

WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW

PROBLEMS
OF PEACE AND
SOCIALISM

**AUGUST
1961**

VOL. 4, NO. 8

35 CENTS



World Marxist Review:

Problems of Peace and Socialism

Theoretical and Information Journal of Communist and Workers' Parties

CONTENTS

ABDELKADER, ADNAN, AMIR, FERHAT: Solidarity — A Potent Force	3
P. ALBERDI: Industrialization of the Economically Backward Countries	9
M. OLSHANSKY: Some Topical Aspects of Soviet Agricultural Development	16
I. NOERLUND: The Swing of the Masses to the Left and Perspectives of the Communist Party of Denmark	22
E. GLUECKAUF: Whither the Social Democratic Party of Germany?	30
E. ARAB-OGLY: Is There a Danger of Overpopulation?	38
N. ZHAGVARAL: From a Nomadic to a Settled Life in Mongolia	50
A. EL MAGHREBI: The United Nations: Its Possibilities and Reality	54

IN THE COMMUNIST AND WORKERS' PARTIES

EL. VELAZCO: Venezuela: New Conditions Call for New Tactics	60
J. GOLLAN: Great Britain: Party Building Year	63
RAHMAT: Communist Party of Indonesia: Strengthen National Unity	66
F.H.: The Key Task of the Czechoslovak Communist Party	67
The Korean Party of Labor on the Eve of Its Fourth Congress	69
From the Experience of Publishing Activity: J. Bermudes (Argentina); M. Strang (Great Britain); H. Kierluff (Denmark)	70
K. SACHER: Ideological Discussions	72

PAGES FROM HISTORY

K. OLBE: Symbol of the Fight Against Militarism and War	74
---	----

EXCHANGE OF VIEWS

Crises and the Working People	
A. PESENTI: Role of the Class Struggle in Economic Development	76

REVIEWS

K. ULAGI: "Press Lords Vs. Press Freedom"	82
H. KOLBE: A Sober View of Bonn Policy	86

COMMUNICATIONS AND COMMENT

L. GRUENEWALD: The Habsburgs Again	88
---	----

AGAINST THE PERSECUTION OF DEMOCRATS

J. SHERIFF: Arbitrary Action of U.S. Authorities	91
A. SABER: Freedom for the Political Prisoners in the UAR	92
A. MERCAN: Martinique Is Fighting	93

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—\$3.50. Czech—\$6.50. Russian—\$3.50. Spanish—\$3.50. German—\$3.50.



Journal of the

United States

Geological Survey

Professional Paper

2000

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

100

Solidarity—A Potent Force

Cooperation and Mutual Aid Between the Newly Independent Countries of Asia and Africa

THE national-liberation movement against colonialism has spread far and wide. At the present time the main battle is being fought in Africa, important victories have been won on the Asian continent, and the anti-imperialist struggle is growing in Latin America.

Colonialism is retreating before the advance of the national-liberation movement. It is doing so under compulsion and unwillingly, fighting a stubborn rearguard action—drowning Angola in blood, striking at Cuba, counter-attacking in Laos and resorting to individual terror wherever it can. Leaders of the national-liberation movement like Bandaranaike in Ceylon, Moumbe in the Cameroon, Lumumba in the Congo and many others have fallen victim to this terror.

The imperialist beasts of prey are ever ready to fly at each other's throats for the sake of some tasty morsel, but when they sense the danger of their prey eluding their grasp altogether, they hunt in packs. For appearance's sake, the American and British delegates in the United Nations may dissociate themselves from the Portuguese colonialists. Yet Angolans are shot in cold blood by Portuguese punitive forces armed with American-made weapons and trained by British instructors experienced in the "art" of stamping out rebellions in the colonies.

This collective imperialism is counterposed by the united front of the peoples who wish to free mankind from colonial oppression. The cooperation and mutual assistance of these peoples is dictated by the logic of the struggle.

The Birth of Solidarity

Ever since the Second World War the objective tendency of the anti-imperialist forces to unite has grown in proportion to the development of the national-liberation movement. With the decline of imperialism and the rise of socialism into a world system the struggle for national independence is no longer an unequal duel between the colonial powers and the colonies. The colonial peoples' struggle has had the active support of the

socialist countries and of the masses in the capitalist countries as well. The ranks of the fighters against colonialism have been swelling from year to year. Out of this common struggle and the common objective of building independent states a movement of solidarity has emerged.

At first the imperialists sought to minimize the role and significance of the Afro-Asian solidarity movement. When in 1955 the Bandung conference took place, which President Sukarno of Indonesia called the first international conference of colored peoples in human history, the imperialists were inclined to treat it as a joke. "Bandungia," they scoffed, "where is it?" "What can the African Negro and the Burmese Buddhist say to each other?" On the eve of Bandung, the *Economist* (London) wrote that it promised to be historic in conception, dubious in execution and unsatisfactory for nearly all its participants.

The critics were right in only one respect: the Asian and African countries are indeed very different from one another. They have different languages, different cultures, and the color of their peoples' skins is not always the same. But the imperialists failed to notice that these countries have much more in common. They have many common topics of discussion, much common ground for joint action. They have a common enemy—imperialism—common tasks in the struggle for national independence, and a common resolve to take their destiny into their own hands.

Although they differ as regards level of economic development these countries are alike in one respect: the colonial yoke has left them all economically far behind the industrially-developed countries. They have no technical or scientific personnel of their own. They all suffer from a shortage of teachers and doctors, and they are faced with the job of eradicating illiteracy and disease. Cooperation and mutual assistance among the Asian and African peoples is imperative if they are to win the fight against imperialism, develop their countries and make them prosperous.

The idea of Asian and African solidarity which first manifested itself at Bandung little

more than six years ago has taken deep root among the people of these countries.

The ignominious defeat of Britain, France and Israel in the Suez affair showed the influence which this solidarity can exert on international developments. Two big colonial powers and their flunkey attacked a weaker country. Formerly everything would have been quite simple, for in those days might was always right. This time "the mighty" had to beat a hasty retreat. Egypt emerged the victor. She won because she was not alone in her fight against the invader. The peoples of the world were on her side. The firm and unequivocal position adopted by the Soviet Union played an important role, as did the solid stand of the Afro-Asian peoples, and their vigorous condemnation of the imperialist aggression.

The *Economist*, which had predicted failure for the Bandung conference, changed its tune. The westerner, it wrote, could now clearly see that the crusade proclaimed in Bandung had been almost won.

Progressive men and women in Africa and Asia are confident that their countries can and will play their part in world history. For this three things are essential: close cooperation between the countries fighting against the colonialists, a firm alliance with the socialist camp, and the support of the people in the struggle against imperialism. In the sphere of diplomacy, cooperation of the young Afro-Asian states can be ensured through joint commitments in the face of the imperialist threat, and by forming an anti-imperialist front in the United Nations. This can and must be done.

Initial Successes

What are the initial results of Afro-Asian cooperation?

In the economic sphere. The Afro-Asian countries account for 56 per cent of the total area of the earth and about 70 per cent of its population. They possess vast mineral wealth. However, the economy of these countries was for long completely subordinated to that of the metropolitan countries. It labored under the burden of non-equivalent exchange. It was nearly always a mono-culture economy, and this meant on the one hand plunder and on the other, hazardous dependence on the fluctuations of the world market prices, low as they were, for raw materials.

To overcome their backwardness the underdeveloped countries must build up a diversi-

fied economy. One way to do this is to strengthen economic ties with one another.

Economic cooperation among the Afro-Asian countries was discussed at a conference held in Cairo over December 8-11, 1958, attended by more than 500 businessmen from 39 countries. The conference endorsed recommendations for cooperation among the economically backward countries at state level, and called for the expansion of trade and payments agreements between them.

At present the volume of trade between the Afro-Asian countries is approximately 11-12 per cent of their total foreign trade. It can and must be expanded. Moreover, since these countries have common economic problems a common approach to their solution will benefit all concerned.

The need for more Afro-Asian cooperation in drafting national-economic development programs was stressed in a speech delivered in February this year by Narayan, a member of the Indian Planning Commission. He noted that these countries could render one another more effective assistance in the production of food and the development of agriculture, in foreign trade and technical education.

The third Afro-Asian economic conference, scheduled for the end of this year in Delhi, will discuss ways and means of bringing about closer cooperation between the 38 countries of these continents and rejection of Western aid if the latter is tied up with shackling commitments. A plan submitted by the UAR, Guinea and Ghana, providing for the conclusion of shipping and barter agreements between the Afro-Asian countries and an agreement on air communication, will also be examined (at present passengers traveling from East to West Africa are frequently obliged to make stopovers in... Paris and London!).

Here are a few more examples. The council for economic cooperation between the Afro-Asian countries, which met in January at Aswan, resolved to set up an Afro-Asian Economic Institute to study problems of economic development. The Institute will be financed by the member countries on a voluntary basis. The council approved a proposal to establish an Afro-Asian Arbitration Board. The third session of the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa, held in February in Addis-Ababa, passed a resolution to call a conference to study Africa's natural resources. It is proposed to make a survey of the power resources of the African coun-

tries for the purpose of industrialization. Of course, everything depends on how and in whose interests these decisions will be implemented.

In addition to cooperation on a continental scale, cooperation on a bi-lateral and regional scale is being developed as well. To date trade and payments agreements have been concluded between the UAR and Somali (December 1960), and between Mali and Guinea (February 1961), and a trade agreement between Morocco and India (September 1960). Modest though they are, these are definite steps toward strengthening economic ties between the Afro-Asian states.

The imperialists, by forming their own trade blocs, are trying to hinder Afro-Asian cooperation. The question of the effect of European economic groupings on the economy of the African countries was one of the items on the agenda of the third session of the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa. Delegates from a number of countries described the activities of these groupings as a form of economic colonialism, which is detrimental to the development of the African continent and is aimed at weakening African resistance to colonialism and imperialism by driving a wedge between the different countries. Some of the European imperialist powers, France for example, are trying to draw a number of African countries into the Common Market — a variant of the cherished dream of creating a "Euro-Africa" under monopoly domination.

The assistance of the socialist camp is a pillar of strength for the Afro-Asian countries in their difficult struggle with the imperialist sharks. A United Nations survey of the world economic situation in 1958 showed that trade with the socialist camp has a beneficial influence on the raw material market. The agreements with these countries, which guarantee in advance a definite volume of trade at fixed prices, have proved to be a stabilizing factor for the raw material exporting countries in periods of low business activity on the world markets. The credits extended by the socialist countries create favorable conditions for exchanging raw materials for manufactured goods and stimulate the export of raw materials. These credits are granted on easy terms and economic aid is rendered without strings.

In the political sphere. Their periodic meetings around the conference table enable the young Asian and African states jointly to discuss the many urgent problems confronting them. These gatherings are the occasions for exchanging experience of the struggle against imperialist machinations. Formerly the fate of the "colored peoples" was decided at congresses in European capitals, and the opinion of the nations concerned was not taken into account. Indeed, they were not even consulted. Today the Asian and African states are themselves discussing their own problems.

The following table gives an idea of the principal gatherings of representatives of the peoples and governments of the Afro-Asian countries held between 1955 and 1961.

Meeting	Date	Place	No. of countries represented
Bandung Conference of Asian and African Countries	18-24 April, 1955	Bandung	29
First Conference of Independent African States	15-22 April, 1958	Accra	8
Conference of Independent African States	4-8 August, 1959	Monrovia	9
Third Conference of Independent African States	14-24 June, 1960	Addis-Ababa	13
First Conference of African Peoples	5-13 Dec., 1958	Accra	27
Second Conference of African Peoples	25-31 Jan., 1960	Tunis	30
Third Conference of African Peoples	25-30 Mar., 1961	Cairo	32
First Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference	26 Dec., 1957-1 Jan. 1958	Cairo	45
Second Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference	11-15 April, 1960	Conakry	58

After Bandung the next landmark in the consolidation of Afro-Asian unity was the solidarity conference of the two continents held in Cairo at the end of 1957. It showed that the different nations advancing to freedom and independence by different roads were united in their desire to achieve the common goal. Other meetings and conferences followed. The Conference of African Peoples held in Accra in December 1958 pledged to work for the full liberation of Africa within the lifetime of the present generation. At the Third Conference of African Peoples in Cairo last March attention was focused on exposing neo-colonialism, the old imperialist policy in new garb. In January 1961 the leaders of a number of African states met in Casablanca and adopted a Charter reaffirming the striving of the African states participating in the conference for the liberation of the entire continent from foreign domination. The Casablanca Charter speaks of the desirability, given the appropriate conditions, of creating an African Consultative Assembly with the participation of all the African states. It was also decided to set up several committees for expanding cooperation between the countries participating and for the coordination of their policies. These joint committees, provided they serve the interests of the peoples and are controlled by the people, could go a long way toward consolidating the independence of the liberated African states. And surely the African people should be primarily interested in strengthening that independence. Surely the African countries should be the first to come to the aid of the Algerian, Congolese, Angolese and other peoples in their struggle to defeat the imperialists and win independence.

The Third African Peoples' Conference in Cairo resolved to establish an African Liberation Fund in support of the national-liberation movement to be administered by a special committee. The Conference recommended establishing a "Free Africa" radio station to combat imperialist propaganda.

A top-level conference of the states outside the military blocs (chiefly the Asian and African countries) is scheduled to be held this September. As a rallying point for all the forces working for peace and democracy, a conference of this kind could contribute much to the solution of urgent problems and help to ensure the peaceful development of international relations.

While the various forms which political cooperation of the newly independent states

will take have not yet been clearly delineated, the need to broaden this cooperation is generally recognized.

Representatives of the new countries likewise meet and collaborate within the framework of the United Nations. The 24 African and 21 Asian delegations in the United Nations have altered the physiognomy of that international body. Those who support the idea of peaceful coexistence and the principles of Bandung are no longer in the minority. Gone are the days when imperialism alone decided the fate of the world.

However, the fact remains that the representatives of some of the newly independent countries in the United Nations still vote with the imperialist powers on certain issues. At the XVth General Assembly, for example, several Afro-Asian countries supported the colonial powers on such cardinal questions as Algeria, China's representation in the United Nations, and the structure of UNO. It should not be assumed that this position reflects the will of the peoples of these countries. On the contrary, it merely indicates that the statesmen of some of the newly independent countries are less concerned with defending their people's interests than they are with carrying out orders of the former colonialists, a fact which helps the imperialists to undermine the solidarity of the Afro-Asian peoples both in the United Nations and outside of it. They provoke conflicts between the Afro-Asian countries on minor issues, they seek to set "Monrovia" against "Casablanca," Asia against Africa, French Africa against British Africa, and they create tension in the Congo, Algeria, etc., meanwhile spreading the fiction of their own demise.

