

Workers of All Countries, Unite!

World Marxist Review

January, 1960
Volume 3, No. 1
35 Cents

PROBLEMS
OF PEACE
and
SOCIALISM



World Marxist Review:

Problems of Peace and Socialism

Theoretical and Information Journal
of Communist and Workers' Parties

CONTENTS

On the Threshold of 1960	3
B. RYURIKOV: Man and Socialism	9
T. WEGENER: Apologetics of Capitalism (Apropos of the New Program of the Social Democratic Party of Germany)	17
N. IRIBADZHAKOV: The Bankruptcy of Contemporary Bourgeois Philosophy	24
I. NORLUND: The Communist Party and the National Interests	31
L. JUNTILA: For Unity of Action	37
A. ISKENDEROV: A Continent in Ferment	42

IN THE COMMUNIST AND WORKERS' PARTIES

Appeal to the Communist Parties of the Capitalist Countries of Europe to All Workers, to All Democrats	46
Peaceful Coexistence and the Work of the Communists (USA)	51
E. V.: Discussion on Scientific Progress and Social Development	53
K. TELL: Our Year's Plan	55
R. ROJAS: Recruiting New Members	57
Educational Activity in the French Communist Party	58
SHORT NOTICES	61

EXCHANGE OF VIEWS

The Struggle of the Communist and Workers' Parties Against Revisionism Contributions by: E. KALMAN, LI MAN TRUONG, T. DANISZEWSKI, P. REIMAN, S. MANUSHI, TSIANG CHUN-FAN, L. EINICKE, G. VAN MOERKERKE, TJOO TIKT TJON, S. AVIRMID, P. GEORGIEV, I. NORLUND, J. ROSNER, N. DONIA, J. CHAMBAZ, N. GOLDBERGER, L. GRUPPI, J. JACOBS	64
---	----

REVIEWS

N. KULAGIN: Technology and Social Progress	80
JORGE DEL PRADO: A Book that Calls to Action	83
J. NAGY: The Ideological Weapon of the Hungarian Communists	85
M. STRANG: Things Are Not What They Seem	89

COMMUNICATIONS AND COMMENT

C. HAROCHE: What Is Happening to Farjallah Helou? (A letter to the Editorial Board and our reply)	90
T. DOCKTAIL: A Shadow of the Past	91
K. SACHER: From Marxism to Religion and Back Again	92

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

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

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

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

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

THE HISTORY OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

FROM THE FIRST SETTLEMENT
TO THE PRESENT TIME

BY
JOHN H. COVINGTON

IN TWO VOLUMES.
VOL. I.

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY
JOHN H. COVINGTON,

AT THE
PRINTING OFFICE OF
JOHN H. COVINGTON,

NO. 10, CORNER OF
NASSAU AND
NORTH STREETS.

1847.

THE HISTORY OF THE
CITY OF BOSTON

FROM THE FIRST SETTLEMENT
TO THE PRESENT TIME

BY
JOHN H. COVINGTON

IN TWO VOLUMES.
VOL. I.

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY
JOHN H. COVINGTON,

AT THE
PRINTING OFFICE OF
JOHN H. COVINGTON,

NO. 10, CORNER OF
NASSAU AND
NORTH STREETS.

1847.

THE HISTORY OF THE
CITY OF BOSTON

FROM THE FIRST SETTLEMENT
TO THE PRESENT TIME

On the Threshold of 1960

THE past year was marked by two outstanding events: man, overcoming the Earth's gravitation, opened the era of the conquest of space, and the process of easing international tensions set in.

These developments, which have given the past year special prominence in history, were conceived by socialism. The Soviet Union opened the way to outer space, and the efforts of the socialist countries, particularly the Soviet Union, initiated the change in the political climate, and the thaw in the cold war.

These achievements have enhanced the prestige of socialism in the eyes of mankind. It is not fortuitous that people in the West are asking: "Why was the USSR first to make the breakthrough into outer space?" Even those who do not hold progressive views, who are reluctant to look truth in the face, are compelled to revise their views on the role of socialism. Thus Donald David, Chairman of the Council of Trustees for the Committee for Economic Development of the United States, said that behind the Sputnik there is the rocket, and behind the rocket there is advanced science and technology. But there is more to it than that. There is the social system, the system of human institutions.

The slick propaganda of the opponents of socialism who claimed that the Soviet achievements in science and technology were made at the expense of living standards has also failed. Experience shows that the production base of the socialist system ensures steady development in all spheres, including living standards.

For decades imperialist propaganda has harped on the theme that under socialism the individual has no freedom, that his rights are restricted by the state. But many in the capitalist countries are now beginning to ask whether man deprived of freedom can rise to such heights in science and technology, can compel the laws of economic and social development and the laws of Nature to serve his needs. Perhaps it is bourgeois society that is not free because it is incapable of giving free rein to human energies or of generating the enthusiasm needed to achieve lofty aims? The correct answers to these questions signify the collapse of the "Western conceptions" about man's place in capitalist and

socialist societies. And this collapse is now taking place.

At the moment it is impossible to grasp fully the deep-going process of revaluation engendered by the scientific and technological advance of the USSR, now observed among some sections of the world public who do not share communist views. But people in the West feel that something new has entered their lives, the significance and consequences of which have yet to be felt in full measure.

According to H. G. Wells, Lenin in 1920 expressed a novel idea. Recalling his conversation with the Soviet leader the British writer said that Lenin, speaking about generally accepted views, pointed out that all human concepts were adapted to the scale of our planet; they were based on the supposition that technological potential as it developed, would never go beyond the bounds of the Earth. Were we to establish inter-planetary communications, Lenin went on, we would have to revise our philosophical, social and moral concepts.

Lenin's thought is of special significance today. Not only are Soviet achievements greatly enriching the natural sciences and technology, not only are they ushering in a new era in international relations, they are also revolutionizing man's outlook. The study of these achievements will enrich Marxist theory and make its ideas still more attractive to all thinking people. The facts are convincing the people that the socialist road is the right road, the road to follow. Man's entry into a new phase of development stresses the significance of the epoch-making revolution of October 1917 and shows that it must be regarded as the starting point in defining the characteristic features of our time.

Wells mentioned another thought expressed by Lenin. The technological potential having become unlimited, Lenin said, will put an end to violence as a means and method of progress. These words are the clue to an understanding of the connection between the events which we have witnessed: interplanetary flights and the relaxation of international tension. The Soviet Union with its immense technological potential, vitally concerned with man's well-being, has suggested that force as a

means of settling international issues be abandoned, that the Powers should take the way of general and complete disarmament. The weight of these proposals is confirmed by the fact that Soviet advances in rocketry — the concentrated expression of the rapid development of the productive forces of the socialist system — point to the consequences for anyone daring to unleash a new world conflict. Given the present level of science and technology, all forms of relations other than those of peaceful coexistence between countries with differing social and economic systems are virtually ruled out.

★ ★ ★

While the changes that have taken place in the world had been prepared over a long period, the year 1959 was outstanding in this respect. The world balance of forces was tipped in favor of socialism. Carrying out the decisions of the Twenty-First Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Soviet people, launching all-out communist construction, have achieved remarkable successes in all spheres of man's activity. The power of People's China, too, has grown, and its role in international affairs has become more significant. The other People's Democracies building socialism have also made impressive gains. And the socialist countries have chosen to use their colossal might to strengthen the forces working for peace and progress.

The year 1959 will be remembered not only as a year of steady advance by the working class of the socialist countries, but also as a year of selfless struggle waged by the proletariat of the capitalist world.

This struggle, fought on a vast scale, displayed a great variety of forms, demands and slogans. Peace campaigns, peace months, anti-war rallies, political demonstrations, strikes, international solidarity forums, unemployed marches, movements against the policy of the monopolies and of the monopolist associations, demands for higher wages, for full employment, nationalization, control over investments, and structural reforms — such are some of the forms and methods used in the class battles against the imperialist bourgeoisie. In Italy some five million participated in strikes, in Japan about four million. In Argentina, during the 48-hour strike in September some three million workers downed tools; in the United States during the first 10 months of the year there were 3,525 strikes. Bitter and prolonged strike action was waged by one

million metal workers in Italy; 250,000 workers were on strike in Belgium, 100,000 printing trades workers in Britain and half a million steel-workers in the United States. The strikers were, in many instances, supported by farm laborers, farmers, office workers, small businessmen and the middle sections generally. The working-class movement was marked by another important event — the national strike of the Spanish workers of June 18, 1959, initiated by the Communist Party and supported by other anti-Franco organizations.

In the final analysis all this working-class action, including economic struggle, served the cause of peace, sapping the positions of its main opponents — the imperialist monopolies and reactionary political groupings.

The past year was also noted for the rise in the anti-war struggle waged by workers. In Dortmund, West Germany, 100,000 people declared a protest strike against the installation of a missile-launching site and brought all enterprises, offices and transport to a standstill for 10 minutes. In Stevenage New Town, Britain, the country's first strike against the manufacture of thermo-nuclear weapons was held. The will of the workers for peace was felt in full measure at the All-Europe Trade Union Conference held in Goerlitz-Zgorzelec, which discussed the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany, disarmament and the banning of atomic weapons. In accordance with the conference resolution a peace month was held, which turned out to be a powerful manifestation of the peace-loving forces of Europe.

A striking display of courage in combating the war threat and for national independence were the rallies, demonstrations and strikes of the Japanese workers on the "Day of Joint Action Against the 'Security Treaty'." In the course of 24 hours some three million people participated in the mass actions. The demonstrators—Communists and Socialists, workers and students, professionals and housewives — marched under the slogan: "Bar the way to war!", "For a peaceful, democratic and neutral Japan!", "Down with the American *diktat*!"

The World Peace Movement, which united hundreds of millions of people of different political and religious views, has grown stronger and has assumed many new forms. On the call of the World Peace Council campaigns were conducted for the discontinuation of nuclear weapons tests, for banning the production of nuclear weapons, for summit talks. Movements and organizations

not connected with the World Peace Council also stepped up their activity against the cold war and for peaceful coexistence. In Britain, for instance, the Movement for Nuclear Disarmament gained wide popularity as did the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy in the United States. It is worth noting that in the United States where peace supporters have been subjected to repressions there is now a coast-to-coast network of committees working for peaceful coexistence, organizing rallies, gathering signatures to petitions welcoming the exchange of visits between Khrushchov and Eisenhower, demanding termination of nuclear tests and urging agreement on universal disarmament.

A growing influence on world affairs is exerted by the national-liberation movement. The beginning of last year witnessed the victory of the popular revolution in Cuba. An intensive struggle for national liberation is being waged in Africa. About one-fourth of the territory and one-third of the population of that continent are no longer under colonialist domination. The international prestige of the newly independent states has risen — their peace policy contributes to the changes now taking place in the world and to co-operation between all countries.

The struggles waged by the working people during the past year were difficult and complicated. Not all the class battles, democratic campaigns and national-liberation struggles were successful. In some countries the reactionaries have intensified their onslaught against the rights of the working people; disgraceful trials of democrats and peace fighters have been staged. The democratic forces encountered numerous difficulties created by the imperialist agents in order to weaken the struggle of the peoples for peace, to sow discord among them, to instil pessimism and force them into passivity. But temporary setbacks, no matter how bitter, cannot overshadow the main objective. The struggle of the working people, the working class in particular, was a major factor contributing to the gradual change in the world climate.

★ ★ ★

Last year, under pressure of the peace forces, the big bourgeoisie in a number of the leading imperialist countries began to withdraw from the positions of the cold war. Certain changes appeared first in the policy of the rulers of Britain and later of

the USA. During Khrushchov's visit to the United States and particularly after it many spokesmen of Big Business and official circles admitted that the postwar U.S. policy has entered a blind alley. The more far-sighted voice the need to revise both the foreign policy dogma of the cold war and the traditional concepts of the economic competition between the USSR and the USA. These sections feel that it is high time to turn to peaceful coexistence on a reasonable basis.

In Western Europe there are statesmen, until recently deaf to sensible proposals for improving international relations, who are now compelled to assess the situation more soberly. Symptomatic in this respect are de Gaulle's invitation to Khrushchov and the forthcoming visit of President Gronchi to the USSR. In other countries, too, sober-minded bourgeois politicians recognize the need to eliminate the tensions between East and West.

Not for a moment, however, should we forget that the détente is only beginning to get underway and that the forces opposing this process are still strong. It would be wrong to think that the monopolies, who wax rich on war contracts, and their political advocates will voluntarily lay down their arms. Some monopolists and politicians, hostile to the turn in international affairs, are stubbornly clinging to the bankrupt "positions of strength" policy and insisting on strengthening the aggressive blocs. Among the initiators of this policy are Rockefeller, Truman and Acheson. The successes of the peace forces impel the reactionaries to make frenzied efforts to sow discord and mistrust among the nations. Illustrative of this was the recent imperialist provocation in Laos, the obdurate attempts to force the U.N. to discuss the "Hungarian" and "Tibetan" questions, and France's plans for a nuclear test in the Sahara. The West German revanchists headed by Adenauer, fearful of any letup in tension, are striving might and main to intensify the cold war.

The peace forces must display the utmost vigilance and take vigorous action in order to isolate the forces of evil and prevent them from provoking new conflicts and international friction.

One of the burning international issues is the problem of disarmament. The Soviet proposals for general and complete disarmament have captured the imagination of people everywhere. Yet there are people in the West—sincere in their desire for dis-

armament — who doubt the practicability of this step. They ask: will not this plan remain a good intention never to be realized? We would ask them to ponder over such things as the hatred of peoples for imperialist military gambles, the ardent desire to live in peace, the technological potential which has become unlimited. These things make the very thought of war an absurdity. It is here that we see the connection between the Soviet proposals for disarmament and reality — this is the token of their practicability.

The realism of the Soviet proposals is that world peace, socialism and communism are organically linked, that war and militarization are alien to the very nature of socialist society. Those who have grasped the essence of socialist relations will not be surprised at the Soviet Union proposing complete disarmament at a time when its economic potential and military power have grown tremendously. They realize that disarmament has become practicable precisely because socialism is superior to imperialism in the military sense also. Perhaps it will be useful if we draw a comparison: it is common knowledge that at one time U.S. imperialism had a monopoly of atomic weapons. It used this circumstance to launch its "positions of strength" and "brinkmanship" policy. Later, when the lead in the production of modern weapons was taken by the Soviet Union, the latter, true to its policy of peace, proposed universal disarmament, which opened up before mankind the prospect of ending wars and ushering in the era of peaceful co-operation.

★ ★ ★

International support for the foreign policy principles advocated by the socialist states, and not for imperialist doctrines, is gaining the upper hand. The principle of peaceful coexistence is now upheld by 1,700 million people of the socialist countries and of the newly independent countries of Asia and Africa, and by the overwhelming majority of the population in the Western countries; moreover, it has been recognized by the United Nations Organization.

The worldwide triumph of these progressive ideas cannot but alarm those who oppose the relaxation the tensions. Ideological struggle in the realm of international relations is manifest particularly in the attempts by bourgeois politicians to distort the idea of peaceful coexistence, to attribute to it a meaning totally alien to its spirit and to

falsify it. In an effort to discredit peaceful coexistence the *New York Times* declared it to be a communist claim to new conquests through subversion. *The policy of peaceful coexistence signifies relinquishing war as a means of resolving controversial issues; it implies the obligation of each country to refrain from infringing the territorial integrity and sovereignty of another.* This policy rules out any interference in the internal affairs of other states designed to change their state system or for any other reason.

Much confusion is caused also by the spokesmen of the so-called "non-bloc position." In their recent statements they have tried to make it appear as though peaceful coexistence creates possibilities for the collusion of the Great Powers with the object of securing for themselves spheres of influence at the expense of the smaller nations. These people are deliberately blind to the cardinal difference between peaceful coexistence and the imperialist policy of dividing the world into "spheres of influence."

The struggle around the idea of peaceful coexistence is not yet over. It is vital that this idea should be assimilated by the masses.

In some countries the working people are apprehensive that an improvement in relations between the capitalist and socialist countries may adversely affect the struggle of the masses for socio-economic progress, for a better social system. These apprehensions are totally unfounded. The principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other states — the cornerstone of peaceful coexistence — flows from a recognition of the right of each nation to choose freely on the basis of its experience the social system of its choice. The progressive nature of peaceful coexistence is that it combines lasting peace, normal good-neighborly relations between states having different social systems with the dynamics of social and political processes. Nor does peaceful coexistence signify attenuation of the class struggle, as is claimed by the revisionists. Class struggle is an objective factor and it cannot disappear simply by writing it off. The reactionaries are upset by the relaxation of the tension because the latter helps them to exploit the working people, to oppress the colonial peoples, suppress democracy, persecute the Communists and crush the labor movement.

The imperialists, understandably, are doing everything to fan anti-communist hys-

teria in the new situation and to renew the attacks on democrats and progressives. It is obvious, however, that given an international détente, it will be more difficult for them to do this. The growing prestige of socialism, together with Khrushchov's visit to the United States, has delivered a heavy blow at anti-communism.

★ ★ ★

The new situation confronts the working-class movement with the following tasks: first, to consolidate the change for the better in international relations and to work to turn the relaxation into a stable peace; second, to make maximum use of these changes in upholding democracy and social progress, and in improving the conditions of the people.

It would be a mistake to think that in the capitalist countries profound social changes will take place automatically, merely as a result of the strength and international prestige of the socialist countries. The growing influence of the socialist world system favors working-class struggle. But we should not forget that with the relaxation of tension the bourgeoisie will step up its efforts to keep the working people divided. It will rely to an even greater degree on the revisionists to spread illusions about the so-called changing nature of imperialism, it will try to deceive the masses by paternalism and reformism, and to intensify exploitation by more sophisticated and flexible methods. Only resolute action by the masses will compel the bourgeoisie to make social and political concessions.

Today as never before the working class bears a supreme responsibility for the destiny of peace. The working class is multi-million strong; it is politically steeled and the best organized class in modern society. Its ranks (including families) number no less than 500 million. If this great force acts in an organized manner in the interests of peace and progress, it will be able to break any resistance offered by the reactionaries.

But the success of the working-class struggle is jeopardized by the lack of unity. And for this the working class of the capitalist countries is paying dearly. Absence of unity is the basic reason for the setbacks and defeats suffered by the labor movement; only the imperialists gain from it.

The blame for this is to be laid at the door of the Right-wing Social-Democratic leaders, who place their anti-communism

before the class interests of the working people. Some of the leading Social Democrats and the Right-wing labor chiefs surpass even many monopolists in their attacks on socialism and the progressives. During Khrushchov's tour of the United States, Walter Reuther and other reactionary union leaders played a key role in the game of the brinkmanship politicians. Recently Helmer, an Austrian Socialist Party leader, went so far as to propose "the lowering of an iron curtain" between West and East. The policy of capitulation pursued by the Right-wing Social-Democratic leadership is manifest in the new program adopted by the Social Democratic Party of Germany. By supporting NATO, the cold war and the anti-communist line in the labor movement, the Right-wing Social Democrats are forcing the working people to withdraw their confidence from them. Symptomatic in this respect was the defeat suffered by the British Labor Party in the recent general election.

At present the working-class movement has no task more vital than achieving the unity and co-operation of all its sections. The situation is now most favorable for success in this effort. The Communists are extending the hand of friendship to their Socialist comrades in order to fight jointly for peace, for banning nuclear weapons tests, for disarmament, better conditions, economic and social reforms. The Communists are sincerely ready to display the maximum good will, tact and patience in establishing co-operation. Any, even the slightest, attempt on the part of the Social-Democratic parties to overcome their anti-communist prejudice and to make a contribution to the common cause will meet with approval and support on the part of the Communists.

The working class is strong because it takes cognizance of the interests of the broad sections of bourgeois society — peasants, urban petty bourgeoisie and other middle sections — and upholds these interests as if they were its own. The position held by the working class in society imparts to it the role of leader of all the working people; its mission is to unite, organize and head the struggle of all the peace forces. The changes in the international climate open before the proletariat and its Communist vanguard new possibilities for political initiative, for establishing broad contacts, finding a common language and concluding agreements with forces with

which it had no contact in the past. From this follows the urgent necessity to pursue a flexible and bold policy of alliances with all democratic and peace-loving forces in each country and on a world scale.

The alliance of the working class with the democratic forces in an urgent necessity for democratizing all aspects of public life, for curbing monopolies and improving the conditions of the working people of town and countryside.

Peace is needed by the peoples of both the socialist and the capitalist countries. The Communists have always been in the forefront of those fighting for peace and progress. The appeal issued recently by the Communist parties of the European capitalist countries is a call for peace, for uniting all working people, all who believe in progress and freedom.

The Communist parties are now in a more favorable position to solve the burning public issues in the capitalist countries. In addition to exposing the imperialist policy of the ruling circles, they are advancing their own national and democratic program on all questions of home and foreign policy, a program of practical measures. The Communist parties seek to link the slogans for immediate aims (slogans which take into account the specific conditions in each country) with the perspectives of the working-

class struggle. In working to change the socio-economic conditions the Communists are exposing revisionism which is still the main danger in the international Communist and working-class movement. They are also fighting to overcome dogmatism and sectarianism, which act as a hindrance to winning the masses and to drawing broad sections into the struggle against the monopolies.

Progressive mankind is confident that 1960 will be a year of new great achievements. The countries of socialism will register new victories in the economic, scientific and technological spheres; the people will enjoy higher living standards and achieve further progress in culture. The ideas of communism will become even more attractive. These factors will play an important role in the outcome of the peaceful economic competition between the two systems, which opens up the realistic prospect of delivering humanity from the oppressing fear of war and the frenzied arms drive.

But the road to this goal will not be a smooth one. Many difficulties and dangers lie ahead. In order to overcome them and to realize the aspirations of mankind the working people and all democrats must be united. Only persistent struggle and resolute mass action will crown with victory the cause of peace and ensure a happy future for our generation and for our children.

Among Our Contributors

THOMAS WEGENER: Member of the Political Bureau, C.C., Communist Party of Germany.

BORIS RYURIKOV: Soviet writer.

NIKOLAI IRIBADZHAKOV: Bulgarian philosopher, editor of "New Times," theoretical organ of the C.C., Communist Party of Bulgaria.

IB NORLUND: Secretary of the C.C., Communist Party of Denmark.

LARS JUNTILA: Secretary of the C.C., Communist Party of Finland.

Man and Socialism

B. Ryurikov

(Polemical Notes)

ANTI-COMMUNIST propagandists know how to work in their own way—with the situation changing they alter their tune, new notes appear in old melodies. One cannot fail to notice that of late they have been playing with particular zeal one and the same raucous tune: socialism threatens the individual, prevents the development of the personality.

In the not too distant past there were cries that socialism was fraught with misery, low living standards, stagnation in technology and production, that the economic plans of the socialist countries were bound to fail, and so on. Who nowadays will take these tales seriously? From their own experience the people in the socialist countries know that socialism has brought them a better life. And even to the blind, upon encountering socialism's feats in science and technology—the space rockets, Sputniks, the nuclear-powered icebreaker, world-leading jet airliners—it is clear who leads in these spheres.

So now a new tune is heard with increasing intensity: true, there is more bread, meat, footwear, clothing in the socialist countries; true, they have excellent machines. But the socialist system allegedly suppresses the individual. Admitting the considerable material progress made by the Soviet Union in recent years, Andrew H. Berding, U.S. Assistant Secretary of State, claimed that it was attained at the sacrifice of other, higher, values, which fact he regretted.

It would be a too obvious exaggeration to say that the idea of Mr. Berding is distinguished by original thinking. His former chief, the late John Foster Dulles, lamented in his *War or Peace* that there was no God in the socialist countries and therefore "the individual personality has no sacredness. What is important is material welfare." Such contentions have become commonplace with bourgeois propagandists. They are to be found, in different versions, in glib articles in the venal capitalist press, and even in the "serious" program recently adopted by the German Social Democratic Party, a program compiled in full accord with bourgeois-liberal social science. The aim is to debunk social-

ism and to extol capitalism—"a system of free enterprise" which, allegedly, favors the development of the individual.

All things need to be examined from the standpoint of history. When capitalist society fought the feudal system it put forward progressive ideas and sought the emancipation of the individual from the fetters of feudal ideology and morals. Not only did capitalism bring with it a tremendous growth of the productive forces and a rapid technological advancement—the transition from feudalism to capitalism opened up, to use the words of Marx, a new field of freer development for the individual, and Marxism has always recognized the progressive significance of this transition. While they have never idealized bourgeois democracy, Marxists realize that this democracy enabled the working class to unite, organize and become aware of its role. But with the march of history capitalism has become "the most reactionary impediment to human progress" (Lenin). The imperialist bourgeoisie openly tramples underfoot all progressive aspirations in an attempt to save the system—inimical to the majority of mankind—from the advance of the progressive forces working for peace and socialism.

Vice-President Nixon recently stated that the United States "has from the standpoint of distribution of wealth come closest to the ideal of prosperity for all in a classless society."

The *New York World Telegram and Sun* carried a series of articles by its correspondent W. Klein on the New York slums — overcrowded, lacking even elementary conveniences. The people in question are not a small group. New York, the richest city in the capitalist world, has, according to Klein, 1,132,000 people living in slums. . . . The author wrote that all the loathsome signs of misery lacking any signs of spiritual life, turned out, when he came in close contact with it, to be even more horrible than he had imagined. And perhaps the most horrible thing about it was that poverty existed alongside abundance, hunger amidst fabulous wealth.

We would like to know what the slum residents, whose conditions are admitted as being monstrous even by the capitalist press, think about this "ideal prosperity"?

True, the United States is a rich country with a high standard of living. Its historical development, the exploitation of considerable areas of the world and the rapacity of the monopolies have enabled it to become a world banker and usurer, systematically multiplying its riches.

But the apologists of the "American way of life" are reluctant to notice the reverse side of the medal—chronic unemployment, ruin of the farmers, polarization of wealth, the inequality of Negroes, immigrants and others.

The main thing is that in the "American paradise" the economy and politics serve the mercenary interests of the monopolies with the result that even economic and technological progress (automation, mechanization) turns against the working people, and becomes for them a scourge. The boasting of Nixon reminds us how important it is not to be content with "average figures" but to analyze the concrete conditions of the people, their different categories, without losing sight of the general trend. And this trend in the capitalist countries is determined by the fact that the capitalist system rests on the appropriation by a tiny handful of the riches created by millions; this is the main thing that blocks the way to a broad and free development of the individual.

After Khrushchov's American visit Senator Thomas Dodd declared that the Soviet leader had harmed "the cause of freedom" by succeeding, as he put it, in pushing the hatred of communism into the background. The German philosopher K. Jaspers even finds theoretical justification for use of the A-bomb against the socialist camp. According to his logic, fomenting hatred for the builders of the new world is a manifestation of freedom. Modern war with its merciless and destructive force is a deadly menace to the very existence of millions of people.

The misanthropic advocacy of war, of arms as a means of settling controversial issues, the glorification of violence and brute force as a standard of relations—all this is profoundly hostile to the personality.

Capitalism inculcates individualist ethics based on private property, greed, brutality and thirst for aggrandizement and strives to imprison people in the stifling world of selfish interests.

From this it by no means follows that the ruling classes of the capitalist countries have managed to mould the working people in their own image. To think thus would mean failure to understand and respect the soul of the people. The historical path of the people is one of creation and construction. This path awakens to life and unites the forces of resistance to the destructive tendencies of private property. The struggle against enslavement and for a better life unites one exploited generation after another, tempers their spirit, deepens their class consciousness, the spirit of collectivism, fraternal solidarity and militant staunchness, produces men of character, brilliant and spiritually rich individuals from the midst of the people.

If the working people in the capitalist countries succeed at times in making definite and considerable advances in culture and intellectual life (education, progressive literature, democratic theatre and cinema), they do so in stubborn struggle against the ruling classes. This struggle of the masses is a counterweight to the destruction of the individual under capitalism.

Our ideological opponents, claiming that Marxism attacks the individual and his development, assume the pose of defenders of the individual.

"Freedom means individualism," exclaims the American columnist C. L. Sulzberger. If that is so, then criticizing individualism means opposing freedom. But if we have in mind not merely words but their profound meaning, Marxists are for complete and all-round development of the *individual*, for the creation of social conditions that facilitate his progress, precisely because they are against *individualism* with its counterposing of the individual to society and to other people.

To the individualist, freedom means weakened social bonds, lack of moral obligations, and love of self. But any sincere person will turn his back on this sort of "freedom." Genuine freedom signifies cognizance of the laws of nature and society and the possibility of taking actions that are guided by knowledge and noble convictions. The individual who goes it alone is powerless, in fact he cannot exist in the real world isolated from society. Only Baron Muenchhausen could drag himself out of a bog by pulling the tail of his wig. "Free will" minus contact with the advanced forces of the epoch, and drifting in different directions driven by occasional winds, is in fact a manifestation of

ugly dependence on the worst effects of the world of private property.

The personality has no more dangerous enemies than those philosophers who sing the praises of the individual—solitary, lonely, and opposed to the world. They write about the individual as the “supreme treasure,” about the “inner rights of the individual,” “respect for the individual.” But they deprive the individual of the main thing — *the basis of development* — contact with social progress. Bourgeois individualism leads the individual away from public life, turns him into a hermit, spiritually impoverishes and de-personalizes him.

Modern bourgeois idealist philosophy — existentialism, personalism, pragmatism, positivism, etc. — tries to justify individualism, to ennoble the egoistic concept of the individual. Thus, existentialism which is in vogue now counterposes individual spiritual life to the real, social, economic life. “The clearer I perceive the world the more lonely I feel in it, which, being alien to me, cannot give me consolation,” proclaims K. Jaspers, apostle of German existentialism. M. Heidegger, only recently a Nazi theoretician, and today the standard-bearer of philosophical thinking in West Germany, contends that “being-in-the-world . . . means always being for one’s own sake.”

The modern quest for seclusion is in fact designed to conceal the desire of the “strong” man to secure his well-being and happiness by subordinating and suppressing others or the desire of the spiritually weak to flee from society and the difficulties of social struggle to the world of illusions. The French philosopher J. Politzer aptly called the “freedom of intellect” propagated by bourgeois individualists, the *freedom of indifference* to man. Any moralizing theory or “philosophical” concept which leads the individual away from real life and isolates him in an abstract world are false and reactionary, and do harm both to society and the individual. “Only in community with others has each individual the means of cultivating his gifts in all directions; only in the community, therefore, is personal freedom possible,” Marx wrote in *The German Ideology*.

Marxism severely criticizes the ideology which extols the right of the strong to climb up at the expense of the happiness and lives of people like himself or who preaches indifference to society and people.

Sermons on solitude cannot give one any perspective, and it is not fortuitous that the pronouncements of individualist philosophers

reek of utter pessimism. Their books are full of gloomy predictions. In fat volumes and in thin booklets the authors predict “the end of history,” “absolute death” — ideas designed to suppress social feeling, to disseminate passivity and the sense of doom.

The chief character in *The Break*, a novel by the Yugoslav author M. Lalic, has the following reasoning about life and death and the transitory being: “Death is quiet, or at least it cannot torment man. Life alone is brutal. It is crafty in its tricks and is multifaced all the time. . . . At times life awakens people, charming them with tales about the kingdom of freedom, deceiving them into what they think to be yet unexplored fields. But then it assails them with an animal fear and drives them back. And so it has been for all time: from the time of Spartacus to the time of the Spartak uprising in Germany. Old Sisyphus rolls his stone up the hill.”

Thus, life and the struggle for freedom are endless and useless Sisyphean labors, while peace comes only with death! The above-mentioned M. Heidegger poses the same problem not in fiction but in philosophy. “Is there for being-in-the-world a higher instance of the possibility of being than death?” Fear is proclaimed the highest quality of the individual, for it reminds one of the tragic nature of the world and attests to the complexity of those who comprehend this tragic nature. The fearless are ordinary and hackneyed. Only fear distinguishes an extraordinary personality. “Fear alone, because it isolates, contains possibilities of superlative development.”

Such is the unique nature of the personality: each trembles in his own way, teeth chattering in an agony of fear. One would hardly envy such “individuality . . .” Indeed, what sort of philosophy is it if it *envies the dead* instead of *inspiring the living*?

It is becoming increasingly difficult for the capitalist ideologists to hold the peoples in check, so they resort to intimidation and moral suppression in order to divert the masses into passivity. They are trying to frighten the masses with communism, the atom bomb, the forthcoming Asian invasion of Europe, and similar “horrors” up to the appearance on our planet of horrible cosmic creatures. To the old apocalyptic forecasts is added the panic-stricken feeling of the lost characters of the atomic and space age who delare themselves to be “castaways on a doomed planet.”

But our planet does not in any way resemble a ship wrecked in a storm. Instead

of ending, the history of mankind is just beginning. People who know the laws of social development and who are taking part in the grand progressive movement of our times—the struggle for socialism—will not yield to pessimism, nor will they lose faith. There are no better means than comradeship, joint struggle and work to instil confidence in the progressive forces, confidence in the mind, the courage and will of the working people, in their ability to curb the destructive forces of oppression and violence. In each generation the people produce from their midst selfless champions of freedom who serve society both in words and in deeds.

The letters of the butchered anti-fascist patriots published in France and Germany depict a courageous and inspiring type of new man, the fighter for happiness for all.

Gabriel Peri, editor of *l'Humanité*, wrote before his execution: "I have remained loyal to the ideal to which I have devoted my whole life. . . . And if I had to live my life over again, I would choose exactly the same path."

Walter Husemann, a German Communist, wrote: "It is easy for me to die because I know what I am dying for. My executioners will, in the not too distant future, die a more horrible death."

Yannis Tsitsilonis, a twenty-year-old Greek patriot, condemned to death by reactionaries, wrote in a letter to his mother: "When the day of freedom comes, when the bells ring out the glad tidings of joy and victory, you, mother, will say to yourself that they are being rung by Yannis, your son."

When Pierre Guyot, a young French patriot, was called to the colors and sent to Algeria he declared he would not use arms against the Algerian people. The court, of course, sent him to jail. But it is people like Raymonde Dien who stopped a train loaded with arms for the "dirty war" in Vietnam; like Henri Martin who raised his voice in protest against the bloody plans of the imperialists: like Pierre Guyot and other young French patriots, who defended the genuine interests and the national dignity of France. They showed what a man can do when he clearly realizes his duty and has a firm will.

To bourgeois humiliation and suppression of the individual the new world counterposes its splendid motto: "Man, how proud the word sounds!"

Socialism has abolished private ownership of the means of production, the basis for enslaving the individual in capitalist society, replacing it with common ownership. It has opened the way to progress in all spheres of public and personal life. Not profits, but the well-being of each member of society and the fullest satisfaction of his material and spiritual needs constitute the goal of social production under socialism. *Social progress* serves the development of man, while new *relations between people* in production, in public and personal life contribute to the all-round development of socialist society.

"If man is shaped by his surroundings, his surroundings must be made human," wrote Marx in *The Holy Family*. And life demonstrates with increasing clarity the profundity and effective meaning of these words.

The era of building socialism and transition to communism is marked by an unprecedented activity of the millions who rise to the pinnacles of statesmanship, creative labor, culture and science. Everyone has a vast field before him where he can apply and develop his talents and abilities.

People's China is making a truly magnificent leap in its economy and culture. Industrialization and the rise of people's communes imperatively demanded the mobilization of forces, knowledge, experience and the initiative of hundreds of thousands, indeed millions of people; the great transformations are a school where millions learn creative work. In the German Democratic Republic there are over 50,000 socialist labor teams which represent a wonderful combination of enthusiasm, innovation and daring. Their efforts are accelerating the political and cultural advancement of the workers.

Or take the experience of the Rumanian, Bulgarian and Czechoslovak producers' co-operatives which have produced tens and hundreds of thousands of talented organizers, the masters of the land, who are working successfully to create abundance.

Reactionary propagandists call people of the free socialist countries "captives of communism." Life gives the lie to these concoctions, showing their authors to be captives of capitalism—slaves of the inkwell.

The broadest possible development of the working people and the fullest utilization of their abilities is the law of socialist society whose motive force is the consciousness, talent, will and energy of the millions.

Bourgeois critics of our system cannot understand (or they pretend not to under-

stand) the new relations under socialism. The *New York Herald Tribune* reported a speech by Philip D. Reed, president of the General Electric Co., who, commenting on the possibilities of the Soviet Seven-Year Plan, noted that the Russian system precluded free enterprise and incentive for capitalists, and predicted that the Russian drive for economic superiority would, in the long run, crash against this rock which, in his view, was a fundamental drawback.

A nameless emigre "researcher" wrote in a booklet put out by the notorious Institute for Study of the USSR, a U.S. espionage center in Munich, that the Soviet regime had abolished private property and by so doing had closed the way to personal initiative in industry, agriculture, trade and other branches.

So the personality is suppressed and the ways to "personal initiative" closed, because under socialism no one can become a capitalist, a landlord or a department store owner. What a profound self-exposure of the "critics of socialism" is to be seen behind these reproaches. For them success means enrichment and gain. . . . What poverty of psychology there must be in the man, if he sees no stars in the sky other than the career of a prosperous shopkeeper!

The views of the revisionists who contrast the individual to society and the state are imbued with the bourgeois spirit. In this respect mention should be made of an article by M. Vassilev published in the Yugoslav journal *Socializam* and entitled "Socialism and the Personality." The aim of the article is to substantiate and defend the "theoretical postulates" of the program of the Yugoslav League of Communists where it speaks about the individual. The program, as we know, contains an obscure anarchic formula:

"Socialism cannot subordinate man's personal happiness to some 'higher aims' because man's happiness is the supreme goal of socialism."

Yes, socialism is being built for man, but he cannot achieve happiness in solitude—for this he joins the common ranks of fighters and builders. Industrial and social organization requires that the individual join the common movement and be subordinate to it in both common and personal interests. Revisionism implants scepticism in relation to the common aim, and demagogically flirts with the individual whom it undertakes to "protect" from serving higher aims. Vassilev, for example, supplies one of the chapters in

his article with the following title: "'Higher Aims' Versus Man's Personal Happiness."

"Marx never conceived any preference for 'society' to the individual after the positive abolition of private ownership," writes Vassilev, and further: "Under socialism the 'individual' can be subordinated to society only on the basis of bureaucratic despotism, which of necessity manifests itself as a subordination of the working individual to the 'system' which rules over him, instead of the individual utilizing the system to regulate his own relations."

Such is the tune of these forlorn theorists who cling to the rotten dogmas of the ideology of private property. Revolutionary Marxism rejects in principle the counterposing of the individual to society, a counterposing which Vassilev so strongly favors. Marx trenchantly criticized anarchic individualism and disregard of the common interests. In his article "On Authority" spearheaded against anarchic tendencies, Engels, proceeding from the requirements of socialist production, writes that a certain authority, a certain subordination is compulsory for us "by virtue of the material conditions under which production and the circulation of products take place." Speaking about questions of organizing production Engels stresses: "Whether they are settled by decision of a delegate placed at the head of each branch of labor, or, if possible, by a majority vote, the will of the single individual will always be subordinated." This problem was tackled by Lenin in an even more definite and concrete way (cf., for example, his work *The Immediate Tasks of Soviet Government*).

Marxism and the collectivist outlook inherent in it has done incomparably more for the development of the individual than all individualist philosophers, no matter to what stellar nebulae they elevate the individual in words. Socialist society—more than any other society—is concerned with the happiness of each man, with the development of his personality. But one cannot reach this all alone, in isolation from society and without the backing of the state, particularly in conditions when socialism is opposed by the old world.

Vassilev attacks what he calls "étatisme," the "hegemony" of society, the hegemony of "higher aims," discipline, subordination, etc. Denying in essence that socialism signifies the harmonious combination of common and personal interests, the author assumes the role of a zealous advocate of the personal against the common. With the unity of the

common and individual interests, the conscious and free subordination to the common decision means co-ordinated and united action, free of coercion and violence. But Vassilev views socialism through the prism of an offended Philistine who regards any subordination to the common interests as suppression of his individuality.

