some military officials in Saigon . . . These perennial optimists continue to promote delusive dreams of military victory. United States military commanders recently have been stressing what they say is a marked improvement in South Vietnamese forces and a drastic decline in the fighting qualities of the enemy. . . .

"The siren call of the repeatedly discredited prophets of military victory must not be permitted again to divert the nation from the only sensible path to peace in Vietnam — a path that runs today through Paris."

Thanks to the valiant struggle of the people of Vietnam, thanks to their support by the socialist countries and world public opinion, thanks to the widespread opposition in the United States to this unjust war, substantive talks have now begun in Paris. On the one hand they have aroused hopes in the world, on the other they have spurred the sinister war mongering forces in Washington and in Saigon to sabotage the talks by all possible means. We shall certainly witness a struggle between these opposing tendencies.

Zygmunt BRONIAREK

Dangers of Israeli policy

The very first days of 1969 witnessed a sharp escalation in the aggressiveness of Israeli militarism. Another large-scale military confrontation between Israel and the Arab countries, fraught with the danger of involving the great powers, is looming up.

The escalation was highlighted by the treacherous Israeli raid on the Beirut international airport, carried out according to official Israeli sources by a decision taken at cabinet level. This action, which shocked world opinion, was the most reckless of the Israeli sallies against her Arab neighbors since the June war.

In the eyes of the Israeli military strategists Jordan and Lebanon are the weak links in the Arab countries. Hence the concentrated efforts to force these two countries to seek a separate settlement with Israel on the basis of the status quo post-June 1967, to neutralize them and thus break up Arab solidarity, to strengthen the positions of the reactionaries in these countries and ultimately isolate the anti-imperialist regimes in Cairo and Damascus.

The General Secretary of the Israeli Communist Party, Meir Vilner, speaking in the Knesset (Parliament) condemned the raid on Beirut airport as a sabotage action against peace efforts. "This raid on Lebanon," he said, "has seriously undermined the intensive international efforts now underway to find a way out, a political solution to the crisis in our region. Who can deny that the raid has caused grave harm above all to Israel?"

The Beirut raid can hardly be seen as an isolated action since it has long been obvious that the Israeli strikes are against military and civilian targets especially in Egypt, Jordan and Lebanon, that is, against countries that have expressed their readiness for a political solution of the crisis, against those countries that have declared their readiness to implement the November 1967 decision of the Security Council, i.e., withdrawal of Israeli forces from the occupied territories, on the Arab side termination of the state of belligerency with Israel, and respect for the latter's right to sovereign existence within recognized and secure borders.

WHY THE ESCALATION?

Israeli official spokesmen describe their military actions against the Arab countries as "retaliation" for the Arab military operations against Israel—explaining the bombing of the Amman-Aqaba bridges and Beirut as retaliation for Arab resistance operations. But such "retaliation" cannot be justified because it serves aggressive purposes, being aimed against the Arab resistance to the continued occupation and annexation of the Arab territories.

This is not a new policy; ever since the founding of the Israeli state its Zionist leaders have coveted the west bank of the Jordan, the Gaza strip and the Golan heights in Syria. And their assault on the Arab states was, clearly, an attempt to carry forward their far-reaching aims. The Israeli rulers do not hide their intentions of retaining all the war spoils and imposing a humiliating peace on the Arabs by forcing them to recognize the "status quo." This is underlined by the policy statement submitted to the United Nations, in what is called the Israeli nine points for a "peace" settlement.

The gist of this "peace plan" is:

1. Evading the situation arising from the Israeli war of aggression.
2. Rejecting the obligations contained in the Security Council decision of November 22, 1967, and insistence on direct negotiations.
3. Non-recognition of the U.N. injunction that Israel should withdraw from occupied territories.
4. A desire to obtain territorial acquisitions and other advantages regardless of the rights of the Arab people of Palestine.
5. Denial of the responsibility of the Israeli rulers for the situation created in the Middle East arising from the policy of strength in collusion with imperialism, and the policy of total disregard for the Palestinian Arabs over the past twenty years.

In short, this policy, which runs counter to international law and the U.N. Charter and is directed against the rights of peoples, can never lead to peace.

The Israeli leaders have never made any secret of their resolve to retain and annex

the occupied Arab territories. Attempts are made to change the demographic nature of the occupied territories by forcing the people to flee from their homes and go to the east bank of the Jordan, by establishing Jewish settlements in the Arab territories and an occupation regime to secure fulfillment of this task.

The perspective held out by the extremists in Israel for their people is that sooner or later another round of war is inevitable. In the words of Army Commander-in-Chief, Haim Bar Lev: The prospect of peace is distant. Each side wants a settlement so different from the other, to such an extent that it seems it will be impossible to make both ends meet. Yet the danger of another outbreak of war is being created by the Israeli militarists and their patrons. But growing international public opinion against the Israeli defiance of U.N. decisions, the growing resistance in the occupied Arab territories, the intensive efforts conducted by peace forces of the world headed by the Soviet Union for a just political solution, the growing concern and discontent of the Israeli public — all are exerting tremendous pressure on the Israeli front and could upset all the calculations of the Israeli hawks.

THE SCRANTON MISSION

The deterioration of the U.S. position in the area due to Washington's support of the Israeli aggression prompted the mission of Scranton as the emissary of Richard Nixon, then president-elect. It goes without saying that the change of men in the White House has not changed the global strategy of the U.S., but it may signify some tactical changes on issues like the Middle East for example, especially after the failures of American policy there in recent years.

The purpose of the Scranton mission was to seek an American solution to the Middle East crisis in line with American interests, securing substantial gains from the Israeli military victory over the Arabs in 1967.

The purpose of the mission was, therefore, to give a new impetus to American "friends" in the area and to strengthen their claim that the Arabs should not adopt a hostile attitude to U.S. imperialism, which would force it to a greater reliance on Israel.

A purpose of the Scranton mission was to strengthen the positions of Arab reactionaries at the expense of the progress-

ive regimes in the area, to create a favorable atmosphere for carrying out the imperialist plans envisaging major concessions by the Arabs in line with imperialist interests, and to find a solution to the Palestine question in line with the ambitions of the Israeli rulers and to the detriment of the Palestinian Arabs.

BOMBS INSTEAD OF BUTTER

Although the Israeli rulers say that they do not want another outbreak of war, militarization is the order of the day. At the beginning of the year, in submitting the annual budget to the Knesset the Finance Minister declared: "The next year's budget, like the previous ones, will be a military budget, namely, in allocating the reduced resources at our disposal the issue of security occupies the first place. All other budgetary items will have to be content with what remains." The proposed budget amounts to £7,850 million, compared to 6,362 million last year, a rise of 23 per cent. "Security expenditure swallows up three-quarters of the revenue from direct and indirect taxes," the Minister stated. And he underlined that from this proposed budget 37 per cent will be allocated for security and special items.

The Minister admitted that income from taxation will rise by 17 per cent over the previous year. Wages will remain frozen in 1969 despite the rise in prices.

Last September Premier Eshkol caused a furore both in Israel and in the outside world when he announced that Israel had the know-how for making an atom bomb. And, he added, we should not be in a hurry to sign the agreement for non-proliferation of atomic weapons. Western, particularly American, sources persist in leaking stories to the effect that Israel may have an atomic weapon in a year's time. Whether these forecasts are true or not the fact is that it was Eshkol's statement that set off the speculation. Was it merely the intention of the Israeli Prime Minister to withhold signature to the agreement on non-proliferation until Israel becomes a member of the atomic club?

Clearly the Israeli military pressure on her Arab neighbors and the psychological preparation of international public opinion for the introduction of atomic weapons into the area in no way facilitates a peaceful settlement in the Middle East. On the contrary, it only adds to the danger of another explosion in the area.

SOVIET INITIATIVE— THE ROAD TO PEACE

The Soviet Union, striving to eliminate the tensions in the Middle East, is insisting on fulfilment of all the points in the 1967 Security Council resolution. Most salient of these points is withdrawal of all Israeli troops from the occupied Arab land. In his interview granted the Japanese newspaper *Mainichi*, Alexei Kosygin, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, pointed out that the Middle East crisis has its source in the Israeli aggression.

The Soviet proposals, designed to secure a just and durable peace in the Middle East, have attracted worldwide attention. The Soviet initiative, the gist of which was that the great powers should assist in settling the Middle East problem on the basis of the November 1967 Security Council resolution, was universally welcomed.

Highly placed Western diplomats were quoted in the *New York Herald Tribune* as

saying that the "new Soviet proposal may open the possibility of a Middle East settlement."

Official Israeli circles, however, reject any initiative involving the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the occupied territory, and refuse to comply with the resolution of the Security Council of November 1967. Yet the people of Israel are weary of the war and of the instability. They are coming to realize that the Soviet initiative is in the interest of all the peoples in the area, including Israel.

Soviet policy in the Middle East is designed to frustrate the aggressive aims of the imperialist circles, to lay bare the intrigues of the reactionary forces. The Soviet proposals are designed to achieve a speedy solution of the problem. In the opinion of the Israeli Communist Party and all peace-loving forces in the country, the Soviet initiative opens up new prospects for normalizing the situation in the Middle East.

Saliba KHAMIS

READER'S QUESTIONS

Background to events in Northern Ireland

For months past Londonderry, Belfast, Newry, Armagh and other towns in Ireland's northern province of Ulster have featured in the world press and television. The reason—a Civil Rights struggle and a most savage reaction by a police force specially trained in all the arts of brutality.

And since the Ulster police are, understandably, somewhat shy of television viewers catching a glimpse of their methods, so reminiscent of the Gestapo and of police in Chicago, it is hardly surprising that cameramen and journalists are often the first victims of their batons.

About 40 per cent of Ulster's population

of 1,500,000 are Roman Catholics, the other 60 per cent Protestants, and for the most part the two communities, particularly in Belfast and Londonderry, live in a kind of apartheid atmosphere of distinctly separate areas.

A complex of historical, political and economic reasons explains what to the outsider seems to be, and is, a fanatical intolerance on the part of top men in Ulster's Protestant population in relation to Catholic citizens.

There is discrimination in jobs, discrimination in housing and discrimination in voting rights.

The city of Londonderry can be taken as a typical case. There the population is two-thirds Roman Catholic, one-third Protestant. Yet it has an electoral system which ensures that the Protestant minority has a permanent majority on the City Council.

One of the Londonderry electoral wards, wholly Catholic, has a population of 30,000 and elects eight members to the City Council. Two other wards, smaller, while they have some distinctly Catholic streets, are mainly Protestant residential areas. With a total of 24,000 inhabitants these two wards elect twelve Protestant councillors. A property qualification for local government elections can give owners of shops and other businesses up to six votes for each business so that the business community has no difficulty in perpetuating a Protestant majority on the City Council.

This majority, naturally, determines the number of housing units to be built in the city and, what is more, determines who shall qualify for housing. Some lucky Catholics do qualify, but certainly not in proportion to their two-thirds majority of the population.

With unemployment chronic in Ulster as a whole and running at a rate of 7.5 per cent of the male labor force, in Londonderry the rate is in excess of 15 per cent. And as it is with housing so it is with jobs. "No Catholics need apply" is the often unwritten law of employers and municipalities.

The immediate source, then, of the present discontent in Northern Ireland can be traced directly to these discriminatory practices in the matter of jobs, housing and voting rights.

These, however, their immediacy notwithstanding, are not the only sources of the discontent.

Northern Ireland is an amputation inflicted on Ireland by the British government when it passed the Government of Ireland Act, 1920.