Some countries have begun to foster the illusion that "imperialism is dead"; others are so engrossed in their own internal problems that they tend to underestimate the importance of Afro-Asian solidarity. But these tendencies are being overcome. This is evident from the unanimous condemnation of apartheid in the Union of South Africa and of the actions of the Portuguese colonialists in Angola. Condemnation of the South African policy has taken concrete forms: South African goods have been boycotted and diplomatic relations have been severed with the racist government of that country. The Afro-Asian countries, in common with all the peace-loving states, are insisting on United Nations action to end the colonialist terror in Angola.

Such are some of the results of cooperation among the Asian and African countries. They

are as yet modest, but the vital interests of these countries, sometimes indeed their very existence, depend in great measure on strengthening and expanding this cooperation. This is primarily in the interests of the nations concerned. But the significance of cooperation and mutual aid transcends the national boundaries; it provides a solid foundation for the Afro-Asian states to exercise their right to play their part in world affairs, a right imperialism had always denied them.

Enemies and Allies

The scales are tipping more and more in favor of the forces of peace and progress. The imperialists are making desperate efforts to stop the process by aiding and abetting reactionary elements in many Afro-Asian countries. Where they have been unable to instal governments obedient to their will, they foment insurrections, supply money, arms and personnel to the forces of internal reaction. That is what happened some years ago in Indonesia, and it is happening again today in the Congo and in other countries.

The lot of the countries ruled by colonialist agents is unenviable to say the least. The more "aid" they get from the imperialists, the greater the poverty of their people and the feebler their economy. This is glaringly evident in the case of South Korea, South Vietnam and Turkey. Attempts are now being made to impose this "aid" on many African countries.

But having suffered so much under imperialist domination the countries are learning to discern the difference between capitalist "aid" and the assistance rendered by the socialist countries.

A feature of the aid of the socialist states is that it is not imposed by anyone. It takes account of the needs of the newly independent nations and helps them consolidate their political independence. "The help extended by the U.S.S.R. and the other socialist states to the countries which have won independence," said Khrushchov, "has but one aim — to help strengthen the position of these countries in the struggle against imperialism, to further the development of their national economy and improve the life of their peoples."

The Afro-Asian peoples have not forgotten that the national independence of most African and Asian countries was won thanks to the heroic struggle of the Soviet Union and the whole socialist camp against imperialism, a struggle which cost them untold sacrifices. It is the fraternal, selfless aid of the socialist

camp that has enabled the national-liberation movement in these countries to stand its ground against imperialism and to forge ahead.

In an effort to prevent friendly relations between the economically backward countries and the socialist camp, the imperialists are trying to scare the former with the bogey of Communist penetration. Anti-communism, the main propaganda weapon of the imperialists at present, finds support among the upper crust of the national bourgeoisie, which has chosen the path of compact with imperialism and is resisting the spread of the national-liberation movement. Anti-communist propaganda finds favor also with the colonialist stooges who have made their way into power in the new states.

Experience has taught the Afro-Asian peoples that they can rely on the support of the international communist and working-class movement in their struggle against imperialism. Thanks to the radical changes in the alignment of world forces brought about by the existence of the socialist camp the colonialists can no longer check the development of one or another country by brute force as in the past. And hence, by blackening communism, they are trying to isolate the Afro-Asian peoples from their trusted allies — the countries of the socialist camp.

Experience shows that wherever anti-communism has been denounced and swept aside, the peoples are able to consolidate their independence and forge ahead. But on the other hand, wherever anti-communism is entrenched, the militant anti-imperialist spirit of the people is weakened and national unity shattered.

Playing up the "communist threat" the imperialists insist on "strong governments". But what they mean by a "strong government" is a government of the local moneybags who as a rule are linked with the foreign monopolies, whose class interests outweigh the interests of the nation and who dread above all the development of national revolution. To prevent the latter contingency, this "strong government" brings the full weight of its power against those classes and organizations which are actively fighting to extend the national-liberation movement and secure complete independence. The "strong government" bans political parties, muzzles the press, breaks up meetings, demonstrations and strikes and crushes every manifestation of democratic liberty. It throws Communists, anti-imperialist patriots and other democrats into prison where they are tortured, some-

times to death. So much for "strong government".

The political significance of "anti-communism" was exposed in the Statement of the Moscow Meeting of the 81 Communist and Workers' Parties. "The aims of the Communists accord with the supreme interests of the nation. The reactionaries' efforts to break up the national front under the slogan of 'anti-communism' and isolate the Communists, the foremost contingent of the liberation movement, weakens the national movement. It is contrary to the national interests of the people and threatens the loss of national gains."

But the imperialist Big Lie is deceiving fewer and fewer people. Symptomatic in this respect was the resolution adopted by the Twelfth Congress of the Federation of Students of Black Africa in France which noted that in the face of the firm resolve of the masses to wrest their freedom by revolutionary struggle, imperialism is using anti-communism as an instrument for splitting and weakening the forces fighting for liberation. The Federation, says the resolution, "is convinced that the unity of all anti-imperialist forces without exception, on an international as well as a national scale, is an urgent necessity in the face of the combined actions and aggressive machinations of moribund imperialism," and that "consistent patriotism is incompatible with anti-communism, which is an instrument of deception employed by international reaction to divide and weaken the national-liberation movement."

Of singular importance in furthering African unity are the various democratic trade union, youth, women's, peasants' and other organizations operating on the scale of the whole continent. In May, for example, the first conference of African journalists was held in Bamako. It was conducted under democratic anti-imperialist slogans and resolved to set up an All-Africa Journalists' Association.

The role of the African working class in uniting the peoples of the continent cannot be overestimated. An All-Africa Trade Union Federation was inaugurated at the congress of trade unions from 38 countries held at the end of May in Casablanca. According to a trade union leader from Ghana, this federation must become the vanguard of the national movement for the complete emancipation of Africa from colonialism, capitalist exploitation and race discrimination.

The effectiveness of the joint struggle of the Afro-Asian countries against imperialism de-

pends on the strength of the progressive and anti-imperialist forces in each country and on the mutual confidence of the nations concerned. A truly invincible national front can be created only if the broad masses take part in it. The people are on the move, and it is in the interests of every African and Asian country to rouse them to action against imperialism and to unite them in a general anti-colonial front. This, however, is possible only if democratic liberties are honored, and if the mutual aid and good-neighborly relations between the Afro-Asian countries are founded on principles of equality and respect for the interests of the peoples striving for progress.

Any attempt to take advantage of the principle of mutual aid and solidarity to impose any *diktat* on other countries would be a threat to the development of the Afro-Asian countries, particularly the weaker countries.

Tendencies of this kind are actively encouraged by the imperialists who seek to induce the Right-wing bourgeois elements in the governments of some Afro-Asian countries to adopt this course by offering them capital in the form of "loans" and "aid". This policy of the imperialists (primarily of the U.S.) is supported by those upper strata of the national bourgeoisie who have betrayed the national revolution and have chosen the path of expansion at the expense of less developed countries. Besides furthering their own expansionist ends, these elements are, in effect, acting as agents of the imperialist monopolies who use them as a screen for penetrating into countries where direct invasion is difficult.

This policy, pursued by the Egyptian big bourgeoisie in particular, is meeting with the resistance of the people inasmuch as it runs counter to their striving for progress. Egypt's subordination of Syria has aroused the justified suspicions of other Arab countries as to the designs of the Egyptian bourgeoisie. The peoples cherish the principle of equality for all countries, big and small, no less than the principle of sovereignty and national independence. They are convinced that all nations have an equal right to progress and happiness, to freedom and independence.

It is natural, therefore, that the resistance of the peoples of the underdeveloped countries to the policy of subordination is supported by the entire national-liberation movement and by all the forces of peace and progress.

In combating colonialism, the countries of Asia and Africa are working for peace. As the

Indian author Mulk Raj Anand put it, they need "a thousand years of peace" to cope with the complex economic problems confronting them. Hence they are keeping clear of the aggressive military blocs — a form of collective colonialism—in which the imperialists would like to inveigle them, and they emphatically condemn the attempts of U.S. imperialism to extend those blocs on the Asian and African continents.

The solidarity of the newly independent countries has emerged as a new force, a force which is both accelerating the process of colonial disintegration and consolidating world peace. It is a thorn in the side of the imperialists who still dream of the good old days when "divide and rule" was the maxim. They are hoping to bring back those days by using all possible means — puppet govern-

ments and economic pressure, calumny and assassination, by ferreting out every point of disagreement between the new countries and exaggerating it out of all proportion. But there are factors working for Afro-Asian solidarity, such vital factors as the policy of friendship and disinterested aid of the socialist countries, the support of the masses in all countries of the world, and the growing political awareness of the Asian and African peoples themselves. The co-operation of the newly independent countries is an historical necessity. And, despite all imperialist obstacles to Afro-Asian unity, the solidarity of all freedom-loving peoples is growing and it will sweep away all the barriers in its path.

ABDELKADER (Algeria), ADNAN, (Syria), AMIR (Indonesia), FERHAT (Morocco)

Industrialization of the Economically Backward Countries

Paulino Gonzales Alberdi

INDUSTRIALIZATION is one of the primary tasks of national liberation in the economically backward countries. Not merely priority development of industries processing raw materials, as some bourgeois economists hold, but the creation of a modern engineering industry, for there is no other way of putting an end to dependence on the imperialist powers, raising living standards and increasing the productivity of labor.

In recent decades industry, mainly light industry, has made considerable progress in a number of underdeveloped countries. In Latin America, for instance, the number of workers engaged in industry increased from 750,000 in 1920 to 4,000,000 in 1955.

This was due to a number of circumstances. For one thing, during the two world wars many manufactured goods which previously had been imported began to be produced at home. Growing production of raw materials and food in the more developed

countries narrowed the market for some of the staple exports from the colonies and dependencies. Moreover, the prices paid for the latter steadily declined compared with the prices of imported manufactures.

As is known, monopoly domination and subordination to the imperialist governments deformed the economy of the underdeveloped countries, making them dependent on the export of food and certain raw materials. Now, as a result of the shrinkage of the market for these exports and the fall in the prices paid for them, most of these countries find themselves unable to finance their import trade and this has won considerably more support for industrialization.

"Although the population and the need for imports have notably increased, Latin America's import potential is less than in 1925-29," the former Chilean Minister of Economy Baltra has said. The Argentine economist Dr. Raul Prebisch, Secretary of the U.N. Economic Commission for Latin America, has

pointed out that "industrialization of Latin America is the inevitable demand of economic development".

In a commentary on the lecture delivered by Jean Royer, Assistant Secretary of GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade), the Buenos Aires newspaper *Clarín* (January 10, 1960), citing data released by this and other international organizations, stated that whereas 30 years ago the underdeveloped countries had a favorable trade balance of \$3,000 million, they now have a deficit of nearly \$4,000 million. The newspaper also pointed out that technological progress has resulted in the industrial countries needing fewer raw materials to produce the same quantity of manufactured goods, that they have increased their own production of grain, cotton, vegetable oil, fats and other natural products and are using more synthetic raw materials.

The people in the underdeveloped countries, ranging from the working class to some sections of the big bourgeoisie and some landowners, advocate industrialization, though they are not all equally interested in independent economic development. The opposition to a national industry comes mostly from the imperialist monopolies.

Imperialism and Industrialization of Underdeveloped Countries

The imperialists are against industrial development in the economically backward countries, or, at best, they would limit it to secondary branches. In this they have allies in those big landowners whose interests coincide with those of the monopolies.

To justify their resistance to industrialization, the imperialists and their accomplices fall back on the old theories of economic liberalism, eulogizing "free enterprise", "free competition" and "equal opportunity" and denouncing state interference in the economy. In practice, however, they are bent on preserving the market for the manufactured goods of the highly-developed capitalist countries.

At the session of the U.N. Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East held in 1948 in Utakamunde, India, the chief U.S. delegate, Grady, recommended for the Asian countries a gradual, agrarian development. The British delegate, Stent, supported him, declaring that heavy industry did not meet the immediate requirements of the countries concerned.

In recent years the spokesmen of "free enterprise" have been holding up what they call the "West German miracle" as an "object lesson". The Adenauer government sends its high-pressure salesmen to Latin America to boost "private enterprise". In June a congress for "promoting the arts and crafts in the underdeveloped countries" was held in Federal Germany with Foreign Minister von Brentano as one of the principal speakers.

International finance organizations, such as the Export-Import Bank and the International Monetary Fund, are used to prevent "hasty" industrialization. The International Monetary Fund, for example, imposes on the governments of the underdeveloped countries conditions designed to prevent them from protecting and developing their industries and creating a national economy.

The agents of imperialism and their big landowner associates who are trying to establish a front of landowners, peasants and farm laborers against the industrial proletariat, attribute the hardships experienced by the Latin American peasants to the growth of industry. In point of fact, the impact of the decline in exports and fall in the prices of raw materials and food products would be far more painful were it not for the industrial development, relative though it is, in some of the underdeveloped countries.

However, the political and economic situation in these countries, especially in Latin America, forces the foreign monopolies to do something about industrial development. One of the compelling factors is the patriotic mass movement for industrialization. Another is the aid extended by the USSR and the other socialist states to help the underdeveloped countries build up their national economies.

Not only the ordinary people but also spokesmen of the national bourgeoisie and some landowners are demanding more trade with the socialist countries.

Jean Royer, whom we have mentioned earlier, points out that "there is nothing to prevent the underdeveloped countries from obtaining the means necessary for their economic development from the communist countries" by concluding agreements under which the latter "undertake to supply everything needed for the establishment of various industries in exchange for rice, grain, cotton or other export products over a five to ten-year period at the usual interest rate of 2.5 per cent".

Royer says this in order to warn the imperialist governments of the danger presented to them by the disinterested assistance rendered by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

When the Frondizi government in Argentina was engaged in oil negotiations with imperialist interests on the pretext that concessions were necessary in order to pay for much-needed oil-field equipment, a government mission sent to the USSR was able to obtain a long-term loan of \$100 million at low interest precisely for this purpose. The government, however, used only a ridiculously small part of the credit, preferring to pay a large sum in dollars to the imperialist monopolies besides handing Argentina's oil resources over to them to the detriment of the national interest. Indeed, it is not rare for the governments in underdeveloped countries to enter into trade relations with the socialist world not because of any desire to serve the national interest but because they regard it as a way of forcing the imperialists to continue giving them hand-outs in the shape of "loans", "aid", etc.

The monopolies are doing their best to retain control over the economic development of the underdeveloped countries. What this leads to can be seen from the example of Brazil, where, according to Gilberto Paim, an economist in the Brazilian Research Institute, at least 80 per cent of the foreign investments are non-essential and even detrimental to the country.

As Lenin pointed out in his *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, it is enough to own 40 per cent of the stock of a company to control it, and, if it holds 40 per cent of the stock of other companies, also the capital of the latter. In this way a 40 per cent interest in a company may control a total capital exceeding the original investment many times over. According to data released by the U.S. Department of Commerce and other official sources, in 1950 the United States, through foreign investments in mixed companies amounting to \$11,700 million, controlled a total capital of \$22,200 million.