Our argument with the revisionists is not about abstract, purely theoretical ideas. The building of socialism and the gradual transition to communism require organization and discipline, thorough and sober analysis of all particulars of the development, effective leadership and united action. In the socialist countries there are as yet bureaucrats, shirkers, and anti-social elements. Some are still affected by the corrupting "traditions" of capitalism. Socialist society cleanses social and personal relations of all bourgeois survivals, above all through the strength of public opinion and collective influence. Some morally-corrupt elements claim that the demand for discipline and order restricts the "freedom of the personality." But it is precisely respect for the personality of an honest worker that makes it imperative to show the shirker, the parasite and the egoist where his place is. Arbitrary action on the part of one man is always a restriction and violation of the rights of others. Freedom of the individual by no means denies discipline, civic duty and respect for people and their community.

* * *

When young workers of the team headed by Anatoly Ledyshev at the Orjonikidze Machine-Tool Factory in Moscow formed a communist labor team, they introduced their pledge with the following words: "Let us imagine that the dream has come true: tomorrow we are entering communism."

Their decision was to take up work with a will, to regard it as a prime necessity and joy, to work in a creative, industrious way, be keen on everything, adopt the rule, "each for all and all for each," exchange experience and study, improve ethics and culture.

When Soviet people were bringing the virgin land under the plough, building plants in the Siberian taiga and power stations on the uninhabited banks of great rivers they were inspired by social aims, by the noble ideals of socialism.

"The spirit of individualism, self-interest, the thirst for profit, hostility and competition—these are the essence of the ethics of bourgeois society," said Khrushchov at the Twenty-First Congress of the CPSU. "Social-

ism upholds different ethics — co-operation and collectivism, friendship and mutual assistance. It accentuates concern for the common good of the people, for the all-round development of the human personality in a collective where man is a friend and brother to man, not an enemy."

Important changes are taking place in socialist society; ideological, ethical incentives and public influence will, more and more, replace administrative regulation.

Active participation in the life of society and the state, the right to work, the opportunity to choose a profession, to get an education, to enjoy leisure and to benefit from a free health service, freedom of conscience, freedom of the press, assembly and demonstrations in the interests of the people, the growing material and cultural standards — all add up to *real guarantees* of a full and all-round development of personality.

The denunciation of the personality cult which is alien to Marxism-Leninism, has further raised the activity of the masses. Intolerance of defects, conservatism and bureaucracy, the desire to be rid of them are still another example of the people being masters of all social life.

To capitalism's promise of a refrigerator, car and a TV set for the fortunate, communism counterposes the call to build a society in which there will be *plenty for all*.

The Soviet Union knows no unemployment, no bankrupt farmers and no poverty. Its national income is designed to meet the needs of the working people. Between 1940-58, which includes the period when the country was affected by the grimmest of wars, the real income of the factory and office workers doubled while that of the peasants more than doubled. The Seven-Year Plan will further raise these incomes. This year all factory and office workers will go over to a six- and seven-hour working day without reduction in wages; on the contrary, in some cases wages will go up. Speaking generally, the USSR will soon have the shortest working day and working week; taxation will shortly be abolished while wages and pensions will rise.

The "aristocrats of the spirit" engrossed in pure thinking might be shocked by "earthly" practice. At the philosophers' congress in Venice some blamed materialist philosophers for mixing up philosophy with "transient interests."

One might pretend that philosophy is above prosaic life, but if a science turns

away from the everyday life of the millions, so much the worse for it. One might with studied arrogance "disregard" the fact that the Soviet Union will soon have the shortest working day, or scorn the question of what introduction of the latest technology in industry and the greater part played by scientists in production mean for the workers. But those who know the value of labor are well aware of what it means: work becomes increasingly more mental and is enriched through all the achievements of the human mind; the essential distinctions between manual and mental labor are rapidly disappearing. Labor, no longer a burden, becomes the prime necessity of man, an outlet for his energies, a source of joy and delight. This process is only one stage in the development of the human personality.

The movement of advanced workers is associated with the name of Valentina Gaganova, team leader in a textile mill, who took up more difficult work, despite a temporary reduction in wages, to enable those who were lagging to catch up with those ahead and thus achieve common success.

The nobility of our times is often manifest in the commonplace things. Gaganova, at the time leader of an advanced work-team, was advising Ludmilla Shabalova, leader of a team working below capacity. Ludmilla answered with a grudge: "It's easy to talk! Have a go and see what you can do."

Taking over the backward team Gaganova demonstrated that she was *not taking a detached view* of the work of her comrades, rather that a class-conscious worker is responsible for the shop, the plant, moreover, for the country as a whole.

This is a good example of the new attitude of the workers to labor. Today in the Soviet Union three million workers, engineers and technicians participate in the communist labor teams. In 1958 alone 1,600,000 rationalization suggestions were introduced in industry, which saved the state 8.5 billion rubles. What a mighty force popular initiative is can be seen from the determination of workers in many factories and branches of industry to fulfil their seven-year plan in six, five years and even in less time. Thus, the advanced thinking of workers and engineers is becoming a motive force in our society.

Labor is becoming more skilled, rising to the level of an engineer. Technological progress accelerates the intellectual growth of the workers. In Odessa, for example, an Institute of Advanced Methods of Labor was organized on the initiative of the turner G.

Nezhevenko. The function of the Institute, whose instructors are engineers and workers, is to introduce new experience in production.

Technological progress in the Soviet Union is not commanded "from above," by administrative methods, as our opponents claim, but is initiated from below by the workers, with the active support of the state and administrative bodies and of the people as a whole.

Many workers, collective farmers, engineers, teachers, etc., have won countrywide renown. When we are told that the new system will not create incentives for personal initiative, we needn't argue the subject in an abstract way. The sceptics — who can hardly be said to be without self-interest — have already had the answer from life, from the experience of all the socialist countries: there is no need to "look for" what has long been found, which is real and has demonstrated its strength by its accomplishments. The socialist system, putting an end to the inhuman and brutal incentives of an exploiting society, has found *new incentives*, new motive forces of social conduct, and by so doing, appeals not to egoistic instincts but to the best in the human personality, to man's initiative.

The development of the productive forces and higher material standards raise sharply the demand for spiritual and cultural development. Marx pointed out that reducing social labor to the necessary minimum was an important condition for the free development of the individual. He called free time *the time for leisure and superior activity*. And socialism ensures this possibility not to the chosen few or to the lucky ones, but to all.

A democratic, popular culture is being developed in the socialist countries. There are more books, films, theatres, museums, radio and TV stations. Workers and engineers, who now have more leisure, are flocking to the people's universities (and there are over a thousand of these in the USSR) where lectures on history, philosophy, ethics, music and literature are read; they take part in amateur theatricals, go in for sport. The world of knowledge, of noble and humane feeling, is opening up more and more to them.

In the Soviet Union there are over 200,000 amateur art groups and choirs embracing some four million factory and office workers and collective farmers. The quality of their performances is so high that it became possible to open dozens of amateur theatres.

The socialist way of life, now taking shape in the countries free of exploitation, shows the whole world the way to happiness. The man of the new world whose labor has become free and joyful is developing into a harmonious personality combining communist ideology with a wide range of knowledge, professional training and physical perfection. There is no need to guess what the man of the future will look like. This new man cannot be invented or designed in a laboratory — he is growing and maturing in the course of building communism, casting off all the grime of the past and acquiring new traits. It is clear that with the growth and consolidation of the new social system there is emerging a new *type of personality* absorbing everything noble and humane created by past history, and indicating the splendid new era in human development.

Socialism has laid the foundations for the universal development of the individual, it makes man nobler, spiritually richer and adds to his talents; and this is only the beginning.

* * *

When Marx was asked for his views on happiness, he replied: *struggle*. In reply to the question what he considered to be his characteristic feature, he answered: *unity of purpose*.

A definite social stand, a clear world outlook, purposefulness and consistency in working for the ideals of communism—such is the basis on which personality develops.

Socialism produces people of splendid moral fibre. The founders of scientific communism — Marx, Engels, Lenin — and their followers, will forever remain an example of moral greatness. And that brilliant group of revolutionary fighters — K. Liebknecht, E. Thaelmann, G. Dimitrov, M. Cachin, A. Gramsci, C. Zetkin — were all people with clear heads, iron wills and noble souls. The men of the Soviet Army, the Resistance fighters in Europe, the workers and peasants opposing the monopolies, the common people fight-

ing against the war danger and the revival of fascism—all personify the nobleness of the new world. And everywhere we see Communists marching in the front ranks of the working people. The Communist Party has been banned in Federal Germany and is declared anti-constitutional in the United States; in France the Communists are hounded by neo-fascists; in some colonies they have been driven underground. But is it possible to halt the march of history?

Ernst Thaelmann wrote in a letter from prison: "Integrity of character is the inalienable quality of the progressive personality, for the value and the scale of personality are determined by its character. What is most typical of a personality? That a man at any moment can subordinate all his being to the idea in a desire to attain something higher. . . . The flame which lights our hearts and fills us with spirit, leads us along the battlefields of our life."

Nowadays there is no moral value higher than the ideals of socialism and communism. This makes it incumbent upon us to support everything new and progressive which appears in life and labor, to fight with renewed strength against everything outlived and deformed remaining from the old world.

Socialist society, like a great sculptor, creates strong and harmonious characters free from the defects and vices of the past. Over a hundred years ago the *Communist Manifesto* predicted the appearance and the triumph of people of this caliber. For over a century revolutionary Marxism in its fight to reconstruct society along socialist lines and for the emancipation and happiness of the working people, has, simultaneously, been moulding the new man. And the everyday activity of the people guarantees that the society of complete human happiness will be built. And in the face of the grandeur and beauty of this daily exploit the attempts of the slanderers and detractors to blacken the new world and the new man are indeed miserable and trifling.

Apologetics of Capitalism

(Apropos of the New Program of the Social Democratic Party of Germany)

Thomas Wegener

THE Extraordinary Congress of the Social Democratic Party of Germany held in Bad-Godesberg in November 1959 adopted a new, "fundamental program." The very name "fundamental program" is deceptive. How can one talk about fundamental theses when Ollenhauer, the Party chairman, declared in his opening speech that the draft could not be described as a scientific document? Indeed, there is nothing scientific about the new program. The abandonment of the scientific approach is the direct consequence of the official rejection of Marxism. Ullrich Lohmar, a Right-wing theoretician, whose group has seized the leading posts in the Party, defined the ideological base of the new program in the following terms:

"Marxism as a philosophical, economic and social theory has been deposited by the Social Democrats in their archives."

Thus the authors of the Godesberg program have gone farther than the old-style revisionists who abandoned the teaching of Marx and Engels step by step, and who hadn't the heart to proclaim this openly; this is evident from the previous Heidelberg program adopted in 1925.

The West German bourgeoisie, not to speak of the bourgeoisie of other countries, has welcomed the new program. *Der Rheinische Merkur*, organ of Adenauer's Christian Democratic Union, claimed the new program was "the result of the educational work of the Christian Democratic Union." The *Washington Post and Times Herald* in its editorial "Burial of Marxism" noted with satisfaction that by adopting the new program the German Social Democrats have ceased to be a Socialist party in the true sense of the word. The American paper expressed the hope that henceforth the two-party system will be as firmly established in the political life of Germany as it is in the United States. What an inviting prospect for the Party of Bebel and Liebknecht—to become the image of one of the two ruling parties of a big imperialist power!

The Swedish *Dagens Nyheter* triumphantly announced that the new program crowns

"an epoch of socialist illusions." Lastly, *Il Popolo*, organ of the Italian Christian Democratic Party, which is close to the Vatican, hailed the "bold step taken by the German Social Democrats in freeing themselves from ambiguity."

Why is world imperialism so kindly disposed towards the program of a party which has numerous followers among the working people of West Germany who are opposed to imperialist policy? Why is it so eager to grant the certificate of loyalty to this party? The explanation is that the monopoly bourgeoisie in each country hopes that the abandonment of Marxism by the German Social Democratic Party — one of the oldest and most influential of the Social Democratic parties — will discredit this teaching in the eyes of the working class and weaken the revolutionary character of the international labor movement. The German Social Democrats are publicizing their program as a document of international significance, as the embodiment of "democratic socialism."

There can be no doubt that the Right-wing Social Democrats in Federal Germany and in other countries will use the Godesberg program in an attempt to deceive the working class. That is why a critical analysis of this document will not be out of place.

German Social-Democratic Leaders Side with Militarism

Let us look first of all at the attitude taken by the Social Democrats to the decisive issue of our times—the danger of a new world war. The program says: "The Social Democratic Party of Germany stands for defense of the free democratic system. It maintains that defense of the country is a necessity."

In order to understand the meaning of this formula let us recall the former stand of the Social-Democratic leaders on this question. At their Stuttgart Congress in May 1958, they declared that they would never recognize "defense of the country" as a necessity as long as the Adenauer government is in power and the cold war policy pursued. The Stuttgart resolution read: "Only when the present

foreign and military policy has been replaced by another policy of relaxing tensions and reuniting Germany in conditions of guaranteed freedom will it be possible to organize a reasonable national defense of the Federal Republic." Thus barely a year and a half ago the Social-Democratic leaders admitted that under the Adenauer regime "defense of the country" was simply a screen for the militarist and anti-people's policy. Indeed, it was the big capitalists and the leaders of their party — the Christian Democratic Union — who, in implementing the arms drive and in preparing revanchist action against the democratic states, preferred to wait for the opportune moment before putting their cards on the table; it was they who were the first to speak hypocritically about "defense of the country."

The Stuttgart Congress unanimously condemned the introduction of conscription. However, the present program makes no mention of this: the party does not express any views on conscription, apart from stating its readiness to defend any citizen refusing to serve in the army "if this goes against his conscience." In the "fundamental program" there is no mention of the party's stand on this fundamental issue!

At the Stuttgart Congress, Ollenhauer declared that the fight against atomic armament, far from being "a matter of tactics, was a matter of life and death." At the same time the demand to prohibit atomic weapons on the territory of the Federal Republic, though endorsed by the majority of the delegates to the Bad-Godesberg Congress, was not included in the "fundamental program."

It is true that further on the program — obviously under pressure from the anti-militarist rank and file — proclaims that the maintenance of peace is "a vital and urgent task." But the new line of the Social-Democratic leaders on militarization indicates that so far as they are concerned this declaration is nothing but a flowery phrase doomed to a paper existence.

What is the explanation for this about turn? Is it because the objective conditions have changed?

Neither the international nor the internal situation is assessed in the program. This omission, a deliberate one, enabled the leaders to by-pass the burning issues of today, to conceal from their rank and file that they are for a state in which power belongs to the monopolists whose main instrument is militarism. Two forms of this militarism have been developed to the extreme, forms which

Lenin characterized as "military force used by the capitalist states in external conflicts ('Militarismus nach aussen' — to use the German term)" and "arms which in the hands of the ruling classes are used for suppressing all kinds of (economic and political) movements of the proletariat ('Militarismus nach innen')." The adoption of revanchism as the official line and the banning of the Communist Party show that Lenin's words apply in full measure to the situation in Federal Germany. At present the monopolists exercise their power in the form of a military-clerical dictatorship screened by a flimsy parliamentary veil. And yet the Social-Democratic leaders have the nerve to speak of defending their "free, democratic system"! If democracy is threatened, it is not threatened from without, it is threatened from within — by the lords and masters.

In reality the objective conditions have changed. Now more than ever before the people of West Germany are alarmed at the atomic arming of the country. Foreign missile launching sites are being installed, missile production at home is being boosted, and atom-bomb and rocket dumps are being replenished. The people are becoming increasingly aware that these steps have nothing in common with security.

An even more important change is that as a result of Khrushchov's visit to the United States the ice of cold war has begun to thaw. This visit has not only had an effect on Soviet-U.S. relations but also on conditions in many other countries. The idea of peaceful coexistence is making headway all over the world, including West Germany. Such a factor as the change in the world balance of forces as a result of the moral, political and military superiority of the camp of peace and socialism has had an impact on the West Germans. The proposals for universal disarmament submitted to the UN by Khrushchov on behalf of the Soviet Government, together with the prospects opened up by the economic successes of the socialist countries are stimulating the people of the Federal Republic to struggle actively for an alternative to Adenauer's bankrupt policy. The proposals of the German Democratic Republic aimed at relaxing the tension in Germany, at stopping rearmament and the installation of atomic weapons, securing a peace treaty with Germany, settling the West Berlin question peacefully and concluding a non-aggression pact with the Federal Republic

*V. I. Lenin, *Militant Materialism and Anti-Militarist Tactics of Social Democracy*.

lic are winning prestige for the Democratic Republic among the people in West Germany.

Two factors, namely, the relaxation of international tension together with the growing popularity of the policy pursued by the socialist countries, and the awareness among the people of the danger ensuing from the militarist course of their government, are making things difficult for Adenauer and Co. The particularly aggressive West German imperialists are doing their utmost to create conditions which will enable them to persevere in their criminal "positions of strength" policy. But these conditions can be created only by overcoming the resistance of the working class and the people to the militarist course. To achieve this the German militarists could not but approach their old friends — the Right-wing Social Democrats.

The fact that after the war the Right-wing leaders, despite the bitter lessons of history, managed to maintain the split in the working class of West Germany enabled the monopolists to re-establish and consolidate their domination. With the aid of anti-communism and lucrative jobs on the supervisory boards of companies and international monopolies, Big Business managed to woo the Right-wing leaders for German imperialism.

Paradoxical though it may sound, it is a fact that the Right-wing Social Democrats support the imperialist army and militarist policy of West Germany at the very moment when real possibilities for a general relaxation of tension and for disarmament have appeared; it is worth noting that they proclaim this support in the country which constitutes the gravest threat to peace in Europe. The section of the program under discussion (and this is true of other sections, too) shows that the monopolists and the militarists have succeeded in getting the Right-wing leaders of the Social Democratic Party to abandon an independent policy.

Their explanation of this step is that by recognizing "defense of the country" as a necessity, the Social Democratic Party will be able to "wield more power and influence in the state." In other words, they are saying that by adopting the stand of the Christian Democrats on this issue the Social Democrats will win more votes in the forthcoming elections to the Federal Parliament. But this means that they are simply deceiving the workers, and the members of the Social Democratic Party in the first instance. The Adenauer party can be pushed into the background only on the condition that its oppon-

ents, long before the elections, rally the people against the Chancellor's policy, that is, against militarism and revanchism.

Support for Monopolies

The main part of the "fundamental program" is the socio-economic section which intertwines with the final part "The Way." These sections say: "The proletarian, who at one time had no rights and was defenseless . . . , who was simply an object of exploitation by the ruling classes, now occupies his place as a citizen with recognized equal rights and duties." ". . . The object of the Social-Democratic economic policy is constantly growing well-being and a fair share for all in the income derived from the national economy, life in conditions of freedom without an undignified dependence and exploitation."

Whereas the Heidelberg program acknowledged the exploitation of the working people by the capitalists, the new program denies this. Whereas the Heidelberg program proclaimed the need to nationalize the land, minerals and power resources, the new program rejects nationalization outright because it is "fraught with danger." (The danger of socialism, perhaps.) ". . . Free competition and free enterprise are important elements of Social-Democratic economic policy," says the new program. ". . . The Social Democratic Party confirms its adherence to the free market. . . ."

It is clear from this that the leaders of German Social Democracy are determined to maintain the capitalist system, with its private ownership of the means of production and exploitation of the working people. For without this system the "free market" and the other bourgeois "freedoms" so dear to the hearts of the fathers of this program would be out of the question. The economic section of the program is almost an exact copy of the "neo-liberal" concept of the Federal Government, a concept which helps to consolidate the rule of the monopolies under the banner of free competition. Erhard, Federal Minister for Economy, the principal exponent of this concept, immediately confirmed his rights as its author. He was, he said, perfectly satisfied with the economic section of the Social Democratic program. "All that is best in it," he added, "has been taken from me; the facade, it is true, being given a fresh coat of paint." Hence to claim the Godesberg program a socialist program is much the same as saying that Professor Erhard is a Socialist.

Having parted company with Marxism, the Social-Democratic leaders have abandoned

the materialist conception of society according to which the nature of production relations determines all the institutions of society. The authors of the program claim that under the capitalist mode of production a fundamental change in the distribution of the national income can be achieved without affecting the production relations, merely by establishing a "fair wage policy." They then contradict themselves by saying that "those who run the big economic organizations have charge of values worth millions and command tens of thousands of workers; they not only run the economy but exercise domination over people . . . , they are usurpers of state power." And unless the relations of ownership are changed, that is, unless the economic power of the monopolies is abolished, the latter, dominant as they are in the sphere of distribution, will hardly be "more fair" in sharing the national income.

This point, of course, is ignored in the program.

The complacent claim is made that the program is an "advance" on Marx. Its authors, it would seem, are unaware that Marx in his *Critique of the Gotha Program* left not a stone upon a stone of a similar edifice erected by the founders of German Social Democracy. Marx wrote: "The distribution of the means of consumption at any time is only a consequence of the distribution of the conditions of production themselves. The latter distribution, however, is a feature of the mode of production itself. . . . Vulgar socialism . . . has taken over from the bourgeois economists the consideration and treatment of distribution as independent of the mode of production and hence the presentation of socialism as turning principally on distribution." These words, written 84 years ago, apply in full measure to the vulgar Socialists of our day.

Since it is impossible wholly to close one's eyes to monopoly domination the authors of the program get over the difficulty by speaking about mysterious "groups of interests." There is an indignant condemnation of "abuse of economic power," but, in contrast to the Heidelberg program, not a word is said about abolishing the monopolies.

The new line, then, ends in surrender to monopoly capital. The Right-wing Social Democrats see their role in the competition between socialism and capitalism as that of helpers of the capitalists, subordinating the workers' interests to those of the imperialist monopolies. And so they compiled the economic part of the program in a way that en-

abled them to cloak the apology for monopoly capitalism in the shabby dogma of vulgar socialism.

Don Quixotes or Frauds?

Of all the words encountered in the program the most widely used is the word "democracy." Democracy, lauded in every way, is, we are told, the supreme aim of all the activities of the Social Democratic Party.

But this statement alone shows that the state of affairs in the Bonn Republic has nothing in common with genuine democracy. This, by the way, was admitted by Ollenhauer at the congress. The proclamation of this aim reflects to a degree the discontent of the rank and file with a system of democracy which in the nature of things can only be democracy for the minority. But here the authors make an about turn. "We," they cry, "are against any kind of dictatorship!" obviously bearing in mind the dictatorship of the proletariat — the supreme form of proletarian democracy. As to the present bourgeois dictatorship in West Germany — that does not worry them.

Caught in a vicious circle — "the present democracy is no good, but we don't want any other" — they propose methods for "improving" society which cannot change anything. And this is understandable: by abandoning the aim of an economic reconstruction of society the authors of the program closed the door to its political reconstruction. Their democratic socialism rests on three pillars: "freedom, justice and solidarity." They are bent on bolstering up, if not erecting, these pillars in the Bonn state. The first word — freedom — is well known from the times of the French Revolution of 1789. Inscribing freedom on its banner capital established itself throughout the world. For the capitalist freedom signified exploitation, justice—appropriation of the surplus value created by the labor of the worker. As to the meaning and origin of the third word—solidarity—the authors are somewhat more than vague: "obligations deriving from the association of people." This is the ideal for which the Social Democrats strive, "whereas the Communists take advantage of the disunity of society. . . ."

True enough, the Communists make no secret of the fact that they take advantage of the "disunity" of capitalist society — which, in the terminology of Marxist-Leninist theory, is class struggle; moreover, they take advantage of it on behalf of the working class, expressing thereby the interests of the majority of mankind as against the relative-

ly small minority which comprises the bourgeoisie. In this way alone is it possible to establish a true democracy, democracy for the majority. "Solidarity" between worker and capitalist can but bring grist to the mills of the latter. "Go back to work," the capitalist says to the striker, "you are damaging your own interests, act in solidarity with me, that is, do what I tell you." Such is the view seen from the top of the three pillars of "democratic socialism," Godesberg style.

It is not fortuitous that bourgeois sociologists and economists develop the same idea of "solidarity" and, seeking to ignore the class struggle, plead with the workers to sign an eternal truce with the bourgeoisie. It will not be amiss to point out that Ollenhauer, parroting these gentlemen, calls upon all sections of society in West Germany to practise "self-restriction and tolerance." In point of fact this call, made from the rostrum of the congress, was addressed to the working people, because to persuade a capitalist to practise "self-restriction" for the sake of "solidarity" with the worker would be just the same as persuading a wolf to become a vegetarian.

In boosting the idea of "solidarity" and avoiding the term "class struggle" the Social Democrats evidently think they will succeed in abolishing class struggle without abolishing capitalism. In other words, the compilers of this program have decided to annul the laws of social development. But propaganda of this kind can only lull the class struggle, and even then only momentarily, until such time as the irrevocable movement of the working people of West Germany sweeps away the tinsel and glitter.

One can hardly fail to notice the kinship between the high-falutin sentimental language of the program and the sermonizing of travelling preachers! As a matter of fact the authors make no effort to hide this, because for them "Christian ethics" is one of the sources of "democratic socialism." This, then, is their socialism! That being so, what term can we apply to the philistine dreams of the bourgeoisie which Marx and Engels ridiculed in their day?! In his criticism of Duehring's "natural system of society" built on "the universal principle of justice" Engels ironically pointed out that Herr Duehring thus saved himself from "any dependence on troublesome material facts . . ." "Our modern Don Quixote, seated on his noble Rosinante 'the universal principle of justice,' . . . rides out proudly on his knight errantry . . ." Engels goes on, "but we fear, we fear, he

brings home nothing but the old familiar barber's basin."*

Engels had every reason to dub Duehring Don Quixote, for he was the victim of his own deception. However, the compilers of the Godesberg program have another aim in mind. They want the German (and not only the German!) working class to take a barber's basin for a knight's helmet, a slightly embellished bourgeois society for a socialist Paradise.

Having abandoned a class position the Social-Democratic leaders deny the leading role of the proletariat in solving national problems, including the issues of strengthening peace and abolishing militarism. What is more, they are not even fighting to win power for their party. Their program speaks only of sharing power with the militarist and clerical reactionaries. Indeed, during the recent elections in West Berlin and Bremen the Social Democrats won an overwhelming majority. But they showed no desire to make use of their majority. They acted against the democratic will of its electors when they entered into a coalition with the Christian Democratic Union, ceding to it the most important posts. That is why one of the members of the Party said that the new program was a "law for emergency powers to collaborate with the Christian Democrats."

Viewing this in the long term it can be said that the policy of the Right-wing leaders is aimed at the self-destruction of the party as a Social Democratic Party, at complete subordination of the working class to the German imperialists. This is another reason why the big bourgeoisie is so delighted with the "fundamental program" of the Social Democrats.

Not only does this program discard the socialist traditions of the party, it relinquishes the idea of fighting to enforce the democratic and freedom-loving will of the people. On the issue which is the touchstone for any German party — namely, national reunification — the Social Democrats have made a step backward — their program makes no mention of their plan for Germany which they submitted last spring; this plan differed essentially from the Adenauer line. Here, too, the Right-wing leaders, acting contrary to the national interests, have adapted themselves to the aims of German imperialism.

The program is silent about the need to annul the medieval law banning the Com-

*F. Engels, *Anti-Duehring*.

munist Party. Its text, moreover, conditioned to anti-communism, is sadly indicative of the solidarity of its compilers with the inspirers of the Karlsruhe trial.

Although designed as a rebuttal of communism, the program has had the opposite effect. Its authors, voluntarily or involuntarily, have demonstrated that the vaunted "third way" simply does not exist, that Social Democracy is identical with bourgeois ideology. The Godesberg program is indeed a sort of culmination — to use the term of *Dagens Nyheter* — not, however, of socialist ideas, but of the evolution of Social Democracy.

The German Working Class Remains True to Socialism

The new program and the Bad-Godesberg congress nevertheless do not fully reflect the situation in the Social Democratic Party of Germany. If one were to compare the amendments (300 in all) sent in by the Party branches with the "fundamental program" as finally adopted, the conclusion could be drawn that profound contradictions are maturing inside the Party. It cannot be otherwise because the workers are the backbone of the Party, and the German working class, raised on socialist traditions, cherishes its ideals. Up to the last moment the leadership trembled for the fate of the program. That is why a few days before the congress opened they resorted to tactics of a "massed onslaught" against the delegates. This move was facilitated by the fact that the opposition was not united and that its spokesmen were unable to offer guidance or perspective. But even after the adoption of the program some of the leaders said that about half of the delegates could not be permitted to report on the congress since the "majority of the delegates interpreted the program in their own way."

It is also noteworthy that most of those who spoke in the debate criticized the program. It was supported mainly by a few of the top leadership. The opposition has a broad base in the branches, on the boards of the larger district organizations, among members of the Bundestag and even among the leaders.

The oppositionists expressed anxiety that the workers and the electorate would not be able to distinguish between the Social Democratic Party and the Christian Democratic Union.

The rejection of the Social-Democratic plan for Germany and above all the cessation of the struggle against atomic rearma-

ment were criticized, as were the rejection of the peace treaty and the proposal for setting up on a parity basis a body to represent the two German states.

The greatest opposition—embracing about one-third of the delegates—was directed against the economic section of the program. The main reason for this was the abandoning of the socialist perspective and the principle of public ownership.

Some of the delegates spoke against the break with Marxism. They emphasized that the developments in West Germany had confirmed the soundness of Marxist theory. This circumstance, which troubled Ollenhauer more than any other point, showed that the working-class core of the Party wants to remain true to Marxism.

The principle of "defense of the country" was severely criticized, despite the fact that only sixteen delegates voted against the section. This is typical of the situation in the party—anyone dissenting on questions of principle faces the threat of expulsion.

Even before the congress members were being expelled at the rate of 30 to 50 a week. After the congress Wehner and the other Right-wing leaders stressed the need to intensify the fight against the Left. The inspirers of the new program have canvassed the co-operation of the Adenauer government in this respect. The so-called "Eastern Bureau" of the Social Democratic Party informs the Bonn police authorities about opposition members.

More and more rank and file members and functionaries are seeking a way out in the effective implementation of a democratic, working-class policy. The opposition elements are closing their ranks, working out demands for an independent policy, which was foreshadowed in the Social-Democratic plan for Germany.

The Right-wing leaders, bent on isolating the opposition, are encouraging passivity among the members. Much will depend on how soon the oppositionists among the rank and file and the functionaries will be able to unite around a common platform and play an active role in the factories and in the trade unions in fighting for the economic, social and cultural demands of the workers.

While this program deepens the division in the working class of West Germany and intensifies the inner-party struggle, the policy of the Communist Party of Germany derives, on the contrary, from the need to overcome the division—the misfortune of the

working class. At the time the new social democratic program was being adopted, the Communist Party was circulating to the people of West Germany the draft resolution of its conference. This draft, headed "The Situation in the Federal Republic and the Fight for Peace and Democracy," explains the need for re-establishing working-class unity, for understanding with the rank-and-file Social Democrats.

In some districts the Communist Party, because of the proscription, has not been able to maintain sufficiently close ties with the Social Democrats. There are opportunist vacillations on the question of the role of the Communist Party; in respect to maintaining relations with the Social Democrats there is much sectarian sentiment. And unless our Party convinces all its members about the opportunities now open for establishing good comradely relations with the Social Democrats in the interests of united action for peace, democracy and the immediate demands of the working people, it may well be that the adoption of the new Social Democratic program will further encourage sectarian sentiment. The leading bodies of the Communist Party should be well informed about the situation in the Social Democratic Party, about the thinking among the Social-Democratic rank and file, the issues on which they argue, and about the replies they get to their numerous questions.

In West Germany there are forces which can ensure the carrying out of a policy of peace and democracy. In the past years they participated in various important movements and are now exerting a growing influence on the developments in the country. But the main shortcoming is that these forces are disunited. In order to re-establish unity of action in the working class painstaking explanatory work is needed. Many comrades

in the Social Democratic Party are aware that it is not the Communists but Adenauer and the Right wing in the Party itself who threaten the independent existence of the Social Democratic Party.

That is why many Social Democrats have protested against the ban enforced by their leaders on contact with the Communists. Experience shows that this contact is natural and inevitable. All the forces in the Federal Republic fighting for peace are establishing contact with the Communist Party because of all the West German parties it is the most consistent fighter for peace.

The ideas and proposals of the Communist Party have helped it to extend its influence over the working class. This is evident in the enterprises and is illustrated by the results of the elections for the production councils. The main task, as the Communist Party sees it, is to organize a broad discussion among the workers on the ways and aims of the struggle against militarism and the arms drive, to secure peace and democracy. The more strongly the power of the workers is displayed, the less real will the "fundamental program" appear in their eyes. This program is no good for the working class and the people of West Germany. A program which breaks with Marxism, which is an apology for the capitalist system, which urges collaboration with Adenauer, is not in tune with the times. Contrary to what the organizers of the Bad-Godesberg congress claim it is a step backward.

The reply to this program will be the struggle of the united working class and people, a struggle aimed at abolishing the bankrupt policies of the German monopolists. In this struggle we declare our solidarity with all Social Democrats who, like us, want to live in peace, without atomic weapons, and to enjoy democracy and social well-being.

The Bankruptcy of Contemporary Bourgeois Philosophy

Nikolai Iribadzhakov

WHEN WE speak of contemporary bourgeois philosophy, we have in mind the Western philosophy of the epoch of imperialism.

Changes in the economy, in social relationships and in the political life of capitalist society in the epoch of imperialism could not fail to bring about changes in philosophy, which has always been closely linked with the interests and the struggle of the classes. A feature of the new stage in world capitalism is the complete break of bourgeois philosophy with materialism and with all the theses leading to materialist conclusions.

But that is not to say that materialism is passing out of the world outlook of bourgeois scientists altogether. While materialism may have been cast out of bourgeois philosophy, it is still manifest in natural science. And this is not accidental. For, as Lenin pointed out, materialist tendencies are bound to appear and dominate among those bourgeois natural scientists, physicists, biologists and mathematicians who make a study of the physical world. In their philosophical views these scientists seek to dissociate themselves from materialism, set themselves against it, while some avow adherence to subjective idealism. But research in the sphere of the natural sciences constantly leads them to conclusions which run counter to their philosophical views and confirm one or another thesis of materialism. These spontaneous manifestations of materialism among bourgeois naturalists do not, of course, determine—nor can they determine—the character of modern bourgeois philosophy which, generally speaking, is an idealistic philosophy.

The reactionary nature of bourgeois philosophy came out with particular force after the October Revolution and the emergence of the socialist world. Latter-day bourgeois philosophy is the philosophy of a moribund class. It reflects the profound and insoluble crisis of capitalist society, the bourgeoisie's fear of the masses and communism, its lack of perspective and feeling of doom, its vain

attempts to find a way of saving capitalism from destruction, to halt the disintegration of the capitalist world and the triumphant march of communism.

* * *

A feature of present-day bourgeois philosophy is the great diversity of trends and schools. This, bourgeois scholars make plain, is due to the fact that bourgeois philosophy is creative. But neither its activity, its variety of schools nor its various trends with their internal discords, provide any proof that bourgeois philosophy is flourishing. Some of its spokesmen make no secret of this. "At first glance," writes von Brandenstein, "it would appear that in our time philosophy is blossoming. Numerous philosophical books and journals are published in Europe; we have a relatively large number of chairs of philosophy; discussion is lively and the teaching staff active, while the international congresses of philosophers are bigger than ever. But upon a closer look this blossoming appears to be largely a mirage."*

The majority of the modern bourgeois philosophers are followers of the founders of the various reactionary idealist systems of the past. Take, for example, pragmatism, the generally accepted philosophy of the American bourgeoisie. Bertrand Russell in his *A History of Western Philosophy* characterized the philosophical views of William James, the founder of pragmatism, as "an attempt to build a superstructure of belief upon a foundation of scepticism and like all such attempts it is dependent on fallacies . . . Berkeleian idealism combined with scepticism. . . . But this is only a form of the subjectivist madness which is characteristic of most modern philosophy" (p. 846).

That latter-day bourgeois philosophy should be bankrupt is only natural. This is because philosophy is called upon to help save a social system which has outlived its day. The variety of philosophical schools in the capitalist world—schools claiming to have

**Zeitschrift fuer philosophische Forschung*, 1958, Bd. XII, H. 1, S. 102.

accomplished a revolution in science—is merely one of the most obvious symptoms of the crisis of philosophy and of its barrenness.

The fact that they are all sterile and unable to retain a foothold in bourgeois philosophical life for any length of time explains the multiplicity of philosophical doctrines in the epoch of imperialism. Neo-Kantianism, which was the most fashionable trend during the first few decades of our century, subsequently passed into the background, giving place to empirio-criticism, neo-Hegelianism, Bergsonism, Freudism, pragmatism and other trends, all of which suffered the fate of short-lived philosophical theories. And although they have not yet sunk into complete oblivion, they have long since lost the attraction and glitter of novelty, the glamor of the "Copernicus revolution" in philosophy, etc. Neo-positivism, existentialism, personalism and neo-Thomism are now the vogue in capitalist countries. But their fame is likely to be even more ephemeral.

The foregoing does not imply that bourgeois philosophy can be completely reduced to the idealist teachings of the past. To assert this would be both wrong and dangerous, for it would conceal from us the specific features of the philosophy of the imperialist bourgeoisie, features engendered by the material conditions of its existence and its role. The bourgeoisie of today is not what it was in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. It has become a reactionary class; it is reactionary above all in relation to the working class and socialist society, now the standard-bearers of progress. The bourgeoisie's struggle against the proletariat, against the socialist system and the revolutionary ideology of the working class has imparted to its philosophy an ideological content which it did not possess before and, what is more, which the philosophical teachings of the past could not historically possess. A feature of bourgeois philosophy nowadays is its anti-Marxist and anti-communist character.

Bourgeois philosophers realize only too well that dialectical materialism and communism cannot be combated by the ideas of the past, that they cannot bank on holding their own for long, or to achieve anything with these ideas alone. Thus, they are seizing on recent scientific discoveries, and using science for their own ends.

Lenin stressed time and again that Marxists should never lose sight of the fact "... that it is precisely the sharp upheaval which modern natural science is undergoing that very

often gives rise to reactionary philosophical schools and minor schools, trends and minor trends."* These words have been fully confirmed. We see that not only the variations of philosophical neo-positivism (whose impact is felt mainly in the works of bourgeois scholars in the spheres of natural science, linguistics and history), but even neo-Thomism—which is closely connected with Catholic circles—are doing their utmost to seize upon the latest discoveries of natural science, to interpret them to their own advantage and thus take on a modern scientific appearance. It would therefore be erroneous and dangerous to be lulled by the thought that the bourgeois philosophers are merely digesting and combining the reactionary philosophical ideas of the past. Were this so, the task of Marxists would be simple.

* * *

There are both subjective-idealist and objective-idealist trends among the motley trends and schools of bourgeois philosophy. There are even varieties of vulgar materialism, such as the so-called neo-materialism of the French philosopher Charles Mayer. But subjective idealism, represented above all by neo-positivism and existentialism, is the prevailing trend.

Neo-positivism in its various forms predominates in Britain and the United States. Thanks to its close inter-connection with natural science, mathematics, cybernetics, etc., it is also widespread among natural scientists and, hence, among bourgeois intellectuals in other countries.

Existentialism and its variations exert great influence in West Germany, France and other European countries. After the Second World War it became the most fashionable and influential trend in Western Europe. But its influence has waned in recent years, and its place is being taken by personalism and other idealist trends. Contemporary bourgeois philosophical literature speaks of a crisis of existentialism because it has proved powerless to halt the ideological offensive of Marxism and to secure for the West, i.e., for the bourgeoisie, the "spiritual guidance of the world."**

There are big differences between these two trends and a bitter ideological struggle is in process. Whereas neo-positivism is rationalistic, existentialism is the main form of contemporary irrationalism; whereas neo-positivism regards "ontological" problems

*V. I. Lenin, *On the Significance of Militant Materialism*.

**F. Heinemann, *Existenzphilosophie lebendig oder tot?* Stuttgart, 1954.

(on the essence and meaning of the world) as metaphysical and meaningless, existentialism allots them first place. Because of the differences and the contest between these two trends, a contest at times fierce and bitter, some bourgeois philosophers hold neo-positivism and existentialism to be the most hostile and irreconcilable trends in the history of philosophy. ". . . A sharper contradiction will hardly be found," writes W. Stegmüller, "than that between existentialism on the one hand, and logical positivism on the other. There has been nothing like this in the whole history of philosophy."*

We cannot agree with this. The difference between neo-positivism and existentialism is of a subordinate and secondary nature. What is important is that they both serve the bourgeoisie as an ideological weapon; they have common ideological motifs by virtue of which they serve one and the same class and are drawn closer to each other; in the final analysis, neo-positivism and existentialism are mutually complementary.