This Act severed the most industrialized part of the country from the mainly agricultural south. Military, or to be more precise, naval, considerations played their part in this. Ulster, regarded as being more loyal to British conservatism, offered harbors which in the thinking of the statesmen of the day could be used by the Royal Navy to safeguard Britain's Atlantic communications. Moreover, no British statesman in 1920 wanted a repetition of the 1912-14 troubles when the Ulster Orange-

men, supported by a "mutiny" of high-ranking pro-Orange officers in the British Army, threatened rebellion against the British Government. Such were the considerations which prompted the establishment in 1920 of the Northern Ireland state.

Northern Ireland is a pauper state in the sense that only heavy subventions from the Treasury in Whitehall enable it to ward off complete bankruptcy; it is a pauper state of slums, unemployment and chronic poverty which annually force some 10,000 of its young men and women to emigrate.

Among the inducements offered to foreign capital is the Government statement, in a booklet designed to attract investors, that the high level of unemployment "is a situation which you can use to your advantage." And naturally foreign firms in search of cheap labor and quick profits—West German, Dutch, American as well as British—have taken the hint. But with the older industries such as shipbuilding, linen-making and agriculture in a state of decline, the newer industries do not provide enough jobs for those made redundant by the decline in traditional industry. And so each year pumped into this pauper state are subsidies from London, paid for by the British taxpayer, to the value of £140 million, part of which goes to maintain the Royal Ulster Constabulary and the Special Police—the latter a para-military force whose chief function is to crush with the utmost brutality the slightest manifestation of discontent on the part of the people.

The religious division of the population of Ulster has a long and painful history. And of this history it can truly be said that, as Shakespeare put it, the evil done by men lives on long after they are dead.

And for Ireland living on to this day is the evil first caused by Pope Hadrian IV (the only English Pope in history) when, in the twelfth century, he issued a Papal Bull granting to Henry II the exclusive right to conquer the country. The English conquest, however, was inconclusive, with the Irish refusing to recognize English suzerainty. Rebellion followed fast upon rebellion until in 1607 King James, first of the Stuart kings of England, decided on a scorched earth policy for Ireland. The natives of Ulster were with callous brutality evicted from their homes and land and driven, that is those who survived, into the remote and bleak mountain areas.

Thousands of Scottish and English Pro-

testants replaced the Irish Catholics on the plains of the north, and from this evil act, known as the Plantation of Ulster, date the first religious divisions in Ireland. A bare thirty years later, in 1641, the Irish, driven to desperation once more, rose in rebellion in an endeavor to oust the alien settlers and regain their land. This evoked a bloody response from Cromwell, then intent on consolidating the national state not yet known as Great Britain. Cromwell waged a war of extermination against the Irish, so much so that to this day the Irish speak of the "curse of Cromwell."

Cromwell's Puritan settlers, largely army officers, were rewarded with large tracts of Irish land, thus deepening and hardening the religious division.

The "glorious revolution" of 1688 which brought William of Orange to the throne in Westminster, sealed the political domination of Protestantism in Ireland for the best part of 250 years, and from William's reign and his name date the beginnings of the Orange Order in Ulster. Adoration of William of Orange by the Ulster Orangemen is exceeded only by a psychopathic hatred of everything Catholic. This order, a semi-secret organization, with a membership not far short of 100,000, dominates the entire political life of Northern Ireland. Its membership ranges from Prime Minister to policeman, from the millionaire industrialist to the foreman and even craftsman in the factory. The ultra-conservative Unionist Party—the ruling party in Ulster for more than 40 years—is an offshoot of the Orange Order. Some of the Order's police branches delight in the name of "Cromwell's Ironsides." Its female branches are known as the Loyal Orange Women, and for the children there are the Junior Orangemen.

And if the *elite* Orange Order is in many ways reminiscent of Hitler's SS, the rabble-rousing Ian Paisley, self-styled leader of the Free Presbyterian Assembly, is more reminiscent of the Nazi stormtroopers. Paisley and his toughs turn up at all the Civil Rights demonstrations and, under the protective wing of the police, provoke clashes with the marchers.

Sometimes, the police actually emulate Paisley's stormtroopers. This was the case on 6 January when they surged through some of the Catholic streets in Londonderry smashing doors and windows and assaulting men and women who dared to remonstrate with them.

A Labor Member of Parliament, Mr. John Ryan, who along with other MPs witnessed the police brutality, was shocked by what he saw. A statement issued by the Executive Committee of the Northern Ireland Communist Party said that the police had acted "in a manner worthy of Hitler's Gestapo."

Ever since 1920, when the Lloyd George Government partitioned Ireland, the Unionist Party and the Orange Order have had things very much their own ultra-reactionary way.

But as the mass actions of recent months have shown, the tide is now beginning to turn against them.

Active opposition to the reactionary policy comes from the Civil Rights Association—a non-sectarian front of the Catholics and Protestants, of Labor Party members and Communists, of Republicans and Nationalists, of trade unionists and students, and men and women of numerous other organizations.

And the unity and action have yielded the first gains. Prime Minister O'Neil had to get rid of his obnoxious Home Minister Craig because of the uproar against the police brutalities. Court actions and fines imposed on demonstrators have been adjourned until May with the likelihood that they will be withdrawn altogether. Yielding to the public demand, the Government has replaced the Londonderry City Council with a Special Commission charged with the job of bringing justice and democracy into the local administration. These results, while heartening to all who fought for them, are seen as just the beginning.

A policy statement issued by the Northern Ireland Communist Party calls among other things for a universal franchise that will guarantee one person one vote at the age of eighteen; immediate legislation to prevent discrimination on grounds of religion, race or color; since private enterprise has failed even to touch the fringe of the thousands now unemployed for years, the Party urges plans to employ all the people, with Government publicly-owned industries playing their role; employment at all levels on Government appointed bodies, central and local Government, and their services, to be based on ability alone—and seen to be so; a housing target of 17,000 units in 1969 with progressive yearly increases; all housing allocation made by truly representative bodies of the people

who will submit their work for public inspection.

The fight for civil rights has been largely diverted from the streets to an electoral campaign. A general election took place on February 24, and although the outcome—a Unionist majority—was a foregone conclusion, it afforded the civil rights opposition an unusual opportunity to put its case for a genuine democratization of public life in Ulster.

The new feature in this election was the split in the ranks of the hitherto solidly united Unionist Party led by the outgoing Prime Minister Terence O'Neill. O'Neill and his supporters, regarded as the "moderate wing" of the Party, were under heavy fire from the extremist Protestant group of whom Ian Paisley is its noisy spokesman.

The results were: 39 Unionists (no Paisleyites among them); 13 anti-Unionists (Nationalists 6, Independents 3—civil rights leaders, Northern Ireland Labor 2, Republican Labor 2. This means that there are two fewer anti-Unionists than in the last Parliament. But it would be wrong only to look at the election results.

The people of Northern Ireland are on the march, there is a growing unity, and the religious division which has plagued the country for so long is showing signs of crumbling. Rightly the people look, re-

grettably so far in vain, to Westminster to see if Mr. Wilson and his Labor Government are taking any steps to help them in their time of trouble. They recall Section 75 of the Government of Ireland Act 1920 which contains the vital reservation: "Notwithstanding the establishment of the Parliament of Northern Ireland or anything contained in this Act, the supreme authority of the Parliament of the United Kingdom shall remain unaffected and undiminished over all persons, matters and things in Northern Ireland and every part thereof."

Growing numbers of Northern Irish would like to see this "undiminished" authority over "all persons, matters and things" used for the purpose of putting an end to the Hitler-like police state in their country. After all, they have seen Mr. Wilson's recent enthusiastic gesture in despatching HMS Fearless to the Mediterranean to strengthen NATO naval forces in the area against a mythical danger. They would like, therefore, not rash or reckless gestures such as the Fearless action, but the strictly constitutional measure of applying the pertinent clause of Section 75 of the Government of Ireland Act of 1920 to Ulster where British democratic life has been replaced by a police state.

J.G.

Repressions against progressives is the order of the day in most countries where capital holds sway. Even bourgeois states which boast of their "parliamentary democracy" pursue a naked policy of persecution against those who call for social reforms, abolition of exploitation and an end to nuclear war preparations.

Bourgeois propaganda is most liberal in describing the "humanism" and "democratic nature" of capitalist society which allegedly gives the individual the right to think freely and to engage in political activity. It harps on the theme of the "dying out of class struggle," on the "harmony of national interests."

But humanism and democracy, harmonious cooperation between all segments of society are features alien to states where the interests of exploiters and imperialists get top priority. Whenever their capital is at stake, their rule jeopardized, brutal repressions come into play.

Bent on stifling the peoples' desire for independence, social and economic progress, on crushing the revolutionary movement, imperialism stages military coups and installs ultra-reactionary cliques.

The political repressions, persecutions and assassinations speak of the degradation of bourgeois justice. Military tribunals condemning Communists to death, or long terms of imprisonment, are regular features in Indonesia, Iran, Greece, Colombia and other countries.

It is the duty of the people to campaign against the persecution of revolutionaries and democrats, against the barbarous practices of the reactionary regimes which are imperilling elementary human rights.

Our journal sees its duty in publicizing the crimes of imperialism and its puppets, voicing the solidarity of progressive world opinion with Communists and patriots who, undaunted by the terror, are battling for the happiness of their peoples.

Indonesian patriots fight on

The black clouds of a ruthless terror hang over the Land of a Thousand Isles. The anti-Communist campaign unleashed by the reactionaries after the events of September 30, 1965 is still raging, mowing down more and more victims.

Several hundred thousand Communists and those suspected of association with them—members of youth, student, women's, peasant, labor, cultural and other organizations — have perished. Communist Party leaders Aidit, Lukman and Njoto were executed without trial. Last summer the Indonesian authorities disclosed the killing, during a police operation in Eastern Java, of Political Bureau member Hutapea. In October another atrocity was perpetrated: the shooting, after a rigged trial and despite worldwide protests, of two Political Bureau members, Comrades Njono and Sudisman, and Comrade Virjomartono, head of the Djokjakarta Party organization.

Over 100,000 Communists and other patriots are held in prisons and concentra-

tion camps. The conditions of their captivity doom them to a slow death. Torture is used to wrest from them the names of their comrades working underground. Groups of prisoners are often secretly taken to out-of-the-way places and murdered. As a rule, these mass executions, reminiscent of Hitler's savagery, are based on the false "attempted escape" reports from concentration camp commandants. In Central and Western Java, "shortage of food" is the pretext used to justify the massacres. Malnutrition and epidemics caused by the unsanitary prison conditions also take a heavy toll.

The militarists openly proclaim the aim of total liquidation of the Communist Party and physical destruction of its functionaries. Suharto, the head of the clique, declared in a recent speech that "elimination of the remnants of the CPI is the principal objective in stabilizing the political situation."

But the terror, far from bringing about

the "stabilization" wanted by Suharto, only heightens the hatred of the people, of all Indonesian progressives, for the regime which has elevated medieval barbarity to the level of state policy. They are countering it with an ever-growing resistance which has of late assumed also the form of armed struggle. Guerrilla detachments are being formed in various parts of the country. Communist-organized patriotic activity especially in remote towns and villages is a source of trouble to the Suharto regime. In some provinces, notably Eastern Java, the guerrillas have inflicted heavy losses on the punitive units. The Western press, quoting official sources in Djakarta, has reported that the Communists are working to restore their positions and to organize an effective underground movement. *France Presse* reported in January that 200,000 Communist activists are operating in Indonesia. They are actively aided by workers, peasants and intellectuals. Even in the army, its mainstay, the dictatorship has failed to root out progressive views and Communist influence. Proof of this are the ceaseless purges in the armed forces, reported in both Indonesian and Western papers. Many officers, suspected of "disloyalty" to the junta, have been discharged.