In his report to the Fifth National Conference of the Communist Party of Argentina in 1946, Victorio Codovilla said that "it is becoming more and more patent that the participation of foreign capital in *mixed* national enterprises is today the *feature of imperialist penetration* of the colonial and dependent countries".

Mixed enterprises enable the imperialist monopolies to control a substantial part of the industry of the underdeveloped countries with a minimum investment. This applies *especially to the state-owned enterprises*, through which they capitalize on the privileges accorded to state undertakings as regards credits, protective tariffs, etc.

The imperialists resort to a wide range of devices to hinder industrialization. When they cannot prevent the growth of certain industries, they seek to bring them under their control in order to safeguard their super-profits and retard industrial development generally. Moreover, penetration of the state-controlled mixed undertakings enables them to conceal their activities from the people, who support state participation in the economy.

In countries with weak economies controlled by the foreign monopolies with the support of the semi-feudal landlord class, and ruled by governments which, owing to the economic subordination, are often politically dependent as well, foreign investment can but strengthen the domination of the imperialist monopolies and increase their super-profits.

The imperialists insist, as a condition for loans and private investment, on the right freely to export the profits. At present the monopolies pump out more from the underdeveloped countries than they put into them. According to U.N. data, for each dollar they invested in Latin America in 1946-1954, the U.S. monopolies took out \$3.17 as profit. In 1946-1959 they invested \$4,400 million and took out \$8,004 million.

In order to divert the people from struggle for a higher living standard and genuine economic progress, the imperialists, primarily the North American, offer "aid", "economic cooperation" and other schemes, the real purpose of which is still greater economic and political subordination of the underdeveloped countries to their interests. This applies also to the "aid" offered in the ten-year plan for Latin America proposed by President Kennedy, which provides for more interference by the U.S. government in the political and economic life of the Latin American countries. The miserly initial appropriations — \$500 million for the whole of Latin America with its population of nearly 200 million — show that it in no way differs from the previous schemes of the kind concocted in Washington.

The Attitude of the National Bourgeoisie

The national bourgeoisie is interested in the government measures for industrialization. The same can be said of the agrarian bourgeoisie (and also of some of the landlords) who sell their produce on the home market, inasmuch as the development of industry expands this market.

Nevertheless, the national bourgeoisie in the colonial and dependent countries that are at a higher stage of capitalist development is taking a half-hearted stand on the matter, for it is afraid to take resolute action against the imperialist monopolies and the landlords. Even when it is in a position to influence the governments, it presses at most for certain measures in the sphere of customs duties, state control over foreign exchange, cheaper credits, etc. Measures of this order, however, are clearly insufficient to ensure all-round development of industry.

In those countries that developed as dependencies of British imperialism some bourgeois spokesmen have been urging orientation on U.S. imperialism in order to promote industrialization. This is the line, for instance, of the Forja group in Argentina, which came into being during the first Radical governments (1916-1930). The top leaders of this group joined forces with the Peronists, and later began to propagate the defeatist policy of Frondizi in the so-called integrationist trend which advocates unity of the Peron and Frondizi supporters, of army and church, with a view to developing industry and exploiting the country's resources jointly with the U.S. imperialists.

The Economic Commission for Latin America and the Organization of American States are spreading illusions concerning "common or regional markets" among the national bourgeoisie, claiming that these markets will solve the difficulties encountered by Latin American industry. However, they cannot conceal that this would merely shift the underlying contradictions from the national plane to that of the "common or regional markets". In particular, the creation of a "common market" would result in the industries of the more developed countries hindering the industrialization of the less developed.

The Economic Commission and its secretary are simply confusing the issue when, after assessing the damage done to the Latin American countries by their economic relations with the imperialist powers, they ad-

vocate imperialist investments in industry as the way out.

The national bourgeoisie is far from consistent in its attitude to state capitalism. When it is a question of building heavy industry, it is anxious to shift the job on to the state, since the investments required are enormous and the returns not immediate. At the same time it is opposed to "excessive" state interference whenever a government yields to pressure from the masses and introduces measures limiting capitalist profit. Advocacy of "free enterprise" is accompanied by pleas for state assistance.

When he was in power, Peron repeatedly voiced the view that the state should operate only the unprofitable industries which do not attract private capital. But as soon as they begin to yield a return, the private employer should take over. Mixed undertakings were, for Peron, the initial step in effecting such a transfer. This, indeed, is the view of the national bourgeoisie, which regards the state as a guarantor of its investments, something in the nature of an insurance company prepared to compensate it for any likely loss.

Industrial development also requires a far-reaching agrarian reform. For only by improving the condition of the peasantry can the home market be expanded and industry ensured the raw materials it needs. But the industrial capitalists, who have no desire to encroach on property rights and who themselves sometimes are the owners of latifundia, are opposed to a genuine agrarian reform. Instead they advocate land purchase by the state for resale to the wealthy peasants. Being interested in cheap agricultural raw materials, they support the mechanization of farming by the "Prussian" method, i.e., cultivation by landlords and rich farmers, completely ignoring the interests of the sharecroppers and other exploited small producers.

While it is unwilling to support a radical agrarian reform or the nationalization of imperialist-owned enterprises, the national bourgeoisie wants to increase national "accumulation" at the expense of the working people. Clearly, this accords with the interests of the imperialists and the landlords. This policy is advocated in a number of plans advanced by Raul Prebisch.

But the more consumption by the workers is reduced as a result of the decline in real wages, the more the home market shrinks. The imperialist enterprises and the big na-

tional capitalists linked with the imperialists take advantage of this to eliminate the small and medium manufacturers.

Some Latin American governments, in keeping with Keynesian theories, have resorted at times to inflation in order to make more credits available to industrialists, to finance state-owned enterprises and public utilities, and to cover the vast sums swallowed by the armed forces, by the political repression, corruption, the administrative machinery, etc. As a result, the cost of living soared, real wages fell, and an acute financial crisis set in which was then used as a pretext for accepting aid from the International Monetary Fund and the imperialist banks on conditions that virtually turned the recipients into colonies.

Thus we see that the attitude of the national bourgeoisie toward industrialization is a wishy-washy one. It wants to develop industry, but without abolishing the foreign monopolies or the latifundia; on the contrary, it looks to the imperialists for financial aid and often associates itself with the latifundists, both by buying land and inviting the latter to become its partners in industry.

The Statement of the Meeting of 81 Communist and Workers' Parties says:

"In the present conditions, the national bourgeoisie of the colonial and dependent countries not connected with the imperialist circles is objectively interested in accomplishing the principal tasks of anti-imperialist, anti-feudal revolution, and therefore can participate in the revolutionary struggle against imperialism and feudalism. In that sense it is progressive. But it is unstable; though progressive, it is inclined to compromise with imperialism and feudalism. Owing to its dual nature, the extent to which the national bourgeoisie participates in the revolution differs from country to country. This depends on concrete conditions, on changes in the relationship of class forces, on the sharpness of the contradictions between imperialism, feudalism and the people, and of the contradictions between imperialism, feudalism and the national bourgeoisie."

Complete industrialization of the underdeveloped countries cannot be divorced from the sum total of the economic and political tasks of national liberation. There can be no genuine development of industry without class struggle, without the proletariat and its Party playing the leading role.

The Working Class, the Communists, and Industrialization

The programs of the Communist parties in the underdeveloped countries call for all-round support of industrialization. In other words, the Communists are working to ensure the economic independence of their countries. At the same time they bear in mind that industrialization and the attendant growth of the proletariat enhance its weight in society. Industrial development is one of the decisive factors paving the way to socialism.

Naturally, the Communist parties lay the emphasis on heavy industry (iron and steel, engineering, etc.), the lack of which makes light industry dependent on foreign machine tools and other equipment, spare parts and certain raw materials. It is mostly this dependence that enables the foreign monopolies to subordinate the economies of the underdeveloped countries where light industry is the predominant or often the sole type of industry.

The Communist parties, guided by Marxist-Leninist theory, have imparted new meaning to the struggle for industrialization and economic progress in the underdeveloped countries.

There have been instances of the working class fighting for industrialization without a Communist Party to lead it. Whenever this was the case, it merely supported the industrial bourgeoisie and the bourgeois nationalist parties, which above all sought to increase the capitalists' profits and hence advanced no economic program aimed at improving the conditions of the masses. As a rule the demands put forth under these circumstances did not go beyond higher customs duties on one or another national product. Though movements of this kind were useful, they could not provide basic solutions to economic problems.

The role played by imperialism in the economy and the attitude the working class should take toward it had not been seriously examined in the underdeveloped countries before the Communist parties appeared on the scene. As a rule it was only the political leaders of the national bourgeoisie who took up the defense of the national economy, and they did so in a half-hearted and inconsistent way.

The anarchist and reformist leaders who, beginning with the end of the last century, played a prominent role in the labor movement in a number of Latin American countries,

made no distinction between foreign capitalists and the national bourgeoisie, completely ignoring the existence of imperialism. In Argentina the leadership of the Socialist Party used to advocate "free trade" on the grounds that protectionism merely enriched the industrialists and raised the cost of living. They agreed with the pro-imperialist ideologists of free trade that the doors had to be thrown wide open to foreign capital. They saw no prospect of a broad national-liberation front led by the working class and directed against imperialism and latifundism. And since they did not fight concretely for socialism, they could not visualize the way forward to this goal through the agrarian anti-imperialist revolution. In recent times, however, some Argentine Socialists have adopted an anti-imperialist attitude.

The ideologists of Yugoslav revisionism claim that industrialization and economic progress in Latin America are the concern of the governments alone. (This opinion is expressed, for example, by Vladimir Dragomanovic in his article "The Specific Role of the State in the Development of Latin American Capitalism", published in the Yugoslav journal *International Problems*, No. 1, 1959.) By doing so they are merely spreading illusions among the Latin American working class as regards the role of the bourgeois-landlord governments in developing the national economy. If some Latin American governments have promoted industrialization to some extent this does not signify that they have ceased to champion the privileges of the foreign imperialists and the semi-feudal latifundists.

As for the Trotskyites, they claim that the bourgeoisie has gone over completely to the camp of the counter-revolution and are trying to drive a wedge between the working class and its natural ally, the peasantry.

The Communist parties are working consistently to unite the working class in defense of its specific interests and a program of national liberation, to build an alliance of the working class and the peasantry and draw into the united national-democratic front other sections of the population such as the students, the small urban bourgeoisie, etc.

Even if part of the industrial bourgeoisie has gone over into the imperialist camp and is controlled by the monopolies through the banks, mixed companies, etc., there is an-

other, considerable section which is threatened with ruin by these monopolies and the big national capitalists associated with the latter. This section can and should be drawn into the united democratic and anti-imperialist front. The opportunities open to the national bourgeoisie to apply their technical and commercial abilities even when socialism is being built should dispel the fears sown among them by the imperialists and their agents in order to impel them onto the perilous, suicidal path of anti-communism.

There are also many non-socialist measures which a government formed on the basis of the national-democratic front could carry out to ensure industrialization and economic progress generally.

At present the Latin American and other economically backward countries are experiencing an acute shortage of capital. The main reasons for this are the export by the imperialists of their profits and the decline of export prices compared with the prices charged for imported goods. It has been estimated, taking the 1950 purchasing power of the dollar as the basis, that in Argentina alone the difference between the profits pumped out of the country and the investments made in it plus the losses resulting from the fall in export prices added up to \$33,200 million in the period from 1900 to 1959. In 1958-59-alone, Argentina suffered losses amounting to \$830 million for these reasons.

Clearly, a united national-democratic front government could find the capital needed for industry by prohibiting the export of imperialist profits and securing their reinvestment in the country, strengthening the national and state sectors of the economy through nationalization of the imperialist enterprises, putting an end to the imperialist monopoly in foreign trade and expanding trade with the socialist world and the countries which have freed themselves from the imperialist yoke.

Such a government would establish its own foreign trade monopoly in the interests of the country. A radical agrarian reform would considerably improve the condition of the peasantry and enable the government to channel, by implementing a proper price policy, part of the money now pocketed by the landlords in rent to the development of the national industry.

Nationalization of the banks and their transfer to the government of a united-

democratic front would make it possible to provide credits for the building of a heavy industry and the development of the national economy as a whole. The private banks, being subordinated to imperialist interests, place the national accumulation at the disposal of the foreign monopolies.

A government of the united national-democratic front would be able to use the nation's resources for industrialization and other purposes ensuring the country's progress and independence, whereas the capitalists invest their free money not where it is needed to promote national progress and well-being, but where the biggest profits can be obtained, or where they believe their investments are most secure. At the Inter-American Economic Conference held in Buenos Aires in 1957, the spokesman of one of the Latin American governments declared that something like \$4,500 million were hoarded by Latin American capitalists in U.S. banks.

Heavy taxation of the landlords pending expropriation, as well as of the big capitalists, would be a way of compelling them to help finance the development plans proposed by the united national-democratic front government. The huge sums which some underdeveloped countries spend for military purposes and for political repressions in conformity with their agreements with the U.S. government could also be used for this purpose.

The existence of the socialist world with its policy of disinterested aid to the underdeveloped countries leaves no justification whatever for capitulation to imperialism for the sake of obtaining the capital and the technical assistance needed for industrialization. The example of the assistance rendered

by the U.S.S.R., China, Czechoslovakia and the other socialist countries to Cuba is proof of this. The Cuban revolution, which ushered in a new stage in the struggle of the Latin American peoples for liberation, is one of the most significant developments in the history of the national-liberation movement.

The other Latin American countries are experiencing difficulties in building up their industries and developing their economies generally, for the capitalist path which they are following prevents them from breaking once and for all with the colonial and feudal past.

But even under capitalism, the working class, in alliance with all the anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly elements of town and country, can greatly influence the course of economic progress. Indeed, a broad national front led by the working class and its vanguard—the Communist Party—can play the decisive role in giving effect to far-reaching economic and social reforms.

As the Statement of the 81 Communist and Workers' Parties points out, the people "are beginning to see that the best way to abolish the age-old backwardness and improve their living standard is that of non-capitalist development." Socialist industrialization is the quickest and most advantageous way for any nation.

In those backward countries where capitalist relations are at a comparatively high level, the way to socialism lies through the agrarian anti-imperialist revolution, through the establishment of a united national-democratic front based on the alliance of the working class and the peasantry. Given the leadership of the working class and its Party, the victory of this front is assured.

Some Topical Aspects of Soviet Agricultural Development

Mikhail Olshansky

In view of the worldwide interest in Soviet agriculture we print below an article by the Minister of Agriculture of the USSR, written especially for our journal.

THE Communist Party and the Soviet government have always seen the problems of agriculture in the light of the general tasks of building socialism. Taking full cognizance of the changes in the life of the country and the requirements of society, they have at each stage in the development of the socialist society advanced new tasks in this sphere. And now, too, when the Soviet Union has entered the period of the full-scale building of communism, it is only natural that new problems should have arisen before agriculture.