In his *Ludwig Feuerbach* Engels said that the relation of thinking and being is the basic question of all philosophy, especially of modern philosophy. This question has two sides. The first is: which is primary, spirit or matter? The philosophers who hold that spirit is primary, giving rise to matter, who assert that the world is basically spiritual, that no reality derives from the spiritual, comprise the camp of idealism. So-called objective idealism accepts that nature existed prior to man, but believes that nature and man are the result of the creative activity of a divine "idea" or "spirit." So-called subjective idealism affirms that the world is the product of the subjective consciousness of man and does not exist outside it. Philosophers who regard matter as primary, the world as material and who hold that the spirit is the product of matter and does not exist independently of it, belong to the camp of materialism.

The second side of the basic question: is our thinking capable of correct cognition of objective material reality? Are our ideas and thought a correct reflection of it? The answers which the philosophers give to this question also split them into two camps. Some reply in the affirmative, others—representatives of agnosticism—do not. The former include not only materialists, but idealists, too—Hegel, for example. The second group consists of either avowed idealists or

philosophers who waver between materialism and idealism. But agnosticism, that is, the doctrine that the objective world is unknowable, inevitably leads to idealism.

What existentialism and neo-positivism have in common is that they answer these questions in the same way as do subjective idealism and agnosticism.

At the basis of existentialism are the same subjective-idealist ideas which we find in Berkeley, Fichte, Avenarius, Mach and the other subjective idealists whom Lenin searingly criticized in his *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*. In his *Philosophical Belief**, Karl Jaspers, a pillar of existentialism, advocates subjective-idealist views, which in no way differ from those expressed by Avenarius on the so-called principal coordination. "What do I know?" Jaspers asks, and replies: "all that I know consists in contrasting subject to object, it is the object for me, a phenomenon, and not a thing as such. But in contrasting 'subject-object,' the object and subject are interconnected. There is no object without a subject, but neither is there a subject without an object. . . ."

Representatives of neo-positivism affirm that their philosophical views have nothing in common with materialism or idealism. The fundamental and diametrically opposed trends in philosophy are not, in their view, materialism and idealism, but metaphysics (in which they include both materialism and idealism) and positivism. It goes without saying that for the neo-positivists there is no greater sin than to impute to them "metaphysics." But the trouble is they are not always clear as to what should be understood by "metaphysics." "The accusation of metaphysics," says Bertrand Russell (*My Philosophical Development*, p. 221), "has become in philosophy something like the accusation of being a security risk in the public service. I do not for my part know what is meant by the word 'metaphysics'."

The important thing is that the neo-positivists' attacks on "metaphysics" camouflage their subjective idealism. Victor Kraft, a leading neo-positivist, in a way admits this in his *Viennese Circle*. "From fear of metaphysics," he writes, "one does not dare go beyond the compass of experience," that is, beyond the limits of the experience of the ego. The neo-positivists affirm that "material things are only auxiliary notions for the classification of these experiences," that the "external world is only a logical construction,"

*W. Stegmüller, *Hauptstroemungen der Gegenwartsphilosophie*, Wien-Stuttgart, 1952, S. 44.

*Der philosophische Glaube, Muenchen, 1954, S. 24-25.

etc. The neo-positivists not only deny that it is possible to give a definite answer to the question of whether objective material reality exists outside and independent of human consciousness, but resolutely reject this way of posing the basic question of philosophy, declaring it to be "metaphysical and meaningless."*

In this way the neo-positivists try to prove that philosophy should not deal with problems relating to objective reality; they reduce it to the "logic of science," to the "mathematics of language," etc. "Philosophy," says Rudolf Carnap, "is the logic of science . . ." and "the logic of science is the syntax of the language of science."** In his view philosophy should study the grammatical structure of the language of science.

Wittgenstein's neo-positivist assertion that, in itself, human speech, and not objective reality, is the subject matter of philosophy is so untenable that it was sharply rebuffed by Russell, despite the fact that the latter's philosophical views took shape under the influence of Wittgenstein. Russell regards as incomprehensible the philosophy now upheld by the Wittgenstein school of neo-positivism. "Its positive doctrines," he writes (*My Philosophical Development*, pp. 216-217), "seem to me trivial, and its negative doctrines unfounded. I have not found in Wittgenstein's *Philosophical Investigations* anything that seemed to me interesting, and I do not understand why a whole school finds wisdom in its pages." ". . . if it is true, philosophy is, at best, a slight help to lexicographers, and at worst, an idle tea-table amusement."

Nothing need be added to Russell's condemnation of neo-positivism. It seems to us that his characterization is clear enough; it is particularly instructive for those revisionists who suggest that dialectical materialism should be discarded and replaced by neo-positivism as the philosophical basis of Marxism.

It should be stressed that some Marxist philosophers, affected by revisionist vacillations, sometimes become influenced by neo-positivist ideology. Neo-positivist philosophy, because of its links with natural science, can be a grave danger in the socialist countries too. The neo-positivists reiterate that they proceed from the latest achievements of natural science, but this is an old ruse of the

idealist philosophers, one which Lenin exposed in his *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*.

In our approach to neo-positivism we should follow Lenin's words to the effect that bourgeois scholars with positivist views can make very valuable contributions in the special fields of natural science, "but they cannot be trusted one iota when it comes to philosophy."* Mathematics, cybernetics, and mathematical logic are one thing, and neo-positivist philosophical conclusions drawn from these are another. The first can be useful for science; the second are unquestionably harmful. Failure to understand this leads to philosophical revisionism, to reunuciation of Marxism.

As a variety of subjective idealism, both neo-positivism and existentialism deny the existence of objective laws in nature and society and the ability of the human mind and scientific knowledge to provide us with a true picture of the world. Both existentialism and neo-positivism deny the existence of a scientific world outlook; they attack the materialist principle of causality of all phenomena and preach indeterminism. According to them scientific knowledge cannot penetrate into the essence of natural and social processes or foresee the future. This is typical not only of existentialism and neo-positivism but of the whole of contemporary bourgeois philosophy, which reflects the gloom of capitalism.

Time was when bourgeois ideologists held aloft as their ideological banner the teaching on the objective laws of the world, on the knowability of the world, on the power of the human mind, on socio-historical progress, etc. The bourgeoisie then was a progressive, revolutionary class. It had no misgivings either about the present or the future. But that time has long since passed. World domination by the bourgeoisie, which at one time it considered as eternal and immutable as the laws of nature, is coming to an end. Powerless to halt the liberation of the people from the chains of imperialism, or to save its system from destruction, it is in a state of mortal fear and despair.

In no single philosophical teaching are the hopelessness and despair of the present-day bourgeoisie, its profound pessimism, dread of science, of the present and still more of the future so vividly mirrored as in existentialism. With every justification the bourgeois philosopher von Rintelen calls

*V. Kraft, *Der Wiener Kreis. Der Ursprung des Neo-positivismus*. Wien, 1950, S. 162-163.

**R. Carnap, *Introduction to Semantics and Formalization of Logic*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1959, p. 250.

*V. I. Lenin, *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*.

existentialism the "signature of our time," the "mirror of the present" (i.e., the bourgeois present).^{*} The philosophy of existentialism is the absolute negation of the ideology of an erstwhile revolutionary bourgeoisie. Rintelen pinpoints the features of existentialism as a philosophy of the moribund bourgeoisie. "I no longer stand before the world confidently and jubilantly," he writes, "as in the days of the Renaissance, Goethe and, partly, Romanticism. I am alien to it and hostile in my utter helplessness." Reaching this pessimistic conclusion he presents the world, too, as a hopeless picture. "The world no longer appears as a well ordered system, the result of a divine miracle." "The gay sobriety has gone. . . . We ourselves are in the grip of hopelessness."^{**}

In existentialism—the philosophy of irrationalism and mysticism—"we have ceased to regard the world optimistically."^{***} S. Kierkegaard, the precursor of this philosophy, affirmed that man never could know the substance of being, could not explain its meaning. The fundamental aim of all human effort was to save the soul in a perishing world. Heidegger, another exponent of existentialism, says that "being discloses its essence in fear." "Nothing," "fear," "despair"—these are the categories with which the philosophy of existentialism operates; its chief category is "death."

Dialectics occupies an important place in existentialism. But the existentialist dialectics is as different from the Hegelian as black is from white! The existentialist criticism of Hegel's philosophy is criticism from the Right, from the reactionary, subjective-idealist positions. It is precisely the profound distinction between the dialectics of existentialism and the dialectics of Hegel that pinpoints the transformation of a one-time progressive bourgeois ideology into a reactionary ideology. With all its conservatism and inconsistency, Hegelian dialectics recognized the spasmodic development from the lower to the higher. The negation of that which exists, according to Hegel, does not imply its disappearance, it is a creative negation which includes a successive interconnection between the old and the new, a negation that rejects the existing in order to raise reality to a higher plane. According to the existentialists, however, the negation of the old does not signify the birth of something new. For them there is no such thing as creative nega-

tion. And this is understandable. If existentialists declare the problem of death to be the basic problem of their philosophy, this inevitably casts a gloomy shadow on their views on dialectics.

Existentialism is the crystallized expression and the further deepening of the irrationalism and pessimism of bourgeois philosophy. Early in the epoch of imperialism Nietzsche saw the greatness of man in his realization of hopelessness. Hence the existentialists constantly refer to Nietzsche, but they go still further. Did not Nietzsche himself say that the pupil who did not excel his teacher was a bad pupil? In their pessimism and hopelessness the existentialists have left Nietzsche far behind.

Hopelessness and despair, "infinite loneliness," and the "tragic impasse" of the present-day bourgeoisie in a world which not merely detests it, but is forcing it out of the historical arena, are features not only of existentialism but, in one degree or other, of all modern bourgeois philosophy.

* * *

When the bourgeoisie was a revolutionary class its ideology was frequently anti-clerical and atheist. In the epoch of imperialism, however, religion plays an increasingly important role in the ideological arsenal of the bourgeoisie and its philosophy is becoming more and more permeated with theology. Lenin's apt description of the bourgeois philosophers as priests minus the cassocks, is as valid as ever.

The "theologization" of bourgeois philosophy is strikingly expressed in the spread of neo-Thomism. The neo-Thomists are active opponents of existentialism and neo-positivism, now the two most widespread trends in bourgeois philosophy; they are against existentialism for its irrationalism, and against neo-positivism for its subjective idealism and agnosticism. But this does not alter the fact that neo-Thomism is more reactionary than all the other trends, that it combines defense of the reactionary interests of the imperialist bourgeoisie with medieval scholasticism. It emerged at the end of the last century when Pope Leo XIII, in his encyclical *Aeterni Patris* (1879), officially advanced the task of reviving the philosophy of Thomas Aquinas and of thus creating an ideological weapon for the Catholic Church with which to counteract the growing influence of Marxism. The social purpose of neo-Thomism is to stave off socialist revolution, to save the capitalist system from destruction.

^{*}Cf. *Zeitschrift fuer philosophische Forschung*, 1949, Bd. III, H. 2, S. 178.

^{**}*Ibid.*, S. 184, 195.

^{***}*Ibid.*

Up until the First World War the meager influence neo-Thomism exerted was confined to the Catholic Church. But it soon spread, especially rapidly after the Second World War. Today it is one of the most widespread trends in bourgeois philosophy. It is entrenched in France, Italy, Spain and Belgium (where one of its biggest centers is located — the philosophical institute attached to Leuven University), in West Germany and in Latin America. In Catholic countries neo-Thomism is gradually supplanting other trends of bourgeois philosophy. It has at its disposal the worldwide organization of the Catholic Church with its numerous theological and philosophical faculties in the universities, a huge and experienced army of missionaries, dozens of journals, newspapers and publishing houses. The neo-Thomists rely on the support of Catholic political parties and on their propaganda machinery (these parties are in power in West Germany, Italy and elsewhere).

Neo-Thomism is objective idealism. It claims that the world was created by God. It discards all variations of subjective idealism: neo-Kantianism, neo-positivism, existentialism, etc.; it accepts that the material world exists outside and independent of the human mind, and that man can get to know objective reality. "The Thomist theory of knowledge," writes Bochenski, "is *realistic* in the literal sense of the word: the subject creates not the object, but only its spiritual image. . . . To know does not mean to create the knowable, but only to understand it in itself."* Neo-Thomism does not openly attack science. It seeks to link knowledge with belief, science with religion, to demonstrate that science can "cohabit" with religion, that religion does not impede the development of science but, on the contrary, needs its help.

The bourgeoisie finds neo-Thomism of exceptional importance in its anti-Marxist struggle. In contrast to other bourgeois philosophical and sociological trends, neo-Thomism does not deny the existence of classes and the class struggle, or that capitalists exploit workers. On the contrary, it has recourse to the anti-capitalist demagoguery widely used by imperialist reaction and the ideologists of Social-Democratic parties in shaping the ideological basis of "people's capitalism." At the same time neo-Thomism is extremely active in the struggle against Marxism-Leninism. Anti-Marxist works by neo-Thomists, as, for example, G. Wetter's

Dialectical Materialism, J. Bochenski's *Soviet-Russian Dialectical Materialism*, Y. Hommes' *The Technical Eros*, J. de Vries' *The Theory of Knowledge of Dialectical Materialism* are studied by bourgeois, Social-Democratic and revisionist critics of Marxism.

Neo-Thomism, it should be noted, is dangerous not only because it has a broad and organized mass base among Catholics, but because it is more flexible than the other bourgeois philosophical teachings. Its flexibility is illustrated in its criticism of Marxism. The neo-Thomist philosophers carefully study Marxist literature. Taking into account the popularity of Marxism, many of them refrain from flatly denying its importance. In their anti-Marxist works they pretend to be objective in their exposition and assessment of Marxist philosophy. Many neo-Thomists emphasize that there are correct principles in Marxism, with which they are prepared to agree. These "principles," it goes without saying, are insignificant and non-typical facets of the Marxist philosophy. But acceptance of them testifies to the cunning of the neo-Thomists, for in this way it is easier to deceive the reader and convey a false impression of Marxism.

In this respect the neo-Thomists are even more resourceful than the ideologists of "democratic socialism" who deny outright that Marxist philosophy has any positive elements. The latter not only disavow dialectical materialism, they are even more bitter in their hostility to Marxist philosophy than the neo-Thomists. This was particularly evident in the attitude of Social Democrats to Wetter's *Dialectical Materialism*. *Geist und Tat* (October 1952), theoretical journal of the Social Democratic Party of Germany, and *Die Zukunft* (May-June, 1957), theoretical journal of the Socialist Party of Austria, criticized Wetter's book for not throwing out dialectical materialism lock, stock and barrel, for recognizing its "positive elements." *Geist und Tat* was highly indignant. Weniger's article, headed "Dialectical Materialism under the Magnifying Glass" and sub-headed "Monerot or Wetter" draws a parallel between the critique of dialectical materialism in Wetter's book and the criticism made by Jules Monerot, the French "socialist," in his *Sociology of Communism*.

The two books have to be read and compared in order to judge the depths to which the representatives of opportunism have sunk. Starting by revising and "supplementing" Marxism, "bringing it up to date," "improving" it and so on, they have ended up

*J. M. Bochenski, *Europäische Philosophie der Gegenwart*, Muenchen, 1951, S. 249.

by completely denying Marxism, thus surpassing even the ideologists of Catholic reaction. And indeed, whereas the neo-Thomist Wetter recognizes "positive" and "correct" elements in dialectical materialism, the "socialist" Monnerot finds nothing positive in it and denies it altogether. Weniger not only reproaches Wetter for making concessions to dialectical materialism, he takes it upon himself to instruct one of the ideologists of neo-Thomism how to criticize Marxism in a bourgeois spirit. He compares the two books, accusing Wetter of objectivism, and pointing out that overt anti-Sovietism is undoubtedly a merit of Monnerot's book (See *Geist und Tat*, 1952, No. 10, S. 296). The spokesmen of "democratic socialism" evidently want to say to their capitalist masters: Look, not only is there not a shred of Marxism about us, we are more skilled in combating it and are better defenders of capitalism than the leaders of Catholicism!

Yet, painful though this may be for Social-Democratic theoreticians, many bourgeois philosophers, including ideologists of Catholicism, are compelled to speak of the "positive" elements in Marxism. Moreover, neo-Hegelians like Kojève, existentialists like Sartre and Catholic spokesmen like Steinbuechel and Reding are now flirting with Marxism. Why? The point is that, despite the new names and the pretentious claims, the various schools and trends of contemporary bourgeois philosophy are, like all vogues, on the way out, while the influence and power of attraction of Marxism are steadily growing. There is no other philosophy, no other ideology which has so many followers and exerts such an influence on the course of history as Marxism.

And it can be said that the popularity of Marxist ideology will eventually lead many progressive bourgeois intellectuals to reject

philosophical idealism and turn to dialectical materialism. It is the duty of Marxist philosophers to help the progressive intellectuals in the capitalist countries to make this change, using for this purpose data on modern natural science, and to show that contemporary bourgeois philosophy is merely the apologist of a decaying system.

Bourgeois philosophy is sinking deeper and deeper into the swamp of idealism, agnosticism, mysticism and pessimism. The conflict between it and science will continue to grow. That is why it has no future and will perish just as surely as will capitalism.

But this does not mean that it will perish of itself. Peaceful coexistence of the two systems in no way detracts from the importance of the ideological struggle, and this includes struggle between dialectical materialism, the truly scientific world outlook of our age, and the essentially anti-scientific tendencies of modern idealism. Idealist philosophy occupies an exceptionally important place in the ideological arsenal of the imperialist bourgeoisie. In the capitalist countries its reactionary ideas permeate the social sciences, natural science, the arts and bourgeois culture in its entirety. They hold captive not only most of the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois intellectuals. In numerous and diverse ways—through popular philosophical literature, religion and the Church, science and the arts, the universities and the press—the ideas of this philosophy are poisoning the minds of considerable sections of the people, subordinating them to reactionary policy. And that is why ideological struggle, even in the sphere of the most abstract ideas, assumes such importance in the day-to-day theoretical and practical activity of the Communist and Workers' parties in all countries.

The Communist Party and the National Interests

Ib Norlund

OVER a hundred years ago when Marx and Engels proclaimed the slogan, "Working men of all countries, unite!" the bourgeoisie and other reactionaries accused the Communists of wanting to destroy the nation. Even if they were capable of grasping that the Communist movement, right from its birth, held out the prospect of *regenerating the nation*, they would never have admitted it.

"Since the proletariat must first of all acquire political supremacy, must rise to be the leading class of the nation, must constitute itself the nation," the *Communist Manifesto* says, "it is, so far, itself national, though not in the bourgeois sense of the word." Soon the whole world realized that only the working class and its allies could really speak for the nation. The Paris Commune was a classic example of how the bourgeois reactionaries show no scruples in abandoning the cherished interests of the nation whenever these interests clash with their narrow class principles; but the proletariat, which soon gave the workers of all lands their anthem—the "Internationale"—took to arms and upheld the cause of the nation.

This example was not the only one of its kind. With the passage of time it became increasingly evident that *the working class is the most reliable guarantee of the future of the nation*, that this is brought about by capitalist development. Bourgeois propaganda is doing its utmost to prevent the working class from becoming conscious of this fact, because consciousness of it would make it redouble its efforts in the fight for a new society.

Under imperialism the national question has merged with the liberation movement in the colonies. But this is not all. In our days imperialism threatens even the older independent nations with complete or partial subordination. Thus the small but highly developed capitalist countries *are again confronted with the national problem*. Not infrequently the big imperialist powers resort

to new methods in their relations with them — proffering "alliances," "economic aid," "defense of freedom and democracy," etc. In point of fact, this policy is *tantamount to a new colonialism*. Forced to loosen their grip on some of the "underdeveloped countries," the imperialists are turning to the more developed but small countries in order to secure markets and spheres of investment and impose on them unequal agreements. These countries are prevented from utilizing their resources, from taking the way of economic progress and are used as strategic bases for all-out war. Thus the way is paved for infringements on the sovereignty of these countries and even for its nullification.

In these circumstances *the national degradation of the bourgeoisie* becomes more pronounced. The monopoly bourgeoisie of the formerly independent countries actually saps national independence, placing its ties with the foreign monopolies of the big powers above the interests of the nation. It even endeavors, with foreign backing, to make the working people pay for its own national betrayal.

The working class, naturally, becomes the backbone of the nation. This, and the fact that it is exploited by both foreign imperialists and the local monopoly bourgeoisie, impels the working class to unite around itself the overwhelming majority of the people and isolate the monopoly bourgeoisie. The leading role of the working class in upholding the nation and its struggle against exploitation become two aspects of one and the same question. We get, then, the perspective of merging the national movement for independence and the social struggle of the workers into *a single stream* representing an invincible force.

The small nations can successfully resist imperialism only by relying on the international solidarity of all the forces opposed to imperialist violence. Thus, the internationalism of the working class is decisive for its leading role in the national movement.

To make the working class conscious of its national role is one of the major tasks facing the socialist movement, and especially important, as the Communist Party's experience shows, is the struggle against bourgeois ideology which seeks to confuse this question.

National Degradation of the Danish Bourgeoisie and Democratic Patriotism of the Communists

The point mentioned above has found manifestation also in the struggle waged by the working class in Denmark. The bourgeoisie has always denounced independent class movements, including the Social-Democratic movement, as being "foreign," "un-Danish" and "alien." Socialist ideas have been branded at different times as being "French," "German" and, later, as "Russian," depending on the country to which the center of the working-class movement shifted. If the charge had little logic, the purpose was perfectly clear.

At the turn of the century, when Danish capitalism was still on the upgrade, the bourgeoisie stood for national independence, but always only to the extent that independence furthered its class interests, enabling Danish capitalism to seek advantages. That is why the bourgeoisie pursued a policy of neutrality, keeping the country aloof from conflicts between the Great Powers. While this aim harmonized with the national interests, the means of achieving it did not. The rulers tried to balance between British and German imperialism, making concessions to both sides. As a result, the economy became dependent on British imperialism, while German imperialism dominated in the military sphere. This balancing act, naturally, did little to "secure" the national interests and made itself felt in full measure when the general crisis of capitalism upset the stability of the imperialist system. Ever since then the national degradation of the Danish bourgeoisie has been obvious.

During the 1929-33 crisis Britain renounced the privileges granted to Danish capitalism on her markets (the Ottawa agreements of 1932) and used her economic links with Denmark for imperialist exploitation. Some of the Danish monopolists went so far as to suggest that Denmark should enter the British Empire as a Dominion. Others, however, preferred to forsake the sinking British ship, and turned to aggressive Hitler fascism. All

of them betrayed the national interests. But this did not stop them from talking loudly about "defending the nation," about the Danish and Scandinavian "spirit," or from branding dissenters as "enemies of the nation" and as being "un-Danish." The bourgeoisie wanted to cover up its tracks, but its deeds betrayed its intentions. The ruling class refused to support the proposal for collective security against the aggressors. The bourgeoisie sought to disarm the people ideologically. The Foreign Ministry instructed the press not to publish articles or cartoons depicting the Nazis in their true light. Communist editors, who disobeyed this directive, were prosecuted on various pretexts. It was maintained that since Denmark was a small country it had no alternative but to "accommodate itself" to the big imperialist powers. Thus, in advocating renunciation of national independence, the monopoly bourgeoisie wanted to clear the way for its policy.

However, a wave of democratic anti-fascist patriotism arose against these tendencies. The standard-bearer of this patriotism was the working class inspired by the Communist Party. The Communists pointed to another way for Denmark: the support of all forces working for an anti-fascist front to curb the aggressors; strengthening friendly relations with the Soviet Union—a vital factor of peace for Northern Europe as well; alerting the people to the danger of fascism both at home and abroad and rallying against it; an economic policy restricting monopoly rule and in keeping with the demands of the workers' organizations. Sentiment in sympathy with these proposals was evident among the different strata of the population and in other political parties.

The situation was favored by the worldwide struggle against fascism. The Communist slogan, "The fight in Spain is our fight," solidarity with the Spanish Republic, helped the people to understand better not only what the Spanish democrats were fighting for, but also the real interests of Denmark. Thus it was that internationalism again stimulated the genuinely national feeling.

The conflict between the two lines—democratic patriotism and renunciation of national independence—continued throughout the Second World War when the nation was confronted with a mortal danger. The developments of this period clearly showed who were the true champions of the country's interests.

The Rise of the National and Liberation Movement

The Danish monopoly bourgeoisie rejoiced when Czechoslovakia, after Munich, fell prey to the Nazis. "The best news for the past twenty years," ran the front-page headline in one of the big newspapers, thereby betraying the hopes of the bourgeoisie for a united capitalist military bloc against the first land of socialism. A narrow class approach prevented the bourgeoisie from realizing that Munich was a grave menace to Denmark.

The logical outcome of this after the outbreak of war was encouragement for the provocative policy pursued by the reactionary Finnish government which led to the war with the Soviet Union. Both before and during this war the Danish rulers conducted a slander campaign against the USSR and persecuted those who acted differently. Why did they do this? They hoped that the Finnish-Soviet conflict would turn the world war into an all-out crusade of the capitalists against the Soviet Union. The bourgeoisie was reluctant to face the truth, to see that this could only injure Denmark.

Its hopes, however, failed to materialize. The result of this senseless anti-Soviet campaign was the isolation of Denmark from the USSR—the sole force capable of helping her to maintain her independence and to stay out of war. As proof of the opportunities that existed in this respect we could mention the letter sent by the Swedish government to the Soviet government after the war in which the former gratefully acknowledged that Soviet influence had enabled Sweden to maintain neutrality.

The Communist Party suggested a policy that corresponded with the interests of the nation. If the war could not be stopped, then Denmark and the other Scandinavian countries should endeavor not to become embroiled in it. For this purpose Denmark should have used the only real opportunity then available to her—support the peace policy of the Soviet Union and avoid infiltration by belligerent imperialist groups. Despite red-baiting, the Communist Party combated the adventurist policy pursued at the time of the Finnish war. The staunchness of the Communists was vividly described by Martin Andersen Nexø who himself was subjected to persecution (his books were burnt and he was denounced as "a traitor"). "In the capitalist world," he wrote, "love of country is a strange thing. Like wormwood, it thrives on arid, rocky soil. This love is pure and

beautiful only among those who have nothing to thank the country for."

On April 9, 1940, when the Nazis occupied Denmark, the existence of the nation was at stake. This was the impasse to which the ruling class had brought the country! Some of this class dreamed of Germany and Britain reaching agreement on launching war against the Soviet Union, thereby providing new opportunities for Denmark. Feelers were sent out in secret to the two sides. Documents published after the war showed the futility of relying on British imperialism. The German diplomat, Ulrich von Hassel, a non-Nazi, noted in his diary that the British, who up to 1941 favored a separate peace with Germany, adhered to the view that "Holland and Belgium should be restored, while Denmark should remain under German influence."*

The Danish monopolists pursued the policy of "adaptation," that is, subordination to Nazi Germany and her plans for a "new European" empire. For this purpose the monopolies placed their men in the government. Premier Stauning, a Social Democrat, admitted in March 1941 that official policy could, conceivably, lead to the end of Denmark as a nation, and called for adaptation to Hitler's "new order in Europe." "True," he said, "this may result in conditions different from those to which we have been accustomed, but this will hardly be of decisive significance. In any case I see in this our task which we will have to carry out.

"The best thing would be quietly and voluntarily to facilitate, when the time comes, the adaptation of which I have given a general outline. After all, the devil is not as black as he is painted."

And so the Nazi orders were obeyed by the politicians. The collaborators trampled upon the constitution, outlawed the Communist Party, hunted its members and other patriots, handed them over to the Gestapo and urged the population to betray the Resistance fighters. Simultaneously attacks were launched against living standards and democratic rights. As a preliminary to destroying the nation, the people's will had to be crushed.

But the people remained staunch. The Communist call for resistance met with a growing response. The Communists, inspired by the heroic struggle of the Soviet people against the Nazi invaders, organized and led the Resistance Movement.

*Ulrich von Hassel, *Vom Andern Deutschland*, Zuerich, 1946, S. 184.

Strikes in industry merged with the democratic and national movement. The working class became the recognized leader of the people; this was clearly seen during the "nationwide strikes" against the fascist rule and the capitulation policy of the ruling class. The strikes of the factory workers were joined by office employees and shopkeepers.

So powerful was this movement that on August 29, 1943, the collaborators dissolved their government and did not dare form a new one. August 29, a day of resounding success for the policy of resistance, has entered history as a significant date in the battle for freedom.

It is doubtful whether the capitulators realized the seriousness of their setback. In a circular issued shortly after August 29, Alsing Andersen, acting chairman of the Social Democratic Party, praised the policy of collaboration, declaring that it "could have been pursued to the end of the war had not the coalition of chauvinists and Communists fostered a different thinking among some sections of the population." "These men," concluded the circular, "are responsible for the situation that has arisen, and they cannot evade this responsibility." But the responsibility for the events of August 29 is the responsibility for the victory won by the national-liberation movement in Denmark. And neither the Communists nor the other Resistance fighters had anything against being held responsible for them. More and more people joined the liberation struggle. The underground Freedom Council became the most authoritative body. The resistance gained strength and took on various forms. The Freedom Council was recognized by the Soviet Union and Britain as the representative of Fighting Denmark; it secured for the country her place in the anti-Hitler coalition.

The victory of the liberation movement which helped to save Denmark was, in essence, the victory of the democratic national policy suggested by the Communists as a basis for unity in contrast to the policy of monopoly capital. Christmas Moeller, Conservative leader and Foreign Minister in the Liberation Government, wrote in a message to the Communist Party in August 1945: "It would be much better for Denmark if more people, and not only in the Communist Party, were aware of the powerful and positive force embodied by the Soviet Union. I can say this with greater confidence because like many more I was mistaken before the war and during the first years of the war. Fortu-

nately for Denmark the Communist Party fought for an understanding of Russia which is bound to exert a greater and more decisive influence on the international situation and on our country, too." Moeller added that the basic concept of the best foreign policy for Denmark had been outlined by the Communist Party prior to 1939.

Democratic Patriotism vs. an Anti-National Policy

The foregoing was soon forgotten by the bourgeois leaders. Shortly after the liberation, the British and U.S. imperialists resumed their pressure on Denmark. And as this pressure intensified it brought a new grave danger to national independence.

Soon official policy changed radically. Though national independence was proclaimed the basis of this policy, the monopolists, now more dependent on foreign imperialism, placed their selfish interests above the national interests. This was tantamount to a new betrayal of the nation. Immediately after the liberation, the government announced that its primary concern would be to abolish foreign dependence. But acceptance of the Marshall Plan and the unequal terms of trade, especially with Britain, signified that Denmark had become more dependent on Western imperialism. It was officially declared at one time that Denmark wanted "equally cordial relations with the East and the West," but in 1949 she signed the aggressive anti-Soviet Atlantic pact. It was stated in 1947 that "long-term disarmament of Germany and guarantees against any resurgence of German militarism were vital to Denmark." But a few years later Danish leaders began to advocate West German rearmament and allowed the reborn German militarism to influence Danish policy.

The consequences of this return to an anti-national policy, discredited during the war, soon made themselves felt.

In the economic field acceptance of the Marshall Plan led to devaluation. The ratio between export and import prices became less favorable and the increased military expenditure further aggravated the situation. Denmark was compelled to sign extortionate trade agreements, while her trade with the socialist countries was reduced to a minimum. Foreign exchange difficulties became the usual thing, reflecting the intensified imperialist plunder of the country. And now the joining of the Outer Seven signifies continuation of the same old policy and is bound

to strengthen the domination of foreign monopolies.

With regard to the military aspect the further elaboration of NATO plans made the prospects gloomier. The armed forces lost their sovereignty. The militarists look on Denmark as a pawn. She is assigned the "No. 1 strategic position in Europe" (such is the opinion of Nazi admirals in West Germany). It is maintained that the Danish Straits should be closed to the Soviet Navy but kept open for the passage of Western warships into the Baltic. What will be the outcome of this in the event of the war breaking out, of which the NATO leaders dream? Naturally, the other side, too, will regard Denmark as the "No. 1 strategic position." And such a war would be tantamount to national catastrophe. Yet this is the "perspective"!

Even in peace time this policy is fraught with dire consequences for the nation. The NATO leaders call for increased military expenditure, for atomic and rocket weapons, for foreign military stores and bases on Danish territory and, lastly, the placing of Denmark under the "protection" of German imperialism. The end might be that Denmark will become a focal point of international tension. This, too, is the "perspective"!

The policy imposed on Denmark by the monopolies runs counter to her interests. And nothing is changed by covering it up with talk about the "nation" and "democracy" and by using bourgeois nationalism to conduct venomous and slanderous anti-Soviet propaganda.

The Communists have called on the people to fight for another program, a program of safeguarding the vital interests of the nation.

The people of Denmark, like the people of any other small nation occupying an analogous position in the capitalist world, should realize that their vital interests are closely linked with the main task now facing mankind: to avert a new war and to ensure the peaceful coexistence of differing social systems. A policy which ignores the aspiration of the peoples for peace cannot be a genuinely national policy.

The small nations can contribute to peace either by declaring their neutrality which would be recognized by the Great Powers or by establishing atom- and rocket-free zones, which would likewise be guaranteed by the Powers, or by a system of equal treaties with other countries. A foreign policy of this kind would enable them to avoid involvement in conflicts between the Great Powers. The so-

cialist countries, particularly the Soviet Union, have proposed guarantees for a peace zone and relaxation of international tension, whereas the imperialists, seeking to use the small countries as pawns in their military gamble, have not expressed any sympathy with this desire. That is why for the small countries the fight for peace signifies a fight for freedom of action in national policy. With the present-day correlation of forces on the international arena the small nations have every opportunity to pursue an effective peace policy. This policy should, first, be based on a realistic assessment of the peace factors and, second, the popular desire for freedom and national independence.

Denmark, then, should withdraw from NATO and from the "common markets" of the Western monopolies. She should have equal economic relations with other countries and use all opportunities to develop trade with the socialist world. Denmark should proclaim neutrality and obtain guarantees from the Great Powers. It is especially important to thwart the plans of the NATO militarists, notably the West German, to draw Denmark deeper into their war preparations by urging her to accept atomic weapons and by setting up dumps and other installations for the Bundeswehr. Of special significance in this connection are the Soviet proposal for making Denmark and the North a guaranteed zone free from atomic and rocket weapons, and the proposals of the Baltic socialist countries for treaties of non-aggression and co-operation which would make the Baltic a sea of peace.

These foreign policy demands are ceaselessly advanced by the Communists as an alternative for the people. The Communists, working for a change in policy, want to unite the patriotic forces of the nation. When Denmark joined NATO, they called on the people to hold a protest demonstration outside Parliament; this demonstration was one of the biggest in the history of Copenhagen. In 1952 when the NATO men declared their intention to station U.S. air forces in the country, the Communists protested again and, gradually, enlisted the support of other people. Joint protests came from all trade union organizations. Town committees, set up to conduct the campaign, explained the gravity of this fatal step.

These developments coincided with the discussion on the new constitution. The draft envisaged relinquishing sovereignty "in favor of international agencies." This, too, became the subject of a nationwide debate,

with the result that the relevant article barely received the necessary 45 per cent of the votes, though all traditional parties supported it. The political leaders took fright, and in the summer of 1953, first the Social Democrats and then other parties suddenly changed their line and, alluding to the "present-day circumstances," opposed the siting of foreign bases in the country.

A similar protest movement was witnessed on other occasions, e.g., in 1956 when the government agreed to West German remilitarization. Committees mushroomed throughout the country; government offices and the Folketing were inundated with protests signed by more than 300,000 people. The masses also protested against NATO stationing atomic weapons on Danish soil. The government repeatedly assured the people that these plans had been rejected. This was one of the main points in the electoral platform of the Social Democratic Party in 1957. But it showed up once more in NATO plans and remains in the forefront of the struggle.

In February 1958 the public learned about the secret talks with Bonn concerning the setting up of German depots on Danish territory. The national resentment was such—the people had not forgotten the German "protection" of 1940-45—that the government had to suspend the talks. At present, however, renewed attempts are being made to achieve this aim by establishing "NATO depots" (NATO arms have been standardized).

This maneuver gave rise to another powerful wave of protest. A feature of this movement is that the leading role of the working class in it is becoming more pronounced. In a number of towns and districts the usual Party rules were brushed aside and the people protested jointly against atomic armament and subordination to German militarism. These protests engendered the idea of holding a national conference of workers. The recent relaxation in international tension favors the movement against involving Denmark in military gambles. The bleak economic outlook — a consequence of joining the monopolist Outer Seven — also favors it.

The Communists painstakingly explain the folly of the atomic policy and the danger of West German militarization; they tell about new developments in the German Democratic Republic, which the Danish government obdurately refuses to recognize. The Communists point to the advantages of greater trade with the socialist world, to the consequences of subordinating the country to the Western monopolies. By so doing they combine action

for the immediate interests of the working class with struggle for the nation's future.

There are, then, as before, two conflicting trends in Denmark: the anti-national policy inspired and led by the ultra-reactionary monopoly forces, and the democratic policy of national independence championed by the Communists. As Marxist-Leninists, the Communists, basing themselves on internationalism, can better distinguish between the forces of war and the forces of peace, and have a clearer vision of the real interests of the nation.

History repeats itself. Those who are pushing Denmark onto the road of national catastrophe try to justify themselves, posing as "champions of the national interests" and branding the true patriots, first of all Communists, as "anti-national," "un-Danish," etc. In this unsavory business they are aided by the revisionist group led by Aksel Larsen, formerly chairman of the Communist Party. The Larsen group feeds the anti-Communist campaign, the main argument of which is that the Communists are "un-Danish." It aims to disrupt the unity of the people around the national program, and resorts to demagoguery to get pacifists to put forward "unilateral disarmament" of Denmark as the basic demand. These maneuvers, however, are nullified by the real situation in the country, which is determined by the change in public opinion.

So far the reactionaries still have the decisive say in determining policy. The supporters of imperialist infiltration and NATO still occupy important positions. They are "NATO's fifth column" in Denmark. They used their influence in the press and other mass media, in the Government and in the economy to make Khrushchov's visit to our country impossible. Thus a good opportunity to uphold Denmark's interests was lost.

But the attitude of reaction, in addition to exposing the injurious activity and weakness of official policy in safeguarding the national interests, has helped the masses to realize that NATO policy brought the country to an impasse. There is also the uncertainty engendered among a big section of the ruling class by the various "European" markets.

It is becoming increasingly evident that the monopoly policy can only turn Denmark into a kind of "underdeveloped area" and, given certain conditions, make her a helpless victim of war. The people are beginning to understand that the salvation of their country lies in support for the forces standing for peace in the world.

For Unity of Action

Lars Junttila

IN RECENT years the Communist Party of Finland has acquired useful experience in the fight for working people's unity of action. It will be pertinent to recall the main stages of this struggle, since this will help the reader better to understand the problems confronting us today.

In its "Unite for Action" appeal issued in January 1954, the Central Committee of our Party clearly showed that unity can be built only in struggle for the solution of economic and social problems common to all working people.

Unity, first established in joint actions for partial demands at one or a group of factories, usually took the form of quick strikes, the sending of joint delegations, etc. The workers frequently by-passed their unions, for they knew that the union leaders would not agree to strike because the collective agreements deprived trade unions of this right. Joint actions on a local scale were usually led by provisional committees elected by the workers.

Joint actions have usually been spearheaded not only against the employers but also against the government authorities and those trade union leaders who concluded the "economic truce" and endorsed the wage freeze in 1951. At this stage our Party considered it highly important to explain to the workers the fundamentals of Marxist political economy, which would enable them to understand the nature of capitalism. It was our duty to help the workers to see through the bourgeois propaganda which cloaked class antagonisms and which sought to convince them that their collaboration with capitalists and big landlords, which aimed at stabilizing the economy, would bring about the "welfare state," full employment and a steady rise in living standards. Growing numbers of jobless, falling real wages and soaring monopoly profits shook the workers' belief in the promised full employment and higher living standards. The sharpening class struggle made the workers realize more and more clearly the need for unity of action.