Adding to the discontent with the clique of generals are its efforts to nullify the social and economic gains of the working people, to turn this potentially rich land into a private domain of the Western monopolies, mainly American. Of the 22 contracts for oil prospecting and extraction concluded by the Indonesian regime since

the middle of 1966, sixteen have been signed with U.S. monopolies or companies controlled by them. There is a close connection between the wooing of foreign capital and the savage persecution of Communists and other democrats.

The Indonesian patriots have the sympathy and support of all progressives throughout the world, who condemn those who, kowtowing to the imperialists, have flooded one of the biggest countries of the East with blood and plunged its people into the gloom of medieval barbarity. The Indonesian executioners were castigated by the representatives of 67 Communist and Workers' parties assembled in Budapest last November for the preparatory commission of the forthcoming world gathering of Communist parties. In a unanimously adopted statement the members of the commission declared: "No more blood must be spilt! No more victims! We declare our unshakable solidarity with the Communists and other democrats in Indonesia. Expressing the will of the peoples of our country, we demand an end to the terror and the release of all political prisoners."

The Communists in all countries stand firmly on the side of their Indonesian brothers. They are confident that the torture and the executions will not break the will of the patriots of Indonesia, that they will restore their forces and give decisive battle to the agents of imperialism who are putting the chains of neo-colonialism and obscurantism on the Land of a Thousand Isles.

Ali HUSSEINI

Atrocities in Iran

A People's Party (Tudeh) pamphlet, *Iran Prison and Prisoners*, which we recently found in our mail, tells of the brutal treatment to which political prisoners, fighters for democracy and social progress in Iran, are subjected.

The main thought-control agency, SAVAK, built up with the help of U.S. advisers and consisting of departments respectively controlling political parties, trade unions, government offices, foreigners and "suspicious" elements, is manned by 50,000 picked thugs and an indeterminate but large force of informers.

Government financing of the secret police is unusually generous: the official budget is 250,000,000 rials, which is an obviously minimized figure if we consider the \$5,000,000 which SAVAK spends annually in West Germany alone on surveillance of Iranian students.

The crude methods used abroad have evoked public protests on more than one occasion. Just recently, on January 22, several hundred Austrian students were reported by foreign news agencies to have demonstrated in Vienna against the brutal beating of a group of Iranian students by

SAVAK agents for protesting against the reactionary regime in Iran during the Shah's stay in Austria.

The students and the Communist Party demanded immediate expulsion of the police thugs from Austria.

Need we say that at home SAVAK is complete master, flaunting all legal procedural rules. Political arrests are usually made at night, with one or two agents forcing their way into the home of the victim first, followed by a group of SAVAK officers. Abuse, and often blows, are showered on all inmates of the house.

Interrogation methods are savage. The interrogators live by one rule only: confess your "crime" or die under torture.

A *Le Monde* correspondent quoted a prisoner as saying he would rather go to hell than enter the SAVAK torture-chamber a second time. Defendant Ali Khane Shansi told a military tribunal, "I was flogged at intervals for three days by four officers, who took turns."

Prisoners refusing to confess are killed during interrogation. This was the fate of Kolia Zakharian, member of the People's Party regional committee in Teheran, of Mahmoode Koucheke Shoushtari, Vartan Salakhian, Hosseine Harriri, Parvize Farhoumand and many others.

Trials of democrats, the pamphlet says, are a mockery of the Constitution. Prisoners are often denied the services of a lawyer. Trials are frequently held in the prison cell, lasting no more than a few minutes, during which the accused is not granted leave to speak in his defense and ending with the death sentence. In the past two years, the courts had passed 56 death sentences on democrats, with 38 executions by August 1968.

Prisons in Teheran and elsewhere are overcrowded. Prisoners include members of the People's Party, National Front leaders, Mossadegh followers, progressive clergy and trade unionists. Thousands of workers, peasants, students and intellectuals are serving long prison terms. Safare Ghahremani has been in prison for 21 years, twelve

members of the People's Party army branch for 14, and many others for 18.

Of late, the number of political prisoners has been growing. Another wave of arrests is sweeping the country.

A People's Party newsletter issued in December 1968 reveals that a punitive action against the Kurd minority by a force of over 12,000 gendarmes and an army division culminated in a large number of arrests and some executions. The prospect of the firing squad faces some 200 Kurd and Azerbaijan democrats imprisoned in Tabriz, Rezaieh and in other towns.

The People's Party calls on democrats and democratic organizations throughout the world to protest against these atrocities and demand the release of imprisoned Kurds, Azerbaijanians and other political prisoners.

In 1968, in an open letter to U.N. Secretary-General U Thant, the London-based Committee for the Defense of Iranian Political Prisoners pointed out that in the past fourteen years opposition parties and progressives have been ruthlessly persecuted by one of the most tyrannical regimes of our time in total disregard of human rights and civil freedoms.

The Committee informed the U.N. Secretary-General of secret trials and military tribunals composed entirely of secret police agents who make a mockery of justice.

At a press conference in January, Luigi Cavalieri, a prominent Rome lawyer and member of the Italian Association of Democratic Lawyers, related details of the rigged trial of 14 intellectuals by a Teheran military tribunal, which he attended as observer for the International Association of Democratic Lawyers. He had learned of many violations of law and many cases of torture, he said. At the trial, most defendants disavowed their earlier confessions, obtained from them under duress.

Progressives all over the world are outraged by the atrocities of the Iranian reactionaries who employ Gestapo methods against the opposition. They demand freedom for Iran's political prisoners.

V.K.

Bolivian "Gorillas" in difficulties

At the beginning of the year the Bolivian military clique headed by Barrientos Ortuno proclaimed martial law to justify the ar-

rests and the expulsion from the country of political and trade union leaders, parliamentary deputies and intellectuals opposed

to the regime's anti-national and despotic policy.

The new wave of repressions stems from the very essence of the political system, from the contradictions corroding it. The coup d'état of 1964, which overthrew the government of Paz Estensoro and installed the military junta, was followed in 1966 by rigged elections. A parody of democracy, these so-called elections were designed to veil the fact that a "gorilla" government had taken over, which aimed to deepen the counter-revolutionary process started by the preceding governments. This process is being continued under the false slogans of "consolidating" the gains of the April Revolution and promoting the "program of economic development," based on the essentially neo-colonialist concepts of the Alliance for Progress.

The 1964 coup, staged the same year as the governments of Goulart in Brazil, Bosch in the Dominican Republic and Arosemena in Ecuador were overthrown, was engineered when the regime of the Nationalist Revolutionary Movement was imperilled by the mounting mass struggle.

The fact that Barrientos Ortuno, who is closely associated with the North American monopolies, became president and proclaimed himself leader of the so-called revolution of restoration, is not accidental. The coup was directed by Pentagon "strategists" who are using the reactionaries among the Bolivian military to suppress the mass struggle.

The entire policy of the military junta is aimed at giving the foreign monopolies every access to the country's economy, at paralyzing its state sector, at forcibly preventing the development of the working-class and mass movement. To this end, the army has been enlarged, the state security services modernized with the help of CIA experts and a far-reaching espionage system built up in which Peace Corps members play a big role.

Brutality and lawlessness are a concomitant of the present regime. In May and September 1965, punitive troops specially trained by U.S. military, massacred men, women and children in the mining centers of Huanuni, Catavi, Siglo XX, Cerdas, Miluni, Kani.

These punitive expeditions were inspired by the Inter-American Development Bank, by officials of the State Department and the FRG government to ensure the so-called "Operation Triangular," aimed at denationalizing the big mines.

The reactionary policy of subordinating the country's interests to the imperialists and the policy of suppressing the working-class and popular democratic movement are interlinked. This is borne out by many aspects of the junta's policy. Elementary democratic rights have been abolished, and the country is losing its national sovereignty.

The military junta, bent on remaining in the saddle at all costs, has opened wide the door to foreign capital. All protectionist restrictions have been lifted from foreign capital exploiting Bolivia's natural wealth and oil resources. As a result there is a rush to acquire mining concessions and to form "mixed" companies.

The policy of squandering the national wealth is condemned by the opposition parties, by most students and progressive intellectuals. The government is retaliating by defining opposition as "subversive activity," and using this as a pretext to hound the country's patriots. Thus, in June 1967 it sent a punitive expedition to the mining areas, the backbone of Bolivia's economy and the arena of militant actions by the proletariat. Among the many murdered was Rosendo Garcia Maisman, member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Bolivia, and among those thrown into prison were practically the entire leadership of the Miners' Federation, including Simon Reyes and Oscar Salas, both members of the Central Committee of our Party.

Barrientos Ortuno and his colleagues are serving their foreign masters loyally: by hounding Communists and suppressing the trade union and democratic movements they are creating favorable conditions for the monopolies to entrench themselves in the economy. To mention some: U.S. Gulf Oil has acquired extensive concessions in the eastern part of the country and the right to sell the natural gas obtained there to Argentina and other Latin American states; International Mining Processing which handles the mining of tin ores, Philips Bros., which has a concession in the Matilde zinc mines, one of the most effective in the Western hemisphere. There are also the "veteran" monopolies, among them South American Placers, part of the Rockefeller "Grace" group, which mines gold. Foreign companies virtually control the country's mining industry and much of her imports. Here it is pertinent to mention that Barrientos Ortuno has proposed to the "Tin Barons" who were expropriated back in 1952, to let "bygones be bygones" and

return to the "fold" of economic tycoons.

The junta's policy of turning Bolivia into a state increasingly dependent on U.S. imperialism is, however, encountering popular resistance. Strikes and demonstrations are sweeping the country. During the street fighting in mid-1968 several students were killed. All the state universities took a common stand in defense of national dignity and sovereignty. The junta retaliated with repressions. Eliodoro Alvarado, Ramiro Barrenechea and other leaders of the Students' Confederation and Young Communist League were exiled to remote areas. Mario Monje Molina, Central Committee member, was arrested. His whereabouts is still unknown. Many political leaders and parliamentary deputies were forced to seek political asylum in foreign embassies or to emigrate.

The uncompromising struggle between the "gorillas" and the patriotic forces is spreading. Discontent with the pro-imperialist regime is surfacing also in the army, and more and more officers suspected of "disloyalty" are being demoted or discharged.

The dictatorship is in an impasse. Martial law, the dissolution of parliament, suspension of constitutional guarantees, terror and persecution are powerless to halt the struggle of the patriots for democratic and socio-economic change, for national independence.

In their courageous struggle the Communists and other patriots have the support of the working masses, of the progressive forces of the world, of the international Communist and workers' movement.

Luis PADILLA

Unconquerable will

The dawn cast a pale light through the bars on the cell window. Montegranario Cuenca, the peasant, inmate of the prison for a number of years, slipped off the mattress to the floor, groped for his crutches and, trusting his weight to them, hobbled out into the corridor. Another day had begun. Many were the dawns he had seen in the dungeons of the notorious Tenerife Battalion in Neiva and the Modelo prison in Bogota. The man welcomed the new day with lines of his own:

*It pains me,
The memory of friends
Gone from our midst . . .*

*In Colombia,
As in distant Vietnam,
The people have risen.*

Wounded in both legs, this Communist peasant was captured in Marquetalia and sentenced to 24 years' imprisonment. But captivity has not broken his spirit. The simple verse he writes is of those who fight and die for Colombia's liberation.