I

It will be recalled that the September 1953 meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party marked the beginning of a sharp turn in agriculture. Since then much organizing work has been carried out which has produced gratifying results. The rate of development in the past seven years has been the highest ever. Gross production of agriculture rose by more than half as much again, with the biggest increase in grain production. Some 41 million hectares of virgin land were put under crops and a new grain belt capable of satisfying a substantial part of the country's requirements was opened in the eastern districts—Siberia, Kazakhstan, the Volga area and the Urals. As a result of the extension of the cultivated area and higher yields the gross grain harvest in 1960 amounted to 8,100 million poods (133,200,000 metric tons) as against 5,000 million poods (82,500,000 tons) in 1953. The wheat harvest went up from 41,300,000 tons in 1953 to 63,700,000 in 1960.

With the eastern districts producing more grain, the cultivation of industrial crops could be considerably extended in other parts of the country. The harvest of sugar beet increased from 23,200,000 tons in 1953 to

56,900,000 in 1960, vegetable oil crops from 3,110,000 to 4,320,000, raw cotton from 3,850,000 to 4,400,000, and flax from 162,000 to 246,000 tons. Good progress was also made in livestock raising. By the beginning of this year there was a total of 75,800,000 head of beef and dairy cattle, or 20,000,000 more than in 1954. The number of pigs increased by more than 25,300,000 and sheep by 33,100,000.

As a result state purchases of agricultural produce have increased greatly compared with seven years ago. In 1953 the state purchased 1,899 million poods of grain, and in 1960, 2,852 million. Milk purchases rose nearly 2.5 times and meat more than doubled.

Such, then, are the basic results of agricultural development in the past seven years.

The volume of agricultural products sold to the population is also rising from year to year. Last year, for instance, retail sales rose as compared with the previous year as follows: meat and meat products 13 per cent; milk, butter and other dairy products eight per cent; eggs eight per cent; sugar 13 per cent, and vegetables eight per cent.

The success of our socialist agriculture is more than obvious, yet both the level attained and the rate of growth are still inadequate. They fall short of the requirements of Soviet society at the current stage when the building of communism is the order of the day. The rate of growth in agriculture still lags behind industry. And although production and state purchases have sharply increased in recent years, we still are not able to meet the growing demand for meat, milk, butter and some other food items as fully as we would wish.

This explains the prominence given to agriculture at the meeting of the Central Committee held last January and at zonal conferences of leading agriculturists.

Our opponents have tried to represent the discussion of farm problems and the criticism of the shortcomings as evidence of the "failure" of our agricultural policy. This argument is neither new nor original. The anti-communists must be in a bad way if they have to keep on whipping the same old hobbyhorse. This shabby nag has failed them before and is all the more bound to fail today.

True, we have our difficulties and unsolved tasks in the sphere of agriculture. But these are difficulties of growth, not of decline and crisis. Moreover, all the prerequisites exist for overcoming them rapidly.

The situation in which farm problems were discussed at the January meeting of the Central Committee and the zonal conferences differed fundamentally from that of 1953. Seven years ago all branches of agriculture were seriously lagging. Now, as Khrushchov said, "we are criticizing our shortcomings in a situation marked by the rapid growth of socialist economy, by big successes in all its branches."

While claiming that the lagging production of some farm products is a sign of crisis, our ill-wishers speak in glowing terms of the "abundance" achieved in the capitalist world. For instance, the reactionary Italian newspaper *Messaggero* asks with a studied innocence why it is that at a time when the more highly-developed Western countries are constantly wrestling with the problem of farm "surpluses," the Soviet Union with its vast expanses of arable land cannot satisfy its requirements. The newspaper naturally explains this by "defects" in the collective and state farm system and by the "superiority" of capitalism. But it wisely avoids raising another question: does not the existence of "surpluses" signify that in reality the food requirements of the population are far from fully satisfied? Is the "abundance" not wholly imaginary?

According to *Messaggero*, Italy, too, is faced with the problem of how to dispose of these "surpluses." The best advice on this score could be given by the Italian unemployed. There now are several million wholly or partly unemployed in that country, and no one knows better than they why Italy and other capitalist countries have so-called "surpluses" of consumption goods, and also how they could be utilized. The explanation is simple enough. The "surpluses" exist not because the needs of the population are fully satisfied, but because in capitalist conditions consumption by the overwhelming majority

of the population is exceedingly low and lags far behind production.

In capitalist society consumption is limited not by the volume of production but by the mode of distribution. A majority of the population does not earn enough to buy even all the essentials. Hence the "surpluses" of which *Messaggero* boasts. The Soviet people do not covet such "abundance."

Socialism abolishes the antagonistic contradiction between production and consumption which capitalist society cannot solve. A situation when production increases while consumption by the mass of the population remains stationary or declines cannot arise under socialism. It goes without saying, of course, that socialist society is not in a position at all stages of its development fully to satisfy all the requirements of its members. Consumption directly depends on the level of social production. As the latter grows, the income and material well-being of the working people steadily rise, and their social and personal requirements are met more and more fully.

Now that we are building communism all along the line and that production has risen to a new and higher stage, the material well-being of the Soviet people is improving at a much faster rate. In the past five years the total annual income of the working people has risen: as a result of wage increases by 17,100 million rubles (in the new currency), of tax reductions by 870 million, of discontinuing the state loans by 2,200 million, and by 4,000 million rubles as a result of pension increases.

Income of the collective farmers has likewise increased. Money payment for work performed on the farms has more than trebled in recent years. Moreover, the tax on the collective farmers' household plots has been considerably reduced.

It should be added that the total population of the Soviet Union increased in the period 1956-1960 by more than 18 million, and the urban population by 17 million.

The rising real income and the population growth, especially in the towns, have added to the demand for food, primarily meat, butter and milk. And since income will continue to rise, the demand for these items is bound to grow.

The simplest way to eliminate the disparity between the demand for agricultural products and their production would be to stop or retard the growth of income. This, however, is not a road the Communist Party and the

Soviet government can take. To do so would run counter to the very essence of their policy and the interests of the people. Raising the material and cultural standards of the people is the supreme law governing all the activity of our Party and the Soviet state. *"For us, builders of communism, man is most important,"* N. S. Khrushchov has said. *"The struggle for communism is a struggle for a better life for man. Everything for human happiness, everything for man!"*

This concern for happiness and well-being permeates the decisions of the January meeting of the Central Committee. Taking into consideration the rising demand, the Party and the people re-examined earlier plans and worked out a program for developing agriculture so as to meet all the needs of the day. Underlying this program is the principle advanced by Khrushchov that agriculture must be so developed as to ensure the full satisfaction of the growing demand for food and consumer goods, in other words, that production should always be ahead of demand.

There is now every opportunity for doing this.

First, as has been said above, agriculture has made signal progress in recent years. The present level of production is a far cry from that of seven years ago. Second—and this is most important — the state, thanks to the potential of socialist industry and the high rate of economic development generally, is able to channel considerably greater appropriations than before to promoting well-being and increasing consumer-goods production without slowing down the growth of heavy industry. Our country is now in a position substantially to increase investments, over and above the original seven-year plan provisions, in agriculture and the industries serving it, such as the manufacture of farm machinery and production of mineral fertilizers and building materials.

It goes without saying that heavy industry will continue to be the foundation of the Soviet economy, agriculture included. Unless it is developed further there can be no increase in the productivity of labor in any sphere of the economy. Therefore, heavy industry will be developed as hitherto at a faster pace than other branches. This priority development, however, is not an end in itself, but rather a means towards achieving the main aim of the new social system—higher material and cultural standards and all-round development of the members of society.

It is our task to ensure, on the basis of heavy industry, the balanced progress of all branches of the national economy and to accelerate the rate of growth of farm production. The material and technical base of communism cannot be built and the people assured an abundance of products unless this key branch is steadily developed.

II

To increase farm production so as to outstrip the growing demand is far from being a simple matter. But the Soviet people are firmly convinced that it is fully within their power to do so.

In order fully to satisfy requirements, we must in the next few years raise state purchases of grain to 4,200 million poods, meat to 13 million tons, and milk to 50 million tons, or 1,348 million poods of grain, 4,800,000 tons of meat and 23,700,000 tons of milk more than in 1960. This implies a corresponding increase in production.

How will this be done?

The principal ways and means by which an abundance of farm produce is to be achieved were subjected to thorough examination by the Central Committee and at the zonal conferences. By drawing on practical experience and taking into account the newly-opened potentialities, a system of measures was worked out aimed at intensifying farming and raising the productivity of labor on the collective and state farms.

Investments in agriculture are being considerably increased. Large sums will be allocated primarily to freeing the farmer from dependence on the caprices of nature and guaranteeing annual yields sufficient to meet all requirements irrespective of the climatic conditions. The material facilities available and the level of science and engineering will make it possible to carry out this task.

At present, when we still have not learned to control the weather, the best guarantee of stable harvests in the arid areas is large-scale irrigation.

The irrigated area has trebled since the revolution, totalling together with lowlands adjoining estuaries nearly 12 million hectares. Large though this area is, it is only 5.5 per cent of the total crop area.

Formerly irrigation was undertaken only over limited areas, mainly those growing industrial crops, especially cotton. Now measures are to be launched on a national scale with a view to expanding irrigation not only

in cotton and other industrial crop areas but also in the grain-growing districts.

The Party and the government attach as much importance to irrigation as they did to the opening up of new farmlands in the virgin soil areas. Irrigation will bring under cultivation millions of hectares of land in Central Asia, in the South of the Russian Federation, the Volga area, in Southern Ukraine and in the Transcaucasian republics. This will boost both crop farming and animal husbandry.

Besides irrigation, major work will be undertaken to drain swamps and clear brush in the non-black-earth belt of the RSFSR, in Ukrainian Polesye, and in Byelorussia, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia.

Thus one of the most important ways of increasing farm production is irrigation and drainage. Another factor is a substantial increase in the use of organic and mineral fertilizers. As a result of the increase in the number of livestock and the expansion of peat extraction, far more organic fertilizers are now being used. Production of mineral fertilizers has also increased substantially—from 3,200,000 tons in 1940 to 13,800,000 in 1960, or more than fourfold. But although production has grown at a comparatively rapid rate, the quantity of mineral fertilizers used per hectare of cultivated land is still small.

At present mineral fertilizer is used almost exclusively for industrial crops such as cotton, sugar beet and long-fiber flax, and for potatoes and other vegetables. The supply is still not big enough to take care of the grain areas. By the end of the seven-year plan, however, the supply of mineral fertilizers is expected to increase roughly threefold. Large quantities can then be allocated for the grain-growing districts. The result will undoubtedly be bigger yields of grain crops.

The further mechanization of all branches of agriculture will be another of the principal levers. In the main, the basic farm work has already been shifted to machines. While the number of tractors, combines, trucks and other farm machines has increased one-and-a-half times since 1953, they still are not enough to perform the most important types of field work in the minimum time everywhere in the country. Some branches, particularly livestock farming, are still insufficiently mechanized. In view of this a substantial part of the additional investments over and above those provided for in the seven-year plan will be used to increase the capacity of farm machinery plants and to improve the types of machines and implements put out.

However, it is not simply a matter of shipping more machines and implements to the farms. A *state plan for the completion of the all-round mechanization of all branches of farming* is now being elaborated, with a view to carrying it out in the main during the current seven-year plan. This would usher in a qualitatively new stage in the technical equipment of agriculture and mark another step forward in eradicating the essential distinctions between agricultural and industrial labor, between town and country.

Besides an increase in the output of tractors and other farm machines, a substantial growth is envisaged in state investments in rural electrification. By 1965 all collective and state farms are to be provided with electric power for pumping installations serving livestock premises, milking machines, sheep shearing units, fodder cutters, grain winnowers and driers, machines for the primary processing of farm produce as well as other stationary machines and equipment.

Naturally, it will take time to carry out all these measures. Farm production, however, must be increased without delay. Therefore, while working on these long-term tasks, it is imperative to make the maximum use of the existing possibilities for sharply increasing the production of grain, industrial crops, vegetables, meat, milk and other produce, beginning with this year. The opportunities to do so are ample.

Take, for instance, grain growing. The grain problem has in the main been solved. We now grow enough food grain. But we need more feed grains. And since livestock farming cannot be developed to a higher level without an adequate grain supply, this question is now being posed in the light of the stock farmers' needs as well as the growing food requirements.

Grain production can be increased above all by expanding the area under corn and increasing the yields of this crop. Corn, long cultivated in the southern districts of our country, can be grown for grain in other areas as well. Fulfilment of the corn-growing plan for the next few years will provide the state with more than 1,000 million poods of additional grain.

The wisdom of the decision to open up vast areas of virgin land has been fully proved. These new farm lands have already more than repaid the development costs and are now a major supplier of grain. But their potential is still to be fully utilized. More

virgin land will be put under crops, though not on as wide a scale as hitherto. The emphasis at this second stage in virgin land development is on improving the methods of land cultivation, raising yields and rapidly expanding the output of animal husbandry.

After the January meeting of the Central Committee the collective and state farms began an active search for unutilized reserves. The potential of the farms was reassessed and plans were drawn up for increasing production this year as well as in the next few years. The collective and state farms of Kazakhstan, for instance, are planning to increase their grain production this year to 1,100 million poods and to sell to the state 900 million poods, or 258 million poods more than last year. Their meat production target is 667,000 tons (slaughter weight), and they plan to raise milk production to 2,732,000 tons. The agriculturists of the Ukraine have estimated that they will be able to sell the state this year some 650-700 million poods of grain as against 358 million last year.

III

The new tasks in agriculture cannot, of course, be carried out only by strengthening its material and technical base, important though this is. It is also imperative to improve management in this branch of the national economy, and to perfect both the supply system through which the collective and state farms obtain the materials and technical equipment they need and the system of state purchases. In recent years a number of measures stimulating the development of agriculture have been implemented. These include elimination of excess centralization in planning, sale of the farm machinery and implements formerly held by the machine and tractor stations to the collective farms, and abolition of the obligatory deliveries of agricultural products to the state. All this gave wider scope to the initiative of both agricultural executives and rank-and-file collective farmers and state-farm workers. The local administrative bodies and the collective and state farms are now displaying more independence in matters pertaining to the organization of production.

The central task now is to help the collective and state farms to apply the achievements of science and practical farming. With this in view the functions of the Ministry of Agriculture and its local bodies are being revised. This is not merely a question of alterations in the organizational set-up but of funda-

mentally changing the entire content of their work. Their main function should be to guide the further development of agricultural science and to introduce its achievements as well as the experience of the best farmers in all the collective and state farms in order to raise all the farms to the level of the best.

We now have many farmers who from year to year raise splendid crops and get excellent results in animal husbandry. Khrushchov has aptly called these leading farmers beacons pointing the way to the exemplary conduct of agriculture and to high productivity. The application of their experience and the scientific organization of production in all collective and state farms are the key to abundance.