The false conceptions spread among the workers by the reformist leaders created difficulties in establishing unity. To achieve

unity it was vital to mobilize the entire Party, for there were Communists who, indignant as they were at the wage-freeze, expulsions from trade unions, political discrimination and violation of democracy practised by the Social-Democratic union leaders, did not believe united action was possible. A similar opinion also prevailed but in greater measure among Social-Democratic workers because for many years the opponents of unity had shouted from the housetops that political differences were an insurmountable obstacle in the way of unity which could only be attained under the banner of Social Democracy. In addition, the Social-Democratic leaders asserted that the Communist proposals for unity were but a tactical maneuver.

A broad explanatory campaign undertaken by our Party (mainly in the form of talks and meetings at factories) helped the workers to get a correct idea about unity of action.

Neither religion, nor language or nationality (the Swedish-speaking population numbers about nine per cent) appreciably influence our working class. Different political views, however, make themselves felt strongly both in the trade unions and other organizations. We had to proceed from the fact that many trade unionists, and the most active ones, are members of either the Communist or Social Democratic parties, yet they have to act jointly, especially in common trade unions. On what issues can the trade unionists be united? They are labor agreements and other issues in which all workers and their families are equally concerned. Unity can be achieved in the fight for their demands, even if this conflicts with the policy of a particular trade union or of the Central Association of Trade Unions led by the Social Democrats.

The campaign for better collective agreements helped us to develop unity of action on a larger scale. Between 1954 and 1956 the Communists and Social Democrats discussed common issues at trade union and factory meetings and at conferences of trade union representatives within the confines of one enterprise. As a result demands were made on the leaders of trade unions and the Cen-

tral Association of Trade Unions concerning wage policy and labor agreements. Rank-and-file union members pressed for making the proposals put forward by the trade union branches the basis for negotiating agreements and on other issues. These demands, like those aimed at ending discrimination and violation of trade union democracy, met with increasing support amongst the workers.

In this joint activity the working class gathered strength against the mounting capitalist offensive. The general wage policy from above was gradually replaced by concrete demands voiced from below after democratic discussions at factories and in trade union branches. In substance these demands were quite practicable.

During these years the workers in many industries went on strike to put forward their demands directly to the employers. They did this either on their own decisions or with the backing of the trade unions. In almost all instances where joint action had been established the workers achieved better results than in the branches where they were disunited and passively waited for bounties from above. As a result a shorter working day was introduced in the metal-working industry; hourly wage increases were obtained in the food, leather and rubber industries, as well as on construction sites and in lumber-camps. The employers themselves had to admit that the workers' action forced them to retreat.

Joint decisions, common demands, etc., are a sure step towards unity. But confining oneself to this means to stop half-way. Unity means joint action by workers regardless of party or trade union affiliation. Unity, born out of wage claims and other common demands, will not be disrupted if, in defiance of the reformist leaders, action is launched against the capitalists. This, however, is possible only when the workers jointly discuss their problems and unanimously agree on the kind of action they should take.

Our experience confirms this. Although the struggle for better labor agreements led to only a partial realization of the common tasks set by the trade unions, it nevertheless provided the basis for joint action on a wider scale.

The campaign for higher wages began making headway when the Sejm had abolished in December 1955 the price and wage control and when, a month later, the term of the collective agreements concluded by major unions had expired. The campaign culminated in March 1956 in a general strike of near-

ly half a million workers. While wages had been frozen since 1951 the cost of living was continually soaring. This took place during the boom. And when big capital, supported by the government, started a new offensive against the working class, the Social-Democratic union leaders were compelled, under mass pressure, to give consent to a struggle for higher wages in defiance of the more reactionary leaders like Tanner and Leskinen.

The workers demanded an hourly increase of twelve marks. This demand, advanced at an opportune moment, rallied the masses, stimulated a powerful movement which brought in the wavering elements and forced the Right-wing union leaders to head this struggle.

A few days after the strike began it became necessary to reinforce the strike committees by including representatives of other sections of workers. The development of the struggle necessitated turning from wait-and-see tactics to joint action of the working people. The general strike became so popular that a part of the small farmers and small businessmen began to give material aid to it. As the struggle sharpened the wage claim tended to recede into the background, and the antagonisms between worker and capitalist were thrown into sharper relief. Here and there strike-breakers were recruited by the fascist elements. This rallied the workers still more closely to fight the strike to the bitter end. The workers understood that not only wages were at stake but also the very existence of their common organization—the Central Association of Trade Unions.

The general strike confirmed the correctness of the policy of the Central Committee and the last Congress of our Party in stressing the significance of united action and the need for a militant alliance of the workers and small peasants. It also brought to light the weaknesses of the movement. The protracted "cold war" between the Social Democrats and the Communists, the differences on the CATU wage policy and the policy of subordinating the union leaders to the demands of the Social-Democratic leadership and the major monopolies made themselves felt. All this created an atmosphere of mistrust, fostered prejudice and hindered unity of action by workers holding different political views. But the very logic of the struggle, the fact that the strike had sharpened, impelled the workers to cast away doubts and search together for a path leading to victory.

In those instances where no effort was spared in establishing unity of action the results were good. This was the case not only in the bodies directing the strike but also in the Communist and Social-Democratic branches, in regional committees, in Popular-Democratic and women's Social-Democratic, youth and sports organizations. The participation of all these organizations in the strike was a natural basis for unity. And where neither Communists nor Social Democrats did anything to overcome estrangement and prejudices the opportunities for strengthening unity of action remained unused.

Indicative in this respect is the following example. In one locality the strikers refused to help the strike committee on the plea that the laurels of victory would be reaped by the party having the majority in the leadership of the local trade union (it was concurrently the strike committee). The apprehension that the "opponent" within the trade union may find himself in a more advantageous position is, perhaps, one of the most widespread barriers to unity. In that case the workers failed to see the main thing—it was a matter of the workers' common interests and of the struggle in which everyone must do his best to reach mutual understanding, that victory was most essential. The workers also failed to see that victory could not be won through the efforts of the Communists or Social Democrats alone, that joint action was needed.

The general strike was a success. All the more so since the workers became conscious of their common interests, the importance of united action and of their strength. The struggle laid bare the class antagonisms, and the awareness that these antagonisms are irreconcilable was of special importance. There were those in our country who tried to persuade the workers that "a fair share of the national income" and "planned economy and class collaboration" were possible under capitalism. The general strike unmasked those forces in the trade unions and among the Social-Democratic leaders who oppose unity of action and the mass struggle against the big capitalists. The Social-Democratic workers could not but condemn the proposal made by Vaino Leskinen, the then General Secretary of the Social Democratic Party, to declare a state of emergency for the suppression of the general strike led by the CTUA and whose chairman, Eero Antikainen, was Vice-Chairman of the same Party.

When rank-and-file Social Democrats see that co-operation with the Communists

and other workers and participation in joint demonstrations and deputations yields results, they cannot but ponder over such things as why the leaders of their own Party ridicule, warn and threaten them with material and other difficulties, and even with disciplinary action unless they cease "to fraternize with the Communists," i.e. with other workers. They will also think about why the Social-Democratic leadership presses for violation of class solidarity and urges them to come out against other workers who have exactly the same interests as their own. And they will draw correct conclusions sooner or later because they will have to choose between the working-class movement on the one hand, and capitalism—i.e., poverty, unemployment and political inequality—on the other.

Our experience shows that unity of action should be built around what is common to the working people, not around what divides them. In seeking unity and serving the class interests of the workers, one cannot stipulate conditions other than those which promote the attainment of the mutually approved aim.

Unity of action does not necessitate the renunciation of views and principles on the part of the workers. It should not prevent the workers of various convictions from explaining their views to each other. Neither should unity of action prevent criticism. Those who work against the common class interests of the workers should always be exposed. This criticism cannot shake unity of action but, on the contrary, will strengthen it and help the workers to become convinced of the need for achieving and extending this unity. This will enable the workers to free themselves of reformist illusions and will promote a correct understanding of their tasks in the mounting class struggle.

The five-week strike of the building workers which ended in victory last summer gave the lie to the myth that during mass unemployment the workers are unable to fight openly for higher wages. This strike not only made a breach in the wage-freeze policy, but put to shame the trade union leaders who told the workers that when business was at its high or low tide strike action could not add to their wages. The significance of this strike is that it was a real example illustrating how the workers, if they pool their efforts, can secure satisfaction of their demands even under extremely difficult conditions.

The experience accumulated in the trade union movement and at the factories has laid the foundations for united action on a wider scale. The trade unions in our country influence the entire working class notwithstanding that only one-third of the workers are organized. The trade union movement is the main channel for united action of the working people. The Seventh Congress of the CTUA held in the summer of 1956 unanimously adopted most of the wage and social security proposals before it and in so doing strengthened the basis of unity. In view of the fact that some of these proposals can be effected only in a legislative way the trade unions should make their points of view known to the Sejm and the Government. They should approach those deputies who were elected primarily by the votes of the working people and use the pressure of the masses in support of their demands. If in previous years the Communists and Social Democrats forwarded their demands to the Sejm separately now the greater part of these demands represent joint proposals.

Closer contacts between the workers also changed their attitude towards the peace movement. Formerly, the fight for peace was branded as "political," the problems of which could not be discussed by trade unions. Nowadays the workers regard the fight for peace as one which the trade unions cannot pass by.

The Finnish working-class movement highly values international solidarity. That is why the reactionary forces, taking advantage of the split in the trade unions and seeking to bar contacts and co-operation between our trade union organizations and their opposite numbers in the socialist countries, have suffered a series of setbacks. For example, our trade unions denounced and rejected a resolution moved by representatives of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) following the Hungarian events of 1956 which proposed to break off relations with the trade unions of the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies. The fact that the CTUA joined the ICFTU did not break these contacts either. On the contrary, they became stronger. Of special significance is the fact that the successfully developing contacts between the Soviet and Finnish trade unions are directed by the Joint Trade Union Council of both countries.

The parliamentary elections of 1958 brought a substantial gain for the democratic forces and showed that the working people are uniting not only in the struggle for their

economic interests, but also for the defense of their democratic rights, for a change in government policy.

The facts bear witness to the growing unity of the masses after the elections. Numerous actions by the people have played their part in the downfall of the Right-wing government which pursued a policy of worsening the economic conditions of the people and aggravating international tensions.

The working class feels an imperative need to unite its forces and to co-operate with other sections of the people. This is also necessitated by the growing capitalist offensive.

Unity of the popular forces becomes more and more imperative for other reasons. The Right-wing Social-Democratic leaders work openly to subvert the trade union movement. Along with CTUA they have organized a new central trade union amalgamation. In co-operation with the National Coalition Party (the Big Business party) they pursue a policy directed against the vital interests and rights of the working people.

The alliance with the National Coalition Party entered into by the Social-Democratic leadership deepens the contradictions among the Social Democrats. This can be seen in the fact that the Opposition withdrew from the Social Democratic Party and formed an independent organization called the Social Democratic Union of Workers and Small Farmers. The decision taken by the Social-Democratic leadership last May 25 to establish a new youth union to replace the existing one which is under the influence of the Opposition, and its appeal to women urging them to withdraw from the Social Democratic Union influenced also by the Opposition—all testify to a profound crisis within Social Democracy. It is no longer a monolithic force in the Social-Democratic or in any other mass organization.

One of the reasons for the crisis in Social Democracy was the first success achieved by Social-Democratic and Communist joint action at factories. The splitting activity of the Right-wing Social-Democratic leaders has enabled the workers to see their real intentions, and this opens up prospects for a successful struggle for unity. The so-called Organization of Trade Union Co-operation set up by the Right-wing splitters, to which only a few unions are affiliated, enjoys no mass support among the industrial workers. Even though Leskinen still has many supporters in the leading trade union bodies and at lower levels, the biggest mass organiza-

tion — the Central Association of Trade Unions — is no longer influenced by the Right-wing Social Democrats. Some of the Social-Democratic leaders of the Association are actively opposing the Leskinen group. This is one of the most important results accruing from united action.

The working people of Finland have gone through the period of division, and now they know what unity of action means. They are striving to consolidate their forces in order to strengthen the Central Association, and at the same time they are more vigorously demanding that the leaders of their unions and of the Central Association carry out a policy which promotes the common cause of the working class and leads it to new victories.

Reformist delusions, however, still prevent many Social-Democratic workers from establishing closer unity with other workers on many issues affecting their class interests. Among the workers and in the Social-Democratic organizations people can still be found who have not yet disposed of their blind hatred of communism. Finally, there are not a few Social-Democratic workers who oppose the Right wing and on many points agree with the Communists but who out of fear of the growth of Communist influence are not yet prepared to join forces with them. Ignorance of the aims of the Communists and of their sincere desire for unity often affects united mass organizations and the leadership of the struggle against big

capital and reaction. For that reason the Communist Party has found it necessary to pay closer attention to explaining its views and to step up ideological work among the working people, particularly among Social-Democratic workers.

The building of the united front requires that we display courage, rid ourselves of all prejudice and have firm belief in the will of the workers to unite in the fight for their class interests. The Communists believe their main task to be that of organizing joint action with the Social Democrats "at the bottom," at the factories, on issues affecting the interests of all workers. They criticize those policies of the Social Democratic and trade union leadership which run counter to these interests, and encourage broad discussions on fundamental issues with a view to weakening the influence of bourgeois ideology.

The working-class movement is gathering strength with which to frustrate the encroachments on the workers' rights, to prevent the incorporation of our country either into the Common Market or the British-led "Outer Seven," to forestall an adventurist foreign policy and to rebuff the reactionary ideological onslaught. The working people rally their forces to ensure the independence and peaceful development of Finland and to consolidate friendship and co-operation with the Soviet Union.

A Continent in Ferment

A. Iskenderov

A FEATURE of our times is the growing disintegration of the colonial system. The days have gone when the imperialists were the unchallenged rulers of vast territories inhabited by two-thirds of the population of the world. After the defeat of colonialism in Asia the national liberation movement spread to Africa. This continent, stretching from the Mediterranean to the Cape of Good Hope, from the Indian Ocean to the Atlantic, is the center of a struggle engaging the attention of the world. Recent developments in the Belgian Congo, Kenya, Nyasaland and Rhodesia are indicative of the resolve of the people to achieve liberation within the lifetime of the present generation. The whole of Africa is in ferment, and nothing can stop the sweeping advance of its peoples.

* * *

The countries of Africa differ in their historical, political and economic development. But notwithstanding the diversity and the distinctive character of the problems confronting each of them, they are all united by the struggle for national independence, spearheaded against imperialism and colonialism. All the patriotic forces, irrespective of their class status, are concerned with winning victory in this struggle, because colonialism oppresses, in varying degree, all strata of the population.

African unity is being moulded in the struggle against the common enemy. Faced with this unity the colonialists are compelled to change their tactics. The more far-sighted politicians realize that in the conditions of a growing national-liberation movement the old methods are no longer effective. This has dawned on them as a result of bitter experience in Asia. "If reform does not come in time," writes the American journalist John Gunther, "Africa—the greatest prize on earth—may be lost to the West as much of Asia was lost."

The apologists of colonialism take pains to stress the differences in the colonial policies of the imperialist powers. This is done to show to the African peoples that colonialism can be good as well as bad. There are, of course, differences in the colonial policies

of the European countries. The British monopolists, for instance, display more flexibility at times than do the French who resort to more ruthless methods, of which the sanguinary war in Algeria is an example. A reign of terror prevails in the Portuguese colonies of Angola and Mozambique where slavery still exists. But, be these differences what they may, they do not alter the substance of colonialism.

The peoples of Africa have condemned all and sundry colonialism—the "good" and the bad. That is why the first All-African People's Conference held in Accra over December 5-13, 1958, pointed out that "the great bulk of the African Continent had been carved out arbitrarily, to the detriment of the indigenous African peoples, by European imperialist countries, namely, Britain, France, Belgium, Spain, Italy and Portugal," that "the imperialists are now co-ordinating their activities by forming military and economic pacts such as NATO, the European Common Market, the Free Trade Area, the Organization for European Economic Co-operation, the Common Organization in Sahara, for the purpose of strengthening their imperialist activities in Africa and elsewhere;" and denounced colonialism and imperialism "in whatever shape or form these evils are perpetuated."

The people of Africa were subjected to the most revolting forms of colonial exploitation. The greater part of the continent is still an object of predatory exploitation. The colonial powers developed and waxed rich on the sweat and blood of the people of Africa. Racial discrimination and segregation, forced labor and concentration camps, misery and political oppression—that is what the "civilized" colonialists brought to Africa. Their motto "divide and rule" was nowhere practised so universally and nowhere did it have such fearful consequences as in Africa. In carving the continent into spheres of influence the colonialists showed no regard for ethnic and cultural factors. Tribes and peoples were artificially separated.

In the postwar period the United States monopolies have turned their covetous eyes to the rich resources of Africa. Indicative of

this is the growth of American investments in Africa. According to American sources, the prewar U.S. investments in Africa of \$200 million had grown to \$500 million by 1950. Six years later the figure stood at \$1 billion. Jointly with the West German monopolies, the American oil companies are now penetrating into the Sahara where considerable oil deposits have been discovered.

Referring to American aims in the continent, Joseph Satterthwaite, Assistant U.S. Secretary of State for Africa, said that the United States would soon be compensated for its setbacks in Asia and the Middle East. Africa, he went on, would give the U.S. a chance to take revenge.

Practically all strata of the population are taking part in the anti-colonial struggle in Africa.

The peasants, the mass base of the national-liberation movement, who comprise the vast majority of the population, are subjected to particularly ruthless exploitation both on the part of the imperialist monopolies (which own vast plantations) and on the part of the native feudal chiefs. The conditions of the peasants, aggravated by acute land hunger, impel them to fight against the colonial oppression. In the mind of the African peasant national independence is associated with his cherished dream of land.

In many African countries the land is still owned by clans and tribes, and to a degree this has prevented the appearance of large private holdings. The colonialists, however, have been able to outwit the community and, with its "consent," have seized large estates. Simultaneously a stratum of big landowners, drawn mainly from among the tribal chiefs, has taken shape. This stratum lends its backing to the colonialists.

The working class is the most active and consistent force in the national-liberation struggle. In many African countries the working class began to develop only after the Second World War. Here are some figures: in Nigeria there are some 400,000 wage workers, roughly 1.5 per cent of the population; in Ghana—200,000 or 5 per cent; in Sierra-Leone—80,000, or 4 per cent; in Gambia—5,000, or 2.5 per cent, etc. Their conditions could hardly be worse. There is no fixed working day. In many countries it is as long as 10-12 hours. Wages, in some of the countries of Black Africa, are 50 and even 100 times lower than those of European workers.

In recent years the workers have become better organized. Whereas before the war

there were few trade unions in the colonies, at present there is not a single country which does not have its unions. In Ghana and Northern Rhodesia, for example, more than 20 per cent of the wage workers belong to unions, in Nigeria—more than 40 per cent. The founding of an all-Africa trade union federation will be a landmark in the development of the African labor movement.

However, the working-class movement is still in its infancy. In many of the countries the workers are not yet organized, they are inexperienced in class struggle and have no political party of their own which would unite its efforts in the common struggle against imperialism. Reformism, which is influential in the trade unions, hampers the growth of the labor movement.

But each new battle tempers the African working class, and its class consciousness is deepening. The year 1959 saw a new wave of strikes. In February 6,600 workers employed on the Kariba Gorge project in Southern Rhodesia struck for higher wages; in March the dockers in Durban (Union of South Africa) struck for higher wages and against redundancy; in October 20,000 transport workers in the Belgian Congo stopped work demanding higher wages; in November 24,000 railwaymen in Kenya held a protest strike against racial discrimination; in the same month their fellow workers in Uganda downed tools for a minimum wage for skilled and semi-skilled. The young proletariat is distinguished for its consistency and determination in combating colonialism and imperialism, and all forms of exploitation and oppression.

The national bourgeoisie, too, is taking part in the national-liberation movement. In the fight against colonialism it is a progressive factor, expressing at a definite stage the interests of the patriotic forces of the nation. The progressive nature of the national bourgeoisie is determined by its anti-imperialist attitude, an attitude corresponding to its class interests which are infringed by the imperialist monopolies.

The native bourgeoisie is chiefly a commercial bourgeoisie. As to the national industrial bourgeoisie, its development has been retarded by the presence of a strong European bourgeoisie. This is particularly true of those countries in which there are permanent European settlers — Kenya, Uganda, Tanganyika, Northern and Southern Rhodesia, etc. The national bourgeoisie in East and Central Africa is less developed than in West

Africa where there are fewer European settlements.

The composition of the national bourgeoisie is not homogeneous. The bourgeoisie as a whole, particularly its top section, is characterized by vacillation and compromise. This contributes to its contradictory, unstable and inconsistent nature insofar as the struggle for the ultimate victory of the national-liberation movement is concerned.

These are the main forces participating in the African national-liberation movement. The alignment of class forces in each country, naturally, has its own specific features. In some countries there is either no national bourgeoisie at all or it is just in the process of emerging. In others the patriotic tribal chiefs are also taking part in the movement. Then there are the various intermediate strata and sections whose attitude to the movement differs depending on conditions. The national-liberation movements in Africa are democratic, anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist. At the present stage they do not set themselves socialist tasks. Their principal aim is to fight colonialism and to win political independence.

Unity of all the social forces is the decisive condition for success in this struggle. Never has the national-liberation movement in Africa faced the problem of unity so acutely. The desire of the people for united action found expression at the Accra Conference which called upon all the political parties and their leaders to establish a united front for freedom and independence. The need to unite all the people was underlined at the recent congress of the Democratic Party of Guinea. Unity is the slogan of the widespread pan-Africanism—the ideology of liberating the peoples of Black Africa.

But the striving for unity—the supreme manifestation of which is the joint struggle against colonialism and imperialism—does not mean that there are no differences between the classes of African society. One cannot agree with those African spokesmen who maintain that all the social sections and groups have common interests, and that the Marxist-Leninist theory of classes and class struggle is not applicable to Africa. True, in Africa there are specific features which find expression in a multi-form economy, in the interweaving of the various forms of production relations ranging from primitive tribal to capitalist. But these features do not negate the basic laws of social development.

The achievement of unity by the different classes and social groups is determined not

by the identity of their interests in general but by the fact that at the present stage of the struggle the contradictions between the classes are temporarily relegated to the background. At the moment colonialism is the greater evil for all classes and sections, and until it has been abolished it will be impossible to satisfy the interests of the separate classes.

It would be wrong to think that the growth of the national-liberation movement in Africa has been a smooth and painless process. The road to freedom is a thorny one. And it is a matter for regret that in Africa there are forces which, far from stimulating the movement, help the imperialists in maintaining colonial domination.

Apart from those feudal chiefs who are pillars of imperialism and some sections of the big bourgeoisie closely connected with the foreign monopolies the colonialists succeed at times in winning over some of the native intellectuals in order to split the national front.

But in spite of imperialist intrigues and activities of the African splitters the national-liberation movement is growing, winning more and more supporters.

* * *

The young sovereign states are playing no small role in the national-liberation struggle. Conscious of this responsibility for the destiny of Africa, Sékou Touré, President of Guinea, said that his country regarded itself as an agent in speeding the complete liberation of the people of Africa. On October 2, 1958—the day the Republic of Guinea was proclaimed—they declared that its independence was inseparable from that of the other peoples.

At present there are nine African countries that have recently gained political independence: the United Arab Republic, the Sudan, Ethiopia, Libya, Tunisia, Morocco, Liberia, Ghana and the Republic of Guinea. More than one-third of the population of the continent is now free from colonial oppression. The current year—1960—when four more countries (Nigeria, the Cameroons, Togo and Somaliland) are scheduled for independence will be the beginning of the end of colonialism in Africa.

The colonialists delight in claiming that they are granting independence of their own free will. The reality is altogether different. The imperialists would cease to be imperialists were they to abandon the exploitation of the colonies of their own free will. The

point is that they can no longer disregard the new postwar correlation of forces on the world arena. The victory of the progressive forces over fascism in the war, the communist construction in the USSR, and the building of socialism in the Chinese People's Republic and the other People's Democracies, the emergence of socialism as a world system and the victory of the national-liberation movement in Asia—these factors stimulated the anti-colonial struggle in Africa. And confronted with this struggle the colonialists are forced to make concessions, even to the extent of political independence. Sometimes it is more advantageous to relinquish political power while retaining economic domination rather than losing both. This is one of the specific features of neo-colonialism.

If the struggle for political independence is hard, winning economic independence is even more difficult. Political independence is not the end of the struggle against colonialism, it merely creates favorable conditions for winning economic independence.

The young countries of Africa which have won sovereignty still face many problems. The heritage of colonialism is felt in every sphere: disproportion in economic development, exceptionally low living standards, almost complete illiteracy, lack of indigenous specialists, unsolved agrarian and national questions, etc. The politically independent countries have made definite gains within a short period; they have demonstrated, contrary to the assertions of the colonialists, that they are capable of managing their own affairs. Their governments have somewhat curbed the feudal elements, nationalized a number of big enterprises owned by foreign capitalists, have built state enterprises and have carried out a series of other measures aimed at ensuring economic stability. Of no small significance is the introduction of economic planning. Illustrative of this is Ghana's five-year plan and Guinea's three-year plan. Ghana's plan (1959-64) is aimed at laying the foundations for economic independence. Guinea's plan (1960-1962) envisages the development of the mining industry, agriculture and handicrafts. The banana output will be doubled, coffee increased five-fold and the cabbage-tree three-fold.

Fulfilment of these plans depends largely on foreign credits. Aid is needed to accelerate economic development and to raise living standards. The question is: where will this aid come from, on what terms will it be granted?

The colonial powers, including the United States, pursue selfish aims when granting "aid" to economically underdeveloped countries. The former fear the independent economic development of the latter. Referring to this aid N. S. Khrushchov said that the imperialists indulge in talk about aiding the underdeveloped countries. In reality they are guided by the proverb: "Give to God what you no longer need yourself." They return some of the crumbs of the plunder and continue to plunder by exploiting the people of the underdeveloped countries. For every cent they give, they want a dollar in return.

The aid rendered to the underdeveloped countries by the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies is of a fundamentally different character. The socialist states want to help the former to get rid of the consequences of colonialism as quickly as possible, to overcome the economic backwardness, for without this it will be impossible appreciably to raise the standard of living. The peoples of these countries know that the aid rendered by the USSR and the People's Democracies has no strings attached. It flows from the very nature of socialism which is based on the unshakable principle that all national and colonial oppression should be abolished and that the right of all nations to independent development be recognized.

The Soviet proposals for general and complete disarmament are likewise indicative of the sincere desire of the Soviet Union to help the underdeveloped countries to do away with the colonial past. Were the United States and the other Western powers to accept the Soviet proposal, their acceptance would, as Khrushchov put it, create "new opportunities for helping states whose economies are at present still underdeveloped and need assistance from more developed countries. Even if only a small part of the money released as a result of ending the military expenditures by the Great Powers were earmarked for aid to such states, this could open up a virtually new epoch in the economic development of Asia, Africa and Latin America."

Conscious that their rule is nearing an end the colonialists are making every effort to stave off the final disintegration of the colonial system. In the hope of keeping Africa in chains, they resort to every device, fanning anti-communist hysteria in an effort to frighten the colonial peoples with the "communist danger." But they are finding it ever more difficult to convince the people of some-

thing that they do not believe in themselves. The people of Africa are becoming more politically conscious. They are learning to know their true friends from the sham ones.

* * *

The Dark Continent is awakening to the struggle for national liberation. The second

All-African People's Conference scheduled for Tunis in January will be a landmark on the road to independence. The hour of final liberation from the fetters of colonialism is approaching. The call of the first All-African People's Conference, expressing the will of the continent, resounds more loudly: "Africa shall be free!"

**In the Communist
and Workers' Parties**

Appeal of the Communist Parties of the Capitalist Countries of Europe to All Workers, to All Democrats

On November 21-24 an international meeting was held in Rome, on the initiative of the Gramsci Institute, to study problems of capitalism in Europe.

The representatives of the Communist Parties of capitalist Europe, who attended this meeting, held a general exchange of views on the problems of unity of the working class and of the widest sections of the people in the struggle for peace, defense and renewal of democracy and for the social and economic needs of the workers.

The meeting addressed an appeal to all workers and democrats in the capitalist countries of Europe, the text of which is published below.

THE decisive hour has struck for the future of our people and of all mankind.

War can be eliminated forever, and all energies and resources used to serve human progress. We can wage a successful struggle against human misery and humiliation in every form. We can achieve a new and powerful advance of productive forces, making use of the scientific and technological achievements which, as the Soviet Union has shown, are opening the way to the conquest of outer space by man. The hour has come when emancipation can be achieved by the peoples who are still exploited and oppressed. The possibility of progress and happiness is today real for all.

This is the glowing prospect which today calls all men and women and particularly young people to the struggle.

A turn towards a relaxation of tension has taken place, the further development of which

can end the cold war and establish new international relations based on mutual confidence, equal rights, and on coexistence and peaceful competition between all countries. The policy of the USSR and of all the countries in the socialist camp, supported by their acknowledged superiority in many fields, which is devoted exclusively to serving the cause of peace, has played an essential role in bringing about this new and hopeful phase in international relations. These favorable results prove the truth of the words of the Peace Manifesto in which, two years ago, sixty-four Communist and Workers' Parties called for a firm and confident struggle for peace.

The peoples can now set themselves the attainable aim of banishing war forever. This possibility has found expression in the proposals for general and complete disarmament submitted by the Soviet Government to the

United Nations. The peace of the world would be assured by the destruction of all stocks of atomic and conventional weapons, and by the elimination of armies and general staffs in all countries. It would thus be possible to devote the fabulous sum (more than \$15 billion in our countries alone) now swallowed by war budgets without any benefit for humanity, to the needs of life, to the development of culture, well-being and public health.

The favorable reception accorded the Soviet proposals, not only by the workers but also by the governments, proves that the idea of disarmament and of peaceful competition is imposing itself even in some ruling circles.

At this historical moment, the working class and the peoples of our countries have a great responsibility.

In our countries capitalism has deep roots. Aggression aimed at enslaving peoples of other continents often had its origin in our continent. And today, the ruling classes, supported by the ultra-reactionary circles of the United States, are trying to turn this part of Europe into a stronghold of reaction, by associating themselves with the aggressive policy of the Atlantic Pact. The economic groups which profit directly from the results of the cold war, and the political forces whose power is based on its continuation are hostile to a relaxation of tension.

Our people know the cost of the wars imposed in the past by German imperialism. In West Germany today militarism and imperialism have re-established their power. Their aggressive strength is all the more dangerous since their forces have been entrusted with atomic weapons. The German advocates of a policy of revenge are nurturing plans of aggression against the German Democratic Republic and making territorial claims against several countries in Europe. They represent the main threat to peace in Europe. German militarism has advanced with the connivance of the ruling circles in the United States, France, Great Britain, Italy, etc. This is a crime against the security of our countries and of the whole of Europe. It is a common task of all our peoples to see to it that German imperialism is deprived of the possibility of doing harm.

Moreover, imperialist and militarist circles are not prepared to resign themselves to the loss of the colonies from which they have drawn such high profits. This is the reason for the repressions in the Congo and Black Africa and for the acts against the newly-independent peoples of Asia and Africa, and above all for the war which has been waged

for years in Algeria. An end must be put to this war, through negotiation on the basis of effective recognition of the right of the Algerian people to decide their own destiny. Only by recognizing the independence of colonial peoples can new and beneficial relations be established between them and the peoples of the former ruling countries.

To you all—men and women of the capitalist countries of Europe, we say:

Let us act together for the speediest meeting at the Summit and for its success;

Let us unite our efforts for a solution of the German problem by the signing of a peace treaty with the two German states, for recognition of the German Democratic Republic and a settlement of the problem of West Berlin;

Let us demand together the abolition of foreign military bases and rocket bases, and the establishment of zones of disengagement in Central Europe, as well as in Northern and Southern Europe;

Let us demand, wherever the governments still refuse it, recognition of the Chinese People's Republic, and its rightful place in international organizations;

Above all, let us make our voice heard, let us unite our efforts with those of the peoples throughout the world, to achieve general and complete disarmament. First of all let us secure a ban on atomic weapons, an end to the tests which poison the atmosphere and the abandonment of the planned Sahara test, already condemned by the United Nations.

Let us work for the unity of all peace supporters and all peace organizations in a great campaign for disarmament. Let us support with all our strength the initiatives of the World Peace Movement. Political views and religious beliefs should not prevent men from rallying together in order that once and for all war shall be made impossible.

The steps taken along the road towards easing the tension are evidence that our past struggles have not been in vain. But we cannot afford to wait. The struggle must be intensified. Let us draw from our past successes renewed confidence in our strength in order to ensure lasting peace among the nations and friendship among all peoples.

Workers, democrats of the capitalist countries of Europe!

The favorable changes which have taken place in the international situation open new opportunities for the fight for liberty, to defend democracy, to re-establish it where

necessary and to give it new vitality. These changes are a blow to anti-communism.

Capitalist monopolies and their agents have made use of the cold war and, in some countries, of chauvinism and the spirit of colonialism to attack your rights and liberties.

Fascist dictatorships exist in Spain and Portugal. In Greece a reactionary regime persecutes democrats. In Adenauer's Germany, the Communist Party and other progressive and peace organizations are banned.

In France the regime of personal power established last year has annulled in practice representative institutions and destroyed parliamentary democracy.

Everywhere the big financial and monopoly interests, whose power is constantly increasing, aim at controlling closely and for their exclusive profit, the political life of our countries. The so-called supra-national "European" agencies are new instruments in the hands of the monopolies designed to intensify their exploitation of the peoples and to restrict the liberties already won through age-old struggles.

The imperative need is, therefore, a new advance in the fight for democracy.

The cause of the Spanish and Portuguese peoples, and of the Greek people, is the common cause of all free people. Let us help them in their struggles to establish regimes of political freedom and tolerance. Let us develop a great campaign for the liberation of Manolis Glezos and his comrades, for the liberation of Simon Sanchez Montero and for an amnesty in Spain, and to put an end to the illegal detention of Alvaro Cunhal and to free the other Portuguese political prisoners. The persecutions against many democrats in capitalist countries and against the militants in the liberation movements in the colonies must be ended. Let us work for the repeal of the ban on the valiant Communist Party in West Germany.

Every political freedom and right of the workers must be defended to the utmost, and at the same time an intensified campaign must be conducted for the extension of democracy, to make it stronger against all its enemies.

This is why the Communists demand the fullest democratic development in every aspect of public life.

The level of democratic development is different in each of our countries. But many

demands are common to all our peoples: extension of the rights of elected local, regional and national assemblies at the expense of the executive and central administrations; the fight against unjust electoral laws and discrimination; measures to make elected assemblies a true reflection of political opinion in each country; opposition to the increasing use of systems of class collaboration for the regulation of relations between employers and workers and against the attempts at making trade union organizations subservient to the employers and the government; the struggle to take away from the monopolies direct control over the modern means for influencing public opinion and enable them to be used by democratic parties and organizations.

Workers, democrats!

The struggle for democracy demands today a fight to limit the power of the monopolies, and restrict their domination over economic life and political institutions.

Measures for this aim include: nationalization of some monopolized sectors of industry, democratization of the agencies running the public sectors of the economy; development of the initiative and influence of the workers in every aspect of economic life; democratic control of investment in industry and agriculture; implementation of agrarian reforms and the defense of small peasant proprietors, as well as the defense of other small and middle producers against the stranglehold of the monopolies.

These changes correspond to the interests of the whole nation, of the entire population, the working class, the peasants and the urban middle sections. They would hinder the monopolies from making the workers pay for the consequences of new techniques. These are democratic measures. They do not abolish the exploitation of man by man. But they would limit the power of the monopolies; they would increase the authority and political weight of the working class in the life of the country; they would help to isolate the most reactionary social groups and facilitate the creation of an alliance of all progressive forces and strata which are the victims of the monopolies.

We call for a united struggle to establish, in accordance with the specific conditions in each country, democratic governments which, with the support of the working people, will be able to carry out a program of democratic advance.

Workers, democrats!

The struggle for peace and democratic advance is closely linked to the daily struggle in defense of the immediate interests of the working class and of the peasants, intellectuals, technicians, craftsmen, small traders, small industrialists and others suffering from the policy of the monopolies.

While living conditions differ from country to country, everywhere the monopolies have striven to make the working people bear the burden of their ruinous policy. Contrary to all illusions about a "changed" capitalism, a handful of privileged people have accumulated enormous wealth, while the exploitation of all workers has been intensified and the living standards of big sections of the population, despite the growing needs, far from improving, have, in some cases, become worse.

In none of our countries is full employment assured. In many, unemployment and part-time working remain at a high level. Capitalism has proved unable to develop the economically underdeveloped areas where the poverty of the workers is particularly acute. Millions of workers and peasants are compelled to leave their homeland in order to work in other countries, often under very bad conditions.

In Italy, Spain, Portugal, Greece, and in other countries, survivals of feudal relations in the countryside bar millions of peasants from owning the land they till. Everywhere the growing penetration of finance capital ruins increasing numbers of small and middle landowners and drives millions of agricultural workers off the land. Thus, despite the boom conditions over a number of years, capitalism cannot ensure bread and work for millions of human beings, even in the countries where it was cradled.

This situation tends to become worse as a result of the increasingly rapid concentration of finance capital on an international scale. The European Common Market and the Free Trade Area are not only instruments of the monopolies for plundering the national economy of each country, they also lead to economic and commercial war between our countries, which aggravates social and economic conditions.

Workers!

Only by valiant struggle and ceaseless resistance has the working class been able to limit the harmful effects of this policy. Unity and action have often succeeded in compelling the employers to retreat, in obtaining wage increases, and imposing social measures

which check the unlimited exploitation characteristic of capitalism.

Faced by such associations of the monopolies, the working class of our countries must rally its forces and act for common demands.

An end must be put to the economic divisions brought about both by the Common Market and by the Free Trade Area. The trade barriers between capitalist and socialist countries must be eliminated and effective economic co-operation among all countries established.

United effort is needed in every country and internationally in the fight against unemployment, for full employment, for wage increases, for improving the social services and for equality of rights for women and young workers.

In the spirit of the glorious traditions of past struggles, we are confident that the workers and their organizations will unite in a great international campaign to win the forty-hour week without reduction of wages.

Workers, democrats of the capitalist countries of Europe!

Experience shows that the division of the working-class and democratic forces has always benefited reaction. On the other hand, the people when united have gained victories and reaction has been pushed back.

Today unity is more than ever necessary.

Unity of the working class and democratic struggle is needed to prevent the economic problems in each country being solved at the expense of the working people and for the profit of the trusts.

Unity is necessary to ensure that the problems of political development in our countries shall find a democratic and not a reactionary solution.

Unity is urgently needed to make our governments serve the cause of peace and the relaxation of international tension.

This appeal for unity is addressed to all progressive and freedom-loving people, to all workers, whatever their political views. This appeal is addressed to Christian workers who look forward to better conditions for mankind, and to their organizations.

This appeal for unity we address particularly to the Socialist and Social-Democratic parties, to the members of these parties, to the members of trade unions and co-operatives, with whom we have so many times waged common and successful struggles. The policy of division, harmful to the interests of the workers, has not brought any advantage to these parties. In some countries they

have lost important positions to the Conservative parties as a result of this policy. It is not by abandoning socialist principles and by placing confidence in capitalism that these parties will regain these lost positions. This is not the time to give way to reactionary forces; it is the time for labor and democratic unity.

Of course, there are still many prejudices and differences which have been accentuated by the cold war. But this should not hinder united action for the objectives which the labor and democratic forces must set themselves: the establishment of peace, better conditions for the working people, defense and development of democracy, and a united advance towards socialism.

Meetings and talks are desirable with a view to finding ways to overcome the divisions and to promote in our countries political development in the interest of social progress, democracy and peace.

We shall take part in every conversation and exchange of opinion among representatives of democratic and working-class organizations in a spirit of confidence and mutual respect.

The cause of unity is the concern of the people everywhere. They must take it into their own hands everywhere, in the factories, in the towns and villages.

Workers, democrats!

The perspective of democratic development shows the way forward to socialism. We live at a time when socialism has demonstrated its superiority in all spheres of economic, political and social life. We live at a time when, with the development of co-existence and of peaceful competition, more and more millions of men of differing social background can be won more easily for the great ideals of socialism. The Communists are fully confident that in the conditions thus created the majority of the people in each of our countries will find the ways and means to unite in order to bring about a socialist transformation of society—a transformation whose fulfilment requires the exercise of political power by the working class and other strata of working people.