BLOOD AND TORTURE

The long, arduous struggle of the people of Colombia is known all over the world. Newspaper readers know of the bombed and gutted villages, of the mutilated bodies

of patriots in the areas ravaged by the punitive battalions, and this ever since 1948. The number of the victims of the terror is rising. Armed operations begun in 1964 to crush the peasant movement in Marquetalia raised the curtain on a new phase in the government's repressive policy. The people responded with a guerrilla movement to crush which the authorities proved impotent.

The reactionary regime practices cruelty at its worst. Some 500 political prisoners languish behind bars in eight departments, in the towns of Bogota, Neiva, Rivera, Campoalegre, Ibaque, Armenia, Popayan, Riochiquito, Cali, Palmira, Bucaramanga, San Vicente and Monteria.

Deputies of the People's Liberal Revolutionary Movement Party exposed the dirty work of the judiciary in the Colombian Congress during a debate on the current situation, showing that nearly 20,000 people had been tried by military tribunals in recent years. They revealed cases of inhuman torture: prisoners suspended from trees for a day and a night, deprived of water and food, tormented with fire and electric shock, eyes burned with hot ashes, interrogated before machine-gun barrels on the edge of ready-dug graves.

By and large, the persecutions fall into the pattern of the Pentagon's LASO (Latin American Security Operation) plan envis-

aging punitive police actions, psychological warfare and armed operations — and offensive against the Communist-led peasant areas which, for purposes of provocation, the reactionaries call "independent republics."

The Marquetalia assault was followed by other punitive actions in and around Pato, Guayabero and Riochiquito (by a force of 25,000 or half the Colombian army); the Escualo plan (rounding up of Communists); Continente Plan (reprisals in the towns); Estrella operation (a punitive action in the Sumapaz rural area) and, last but not least, the so-called 10-year plan against communism presented by the Colombian army command to a conference of the continent's armed forces in Rio de Janeiro.

The military budget is like a cancer. Annually, the government allots 6.5 million pesos to the military establishment. Holding complete sway, the militarists are expanding their sphere of activity, extending their tentacles to all areas. In 1967, the army activated the Neiva-based Ninth Operative Brigade chiefly for combating guerrillas, and in 1968 the Tenth Brigade based in Fort Tolomaida, both with the assignment of assaulting the Revolutionary Armed Forces.

Meanwhile, the army, police and civil authorities expanded their intelligence services, a rash of which appeared all over the country under code names such as F-2, B-2, E-2, A-2, S-3 and DAS—all of them under the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency and Military Mission quartered in the Defense Ministry.

In addition to the "ordinary" prisons, there is a concentration camp on La Gorgona Island, comparable in horror to Dante's inferno. The inmates are totally isolated from the outside world and horribly maltreated.

Motorized army patrols raid villages, arresting and tormenting hundreds of peasants, many of whom are put to death on the spot. In the capital, prisoners are tortured in army barracks and special premises, to which victims are brought blindfolded "for interrogation." The dungeons in the military posts are overcrowded with political prisoners, some arrested without warrants and kept behind bars for months, even years.

THE MILITARY TRIBUNALS

President Lleras Restrepo lifted martial law on December 16, but only in order to

impose his plan of constitutional reform: tightening the system of government and giving greater powers to the president.

Knowing that once martial law was lifted, political prisoners would be turned over to civilian courts, the army command moved fast, with military tribunals working overtime in the "hotter" parts of the country.

In Tolima department, the blood-stained Colonel Matallana, veteran of the Korean war, put twenty military tribunals to work simultaneously, sentencing 200 peasants to various terms of imprisonment for contact with the Revolutionary Armed Forces, while another 272, including peasant leader Santander Juan Campos, were tried in Bogota.

Some 50 patriots were dealt with summarily in Neiva, where a military tribunal also tried members of the Communist Party committee of Huila District at the end of November on charges of supporting city units of the Revolutionary Armed Forces. The sentences handed down in January ranged from ten years imprisonment for Emiro Ramon Lugo, nine for Jesus Escobar and Jose Isaac Escobar, eight for Roman Tovar Andrade, Secretary of the Party district committee in Huila, Luis Ernesto Carvajal, Cipriano Alvarez, Resurreccion Morales, Jorge Cerquera, Amadeo Arias, Aurelio Molina, Jose Eiliecer Lozano, Augusto Cesar Losada and Faustino Lopez, seven for Roberto Castrillon and Jose Legva, five for Roberto Sosa, Paulino Martinez and Eusebio Lis, and four for Raul Correa, Campo Elias Avila, Roberto Escobar, Jose Verbo Leyva, Salomon Pastrana, Nicanor Perdomo, Benito Padilla, Juan de Dios Osorio, Marcelliano Almario and Luis Almario.

"On trial here," said a member of the military tribunal convened in the army barracks of Armenia on November 10, 1968, "is the Communist Party, not these prisoners in the dock." The prisoners he referred to were Congress Deputy Domingo Taborda of the People's Liberal Revolutionary Movement Party and a group of peasants charged with being guerrillas. Civilian judges had pronounced Taborda innocent, and the disgruntled military staged their own "case," displaying the clumsiness and blatant anti-Communist orientation of the Colombian gorillas. The tribunal ordered the closure of *Voz Proletaria*, the Communist Party paper, basing its case on false evidence acquired from professional informers. Freed by a civilian court, Taborda

was sentenced to 5½ years' imprisonment by the military tribunal.

Meanwhile, in Puerto Boyaca army thugs killed peasant leader Joaquin Higuita. When wardens of the Calderon concentration camp sponsored by the North American Texas Petroleum Company received the order for his release, the thugs, who belonged to an anti-guerrilla punitive unit, seized Higuita, tortured him, then shot him through the head. But they did not succeed in wresting the names of guerrillas and their aides from the patriot.

Another peasant leader, Gerardo Gonzalez, arrested in November, was first brought to the army post at La Playa, then transferred to Melgar Fort, the security agency, and finally to the Brigade of Army Establishments. Demanding his release, hundreds of Sumapaz peasants signed a manifesto, which said in part:

"In Colombia we have two parallel governments: the military, which has taken control of nearly the entire administrative authority, and the civilian personified by President Lleras Restrepo, who, to all intents and purposes, takes orders from the military." (*Voz Proletaria*, December 5, 1968.)

CLOSING RANKS

Less than a month after lifting martial law, Restrepo warned that he would reintroduce the state of emergency, and without further notice. What the ruling clique wants is to crush popular actions and squash strikes started by the workers against Restrepo's economic policy. In reprisals against mass protests in Cali and other towns in January, the reactionaries attacked street demonstrations, killed a number of people and arrested 300, while

putting many others under strict police surveillance.

A change of government is scheduled for 1970. The incumbent president is to be a Conservative (in Colombia presidents are elected alternately from the two main parties), under whose rule the contradictions racking the country are sure to grow still more acute.

Yet there is the realistic prospect of a broad democratic front, strong enough to combat the army dictatorship. The nightmare of tyranny that has held the country in its grip for the past twenty years will ultimately spark an upswing in national resistance, which will spread to new areas and win fresh recruits.

As we see it, the revolutionary forces will grow steadily and will finally win. The chances of a national unity front emerging in the country are good. The militarists cannot crush the fighting spirit of the people. Punitive operations against guerrillas and the North American intervention have got them nowhere. Our cause is invincible and, as noted by our Central Committee at its meeting in September 1968, "it will continue until reactionary violence is ended and steps are taken to carry through the radical economic, social and political changes so essential for our country."

A campaign at home and abroad for amnesty of political prisoners could reduce casualties in the people's fight against imperialism. Support from fraternal parties helped us time and again to obtain the release of our comrades. So we again appeal to people of good will, to all progressives: campaign in solidarity with the fight waged by the Colombians against the arbitrary rule of the militarists.

Jaime GONZALEZ

No to tyranny!

SPAIN

A state of emergency has been proclaimed in Spain. It was imposed late in January for a three-month period, but with the significant proviso that it could be prolonged indefinitely. Constitutional guarantees, for what they are worth, have been suspended and the police are authorized to conduct house searches, make arrests, put people

in "preventive" detention, all without warrant. The liberalization camouflage has been discarded. Tyranny, outright and unmitigated, has become the law of the land. The Franco regime is out to destroy the democratic forces. Hundreds have been put behind prison bars, many have been tortured.

The official pretext for these draconic measures is student unrest, specifically the anti-regime demonstrations in Madrid, Barcelona, Saragossa and other towns. There have been clashes with the police, and in Madrid the students erected barricades.

That, however, is only one aspect of the steadily mounting resentment against Franco and his regime, which workers, peasants, a large part of the intelligentsia and an appreciable part of the national bourgeoisie regard as the greatest evil that has ever befallen Spain. Opposition has spread to what hitherto have been considered the three pillars of the dictatorship—the clergy, the officer corps and the Falange.

The opposition is spearheaded by the working class with its rich traditions of revolutionary struggle. Strikes for higher wages, industrial safety and a shorter work-week have further aggravated the crisis of the regime. In Asturia, the Workers' Commissions led a series of miners' strikes in the closing days of last year and in the early weeks of 1969. The movement developed into a virtual general strike. And there were more strikes and demonstrations in February in Bilbao, Barcelona and Madrid, despite the emergency and the harsh repressions. There is evidence to suggest that the situation is maturing towards a general strike that might well develop into a nationwide movement against the regime. Peasant discontent, too, has reached a point

where the popular movement in the towns could count on vigorous support in rural communities.

The emergency is directed against the entire Spanish people. The idea is to suppress labor struggles, the swelling protest among the peasants and other sections of the population. Many facts show that the protest is swelling. The Madrid and Barcelona Bar Associations have been joined by colleagues in other cities in a vigorous protest against the latest spate of repressive laws and the special tribunals set up to enforce them. And another indication of widening protest: by February more than 3,000 had appended their signatures to the statement issued by 1,500 men of culture, among them 113 university professors and 191 writers, against the police torture and demanding an end to the repression.

But no amount of police terror can bolster the regime, abhorred and detested by most Spaniards. Shortly after the proclamation of the emergency, the Communist Party Executive called on the people to intensify the fight against the dictatorship. The Communist statement reads in part:

"The state of emergency must be met by a new popular nationwide counter-escalation. The central demand must be repeal of the emergency, release of all political detainees, an end to police terror and emergency measures, full amnesty for political prisoners and exiles."

GREECE

Supported by the U.S., Britain, West Germany and its other NATO partners, the Greek military junta has launched a series of wholesale arrests and trials in an attempt to snuff out the democratic movement. Every expression, real or suspected, of disagreement with the regime, every demand, no matter how meek, to respect elementary constitutional rights, is the occasion for harsh repressive measures. And the main target are the Communists, men and women who are the honor and conscience of the nation.

Towards the end of November, a statement by the Communist Party in its underground newspaper *Ryzospastis* said that the secret police had arrested Grigoris Farakos, a Political Bureau member and prominent leader of the Patriotic Anti-Dictatorship Front (PAM). Also arrested were other Communist and PAM activists: Georgios

Moraitis, Nikos Politis, Lazaros Kyritsis, Pantelis Kyritsis, Nestor Hadzuris, Nikos Kostopulos, Florentia Peru, Yanis Nikopolos. Nothing is known of their fate, but information received from underground Communist and PAM sources suggests that they have been subjected to torture in the notorious Bouboulinas jail in Athens, the scene of Gestapo torture during the German occupation. There is much anxiety over the danger to Farakos and his comrades.