The latest farming methods will be popularized by the experimental model farms now being organized on the basis of the best collective and state farms to serve as an example of how large-scale, highly productive agriculture should be conducted. Here the managers and crop and livestock experts of other farms will be able to learn how to put their husbandry on a scientific footing. So far more than 3,000 model farms have been set up. One of them, the Kubanets State Farm in Timashevsky District, Krasnodar Territory, harvested an average of 3.7 metric tons of grain and 5.3 tons of corn per hectare last year. It has elaborated ways and means of rapidly increasing production. This year it hopes to obtain 4.2 tons of grain per hectare, eight tons of corn, 35 tons of sugar beet, 40 tons of green corn silage on non-irrigated land and 80-100 tons on irrigated land.

The example of the Kubanets farm is helping the other collective and state farms in the district to improve their work. Its fields and livestock sections are for the latter a school of up-to-date farming.

The experimental farms and the specialists working on them are not encumbered with administrative functions. They influence the organization of farm work in their district not through directives and orders, but by scientific advice and by training the farm workers in the use of the latest methods. Thus, not only have the functions of agricultural bodies assumed a new content, the methods of guidance are also changing. Scientific recommendations tested in practice are ousting directives from the top as the principal method of guiding the organization of farm production. This gives local initiative still wider scope.

Until recently the system of supplying the collective and state farms with materials and technical equipment amounted to distribution of the machines, implements and materials which industry happened to be producing.

Now the supply functions have been transferred to a self-supporting countrywide organization operating on an entirely different principle. Acting as an intermediary between the farms and industry, it places with the latter the orders it receives from the collective and state farms. Industry will thus produce only those machines, implements and materials which the farms ask for. The central and local bodies of the new organization include representatives from the collective and state farms. This puts the supply of agriculture on a more solid democratic foundation and will undoubtedly make for more productive utilization of machinery and accelerate technical progress in agriculture.

The state purchasing system is also being reorganized. The procurement agencies are expected not only to attend to the immediate purchases, but to look to the future, "so as not to allow purchases to undermine the farms that do the selling," as Khrushchov has said. Purchases will be made in accordance with contracts amounting to orders placed by the state with the collective and state farms. This will help better to combine the interests of each farm and the nation as a whole.

A key factor in promoting farm production will be, as hitherto, strict observance in the collective and state farms of the Leninist principle of material incentives. But although its importance is unquestionable, it must be said that of late not enough attention has been paid in a number of localities to this question.

While working on the new tasks aimed at further developing agriculture, the people are making particularly exacting demands on managerial personnel. Farm managers and executives must possess wide knowledge, they must have organizational ability and be wholly devoted to the interests of the people. Each year their ranks are augmented by new men and women who have shown their worth in practical work. The Soviet people have no patience with leaders who fail to live up to their responsibilities, who are unable to organize production and who, thinking only of their own careers, resort to all kinds of manipulations and deception. When preparations were under way for the January meeting of the Central Committee, attention was drawn to the fact that some

individuals in leading positions had completely lost their sense of responsibility to the people and were trying to cover up their mistakes by deception, faked plan fulfilment reports, etc. The Party fully supported the people, and those functionaries who had shown themselves unworthy of trust were removed from their posts and duly punished, the penalties ranging all the way to expulsion from the Party. In this way control over the leaders by the people makes it possible to remove incompetent and dishonest functionaries from office and to improve the general level of leadership.

Following the Central Committee meeting, conferences attended by more than 25,000 of the best collective farmers and state-farm workers, functionaries of the Party, the Soviets and the Young Communist League, scientists, agronomists, power-farming experts and other specialists took place in the leading agricultural areas. Subjecting farm problems to a thorough examination and generalizing past experience, the conferences outlined ways and means of making the fullest use of every opportunity to increase agricultural production with the utmost speed in their respective zones.

The zonal conferences, which were attended by leaders of the Party, afforded a striking example of the Leninist style of leadership—not administration by means of orders, through directives from the top that tend to cramp initiative, but guidance exercised in consultation with the people, drawing on their experience, popularizing the best experience, and encouraging a creative approach to the tasks awaiting solution.

* * *

The Soviet people are preparing for the Twenty-Second Congress of the Communist Party in a manner worthy of the occasion. A socialist emulation movement in honor of the Congress is spreading far and wide among the working people of town and country. The collective farmers and state-farm workers, carrying out the decisions of the January meeting, conducted the spring sowing efficiently and in time. All told, some 133 million hectares were sown to spring crops, or 102 per cent of plan.

Thanks to more efficient methods and the favorable weather, the crop prospects are good practically everywhere. Especially promising is the grain crop in the Ukraine, Byelorussia, Moldavia and the North Caucasus. The prospects for corn, cotton, sugar beet

and sunflower, as well as other crops, are much better than last year.

In livestock raising, too, progress has been made. During the first five months of this year the collective and state farm herds of

beef and dairy cattle increased by more than two million head.

The people are doing everything to promote agricultural production and to create an abundance of farm produce in our country.

The Swing of the Masses to the Left and Perspectives of the Communist Party of Denmark

Ib Noerlund

A pronounced swing to the Left can be observed among the masses in Western Europe. The trend differs according to country, depending on the concrete situation and conditions.

In Denmark, as in many other countries, the move to the Left is manifested in mass actions in defense of peace, for democracy and better conditions. The concern evoked by nuclear weapons impels ever new sections of the population, including the youth, to uphold the cause of peace. Not only was the Ban-the-Bomb march this spring much bigger than the 1960 march, it was, bearing in mind Denmark's population, also one of the biggest actions of its kind in Europe.

The growing influence of the Danish and foreign monopolies in the country and the intensified exploitation have led to numerous actions by the working people. Last spring saw one of the biggest economic strikes of the century. In connection with the conclusion of new collective agreements about 120,000, i.e., nearly one-sixth of the organized workers, went on strike. A feature of these actions was the participation of the office workers.

Our people view with growing concern the collaboration of Danish armed forces with German militarists in NATO. More and more frequently the demand is heard for economic and political "structural changes" in Danish society, and despite the official talk about the "welfare state", the class struggle is

making itself increasingly felt. In the countryside there are growing contradictions between the big capitalist farms and the small farms, between the working farmers and the monopolies. The sense of hopelessness and indifference to politics in some sections of the population is yielding to a search for ways of achieving the democratic renovation of the country.

This development, naturally, is meeting with opposition from the monopolies and their allies, who are using new and often more powerful and refined means to split the democratic forces and retard the swing to the Left.

The predominant role in Denmark is played by a handful of monopolists. Twenty-five big companies own 25 per cent of the capital of big and medium joint-stock associations (each of which has a capital of over 1 million crowns). Because of interlocking and agreements the big monopolies have a grip on over half the companies. They thus play a leading role in industry and in some branches of trade and agriculture.

Danish capitalism, especially in the past decades, has been evolving in the direction of state-monopoly capitalism. The arms drive, in which Denmark as a NATO member is involved, is paid for by the taxpayers, and whereas taxes levied on the monopolies are being reduced, those on the working people are increased.

The monopolies are subsidized by the government. They never have had it so good. In 1960 the big banks netted a profit of 39.3 per cent on their capital.

We have, of course, a numerous middle section: 100,000 small farmers and 60,000 middle farmers; 80,000 small and medium tradesmen; 50,000 handicraftsmen and 450,000 office workers. Together with their families they make up a considerable part of the population of 4.6 million.

The working class, a large section of which consists of highly-skilled workers, was organized in trade unions and political organizations at an early stage. It has constantly waged a class struggle and its mass actions have frequently forced concessions from the monopolies. The concessions were made because the country's neutral policy had for a long time enabled Danish capital to obtain additional profits by utilizing the growing contradictions between the imperialist states.

These circumstances, coupled with the systematic propaganda about the "peaceful,"

"progressive" and "democratic" nature of Danish capitalism, prepared the ground for reformist illusions in the working class. That is why the Danish bourgeoisie is able to exercise its rule with the aid of bourgeois-democratic methods even in the stage of state-monopoly capitalism.

Economic Situation and the Popular Struggle

Industrial production has grown considerably in recent years. The fixed capital, run-down in the war years, was replaced, and industry as a whole rationalized and expanded. Industry now employs 35 per cent of the population and makes the biggest contribution to the national product. Manufactured goods account for nearly 50 per cent of exports. Denmark can no longer be thought of as a purely agricultural country. A highly mechanized agriculture now employs 18 per cent of the population.

Official figures illustrate the high level of business activity during the past few years:

	National product	Industrial production	Agricultural production	Unemployment	Basis of trade (1955 = 100)
1955 = 100					
1957	108	108	115	70,900 (10.2%)	94
1958	110	112	116	68,400 (9.6%)	100
1959	117	121	113	44,100 (6.1%)	106
1960	122	125	116	30,000 (4.1%)	100

This activity should be examined in the context of the crisis phenomena which have obtained in the capitalist world since 1957. Being what it is, the economic structure of Denmark usually helps to turn to advantage the first phase of the capitalist crisis, when prices for raw materials fall and those for manufactured goods and foodstuffs maintain their previous level, as the considerable improvement in the terms of trade since the end of the war has shown.

Joining the so-called free trade area has also contributed to increasing business. Following Britain's lead, furthermore, the Danish government is taking the line of joining the Rome Common Market agreement. These factors have promoted new capital investments with the idea of strengthening the competitive position vis-à-vis the foreign monopolies.

It should be said that the economic boom has not strengthened the economic, to say nothing of the political, independence of

Denmark. On the contrary, the country has become even more dependent on foreign powers, and militarist influence has grown. The growth of the power of the monopolies, who have subordinated the country to the big monopolies of the chief imperialist powers, is the feature of the postwar development. This augurs ill for the national economy, and places the country in a hazardous position from the military standpoint.

Denmark's economic and military subordination to the chief imperialist countries is accompanied by intensified brainwashing of the population. The cold-war arsenal is being used, and new forms of anti-communist and anti-Soviet propaganda thought up. Petty-bourgeois nationalist prejudices are assiduously used against the socialist countries, and appeals made for a "small country" to renounce national sovereignty vis-à-vis other NATO members.

Efforts are also being made to distort the true character of the people's struggle dur-

ing the Hitler occupation—the broad national-democratic nature of the liberation struggle and the Communist Party's leading role in it are denied.

But the people are becoming increasingly conscious of the hypocrisy of this talk. The very circles propagating the slogan "Never Again April 9" (Denmark was occupied by Nazi troops on April 9, 1940), are calling for closer collaboration with the Hitler generals in NATO. The workers know from experience that those who talk so ardently about democracy have, in fact, no desire to satisfy their economic and democratic demands.

Monopoly propaganda thus finds itself powerless to prevent the sincerely national and democratic forces in the working class and the people generally from fighting for their interests and against the reactionary policy of the ruling classes.

A mass movement has arisen against this policy, a fact which has compelled the government to maneuver and make concessions. Thus, it rejected "under the present circumstances" the proposal to quarter foreign air forces in Denmark and ratified only after considerable delay, resulting from the popular movement, the agreement to include Western Germany in NATO. Despite pressure by NATO politicians and the Danish militarists, the government has had to refuse atomic arms, although the refusal is so worded that this question can be reverted to in the event of a change in the situation. The Danish militarists are now taking advantage of this and calling for atomic armament.

These, then, are the conditions in which the working people's struggle is developing.

Real wages are now somewhat higher than before the war. But this rise does not at all compensate for the much greater intensification of labor. Taxes and rent swallow up on an average more than half the wages and often all members of a family have to work if they want to maintain a reasonable standard of living.

Many working-class families, it is true, have been able to acquire durables such as TV sets, motor-scooters, refrigerators, small automobiles. But in doing so they have run into debt and this retards their activity in the struggle against exploitation. The law, under which practically every strike, with the exception of strikes during the renewal of collective agreements, is illegal, also retards the development of the mass struggle.

The economic struggle gathered momentum particularly during the renewal of col-

lective agreements in 1956. By an overwhelming majority the workers turned down the proposals made by the government arbiter, which were, however, given the force of law by the government and parliament. The working class answered with powerful demonstrations, by what amounted to a general strike lasting several days. 1959 and 1960 were record years for the number of strikes for many decades. In the spring of this year, as we have already said, the struggle developed into the biggest and most prolonged strike of the century.

Thus the experience of the working-class struggle and our Party's work shows that even during a boom we have ample opportunities for waging an organized anti-monopoly struggle. The difference between what the working people have now and what they should have if all the possibilities of the nation were utilized for the public welfare and not in the interests of the monopolies is particularly apparent at these times.

For this reason the Communist Party has always fought against the tendency to adopt a wait-and-see attitude when business is thriving, and has combated the assertions that "only when their living standards are falling will the workers fight", and reformist and revisionist claims that the boom, besides signifying that "capitalism has got rid of its contradictions", creates exceptionally favorable conditions for the development of the basic features of "Danish capitalism".

It is not that the opportunities for anti-monopoly struggle diminish when business is booming, but new forms adapted to the new conditions have to be sought. This is corroborated by the Party's practical work, particularly during the strike movement of 1959-61, when the workers succeeded in winning more concessions from the monopolies in a few months than they had in many years of reformist trade union leadership. Forms of struggle such as brief strikes, meetings during working hours, and advancing demands for better conditions have become widespread and have proved to be an effective means of struggle.

The Party exposed the intensified exploitation, the huge increase in profits, the monopolies' maneuvers in the sphere of tax policy, and their use of the machinery of state for their own ends. The Party used the concessions won as the point of departure for new anti-monopoly actions by the people. And the masses are realizing that it is the

Communist and the other progressive forces in the working class who are taking the initiative in the fight for better conditions.

The Working-Class Movement and Unity

Unity of the people in the anti-monopoly struggle is possible only when it is based upon working-class unity. The Danish working class, the biggest group, accounting with their families for over half the population, is the most organized anti-monopoly force (the trade unions have a membership of over 750,000). Its social composition is the most homogeneous and it has the most experience in the class struggle.

But the working class is divided, the split is of long standing and has a long history. Historically, the Danish Social Democratic Party headed the trade union organization of the working class. But this Party soon became a reformist party and adopted an extreme Right position in the international social democratic movement.

Its influence declined considerably during the Hitler occupation when the Social Democratic leaders collaborated with the occupation authorities. At the first elections after the liberation, the Social Democratic Party lost many votes to the Communist Party, which polled 12.5 per cent of the total vote. Social democracy was then forced to maneuver and drew up a "left" policy statement. Under working-class pressure the Social Democratic Party was obliged to accept the Communist Party's proposal and to start negotiations for joint action, although its leaders negotiated merely for the sake of appearances.

Despite the fact that the liberation movement had achieved tremendous successes the progressive forces were unable to consolidate them either politically or organizationally. The grip of the monopolies in economic and public life proved to be strong.

Capitalizing on the political talk about stabilizing the economy, and on the minor concessions made by the monopolies (longer holidays, slight increases in old-age pensions and wages of the low-paid workers), the Social Democrats gradually restored the traditional positions of their party as the former political system was re-established.

Once at the helm of state, the Social Democratic leaders threw overboard the anti-militarist and neutral traditions by which their Party had been distinguished before the war, and under cover of unbridled anti-communist propaganda began to implement NATO policy.