Once more, at a decisive time for mankind, our parties place themselves at the service of their peoples and of their countries.

Our parties draw their strength from their fidelity to the principles of Marxism-Leninism, which have proved themselves the most effective doctrine for the emancipation of humanity, the doctrine which enables man to develop his capacity to know the world and to transform it.

This strength comes also from the indestructible solidarity of the Communist Parties of the world, above all, with the great Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Defending the national interests of our countries, developing policies in accordance with the conditions in each country, our parties are linked by bonds of proletarian internationalism, as was fully reaffirmed in the Declaration approved on the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the glorious October Socialist Revolution.

Our parties draw their strength from the confidence and the support which they strive to obtain among their people, by understanding and defending ever more closely their interests and aspirations.

Workers, democrats of the capitalist countries of Europe!

Hearken to the call of the Communists!

In the struggle to strengthen peace, for the advance and strengthening of democracy, for higher living standards and better conditions for the workers, and for a happy future

LET US UNITE!

Communist Party of Austria
Communist Party of Belgium
Communist Party of Denmark
Communist Party of Finland
French Communist Party
Communist Party of Germany
Communist Party of Gt. Britain
Communist Party of Greece
Italian Communist Party
Communist Party of Luxembourg
Communist Party of the Netherlands
Communist Party of Norway
Portuguese Communist Party
Communist Party of Spain
Communist Party of the Republic
of San Marino
Communist Party of Sweden
Swiss Party of Labor

Rome, November 25, 1959.

Peaceful Coexistence and the Work of the Communists (USA)

The National Executive Committee, Communist Party USA, has addressed the following letter to the membership:

DEAR Comrades:

The pre-convention discussion thus far has brought forth many constructive amendments and proposals for improvement in the draft Political Resolution. At the same time, it indicates a general acceptance of the main line of the resolution. This is a line based on the concept of the broadest unity of all who stand for peace, as well as the democratic alliance of the people against the monopolies. It is a line based on the mobilization of the Party for these tasks, and calling for its consolidation and growth, and for the rebuilding of its mass ties.

However, we of the National Executive Committee are of the opinion that since the draft was prepared, many important events have occurred that have brought more sharply to the forefront certain highly significant developments which were not so clearly discernible at the time. These make it necessary to add to the draft and to modify some points in it. We are examining and discussing them, as is the entire Party.

The most striking of these developments is the Khrushchov visit and its consequences. This visit and the projected trip of Eisenhower to the USSR are themselves the outcome of a growing world trend toward peaceful coexistence and of certain tendencies toward a change in direction of foreign policy which had been shaping up in this country.

They represent an important first step away from the inflexible Dulles "brinkmanship" policies, produced by a number of pressures. Among them are the growing bankruptcy of the Dulles line, the mounting force of popular peace sentiment here and abroad, the sharpening of contradictions and divisions among the big capitalists, and the great achievements of the socialist countries.

Underlying these is a change in the relationship of forces on a world scale, with a mounting challenge to the dominant position of American capitalism from a number of sources, confronting the monopolies with an accumulation of increasingly serious problems.

The Khrushchov visit has produced certain immediate effects of great import to the American people. It has reduced world tensions. It could well mark the beginning of a real improvement in American-Soviet relations in that understanding

has been reached on direct meetings, as well as on discussions at the summit, as the method to be pursued in the search for agreement.

This is a great advance, immeasurably strengthening the fight to outlaw nuclear weapons and bringing forward as an issue of the day the question of complete disarmament. It not only opens the door to certain immediate gains, such as the ending of nuclear tests, but creates new opportunities for the peace forces to impose further shifts in foreign policy . . .

But these things will not come as gifts to the American people. Though the exchange of visits is indicative of a recognition by the Eisenhower Administration that the cold-war policies have failed, that the drift toward war must be checked and re-evaluated, this does not mean abandonment of the cold war itself. Nor has the thaw affected relationships with People's China; here the hard cold-war policy continues without letup.

The cold war is far from ended. Its advocates who are to be found in both parties (as symbolized by the Republican Rockefeller and the Democrat Acheson) and in some Administration circles, have already launched a counter-offensive designed to undo all that has been accomplished. They will have to be defeated, and there are battles ahead if the potentialities inherent in the present situation are to be realized.

What is most important, however, is that the cold-war forces have lost much ground and that the forces of peace now fight from a greatly improved vantage point, in short, that tremendous new opportunities now exist to advance the cause of peace—if they are grasped.

In particular, attention must be focused on the issue of disarmament, which has become the subject of intense discussion on all sides and is being regarded as a realistic hope by ever greater numbers of Americans.

What will be the economic consequence of drastic arms reductions?

What are the possibilities of a peace-time economy as an alternative to arms production and the menace of war, an economy providing greatly expanded social welfare benefits and higher living standards for the people?

These are questions being asked and debated by people everywhere, including many who formerly swallowed the hoax of an arms economy as the answer to unemployment.

The Communist Party has always maintained that the American working people are not hopelessly entrapped in a dilemma of war or crisis—that they can and must fight for such a peace-time economy as a far better alternative for themselves. We must support and give leadership to these struggles today.

At the very same time that international tensions are being eased and the possibilities of peace enhanced, the reactionary offensive on the domestic front has been accelerated. In particular, the infamous Landrum-Griffin Act has been passed, fastening new and more powerful shackles on organized labor than did the Taft-Hartley Act. And the steel companies are spearheading a drive aimed against the living standards and working conditions of workers in all industries.

Seemingly, these two trends, in foreign and domestic policies, are contradictory. But in reality, both represent efforts of American monopoly capital to cope with the growing challenge to its position from the socialist world, the other capitalist powers and the liberated countries, as well as with the growing economic problems which beset it at home.

In foreign policy, some sectors of big business seek to accommodate themselves to the existing relationship of forces; on the home front, monopoly unites in an effort to resolve its problems at the expense of the working people.

Such a situation is, of course, not inevitable. The people can and must fight for a reversal of domestic policy, just as they fight for an end to the cold war. Meanwhile, it creates a host of complexities and contradictory positions, giving rise to rifts and conflicts within the ruling class. Similarly, it gives rise to certain differentiations within the top labor officialdom.

These complexities are bound to be reflected in all issues and in the 1960 elections. Here it is clear that peace will be the dominant issue. But it is equally clear that we cannot ignore the position of candidates on such matters as the Landrum-Griffin Act and the dangerous trend it represents.

The passage of this law is already giving birth to a more critical attitude on the part of labor toward the two major parties, and to a growing, healthy sentiment for independent political action. These questions must be taken more adequately into account in the draft resolution . . .

The struggle of labor will grow in effectiveness as it becomes linked with that of the Negro people,

as well as that of the Puerto Rican and Mexican-American people, and especially to the degree that labor fights aggressively for Negro rights.

It is the responsibility of our Party to link up all these struggles and to show their relationship to the fight for peace. We must work to overcome the disunity in the ranks of labor and the people which has permitted the reactionary, offensive of big business to make such headway.

It is our responsibility, too, to bring forward the fight for socialism in the light of the new situation which exists. For the American people are changing their attitude toward socialism. The Sputniks and Luniks, the economic advance and challenge of the Soviet Union, its impressive educational achievements—these and other developments have produced more than mere curiosity in this country.

Americans are examining and weighing the relative merits of the two systems. And they are coming more and more to realize that the socialist achievements offer no threat to them. Hence the lucid descriptions of the Soviet society presented by Khrushchov fell on interested ears.

. . . In a number of places, we already witness significant new signs of breaking our isolation and becoming involved as a significant factor in the mass movements. And the present objective conditions offer real possibilities for expanding this trend.

Of paramount importance in our work is the elevation of the cause of peace and disarmament to the place of first rank which it deserves. In this, we must not underestimate the changes which have taken place.

"Peace to the world!" This benediction has been voiced by man throughout history. Heretofore it has been but a dream deferred, an illusive aspiration, passed down from generation to generation.

But now the material requisites have matured for transforming this dream into a way of living for all the nations of the world. In our time, peace has become a condition for the very existence and further development of human society, just as war has become unthinkable.

. . . Everything in the needs, hopes and aspirations of our people finds its relationship to, and is served by, this central issue of our times—the struggle for peace . . .

Upon the outcome of the now-unfolding struggle for a policy of peace may hinge the fate of mankind. The aroused action of the people for peace can ensure victory in this noble cause. Moreover,

their organized intervention will, by influencing the character of the peace, open the way to a new period of social progress.

Let us therefore appreciate the historic setting in which our 17th National Convention occurs. Let our task and opportunities to further the cause of

peace permeate and animate all our pre-convention discussions. Let us seek ways of applying this lever to the raising of the quality and effectiveness of our work in all spheres—in the trade unions, in the Negro people's freedom struggle, in the communities, among the youth—everywhere. . . .

Discussion on Scientific Progress and Social Development

IN October-November last, *l'Unita*, central organ of the Italian Communist Party, sponsored a discussion on the present and the future of man. In point of fact, however, the scope of the discussion was narrower: the Editorial Board posed to a group of Marxists six questions on the scientific, ideological and political significance of the conquest, as yet in its early stage, of the universe.

These are the questions: Do space flights signify a new era in human history? What is the link between the Marxist concept of passing over from the pre-history to the history of mankind and the vistas opened up by the conquest of outer space? Are the cultural and scientific successes of the Soviet Union the direct outcome of the socialist nature of Soviet society? To what extent do the latest scientific achievements corroborate and develop the Marxist world outlook? How can the obstacles impeding Italian education, science and culture be overcome?

Answers to these questions were given by Mario Spinella, Emilio Sereni, Angelo Pescarini, Valentino Gerratana, Lucio Colletti, Rossana Rossanda, and professors Galvano della Volpe and Lucio Lombardo Radice.

The published replies could not, of course, cover the problems in all their complexity, and were in fact a point of departure for a broader discussion on these questions.

All who took part believe there is an immediate link between Marx's concept of mankind's transition from pre-history to history and the prospects arising from the conquest of outer space, which was begun by the Soviet people, because history is a steadily developing process of man as a social and organized force, mastering nature. But the October Revolution continues to remain the decisive factor in the transition to man's real history, for, despite the significance of conquering space, socioeconomic relationships form the bedrock of human history.

Some of the contributors stressed that a new era begins only when decisive successes in master-

ing the sources of energy and production technology are accompanied by far-reaching changes in the internal structure and organization of society. Such was the case when ploughing was introduced in agriculture; such was the case, too, during the "industrial revolution" in Europe by which is meant not simply the invention of the steam engine, but the formation of a new, capitalist social structure which made for the more rational use and advance of technology.

It was stressed that the conquest of space means that in future man will have practically unlimited power over nature, and represents a qualitative leap. Hitherto, neither capitalism nor any society preceding it created conditions under which man could completely master the laws of nature; not infrequently he became a slave of the machinery he had himself created, a slave of his own scientific achievements. But in the capitalist world, despite economic crises and increasingly devastating world wars, scientific and technological progress went on. This process seems to infuse life into moribund capitalism, while the enormous destruction of the productive forces prepares the ground for the revival of the economy.

But with the coming of the space era this dialectics of destruction and new development of productive forces exhausts itself. Until now capitalist violence led to destruction which, though increasingly great and catastrophic, was nevertheless partial and limited, and did not rule out the possibility of restoring what had been destroyed. Now, however, with atom and rocket production, the possible damage would be irreparable. In order not to lose their power over nature, therefore, people must become masters of the laws of their own social organization. This has only been achieved in consciously planned socialist society. That is why we can say that man already has one foot in the new era, while the other is still in pre-history. This shows the urgency and importance of uniting and emancipating all mankind. And it is not through war that this should be achieved, a war which could spell finis to history in general, but

by following new ways, some of which are now being blazed, while others have been charted and traversed by the Communists and other conscious forces of our times.

All answered the question of how the socialist character of Soviet society had made possible such tremendous scientific and technological advance by saying that neither Sputniks nor Luniks could be produced by a handful of highly expert scientists and technicians remote from the society in which they live and work. Retreating anti-Soviet slanderers are still trying to depict Soviet successes as the work of a small group of scientists, but the fallacy of such assertions is apparent to all who appreciate that scientific and technological achievements can only be born of unparalleled advance in culture and the education of society as a whole.

This was brought home to the officials of the U.S. Federal Board of Education immediately after the launching of Sputnik I, and led to their decision to make a thorough study of the Soviet education system in order to ascertain the reasons for its superiority. Commenting on this fact, the participants in the discussion pointed out that "the launchings of Soviet space rockets should become a starting point for beginning or resuming serious talk with many sincere people about the Soviet Union." And indeed, quite a number of those who until recently really believed the cock-and-bull stories about Soviet socialism being the "negation of civilization," have now satisfied themselves that there has arisen and is developing in the USSR a new civilization, a civilization in which there are not only hundreds of thousands of excellent technicians but also freedom of the individual, a civilization in which a new type of man is developing. Not only are co-ordination of the social means and broad and rational planning typical of the socialist system, but the humane nature of Soviet science is also a feature of this society of free and equal people whose quest for knowledge and innovation has never met with obstacles of a technical or social character. "There is nothing fortuitous in the absolute superiority of socialist society in conquering space," said E. Sereni. The explanation lies in the supreme intellectual, moral, economic and social qualities and potentialities which are indispensable for the accomplishment of this task.

Despite its irrationality American capitalism has produced the A- and H-bombs. But it is now obvious that the technical and economic potentialities of the monopolies and the monopoly state are such that the latter cannot solve the problems of the cosmic era, which even from the purely economic angle calls for concerted work not only of individual factories and industries but also on a nation-

al and international level. The Soviet Union and the other socialist states possess economic and social potentialities which, for the first time in history, can be called universal and truly humane. This, it was stressed during the discussion, is of long standing. Twenty-five years ago the Webbs, the British sociologists, after a thorough investigation into the Soviet Union, wrote that there was no other country where such a tremendous and ramified program of research into both pure theory and technology was being carried out at the expense of the state.

Conquest of outer space, the participants in the discussion said, confirms and enriches Marxist theory. Lucio Lombardo Radice recalled the Leninist definition of living Marxism as a teaching which every new victory of mankind, and every latest discovery develops and enriches. This concept has now been re-confirmed and makes it incumbent on the Communists to undertake serious efforts in order, in a timely fashion, to elaborate pressing ideological problems. He said: "There is no doubt that today, when the revisionist fog has to some degree been dispersed, the main stress should be laid upon bold ideological development of the working-class and socialist movement."

Rossana Rossanda disagreed with *the way* in which the question on the development of Marxist theory in connection with conquest of space was formulated. Historical and dialectical materialism, she said, is not a classification of knowledge which can be mechanically compared with the latest scientific and historical data. Marxist theory is rather "an interpretation of the history of man and nature, an interpretation based upon a method which for the first time has critically and dialectically woven into a single whole the process of abstraction, the logics of development and history. . . ."

This idea was developed by Valentino Gerratana who stressed that Marxist theory was not a catechism, that when Marx and Engels introduced a scientific method into the study of society, this signified an ideological revolution that changed the views on man's relation to nature and made it possible to close the traditional gap between the natural and the social sciences. For that reason historical materialism cannot be divorced from dialectical materialism. Engels pointed out that "with each epoch-making discovery even in the sphere of natural science it (materialism) has to change its form" and that the same was true of historical materialism. "Lenin, commenting on this remark by Engels," Gerratana went on to say, "observed that this revision, far from having anything 'revisionist' in it in the traditional sense of the word, was on the contrary imperatively required by Marxism . . . It should also be said that

the best confirmation of the viability of Marxism is its ability to renew itself, preserving its unity and assimilating the achievements of scientific research. For this two qualities are essential—bold thinking and a sense of responsibility. It is the lack of the second quality that has always characterized the revisionists, who proclaim themselves to be innovators and readily undertake the most superficial improvisations.”

The participants agreed that the struggle for scientific progress and real humanism must embrace the fields of theory and education; it must simultaneously be a struggle for socialism, a struggle to resolve contradictions impeding the development of man and science. In that sense the struggle now going on in Italy for the regeneration of the school and its curriculum is linked closely with the movement for transforming the country along socialist lines.

The discussion helped to clarify from Marxist-Leninist positions the significance for mankind of such tremendous achievements as the spectacular launching of the Soviet Sputniks and space rockets. Any important development of this kind should be viewed from the angle of historical perspective and utilized further in the political and organizational work of the Communists. Italian Marxists taking part in the discussion tried to make their own individual contribution to clarifying the perspectives that are opening up and the tasks that these will entail.

The *l'Unita* initiative is of practical significance, too, in that it provides Party functionaries and activists as well as its readers with topical prob-

lems to ponder over and convincing arguments for use in day-to-day propaganda work. The discussion helped make clear that it is not enough just to note the far-reaching changes taking place in the world, the important thing is for everyone to make an effective contribution to changing people's minds, to the new processes of social development now taking place and the impact of the astounding achievements of the USSR and socialism.

Perhaps the best way of concluding this brief account would be to quote Comrade Togliatti's words at a meeting of the Central Committee of the Italian Communist Party, held on the occasion of the 42nd anniversary of the October Revolution:

“Throughout the capitalist world . . . there is a yawning gulf between the tremendous leap that has been made in all spheres of scientific development and the way the conditions of the masses are changing or remaining unchanged . . . And we feel that the space era, on the threshold of which we now stand, is an expression of scientific progress in all fields of man's activity, linked with the new, decisive, ever-accelerating and revolutionizing forward movement to socialism.

“To reach the moon means above all building a society which is not founded upon the privileges of small groupings, but makes man . . . the pivot of social life. . . . The scales today are tipping in favor of socialism, and this makes feasible the proposals for an international détente . . . and general and complete disarmament . . . Italy, too, must march forward, to socialism. That is our moon and we want to reach it.” E. V.

Our Year's Plan

THE plan for political and organizational work, endorsed by a meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Sweden, and distributed among all Party organizations, covers the period up to September next when the general election will be held. It analyzes the present situation, briefly formulates the political line of the Party and envisages steps for conducting work among the masses on a larger scale.

A feature of the present situation is big capital's intensified offensive on the conditions of the masses. The Social-Democratic government is making concessions to the bourgeois parties, thus making it easier for big capital to carry out its schemes. In view of this the Party considers it to be highly expedient to concentrate all its forces on uniting the working people in the fight against reaction, for changing the economic policy.

The Party opposes intentions to abolish the important social reforms won in the past, and protests against the raising of taxes under the pretext of bringing revenue into line with state expenditures. The Party indicates realistic ways of replenishing the state treasury. The money is there in plenty and that is where it should be taken from.

This is not merely a call but precise calculations elaborated by the C.C. meeting and envisaging concrete economic steps.*

The C.C. calls on all Party organizations to put forward economic demands and help organize powerful mass resistance to the reactionary plans of big capital and its parties.

Various steps should be taken to organize the movement for the economic policy suggested by

*See No. 12 (1959) of *World Marxist Review*, “Economic demands of the Party” (Brief Notes).

the Communists as an alternative to that pursued by the government. On the initiative of many Party committees conferences attended by representatives of trade unions, working-class political organizations, tenants, pensioners and other associations were assembled to discuss economic matters. A conference on the tax policy in Goeteborg was attended by 280 delegates representing 40 organizations; at a similar conference in Stockholm 263 delegates represented 35 organizations. Conferences in other towns were also widely representative.

The Party calls on the trade unions to organize meetings where representatives of various trends could exchange views on the economic policy. The Communists are taking part in the tenants' fight conducted against encroachments on their conditions, higher rents, etc. In the municipalities they are voicing the popular indignation over the state expenditures for which the communities are forced to pay. Petitions adopted at enterprises and neighborhood meetings are insistently demanding a new economic policy. There is no doubt that in the course of mobilizing the masses for the Communist-sponsored economic program many new forms of mass struggle will evolve.

The plan further envisages organization of mass action against the demands of the bourgeois parties and the generals that the armed forces be equipped with nuclear weapons. The Party holds that nuclear arms are arms of aggression and incompatible with the policy of neutrality. They are detrimental to our security, arouse suspicion of our professed policy of steering clear of alliances and increase the danger of the country being drawn into war. Those who seek to equip the army with atomic weapons and to change the foreign policy, are openly advocating military co-operation with the Atlantic bloc.

The Party calls on all mass organizations and peace supporters to actively oppose atomic arms. We are dealing here with a question that is decisive for the whole of mankind—namely, the preservation of the present generation. The struggle against atomic arming of Sweden should naturally be linked with the worldwide struggle against bomb tests and for the banning of atomic arms and other means of mass destruction. Now that the situation in the world arena is changing in favor of peace and mutual understanding, the calls of the Party are meeting with ever-growing response because they accord with the peaceful aspirations of the majority of the Swedish people.

Another point in the plan—a particularly important one for an industrial country like ours, where over half the population is made up of factory and

office workers—is that of the working people having a say in labor relations.

Factory owners and boards of joint-stock companies can carry through mass dismissals by a stroke of the pen, decide whether enterprises are to work or close down, etc. In conditions characterized by increasing difficulties life itself impels the working people to rally their forces for the democratization of production conditions.

The political tasks formulated by the Party have organizational backing. For example, when the *Ny Dag* and *Arbetartidningen* were celebrating their 30th anniversary, a campaign was organized for raising the sales of these papers. A special newspaper entitled *1960* is being put out in hundreds of thousands of copies and will be distributed for ten months—until the election takes place. The Central Committee has appealed to the membership and supporters for financial help. A so-called Fighting Fund has been established and a goal set—to collect one million crowns for the press, trade union work and the election campaign. It is also planned to extend the network of Party organizations and to increase the membership, particularly at points of production.

If the Party keeps in step with the times, listens carefully to the workers and displays initiative in their struggle, conditions will be favorable for setting up more Party branches at the enterprises. A Communist must set an example by his work in the trade union and at the enterprise, rally the workers and lead them to battle. Discussion of local political affairs has been made the duty of all Party organizations.

It has been decided to organize, in the district and other important centers, weekly seminars to be held during the winter and spring. Emphasis in Party education will be laid upon burning social problems in order to know the current situation better, to teach members how to analyze events from Marxist-Leninist positions. This condition is indispensable for stepping up the activity of Communists and sympathizers and making their political work more effective.

The conferences of the district Party organizations now in process are drawing up their own plans for the year on the basis of this C.C. decision. Branches have also held meetings on the political and organizational tasks deriving from the plan.

The militancy which prevailed at these meetings promises that the work commenced will yield good results.

Knutt TELL
Secretary of the Central Committee,
Communist Party of Sweden

Recruiting New Members

NOT long ago the Chilean Communist Party organized a campaign named after Luis Emilio Recabarren, one of the founders of the Party. The aim of the campaign which lasted six months was to increase the membership by 50 per cent, to strengthen the working-class composition of the Party, consolidate its positions in important industrial centers, and to recruit more peasants and women. Many regional and district organizations overfulfilled this quota. In Colchagua, for example, which is a purely agricultural area, membership increased by 160 per cent, in the south of Santiago Province—by more than 60 per cent; 20 new branches were organized there among the workers and 19 among the peasants. Peasant branches are being formed not in the villages but on the estates. In the north of this province one of the regional committees substantially increased the membership, establishing 16 new industrial branches, 14 peasant and 8 women's branches. Important success was also scored by other regional and local Party committees in the various parts of the country. Thus, in San Francisco de Mostazal, a small village in the O'Higgins Province, where there were formerly only seven Communists, there are now 40. In Estacion Llanquihue, a lumbermen's settlement, there were only three members of the Party; now this number has risen to 40.

Particular mention should be made of the growing membership among workers at copper-ore mines exploited by the U.S. monopolies. As a result of ten years of red-baiting and witch-hunting our organizations in these extremely important working-class centers were crushed. But thanks to the Recabarren enrolment Party organizations have been re-established and strengthened at the mines in Chuquicamata, Potrerillos and others. At the El Teniente pit where, before the campaign, there was only one branch, there are now four with a membership of over 40.

On a countrywide scale the target set for the campaign was on the whole reached. The membership rose by 47 per cent. This is gratifying for last year as a result of the Galo Gonzales enrolment the membership increased 122 per cent.

Since March 1958 the strength of the Party has trebled, despite the fact that some 10 per cent of the membership was lost during the card-exchange campaign. There were various reasons for lapsing, such as a change of place of residence and also some organizational drawbacks.

A feature of the present campaign was the active participation of all Communists, Party

committees and branches all of whom displayed much initiative. First of all mass meetings were held to discuss important national issues and questions worrying individual sections of the population. Overflow meetings were indicative of the growing prestige and influence of the Party. Then, all Party branches organized open meetings inviting friends and sympathizers: workmates, if it was an industrial branch, and neighbors if it was a community branch. Usually tea and cocktails were served after the meeting, or else they were followed by a dance. Many expressed their willingness to join the Party at these informal friendly meetings.

Besides work among the masses close attention was paid to work with individuals. Talking to people, explaining our political line, patient persuasion, circulation of Marxist literature—all this was instrumental in winning members.

Our Party has truly enormous possibilities of growth. As a result of the pro-imperialist policy pursued by the Alessandri administration the masses show more and more sympathy for the Communists. And on the other hand the great successes of the socialist camp are arousing increasing enthusiasm among the people.

The popular support for our Party which was born out of the working class and whose whole history is closely linked with working people's struggle, is growing. But there are reasons impeding a greater influx of new members. Above all we should mention the mass dismissals which have raised the number of jobless to over 200,000. In provinces unaffected by dismissals the enrolment was a success; but the position was different where the workers were forced to go to other provinces or even neighboring countries in search of work. In the Antofagasta Province, for example, 200 Party members were laid off at the saltpeter mines. This naturally affected the work of the Party organizations. The same thing happened in Caldera port, Atacama Province, where all Party members had to leave because of the dismissals.

But all the difficulties notwithstanding, thousands of new members, including many women, joined the Party both in industrial and rural areas. Hundreds of new branches have been established in the factories, villages, and among women.

Our aim was not only to win new members but also to get premises for the Party. Many regional and local committees bought houses on money collected by the members; in other places our comrades are themselves building houses for the Party.

The distribution of the Party press and Marxist literature was a success. The circulation of our theoretical journal *Principios* has been substantially increased.

El Siglo, the Party organ, is sold either in the streets or through special agencies of the National Press Association which services all newspapers in Chile. The Party decided to organize teams of Party members to do house-to-house selling of the paper on Sundays. This may help distribution only a little, but the method has great political significance for it enables us to establish closer contacts with the readers, and is instrumental in winning new members. Within half a year the Sunday teams in Santiago raised the sales of newspapers from 3,800 to 7,500 copies. Particularly impressive results were achieved by the Party committee in the San Miguel industrial area where some 2,500 extra copies are being sold every Sunday.

Complying with the decision of a C.C. meeting all members of the Central Committee went into the streets one Sunday to sell *El Siglo* together with teams from their branches or from the branches in the localities where the C.C. members were on that day. On subsequent Sundays their example was followed by the middle-rank Party functionaries in many of the provinces.

Much experience was gained during the Recabarren enrolment. Winning and educating new members has become a permanent part of the work. Many regional committees and local Party organizations have set themselves the task of doubling their memberships as soon as possible. In order to win important positions at the municipal elections this year the Party is working to get all

working people on the voters' lists. Although the electoral law is a reactionary one, the working class and the people increasingly realize the importance of taking part in elections, using the right to vote as an instrument for their emancipation. They understand that if, on the basis of the Socialist-Communist agreement, the unity of the working-class movement becomes stronger; if the success won at the 1958 presidential election is consolidated; if the Popular Action Front gains strength, and if a powerful progressive-democratic coalition is built under the leadership of the working class, the anti-national schemes of the Alessandri administration will undoubtedly end in a fiasco. This will limit the maneuvering capacity of the imperialist and reactionary forces, and accelerate the conditions for a radical change so vital for Chile.

The severe repressions of the past decade have not broken our Party, nor have they severed it from the masses or extinguished the ever-burning flame of Marxism-Leninism in our country. The shortcomings which obtained during the illegal period of the Party have been overcome, while the present shortcomings can be eliminated, as the Recabarren enrolment has demonstrated, in the course of our day-to-day struggle. The influx of workers, peasants and women into the Party confirms what the Chairman of our Party, Lafferte, has said so well—we are those "who are in the majority and who are better." Continuing to attract new members the Party sees to it that they raise their ideological and political level and establish close contact with the masses. We are confident that a powerful, genuinely mass Communist Party will develop out of the popular struggle in Chile.

Rodrigo ROJAS

Educational Activity in the French Communist Party

(An Outline)

THE educational system in the French Communist Party is flexible and comprehensive; it enables the members to acquire the necessary political and theoretical knowledge.

One of the most widespread forms of education are *talks on theoretical questions* linked with current political tasks. Each subject is discussed at several talks (some 20 minutes each) conducted at branch meetings once or twice a fortnight.

Lately the talks have centered around the results of the Fifteenth Party Congress, the Khrushchov

visit to the United States, the economic successes of the Soviet Union, the prospects for an international détente, and the fight for regenerating democracy and for the economic demands of the working people. During the annual card-exchange the subject of talks, to which sympathizers are also invited, is the Communist Party.

Almost every Party committee has a *study group* for active members, the aim being to discuss theoretically the current political questions. The members are supplied with outlines and lists of

reference material. The studies usually begin with a brief introduction by one of the members, which is followed up by a discussion.

In the past three years the Party departmental organizations held many *theoretical conferences* to discuss matters of vital concern to them. The theses of the planned report are distributed among all Party organizations which then send delegates to the conference (the number often amounting to several hundred). Sometimes these reports are discussed also in the Party press.

The report is read at the conference by a member of the departmental committee. The delegates, speaking in the discussion, share their experience and the views expressed on the point at issue in their branches. Then one of the Central Committee members sums up the discussion and outlines the measures to be taken to improve Party work in connection with the question discussed.

In many departments conferences on the impoverishment of the working class were held; they were organized not only on a territorial basis but also in relation to trades. With the coming of autumn and winter the work of Party departmental organizations in rural areas becomes more active. Many of them plan conferences to discuss Party work in the countryside. The Party committee of the Loir et Cher Department presented a report in which it showed the class character of the government's agrarian policy, what the capitalist path of rural development brought the peasants and what socialism would mean to them. It also formulated the immediate demands of the Party in the countryside, the tasks of the Party organizations and the work of Communists among the peasants.

Party schools are the most widespread form of Marxist-Leninist education. There are three types: elementary, departmental and central schools.

Elementary schools are organized by sections and even by branches. All members, functionaries in the first place, must finish such a school. Particular attention is paid to drawing members from factory branches. The aim of these schools is to help members get a better understanding of the Party's policy, the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism and to show the role and significance of the Party in the working-class struggle. The curriculum elaborated by the Central Committee with regard to the political situation includes in the current study year six theoretical problems: social classes and capitalist exploitation, the nation and the national role of the working class, the struggle for democracy, the fight for peace, communist ideals and Party organization.

A curriculum, drawn up for schools in rural areas, envisages a deep study of the question of the worker-peasant alliance.

The studies are held once a week in spare time. The Central Committee publishes annually educational material for distribution among the students. The tutors give students advice, explain to them how to study the material, single out the main ideas useful in practical work, and formulate arguments for a more effective struggle for Party policy.

In his introductory talk the tutor does not retell the contents of the booklet but poses key questions for the students.

The first hour of the next class is devoted to discussing these problems. The tutor encourages the students to think independently and draw the necessary conclusions. He conducts the discussion and sums it up.

Departmental schools aim at ideologically training cadres for sections, departmental Party and mass organizations and large enterprises. Their program is more extensive and comprehensive than that of the elementary schools. They are full-time schools—the students study for 9 to 12 days.

Last year the program of the nine-day school included the following points: social classes, the national betrayal of the bourgeoisie and the national role of the working class, the international situation and the fight for peace, the impoverishment of the working class and the economic and political struggle, the struggle for the restoration and regeneration of democracy, the worker-peasant alliance, the colonial peoples' struggle for independence and for a solution of the colonial question in the spirit of the times, the struggle for unity of the working-class and democratic forces, and the Communist Party. The students heard a lecture, "Marxism-Leninism—Our Compass," and studied a theoretical work by one of the founders of Marxism-Leninism chosen by the tutor.

In the twelve-day school the program includes two more points: "What the Communists Want" and "Marxism-Leninism—Our Compass." A lecture is delivered on Party work among the youth. Every student must write a treatise on work among the masses or in public organizations; the students also study one of the theoretical works or Party resolutions.

There are two types of full-time schools because account must be taken of material difficulties plus the fact that some cannot get sufficient leave from their place of work. Twelve-day schools are usually run by the bigger departmental organizations where it is easier to decide organizational questions. Small Party organizations often pool forces in order to open a joint school of either type. However, each departmental organization tries to have its own school, for this allows specific conditions in the area to be taken into account.

There are also *part-time departmental schools* designed for members who cannot get time off and for women who are unable to put aside their household duties. For these members there are also evening and Saturday schools. Similar types of schools are established by departmental organizations which have no premises for full-time schools. The program is not as varied as in the full-time schools; it includes six seminars held once or twice a week.

Many departmental organizations conducted their schools during the summer holidays which kept the costs down.

For members working among the peasants there are nine-day *peasant schools* which serve members from several adjacent departments. Their program and subjects are also approved by the Central Committee. Of late the subjects were as follows: the international situation and the fight for peace, the capitalist path of rural development and class differentiations in the countryside, the State and freedom, the Party, the worker-peasant alliance, the agrarian program of the Communist Party, the working class, the Communist Party and the struggle of the colonial peoples for independence. A special lecture was devoted to the anniversary of the Russian Revolution.

The students of the departmental schools are given outlines of the lectures beforehand. After the lecture they study the necessary literature, then the lecturer poses several topical questions and the discussion begins.

The study of the Party documents is so organized as to enable the students to understand the basic ideas and theoretical background of each document.

The students write theses on the most important political and theoretical subjects. After consulting the tutors the school director puts two or three questions to the students, which they answer in written form, linking their theoretical study with practical knowledge. This kind of study enables the students to introduce their own thoughts, because they consider theoretical concepts on the basis of the political struggle of the moment.

Theses are analyzed orally. A student reports on his thesis, it is then discussed, and the tutor draws conclusions with regard to the opinions voiced. Lessons in these schools last for a total of ten hours a day.

Central schools, organized on a national scale by the Secretariat of the Central Committee, train leading cadres for the departmental organizations, bigger sections and mass organizations. Their program includes philosophy, political economy, history, politics, literature, etc.; the course lasts four months. There are also central schools of a

general type with a less extensive program (four weeks only).

The specialized central schools (four weeks or fifteen days) are called to help various categories of Party workers in the departments (tutors, journalists, correspondents) in getting general and special education. Their program, also approved by the C.C., varies depending on the category of students.

The Party closely links political education with extensive explanatory work and seeks forms conducive to taking Marxism to the people. The *New University*, founded in 1932 in Paris (then called *Workers' University*), is a specific form of political education for trade union and Party functionaries. Many prominent working-class leaders have graduated from it. Formerly, its program included philosophy, political economy, Russian and English. Today philosophy, sociology, political economy, history of the working-class movement of a number of countries, literature, history of science and French and Russian are being studied.

Compared with 1958, the body of students rose last year by 25 per cent. Here are a few figures: the first and second-year courses of the Russian language faculty had 250 students each; 290 attend the first year course of the philosophy faculty, and over 300 study the history of science. The interest in the University is so great that it is being attended by factory and office workers from nearly all enterprises in Paris, including a few hundred non-Party workers.

The University has three centers in Paris, one of which serves mainly college students. It also has branches in other towns.

Tutors do their work as a Party assignment without salary.

For intellectuals the accepted form of Party education is lectures organized by the Central Committee on individual subjects (for example, socialist realism, the Communist and the Catholic). Party organizations also invite workers to these lectures.

To help members studying theory in groups and schools the Central Committee publishes annually booklets on various subjects. *Propaganda Bulletin* is printed for propagandists and branch and committee secretaries. The Agricultural Department of the Central Committee puts out *Information Bulletin*. The Propaganda Department draws up methodological guides and lists of literature for the elementary, departmental and central schools.

The Secretariat of the Central Committee pays close attention to selecting and training tutors for the elementary schools, for on this depends extension of the network of these schools and the quality of the teaching. It has become a rule that a worker

—an active member of a section committee—is appointed director of a school. He acquires pedagogical experience in the course of the studies. To facilitate ideological and pedagogical training of school directors, one- or two-day seminars are held under the auspices of the departmental committees. Those attending also do practical work.

Short Notices

Bulgaria

THE GROWING ROLE OF SCIENCE IN SOCIALIST CONSTRUCTION

THE Central Committee of the Party and the Council of Ministers have adopted a decision on the further development of Bulgarian science and enhancing its role in socialist construction.

The Bulgarian Academy of Sciences unites 35 institutes; the number of higher educational establishments has grown to 20, and many specialized research institutions have been set up. In all over 5,000 scientists are working at these centers of science. "An historical achievement of our science," reads the resolution, "is that it has resolutely broken with reactionary theories and is developing on a Marxist-Leninist basis."

But some of the branches still lag behind the growing requirements of socialist construction and the level of world science.

"The fundamental and immediate task of Bulgarian science," the resolution stresses, "is to elaborate the vital problems of socialist construction on which the accelerated economic development of our country depends."

It has been decided to attach research centers to all departments of the Academy of Sciences; to set up research institutes—which will incorporate the departmental institutes; to form groups of scientists at factory laboratories. A long-term plan will be drawn up for training cadres for the key branches of science, above all for physical, mathematical, chemical and technical sciences; there will be greater co-operation between the Academy of Sciences and the higher educational establishments, research centers and organizations.

The Party and the government attach special importance to strengthening contacts with Soviet scientists and those of the other socialist countries.

Measures have been envisaged for the further development of physics, mathematics, chemistry,

The Central Committee organizes special seminars (lasting one or two weeks) for training the directors of departmental schools.

In all central schools the courses are directed by members of the Central Committee or workers in its departments.

the technical sciences, geology, the agricultural, biological and medical sciences.

Those specializing in the physics and mathematics branch have been set the task of conducting research mainly into the use of atomic energy, semi-conductors and electronics and to work out problems of applied mathematics.

Scientific workers in the field of social sciences have been advised to study the problems of socialist society more deeply, particularly those which will contribute to making an economic leap forward. Those in the sphere of philosophy, political economy, pedagogics, history, law, the history of literature and the arts, and linguistics should work still more actively to inculcate socialist ideas in all spheres of public life and in the minds of people, to fight uncompromisingly against all survivals of capitalist ideology.

The resolution stresses the need for Party organizations to play a greater role in the work of scientific establishments.

Iceland

ELECTORAL SUCCESS

THE recent general election has demonstrated that the Socialist Unity Party (formed in 1938 as a result of the merger of the Communist Party and the Left wing of the Social Democratic Party) is playing an increasingly important role in the country's political life.

The Party owed its success to the fact that it was the initiator of the laws on taxing big property, control over banks and greater housing construction, etc., passed by the Althing (parliament). The Party fought persistently against the high cost of living, for full employment and higher wages, the extension of the fishing zone from four to 12 miles and for greater economic contact with the socialist countries. These demands found a wide response among the masses and in the united trade union center.

In 1956 the Party entered into an electoral bloc—the People's Alliance — with the Left-wing Social Democrats who were discontented with the policy of their party. And this alliance won seven seats

on June 28, 1959, at the election for a new parliament which was to change the electoral law based on the majority system for one based on proportional representation.

When a new electoral law was passed, the Parliament was dissolved and a new election held. Although all forms of anti-communist propaganda were used against the People's Alliance the reactionaries failed in their schemes. The Conservatives, possessing an enormous propaganda machine and unlimited finances won 24 seats out of the 60, but they lost 2.9 per cent of the votes as against the June elections. The Progressives (17 seats) lost 1.5 per cent of the votes. The Social Democrats now have 9 seats, while the Party for the Defense of the Nation failed to obtain a single seat. The People's Alliance, having won more votes than at the previous election, now has 10 seats.