Late in January an Athens military tribunal tried ten resistance fighters on the trumped-up charge of having engineered the explosion in down-town Athens which the junta made the pretext for a fresh anti-Communist campaign. While admitting membership in the Communist Party, all the defendants categorically denied that they had anything to do with the explosion.

As Communists, they told the court, they were in principle opposed to individual terror. Flouting all the evidence, the tribunal found them "guilty" and passed 16-year prison sentences on Dimitrios Dariotis, film director Anastassiadis, student Kallerghi and workers Reclitis and Petropulos. In January the same tribunal sentenced Pavlos Nefeludis, a clerk, to life imprisonment, and Periklis Rodakis, a print worker, to 17 years on trumped-up charges. In February a Salonika tribunal sentenced two soldiers to 22 years' imprisonment each for opposition to the regime.

Among the 137 women in the Amikarnisos prison on Crete are several prominent Communist Party members: Avra Partsalidi, Mina Yalu, Rula Kukulu, Maria Karaerghi, a former EDA Member of Parliament. For nearly 18 months now they have been kept in unheated cells, deliberately denied adequate food, even drinking water. Many are seriously ill but the authorities have refused to transfer them to a hospital. Some have no knowledge of their children and husbands, who have likewise been arrested.

About 1,500 political prisoners are being

held in a concentration camp on Leros Island in the eastern Aegean. About 700 are on the Central Aegean island of Yaros, where there is no fresh water supply—each prisoner is allowed just enough water to keep him from dying of thirst.

Torture of the most horrible kind is used to force prisoners to "confess." Every effort is made to keep this secret. However, some information has filtered into the world press. The *London Sun*, for instance, carried a series of articles by a special correspondent who interviewed men who had spent time in the torture chambers. He describes the "washroom" on the fifth floor of secret police headquarters on Bouboulinas Street in Athens where suspects are flogged with iron rods or subjected to electric shock. Or a man may be blindfolded, put up against the wall and shots fired over his head.

But the struggle continues, the repression notwithstanding. And Greece's patriots know that they have the support of the whole of progressive mankind. Worldwide protest is not abating—it will continue until an end is put to the fascist terror against the country's finest sons and daughters.

Books by Chilean Communists

A useful contribution to the political, social and ideological struggle going on in Chile has been made by four books recently published by Chilean Communists.

Communist Scientific Humanism by Orlando Millas* is based on a series of lectures delivered at the University of Chile under the general heading "Introduction to the Ideology of the Communist Party of Chile." In this book the author, taking issue with bourgeois ideologists, surveys the theoretical basis of Marxism-Leninism. He lists challenging problems of today and searches for solutions to them.

Analysis of the development of Marxism, from the works of its founders to the writings of present-day theorists, goes hand in hand with a detailed description of the program of the Communist Party of Chile revealing to the reader the unity of revolutionary theory and practice indicative of the humane principles of Party policy.

"The Active Process of Life," a particularly interesting chapter, opposes dialectics to dogmatism. It points out the significance of the historic battle between the dialectical method, on the one hand, and *a priori* theories and various dogmas, on the other, and argues against idealism. It emphasizes the superiority of the critical thinking and scientific method of Marxist philosophy over the speculative character of idealist concepts. The starting point of the author's criticism is the methodology used by Lenin in *Philosophical Notebooks*.

The chapters "Humanizing the World" (the self-creation of man), "Humanizing Man's Sentiment" (the theory of knowledge), "Doing Away with Alienation" (realization of the human essence) and "The Revolutionary Movement" (the philosophy of practice) follow the same method, that is, analyze the various problems and concepts as they carry on the polemics. At the same time they apply the author's con-

clusions to national and international life.

It is safe to predict that the book, based on lectures for university students and teachers, will be of interest to them. And as the author's main proposition and conclusions are set out clearly, the book can be used as a manual for the ideological schooling of leaders of the popular movement in Chile.

The Chilean Economy. A Marxist Approach, by the economist José Cademartori,* describes the general state of the national economy, its evolution and the crisis through which the country is now passing.

Chile's natural resources offer a vast potential for developing the economy and raising the standard of living, the author notes. But, he adds, "our country, like any other country with a semi-colonial economy, has been explored very superficially . . . Industrialists and foreign capitalists are interested in only the most important things: saltpetre and copper." The author then exposes the imperialist myth of "popular poverty" which, allegedly, would nullify any attempt to make extensive use of the country's natural resources.

The author examines the class struggle at the different stages of Chile's social and economic development from the standpoint of historical materialism. He analyzes the first manifestations of this struggle in the clashes of the indigenous population with the feudal system embodied by the conquistadores, the formation of classes, the rise of capitalism, the development and formation of a working class and the penetration of foreign capital, chiefly British capital, in the nineteenth century and U.S. monopoly capital today.

Cademartori's highly interesting treatment of agricultural problems, such as the difficult problem of social classes in the countryside that has yet to be studied

*Orlando Millas. *El Humanismo Científico de los Comunistas*. Santiago de Chile, Editorial Andrés Bello, 1968. 259 pp.

*José Cademartori. *La Economía Chilena. Un enfoque Marxista*. Santiago de Chile. Editorial Universitaria, S.A., 1968. 293 pp.

properly, ends with an analysis of the agrarian crisis, which affects the whole economy and dramatically underlines the need of a radical agrarian reform.

Most interesting is the chapter on the economic crisis. It surveys the general and particular aspects of the crisis and reaches the conclusion that the economic structure of Chile is in urgent need of revolutionary change fully abolishing the big landed estates, the national oligarchic monopolies and foreign combines. These changes must be brought about by an anti-feudal, anti-oligarchy and anti-imperialist revolution "not restricted to ending the old relations of production but creating new ones. This is the fundamental economic task."

Problems of the Christian Democrats, Property, Revolution, the State is the title of a book by Sergio Vuskovic.* The six chapters of the book are concerned with (1) the Christian theory of the revolution, (2) Christian Democracy and revolution, (3) the Church and its theory of the state, (4) Christian Democracy and the state, (5) the Christian concept of property, and (6) the "communitary" society.

The book points to the need for a more profound study of Christian Democrat doctrine and activity, especially because their government, in power for over four years now, has little to show for its "revolution in freedom." Bitter experience compels numerous Chileans, once enticed by reformist talk into backing the Christian Democrats, to seek a way out.

The author by no means takes a purely negative *a priori* stand on Christian Democrat doctrine. In strict accordance with Leninist methodology, he reviews the political, economic and social concepts of the Catholic Church, specifically in Chile, against the background of Christian Democrat theory and practice, which are far from being always in harmony. The Church has high hopes of the Christian Democrats' carrying its postulates into politics.

The author, while admitting the hazards of an extensive and exacting analysis of alien political and philosophical concepts, first of all the danger of "making facile or enthusiastic concessions to what was once rejected without qualification," insists on the need to delve deeply and critically into the other ideology. "We may even accept some truths that, while proceeding from old ideas, are likely to contribute to our

own theory and practice as subsidiary factors."

Not for a moment does the author forget the class heterogeneity of the Christian Democrats, which accounts for the lack of unity of views. There are at best some fundamental principles that are not, however, exempt from essentially different interpretations by the spokesmen of the different trends.

The main thesis of the book reads: "The Christian Democrats cannot lead the revolution in our country by virtue of their class origin and philosophical attitude. This role belongs to the working class and its allies." This does not run counter to another conclusion of the author, who, confirming the existence of diverse ideological trends in the Christian Democratic Party, declares for a dialogue and united action with "the more farsighted churchmen and Christian Democrats." This is one form of preparing for the revolutionary change Chile needs.

Eduardo Labarca Goddard's *The Invasion of Chile: Foreign Interference*,* is a stirring account based on the author's personal experiences. Labarca, political editor of *El Siglo*, investigates the various forms of imperialist penetration in Chile. On the strength of documentary evidence, including sixty documents made public for the first time, he exposes foreign penetration in the trade unions and in the student movement, in the armed forces, the universities, mass media, religious institutions and other spheres.

The book lays bare the activities of the CIA, which, as well as carrying on espionage pure and simple, inspired an abortive campaign to split the trade union movement allocating \$2,171,000 for the purpose. It examines CIA subversion in the student organization, an activity unmasked in *Ramparts* early in 1967. An appendix contains the biographies of 48 CIA agents known for their subversive activities in our country.

Another chapter exposes the U.S. Embassy, which is staffed with a personnel of 225 (plus 200 Chilean employees), whereas the Chilean Embassy in Washington employs only eight people. This enormous disparity alone is an indication of activities going well beyond diplomatic bounds. In fact, the U.S. Embassy is the headquarters of the imperialist meddling.

*Sergio Vuskovic. *Problemática D.C., Propiedad, Revolución, Estado*. Santiago de Chile, Editorial Austral, 1968. 128 pp.

*Eduardo Labarca Goddard. *Chile Invadido, Reportaje a la Intromisión extranjera*. Santiago de Chile, Editorial Austral, 1968, 349 pp.

The author has carefully selected documents and data bearing on U.S. and West German interference in the 1964 presidential elections. The pages about the Peace Corps, which tries to reach the peasants and the backward sections of the urban population, are worthy of note.

The author's objective and stimulating presentation of the material and his bold and outspoken condemnation of the U.S. imperialists and their allies in Chile make the book a welcome aid in our people's fight against imperialism, for freedom.

Waldo ATIAS

As a Communist sees it

"The Communist Viewpoint,"* a new book by Ib Norlund, whom our readers know as the author of numerous articles on the labor and Communist movement, discusses topical issues of class struggle, peaceful coexistence and the transition from capitalism to socialism, the role of the socialist world system and the national liberation movement.

The first chapter is devoted to complex aspects of the ideological struggle, to the laws governing the moulding of social consciousness. Knowledge of these problems is rightly regarded by the author as the key to understanding the essence of the ideological struggle underway in society. "The ideological forms play the decisive role in the superstructure, which, without them, cannot serve the maintenance of a stable social order," Ib Norlund writes. "The apparatus of power can be seen, pinpointed and combated. . . . But it is infinitely more difficult to combat ideas and ingrained prejudices which have become rooted in the minds of people." For the author the ideology of bourgeois society cannot but be an ideology of deception, an ideology standing between man and reality, and preventing the blossoming of the human personality. On the contrary, socialist ideology makes possible fruitful solution of problems confronting man.

Refuting the reformist contentions about an alleged disappearance of classes and of class struggle, Norlund turns to the facts of Danish reality in order to demonstrate the clear-cut distinctions in the economic and social status of the different classes. Danish capitalists readily admit that a bare 200 people preside over the destinies of their system; their interests are served by a developed system of state-monopoly capitalism.

The author examines the new forms of exploitation of the working people. True, he says, the working class has achieved certain successes in the fight for its rights, but this by no means signifies its *embourgeoisement*. "The striving for social change, for a revolutionary position stems from the contradiction between the existing possibilities for satisfying requirements and the actual conditions of life." The class struggle, Norlund points out, has grown both in scale and complexity, for state-monopoly capitalism functions as a system of organically interconnected economic, political and ideological institutions. Hence, the struggle against it must be waged in all these spheres.

His study of the connection between the fight for reforms and the revolution leads the author to conclude that "the implementation of an extensive program of anti-monopoly reforms can, given sufficient mass support, create a situation in which the 'top,' i.e., monopoly, will be unable to continue 'to rule in the old way.' This means that a revolutionary situation affecting both the 'top' and the 'lower strata' could set in in a new way. . . . The new element being that it derives basically from the initiative of the masses and not just when a catastrophe generated by the old order is precipitated upon society."