They called openly for the replacement of the Party's socialist fundamentals by an ideology of "democratic socialism", and recently issued a new program repudiating expropriation of the means of production and the class point of view generally. The concept of working people's unity against the monopolies was replaced by the concept of "co-operation" of all classes.

Under the impact of the military and social consequences of NATO policy, however, developments in the Social Democratic Party over the years testify to the maturing of an internal crisis. This is seen in the rise of a Left trend in the Party and especially in the trade unions during 1956 at the time of the renewal of the collective agreements. The internal differences, however, were temporarily silenced by the anti-communist witch hunt in connection with the Hungarian events.

The bulk of those voting for the Social Democrats consists of workers and a considerable section of the petty bourgeoisie. Hence, sensitive to actions by the workers and having to reckon with their feelings, the Social Democrats are maneuvering and showing restraint in regard to some of the more dangerous aspects of NATO policy.

The Communist Party plays the leading role in the struggle against NATO policy, against the monopoly domination and for satisfaction of the workers' needs. After 1945 and during the cold war the reactionaries succeeded in ousting the Communist Party from some of the positions won by it during the liberation. An average of from 4 to 5 per cent of the electorate have been regularly voting for the Communists since 1945. This figure does not, however, fully convey the Party's influence among the masses. Its policy of unity, and especially its policy of consolidating joint action by the Social Democrats and the Communists, has enabled the Party to play the leading role in mass actions for better conditions, for peace and democracy. In a policy statement, "The Danish People's Road" (1952), the Communists showed the prospects of the democratic struggle for a peace-loving and independent national policy, against the monopolies and for the transition to socialism. This policy was carried further in a new Party document "Program for the Renovation of Democracy", adopted in September 1960.

To develop united action in the fight for peace and the interests of the working people, the Party had to combat sectarian habits and prejudices. But it did not pay sufficient attention to the fact that some revisionist trends

had intensified in its ranks. Making the most of the complex international situation that arose in 1956, the revisionists became more active, openly attacked the Party and sought to divert it from the path of class struggle and proletarian internationalism. Their treacherous efforts, at first screened and then openly supported by Aksel Larsen, who for many years had been Chairman of the Party and its first representative in Parliament, created a complicated situation.

In 1958, after publication of the Yugoslav revisionist program, Larsen began a factional struggle against the Party and its policy. The Party was forced to combat revisionism by means of a broad discussion. At its Twentieth Congress in November 1958 the subversive activity of the revisionists was condemned by an overwhelming majority, with only thirteen voting against.

The Party's militancy grew when an end was put to this subversive activity. It was clear to the Party that to consolidate its victory over the revisionists every effort had to be made to extend contact with the masses. Some results were achieved in this field. The Party played an important role in developing the strike movement in 1959-61.

The work was far from easy. The condemnation of revisionism and the expulsion of the revisionists naturally meant a loss of membership, and also fewer subscribers to the Party press. These losses (20 to 25 per cent) were tangible, but not overwhelming. Most of those who left the Party, moreover, ceased to take part in political life.

With a small group of ex-Communists Larsen formed the Socialist People's Party (S.P.P.), stressing that this would be a "people's party", not a workers' party, that it was a Marxist party, but not a Leninist party. Larsen merely succeeded in knocking together a very modest basis for the new party.

Politically the idea behind the S.P.P. was to get hold of the Left movement and thus prevent the Communist Party from growing. With this end in view the Larsens took over some of the demands advanced by the Communists and gave them out as their own. At the same time they launched an anti-communist propaganda campaign, accusing the Communist Party of being an anti-national, anti-democratic party. Posing as a conscience-stricken "repentant sinner", Larsen came out as the "chief witness" against communism.

This, naturally, played into the hands of reaction. The S.P.P. aided the bourgeoisie in its efforts to prevent the development of the

swing to the Left in the mass movement. For this it was widely acclaimed by bourgeois propaganda. Larsen was lauded for "breaking with Moscow", popularized as an "independent", "Danish" Socialist, and quite the opposite of the Communists.

The parliamentary elections were held in November 1960 in a situation that was made more complex both by the illusions engendered by the boom and the splitting activity of the revisionists. The reactionaries, naturally, utilized this in their anti-communist propaganda.

The elections brought about the following. The Social Democrats, cashing in on the "prosperity", advanced the slogan: "Make the good times better!" They won over some of the petty-bourgeois voters who previously had voted for Right-wing bourgeois parties, and gained six new seats.

The Conservative Party — the traditional reactionary party, which is closely linked with the financial oligarchy, advocating a firm NATO militarist policy and having influence among the middle sections—gained at the expense of the Venstre Party which represents the interests of the big farmers, has close connections with the monopolists, and had a common program with the Conservatives. An ultra-reactionary group which broke away from the Venstre Party and the Conservative Party formed an "independent" party and obtained six seats. The Radical Party, supported by the middle sections and intellectuals in the towns and by the small peasants and with strong anti-militarist traditions in the past, was in 1957 represented in the government which supported NATO and favored increased military spending. Its "liberal" economic policy provided private capital with opportunities for profiteering in house building. The Radicals lost three seats. The Legal Union Party whose demagogic slogans increased its vote at previous elections, did not live up to its promises and lost its nine seats.

Larsen's party, for which the most heterogeneous groups voted, secured eleven seats. A considerable number (possibly the majority) of those who voted for it were Social Democrats who were moving to the Left. The Communist Party, too, lost votes to the S.P.P. The S.P.P. also won votes from the Radicals and it benefited from the defeat of the Legal Union. Even some of the extreme Right voted for Larsen because of his anti-communism.

The election results were unsatisfactory for the Communist Party which lost its seats in Parliament, although it had every reason to

expect better results in view of the influence it enjoyed during the recent strikes and the exceptional success of the Party press fund campaign launched shortly before the election.

Post-Election Developments

Developments since the elections show that the "Folketing without Communists" has not made the "good times better", nor has it brought the "renovation" promised by the Social Democrats and the revisionists.

Quite the reverse. The class struggle has intensified. During the campaign for collective agreements the workers were more active and evinced a greater desire for struggle. In guiding the strikes, however, the Right-wing union leaders deliberately pursued a policy which led to no appreciable satisfaction of the demands of the working class. At the same time the government made considerably more concessions to the big farmers and finance capital.

The basic claims on which the working class was united in the strikes, a minimum weekly wage of 250 crowns, a 40-hour week, equal pay for equal work, were for the first time drawn up by the Communist Party, and the Communists in the localities played a leading role in the struggle to win them.

Bearing in mind the experience of the strikes and the conciliatory policy of the Right-wing trade union leaders, the Communist Party is now trying to organize a broad discussion among the workers, of which the main question is the need to elaborate a new and more militant policy in the trade unions. Government intervention in favor of the big farmers and finance capital has shown that the struggle for the workers' interests cannot be divorced from the political struggle, otherwise gains achieved in the economic struggle will be annulled by the political acts of the government. Thus the working-class movement is confronted with the task of showing itself to be stronger politically. This creates the conditions for raising the anti-monopoly struggle to a new level.

The plan for Denmark's joining the Common Market and the plan for a common Danish-West German military command likewise pose new problems before the nation. The Communist Party is playing a prominent role in the struggle to frustrate these plans.

The Larsen revisionists were unable, after the elections, to achieve any tangible results in enlarging and strengthening their organizations. Their contacts with the electors are very loose and in the main are maintained through the bourgeois press.

During the election campaign the Larsen party, concealing its true face, promised all things to all groups of electors. It continued these tactics after the elections, but developments have compelled it to clarify its position and reveal its true colors. The leaders talk a lot of their "people's policy" and their policy of "renovation", yet they show no initiative in implementing it. The so-called "realism" of these leaders has led them to reconciliation with the monopolies, and this is already evoking criticism within the party's ranks. The S.P.P. did not play an active role when the collective agreements were being concluded, or at the time of the strikes. The opportunist character of its leadership is revealed still more clearly on such issues as the tax policy, allocations for youth education, and employees' salaries. On the matter of putting a stop to soaring prices and profits, the S.P.P.'s stand was so opportunist that even the Social Democrats criticized its leaders "from the left". By supporting the proposal to place an army corps at the disposal of UNO, the S.P.P. leaders even reneged on their favorite slogans for unilateral disarmament.

The "socialist character" of the S.P.P. leadership is becoming increasingly dubious. At one time these leaders said they were Marxists. But in a first speech in Parliament the spokesman of the S.P.P. faction announced that "the theories of Marx and Engels are of no decisive importance for a detailed appraisal of the period in world history known as the atomic era". At first the S.P.P. leaders said that only the "mistakes" of the socialist countries should be criticized; now this "criticism of mistakes" is turning into calumny of the socialist countries and their policy.

Contradictions are growing among the supporters of the S.P.P., especially between the leading group of hidebound anti-Communists and those who voted for the S.P.P. in the hope that it would pursue a new policy spearheaded against the monopolies. These contradictions are making themselves felt more strongly as the swing to the Left gathers momentum.

Conclusions and Prospects

These developments and especially the election results have compelled the Party carefully to study the situation, its own activity and the objective and subjective causes influencing the march of events. The Party has done this and arrived at the following conclusions.

The general political line set out in the Party's policy documents is based on the real state of affairs in Danish society, a state of

affairs that has not changed since the elections.

The S.P.P.'s election success gives no ground for either revising or questioning the view that it was essential to abolish the revisionist group in the Party. On the contrary, the Party is convinced that in doing so it acted correctly. A big drawback, however, was that the anti-revisionist struggle was waged in the main as a purely internal matter. As the meeting of the Central Committee, held in November 1960, pointed out, "the Party did not explain Larsen's policy to the people as it did to its own ranks during the pre-Twentieth Congress discussion". With the defeat of the revisionist group some Communists erroneously concluded that revisionism was finished, that it could no longer play any important part in political life and that further discussion with the revisionists would merely serve to disseminate revisionist views. Now the Party is convinced (and we think our lesson is of value to others as well) that the anti-revisionist struggle should be waged not only within the Party but also among the broad masses of the working people, to whom the essence and the danger of revisionism should be explained in a popular way. Otherwise, as the elections revealed, revisionism may become a dangerous instrument in the hands of the bourgeoisie who use it skilfully with all the media at their disposal.

The Party's Twentieth Congress (1958) stated that "at present revisionism is the chief ideological danger for our Party", that this calls for "a greater and more consistent contribution to the dissemination of Marxist views". At the same time the Congress underlined that "the struggle against revisionism should be combined with serious work to overcome dogmatism, from which our Party also suffers. Dogmatism is manifested both in defining the political and practical tasks, in implementing these tasks, and in bureaucratic methods of leadership."

The meeting of the Central Committee in January analyzed the situation, pointed out that the Party continues to regard revisionism as the main danger and stressed that "the influence of revisionism can be overcome only if the Party gets rid of dogmatism and formulates its day-to-day policy on the basis of creative Marxism, with due regard to the situation and conditions. Hence revisionism and dogmatism should be combated simultaneously."

The Party's policy document, "Program for the Renovation of Democracy"*, has given

a more concrete character to our political line.

On the basis of this program, the Party is working out a policy on various questions germane to the struggle. A detailed study of economic and social problems has been published, a program for reform of the tax system put forward, and the basic principles of a new housing policy elaborated. Arising from the experience of the strike movement, explanatory work is being conducted on a big scale to substantiate the workers' demand for the right to participate in the management of industry, for satisfaction of the day-to-day demands of the working people.

The Party is doing its utmost to encourage initiative in the local organizations and among its members so that the urgent problems raised by the people can be discussed by the Party and action taken. Only in this way can the Party become a force capable of uniting the nation and directing and developing the struggle. It is particularly important, now that the Party temporarily has no tribune in Parliament, to use the tribunes in the mass organizations and the various movements. The Party, too, must create new forums, at the same time it is fighting to regain representation in Parliament.

The Party is also developing its ability to show political initiative in new ways and has already registered good results. It has, for example, unmasked in court the anti-national activities of the former commander-in-chief of the Danish land forces with the result that he has been removed from his post and a wave of protests triggered off against the growing West German penetration of the Danish armed forces through NATO. Our exposure of the monopolists' tax machinations has raised the question of the democratization of the tax policy in general.

The election results emphasize the vital importance of the work of strengthening the Party's contact with the masses. This calls for greater efforts in the trade unions, in the fight for peace and for political work in the localities. The latter is of exceptional importance in view of the forthcoming 1962 communal elections.

The Party has some useful experience of joint action, especially with Social Democratic workers. The emergence of Larsen's S.P.P. has, naturally, placed additional obstacles in the way of achieving working-class unity. But those who supported the S.P.P. during

*See *World Marxist Review*, No. 11, 1960, pp. 72-73.

the elections, have weak links with it and its leaders, and many of them can be won back to active struggle for the people's interests.

The diversity and complexity of the tasks confronting the Party call for more flexible and livelier methods of work. Articles for the press should be written in a clear, lucid manner. The Party is trying to overcome the conservatism and sectarianism which we still have among us, by urging a livelier and more vigorous style of work in its leading bodies and press, by widely popularizing praiseworthy examples of local initiative and speaking candidly with anyone who sincerely wants to discuss the problems of the day.

It is particularly important in the present conditions, when monopoly and other hostile propaganda is trying to use the election results against us, to strengthen the Party ideologically. And this can be done only if the struggle is waged on two fronts, against revisionism and against dogmatism.

Characterizing the election results, the Central Committee meeting held last November pointed out how important it was, precisely now, to have "a party which consistently advocates international working-class unity and which does not fear to make known

the significance of the proposals advanced by the socialist countries for the consolidation of peace."

Our Party's strength lies in its continuing the traditions of the renowned Danish Socialists and people's democrats, the traditions of consistent struggle for peace and democracy, against militarism and war.

The Party has staunchly withstood the moral blow of the electoral defeat. There was no panic, for at the same time a number of new members, people conscious of their duty in the given situation, joined the Party.

The events of the recent period, the growth of the anti-Bomb movement, the concern evoked by the plans to create a joint Danish-West German command, the big strikes during the renewal of collective agreements, the new wave of militant action in retaliation to the attempts of the monopolies, with the aid of the government, to revoke concessions won by the workers, all are proof of the swing to the Left and create the conditions for new achievements in uniting the people, for carrying out a broad democratic policy in the fight for peace and national independence, for social progress, to free the country from monopoly domination and pave the way to the socialist future.

Among Our Contributors

PAULINO GONZALEZ ALBERDI: *Member of the Central Committee, Communist Party of Argentina.*

MIKHAIL OLSHANSKY: *Academician, Minister of Agriculture of the USSR.*

IB NOERLUND: *Secretary of the Central Committee, Communist Party of Denmark.*

ERICH GLUECKAUF: *Member of the Political Bureau, Communist Party of Germany.*

NYAMYN ZHAGVARAL: *Deputy Chairman, Council of Ministers of the Mongolian People's Republic.*

JOHN GOLLAN: *General Secretary, Communist Party of Great Britain.*

Whither the Social Democratic Party of Germany?