The Alliance continues to fight against inflation and the further offensive of big business against living standards; for reducing the profits amassed by the banks and oil companies and the cost of the administrative apparatus; for a 10-year plan of economic development and electrification; the establishment of a workers' bank; for the export of fishing products and the import of main items to be taken over by the state; for putting into effect the Althing resolutions concerning the withdrawal of the U.S. armed forces and the expansion of the Icelandic fishing zone to 12 miles; for Iceland's withdrawal from NATO and her being proclaimed a neutral state.

Morocco

IN DEFENSE OF THE PARTY

FOR several months now the government has been trying might and main to impose a ban on the Communist Party, accusing it of being incompatible with Islam, the monarchy and the national traditions.

On October 29 the civil court in Casablanca, which investigated "the case of the Communist Party," rejected these false charges. The court found from the Party Rules that the Party's activity did not run counter to Islam; that admittance to the Party was open to Moroccan citizens of any nationality irrespective of their creed; that the Communists could not be accused of evil designs and that the Communist Party should be regarded as a party acting in the interests of the Moroccan people, etc. In short, the provocation failed. But the reactionaries are not letting it go at that. The prosecutor has appealed to the Court of Appeal in Rabat, seeking the imposition of a ban.

The Party has issued a statement which says that the decision of the Casablanca civil court "was

clear, explicit, logical and profound in reasoning.

"It is striking proof of the sincerity of the Party which since its inception has fought for the liberation of the country and for its grandeur, for the emancipation of the people and for their happiness.

"The Casablanca verdict has been hailed with enthusiasm not only by the Communists, but by all sober-minded patriots. Throughout the world the freedom-loving people regard this verdict as a guarantee of justice and wisdom, and a confirmation of the will for a democratic development of the young Moroccan state.

"But contrary to all logic and common sense the prosecutor has lodged an appeal with the Rabat Court of Appeal, demanding the dissolution of the Party. This act cannot but evoke surprise and disappointment, and should be regarded as a flagrant violation of freedom of speech and assembly guaranteed by the law, as running counter to the King's wish to 'learn how to apply democracy,' of which he spoke in his throne speech on November 18, 1959."

The statement goes on to say that: "The Communist Party enjoys the ever-growing support of the workers, peasants and intellectuals.

"It has irrefutable proof of the justness of its splendid cause—the cause of liberating the country completely, of freeing the national economy from foreign monopoly rule; the cause of social justice and democratic development under the monarchy, showing due respect for sound national traditions and institutions.

"Fraternity and humanism—these are the noble ideals of the Party; religious intolerance is alien to it.

"With the loyalty of its members and the solidarity of all progressives, democrats and patriots, the Party is confident of the victorious outcome of the struggle it is waging for existence and for a democratic future for the country."

Switzerland

GROWING PRESTIGE OF THE PARTY

THE Party of Labor did not count on scoring any major success at the last general election. Persecuted, and lacking the premises and propaganda machinery available to the bourgeois and Social-Democratic parties, it was naturally unable to develop its election campaign on the scale the other parties did. In an attempt to maintain the positions won in 1955 it put up its candidates in five cantons. Despite the campaign of

slander and silence and the strong blows to the Party in recent years, its ideas, as the election demonstrates, are penetrating into the masses and its prestige is growing. At the election the Party made peace the central issue, fought against the growing military expenditure, for the extension of democratic rights, social insurance and housing construction.

Compared with the previous election, the number of votes cast for the Party rose from 22,800 to 26,200. The greatest success was scored in the Geneva canton where the number rose from 4,500 to 8,000.

But because of the reactionary electoral law the Party, which formerly had four seats in Parliament, now has only three. The Liberal Party which got 2,000 votes less than the Communists, obtained five seats. In the Vaud canton the Social Christian Party with 3,283 votes obtained the seat which should have gone to the Party of Labor with its 7,296 votes.

In a statement on the election results the Party's leading committee pointed out that the present electoral system was arranged in such a way that "a growing number of votes, far from resulting in additional seats in Parliament, led to a paradoxical outcome—the loss of seats." It further says that "the committee warmly congratulates the comrades from the Geneva Party organization on their remarkable success, and calls for a thorough analysis of both the positive and the less favorable election results in each canton in order to draw lessons for future action. . . .

"The leading committee will do all it can to see that the success of each Party organization will be consolidated and will serve as a point of departure for further political actions in the interests of the working class and the Swiss people as a whole."

Poland

CARD-EXCHANGE CAMPAIGN

A CARD-EXCHANGE campaign has been under way in the United Workers' Party since last October. The rules and regulations have been endorsed by the C.C. Secretariat. All full and candidate members are required to exchange Party cards. The exchange aims at stepping up the acti-

vity of Party organizations in carrying out the tasks set by the Third Party Congress; to explain the ideological and organizational principles of the new Rules, and to bring order into accounting, registration and other Party affairs.

Before the campaign started meetings were held everywhere, at which Party members were briefed on the aims and rules of the exchange; current organizational questions were discussed, and the work of the organizations and members was assessed. Many suggestions were made as to what assignments should be given to particular members and candidate members, taking into account their training, interests and knowledge.

The preparatory work strengthened the ties between the leading bodies and Party branches. Members of Party committees and activists of the Katowice, Wroclaw and some other regions had talks with members who did not take a sufficiently active part in the life of their organizations. The talks revealed that in most cases the passivity of some of these comrades was explained by poor work of their Party organization. The card exchange has substantially improved this work and raised the activity of the members and candidate members.

Party affairs have been conducted considerably better since the campaign; cases of candidate members who have exceeded their probation term have been examined, as well as those of reprimanded members or those whose conduct was incompatible with the Party Rules.

Before the exchange began the members and candidate members were called upon to fill in a detailed registration card. The meetings at which members of district and town committees handed out the new cards were held on a high organizational level in an atmosphere of ideological unity. The exchange had, in the main, been completed by the end of the year.

The campaign has enhanced the prestige of the Party, as the influx of new members testifies. Some 25,000 new candidate members were admitted during the first months of the campaign; of these over 50 per cent are workers and about 15 per cent—peasants. Over 34 per cent of the new members are less than 25 years of age.

The card-exchange campaign has been of tremendous importance for the ideological and political training of the Party members and for improving the work of all Party organizations.

The Struggle of the Communist and Workers' Parties Against Revisionism

THE Fifth International Conference of institutes of Marxism-Leninism and institutes and commissions on the History of the Party attached to the Central Committees of the Communist and Workers' parties was held in Bucharest between August 25 and September 2, 1959. Representatives of the Communist parties of 25 countries (Albania, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Czechoslovakia, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, Denmark, Federal Germany, France, the German Democratic Republic, Great Britain, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Italy, the Korean People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Norway, Poland, Rumania, the Soviet Union and Sweden) and the journal *World Marxist Review* took part in the proceedings. The discussion centered around the struggle waged by the Communist and Workers' parties for working-class unity and against contemporary revisionism.

A report on the "Tasks of Historical Science in the Struggle Against Contemporary Revisionism" was delivered by N. I. Shatagin (CPSU). He spoke of the significance of the Party congresses of the past two years in developing the communist movement and in particular the political and ideological defeat of revisionism; he emphasized the importance of the publication of Marxist-Leninist classics in the anti-revisionist struggle and briefly reviewed the books, pamphlets, symposiums and documents published in the recent period. These are of great help in training party functionaries and the masses of people in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism. Shatagin's report dealt with three problems: the growing role of the Communist parties in the working-class movement at the present stage and the ways of transition from capitalism to socialism. The speaker subjected to criticism the revisionist views on fundamental questions of Marxist-Leninist theory.

Citing concrete examples from their own countries the participants in the conference elaborated upon the basic trends of the report. We publish below abridged texts of their contributions. Materials on the other problems discussed — the struggle of working-class unity — will be published in the next issue.

The editors express their gratitude to the Institute of History of the Party attached to the Central Committee of the Rumanian Workers' Party, which arranged the conference and made available to the Journal all the materials pertaining to the discussion.

ENDRE KALMAN (Hungary)

THE offensive against Marxist historiography and particularly the historiography of the Party, constituted part of the general revisionist campaign which helped prepare the counter-revolutionary putsch of 1956.

Marxist-Leninist criticism has already exposed the class content and most important manifesta-

tions and dogmas of modern revisionism (for even revisionism has its dogmas). How is revisionism concretely manifested in Hungarian historiography? To begin with, on the question of the *dictatorship of the proletariat*. Under the impact of revisionism some Hungarian historians regard as a positive feature all efforts of the workers to win and extend bourgeois democracy — and these efforts alone, regardless of the factor of time and situation.

When the Party poses directly socialist tasks they assail it. One of our university lecturers recently asserted that the formation of the Hungarian Soviet Republic in 1919 was premature and hence incorrect. This view is not a new one, it has always been held by the Social Democrats. What is new is that this hoary opportunist banality is being embellished with "Marxism-Leninism."

The revisionists see nothing positive in the policy our Party is pursuing in the second, socialist stage of the development of people's democracy. They deplore our return to the "immediate struggle for socialist measures" after 1948-1949, in spite of the fact that, as they allege, the Seventh Congress of the Communist International had renounced this policy "for good and all." Our revisionists for whom the history of the Comintern is nothing but a series of sectarian errors oddly enough often allude to this Congress. In their view, the essence of the change it contemplated lay in the following: we should not now repudiate the Leninist teaching and the practice of the dictatorship of the proletariat, but, with an eye to the future, regard them as museum pieces to be replaced by a variety of "plebeian democracy" — a concept not infrequently expounded by Georg Lukacs. This standpoint is manifestly a revisionist falsification of the decisions of the Seventh Congress of the Comintern.

Revisionists, all of whom are opponents of the dictatorship of the proletariat, seize on the fact that our Party proclaimed as incorrect the strategic task set in 1929 by the Second Congress of the Hungarian Communist Party—the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat—as the immediate aim of the struggle. They are using the sectarian mistakes made after 1928 as a ground for rejecting the Party's past completely, or at least up to the year 1937. In June 1956 Lukacs put forward his theory regarding the constant struggle in the Party between two lines: the "sectarian," allegedly represented by Bela Kun, and the "anti-sectarian," supposedly originating from Eugen Landler, among whose adherents Lukacs counts himself. It was carried forward by Imre Nagy. The entire theory is false throughout. It is contrary to the facts of history, but remnants of it are still to be met with.

Sectarian mistakes, according to revisionist concepts, are such a common feature of the Party's history that no room is left for positive results. Lukacs was already talking in 1948 about the "ineffectiveness of the underground movement" in Hungary. The history of the Party and the working-class movement is depicted by the revisionists in sombre colors. Some are substantiating this "theoretically," claiming that Party historiography should primarily concern itself with the Party's

mistakes, as it is from these, allegedly, that the most useful lessons can be drawn.

Facts are ignored and the Party's struggle is represented as if it were spearheaded against the Social Democrats and not the bourgeoisie. At one discussion an attempt was made to lay the responsibility for the success of Nazism at the door of the Communist Party, at another to make it answerable for the strained international situation in 1949.

In assessing the reasons for the defeat of the Hungarian Soviet Republic some historians hold that too much emphasis has been laid upon the external intervention and too little on the internal factors. When, however, the question touches upon the establishment of the Hungarian Soviet Republic, many refer to the external factors (postwar dislocation, etc.). They hold, too, that the Hungarian people's democratic revolution developed primarily because of the presence of Soviet troops.

In addition to this scornful attitude towards the decisive part played by the people in history we see attempts to make them, and not definite classes and groups, responsible for fascism, the war and the counter-revolution.

A great deal has been said in Hungary about the old, "wrong," and the new, "correct," interpretation of partisanship. In point of fact, however, the facade of revisionist "partisanship" hides their abandonment of the Leninist concept of partisanship, *bourgeois objectivism*, and surrenders to bourgeois and petty-bourgeois concepts. And the revisionists are just as persistent and zealous in belittling the significance of the struggle waged by the Party and of the mass revolutionary movements, as they are in over-estimating the role of oppositional and vacillating groups and the advocates of the "third way," in highlighting their "services" to the working class. With this goes a warm sympathy for Social Democracy.

Revisionist historians have sought to justify this sympathy of theirs by Lukacs's proposition on "immanent criticism," which idealistically distorts the Marxist concept and the application of this method. Everything, according to this proposition, should be measured by its own yardstick, the activity of each Party should be appraised from the Party's own ideological position and criticism is permissible only if the Party finds itself at variance with its own program. This standpoint is tantamount to repudiating Marxist criticism and to ideological surrender.

A typical feature of revisionist historiography is *nationalism*. (Some of the views mentioned above are also nationalistic in character.)

In the pre-counter-revolutionary period some historians polished up the imperialist theory of

Hungary's "cultural superiority," "her right" to leadership in the Danube basin. They even upheld demands for a revision of the peace treaty and of frontiers with the socialist countries. Imre Nagy's nationalistic phraseology on the "all-embracing national unity of the Hungarians" has influenced some historians. Their superficial treatment of the liberation struggle of 1848-49 provided an ideological weapon which in 1956 was eagerly seized upon by the counter-revolutionaries. The idealization of that particular period of the struggle for freedom was also spearheaded against the Soviet Union, and this was understandable, for the nationalism of the revisionists is anti-Soviet. When our revisionists placed too much emphasis on the Hungarian national peculiarities and the need for a "Hungarian road to socialism," this meant, in effect, repudiation of the universal laws governing socialist transformation and, what is more, repudiation of the Soviet experience and unreserved recognition of the "Yugoslav road."

The revisionists took and are taking advantage of the mistakes made in Marxist historiography, in which many problems have not yet been analyzed, or insufficiently analyzed. A true picture needs to be given among other things of the failures and successes, the positive results and mistakes both in the history of our Party and in that of the Communist International, a true appraisal of the role of representatives of various trends who, although not Marxists, opposed the bourgeois groups in power. I have pointed out the false concepts of the revisionists on these issues. We must combat these concepts which can only be eradicated through scientific Marxist elucidation of these questions. That is the fundamental task of historians in the struggle against revisionism. To carry it out we must overcome conservatism, which still clings tightly to out-moded superficial and erroneous views and methods. In other words, the works of historians should be permeated with the spirit of creative Marxism.

LI MAN TRUONG (Vietnam)

WHAT problems did the reactionary bourgeoisie and revisionists pose in Vietnam?

In the political sphere: They resolutely set themselves against the Party leadership, exaggerated its mistakes and shortcomings, denied the past achievements of the revolution and the Party as well as the gains of the agrarian reform and, hence, the leading role of the Party in the socialist revolution. They preached bourgeois liberalism; they made a point at first of demanding the extension of democracy and later on, the strengthening of the dictatorship, or the development of democracy without consolidating the dictatorship. Because

the national bourgeoisie of Vietnam is numerically small and weak, there was no need, they decided, for a class struggle against it. They spread bourgeois nationalism and chauvinism, waged battle against proletarian internationalism, and sowed seeds of mistrust about the aid rendered by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

In the economic sphere: The revisionists affirmed that inasmuch as industry was not yet developed state trade should, for a definite period, be of a limited nature, while no restriction should be placed in the way of the spontaneous development of the free market. The state, they claimed, should concentrate on expanding heavy industry while light industry should be in the hands of private capitalists.

In the sphere of culture: Literature and art, the revisionists proclaimed, carry a "mission of protest" against any social system. They were up in arms against the slogan "literature and art must serve the working class, peasants and soldiers." Trying to steer literature and art along the channel of bourgeois individualism they announced that they serve the "abstract" man, irrespective of his class status. They launched an attack on the socialist literature and art of the Soviet Union, the literature and art of the Resistance period.

Using the slogan "against dogmatism and banality," the revisionists renounced the leading role of the Party in the field of literature and art, and demanded in effect that guidance of literature and art should be left to the bourgeois intelligentsia.

Basing itself on the economic achievements of the Vietnamese people and the success of the Republic's home and foreign policy, the Party corrected its former mistakes, launched a decisive offensive against reaction and revisionism on the ideological front and secured complete unity on fundamental theoretical and practical matters.

TADEUSZ DANISZEWSKI (Poland)

REVISIONIST ideological pressure was exceptionally strong at the end of 1956 and the beginning of 1957. While the new Party leadership headed by Gomulka were developing socialist democracy and securing the support of the masses, seeking to consolidate people's power and accelerate the construction of socialism, the revisionists with their theories were, in fact, playing into the hands of the reactionaries who wanted to restore capitalism in our country.

At that time, many journals on history, as well as publications dealing with cultural and political problems, featured numerous articles whose authors, under the slogan of abolishing distortions in methodology, examined the fundamental prob-

lems of the history of our Party and the working-class movement in a "new" way.

This criticism was not altogether without foundation. Undoubtedly, dogmatism prevailed for many years in our scientific work, particularly in the field of Poland's recent history and the history of the working-class movement. The Leninist principle that every phenomenon should be examined from the standpoint of history was often violated. Not enough study was given to historical phenomena in the process of their development. Complex processes were simplified. There were frequent instances of bare illustrations of ready-made principles and axioms, with no profound analysis based on facts and documents.

These and similar schematic approaches certainly needed to be severely criticized from Marxist-Leninist positions. Unfortunately sound grains of criticism were often intermingled with revisionist weeds.

In particular were the revisionist views crystallized in the report made by the spokesman of the Institute of History of the Academy of Sciences at the National Congress of Historians at Krakow in 1958. This report presented the important achievements of Polish historical science during the past ten years as nothing but a series of errors and distortions.

Under the pretext of combating presentism* certain publications on historical subjects mechanically counterposed science and ideology in the humanities, particularly in historiography, isolated them from each other. They propagated the principle of storing up historical facts without their assessment by the researcher. Analysis of the historical process from the standpoint of social progress was considered as subjectivism and voluntarism.

The Polish revisionists discarded the principle of partisanship in historical science and the social sciences generally, making a caricature of it.

The position adopted by the Polish revisionists on this question led directly to bourgeois objectivism. It gave the green light to the various schools of reactionary historiography.

In the matter of the history of the Polish labor movement the revisionists equated the SDPL and the PSP.** Both parties, they said, had services to their credit, both made mistakes: "The SDPL correctly assessed the significance of the class factor, but underestimated the national factor. The PSP, on the other hand, appreciated the importance of the national question, but underrated the significance of the class factor." This assertion does

not square with the facts and has nothing in common with Marxist analysis. If the SDPL adopted an incorrect and non-Leninist position on the national question, it by no means follows that the PSP had taken the correct attitude. Quite the reverse. The experience of the Polish labor movement shows clearly that the PSP (I have in view the official position of the Right-wing leaders) approached the national question not from proletarian, but from petty-bourgeois positions.

It is a characteristic feature of the revisionists that they study this or that question—the national in this instance—superficially, perceive only its formal aspect and are incapable of seeing the real class content of a phenomenon.

We certainly cannot agree with the oft-repeated suggestion made by revisionist elements that "the PSP contribution to the cause of independence" should be inscribed in the annals of the Polish United Workers' Party. There is, unquestionably, room in our Party's treasured record of achievements for mention of all patriotic and liberation actions by the Polish people, including those of the rank-and-file leaders of the PSP who fought tsarism selflessly. But this is not to say that we shall allow Pilsudski's nationalistic notions and pro-imperialist concepts of independence, which ran counter to the interests of the Polish liberation struggle and were levelled against the Russian revolutionary movement, to find their way into the traditions of the Polish United Workers' Party.

Revisionists in Poland and in other countries have, we observe, displayed a heightened interest in the works of Rosa Luxemburg, particularly in their weak points. Referring to her unfinished work on the Russian revolution, a work she wrote while in a Prussian prison, when she had no recourse to important original sources and which, after leaving prison, she herself severely criticized, the revisionists are defending Rosa Luxemburg's incorrect thesis counterposing the problem of democratic rights and liberties to the problem of proletarian dictatorship and the need of struggle against its enemies.

Dogmatists used to simplify complex historical phenomena and confine themselves to the more general definitions without going into details or studying the various aspects of the question. Revisionists and those under their influence, on the other hand, get themselves involved in details and particulars and lose sight of the fundamental phenomena which, in the final analysis, play the decisive part.

We are arguing against revisionist theories from Marxist positions. Our own painstaking and conscientious efforts are demonstrating that the Marxist-Leninist world outlook and the Marxist-Leninist

*The assessment of historical facts from the viewpoint of the political requirements of the day.—Ed.

**The Social Democracy of Poland and Lithuania; the Polish Socialist Party.—Ed.

methodology guarantee a high-quality scientific product.

PAVEL REIMAN (*Czechoslovakia*)

THE revisionists are doing all they can to distort the history of the international labor movement and the Communist parties, frequently resorting to arguments which Right-wing Social Democrats formerly used against the Communists. We all remember the cries these old traitors of the working class raised about "orders from Moscow." And we now hear of clumsy attacks on the Comintern. Tito took the advantage in his speech on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the Communist League of Yugoslavia to charge our Party, the only Party which in 1938 fought for the country's independence, with responsibility for the surrender. There can be no question that the revisionists are ideologically drawing closer to Right-wing Social Democracy.

We are following closely the work of the social-democratic historians in Austria, because in the past the working class of Czechoslovakia had many militant traditions in common with the Austrian proletariat and at one time, even a common party. One of these historians has published a pamphlet entitled *The Way Out of Darkness*, which has been edited by Oscar Pollak, chief editor of the *Arbeiter Zeitung*. A more apt title for it would be *The Way to Darkness*. It does not even mention Karl Marx as the founder of the revolutionary socialist movement. All the services in developing the labor movement are attributed to Lasalle, K. Kautsky and, needless to say, to V. Adler, the founder of reformism in the Austrian labor movement.

Curious, too, is the attempt of Hannak, another Austrian Social Democrat, to split up the history of his Party into periods. He divides it into ancient times, the middle ages and modern times. In the latter even Marxist terminology is superfluous; thus, Otto Bauer and Friedrich Adler are made to look like medieval figures.

Study of the works of contemporary social-democratic and revisionist historians attests to their inability to comprehend the real advance of historical development which has led to the creation of the mighty socialist camp with its population of over 900 million. Filled with frenzied hatred of communism, they believe in miracles, count on objective processes changing, and talk loudly of the imaginary differences in our camp. These people, needless to say, make no effort to study or explain historical development scientifically and it is not fortuitous that among them we meet people like Jaksch who backs the German imperialists in their territorial claims in Eastern and South-Eastern Europe.

We Communist historians cannot take up exclusively defensive positions. The conditions prevail for our going over to the offensive. History has demonstrated that the reformist and revisionist path leads to the defeat of the working class at all crucial points of development, whereas, conversely, the Marxist-Leninist path, the path of communism, despite temporary retreats or defeats, has led to epoch-making victories. Our historiography should thus proceed from the results already achieved in the historical process.

The Communists have no need to distort or embellish history, to gloss over the weak spots, errors and difficulties of the revolutionary working-class movement. But neither is it our business to rummage in the mistakes of the past, to exaggerate their significance; for in spite of all difficulties the path traversed by the Communist parties was basically correct.

The fight against revisionism demands that we should not confine ourselves to expounding the struggles waged by our parties in the past, when we were still capitalist countries. We have been living in new conditions for 15 years now. During this time our parties have acquired a large store of historical experience in the building of socialism. As yet, scant attention has been paid to recent history, the history of the past 15 years, which have brought such a great change in the destiny of our peoples. We in Czechoslovakia are trying to make good the time we have lost in this respect as quickly as we can.

SOTIR MANUSHI (*Albania*) subjected to thorough criticism the practice of Yugoslav revisionists on the national question.

THERE is a considerable Albanian minority in Yugoslavia. Most of the people living in Kossovo and the Dukadjin Valley are Albanians. There is an Albanian minority in Macedonia and Montenegro. All are spirited and courageous people. Throughout the centuries they have been impervious to denationalization, have preserved their language and customs and despite unabated terror, have not left their homes or their sweat-and-blood drenched lands. Neither the terror of the Turks, nor the savagery of Pashic broke them.

During the anti-fascist struggle the Albanian population in Kossovo, Macedonia and Montenegro fought shoulder to shoulder with the other peoples of Yugoslavia. They felt certain that this time their dream of self-determination would come true.

But after the liberation the Yugoslav leaders did not grant the Albanian population the promised right to self-determination. The administrative division of the Albanian population is aimed at

denationalization. Albanians in Yugoslavia live on a common territory, yet administratively they are divided into three republics—Serbia, Macedonia and Montenegro, while those in the Jablanica region, who have been transferred to the Serbian Republic, are not regarded as a national minority at all.

Both in the sphere of economic policy—particularly agrarian—and education, the Albanian minority is discriminated against. Albanian schools have been reduced in number and efforts are being made to stop instruction in the Albanian language. The history of Albania, and especially the history of the national-liberation struggle of the Albanian people, is either not taught at all or is falsified. All this is diametrically opposed to Marxist principles.

TSIAN CHUN-FAN (*China*)

AFTER each important victory of Marxism, revisionism has launched an attack against it. That was how matters stood in the 'nineties of the last century when Marxism, having scored a victory over all hostile trends, became the chief ideological trend in the labor movement. That was the situation after the triumph of the October Revolution; it was so after the victory won by the peoples in the Second World War and also upon the formation of the socialist camp.

The revisionist standpoint, which has found expression in the Yugoslav program, is, in point of fact, a rehash, in the 'fifties of the twentieth century, of Bernsteinism; it is Bernsteinism in the new conditions. The Yugoslav new Bernsteinists, slavishly imitating Bernstein's methods, repeat in a different form old theoretical concepts on policy, economics and philosophy.

In China the Rightist elements, ostensibly helping the Party in the rectification campaign initiated in 1957, used this movement to attack the Party violently. They wanted the Communist Party to leave the stage, so that the bourgeois parties could "come to power by turns."

The Rightist elements embellished the bourgeoisie. Exploitation by the Chinese capitalists, they said, was "unconscious exploitation," that since private works and factories had been turned into mixed state-private enterprises according to industry, the Chinese bourgeoisie no longer had a dual character, that it was a "red" bourgeoisie. And they insisted that a political party of the "red bourgeoisie" should be formed and power shared with it, that bourgeois "democratic rule" should be installed. In this way the Rightists tried to thrust China back onto the path of capitalist development. Yet another variety of Rightist elements

called for the establishment of an "institute for political planning" and for bourgeois parliamentarism.

In the scientific and cultural fields the Rightists drew up an anti-socialist, "scientific program." They called for the revival of bourgeois social sciences which were to replace the Marxist-Leninist social sciences. The Communists, they said, were ignoramuses, incapable of guiding science, culture and education. They insisted that scientific, cultural and educational institutions be placed under the direction of bourgeois intellectuals. In the sphere of literature and arts, too, there were people who came out with revisionist statements and, under the guise of combating dogmatism, attacked Marxist principles. They demanded "disclosure of the seamy side of life" from the bourgeois standpoint, attacked socialist realism and took up arms against the Party guidance of arts and literature.

A nationwide ideological struggle was launched against the reactionary ideas and revisionist views of the bourgeois Rightist elements, in the course of which facts were cited which disproved their rotten theories and revealed things in their true light. The struggle was taken up throughout the length and breadth of the country by parties, institutions, educational establishments, public organizations, professions and branches of science and assumed the form of organized meetings, discussions and *tatzepao*.^{*} It was also carried on in periodical publications and pamphlets. As a result all anti-Party and anti-socialist actions were refuted and the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism upheld.

LUDWIG EINICKE (*German Democratic Republic*)

A GREAT duty devolves upon historians in the German Democratic Republic—the duty of helping the working people to learn the lessons of German history. This is an important contribution to the peaceful solution of the German problem.

The Right Social-Democratic leaders speak of the "third way" of solving the national question. At bedrock of this blather about the "third way" of reunifying Germany lie "theories" on the "third way" to socialism.

Carlo Schmid, member of the Board of the Social Democratic Party of Germany (SDPG), advocates that Social-Democratic workers should "cast away" "antiquated" Marxist ideas and traditions as being nothing but "useless ballast." *Neue Gesellschaft*, theoretical journal of the SDPG, describes the Marxist ideas held by many Social Democrats—ideas which social development has corroborated

^{*}Views and criticisms written out in bold Chinese characters on large sheets of paper and posted for all to see.—Ed.

—as “strange fidelity to out-lived forms and concepts.” But the bourgeois forces in the SPDG are not finding it plain sailing to eradicate Marxism from their party, ceaseless though their efforts are. For though revisionism has been in existence for many decades, in spite of the twelve years of Nazi dictatorship and the years of Adenauer’s rule, the prestige of Karl Marx is still high among the Social-Democratic rank and file in West Germany.

Einicke, further, spent some time in analyzing the draft program of the SPDG. An article on this subject appears in this issue.

A SPEECH by Waldemar von Knoeringen, Vice-President of the SDPG, should be examined from the angle of its impact on the rank-and-file Social Democrats. He called for “dissociation from the Communist ideology and the Communist form of totalitarian rule.”

This and other pronouncements by von Knoeringen show that the so-called struggle waged by the Right-wing leaders of the SDPG on two fronts and their allegedly intermediate position between these fronts boil down politically to a unilateral battle on the anti-Communist front hand in hand with the imperialists.

Increasingly insistent demands are being heard among members and sympathizers of the SDPG for more resolute action against militarism. A decisive “NO” should be said, they hold, to reaction’s third attempt to build its system on military force, in this particular instance, on atomic weapons. The Right-wing Party leadership is attempting to use the growing opposition of the Social-Democratic workers to the advantage of revisionism.

With a view to realizing the aims of the SDPG Right-wing leadership, Erich Nochara, subversive-activities expert in the SDPG leadership, has drawn up a detailed plan* of undermining activities to be carried out by the revisionists in the German Democratic Republic and other socialist countries. He proceeds from the fact that these subversive activities can only have the desired effect “in conditions of relaxed tension.” The policy of détente, according to Nochara, should be put to good use by the revisionists, whom he calls the “Left liberal wing.” The revisionists’ “realistic program” should be an “evolutionist revision of everything of moment” with a view to “liquidating” the socialist system and “eliminating” its “representatives.”

Under the impact of Social Democracy and Yugoslav revisionism, revisionists in the GDR interpreted the decisions of the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU to mean that the policy of détente

implied a weakening of the class struggle. On this ground demands were made for the elimination of certain functions of the socialist state, in particular those of the security organs. The policy of our revisionists, the policy of “opening the valves” and “letting things drift” was in keeping with the general revisionist concept of “relaxation” and “liberalization.” The policy of easing tension and the Party’s efforts to establish relations of a new kind with the West German Social Democrats were regarded by some people as being tantamount to its renunciation of Marxism-Leninism.

Revisionist concepts emerged in the GDR because those who spread them have little to do with the construction of socialism and have not yet overcome the influence of bourgeois ideology. And they were frightened by the difficulties that crop up in the struggle to consolidate worker-peasant power, for they have yet to grasp the problems arising in the transition to socialism and the contradictions that obtain in this period. These people hold too simplified a view on the reunification of Germany and seek for an “easier” way to effect this. And hence they fell and are falling into the traps set by certain West German Social Democrats.

Then Einicke cited examples from German history to demonstrate how the “third way” policy had brought heavy defeats on the working class and proved fatal for the nation as a whole.

One of the fundamental tasks of the Marxist historians in the GDR is to make the working class and all the working people in West Germany realize the danger inherent in contemporary West German revisionism. And the economic, political and cultural advance made by the German Democratic Republic in the course of socialist construction has substantiated and corroborated our work on the theoretical front.

GERARD VAN MOERKERKE (*Belgium*) *

IT is the view of many activists and even leaders of the Belgian Socialist Party that the party’s defeat at the last elections was due to the lack of a real socialist doctrine. A call was sounded for a new socialist program of action. And so the “Report on Planning and Organization of the Economy” saw the light of day.

The Belgian Social Democrats have a soft spot for planning. Many of them — mainly Left union leaders—have visited the Soviet Union or some People’s Democracy in the recent period. They did not gainsay the achievements of the socialist system on their return, but examined them through

*See Erich Nochara, “Revisionism and Policy Towards the East,” *Neue Gesellschaft*, April 1958.

*Gerard Van Moerkerke spoke on both items of the agenda; the part of his speech dealing with the struggle for working-class unity will appear in the next issue.—Ed.

the prism of planning. They noticed only the formal side, failing to see that planning is a success in the USSR and the People's Democracies because it is practised under a socialist system. In their view planning itself is enough to cause capitalist anarchy to end of its own accord.

We must say outright: we stand for structural reforms, nationalization and implementation of some measures of planning under capitalism. We believe these measures can take on quite another importance than was the case in the years before the Second World War and immediately after it, and we believe that given constant and increasingly interdependent economic and political action arising out of the struggle of the masses, these measures can weaken the capitalist system and open up the perspective of a peaceful yet revolutionary transition from a capitalist to a socialist system. This possibility is a realistic one, thanks to the fact that the world balance of forces is tipping more and more in favor of socialism.

A number of things are necessary if we are to take this path:

We must find out the value, the scope and the limits of the reforms in question and of certain measures of planning, and show their present and long-term importance;

It should be emphasized that these reforms only take on a revolutionary meaning when they are the result of struggle for the satisfaction of the constantly growing requirements of the people and not the result of manipulation by several outstanding minds. This struggle will make the masses understand that the satisfaction of requirements or, rather, the better satisfaction of requirements necessitates structural reforms. Struggle for structural reforms, without preceding action for immediate demands, leads to administrative measures devoid of revolutionary content. It is not a question of certain purely formal changes—of one or two socialists more on the board of a nationalized or semi-nationalized company, etc., but of a partial change in the content. The struggle for these reforms, for nationalization and certain forms of planning, a struggle which aims at weakening oligarchy rule, should be waged against the trusts, not for a compromise with them but for the revolutionary perspective of liquidating capitalism.

TJOO TIKT TJOEN (*Indonesia*)

FROM the early period of its history the Party has been alternately affected by "Left" deviation or Right deviation, or even "Left" and Right simultaneously. But it can be said that the Party as a whole has never been affected by the disease of revisionism. This can hardly be called pure

chance, but is rather the result of some objective factors. Firstly, the Communist Party of Indonesia developed as a working-class party in a colonial country where poverty and misery were widespread among the population.

On the other hand, the sources of the huge profits drawn by the imperialists are steadily narrowing and so are their possibilities of creating a "labor aristocracy" in their colonies to exert pressure on and disrupt the working-class movement. This is precisely the reason why the Right-wing Socialists in Indonesia and their party (the Socialist Party of Indonesia) are unable to win over the working people. Their influence is limited only to a small circle of the intelligentsia and this distinguishes them from the Right-wing Socialists in Europe.

Secondly, throughout its existence, the CPI has been educated and tempered by the spirit of proletarian internationalism. And from the start it has been an inseparable part of the international revolutionary working-class movement.

Thirdly, since its birth the CPI has taken deep root among the broad masses of working people. These close ties with the masses have nourished and developed the revolutionary traditions of our Party.

In connection with the revisionist theory expressed in the Yugoslav program, we should mention a number of points which are worth noting in relation to the situation in Indonesia: During the last few years some concepts and ideas have been spread among the people that the only way to socialism is, in accordance with the peculiar features of Indonesia, the peaceful way; that with the formation of the Republic of Indonesia, they affirm, it will be possible to build a "just and prosperous society" or "socialism without proletarian dictatorship," that "state-capitalism and co-operatives in capitalist society are elements of socialist economy," etc. These ideas may engender revisionism in our country if we do not unceasingly fight against them. These ideas are helping those who seek to drag Indonesia onto the path of the "third force," which has for a long time been the dream of the Yugoslav revisionists. I would add that Tito's visit to Indonesia showed that they had miscalculated. His peculiarities, love of luxury and some of his statements merely confirmed to the Indonesian people the correctness of the Party's standpoint on the Yugoslav problem.

Relying on imperialist forces abroad, Indonesian reactionaries are spreading pornographic books, films, songs and dances with the aim of degrading the morals of the Indonesian people (especially its young generation), and propagating the "American way of life." A great deal of material is being published on "people's capitalism," "Islamic so-

cialism," people's socialism," etc., in order to poison the minds of the Indonesian people, particularly the working class.

The Communist Party of Indonesia has grown rapidly in the past few years. The rapid increase of its membership is a good achievement. But this has, on the other hand, also led to the numerical increase of the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois elements within the Party, and this may lead to lamentable results unless we step up the ideological struggle and the study of Marxist-Leninist theory.

The growth of the Party, its progress in parliamentary struggle and, what is more, its achievements in the economic administration of a number of towns and provinces may make many of our Communists dizzy with success and bring them into the mire of bourgeois ideology. The Communist Party's success in building a united national front enabled some Party members to enter into close contact with the bourgeois elements outside the Party. This enhances the possibility of certain Party cadres being taken in by bourgeois ideology in their ideological work. The Party is therefore concentrating on its struggle against revisionism.

S. AVIRMID (*Mongolia*)

IF the Rightists in our Party underrated the possibility of the rise of capitalism and overestimated the national peculiarities, the "Leftists" underrated the national peculiarities and failed to understand the possibilities and conditions for the gradual transition to socialism, by-passing capitalism.

Petty-bourgeois opportunist deviations, which have not infrequently been observed in the leadership of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party (MPRP) in the past, were conditioned by internal and external factors, of which we shall note the following:

- 1) the Party consisted of people of a non-proletarian, arat (peasant) origin;
- 2) the revolutionary core of the Party consisted of people with communist sympathies but as yet with insufficient knowledge of Marxist theory;
- 3) the influence exerted on the Party by the feudal lords, monks and bourgeois elements;
- 4) imperialist threat and pressure;
- 5) impact of opportunism in the international communist movement on the Party.

Despite these factors the MPRP, having traversed a difficult and zigzag path, steadily gained in strength ideologically, organizationally and politically and, finally, adopted firm Marxist-Leninist positions.

Petty-bourgeois ideology and dogmatism make themselves felt in the Party. In December 1957,

the Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the MPRP, having discussed the Moscow Declaration and the Peace Manifesto, stated that dogmatism was a grave obstacle in the ideological life and the practical activity of the Party, and set itself the task of eradicating it.

We attach great significance to criticism in historical science. Criticism, it may be said, is practically non-existent among our historians with the result that the overcoming of dogmatism is retarded and likewise the development of theoretical thought.

In the sphere of historical science, dogmatism is revealed in the following way:

a) The learning by rote and the repetition of general theses and formulas of Marxist theory, an insufficient ability to apply materialist dialectics in studying and explaining concrete phenomena and events. As a consequence, realities, instead of being explained in a correct Marxist way, are squeezed into formulas.

b) Problems are studied in isolation and are divorced from the historical factors which gave rise to them. The approach is not sufficiently critical. This, on the one hand, leads to the history of the Party being described as a series of triumphs. The struggles and difficulties, defeats and retreats, mistakes and shortcomings from which our Party has gained its political maturity and flexibility—these are ignored or glossed over. On the other hand, an uncritical attitude to the source materials leads to exaggerating mistakes and shortcomings, to underestimating achievements.

c) Study of the history of the Party is not linked in a proper way with the tasks of building socialism and its perspectives. This is partly because our historians are not adequately acquainted with the practical work of the Party, with economic problems, and because of lack of understanding of the role of our socialist state and socialist democracy, etc.

PYOTR GEORGIEV (*Bulgaria*)

THE Yugoslav revisionists have picked on Bulgaria as a special target for their attacks, conducting a malicious campaign on the radio and in the press, fomenting hatred of our country and slandering the Communist Party; these lies are caught up and assiduously spread by the imperialist propaganda centers.

The Yugoslav revisionists are trying to find justification for their nationalist attacks on Marxist literature. In 1958 a noisy campaign was organized to commemorate the fortieth anniversary of the breach made by the Entente army and the Serbian military units on the Salonika front; Bulgaria

suffered defeat and the Balkan States were occupied. This victory, according to the Yugoslav leaders, signified the liberation of their peoples and the beginning of their statehood.

Lenin, it will be recalled, denounced Kautsky for considering the war of Serbia against Austria separately and dubbed him a "sophist." The Yugoslav propagandists concealed this part of Lenin's article in order to embellish the nationalist policy of their government.

On the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the First Congress of the Bulgarian Communist Party, *Komunist*, organ of the Yugoslav League of Communists (June, 1959), published an article which grossly distorted the role played by our Party in the 1923 uprising, during the Second World War and in building socialism. After 1948, the article says, "Stalinism" adversely affected socialist relations and consolidated bureaucracy in Bulgaria. If this was so, how are we to explain the rapid economic and cultural advance which culminated in the victory of the socialist relations of production, whereas in Yugoslavia private ownership still dominates in the countryside and capitalistic anarchy reigns in the economy?