Discussing the situation in the Danish labor movement the author notes that despite the strong anti-monopoly sentiment of the people which led to the parliamentary "labor majority" in 1966, the will of the working people is not reflected in government policy. Much of the blame for this rests with the Left in this majority which, influenced by the Socialist People's Party, dared not effect anti-monopoly measures. Norlund substantiates the line of the Communist Party in home and foreign policy

*Ib Norlund. Det kommunistiske synspunkt. Stig Vendelkaers forlag, Kobenhavn, 1968. 265 s.

and shows how events have confirmed the correctness of the Communists' view.

One chapter is devoted to the international Communist movement. The international character of the Communist movement, we read, is natural and necessary. There are general laws of social development whose full and unequivocal recognition is in the interest of all consistently progressive forces. On this recognition is founded their common ideology. There exists only one scientific socialism, which is constantly being developed and enriched by the efforts of the Communists in all countries. Its general truths are always valid. The need for unity of action of the working class and its parties stems, among

other things, from the vital problems common to all countries. "Internationalism signifies relationships of reciprocity in keeping with which every party acts on its own responsibility in upholding common interests. One side cannot solve the problems of another, and it would be incomprehensible and unjustified for such a demand to be made. Each side must solve its own problems, but activity based on mutual understanding can create *prerequisites* for their solution."

Norlund's book, imbued with profound optimism, will enable the reader to gain a deeper understanding of the essence of Communist policy.

G.P.

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 2
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.

Books listed here are in the language of the country of publication

ENGELS, F. *Dialektika prirody* (Dialectics of Nature). Moscow, Politizdat, 1969. 358 pp.

LENIN, V. I. *Izbrannyye proizvedeniya* (Selected Works). In three volumes. Moscow, Politizdat, 1968.

A magyar internacionalisták a Nagy Októberi Szocialista Forradalomban és a polgarháboruban (Hungarian Internationalists during the October Socialist Revolution and the Civil War). Budapest, Kossuth Könyvkiadó, 1968. 820 pp.

APRO, A. *A KGST-országok gazdasági együttműködése és a magyar népgazdaság* (Economic Cooperation of the CMEA Countries and the Hungarian Economy). Budapest, Kossuth Könyvkiadó, 1968. 300 pp.

BANASZKIEWICZ, J. *Powstanie partii hitlerowskiej* (The Rise of the Hitler Party). Sociological investigation of nazism's genesis. 1919-1923. Poznań, Instytut Zachodni, 1968. 525 pp.

BAUER, A., EICHHORN, W., KROEBER, G., SCHULZE, H., SEGETH, W., WUESTNECK KLAUS - DIETER. *Philosophie und Prognostik* (Philosophy and Prognostication). Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1968. 368 pp.

Beiträge zur Marx-Engels-Forschung (The Study of the Marx-Engels Heritage). Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1968. 318 pp.

Documente din istoria miscarii munitoresti din Romania. 1910-1915 (Documents on the History of the Labor Movement in Rumania. 1910-1915). Institute of Historical and Socio-Political Studies, CC RCP. Bucharest, Editura politica, 1968. 1085 pp.

GINDEV, P. *Ideologicheskiye diversii na antikommunizma* (Ideological Subversion of Anti-Communism). Sofia, Science and Art, 1968. 166 pp.

HONDT, Y. *Hegel et son temps* (Hegel and His Time). Paris, Editions sociales, 1968. 299 pp.

OBICHKIN, G. D., PANKRATOVA, M. Y. *Pisma Vladimira Ilyicha Lenina* (Lenin's Letters). On the basis of the Complete Works. Moscow, Politizdat, 1968. 360 pp.

SALINI, L. *Mai des proletaires* (Proletarians' May). Paris, Editions sociales, 1968. 173 pp.

TANALSKI, D. *Wolnosc czlowieka* (Freedom of Man). Personalism and Marxism. Warsaw, KiW, 1968. 288 pp.

Trotskizm-vrag leninizma (Trotskyism — The Enemy of Leninism). Moscow, Politizdat, 1968. 359 pp.

WOHLGEMUTH, H. *Die Entstehung der KPD. 1914 bis 1918* (The Origin of the Communist Party of Germany. 1914-1918). Review. Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1968. 364 pp.

SUPPLEMENT

Facts about the condition of the working class in the developed capitalist countries

Survey prepared by the
Institute of the International Working-Class Movement,
Academy of Sciences of the USSR

I. GROWTH OF THE LABOR FORCE

The working class has always been the leading force in the fight against monopoly oppression, for social progress. The role of

wage labor, mental and manual, and the numbers of wage-earners in modern capitalist society, are growing steadily.

Factory and Office Workers (Capitalist Countries)

	1950 mlns.	1960 mlns.	1960 % of 1950	1967 mlns.	1967 % of 1950
Highly developed capitalist countries ¹	160	180	112	200	125
Asian, African and Latin American countries	130	155	119	170	131
TOTAL	290	335	116	370	128

¹ United States, Canada, West European countries, Japan, Australia, New Zealand.

The percentage of wage-earners in the total of gainfully employed is constantly growing.

Percentage of Wage Earners

	Year	Percentage of Total Gainfully Employed	Year	Percentage of Total Gainfully Employed
USA	1955	85.2	1967	89.0
Britain	1951	92.4	1966	92.5
FRG	1950	70.8	1967	80.7
France	1954	64.9	1965	72.0
Italy	1951	61.0	1966	63.0
Japan	1955	38.6	1966	59.1
Canada	1961	82.4	1967	85.0

The economic structure and distribution of labor in the various branches of the economy are changing rapidly, spurred on by the technological revolution and the intensified competitive struggle between the main capitalist countries. The percentage of workers in the "traditional" branches of production, especially agriculture, has shrunk visibly, while that of white-collar workers,

managerial personnel, researchers and technicians, as well as employees in the services, has increased.

In 1950-1965 the percentage of factory and office workers in the industrial labor force (extractive, manufacture, power, transport and communications) declined from 57 per cent to 53, in agriculture (including fisheries and lumbering) from 7 per cent to 4, while rising from 36 per cent to 43 in the non-productive branches (trade and services). Italy, France and Japan alone registered a relatively higher percentage of wage labor in agriculture.

The technological advance is sparking rapid changes in the structure of the working class (e.g., in the United States average "longevity," of a trade or skill is now down to 10 years). And while the general proficiency of skills has risen visibly, the percentage of unskilled labor has shrunk. In the United States, the skilled labor force increased numerically by 50 per cent between 1941 and 1968, while the number of unskilled fell by 45 per cent.

Structural Changes in the U.S. Working Class

	1940	1950	1960	1965	1967	1968 (March)
Skilled labor, millions	6.1	7.7	8.6	9.2	9.8	9.6
percentage of total	27	33	35	35	36	36
Semi-skilled, millions	10.9	12.1	12.0	13.4	13.9	13.8
percentage of total	48	52	50	51	51	52
Unskilled, millions	5.6	3.5	3.7	3.8	3.5	3.1
percentage of total	25	14	15	14	12	12
Total, millions	22.6	23.3	24.2	26.5	27.3	26.5

One consequence of the rapid change is that the social boundaries of the working class have expanded considerably, chiefly

by encompassing the so-called white collars. Many of the new categories of white-collar workers and intellectuals perform functions

akin to those of industrial labor generally and, as a rule, their material and social conditions differ but slightly from those of the basic labor force. On the other hand,

the worker of today is gradually approaching the level of technicians and engineers in general education and training, often surpassing office workers in these respects.

Main Groups of Employees in the U.S.* (in millions)

	1950	1960	1965	1967	1968 (March)
Employees	22.3	28.7	32.1	34.2	35.4
Percentage of total labor force	37.5	43.1	44.5	46.0	47.5
Including:					
technicians and engineers	4.5	7.5	8.9	9.9	10.5
office workers	7.6	9.8	11.2	12.3	12.6
service workers	6.5	8.3	9.3	9.3	9.4

*Excluding managerial staff which in U.S. official statistics includes managers and owner-managers (7.7 million in 1968).

To be sure, the numerical growth of white collar employees and the changes in their socio-economic conditions have not erased the functional and social differences be-

tween factory and office employees any more than the differences among office employees.

II. EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT

A re-distribution of labor is underway between branches and various types of production, the examples of the United States

and the Federal Republic of Germany being indicative of the scale of the process.

Redistribution of Factory and Office Workers by Industry in USA and FRG

USA: 1967 in percent of 1960		FRG: 1967 in percent of 1958	
Engineering	162.5	Transport engineering	146.8
Electrotechnical	196.2	Chemical	124.5
Chemical	156.5	Aviation	366.6
Printing	140.1	Engineering	116.8
Transport engineering	153.9	Electrotechnical	112.8
Tobacco	84.5	Textiles	78.4
Textiles	76.2	Coal	52.2
Woodworking	74.8	Tobacco	51.5
Leather	88.9	Shipbuilding	47.2

For the working class capitalist rationalization entails a high degree of adaptability to changing production conditions; a high degree of mobility, too, and much expenditure of energy in the search for work. The annual drift of labor from factory to factory is especially great in the United States. Statistically registered dismissals alone add up to 25 million yearly. Besides, sociological investigations show that over 45 million people fail to register changes of jobs, and that some 20 million are switched to other jobs in the same enterprise.

Scientific and technological progress ousts some workers, while increasing numbers of school-leavers cannot get jobs. As a result the unemployment figures remain the same even when business is good. In 1967 and 1968 the number of gainfully employed shrank in absolute terms not only because

of the long-term factors (concentration and rationalization, expansion of enterprises, rising labor productivity, and so on), but also due to the deteriorating economic situation in Western Europe. In 1964-1968 the main European capitalist countries — Italy, Britain, the FRG and France—experienced economic shocks with a negative effect on employment.

The changing requirements of modern industry and, accordingly, a greater demand for new skills (programming, operators, repairs, fitters of automated equipment) are relatively new factors. And because of the inadequacy of the present educational system (general and vocational schools, specialized training and re-training), the labor shortage in these areas is quite considerable. This growing demand against a backdrop of chronic unemployment is one of

the latest contradictions of capitalism. In Japan with its 500 or 600 thousand unemployed, for example, industry was short of 1,300,000 skilled workers in 1966; 1,600,000 in 1967 and 1,800,000 in June 1968.

In the United States where the technological revolution is more advanced, aggregate employment has risen, though in some branches (coal, textiles and footwear) the number of workers has shrunk. A considerable employment increase was registered in trade, banking and in the services, as well as in the administration, and the numbers employed in the war industry (5.6 million in 1967) rose.

The contradictions in the capitalist labor market are made more acute by the use of foreign labor. Workers migrate from economically less developed states (Turkey, Greece, Portugal, Spain and Southern Italy) to the more developed (West Germany, France and Switzerland) where they are employed in the lowest-paid unskilled jobs. In 1968, for example, some five million foreign workers found employment in these countries, and a similar picture exists in the United States, where the main influx is from Latin America.

Meanwhile, unemployment struck a balance at 5.5-7 million.