Some Aspects of the Working-Class Movement in West Germany

Erich Glueckauf

WHITHER the Social Democratic Party of Germany? This is a timely question not only from the standpoint of the future of the German people. It is of international significance as well. For the Social Democratic Party is one of the biggest parties in West Germany and its policies have exerted and will continue to exert a powerful influence on the course of events in the Federal Republic.

Ever since the Schumacher group in the SDPG split the West German working class and gave its support to the Marshall plan, its stand on domestic and foreign policy has helped step by step to restore the power of the monopolies and to turn West Germany into the aggressive, clerical-militarist state it is today.

In pursuing this policy the Right-wing leaders have wrought grievous harm to the Social Democratic Party, whose influence in state affairs and in public life generally has been steadily waning for some time. The SDPG clearly cannot escape responsibility for the fact that the Bonn state has become the chief enemy of peaceful coexistence, disarmament and détente in Europe. In the light of the danger emanating from Bonn, the question of concluding a peace treaty with both German states, eradicating the hangovers of the second world war and averting a new war in Europe, which is once again threatened by German imperialism, is of paramount importance.

The activity of the SDPG and the situation within the Party cannot be regarded as purely the internal affair of the Social Democrats. These are matters of vital concern to the working class, to all the people of Germany.

The Communist Party has waged a consistent and courageous fight for peace, democracy and socialism, a fight that has earned it the esteem of the entire international working-class movement, for the dif-

ficulties under which it labors are well known. From the very beginning the Communists realized that in order to create a peaceful, democratic Germany the combined efforts of the whole working class of Germany would be required. This is the key to the consolidation of all the peace-loving and progressive forces in Germany, the guarantee of success in the struggle for peace and democracy, a struggle that has become the main link in the policy of the Communists in all the capitalist countries. That is why the Communist Party emphasizes the need for a correct appraisal of the situation within the SDPG, because only on this basis can the Leninist principles of distinguishing between the masses and their leaders, and between the Social Democratic leaders themselves, be consistently and intelligently applied.

1. From the SDPG "Plan on the German Question" to the Hanover Congress

In appraising the situation in the SDPG, one should not forget the variety of tendencies and trends to be found in its ranks. A comparison between two important Social Democratic documents of recent years — the "SDPG Plan on the German Question" and the decisions of the last Party Congress in Hanover — is revealing in this respect.

Foreign policy was long the subject of debate in the Party. A considerable section of the membership repeatedly declared against the policy of remilitarization pursued by the Adenauer government. Under pressure of this sentiment, the SDPG on more than one occasion since 1945 criticized Adenauer's policy, objected to West Germany's joining NATO, and participated in the mass movement against atomic armament and conscription. The SDPG plan on the German question, adopted in the spring of 1959, though inconsistent on a number of important points, crystallized, as it were, the trend of thought and action of many Social De-

mocrats. It contained elements of an independent policy, an alternative to the monopoly-militarist course pursued by the government, a course that was suicidal for the country and dangerous for world peace. Among other things, the plan referred to the disastrous consequences of the Bundestag's 1958 decision on the atomic armament of West Germany. It demanded the conclusion of a German peace treaty, the establishment of an atom-free zone in Central Europe and the banning of nuclear weapons for the German army. It was based on recognition of the existence of the two German states and proposed convening an all-German conference of representatives of both German governments on a parity basis.

But though they adopted the plan, the Right-wing leaders of the Party had no intention of carrying it out. The ink was hardly dry on the document when one of them, Wehner, declared that the plan was no longer binding upon the Party. In the new, Godesberg program, the SDPG for the first time recorded its agreement in principle to the arming of the Federal Republic. And during the debate in the Bundestag on June 30, 1960, the Social Democrats came out with the defeatist statement that "there is no longer any alternative to the foreign policy of the present government."

At the Hanover Congress in November 1960 the policy of capitulation and betrayal of the working class and of the national and democratic interests of the German people was carried to its logical conclusion, when the Right-wing Social Democratic leaders discarded all vestiges of an independent policy and openly aligned themselves with Adenauer on foreign policy and rearmament. The foreign policy resolution submitted by them in Hanover states that the determining factor in the present epoch is the conflict between East and West, and that in that conflict the SDPG unquestionably stands with the West. This was blatant support of imperialism against socialism. Brandt, mayor of West Berlin and the Social Democratic candidate for the Chancellorship, declared at that congress that the West German population must get used to "balancing on the edge of fear, to living in a state which is neither peace nor war . . ." This slogan is intended to prepare the working class psychologically for the atomic war which the West German militarists are bent on precipitating.

No wonder the influential pro-Adenauer *Die Zeit* (Hamburg) commenting on the Con-

gress was able to say: "The Hanover Congress, its proceedings and results, is the biggest success Adenauer has scored since the foundation of the Federal Republic." "One can hardly imagine anything more gratifying for a government party than to see after a long controversy its basic political theses endorsed by its political opponent."

The full measure of the Hanover betrayal can only be properly appreciated in the light of Bonn's revanchist yearnings and its efforts to heighten tension within Germany and on the world arena. West German militarism has set itself the aim of swallowing up the GDR and destroying the integrity of Poland and Czechoslovakia in order to revive the imperialist "new order" in Europe. And this is the program to which the Right-wing Social Democratic leaders have in effect lent their signature.

That is what happened in Hanover. The question that naturally suggests itself is: what occurred in the eighteen months between the SDPG plan on the German question and the Hanover Congress? Was there, perhaps, some radical change in the sentiment of the membership?

Quite the contrary. The plan on the German question met with the approval and stimulated the activity of the rank and file. They began at last to believe that the Party could counter the Adenauer policy with a program of its own. They did not want the plan to remain a scrap of paper.

It was at this time that N. S. Khrushchov addressed the All-German Workers' Conference in Leipzig and outlined his proposals for a peaceful settlement of the German question, which were enthusiastically received by the large gathering of labor functionaries from both German states, including members of the Socialist Unity Party, the Communist Party, the Social Democratic Party and the trade unions. Ollenhauer, the Chairman of the SDPG, called on Khrushchov during the latter's stay in Berlin, a gesture that was warmly approved by the Social Democratic workers. At about the same time the first official delegation of Social Democratic journalists paid a visit to the Soviet Union and came back with a report of Soviet policy and Soviet life which, though not too friendly in tone, was nevertheless not tainted by anti-communism.

Such were the developments in the Social Democratic Party following the adoption of the plan. For Adenauer and the militarist circles, and also for the ultra-Rights in the

SDPG leadership it was an alarming situation. "Now is the time to come down on them with the cudgel!" Adenauer had said shortly after the publication of the plan. By "them" he meant the Social Democratic rank and file. As for the cudgel it had long been held in readiness in the shape of the Brandt-Wehner-Erler-Deist group. This was the opportunity they had been waiting for, and they lost no time in making use of it. They started out, with the aid of the Bonn propaganda machine, the department for the protection of the Constitution and the Gehlen espionage organization, by jockeying the Party into a "wait-and-see" position and, by anti-communist baiting and demagoguery, pushing the Lefts into the background and taking over control of the Party apparatus. The final touch came in Hanover when the Party publicly abandoned its independent policy and surrendered all along the line.

"Adenauer's Trojan ass in the SDPG" the Brandt-Wehner group had been called, and events soon showed the description to be well deserved. Wehner, for instance, announced that the Party leadership had never really taken its opposition to Adenauer seriously. Moreover, he added, Adenauer ought to "be grateful to the SDPG leadership for such 'opposition'."

Why did the Brandt-Wehner group, which had endeavored for so long to conceal its hand (Wehner had even posed as a "left"), undertake this unsavory task? In the first place, of course, because it saw its positions alarmingly threatened by developments within the Party following the adoption of the plan on the German question. Another reason, apparently, was that the Right-wing Social Democrats, remembering what happened in 1933, do not want the imperialist foreign policy to be implemented without their participation. When Hitler laid his program before the Reichstag he asked the Social Democrats what their position was. Wels, on behalf of the Party, hastened to pledge Social Democratic support for Hitler's foreign policy only to be told: "Too late, gentlemen!" The Social Democrats were excluded from active policy-making at that time. Wels' successors do not want to be left out in the cold again. Hence the Brandt-Wehner slogan: "We are all one family," which echoes Kaiser Wilhelm's "I don't recognize parties, I only know Germans," and Hitler's talk about the common destiny of all Germans. The Brandt slogan, too, is designed not only to delude the workers. It is also addressed to Adenauer, and to the

monopolist-militarist clique that has seized power in Federal Germany. The Social Democratic leaders are in effect telling them: "There are actually no differences between us, none whatsoever in foreign policy, and in domestic policy only a few trifles worth mentioning."

Hanover was a distressing defeat for the working people of West Germany. This was the bitter truth, but it had to be faced, frankly and squarely. And this the Communists did. Analyzing the situation following the Congress, the German Communist Party declared that the leadership of the SDPG had been seized by a group of adventurers who fully supported imperialist reaction and were now seeking to subordinate the Party to the latter. The Communists also stressed that the struggle within the Social Democratic Party had not ended with the Congress. The outcome of that struggle will decide what role the Party will play in the life of the working class and the nation in the future.

2. Growing Opposition to the Rightists

In order properly to appraise the prospects for the Social Democratic Party one must understand how the ultra Rights were able to seize the leadership and impose the Hanover decisions on the Party.

One reason is that this group managed to delude the workers into believing that they were indebted to the Social Democratic leaders for the material gains which in point of fact accrued from the social and democratic achievements of the German Democratic Republic and derived also from the relative economic prosperity in West Germany.

But will this illusion last? Hardly. It is already clear that although the economic situation is still quite favorable, the increased emphasis on armaments, especially nuclear, is accompanied by encroachments on the rights and conditions of the workers. As for the successes of the GDR, they exert a dual influence — besides forcing the capitalists to make concessions, they show the workers the advantages of socialism.

Another important reason for the influence of the Rights is that, operating hand-in-glove with the political parties of big capital, they have managed to prevent the working class from fully realizing the role of German imperialism and militarism, past and present. A considerable section of the working class in West Germany has yet to learn the lessons of the collapse of the Weimar

Republic and of the two world wars unleashed by German imperialism. The only party in the country which succeeded in doing this is the Communist Party. But the arduous conditions in which it has had to work (especially after it was banned in 1956) and, above all, the policy pursued by the SDPG leadership have prevented these lessons from being brought home to the working class and the working people generally.

The Rights do not venture to deny this. In the May issue of the magazine *Geist und Tat*, organ of the SDPG, we find the following: "Fifteen or sixteen years ago we, Germans, were not allowed to settle final accounts with those who had led us to disaster. The so-called 'denazification' devised by the victor powers did not permit us to purge the national organism consistently and effectively at the right time."

In other words, to raise the question of the role and responsibility of the working class in the struggle for a democratic Germany, for an independent democratic and anti-fascist policy was "not allowed" earlier. And now, the Rights say, it is too late to do this, and hence the only thing is to take a realistic view, i.e., the view of the clerical-militarist state.

The danger of this approach is obvious. It explains why the working people in Federal Germany have been prevented from making a clean break with the past and seeing the present in the proper perspective — the true face of German imperialism, the danger of militarism and chauvinism, and their own responsibility for the future of Germany. The Right Social Democrats are vitally interested in preserving the present confusion in the workers' minds on these fundamental issues. For this is one of the chief sources of their influence.

A lingering nationalism, the failure clearly to perceive the changes that have taken place in the world and, consequently, a lack of faith in their own strength and in the possibility of fighting the monopolies — this is the major weakness of the working-class movement in West Germany today. This was the factor that made it possible for anti-communism to become a state ideology, and to deepen the rift in the working class.

This fact must be fully recognized. At the same time, however, it is important to realize that here too some significant changes are at work. The dangerous trend of developments in West Germany is causing more and more sections of the working class, and

especially the youth, to ask with increasing insistency: how has it come about that only fifteen years after the destruction of Hitlerism, Nazi generals and leaders like Globke, Heusinger and Speidel, the war economy chiefs and butchers of the "third Reich," are again in the saddle in Bonn?

There is no evading this question. It cannot be dodged or "explained away" on the grounds that the moment for settling accounts with the past was "missed."

A sober analysis of the situation indicates that the illusions on which the influence of the adventurist SDPG leaders rests, are gradually evaporating. The flagrant treachery, surrender to the monopolies and militarists perpetrated in Hanover will accelerate rather than retard the process.

Much of what has happened since Hanover bears this out. Take the Easter protest marches against atomic armament, for example. Some 30,000-40,000 people took part — members and functionaries of the Social Democratic Party and trade unions, together with Communists and non-party peace fighters representing the most diverse sections of the population. While this is not a very large number compared with the total population of West Germany, it is nevertheless impressive if one remembers that the marches were banned at all political levels — by the leadership of the SDPG and trade unions on pain of expulsion. This was the first time since 1945 that so many workers took part in a popular manifestation in defiance of their leaders. But the number of participants is less important than the fact that the marches touched off a lively debate on foreign policy and armaments in literally all the organizations of the Social Democratic Party, furnishing additional proof that the Hanover decisions by no means represented the opinion of the majority.

There are indications that processes of the utmost significance for the future of social democracy and the entire working-class movement in Federal Germany are at work in the trade unions. The Brandt-Wehner group fully realize how important it is for them to force the unions into submission, and a bitter struggle is being fought on this issue.

It is a well-known fact that the attitude of the reformist trade union leaders in Germany has as a rule been even more to the right than that of the Social Democratic leaders. Today the situation has begun to change. And not only because it would hard-

ly be possible to stand farther to the right than the latter. Within the unions, under working-class pressure, significant changes are taking place, changes which are exerting a tangible influence on the rank and file of the Social Democratic Party.

Although the Central Board of the West German trade unions is run by men whose politics are as reckless as those of the SDPG leaders, the bulk if not all of the big industrial unions (the metalworkers, woodworking industry, municipal and transport workers, and printers) are voicing open opposition to the defeatist course. This is understandable, for these unions consist mainly of workers whose day-to-day needs and problems bring home to them most forcibly that the policy of monopoly capital conflicts with their immediate interests as well as their desire for peace, democracy and social justice. Hence it is not surprising that the Social Democrats in the trade unions display a greater willingness to fight Adenauer's policy.