IB NORLUND (Denmark)

Norlund described the peculiarities of socio-economic development and of the working-class movement of Denmark. Noting the common features of the basic trends in Danish revisionism and international revisionism, Norlund dwelt on the factors which enabled the revisionists to attack the Communist parties in 1956.

REVISIONISM did not come as a bolt from the blue in 1956. Nor can we dismiss it by saying that it was a product of petty-bourgeois influence. For this would not explain its appearance in a party proletarian by nature. From this standpoint we made a critical survey of the history of our Party.

Why were the revisionists able to raise their heads? We shall single out two periods related, by the way, to certain international aspects. First, the period immediately following the Second World War. Our Party fought valiantly in the liberation struggle against the Nazis. It secured for the working class the leading role in this struggle and directed the struggle. After the war the Party was confronted with the task of continuing the democratic and national struggle and ensuring working-class leadership. In doing so it should have relied on the unity of the people forged during the Resistance. Unity of the working class was especially essential. But at that time the Socialist Party exerted considerable influence on

the working class. The situation was all the more complicated since the Social Democratic leaders, by collaborating with the Nazis, had discredited themselves.

The reactionary forces banded together under the flag of anti-communism and "defense of democracy." Since the Communist Party was the only party that could not be accused of being anti-national it was useless to slander it on this point. However, slogans such as "democratic socialism" were invoked in the attempt to depict the Communists as inconsistent democrats. And here the bourgeoisie had some success. The question arises: did our Party fall back on the defensive at this time? It cannot be denied that there were Party members who tended to look for "excuses" and "justification" instead of attacking and exposing the anti-democrats who used the word "democracy" as a cover.

Denmark, of course, was not the only country to be visited by events of this kind. They were observed in other countries dominated by Western imperialism and with strong Social-Democratic parties. The door was left open for democratic illusions which were used by the agents of British imperialism for propaganda and other purposes. It should be borne in mind that about this time the ground was being prepared for an ideological offensive and for reactionary machinations against Communist parties. It is instructive, for example, that the peaceful transfer of power into the hands of the workers and peasants in Czechoslovakia in 1948 and the socialist revolution in that country were used, and with a measure of success, against our Party. In such circumstances ideological instability could be dangerous for any Communist party.

At that time some of the Communist parties, including ours, began to speak about the possibility of a peaceful transition to socialism. This discussion was useful. But with regard to the particular circumstances in which this transition could take place the concepts of that time were ambiguous. And in 1949 these ambiguities, engendering illusions of a bourgeois democratic nature, militated against a proper understanding of the conditions in which the class struggle was developing on a national and worldwide scale. For this reason we issued at that time a fundamental statement of views elucidating these questions from the standpoint of Marxism-Leninism. Unfortunately, this statement was not fully taken into account in the ideological work of the Party. As a result, ambiguity remained in relation to the nature of our struggle for democracy and this, no doubt, fostered revisionist tendencies.

As the days of the patriotic struggle receded into the past, the reactionaries resorted more and more to bourgeois nationalism in their anti-com-

munist policy. Their anti-Soviet campaign took on nationalistic and chauvinist forms. The propaganda against the socialist reconstruction in the People's Democracies was cloaked in "democratic" and "nationalistic" phraseology. This led to a situation where the less staunch members of our Party, putting the stress on national peculiarities, turned away from proletarian internationalism. Some held the view that, in co-operating with the other peace forces, they should keep away from both the socialist and imperialist camps, since this, they claimed, would broaden the peace movement. In doing so they slid into revisionism.

That is why I consider that the situation in a definite group of European Communist parties in the postwar period should be thoroughly studied. What is still not quite clear is why the Communist parties in those countries where Social Democracy is strong soon lost the initiative they had won during the war and in the immediate postwar years.

It is indisputable that history has confirmed the resolutions of the Seventh Congress of the Comintern and the points contained in Dimitrov's report to that Congress. These documents are a contribution to the common treasure-house of our movement. The main task of the Communist parties at that time was to overcome the "deep-rooted evil" of sectarianism. But did we combat this sectarianism wholly in keeping with the resolutions of the Seventh Congress or did we at that time make concessions to bourgeois democracy and nationalism, concessions which somehow prepared the way for the germs of modern revisionism? This question is now being asked in some Communist parties.

It may be that ideological work slackened at that time (this was the case in our Party) and that the slackening was accompanied by exaggerations in condemning sectarianism, all the way to condemning all the previous work of the Comintern and its leading bodies. I would say that if these points are taken into consideration when writing the Party history of that period, they would help to throw light on the origins of modern revisionism and enable us to intensify the struggle against it.

Lastly, I would urge historians to pay more attention to the problems of the working-class movement in the Scandinavian countries, for they have a certain international importance. Distorted notions about the working-class movement in these countries have long been used by the Social Democrats and revisionists for their anti-communist propaganda. As was said earlier, the Scandinavian problems are a part of the highly important problem of our movement in North-West Europe where Social Democracy still exerts a considerable influence on the working class.

Some of the fraternal parties at times wrongly assess the Scandinavian working-class movement. Scandinavian Social Democracy is sometimes erroneously regarded as a version of Austro-Marxism. We encounter superficial assessments tending to belittle the struggle waged by the Scandinavian Communists, which by no means helps us to overcome our weaknesses.

While the forms of exploitation and bourgeois domination in the Nordic countries have their peculiarities, they can easily be explained from the standpoint of Marxism-Leninism. And knowing them, we can easily grasp the peculiarities of the struggle in Scandinavia.

JACOB ROSNER (*Austria*)

IN 1908 Lenin concluded an article on revisionism with the following words: "What we now frequently experience only in the domain of ideology—disputes over theoretical amendments to Marx—what now crops up in practice only over individual partial issues of the labor movement as tactical differences with the revisionists and splits on these grounds, will all unfailingly have to be experienced by the working class on an incomparably larger scale when the proletarian revolution accentuates all issues and concentrates all differences on points of the most immediate importance in determining the conduct of the masses . . ."

Today, we are witnessing a general, concentrated, concentric offensive against Marxism.

The signal for the attack was given by the Catholics. Marxism, the Catholic scholars and Jesuits tell us, is old-fashioned and, since it is now useless, we must find something new with which to replace it. And widespread among their "new" theories is "social partnership."

In 1956 the Austrian bishops in a message to the faithful devoted special attention to social problems and lauded the "moderate socialism" of such leaders as Pollak and Pittermann. This was good, they said, but it was a pity that the Socialists had not yet completely dissociated themselves from Marxism. So the Party leadership hearkened to the voice of the pastors: a commission was set up immediately, the program was changed and Marxism, to which the Social Democrats had paid lip service, was thrown overboard.

This is one aspect of the offensive. A second one is directed against the socialist camp. There is not a crime that our enemies would not ascribe to the socialist countries. The clergy hold processions, and prayers of mourning for the "silent church," that is, for the church in the socialist countries. Nor are they idle in the matter of war

*V. I. Lenin, *Marxism and Revisionism*.

preparation. There is an organization — Osthilfe (Aid to the East), led by van Straaten, a Dutch priest who conducts his activity mainly in Austria and West Germany. Van Straaten has said plainly that Austria should be a springboard for the attack against the East. By the time "X-day" comes and the way to the East is cleared, he raved, thousands of priests must be ready to invade the East.

The Socialist Party, too, has discovered that Marxism is old-fashioned. The author of its new program is Benedict Kautsky (son of Karl Kautsky). One of our comrades once said that the worst production of the old Kautsky was Benedict. And Benedict's entire activity proves this to the hilt. The *Communist Manifesto*, says this scion of the old Kautsky, was written in the epoch of candles and oil-lamps, but at present there is more light, people have harnessed the energy of the atom and Marxism has become outdated. We Communists always like to hear something new. This is good. But it turns out that in this case the "new" is Christianity which is 2,000 years old, not 100. We criticized this program and upset the plans of the Socialist leaders by launching a broad discussion of it, and particularly in the Socialist Party. The Socialist leaders were forced to amend their program. For example, the original draft proclaimed communism as the mortal enemy, that the system in the socialist countries could be changed only by war or revolution. Later they had to throw this overboard. But even now such concepts as class, class struggle and Marxism are absent. The program is purely liberal, petty-bourgeois, anti-Marxist and, consequently, is directed against the working class.

The Swiss Social Democrats and, later, the Social Democratic Party of Germany have adopted similar programs. Thus all of them are revising Marxism. One of their theoreticians, Branke (if I am not mistaken he is an ex-Nazi), claims in his book that exploitation in the factories, in the sphere of production, has disappeared. It is high prices that make for exploitation. Hence, the consumers should be organized. But the big capitalist is also a consumer—he buys coffee, milk and meat. Thus, we get a kind of "social partnership" in relation to prices. What can one say about this? A witty Frenchman once said: the best way to imagine infinity is to think about stupidity.

For many years the bourgeoisie, and especially the Social-Democratic press, has been fiercely attacking the socialist countries. In this the Social Democrats are in unanimity with the Catholics and the bourgeoisie. No holds are barred. Pollak's report to the Socialist International Congress, for example, reflected a marked change in his position. The situation in the Soviet Union, he said, can be corrected through reforms, not a revolution.

It is his hope that one fine day the CPSU and Khrushchov will invite Guy Mollet and Pollak to Moscow and say to them: please, form a socialist party in our country, we want to be democratized. But in other countries, he warns, a new system can be installed only by means of a revolution. It would seem that Pollak, too, is ready with his "Drang nach Osten."

What is the point here, if we consider the question as a whole? As I see it, we pay too little attention to the fact that Marx and Engels and several generations of fighters sought to free the workers from bourgeois influence and organize them as a class with its own world outlook. This aim has been achieved in the sense that the working class has taken shape, a development which, I hope, will be dramatically shown in the textbook on history of the international working-class movement. The titanic struggle of the working class and the rise of an independent working-class movement can be listed among the outstanding events of the nineteenth century. And now the Catholics and Right-wing Socialists are trying to turn the workers into an appendage of the bourgeoisie. That is why they say that socialism cannot be regarded as a world outlook; the only world outlook is religion. That is why they say exploitation has disappeared, that in the "Welfare State" all classes are equal, only prices change, and, if the price of beer goes up, this should be opposed.

These arguments of our enemies are spearheaded against the independence of the working-class movement. In my opinion, this is the main thing in their activity. They want to deprive the working class of Marxism-Leninism and again subordinate it to the bourgeoisie.

It is my conviction, too, that we have not yet shown clearly enough that slander against the Soviet Union and the socialist camp is simultaneously an offensive against the workers in the capitalist countries. It goes without saying that any isolation of the working masses from the socialist camp would cause division in their ranks and deprive them of the moral support of their fellows in the socialist world. On the one hand, our opponents seek to deprive the workers of Marxism-Leninism as a world outlook. On the other, they seek to deprive them of Marxism-Leninism as a theory which has found application in the socialist countries, which has materialized and found embodiment in the everyday life of these countries. This, as I see it, is the background to the general offensive now being waged against us. This is an offensive against the working-class movement as such, against its dependence.

The revisionists have their own place in this offensive. The bourgeoisie understands that it must act skilfully here. The revisionists say: Marxism-

Leninism is a splendid thing. It just has to be trimmed a little bit. And so they trim and trim and will continue to trim until nothing is left, until the workers lose their independence again. That's how matters stand in the sphere of theory. But what about politics? It is here we encounter the greatest danger.

A hobby-horse of our revisionists is the call to break at least a little with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. They say: treat these countries objectively, or rather in an objectivist way, like any other country. The purpose behind this is to take the workers along the path most suitable to the bourgeoisie.

Now a few words about something that we Austrian Communists (I cannot speak for other countries) overlooked for a long time. Inspired by the successes of the socialist camp we did not always bring out clearly the difficulties involved in building socialism. The impression was created that everything was going well—from victory to victory, that the socialist countries were stepping out along the broad highway.

It is not for us to criticize the shortcomings experienced in building socialism. Our job is to explain to the workers the conditions in which socialism is being built, the difficulties encountered and the sacrifices that have to be made. We should not be afraid of scaring the workers. We can forge a weapon from these difficulties and equip the workers still better by saying to them: see what strength you have when you are led correctly; be the difficulties what they may, you can do things such as history has never known. We paid too little attention to this point, but to criticize in a way suggested by the Socialists would signify isolating the workers from the socialist countries.

N. DONIA (*Institute of Party History, Communist Party of the Ukraine*)

REACTIONARY bourgeois historians and revisionists are falsifying history, seeking to revive nationalist survivals and to discredit everything that consolidates the socialist nations and brings them closer to each other. The Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists in particular specialize in distorting the history of the Ukrainian Communist Party. Bolshevism, they claim, had no social basis in the Ukraine, it was imported from Russia. They are also distorting the history of the struggle for the proletarian dictatorship and for building socialism. Such views (based on the concept that the Ukrainian nation was not bourgeois by nature) have been expounded, for example, by a certain Golub in the *Ukrainian Collection* (No. 9), published in Bonn.

Bourgeois historians, especially the Ukrainian nationalists, cast aspersions on the Ukrainian people, claiming without proof that in the first months of the war the population of the occupied areas of the Ukraine was favorably disposed towards the fascist invaders and that only the wrong policy of reprisals roused the people to action against them.

The falsifiers claim that the partisan movement and the anti-fascist resistance in the Ukraine developed only during the retreat of the invader. These claims, as documents show, have nothing in common with the facts.

A number of Soviet historians, Ukrainians, cannot be absolved of a wrong interpretation of some events. They idealized the past of the Ukraine, for example, some of the bourgeois-nationalist organizations; they embellished the "Borotbists"* and exaggerated their influence on the peasants. In elucidating the history of the Ukrainian Communist Party they inadequately showed the role played by the Party organizations and obscured the principled character of the struggle waged by the Ukrainian Bolsheviks against the anti-Party groups and trends.

In exposing the revisionists and the Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists we should use our tried weapon — scientific argument. Incontestable facts and scientific argument are our weapons in the struggle against the falsifiers of history. That is why our Institute regards as an important task the publication of Party documents showing the true history of the rise of Bolshevism in the Ukraine, and the vanguard role of the Ukrainian Bolsheviks in the struggle for proletarian dictatorship and building socialism.

JACQUES CHAMBAZ (*France*)

THE ideological and organizational principles of the Communist parties, which are under attack from revisionists, did not come out of the blue. They are the result of the study of the experience acquired by the international working-class movement.

J. Chambaz enumerated a number of questions pertaining to the history of the French working class, elaboration of which enriches the Party ideologically and strengthens it in repelling the revisionist attacks.

The revisionists, he went on, have juggled with the documents of the 20th Congress of the CPSU, interpreting them in their own way and claiming that peaceful coexistence is merely a pretext for

*The party of the Ukrainian Left-wing Socialist Revolutionaries (1918-20) which expressed the interests of the kulaks, urban petty-bourgeoisie and nationalistic intellectuals.—Ed.

justifying the political and ideological coexistence of the Left forces and their parties in our country. The passage of time, however, supplied the answer to this question. Imperialism reminds those who have allowed the revisionists to delude them that peaceful coexistence calls for unending struggle of the peoples to prevent the imperialist governments from unleashing war, that it cannot end the class struggle.

Then yielding to bourgeois pressure, the revisionists changed their tune. They have blamed the organizational and theoretical principles and the political course of our Party for the absence of a united front.

Resorting to left phraseology, they demanded that our political and ideological principles should be adapted to the Social-Democratic standpoint. There was, they claimed, an insoluble contradiction between the broad policy of compromise and alliance pursued by our Party and its resolve to retain its principles and political independence.

Our historians should show, using the experience acquired by the international communist movement, including French experience, that a principled stand coupled with tactical flexibility far from being harmful to working-class unity and broad alliances, is the necessary condition for unity, that only this policy ensures the leading role of the Party in the struggle of the working class and the people as a whole.

The revisionists took advantage of the 20th anniversary of the founding of the People's Front to uphold the thesis that the Front was the product of spontaneous mass action imposed on the obdurate leaders of the parties, including the Communist Party. It is therefore important to show the role of our Party at that stage, and in the subsequent period, in rallying the working class and its allies and in overcoming the obstacles which the Right-wing Social-Democratic leaders placed in the way of building the united front and, later, the People's Front.

We devote special attention to exposing the revisionist theories about "people's capitalism." Naturally, we do not deny the changes that have taken place in the working class and among the middle sections. It may be that a more careful study of these changes is needed for success in our struggle. But no analysis of the changes in the composition of the working class, in the system of wages or conditions of labor will alter the basic fact that, by selling his labor power, the worker gets less than he produces.

In combating the ideas of a "better" capitalism, we stress that the laws of capitalist accumulation and the tendency towards relative and absolute impoverishment of the working class have not

ceased to operate in France. We took the offensive on this issue at the time when French capitalism was in a state of expansion, when it was easier for revisionist and reformist ideas to penetrate into the working class.

It can be said that the broad discussion initiated by our Party on these issues contributed in large measure to our electoral success in January 1956, especially in working-class areas, and was, moreover, a vital condition for the strikes which preceded the elections. Even now this ideological victory is helping the workers to understand the class content of the de Gaulle rule.

Our Communist historians should study both the more distant and the recent history of our country. The eventful period from December 2, 1851, to May 31, 1958, shows that political democracy is far from being a characteristic feature of capitalism as the revisionist pseudo-theorists claim.

They ignore the fact that bourgeois democracy, no matter how advanced, has never in itself implied socialism. They would like to forget that, irrespective of the way in which it is achieved, the transition from capitalism to socialism is always a revolutionary leap, the outcome of sharp class struggle.

At the same time we do not counterpose in an abstract way the struggle for democracy to the fight for socialism. We denounce as sectarian the absolutely incorrect concept that by advancing democratic demands we create "illusions" among the masses. On the contrary, the fight for democracy, forsaken and betrayed by the big bourgeoisie, enables the working class to enhance its prestige and rally the broad masses around it. Nationalization of some basic industries, agrarian reform and protecting the small peasant economy from the monopolies, democratic control over capital investments in industry and agriculture can, through a broad democratic coalition, isolate the big bourgeoisie and break the monopoly-led reactionary bloc.

Our revisionists, despite their efforts and the means at their disposal, have little success among the workers. In point of fact, the Communist Party alone is the spokesman of the majority of the working class, and not only of the class-conscious workers. The politically-immature workers are influenced mainly by Social Democracy. It follows, then, that the propagation of revisionism through the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois press, especially through *France-observateur*, is designed as a counterweight to communist influence among office workers and the heterogeneous mass of petty-bourgeois elements, to prevent them from entering into an alliance with the working class. This is particularly noticeable among the intellectuals.

NICOLAE GOLDBERGER (*Rumania*)

After dwelling on the revisionist and nationalist mistakes in elucidating the history of Rumania (an attempt to depict her participation in World War I as defense of the national interests, the exaggeration of the role played by the bourgeoisie in Rumania's history and belittling of the services of the working class in the past, etc.), Goldberger turned to the revisionist exercises of the Yugoslav theorists.

THE new revisionists, he said, contend that they alone are advancing Marxism-Leninism, they claim a monopoly of the theoretical generalization of the processes and changes now taking place in the world. It is significant, however, that the revisionists have never considered it necessary to develop Marxist revolutionary principles in their writings. On the contrary, the invariable purpose and the objective outcome of their "creative development" is to emasculate Marxism-Leninism of its revolutionary content and, consequently, to discredit the revolutionary struggle of the working class.

In an article published in the Yugoslav weekly *Komunist* Radoslav Ratkovic maintains that in the imperialist countries there is "a peculiar way of restricting, changing and eliminating the capitalist socio-economic system" without "drastic changes in the nature of power and the relations of ownership," in other words, without a revolution. His colleague, Milente Popovic, spoke recently on the so-called development of socialist relations in the capitalist countries.

On the pretext of combating bureaucracy and "developing socialist democracy" the revisionists distort the lessons of the Paris Commune and vilify the experience of the Soviet Union and of the other countries of the socialist camp. In an article published last May headed "Proletarian Dictatorship and Its Yugoslav Form," Mirko Perovic refers to two forms of proletarian dictatorship: "administrative-centralist" (in the socialist countries) and the other—"based on non-state unity," on "free associations" (in Yugoslavia). Milente Popovic, on the other hand, says plainly that "bureaucratic étatism" prevails in the countries where "the bourgeoisie was overthrown by violent means, the proletarian dictatorship established and nationalization carried out." He argues for fostering in these countries opposition to the proletarian dictatorship for the purpose of establishing "direct socialist democracy" under which the state withers away. This is an open call for weakening the dictatorship of the proletariat, for organizational chaos in the activity of the socialist state and for relinquishing the socialist state as the principal instrument for building socialism and communism.

LUCIANO GRUPPI (*Italy*)

WHEREAS the profound criticism voiced at the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU was used by us as a positive factor in developing the working-class movement in Italy, the opportunists seized upon it to justify their ideological and political surrender which in reality was conditioned by the accentuated struggle and the attacks launched by the monopolies.

It should be said that we have not always combated revisionism with one and the same means and in the same manner. But we have always sought to ensure a broad discussion so that any error likely to disorientate the members could be explained and the differences between us and the revisionists brought out with utmost clarity.

During the discussion which preceded the Eighth Party Congress one member of the Central Committee (the sole exception) tried in the guise of false self-criticism to vilify our Party. The journal *Rinascita*, edited by Togliatti, published an article under the heading "An Impermissible Attack on the Italian Communist Party." The same issue contained a pointed rebuff by Togliatti.

In another instance when a wrong view was expressed by Giolitti, who did not attack the Party openly, a comradely discussion followed. Giolitti was given the opportunity to expound his views orally and in written form so that we could reply to his arguments and thus enable him and those who shared his views to see the error of their ways. The Eighth Party Congress was the highlight of this discussion. But when Giolitti, persisting in his erroneous views, left the Party, he was trenchantly exposed in the book *Revisionism—New and Old*, by Luigi Longo, Deputy General Secretary of the Party.

In criticizing Giolitti's views on the role of technological progress, we did not confine ourselves to an exposition of the well-known thesis that technological progress should be assessed from a class standpoint, that the decisive element in its assessment is a correct understanding of the production relations under which this progress is made. The working class in the capitalist countries, we stressed, is not indifferent to technological progress. Moreover, the workers welcome it and set themselves the aim of effecting far-reaching socio-economic reforms and of changing the political system by abolishing monopoly rule, that is, turning technological progress into social progress. This, which has not been achieved as yet, will, when it is brought about, create more favorable conditions for the fight for socialism.

The discussion continued when the question was posed: would the use of nuclear energy and auto-

mation by the capitalists lead to a second industrial revolution? We replied in the negative, because an industrial revolution is unthinkable without a change in the production relations, as took place during the rise of industrial capitalism.

Referring to the changes in modern capitalism, Giolitti insisted that the working class should unconditionally accept the parliamentary way of transition to socialism; he demanded that the peaceful way should be accepted as the only possible one. We replied: in seeking power by peaceful means the workers should bear in mind that this depends on the resistance of the exploiting classes; the possibility of winning power peacefully is linked with the situation at the given moment, with the correlation of class forces and, consequently, cannot be guaranteed in all circumstances.

Thus we rejected such a theory of working-class "hegemony" which recognizes only leadership, persuasion and education and rules out coercion and compulsion in relation to the class enemy. While it is necessary to stress the significance of leadership when we speak about hegemony, we should not forget that the latter also presupposes coercion. Leadership and coercion are components of the hegemony of the proletariat, i.e., the dictatorship of the proletariat. It was this point of view that Giolitti rejected.

Since defeating revisionist attacks inside the Party, we have been combating revisionism by means of discussion with the Right-wing Socialists. In doing so we always remember the political purpose of our criticism of revisionism in the Socialist Party, which is the building of firm working-class unity.

It would be artificial, especially for Italy, to separate the struggle against revisionism inside the country from the struggle outside.

Gruppi then gave a number of examples showing how the Italian Communist Party had taken part in the common struggle of the Communists against Yugoslav revisionism, he dwelt also on the struggle waged by the Party against the attempts to distort Gramsci's views on the factory councils.

Our struggle against revisionism, Gruppi said in conclusion, was not reduced to a mere repetition of principles, it was linked with the elaboration of the political line of the Party, the formulation of tasks in the fight for democracy and socialism in Italy, the desire to develop Marxist-Leninist theory in accordance with our own conditions. That is why our struggle against revisionism was closely connected with the struggle against sectarianism and dogmatism—serious obstacles to the creative development of Party policy.

Our policy is bearing fruit. No one can deny that our Party is now stronger than it was before the revisionist attack in 1956. Those who spoke

about a crisis in our ranks at that time have suffered a miserable fiasco. The facts have demonstrated the correctness of our estimate of the Common Market and of the Fanfani policy; and the Socialist Party, too, has had to take this into account in its activity.

J. JACOBS (*Great Britain*)

HERBERT MORRISON, one of the oldest leaders of the Labor Party and architect of anti-communism in Britain, declared in 1948: "We have achieved democratic socialism in Britain without bloodshed and without tears, capitalism as we know it no longer exists; on behalf of the Labor government I want to shake every employer by the hand as a friend and a brother."

The Left in the Labor Party, too, attempted to show that Marxism was no longer valid. One of its leaders, Mikardo, said: "Yes, capitalists still own 80 per cent of British industry but this is not important because they no longer control them. Power is now in the hands of the technicians, we have achieved a bloodless managerial revolution." Alas for Mikardo. As a trade union leader, he has been busily engaged in trying to protect the interests of his members who are being discharged by the very people who, according to his theory, no longer have control of power.

Revisionist theory is also propagated by writers like Crosland.

Crosland writes about post-capitalist society at a time when the offensive against the working class and even against the reforms introduced by the two postwar Labor governments is being intensified. Small wonder therefore that, as Crosland sadly reports, the local Labor activists resist these revisionist ideas.

Jacobs then turned to the difficult struggle waged against revisionism by the British Communist Party during 1956-58.

The revisionists formed factions in the Party and alliances with Trotskyites and other groups outside the Party. They issued a number of anti-Party, anti-Soviet and anti-Hungarian documents even while they were still in the Party. They wrote articles in the capitalist press and also in Right-wing Labor journals attacking proletarian internationalism. Even at this stage they knew that they could not win the Party for their revisionist policies. Their aim therefore was to disrupt and weaken the Party. Thus they again demonstrated that revisionism inevitably leads to the camp of the class enemy.

Their main attack was conducted against democratic centralism and the monolithic unity of the Party. They insisted on the right not to regard Party decisions as binding and to speak and act

against them. They rejected the leading role of the Party and argued that such a concept was an impertinence. They wanted us to take up a hostile attitude to the Soviet Union, arguing that if we openly criticized the CPSU we would show that we were an independent party and not a tool of the Soviet Party.

The ideological battle raged throughout the Party; as a result our public work was almost

at a standstill. The bourgeoisie took advantage of this to launch an attack on the working class.

After defeating revisionism our Executive Committee drew the Party's attention to the need to broaden and deepen the fundamental Marxist-Leninist understanding of each member. For this purpose we have organized more Party schools and are preparing theoretical articles and historical works, in particular, a history of our Party.

Reviews

Technology and Social Progress

THE bourgeois press is full of articles, speeches, reports, etc., on the social consequences of the scientific and technological revolution which signifies man's entrance into the age of the two "A's": the atom and automation. Along with the spate of words come the ultra-modern sociological theories aiming at "rejuvenating" and "galvanizing" decrepit capitalism. These theories are echoed in the policy documents of many political parties. Already in 1957 the Social Democratic Party of Germany declared itself to be the first and only party to base its "convictions and activities" on the theory of the "second industrial revolution." This revolution, states the program adopted by this Party in November 1959, is setting up conditions which will improve the general standard of living, make for the fair distribution of incomes and property, and abolish want and poverty. The scientific and technological revolution is extolled in the program of the Socialist Party of Austria. And the British Laborites are elaborating the theoretical principles of "British socialism" from the same positions.

This flow of pseudo-scientific fabrications is counterposed by a series of Marxist works recently published in various countries. They deal with the social aspects of technical advance in the epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism. Among these *Technology and Social Progress** by G. V. Osipov, the Soviet philosopher, commands attention. The book deals with the rise and development of technique, the interdependence of technological and social progress; it examines the changes which have taken place in the basis and the superstructure of capitalism and socialism under the impact of the modern scientific and technological revolution. And it reviews contemporary

reformist and revisionist theories regarding the part technology plays in social life.

The author of this interesting piece of research first answers the question whether the changes now taking place in production processes may correctly be regarded as a scientific and technological revolution.

The radical technical changes of the mid-twentieth century unquestionably signify the beginning of a veritable scientific and technological revolution. The use of atomic energy and automation open up possibilities for a sharp rise in labor productivity. Changes in the process of producing material values place man in a new relationship to nature. But the importance of the revolution is not restricted to this. Its social consequences are truly great. The production process, by virtue of which people and society create material wealth—the basis of their life—in the final analysis determines the social structure of society and its ideology. Means of production form the material and technological basis of each social system—this is one of the fundamental principles of historical materialism.

The new technology can, it goes without saying, cater to both capitalist and socialist society; the same machines may be found both in capitalist and socialist enterprises. But the crux of the matter is that the social character of utilizing the machinery differs essentially under capitalism and socialism. The difference lies in who gathers the fruits of technical progress—the monopolies or the people. Lenin pointed out that the consequences of technical achievements which effect a revolution in industry will be totally different under capitalism as compared with socialism.

Technological advance and social progress are interconnected and form a uniform process. Capitalism cleared the way for machinery and for this

*G. V. Osipov. *Technology and Social Progress*. A critical essay on the contemporary reformist and revisionist sociological theories. Moscow, Academy of Sciences of the USSR, 1959, 262 pp.

reason triumphed over feudalism. Capitalist relationships, based upon private ownership, cramp accelerated development of modern techniques, whereas socialism creates the prerequisites for technical advance. Technical achievements strengthen socialist economy, but accentuate contradictions inside capitalist economy. As Milton H. Aronson, a U.S. expert on automation, neatly put it, automation cannot make a sick country healthy or a healthy country sick. It can make a healthy economy still more healthy and a sick economy more sick. "There is no ultimate escape from the fact," writes S. Lilley, author of the well-known work on automation, "that capitalism, well though it worked in its time, is not a suitable economic structure for making beneficial use of the advanced techniques of today and the even more advanced techniques of tomorrow. . . . Turn and twist as we may, there is no ultimate way forward except that of changing the whole economic system into a socialist one."*

The motive behind automation under capitalism, as Osipov shows, is the drive for maximum profits. Less working time is required at automated factories to make a commodity. The socially necessary labor-time and, hence, the social value of commodities are determined by average conditions of production. This explains why owners of automated plants obtain their super-profits. U.S. monopoly spokesmen say, too, that fear of the Soviet Union overtaking the United States in automation is one of the major reasons why they are introducing automation.

It is being introduced under fierce competition. The monopolies are getting the better of their weaker competitors precisely because they are the first in the field with automation—which contributes to intensive centralization of capital—and are launching it on a bigger scale. In the complex process of automation contradictions arise between the necessity to develop automation and the desire of separate monopoly groups to retard its development. As A. Barjonet's article brings out, on the one hand automation strengthens the economic domination of the monopolies, and, on the other, aggravates the contradictions of imperialism, both in the framework of one country and on an international plane.**

One of the most important effects of automation partially replacing human labor by machines is the uneven growth of the organic composition of capital and the creation of chronic mass unemployment. Mass unemployment in the USA in 1958, which dropped somewhat in 1959 as a result of the recovery in industry is, as V. Perlo writes, nothing other than the first sign of the new catas-

trophe with which automation, so profitably used by monopoly capital, threatens labor.* About 40-50 per cent of the workers are laid off when enterprises are automated. At the same time those remaining speed up work.

The working class in the capitalist countries is not opposed to automation. Technological advance under capitalism objectively paves the way for the building of a material and technical basis for socialism. However, the transition from capitalism to socialism does not come of itself as the result of technical progress, but on the basis of class struggle and social revolutions. The working class does not fear technology, as many bourgeois sociologists affirm. Was fear behind the U.S. metalworkers' strike which lasted for some months in 1959? One of the chief reasons why the strike was called was that when the steel companies installed the latest machinery, output rates were raised and work teams reduced. The American trade unions—though not always consistently, and not always with due resoluteness—have taken up the cudgels against the unemployment engendered by automation and for a shorter working week and higher wages. The Communist Party of the USA has long since urged this action. The working class is taking vigorous action against the social effects of automation under imperialism. In other words, it upholds technological progress on the basis of social progress.

A considerable section of Osipov's book is devoted to a well-reasoned criticism of contemporary reformist and revisionist sociological theories ("the managerial society," "technical-bureaucratic socialism," "self-governing socialism"). Bourgeois sociologists laud the scientific and technological revolution as a stimulus to the advance of capitalism, and ignore the legitimate question—is not this revolution bringing closer capitalism's death-hour? Vainly do they try to link the scientific and technological revolution of the twentieth century with the advent of a capitalist "era of plenty" and "universal well-being." Contemporary bourgeois sociology is doing what it can to conceal the negative social consequences of automation and to depict it as a radical means, a panacea for solving the fundamental contradictions of capitalism.

Technocracy, a bourgeois sociological trend, is endeavoring to show that the future society that will take shape as the result of the scientific and technological revolution, will resemble neither capitalism nor socialism. A new society, it appears, has come or is coming to replace capitalism. It will be run by technicians and engineers (T. Veblen), industrial managers (J. Burnham), "captains of science," "intellectual capitalists" (J.

*S. Lilley, *Automation and Social Progress*. London, Lawrence and Wishart, 1957, p. 213.

**A. Barjonet, *Problemes de l'automation*. "Cahiers du communisme," Paris, 1959, No. 10, pp. 853-862.

*V. Perlo, *Social Consequences of the Scientific and Technological Revolution*. "Questions of Philosophy," Moscow, 1959, No. 11, p. 59.

Alasco), "economic humanists," etc. The proponents of these theories are spreading illusions to the effect that the state will become the property of the "managers," while intellectuals will make up the new ruling class. These notions are held by many contemporary bourgeois sociologists, they adulate the bourgeois intellectuals and exert a certain degree of influence on a section of them. Technocratic theories aim at alienating the technical intellectuals from the working class. At the present time, however, writes Osipov in an article entitled "Technical Progress and 'managerial society',"* the objective conditions obtain, to a greater extent than ever before, for an alliance between the engineers, technicians and the working class against monopoly capital. Only service to the working class—and the progressive section of the intellectuals in the capitalist countries has already taken this path—can open to them broad vistas for unhampered creative labor.

Many Right-wing Social Democrats have adopted these technocratic theories. And this is not fortuitous. The union between technocrats and reformists is built upon making a fetish of techniques and the false interpretation of its social consequences, on the basis of denying the need for a socialist revolution and the class struggle. "The transition from capitalism to the organizers' regime will be a revolution of theirs which will be announced to the world instead of a socialist revolution,"** wrote Léon Blum, identifying his views with Burnham's. Léon Blum's views are shared by other Right-wing Social Democrats in European and Asian countries (Crosland, Sering, Rindziro Harako and others). Renegades of the Fougeryollas type resort readily to technocracy, counterposing these concepts to Marxism.*** The Right Socialists justify their repudiation of socialism and their refusal to uphold the best interests of the working class by alleging that after Marx, yet another historical epoch, the epoch of "organizers and managers," had "wedged" itself in between capitalism and socialism. While advocating state capitalism they endeavor to combine technocratic ideas with reformist views on the transition to a "socialism" under which the foundations of bourgeois society would be preserved.

It is not difficult to perceive that technocratic theories are only a distorted reflection of the process of monopoly capitalism growing over into state-monopoly capitalism. Their class essence is revealed in the attempt to justify and defend monopoly interests in the new, changed conditions of class struggle. The advocates of these theories resort to social demagoguery and use pharisaical phrases of sympathy with the people. As Osipov's

book shows, the representatives of this utopian and reactionary sociological trend, rejecting democracy and parliamentarism, propagate a state based upon forced labor and a militarized economy. In the face of such sociological speculations, however, social development strikingly testifies that the high-road of human civilization leads to socialism.

The production relations in socialist society provide scope for technological advance. What is the "secret" of the amazing pace of progress made by the Soviet Union which, in a historically brief space of time, has leaped from technical backwardness to playing a leading part in world technological advance? It lies in the socialist system which has awakened the creative forces of the people, liberated and raised the individual and created the conditions for peaceful labor and the blossoming of popular talent. That is why the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are the main center of the scientific and technological revolution that is now setting in. It is true that separate and sometimes important technical problems are successfully solved in the capitalist countries. The scientific and technological achievements of the USSR have won world-wide recognition. The Soviet Union, says the Anglo-Russian Parliamentary Committee in its congratulations on the occasion of launching the third space rocket, is now the world leader in the field of scientific achievements. Comprehensive mechanization and automation of production processes are, particularly after the June (1959) Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the CPSU, taking on a scope that is quite beyond the power of any capitalist country.

As the book under review clearly shows, the people in the socialist countries regard the new technology as a powerful means of mastering nature. Techniques were created by man, as Aristotle in his time said, to "fill the gaps of nature." In socialist society the introduction of new techniques creates the conditions and possibilities for increasing labor productivity. During the first nine months of 1959 labor productivity rose in the Soviet industry by 8 per cent as compared with the corresponding period of 1958. The wealth of society has accordingly grown, living standards have improved and the cultural and technical level of the people has risen. Technological progress under socialism is making it possible to reduce working hours. The USSR, as is known, is going over to the shortest work-day and week in the world. But that is not the limit. Eventually there will be a three to four-hour work day, while real wages will systematically rise. In socialist society planning allows the most efficient use to be made of the labor power. Labor economy effected through automation makes it possible to utilize the released labor power for expansion of production in the same or other industries. To cite

*See *Communist*, Moscow, No. 9, 1959.

**J. Burnham, *L'ère des organisateurs*. Preface par Léon Blum. Paris, 1947, p. XI.

***See *World Marxist Review*, No. 10, 1959.

an example. During 1959-1965 automation and comprehensive mechanization will mean making 7,000 workers at the Magnitogorsk Iron and Steel Works available for other work in the shops and units now under construction. The use of up-to-date machinery in the conditions of socialism does not imply labor speed-up. On the contrary it lightens labor and, it goes without saying, does not and cannot cause unemployment.

We will restrict ourselves to just one example. There has been a high level of automation in the Soviet iron and steel works in the past few years—90 per cent of the pig iron and steel are produced with the help of automation. Electronic computers controlling production processes are being used with greater effect in the metal industry. How has all this affected the steelworkers? Their working week has been reduced by seven hours, yet wages have risen by 14 per cent. Steelworkers are improving their qualifications, one in three is studying, many teams and departments consist of workers who are at the same time extra-mural students. Last year 160 workers from the Nizhne-Tagil Iron and Steel Works, who studied in their spare time, graduated as engineers and technicians.

In their book* dealing with the social effects of automation under capitalism and socialism C. Vincent and W. Grossin, who made a personal

*C. Vincent et W. Grossin, *L'enjeu de l'automatisation*. Paris, Editions Sociales, 1958.

study of automation in the Soviet Union and visited a number of Soviet automated enterprises, stressed that it was only under socialism that automation could develop fully and unrestrictedly and ensure a steadily rising living standard. The same conclusion has been arrived at by J. Auerhan, Czechoslovak scientist, who has made a study of the economic effect of automation in the Soviet Union, and the state and perspectives of the development of automation in Czechoslovakia.**

In the above-mentioned article, V. Perlo speaks of the scientific and technological revolution propelling a socialist society forward in the same way as a rocket-carrier propels a Sputnik.

The new techniques and the corresponding new system of production characterize the material and technical basis of communism—the fundamental condition for creating abundance and distribution according to needs. Possession of the secrets of the atom and the use of its energy will enable people to control the forces of nature, contribute to the leap from the “realm of necessity to the realm of freedom.” The technology of the future, based upon atomic energy and automation, is the technology of a new, higher socio-economic order, it is the technology of communism.