**Average Monthly Officially Registered Unemployed
(thousands)**

	1960	1965	1966	1967	1968 Jan.-Aug.
Highly developed capitalist countries	6,944.4	5,854.3	5,485.6	6,396.0	6,796.2
Western Europe	2,129.8	1,805.3	1,884.6	2,579.6	2,709.3
Common Market countries	1,360.2	1,089.5	1,174.8	1,495.9	1,629.8
FRG	237.4	139.2	154.3	445.0	450.1
France	131.1	141.3	147.1	192.9	255.9
Italy	836.0	721.0	769.0	689.0	726.0
Belgium	114.3	55.4	61.5	85.3	111.6 ¹
Netherlands	41.3	32.6	42.9	83.5	86.1
Britain	377.2	347.1	361.0	599.0	586.5 ¹
Austria	82.3	65.5	61.4	64.6	85.3
Sweden	18.9	16.6	22.2	82.0	36.4 ¹
USA	3,852.0	3,366.0	2,875.0	2,975.0	2,922.0 ²
Canada	446.0	280.0	267.0	315.0	438.6
Japan	500.0	390.0	440.0	500.0	696.0
Australia	16.0	12.5	18.5	21.2	22.7

¹January-December

²January-November

Indicative is that in many West European countries, e.g., France, Austria, Belgium and the Netherlands, and in Canada and Japan, the unemployment in physical terms is now more or less steady, equalling the average annual unemployment in the crisis years between the two world wars, and is sometimes even higher.

Many millions of the so-called part-time employed are, in fact, partially unemployed. According to official estimates, the number of partially unemployed amounts to approximately 50-75 per cent of the wholly unemployed. In the United States, for example, some 2-2.5 million were partially unemployed in recent years.

In the FRG the number of factory workers and office employees has decreased by 542,000 since 1967, with more than 150,000 foreign workers compelled to leave the country. A shorter working week was intro-

duced as a result, accompanied by a smaller wage-package.

In Britain, too, unemployment rose in 1967-1968; the situation in the labor market there is doubly difficult due to the economic instability.

Despite a rise in industrial production in 1967, employment figures shrank in France. The increasing disproportions in the economy coupled with sharper contradictions between labor and capital and the growing social contrasts culminated in class strife in May-June 1968.

In Italy the fall in the number of wage-earners has continued over the past five years. In 1968 the employment figure was 800,000 less than before the 1964 crisis; yet out of the 18.8 million wage-earners only 15.1 million worked a full week, while 3.7 million were partially unemployed. Despite

the optimistic forecasts of the Pieraccini plan no boost in employment has occurred. The high unemployment rate in the capi-

talist countries makes nonsense of the "full employment" boast of the capitalist economists.

III. INCREASED CAPITALIST EXPLOITATION

INTENSIFICATION OF LABOR AND INDUSTRIES

New methods of industrial organization are used by monopoly capital to intensify

labor operations. As a result, accidents, occupational illnesses and, all too often, premature incapacitation, are on the rise.

Industrial Accidents (thousands)

	1958	1960	1962	1963	1964	1965
USA¹						
Total	1,820.0	1,950.0	1,990.0	2,020.0	2,050.0	2,010.0
Fatal	13.3	13.8	13.7	14.2	14.2	14.0
France²						
Total	1,056.7	990.6	1,071.5	1,117.6	1,309.1	—
Fatal	2.1	1.6	2.1	1.8	2.2	—
Italy						
Total	912.4	1,057.4	1,229.2	1,338.3	1,278.1	1,086.8
Fatal	2.0	1.9	2.3	2.2	2.4	3.5
FRG						
Total	2,491.4	2,697.7	2,734.2	2,638.6	2,780.5	2,509.8
Fatal	3.2	3.0	3.6	2.9	3.1	3.0
Britain						
Total	375.0	382.3	372.8	390.4	445.5	296.7
Fatal	1.0	0.9	0.8	0.7	0.8	0.7
Japan						
Fatal	5.4	6.1	6.1	6.5	6.1	6.0

¹Including occupational illness.
²Excluding agriculture

In 1966 and 1967 the accident rate reached peak in the United States (more than two million yearly); in Italy and Britain the number is rising, while in Japan more than 6,300 fatal cases were registered in 1966.

Intensification of labor coupled with unconcern for the workers' health is responsible for the increase in psychosomatic disorders and heart disease. In the United States, for example, 204 mental cases per 100,000 population were detained in institutions in 1940, the figure rising to 309, that is, by 50 per cent, in 1963. Annually, six out of 1,000 workers over 45 years of age (this

applies to 40 per cent of the U.S. working class) die of heart disorders, and four more become invalids. In Japan, neurosis, mental illness and heart disorders were the cause of 13.3 per cent of the general death rate in 1926, and of as much as about 45 per cent in 1965. In France, heart disorders accounted for 6.4 per cent of total deaths in 1900, for 10 per cent in 1963, and for 19 per cent in 1964.

WORKING TIME

The working week in capitalist industry is limited by legislation and collective bargaining.

Formal Working Week (hours)

	Legislative limit	Collective agreements		Legislative limit	Collective agreements
USA, Canada	40	36-40	Sweden	45	44
Australia, New Zealand	40	—	Switzerland	46	44
France, Finland	40	40	FRG	48	40-44
Britain	— ¹	40-44	Italy	48	44-46
Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Iceland, Netherlands, Norway	45	—	Greece, Spain, Portugal, Turkey	48	—
			Japan	48	42-48

¹ Britain has no national legislation limiting male working time. Female labor is limited by law to a 4-hour week and that of teenagers to a 44-48-hour week.

However, as a rule, actual working time is higher than the official norm.

Actual Average Working Week in Manufacturing Industry (hours)

	1950	1955	1960	1965	1966	1967	1968
USA	40.5	40.7	39.7	41.2	41.3	40.6	41.0 ¹
Canada	42.5	41.0	40.4	41.0	40.8	40.3	40.4 ²
Britain ³	45.7	46.4	48.0	47.0	46.0	46.2	46.2 ⁴
FRG	48.2	48.8	45.6	44.3	43.9	42.3	42.3 ⁵
France	44.4	44.0	46.5	46.4	46.6	46.1	45.9 ⁶
Italy	47.8	48.7	48.5	47.4	47.4	—	—
Japan	48.0	48.4	47.8	44.3	44.6	44.8	42.9 ⁷

¹ September. ² June. ³ Men. ⁴ April. ⁵ January. ⁶ March. ⁷ July.

In France, actual working time is considerably above the norm. In July 1968, for example, the average week in building was 49.2 hours, in metal-working 46.5, electrical engineering 45.4, food industry 46-48, chemical 44.5 and leather 43.5.

A similar situation prevails in Britain and other countries where overtime is widespread, while many workers put in less than a full working week. In August 1968, for example, 31.9 per cent of the employees in the manufacturing industries worked an average weekly overtime of 8.5 hours. Meanwhile those not working a full week lost an average weekly 10.8 hours. Overtime in Japan's manufacturing industries added up to a weekly 18.4 hours in 1965, 20.6 in 1966 and 24.1 in 1967. In September 1968, 19.3 per cent of the labor force in U.S. manufacturing worked less than 34 hours weekly, while the actual average working week was 41.1 hours, with 47.3 per cent of the employees working 35 to 40 hours and 33.4 per cent in excess of 41 hours, the latter including 19.7 per cent working more than 49.

LABOR PRODUCTIVITY AND REAL WAGES

The gap between growth of labor produc-

tivity and real wages is a salient token of rising capitalist exploitation.

According to official figures, it is true, the rise in hourly pay has kept pace with that of labor productivity. However, if the dynamics of real wages is examined in the context of rising consumer prices, the rising cost of medical treatment, higher direct taxes and the varying average number of hours worked weekly or annually, we obtain an entirely different picture.

Dynamics of Labor Productivity in Manufacturing Industry (output per worker) (per cent of 1958)

	1960	1965	1966	1967	first 6 months) 1968
USA	110	136	140	140	145
Canada	106	135	137	139	145
Japan	134	188	209	239	261
France	110	138	149	156	—
FRG	126	155	157	162	175
Italy	118	154	172	179	189
Britain	110	125	128	130	138

Price Increases: Consumer Goods & Services
(per cent of 1958)

	1960	1965	1966	1967	first 6 months) 1968
USA	103	109	112	115	119
Canada	102	110	114	119	122
Britain	101	120	124	127	132
Italy	101	129	130	136	138
France	109	126	129	133	136
FRG	102	119	122	125	126
Japan	105	140	147	153	159

The official figures must be treated with caution. Trade unions in France and the United States, for example, estimate that official price statistics are at times 40-50 per cent below the actual scale. But official figures, too, lead unmistakably to the conclusion that the rising cost of living consumes a considerable portion of the wage increase, while the dynamics of real wages trails behind growth of output.

Growth of Hourly Output and Real Wages in USA
(per cent of 1960)

	Real hourly wage 1	Hourly output per worker	Real wage against output growth (4:5)
1960	100	100	100
1965	111	122	90.9
1966	114	125	91.2
1967	117	126	92.8

1 Exclusive of tax increases.

The rising cost of living is a burden on the working people (unless they get corresponding wage increases), pensioners, students, etc.

The picture is bleaker still if we consider the rising taxes, various charges and contributions and the fluctuating number of working hours. In 1966, for example, the U.S. factory worker whose average annual wage had nominally increased \$300 spent \$288 of this to cover the tax increase and the rise in the cost of living (\$49 were "consumed" by the increase in the federal income tax, \$103 by the increased social security contributions, \$21 by the increase in local taxes and \$115 by the cost-of-living increase). Some U.S. economists estimate therefore, that real wages in the manufacturing industry declined somewhat in 1966 and 1967. With a growth in the national income of 12 per cent, they hold, non-

productive incomes went up 22 per cent, while wage-earners' incomes surpassed population growth only slightly (a mere three per cent). This trend continued in 1968 with the cost of living rising 4.4 per cent and taxes going up.

A similar intensification of exploitation was witnessed in France in 1965-1967 and at the beginning of 1968. The average wage in France was among the lowest in the Common Market: in 1967 hourly 3.48 francs, while in Luxembourg 6.22, in West Germany 5.5, in Holland 4.75 and Italy 3.18. After the class battles in May and June wages were increased by 13-18 per cent, depending on the industry. But the capitalists quickly recouped part of their forced concessions by raising prices for a number of commodities and services.

In the FRG real wages dropped and unemployment rose in 1967, while labor productivity kept rising. In 1968 Bonn, in effect, stimulated this trend by pushing up taxes and reducing social expenditure.

The devaluation of sterling in 1967 has contributed to a decline in real wages in Britain. The effect of rising prices was enhanced by cuts in government welfare outlays, an eight per cent increase in taxes and a stiff wage-freeze policy. And the Prices and Incomes Board lately often refused to endorse collective agreements envisaging wage increases in excess of the official ceiling.

In Japan and Italy, workers wrested a 10-12 per cent increase in nominal wages from manufacturers in 1967. But there, too, the intensive policy of capitalist rationalization, higher prices and wages lower than in other developed capitalist states indicated that no tangible improvements occurred in the situation of the working class. Despite the relatively high rate of Japan's economic growth in 1966, wages in manufacturing were officially estimated as 35 per cent lower than in France, 47 per cent than in West Germany, 70 per cent than in Britain and 79 per cent than in the United States.

TAXATION

Tax pressure is one way of intensifying exploitation. In 1965 taxes accounted for 30 per cent of the national income in Italy, 34.1 in West Germany and the United States and 35-35.5 in France and Britain.