N. KULAGIN

**J. Auerhan, *Automatisace a její ekonomický význam*. Praha, 1959, 246 str.

A Book That Calls to Action

WORKS by Jose Carlos Mariátegui have gained wide popularity in Peru and other countries. Ranking particularly high is his *Seven Essays on the Interpretation of Peruvian Reality*,* which has already had eight editions: seven in Peru and one in Chile (Santiago). The last two Peruvian editions, 50,000 copies each, were published in the course of a single year and sold within a matter of a few days.

As the masses learn more about the work of Mariátegui, the enemies of the Peruvian people—the U.S. monopolies and the mercenary oligarchy at home—are taking greater pains to distort its content. But lacking scientific arguments they cannot find a worthy opponent to Mariátegui and attack him (mainly the *Seven Essays*) in a more or less concealed way. Without denying the literary merit of his works they accuse him of “Europeanism,” of applying formulae and methods that are unacceptable in Peru. They use the method of quoting at random, single out questions of secondary importance, and thus try to discredit the

J. C. Mariátegui, *7 Ensayos de Interpretación de la Realidad Peruana*. Lima, Ed. Amauta, 1958, 307 p.

Marxist-Leninist content of the *Essays* and associate Mariátegui with the camp of agnosticism. In about the same way charges are made accusing him of bourgeois nationalism and revisionism.

Mariátegui was an outstanding organizer and leader of the Peruvian working class, founder of the Communist Party and of the first trade union center. He took an active part in the struggle for an 8-hour working day, better conditions and for the university reform (1918-19). Under the impact of the October Revolution he became a convinced champion of the cause of socialism.

Upon deportation for participating in the struggle, Mariátegui went to Italy where, in 1921, he attended the Livorno Congress which founded the Italian Communist Party. While there he organized a Marxist study group for Peruvian immigrants. Upon his return to Peru in 1923 he wrote a number of articles and delivered some lectures on the significance of the first socialist revolution and the leading role of the working class and its Party in building the new society.

In 1924 Mariátegui supported the then anti-imperialist movement bearing the name of the

American People's Revolutionary Alliance. But, remaining loyal to the united front principle, he conditioned his support by insisting that its members preserve their party affiliation and that the independent role of the proletariat as a class be recognized. When the leaders of the movement rejected these terms, it resulted in differences which became particularly sharp after it was decided to turn the Alliance into a "Latin American Kuomintang," i.e., a bourgeois-capitulatory anti-communist party. In the course of sharp polemics that preceded the split Mariátegui wrote in *Amauta*, the journal of which he was the editor, that Latin American revolutions will "only be a stage, a phase of the world revolution."

In 1928 he set up the Organizational Committee for the General Confederation of the Peruvian Workers (May 1), published his *Seven Essays* (June-July) and founded the Peruvian Communist Party (October 7). These events were most important in all his activities.

Mariátegui drafted the program for the Communist Party and defined it as a Marxist-Leninist party. He wrote a report on the Indian question in America and the theses "The Anti-Imperialist Concepts," which were discussed at the first Conference of the Communist Parties of Latin America (Buenos Aires, 1929). Later he drafted two resolutions: on the policy of Party alliances, in which he reveals the class essence of the People's Revolutionary Alliance and the leaders' leaning towards demagoguery and fascism, and on the affiliation of the Party with the Communist International.

The *Essays* are by no means an isolated work. If we bear in mind the time when they were written we will understand that they helped strengthen the class consciousness of the Peruvian proletariat. They constitute a theoretical basis for the program of the Communist Party. In the introduction to his book Mariátegui wrote: "My ideas and my life make up a single whole, a single process. . . . I have but one open and persistent desire: to further the rise of socialism in Peru."

Mariátegui said that Marxism was a universal teaching, whose basic tenets are immortal. He constantly stressed that "in each country Marxism operates in conformity with a specific situation and environment and takes account of all its features," that "socialism in Peru should not be a copy or an imitation. . . ."

The first thing that strikes the eye upon reading the essays is their number, the titles and the order. Why seven? Acquaintance with the book shows a certain logic in this. In keeping with the Marxist method the first three essays deal with the economic basis of Peruvian society and the remaining four—with the various forms of the superstructure.

In the introduction Mariátegui said that initially he had intended to incorporate an essay on the

political and ideological development of Peru, but the subject proved so important that it deserved being extended into a book. We believe that the theses on racial discrimination written for the congress of Latin American trade unions, the theses on the anti-imperialist struggle for the first Conference of the Latin American Communist Parties, and his messages "May Day and the United Front" and "To the Second Workers' Congress"—in which he analyzed the capitalist production relations and class struggle—should also be studied in close relation with the *Seven Essays*:

Here we shall dwell only on the points which seem to us of utmost importance, without making a detailed analysis of each essay.

While defining the ways and the character of the Peruvian revolution Mariátegui, in keeping with Marxist theory, proceeded from the basic law of any social revolution, the underlying cause of which is the irreconcilable contradiction between the production relations and the productive forces. His assessment of the internal and external social factors that had led to the war of independence against the Spanish yoke, and also of the historic factors that accounted for the latifundia rule and the feudal survivals, his ideas about imperialist penetration and the basic antagonisms it was responsible for, were absolutely just. This analysis enabled Mariátegui to conclude that Peru was a dependent, semi-colonial country.

Mariátegui aptly defined the specific features of Peruvian society, of which the most important was the Indian question. The author pointed out that this question "followed from our economy and was rooted in the form of land ownership." He closely examined the position of the Indians (for the most part Quechuas and Aymaras) who, though they comprise the majority of the population, were the object not only of class exploitation but of national oppression too. Mariátegui did not reduce everything to the agrarian question, but persistently defended the social and national rights of the Indian population.

The author repeatedly stressed that the state of the latifundists and big capitalists was the mainstay of imperialist rule, feudal exploitation and oppression. He believed the demand for decentralization of the administration to be logical in those conditions, but warned: "Not only the mechanism of government should be discussed and reconsidered but, above all, the economic basis of the state." But the first thing to do, he wrote, was to end the country's dependence on foreign imperialism and abolish feudalism.

In the essays entitled "Progress of Public Education," "Religious Factor," "Regionalism and Centralism" and "Development of Literature" Mariátegui thoroughly examined the aspects of the superstructure of Peruvian society. Each essay

is a consistent historical analysis. The author demonstrated how the production relations and the class struggle influenced the various forms of the superstructure. Analyzing problems of public education he proved that the main hindrance to national and social development was the lack of genuine national freedom and the enslavement of the country by North American imperialism. The result of the policy followed by the ruling classes was that "national education was not of a national character but rather of a colonial character."

In the essay "Religious Factor" Mariátegui showed that religion in general, and Catholicism and Protestantism in particular, served the ruling class and was its ideological instrument of subjugation. The privileges enjoyed by the church and clergymen both during the Spanish rule and under the Republic he regarded as feudal. "In keeping with historical materialism," he wrote, "socialism considers the church and religious doctrines to be part and parcel of the socio-economic system which breeds and supports them. Therefore it sets the task of altering in the first place the socio-economic system and not the religious doctrines and the church."

In his last essay "Development of Literature" the author condemned feudal survivals in our literature and art, as well as bourgeois cosmopolitanism which capitalized on these survivals with a view to retarding the development of a genuinely national literature and art in Peru.

The analysis of Peruvian life in the *Seven Essays* confirms the conclusion at which Mariátegui arrived later in the Party's draft program: "Only the struggle of the Peruvian proletariat in alliance with the peasantry and the international anti-imperialist movement can bring about the economic liberation of the country. Only this alliance can pose and then resolve the issue of *bourgeois-democratic revolution* which the bourgeoisie has proved unable to carry out."

Though they played an important role in ideologically preparing the Peruvian revolution, we should not regard the essays as infallible. This

would run counter to the dialectical materialist outlook of Mariátegui and the self-critical standpoint from which he always viewed his own activity. A Marxist-Leninist analysis of the book, an objective assessment of it, requires that we should take account of the fact that these are unfinished essays. Also the time of writing should not be lost sight of.

The book contains certain erroneous conclusions and formulations. The author, for example, incorrectly defined the ancient Inca state as being "communist"; in some cases he misused the term "race" in relation to the Indian nationalities of Quechua and Aymara.

In the thirty years since the death of Mariátegui in 1930 there have been no radical changes in the structure and the class character of Peruvian society: Peru still remains a dependent and semi-colonial country. This means that Mariátegui's basic ideas in relation to the first stage of our revolution are valid to this day. But not all the problems posed by him are as burning today as they were in the past. Our country has made some economic progress. Despite obstacles erected by foreign imperialists and latifundists her productive forces have developed. The national bourgeoisie of today is not the "stunted plant on feudal soil," of which Mariátegui wrote. The larger working class, the peasantry and all the oppressed masses have won certain social and political gains due to their heroic struggles. These years have also seen an intensified imperialist offensive inside the country and the change in the world balance of forces in favor of socialism. The main antagonism as well as all other contradictions of our society have sharpened to the extreme, and we have come much closer to our goal.

Our Communist Party furthers Mariátegui's cause both in theory and in its practical work. And since his activity is inseparable from that of the Party, we share with him the successes that we have scored in the thirty years of our struggle.

Jorge del PRADO

The Ideological Weapon of the Hungarian Communists

TARSADALMI SZEMLE (Social Review)* resumed publication in May 1957—six months after the crushing of the counter-revolutionary putsch. By that time the working-class state had been consolidated. However, a big struggle loomed ahead to wipe out the ideological influence of the counter-revolution.

The provisional Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party analyzed in December 1956 the reasons for the putsch and singled out its four factors: the errors of the former Party leadership, conspiracy of the Imre Nagy group, subversive activities of the former capitalists and landowners, and last, but by no means least—the intervention of international imperialism. While the activity of the Imre Nagy group was typically revisionist, the mistakes of the former Party leadership derived mainly from sectarianism and dogmatism.

At that time many people could not properly understand the October events, and we had to explain the counter-revolutionary nature of these to them. *Tarsadalmi Szemle* denounced the "theory" about the second phase of the revolution (according to this theory the working class fought in October for "fuller democracy"). In an article entitled "Hungarian Counter-Revolution in the Light of Marxism-Leninism" (No. 1, 1957) G. Kallai exposed the counter-revolutionary aims that were decked out in the "national" dress. One of the main ideological weapons of the counter-revolution was nationalism spread by the revisionists in the guise of "national communism." "National communism" is in keeping with the tactical aims of international imperialism. The imperialists calculated to disrupt, with the help of this slogan, the ideological and political unity of the Communist parties, weaken the alliance of the socialist countries and lay the groundwork for the restoration of capitalism in Hungary and to start subsequently a frontal attack on the socialist camp as a whole" (Nos. 8-9, 1959).

Nationalism, the journal notes, was the common ideological platform of the counter-revolutionary bloc which united Imre Nagy's followers with the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois politicians, clericals and overt fascist elements. It served as a screen to cover the policy levelled against the proletarian dictatorship and the Soviet Union. Despite the ef-

forts to depict their activity as patriotic, these people slid into betrayal of the country.

Opposing the revisionists of the Imre Nagy group, the Party showed that their demand for "equality" of nations was a thrust at the unity of the socialist camp, while the slogan of "national unity" aimed at weakening the leading role of the working class. Successfully combating nationalism, the Party convinced the masses that "neutrality" of the Imre Nagy kind, the demand for the withdrawal of Hungary from the socialist camp (motivated by the "national" interests) would ultimately have brought the country under the heel of imperialism. Nationalism could have been wiped out had the roots of counter-revolutionary ideology been extirpated and all honest patriots rid themselves of bourgeois nationalism and become socialist patriots.

Falsification of Hungary's history and abuse of the national traditions made it imperative to lay bare the roots of Hungarian nationalism and to show its twofold nature. Historically, Hungarian nationalism was, on the one hand, the nationalism of the bourgeoisified nobility and the bourgeoisie of a nation oppressed by Austria and, on the other, the nationalism of these exploiting classes directed against the downtrodden national minorities. It stands to reason that the two trends should be assessed differently. For anti-Hapsburg nationalism in the days of Kossuth was a progressive trend aimed at winning independence, whereas bourgeois nationalism at the imperialist stage was reactionary being aimed at oppressing the national minorities and kindling hatred for the neighboring peoples.

On the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the Hungarian Soviet Republic in 1959 the journal illustrated, on the example of the glorious revolutionary past, the patriotic character of proletarian internationalism, counterposing it to bourgeois nationalism under reactionary regimes. The Hungarian Soviet Republic resolved the nationality problem on the basis of proletarian internationalism.

The question of the inter-relationship between class and national interests cropped up time and again in the polemics with the revisionists. Imre Nagy claimed that the working class could not subordinate the national interests to its class interests. The Party showed that the class interests of the workers do not run counter to the national interests. Moreover, in fighting for socialism the working

*Theoretical and political journal of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party.

class upholds the national interests. The Theses of the Central Committee on "Bourgeois Nationalism and Socialist Patriotism" noted that socialist construction proceeded within the national framework and led to the continuous progress of the countries building socialism. This is ensured by the leading role of the working class (Nos. 8-9, 1959).

Among the nationalistic trends of the Horthy regime was the "middle way" nationalism represented by so-called "people's" writers who spread the illusion that Hungary may develop along some middle road between imperialism and socialism. The "people's" writers, although they opposed capitalism, failed to understand the policy of socialist Hungary. They thought Hungary could stand "somewhere between East and West," that is, between the Soviet Union and the imperialist countries. In addition, they regarded the peasantry as the basis of the nation, losing sight of the stratification and class antagonisms in the countryside. They admired the postwar land reform but could not understand the socialist changes in the countryside. Their ideology was in a way akin to the views of Imre Nagy. No wonder, therefore, that the nationalism of the "people's" writers and the lack of a class approach brought them close to the counter-revolution (No. 6, 1958).

The Party was engaged not only in the struggle against revisionism; it also opposed sectarianism and dogmatism, and combated the elements who underestimate the role of the people and issue orders instead of carrying out educational work. This erroneous approach is to be observed even now in the key question of building socialism—cooperation of the peasantry. The Right-wing deviationists understood voluntary co-operation as a spontaneous process, while the sectarians could not patiently explain the matter to the peasants and underestimated the individual peasants. In order to ensure a rapid growth of agriculture in 1959 the Party had to combat both Right-wing and sectarian views.

Sectarian views came to the fore also after the March (1959) meeting of the Central Committee; the resolution adopted at this meeting envisaged, in particular, a higher rate of socialist reconstruction of the countryside. Some people again violated the principle of voluntary and gradual co-operation and sought to abolish ground-rent without delay. All this might have sapped the worker-peasant alliance and shaken the faith of the peasants in the Party had not the Party set things right at the proper time.

We must work out the style and methods of Party work in the countryside. The Communists, the journal stresses, should have a differentiated approach to various sections of the peasantry and

regard individual peasants as future co-operative members.

Elaboration of theoretical problems is facilitated by the research made by groups of theorists from the Party Central Committee. For instance, the material on factory councils was discussed by the economic group. Later the journal (No. 2, 1959) elucidated the question of inner-factory democracy with special emphasis on the need to overcome revisionist views in connection with the emergence of "workers' councils" during the counter-revolutionary putsch.

The journal disproved the views of Yugoslav revisionists on "self-management" in industry and upheld the Leninist view on the relationship between factory councils, trade unions and Party branches under the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Many pages are devoted to a criticism of the philosophical views of Georg Lukacs. This question should not be exaggerated, of course. But it no doubt is linked to some extent with the cultural revolution in Hungary. Georg Lukacs sees the main contradiction of our time not in the conflict between moribund capitalism and growing socialism, but between social progress and the forces impeding it. The fight for socialism completely disappears in his concept; he denies that class struggle is the motive force of history.

In his article "The Relationship Between the Philosophical and Political Views of Georg Lukacs" (No. 2, 1958) Szigeti characterized the erroneous political concepts of Lukacs and his errors in philosophy and aesthetics as "the outcome of his surrender to the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois class interests." This ideology is hostile to the revolutionary proletariat. Subjectively, Lukacs conceived it "as a bridge which must bring the middle sections to Marxism, but objectively it has turned . . . into a peculiar ideological basis for the 'middle' way." This approach is also manifested in the aesthetic works of Lukacs, particularly in his notion of partisanship in literature and art. Lukacs estimates partisanship of the workers in the realm of art on the basis of their attitude to the new in social development, but in doing so he gives no class definition either of this "new" or of the partisan attitude to the phenomena of life.

The Party directives on policy in the sphere of culture (1959) pointed to the harmfulness of Lukacs' anti-Marxist views which bring grist to the mill of the revisionists. The directives (published in *Tarsadalmi Szemle*) indicate the ways and means of combating revisionism and dogmatism. The Party attaches primary importance to the leading role of Marxism-Leninism, of the socialist principles in culture. These principles should be extended to education, the arts and science. Marxism-Leninism draws a clear distinction be-

tween nationalism and patriotism. And it is on this basis that we should place the question of national peculiarities in socialist culture, without making the error of interpreting the country's past in a nationalistic way.

The group on cultural matters worked out the theses on Hungarian literature after the liberation (No. 2, 1959). The theses — a brilliant exposition of socialist realism — stated that the revisionist views of Lukacs greatly impeded the socialist revolution in the field of culture and literature. In fact, Lukacs oriented Hungarian literature on critical, not socialist, realism which does not conform to the aims of people's democracy. The writers, he maintained, should draw inspiration not from the Hungarian proletarian literature but from various bourgeois and petty-bourgeois trends.

The theses tore the mask off the writers who prepared the counter-revolution ideologically, exposed their ties with Imre Nagy and exploded the myth about "writer-martyrs." The journal gave the lie to the revisionist idea of free culture, which denied the leading role of the Party, and to the anti-Marxist ideas of the "supra-class" position of writers and artists and of a "single national culture."

Like other Communist journals, *Tarsadalmi Szemle* assists the Party in practical work, in tackling the urgent tasks of Party development. It connects theoretical problems with the everyday work of the Party. Because of this the journal has quickly become popular: it now has a larger reading public than it had before the October events. The journal also contributes to Party education by organizing theoretical discussions, etc. Of great help, for example, were the materials on the work with cadres and on Party activities in the countryside.

Tarsadalmi Szemle wages polemics not only against Hungarian revisionism but also against international revisionism. In the past two years it carried five articles criticizing Yugoslav revisionism. Three of them dealt with the program of the Yugoslav League of Communists, one — with the theoretical aspects of agrarian policy, and the last — with contradictions in the Yugoslav economy. The journal disproves the false in-

ference of the revisionists that modern capitalism is capable of putting an end to crises and the general crisis of capitalism.

The crucial issues of world politics, the successes of the fraternal parties and the problems facing them are also featured. The journal often publishes articles contributed by Communist leaders and publicists of other countries, and makes its contribution to the strengthening of proletarian internationalism. Of major significance in this respect was the popularization of the documents of the Twenty-first Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The survivals of chauvinism and nationalism are combated with a view to cementing solidarity with the socialist countries, the international revolutionary working-class movement and the national-liberation movements. The journal consistently implements the Marxist-Leninist principle that the interests of the workers of all lands coincide in the struggle against imperialism and war.

Tarsadalmi Szemle does not merely register events; it also brings out their nature and their interdependence in the evolution of the basic condition of our time — that between capitalism and socialism.

New big tasks are facing the journal after the Seventh Party Congress (December 1959), which outlined the perspectives of the country's economic and cultural progress, appraised the ideological work of the Party, and pointed to the need of stepping up the struggle against sectarianism, dogmatism and particularly revisionism.

In pursuit of the congress decisions, the journal will elucidate more thoroughly the theoretical problems of socialist construction, socialist reorganization of agriculture and of the cultural revolution. It will expose anti-Marxist views in philosophy and the other sciences and in the practice of socialist construction, revisionist views on socialism and modern capitalism, nationalist distortions in history and literature and the "middle way" nationalism.

The congress has opened up broad vistas for accelerating socialist construction, and *Tarsadalmi Szemle*, no doubt, will play its part in this great and noble cause.

J. NAGY

Things Are Not What They Seem

THE publication of books extolling colonialism is not unusual in the West. Their authors try to bury the shameful past which arouses the indignation of the peoples languishing under colonial yoke. They also try to prove that, although there were "discreditable incidents" in the old days, at present the policy of the colonial powers has changed radically and the sole concern of these powers now is how to help the underdeveloped nations.

The aim of these authors is to retard the national-liberation movement and, since it cannot be checked, to direct it along the lines most suitable to the colonialists. *British Policy in Changing Africa** is a book of this kind.

The author speaks with great authority on the subject: as head of the African Division of the Colonial Office and Governor and Commander-in-Chief of Uganda (1952-56), he was responsible for elaborating and implementing the colonial policy of Britain. But if Cohen knows the real situation in Africa, he says nothing about it.

It is surprising how the author managed to produce so many distortions, subterfuges and half-truths in this relatively small book. There is no mention of the stormy developments which attended the national-liberation movement in the British colonies and which were widely featured by the capitalist press of Britain: the terror in Kenya, mass murder in Nyasaland, etc. You will not find in this book facts on the economic situation and living standards in the colonies. Cohen talks his way out of this. True, he speaks about changes in Africa, about new, independent states. But in this exposition all this is the outcome of changed British policy.

Cohen brings out the reasons which impelled Britain to revise her policy. The West India Royal Commission of 1938, by setting out in clear form the facts of poverty and the backwardness of social services in the Caribbean, had aroused the public — and not only in relation to the West Indies. The war had brought the general feeling that the colonial peoples should be treated fairly. The author also mentions nationalism which grew very rapidly during and after the war. Thus the African liberation movement is considered by Cohen as an important political factor, although he puts it in third place. He makes out that he does not know that it is a movement of protest against enslavement and plunder. "Nationalism in West Africa," he writes, "owes its origin . . . to the

impact of the West." The book is filled with pronouncements such as these: "I have spoken of nationalism as a dynamic force in Africa, but *our own policy has been an influence of far longer standing* in the process of transforming society in Africa — and British officers have been the spearheads of progress" (our italics—M.S.), or "training the people to run their own countries has, I believe, been the main distinguishing characteristic of British administration in Africa."

So that the reader could not have the slightest doubt of the colonialists' desire to help the underdeveloped nations Cohen begins his book with a brief essay on history from which it follows that Britain conquered colonies with a view to abolishing the slave trade (!) "The leaders of the anti-slavery movement . . . looked to the spread of the Christian way of life and to the development of legitimate trade to repair the damage done by slavery." Of course, the author is not so naive as to try to prove that the humanitarian aim was the only motive for the partition of Africa by the Western powers. He admits that other motives — diplomatic and commercial — also entered the picture, but humanity was first and foremost. It is true, he says, that the methods used in securing the agreement of African Chiefs to the assumption of protection were often questionable and that establishment of European control involved some violence. But is it worth emphasizing this, as Marxist historians do? For all the actions of the colonialists were "humanitarian," and today they think only of granting independence to the African peoples.

Throughout the book Cohen lauds the activity of the British colonial administration. According to him, the natives had no better friends than the British officers. The reader learns, for example, that the first step in constitutional reform of the Gold Coast (1946) "was not to any large extent the result of nationalist pressure," but was sponsored by the British Governor. Cohen makes the casual remark that, now and then, as a result of these reforms, a few Africans were elected into legislatures and at that, as a rule, only with voice and no vote.

What does the author suggest and what are his conclusions? In the last chapter he sets forth the policy the Western powers should adhere to in relation to the African colonies. The Western world, he writes, is interested in helping the African peoples to carry forward the task of development. Unlike many other authors who openly speak about the need to help the underdeveloped countries in

*A. Cohen, *British Policy in Changing Africa*. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1959, 118 pp.

order to prevent the spread of communism there, Cohen does not say this forthrightly. For this would contradict the entire "humanitarian" trend of his book. Pride of place is given by him to a moral interest—to help the African peoples to accomplish the development first undertaken by the Europeans. The second is an economic interest—the need of the Western powers for raw materials and markets. And, finally, there is a political interest—to help the African peoples remain friendly to the Western world. Cohen takes pains to

persuade the reader that "in fact the interests of the Western world and of the African countries are broadly the same." The aim of British policy is to convince the Africans of this.

The book is an attempt to prove that Africa is developing according to the plan drawn up in the Colonial Office. It once more confirms that colonialism is doomed, and no false arguments will save it from the sentence passed on it by the African peoples.

M. STRANG

Communications and Comment

What Is Happening to Farjallah Helou?

(Letter to the Editorial Board)

DEAR Comrades,

Our weekly *France Nouvelle* has featured a series of articles on Comrade Farjallah Helou, the Lebanese Communist leader who was arrested last June. People all over the world are uneasy about the fate of this outstanding Arab leader.

Your journal, too, reported about him. Have you had any further news about F. Helou or about the fight to secure his liberation?

Hoping to hear from you,

Yours fraternally,

Charles HAROCHE

* * *

From the Editors

COMRADE Farjallah Helou, Secretary of the Communist Party of the Lebanon, is still imprisoned in Damascus, in the Syrian Region of the UAR. The latest reports received by the Lebanese Communist Party say that Helou has been seen by other prisoners in the Mezzé fortress. According to these reports he looked exhausted and was under special guard. From other sources it is learned that he is still subjected to torture, held in isolation, and that his life is in danger.

The Cairo authorities continue to deny that anyone bearing the name Farjallah Helou is under arrest. This was said in an official reply to the Government of Lebanon. Lebanese newspapers reacted to this communication by publishing the names of political prisoners who, before their release, had seen Helou being escorted by guards to an office of the secret police.

The Beirut newspapers *An Nida* and *Al Akhbar*, quoting reliable sources, reported that Helou was

registered in the intelligence bureau and in the prison as Assaf Mansour. The Cairo press and propaganda, while admitting that an Assaf Mansour was under arrest in a Damascus prison, immediately queried how did he come to be in Syria, who granted him an entry visa. It should be pointed out that there are no visa restrictions on Lebanese and Syrian citizens travelling from one country to the other. Apart from an ordinary identification card no document is required.

The arrest of Comrade Helou was followed by a campaign for his immediate release, which has now acquired an international character. Large numbers of people in Lebanon are supporting the campaign, and also tens of thousands in Iraq. People in Morocco, Tunisia, India, Indonesia, Japan, Latin America and Europe are also demanding the release of Helou. The campaign to save his life is being conducted in the democratic press, on the radio and television in many countries.

The National Committee and Local Committees for the Release of Helou formed last August in Lebanon, which include a number of outstanding public figures and representatives from all strata of the population, maintain that only a powerful international solidarity movement can force the UAR authorities to show respect for the law and release Comrade Helou. Failing this, he should be handed over to the Lebanese government, or, if any charge can be preferred against him, he should be brought before a competent court. The Committee has received many letters from people prominent in public life, lawyers and democrats who have declared their solidarity and their readiness to help.

On November 28 the Lebanese Committee suggested to all progressive organizations in the country that an international committee for the release of Helou should be formed.

All who cherish peace and freedom regard the campaign to secure the release of Comrade Helou as their vital concern. The silence maintained by the UAR authorities is at variance with national and international law. Their methods are reminis-

cent of those used by the Gestapo, and nothing can justify their action,

A broad international campaign can secure the release of Farjallah Helou and enable him to carry on the fight for the freedom and happiness of his people, for world peace.

Editorial Board,
World Marxist Review

A Shadow of the Past

SALVADOR de Madariaga, one-time diplomat and scion of the Spanish Grandees, regards himself as an expert on disarmament. As a delegate to the League of Nations and head of its Disarmament Commission he can certainly be described as an "old hand." And as such de Madariaga finds it hard now and again to refrain from boasting. The disarmament proposals submitted by the Soviet Government to the 1932 Geneva Conference, he writes, "took away the breath of the Big Power delegates." But he, de Madariaga, kept his head, "undertook to answer Mr. Litvinov," and dismissed the Soviet proposals as "demagogic propaganda." The veteran revels in recalling the good old times of the League of Nations. He recalls with relish how a military committee solemnly declared that "while . . . wood and . . . steel" are war material, "the rifle itself is not."

But the old warrior is far from being the benign gentleman that he appears to be at first glance. Through the nostalgic tears for the "good old times" it is not hard to discern the yellow streak of misanthropy. And it is difficult to say exactly whether the itch to take to his pen derives from hatred of all living things or from longing to render yet another service to his imperialist paymasters. Perhaps it would be nearer the mark to say that it is a combination of the two. Be that as it may, a recent article published in the *New York Times Magazine* shows him clinging with both hands to his laurels of a champion of militarism.

In contrast to his companions of the cold war the ex-diplomat does not scare the reader with gloomy predictions about the crisis and unemployment which, we are told, would follow from disarmament. These arguments, having been vigorously disposed of even by bourgeois economists and politicians on the basis of arithmetical calculations, are no longer in vogue. Nor does he blame the "Communists" for prompting the capitalists with the thought of the dangers of disarmament, as is the case with his fellow collaborator on the *New York Times*, Seymour Harris. Madariaga tells his readers that disarmament, while "unfortunate,"

is unavoidable. "It follows," he writes, "that the only way to disarm would be to remove the cause which makes the evil and nuisance of armaments necessary." What is the cause? Muttering something inarticulate about "psychological, economic and financial" as well as "demographic, biological and other factors," Madariaga, with the air of a seer, discovers the main cause in the uncompromising "struggle of wills" between different nations, and above all—in the claims of communism. "The Soviet Union," he goes on, "wants to destroy the Western system; and the Western system cannot survive unless communism evolves or crashes out of history." Having delivered himself of this wisdom, the seer concludes: "... Not only disarmament, but any reduction of armaments is an impossibility." Khrushchov's disarmament proposal to the United Nations is mere "propaganda."

The Soviet efforts to lessen the tension have convinced even the hardened sceptics that the "aggressiveness of communism" is but a figment of the imagination.

Why, it may be asked, did the good Salvador deem it necessary to resurrect the old bogey of "communist aggression," and why did the editors recall at this particular moment the existence of the pompous pensioner of bourgeois democracy? The answer is not hard to seek. First, the cold-war men must be pretty hard up when they are forced to scavenge in the garbage cans. And second, because of the thaw, and because of public feeling on the matter, open advocacy of the cold war and the arms race is no longer a clean business for the "decent ones."

It is no secret that the prospect of disarmament does not cheer the hearts of all. It is far from the liking of the owners of the war-industry concerns, of the bellicose generals and the few who batten, both materially and politically, on the cold war. But it is to the liking of the many, the overwhelming majority of the people of all countries. The worldwide peace movement is becoming a truly irresistible force. And this being so who, if he cares even a little for his reputation, will openly

defend the cold war? Yes, matters really are in a bad way. But the indefatigable editors of the *New York Times Magazine* have found a way out: why, there's old Salvador de Madariaga, he is still going strong. Not so delicate in matters of honor as his noble ancestors, he'll write anything you like. If it does the trick—well and good—if it doesn't, well,

the answer is simple: what can you expect from the old boy?

Yes, things are bad, very bad indeed with the chieftains of the *New York Times Magazine*, and with all the others trying to resurrect yesterday and the day before.

T. DOCKTAIL

From Marxism to Religion and Back Again

AN event reminiscent of the Middle Ages and which profoundly shocked the public took place a few weeks ago in Austria. Kathi Korpitsch, juvenile daughter of a Carinthian peasant, was taken by priests and nuns, with the backing of the authorities but against the will of her parents, to a convent. The vain attempts of the desperate parents to secure the return of their daughter and the fruitless public protests testify to the power wielded by the clergy in present-day Austria.

Whence this power? Links between the ruling Christian Social Party and the Catholic Church were especially strong at the time of the First Republic (1918-34). In the Second Republic (post 1945) the contact between the People's Party, successor to the Christian Social Party, and the Church has not been of the same close nature; but the latter now has the support of the Socialist Party. The two ruling parties compete with each other for the favor of the church; and the success of the Socialists in this ignoble rivalry can be seen from the fact that recently the Pope conferred orders on Slavik and Olah, two Socialist Party leaders.

At the last congress of this Party some of the delegates denounced the leaders for cringing to the Church. "More dignity and less opportunist kneeling," exclaimed E. Weikhart who demanded that Minister of Justice Tschadek, a Socialist, should fulfil his duty and help the Korpitsch family "to regain their daughter."

As was to be expected from a worshipper of the Vatican, Tschadek refused to carry out this demand. In a speech at a meeting of the Socialist Catholic Society this Tschadek, according to Weikhart, "so upset reliable members" (local functionaries) that the Party's attitude towards religion and the Church became a central issue at the congress. Tschadek insisted that the Party should meet the church halfway on the issues of marriage and family rights.

What is the explanation for this eagerness of the "Austro-Marxists," notwithstanding the protests in their own ranks, to accelerate ideological and

political rapprochement between the Socialist Party and the Church?

In October 1956, the Austrian bishops, although they recognized that the Right Socialist leaders had become "moderate," i.e., had subordinated their policy to the interests of capital and had put the brakes on class struggle, demanded nevertheless that they should abandon the socialist world outlook and return the workers to the way of "living relationship with God."

The first point was readily conceded by the Right Socialists in their new program which says that Socialism and Christianity "are wholly compatible"; but the second proved unattainable, for what success can the "Austro-Marxists" hope to gain with their turn to Jesus, when the Jesuits themselves seek, no less vainly, of course, help from Marx in order to preserve their loosening grip on the working people?

At the above-mentioned meeting of the Socialist Catholic Society the following remarkable words were heard: "Since the time Karl Marx wrote his *Capital* no essential change has taken place in capitalist society. To this day the worker owns nothing, if by ownership we mean the right to the means of production; in our days, too, property is the source of unearned incomes, there is class struggle, and the conditions of the masses are insecure."

These words were spoken by the Rev. J. Kleinhappl, until 1955 Professor of Theology at Innsbruck University and a member of Society of Jesus. Kleinhappl opposed those Socialists who claimed that Marxism had become "outdated." Whereas his colleague, Professor M. Reding considers "peaceful coexistence of Marxism and Christianity" possible and desirable* and the Jesuit K. Brockmoeller urges the union of dialectical materialism and Christianity,** Kleinhappl insists that Catholics should recognize the soundness of Marx's views. "In condemning capitalism the Catholic

**Der politische Atheismus*. Graz, 1957, p. 253.

***Christentum am Morgen des Atomzeitalters*, Frankfurt/Main, 1955, p. 161.

social doctrine should agree with Karl Marx," he stresses.

From Marx to Jesus and back again—the reason for this to and fro lies in the victorious march of Marxist-Leninist ideology. In one instance the bourgeoisie wants the Right Socialists to complete their ideological betrayal of the working class, because the influence of Marxism is such that, from the standpoint of the capitalists, even a pseudo-Marxist phrase is fraught with grave danger. In the other instance the clergy (some of them possibly in all sincerity) are borrowing from

the ideological treasure house of Marxism something with which to replenish their arsenal, for the power of attraction of Marxist ideas is such that only by utilizing and distorting some of them can the spiritual shepherds hope to retain their dwindling flocks.

The two instances testify to the weakness of both Christianity and Right-wing Socialist ideology—the chief means which enable the bourgeoisie for the time being to retain its spiritual grip on the minds of some sections of the working people.

Karl SACHER

NEW BOOKS

(Books are printed in the language of the country of publication; the titles here are given in English.)

- E. Altmann, W. Armann and others. *The Law of Capital Reproduction and the Working Class of West Germany*. Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1959, 912 pp.
- J. Auerhan. *Automation and Its Significance*. Prague, Statni nakladatelstvi politicke literatury, 1959, 248 pp.
- Documents on the Tibet Question*. Part I, Peking, 1959, 75 pp.
- A. Donini. *Essays on the History of Religions*. Rome, Ed. Riuniti, 1959, 300 pp.
- R. Iscaro. *One Hundred Questions and Answers on the Trade Union Movement*. Buenos Aires, Editorial Fundamentos, 1959, 231 pp.
- H. J. Kleven. *Fishermen, their Problems and Future*. Oslo, Norsk Forlag Ny Dag, 1959, 112 pp.
- Lenin Miscellany*. Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the C.C., CPSU, Vol. 36, Moscow, Gospolitizdat, 1959, 555 pp.
- Marxist Philosophy and Current Politics*. Materials of a Prague Conference on Lenin's Materialism and Empirio-Criticism. Prague, Statni nakladatelstvi politicke literatury, 1959, 81 pp.
- R. Morandi. *The History of Big Industry in Italy*. Turin, Einaudi, 1959, 260 pp.
- Mu Hsin. *The People's Volunteer Corps of the Liberated Areas of Shansi and Suiynan in the Struggle Against Japanese Aggression*. Shanghai, Shanghai Renmin Chupanshi, 1959, 178 pp.
- A New Stage in Collective-Farm Development. Moscow, The State Social and Economic Publishing House, 1959, 347 pp.
- Ib Norlund. *Essays on the History of the Working-Class Movement in Denmark*. Copenhagen, 1959, 293 pp.
- Peace, Friendship, Socialism*. Visit of the Soviet Party and Government delegation headed by Khrushchov to Poland in July 1959. Warsaw, Ksiazka i Wiedza, 1959, 274 pp.
- Problems of Political Economy of Socialism*. A collection of articles. Moscow, Gospolitizdat, 1959, 342 pp.
- A. Quimbaya. *Three Political Parties in Colombia*. Bogota, Ediciones Suramerica, 1959, 131 pp.
- Rumanian Economy Between 1944 and 1959*. Bucharest, Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Romine, 1959, 648 pp.
- Summary of Karl Marx's Capital*. Prepared by V. M. Gutierrez. Mexico, Editorial Veracruz, 1959, 557 pp.
- Ten Years of GDR's Economy*. Berlin, Wirtschaft, 1959, 347 pp.

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW:

Problems of Peace and Socialism
(monthly)

3-Month Special Subscription Offer

(December 1, 1959 to March 1, 1960)

RATES:

\$5.00 for 18 issues; \$3.50 for 12 issues.

VALUABLE BOOK PREMIUMS FREE WITH EVERY NEW SUBSCRIPTION.

Your Choice of One of the Following Clothbound Marxist Classics:

- #1. DIALECTICS OF NATURE—F. Engels (496 pp.)**
- #2. MATERIALISM AND EMPIRIO-CRITICISM—V. I. Lenin (391 pp.)**
- #3. THE HOLY FAMILY—K. Marx & F. Engels (299 pp.)**
- #4. THE DEVELOPMENT OF CAPITALISM IN RUSSIA—V. I. Lenin (751 pp.)**

Subscribe NOW!

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

Please enter my subscription for **World Marxist Review**.
Enclosed is \$5.00 for 18 issues ☐; \$3.50 for 12 issues ☐
Please send me premium 1. ☐; 2. ☐; 3. ☐; 4. ☐

NAME
(please print)

ADDRESS

Please include 25 cents for exchange and bank charges.

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

FRENCH EDITION:
(La Nouvelle Revue Internationale)
Société Parisienne 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 rozširovani tisku,
Praha 6, Sadova 3
Czechoslovakia

CHINESE EDITION:
Guozhi Shudian,
38 Suchouhutung,
Peking, China

ALBANIAN EDITION:
Ndermarja Shtetnore Botimeve
'Naim Frasheri', Tirana

BULGARIAN EDITION:
Raznoiznos,
1, Rue Tzar Assen,
Sofia

CZECH EDITION:
Artia, Praha 2,
Nove Mesto, Ve smeckach 30

DUTCH EDITION:
Progressief Algemeen Vertaalbureau,
Chr. Snouck Hurgronjehof 22",
Amsterdam-W

GERMAN EDITION:
Deutscher Buch-Export und -Import
GmbH,
Leipzig C 1, Leninstrasse 16

HUNGARIAN EDITION:
Kossuth Kiado, Budapest, V,
Vorosmartyer 4

ITALIAN EDITION:
Libreria Rinascita, Via delle Botteghe
Oscure 2, Roma

JAPANESE EDITION:
Nauka Ltd.,
2, Kanda-Zinbocho
2-chome, Chiyoda-Ku, Tokyo

KOREAN EDITION:
Central publications distribution office,
Phyongyang, Korea

MONGOLIAN EDITION:
Mongolgosknigotorg,
ul. Stalina, 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, Sadova 3

Ediciones Paz y Socialismo,
Apt. Nacional 1253,
Bogota, Colombia

SWEDISH EDITION:
Arbetarkulturs forlag,
Kungsgatan 84,
Stockholm K

VIETNAMESE EDITION:
S'o' xuất nhập khẩu sách báo 32,
Hai Ba Trung, Hà-nôi