In the first three years of the Vietnam war income tax in the United States increased by 27 per cent and the tax on profits by three. Taxes consume more than 33 per cent of a worker's wage in France, the number

of taxpayers doubling between 1958 and 1967 from 4.3 million to nine million when the taxable minimum income was lowered. Direct income tax accounted for 12.6 per cent of the tax revenue in 1962 and for as much as 17.7 per cent in 1968. In the meantime, taxes paid by capitalist companies decreased from 9.9 per cent of the total tax revenue to 7.6 per cent. During the Fifth Republic, the French Government tripled the sum of direct taxes levied on factory and office workers. And this while indirect taxes rose as well; in 1967 the latter amounted on the average to 20-25 per cent of the retail sales prices. In Britain wage-earners pay from 21.5 to 36.1 per cent of their income in direct and indirect taxes, in the Federal

Republic of Germany as much as 36 per cent.

The surplus product in the possession of the state is used to an insignificant extent only to meet the general needs of the working class. Most of it is spent on armaments in the interest of the war-industrial complex.

FAMILY INCOME AND THE COST OF LIVING

The difficult economic situation of the working class, specifically the insufficient wages, is best illustrated by comparing real family income with the "standard" family budgets representing the income essential for an average family.

Wage and "Standard" Family Budget of Urban Worker in USA¹

	Average weekly income (\$)	1959 Standard weekly budget (\$)	Percentage	Average weekly income (\$)	1966 Standard weekly budget (\$)	Percentage
Manufacturing industry	88.3	118.0	74.8	112.3	177.0	63.4
Automobile industry	111.4	118.0	94.4	147.2	177.0	83.2
Textile industry	63.0	118.0	53.4	82.1	177.0	46.4

¹ The "standard" budget is compiled by the Department of Labor as a minimum for a family of four: husband (wage-earner), wife and two children of school age.

Some economists estimate that the incomes of U.S. workers in manufacture covered just 83 per cent of the standard family budget.

In the Federal Republic of Germany the cost of living in 1967 was 14.4 per cent higher than in 1962, total wages shrinking by 6.3 per cent and the average wage covering but 87 per cent of the family budget. And in France the average wage in the main

industries covered no more than 80.2 per cent of the necessary minimum.

Yet mean figures conceal the still more difficult plight of those numerous families whose incomes are below average.

A fuller idea of the wage-earners' economic situation is obtained from the family budget that includes receipts from work done at home and income in kind from various sources. Take a family budget computed for Japan.

Family Income, Including Receipts in Kind and Work Done at Home in Japan

	1956		1966	
	000 yen	%	000 yen	%
Total income	44.2	100.0	110.4	100.0
Cash income	30.8	69.0	75.4	68.5
Including wage	38.6	64.0	70.3	64.0
Cash receipts from work done at home	0.6	1.3	1.9	1.7
Other income	1.6	3.6	3.2	2.9
Other receipts in kind	4.6	10.4	12.3	11.2
Receipts in kind from work done at home	8.8	20.6	22.4	20.3
Number of family members	4.47		4.05	
Number of wage-earners	1.46		1.54	

Despite the fact that the average family declined by 9.4 per cent between 1956 and 1966, the average number of gainfully employed members of the family increased from 1.46 to 1.54 persons, indicating that

the degree of capitalist exploitation increased.

On the other hand, the cash income of an urban worker's family comprises less than 70 per cent of its aggregate income, with

regular wages amounting to but 64 per cent of that income. Income in kind exceeds 31 per cent of the total family income, with work done at home accounting for nearly two-thirds of this income in kind or for more than 20 per cent of the aggregate family income.

IV. SOCIAL AND LEGAL PROBLEMS

SOCIAL INSURANCE

By dint of long and persevering struggle the workers have compelled private enterprise and the state to participate in financing social insurance. However, employees still have to pay quite considerable contributions out of their wages. And in recent years these contributions have gone up, with further increases in the offing. Between 17 and 57 per cent of the social insurance money, ILO estimates, comes directly out of wage-earners' pockets.

The qualifying age for pensions is inordinately high: 65 years for men and women in the United States, West Germany and Spain; 65 years for men and 60 years for women in Britain, Austria and Belgium; 67 years for men and women in Canada, Sweden and Iceland, and 70 years for men and women in Norway. Yet due to the current intensification of labor many are incapacitated long before reaching pension age (in West Germany, for example, 40-45 per cent retire before qualifying for a pension).

To this day, too, employees are not guaranteed pay for the entire period of sickness or even treatment of industrial injuries. It is a more or less general rule that sick pay is not issued for the first 3-7 days of sickness, and in case of a long illness grants are terminated long before recuperation. Similar limits are imposed in the case of forced unemployment.

Social insurance is a convenient means by which the administration exerts pressure. Wage-earners idle as a result of strikes or lockouts, or dismissed for "infringements," are not entitled to unemployment relief.

Regular insurance contributions do not relieve the employee of additional expenditure for medical treatment in case of sickness or injury: doctor's fees, charges for medical treatment, hospital, charges, and the like. In recent years the cost of these services has risen in Britain, Japan and some other countries.

HEALTH AND EDUCATION

In the United States, richest country of the capitalist world, the chart of higher

On the whole, the recent years were highlighted by another substantial intensification of exploitation, scientific and technical progress being used by the capitalist governments to boost the profits of private enterprise and restrict growth of real wages.

disease incidence coincides almost wholly with the areas of concentrated poverty. Chronic illness is the lot of every third person in families with an annual income of less than \$2,000, while in families with an annual income of more than \$7,000 only every 13th member is affected. In the former group annual loss of working time among men in the 45-64 age bracket is 50 days, in the latter category 14.3. Child mortality among non-whites in the United States is double that among whites, mortality in childbirth four times as high. In sum, life expectancy among the poorer sections is 10 per cent below average, while the suffering and losses are considerably higher.

The cost of medical treatment is rising more rapidly than prices, and in some countries more rapidly than wages. In 1960, the cost of ten days in a New York hospital was \$560, in 1966 nearly \$842, and in 1968 almost \$1,000, amounting to three-quarters of the annual income of most aging Americans. The pharmaceutical market, cornered to the extent of 75 per cent by the four biggest drug companies, is one of the most profitable.

Shortage of doctors, trained nurses and other medical personnel, hospital beds and medical institutions, is acute. In 1966, the United States had 351,800 doctors, Japan 137,300, the FRG 109,600, Italy 81,200, Britain 74,400 and France 71,900. Besides, in the capitalist countries medical personnel is usually concentrated in areas of relative prosperity. In 1967, Britain had 468,000 hospital beds, of which 45 per cent were in hospitals built in the 19th century. As many as 540,000 people could not be accommodated and were compelled to await their turn for hospitalization. In 1966 the shortage in hospital beds in the United States was estimated at more than one million. As many as two million mental patients alone were untreated because of the shortage of medical institutions and personnel. In France (Paris area) the age of hospitals averages 70 years.

Education, too, is stamped by the failings of a class society. Despite a shortage of

specialists with a higher and even secondary education (in France, for example, the supply of doctors and chemists covers only 68.9 per cent of the demand, linguists 61.4 per cent, trained engineers 49.5 per cent, lawyers and commercial experts 24.7 per cent), sections suffering most from unemployment are afforded fewer educational opportunities. In the United States, 18.6 per cent of non-whites over 25 years of age are illiterate (against 5.8 per cent among whites). Only one of ten Negro children succeeds in crashing the racial barrier in U.S. schools. In Italy 12 per cent of the population cannot read or write.

Despite the marked increase in the number of university students, those from working-class families are still relatively few: a mere five per cent of the student body in the FRG, 15 in France (workers' and peasant families), Belgium 14, Italy 15.3 and Britain 25. For students from families of intellectuals and employees the figures are distinctly higher: 54 per cent in Belgium, 53 in the FRG, 39 in Italy and 30 in Britain.

Many students combine study with jobs on the side. In Japan, for example, more than half the students are compelled to seek earnings, and in France nearly 44 per cent. From 30 to 57 per cent in those two countries leave college for lack of money and a still larger number incur debts.

Educational establishments are short of premises, equipment, instructors and funds. Government allocations for education are grossly insufficient (only 5.3 per cent of the budget in Japan, 5.1 USA, 4.9 Netherlands, 4.8 Sweden, 3.2 France and 3 FRG).

The students' fight for better conditions, for an educational reform, is becoming more bitter and its nature and orientation approaches the class struggle of the workers.

HOUSING

Despite the expansion of building and the rapid growth of towns, housing is extremely acute. In Western Europe and other areas of the capitalist world the percentage of old, sub-standard housing is on the increase. Rent swallows up between one-quarter and one-third of wage earners' incomes. In 1960 in the United States condemned houses totalled 9.3 million. Since then the situation has barely changed. In fact, slums in the bigger cities (New York, Los Angeles, etc.) tend to grow. The new houses are not built for the poor. U.S. experts estimate that it would take at least 10 per cent of the national income over a five-year period, that is, about \$283,000 mil-

lion, to replace slums with modern housing (while in 1962-1968 alone the U.S. government spent \$395,000 million, or nearly 40 per cent more, on war needs).

In Britain nearly half the housing is more than 50 years old, most of the old houses lacking modern amenities.

In France, more than 15 million people, or nearly one-third of the nation, are officially listed as needing housing or better housing. Yet only a little more than 400,000 new homes are built annually (in the first eight months of 1968 building dropped by four per cent), meaning that to meet just the present demand will take some 12 years.

The crisis in Italy's housing has been increasing over a number of years, with building shrinking visibly. And this while the housing shortage is estimated at 21 million rooms. Inexpensive homes comprised a mere four per cent of the new homes built in 1967 and 1968, whereas even under the government plan they should amount to 25 per cent.

In Japan money spent on housebuilding per head of population is half that spent in France and West Germany and just one-fifth of that in the United States. New building meets only 45-70 per cent of the growth in demand.

Rents are spiralling despite "rent freeze" regulations in some countries, while a substantial number of homes are vacant due to excessive rent (300,000 flats in Italy, more than 250,000 in West Germany, etc.).

LABOR LEGISLATION

Labor legislation and trade-union rights are the object of bitter contention between the working class and the monopoly bourgeoisie.

In some countries the capitalist state and the monopolies have mounted a new joint offensive against the trade unions. In Britain, the Prices and Incomes Act limits the right of trade unions freely to conclude collective agreements, and the Labor Government is most anxious to outlaw the so-called unofficial strikes. Yet nearly 90 per cent of the strikes in the country come under that head.

In the United States, Canada, Australia, Japan and some other countries the governments are taking advantage of existing anti-labor legislation to fight the trade unions. In 1967-68 the Johnson Administration resorted time and again to the reactionary Taft-Hartley Law to ban strikes, and in Japan in May and September 1968 the administration of the state railways fell back on anti-

labor legislation to fight strikes by repressive means (dismissals, suspensions and wage cuts). Similar repressions were employed against communications employees and other categories.

In some countries, however, workers led by militant unions won added trade union rights in 1967-1968. In Italy, trade union groups at factory level have gained official recognition in some industries, their rights guaranteed in collective agreements. In France after the general strike of May-June 1968 the government recognized trade union rights in the enterprises. The National Assembly adopted a pertinent law in December 1968, partially meeting the workers' demands.

Under working class pressure, such arbitrary acts as dismissals are legislatively controlled. Pertinent legislation was passed in Britain, Ireland, France and other countries.

* * *

The working class in the developed capitalist countries is fighting a hard battle for better conditions. And in 1968 it made considerable headway in the strike movement and in cementing its unity. Economic and political upheavals, inherent in capitalism, tend to intensify the class struggle of the millions, for basic rights, progress and socialism.

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