A situation is developing in which the defeatist policy of the SDPG leadership is in constant conflict with the views of the working masses, the rank-and-file members and many Party and union officials in the enterprises and in the unions. The workers and functionaries in the factories think and act differently from the Party chiefs. It is symptomatic that even those who endorsed the Hanover decisions at the Congress have taken a different stand in their factories and trade unions. At the congress of the Metalworkers' Union, the biggest industrial union in West Germany, the Social Democratic delegates (including those who had attended the Hanover Congress) joined the Communists and non-party workers in opposing the Hanover line. They pointed out that the class contradictions were sharpening, exploitation was increasing and that the Bonn state was a state of the monopolists and militarists. They proposed holding strikes against the emergency legislation, and called for a struggle against atomic weapons and for alienation of monopoly property. The SDPG slogan, "We are all one family," was conspicuously absent from all the May Day meetings held under trade union auspices this year, and nowhere could one hear any declarations of solidarity with Adenauer's policy. On the contrary, the workers — Social Democrats, Communists and non-party alike — denounced the intensified exploitation and demanded the extension of their social rights. One well-known Social Democratic union

leader, addressing an audience of 10,000 workers in Munich, exposed the Brandt-Wehner palaver about "Western freedom" in these words: "When we say 'freedom' this is not an empty word for us, and we do not mean the freedom to exploit and oppress or the freedom to grow rich at the expense of others. No, we mean the freedom of the workingman to rule his own destiny. We mean, and we mean it in earnest: freedom from want and poverty, freedom from fear and persecution, wars and destruction, from all exploitation and oppression!"

Heated debates, often involving matters of principle, flare up between many unions and the Rights in the Party leadership. At the time when Brandt & Co. agreed to negotiate with the government and collaborate on the question of the emergency law, Otto Brenner, chairman of the Metalworkers' Union, writing in the monthly magazine *Gewerkschaftliche Monatshefte* (No. 2, 1961), declared that this law was tantamount to militarizing the entire production process, and hence was unacceptable to the trade unions. Brenner described the emergency law as a return to the fascist labor legislation.

The same magazine, reflecting the sentiment of the workers, rejects the thesis that there is no alternative but to collaborate with monopoly capital, and demands socialization of the key branches of industry since economic contradictions have not been removed in West Germany; on the contrary, what is happening is the restoration of the former property and power relations.

The April issue of the *Gewerkschaftliche Monatshefte* also carried an article directed against the anti-communism of the Brandt-Wehner group. Federal Germany, it said, must learn "to overcome its fear psychosis with regard to the Soviet Union, for throughout the past decade that fear has disastrously paralyzed our political thinking, has resulted in foreign policy blunders and has hindered our correct orientation."

Faced with growing trade union opposition, the Rights in the SDPG, backed by such leaders of the Amalgamation of German Trade Unions as Richter and Leber, supported Adenauer's offensive against the unions which has been stepped up in connection with the projected emergency legislation — an essentially anti-union move. The Rights are trying to undermine the unions from within by enforcing organizational changes (viz. compulsory membership for all workers) calculated to turn them gradually into an

appendage to the government, and reduce them to the status of the ill-famed "labor front" of the Nazi days. On the other hand, the Brandt-Wehner group attempted to "purge" the unions of Communists, though judging by the recent elections to the production councils, the move has failed. It is clear, however, that the Rights in the Party will not abandon their efforts to force the unions to toe the line. The success of the process of revaluation and regrouping of forces which has set in in the labor movement and which can be decisive in the struggle against reaction and militarism, for peace and a democratic regime, will depend in great measure on the firmness with which the Brandt-Wehner group are rebuffed.

This process is undoubtedly gaining headway. It is expressed both in the stand taken by many unions and in the growing dissatisfaction of substantial numbers of rank-and-file Social Democrats with the leadership's policy and also in the tendency for greater cooperation between the Social Democrats and Communists in the factories.

The process would develop much faster if many Social Democrats did not cherish the illusion that the Hanover line is merely a maneuver which has as its objective the conquest of power. All the more reason, they claim, to avoid raising controversial issues on the eve of elections. After we have won, we can think about putting our own house in order.

This is faulty reasoning. The Hanover decisions were indeed a maneuver, a maneuver, however, designed not to defeat Adenauer and Strauss, but to break the resistance of the workers to Bonn's militarist and revanchist policies, to make the workers obedient tools in the hands of the former Nazi generals. Moreover, this tactic is not likely to ensure victory at the polls. On the contrary, as the entire experience of the sixteen postwar years has shown, the more the Social Democrats relinquish their independence by trailing behind the monopoly government, the weaker their influence on the political life of the country. You cannot beat your adversary by imitating him, you can but compromise yourself.

That many Social Democrats are beginning to realize this is indicated by the fact that a considerable number of them (including several Bundestag deputies) have decided to vote in the coming elections not for the Social Democratic Party but for the German Peace Alliance, an organization which has

attracted people from all sections of the population united by the desire for peace, disarmament and détente in Germany and all over the world. As for those who still deceive themselves with regard to the "tactical" nature of the Hanover betrayal, they will undoubtedly be brought to their senses by the results of the elections in September.

Evidence of the growing opposition to the Brandt-Wehner group is that the numbers expelled from the Party for their Left views, and of those who have left it of their own volition, are growing. The latter recently published a joint manifesto pledging their resolve to carry on the fight against atomic weapons, conscription and NATO, declaring their support for the SDPG plan on the German question, and demanding the restoration of democracy within the Party.

It should be said, however, that the Lefts are evincing sectarian tendencies and are in too great a hurry to form a new party. The Communists have warned them against taking this step, pointing out that in the present situation they would, by forming their own party, only isolate themselves from the rank-and-file Social Democrats. The sectarianism displayed by some of the left Social Democrats is expressed in the tendency to stand aloof from the day-to-day struggle of the unions and to refuse to cooperate with the peace forces among the bourgeois sections of the population — an attitude which is harmful to the working-class cause.

3. The Communists in the Struggle for United Working Class Action

The answer to the question contained in the title of this article — whither the Social Democratic Party of Germany — can be found in the course of the struggle itself. On the one hand, we find in the party substantial forces fighting for peace, democracy and progress, for the interests of the working people, and these forces will become more active as time goes on. On the other hand, the monopolies, the government that serves them and the imperialist powers are increasing their pressure on the Rightwing Social Democratic leaders who are impelling their own Party toward total loss of independence. The struggle between the two trends will decide the future of social democracy.

What is the likely outcome of that struggle? The Communist Party of Germany believes that in the present situation, determined by the successes and the growing

might of the socialist countries, the consolidation of socialism in the GDR and the struggle for peace and democracy which is gaining momentum all over the world, the healthy forces of German social democracy can win. This, of course, will require hard work and a stubborn fight, the rallying of the forces of the entire working-class movement in Federal Germany.

The Communists do not interfere in the internal affairs of the Social Democrats. But the struggle of the working class and all working people against the monopolies and militarists, against their men in the government party and in the SDPG, is not an internal party matter, it affects the vital interests of the entire working-class movement, of all Germans. The Communists, naturally, cannot stand aside from this struggle.

Despite the exceptional difficulties of its position, despite the persecution, the Communist Party is playing a big role in the working-class movement of Germany. To understand the developments within the working class at the present time due account must be taken of the painstaking work carried out by the Communists over the years; the Communists realize that the course of the political processes which will determine the future of social democracy depends in large measure on their work.

What, briefly, is the attitude of the Communists with regard to the Social Democratic Party of Germany?

The Rights' assertions notwithstanding, the Communist Party is least of all interested in seeing the Social Democratic Party decline. The Communist attitude derives from the general interests of the working class and all the working people of the country. The Communists have no desire to gloat over the decline of social democracy or to adopt a "we-told-you-so" attitude, however justified they might be in doing so. The Communists, who stand for the interests of all working people, would much prefer to see a vigorous social democracy, with an independent policy and playing a much bigger role in the political life of the country. The Communists regard the struggle for an independent anti-Adenauer policy for the SDPG as an important part of the struggle for united working-class action.

They believe that a differentiated approach to the Social Democrats is essential for elaborating a correct line.

After a careful study of the situation, the Communist Party has come to the conclusion that it is imperative to declare before the whole working class that the SDPG leadership at the present time has been seized by a group of adventurers. Hence in defining their attitude to the Social Democratic Party, the Communists cannot support that Party as a whole, even from the standpoint of choosing the lesser of two evils. The adventurers who have seized the leadership are not the lesser evil. They are men who made a compact with the revanchists and militarists and who are actively supporting the NATO policy and the atomic armament of West Germany. Without isolating them inside the working class and in the international labor movement it will be impossible to undermine the power of the monopolies, curb militarism and win the democratic and peace demands of the working people in West Germany. The policy of the Brandt-Wehner group, its joint action with the revanchist leaders of the soldiers' leagues and diverse landsmannschaft associations, cannot be described simply as reformism, even of the extreme right. Brandt, Wehner, Erler, Deist, the men who hold the reins in the Social Democratic Party, have openly sided with the imperialist bourgeoisie. They are not reformists, nor even bourgeois liberals; they are political adventurers who are doing their best to save capitalism and imperialism. At the helm of the SDPG, they are weakening and wrecking the Party, turning it gradually into a wretched appendage of the monopolist Christian Democratic Party.

The only line the working class can take with regard to these men is that of relentless struggle. This is the only course for anyone who really wishes to combat Adenauer, the monopolies and the militarists.

A different attitude, the Communists hold, should be taken towards the reformists in the Social Democratic Party, notwithstanding our ideological differences. There is a solid class basis for this conclusion. The contradiction between the policy of German imperialism and the vital interests of the German people is irreconcilable. Inasmuch as the Rights are in league with imperialism, this contradiction makes itself strongly felt within the Social Democratic Party as well. In addition to the Lefts, many traditional reformists are in disagreement with Brandt and Wehner, and are coming out more and more openly against their policy. There are quite a few of these reformists in the ranks

of the SDPG and in the trade unions, some of them in leading posts. They want to defend the interests of the workers by participating in strikes and in mass movements, in the fight for peace. We, Communists, are with them *in this*, although that by no means implies that we cease to criticize reformism. On the contrary, to develop the class consciousness of the workers, to point the way to socialism, and to propagate the principles of the Marxist-Leninist outlook are all decisive factors in the struggle against the adventurers in the SDPG and in the fight for the unity of all the forces of the working class.

Of course, not all reformists can be measured by the same yardstick. There are some, including well-known trade union officials, who give no thought to and have no conception of the road to socialism and who vacillate during militant actions of the workers, for the simple reason that they have no desire to see the capitalist system seriously shaken. But even these reformists cannot be placed in the same category as Brandt, Wehner and Co.

Officials fighting for the social and democratic rights of the workers, at the present stage of the class struggle in West Germany, come into conflict with the policy of armament and the restriction of democratic rights. And the greater the pressure the masses exert on these officials, or in other words, the more effective and united the working-class action in the factories and in the trade unions, the sharper this contradiction becomes.

Hence, in the struggle for united action, the vanguard of the German working-class movement still has substantial, little-utilized reserves to draw on. The old standards cannot be applied when it comes to pursuing a policy of unity. Today it is essential to see that there is a new situation, a situation in which many Social Democrats are looking for a different road. It is essential to support all the forces rising against Bonn's anti-national, anti-labor and reactionary policy. This requires of the Communists that they eradicate dogmatism and sectarianism, take full cognizance of the new situation and learn to work patiently and in comradely fashion even with people who

do not share their ideology. This is the attitude which the Communist Party today demands of all its members and all its organizations.

The Communists stand solidly for cooperation with the mass of their fellow-workers in the SDPG. The focal points of this cooperation are the factories and the trade unions. In the course of the political and economic struggle the Communists, even though their Party is forced to work underground, find methods of work that enable them to take ever more vigorous action in defense of the workers' interests.

In their day-to-day struggle the workers are shedding many of the illusions fostered during the postwar boom. The regrouping of the forces of the working-class movement is, of course, not a smooth or easy process. However, there is ample evidence that in West Germany, too, the working people are accumulating experience in the course of their struggles. Many Social Democrats with whom the Communists had no dealings whatever in the past are now changing their views and are beginning to realize that they too are responsible to history and that, hence, the Brandt-Wehner group must be isolated. The Social Democrats will be an independent force only when they advance their own alternative to German militarism, when they form a solid united front of action together with the Communists, non-party and Christian workers and all trade unionists. It is toward this united front that the efforts of the Communists are now directed.

The policy of the Communist Party of Germany is founded on the firm conviction that notwithstanding ideological differences, the Social Democrats and the Communists are destined to fight together against militarism and the war danger, for democracy and socialism. The existence of a peaceful German Democratic Republic, its achievements in building socialism, the farsightedness and consistency of the policy pursued by the Socialist Unity Party in establishing fraternal relations between the workers and their organizations in the GDR and Federal Germany are facilitating to a large extent the process of revaluation and regrouping of forces in the working-class movement of West Germany.

Is There a Danger of Overpopulation?

FOR more than a century and a half reactionary ideologists have been invoking the quasi-scientific theory of Malthus, which attributes all social ills to excessive population growth, as a convenient justification for war, unemployment and poverty.

In recent times the capitalist press has again broken out in a rash of headlines like "Soon — Standing Room Only," "Population Growth Is the Cancer of Our Planet" and "Birth Control Is More Important Than H-Bomb Control." There is nothing surprising in this, for each time the contradictions of capitalist society come to a head the threadbare Malthusian theory is trotted out in order to divert the indignation of the working people of the imperialist countries and the peoples oppressed by imperialism from the real cause of hunger and poverty—capitalism, which even in the present age of scientific accomplishment is incapable of guaranteeing a decent life for the working man.

The attempts to exhume the Malthusian doctrine from the grave to which it was consigned long ago by Marxist-Leninist science can be regarded as a tacit admission by the reactionaries of their theoretical poverty and their inability to produce a single weighty argument against socialism.

Not only Marxists but all progressives and unbiased scholars condemn the preaching of Malthusianism and, drawing on the facts, expose it as a wholly unsubstantiated apology of reaction that has nothing in common with science.

The discussion recorded on these pages never actually took place. Yet none of the views are invented. Culled from books, articles and press interviews, they are a *faithful* exposition of the opinions of the scientists to whom they are credited. I have merely taken the liberty of marshalling them in a logical sequence and adding some comments of my own.

E. ARAB-OGLY

THE PARTICIPANTS*

Charles Galton Darwin, grandson of the famous natural scientist, Professor of Physics (*U.S. News and World Report*, November 23, 1959; *Toronto Daily Star*, December 22, 1959).

* * *

Josué de Castro, President, World Association Against Hunger; former Chairman of the Council (1952-1955), Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations; author of *The Geography of Hunger*; International Peace Prize, 1955 (*Le Livre noir de la Faim*, Paris, 1961).

* * *

Colin Clark, British economist, Professor, Oxford University (*Fortune*, December 1960).

* * *

Alfred Sauvy, French demographer and sociologist, Director, National Institute of

Demographic Research (*De Malthus à Mao Tsé-Toung*, Paris, 1958; *Théorie générale de la population*, Vol. 2, Paris, 1954; *Voprosy filosofii*, No. 6, 1957).

* * *

S. G. Strumilin, Soviet economist and statistician, Member, USSR Academy of Sciences (*New Times*, No. 7, 1961).

* * *

Jean Fréville, French Marxist writer and sociologist (*L'Epouvantail malthusien*, Paris, 1956).

* * *

Julian Huxley, British biologist, former Director-General (1946-1948), UNESCO (*New Statesman*, March 21, 1959; *Toronto Daily Star*, December 22, 1959).

*The sources of the quotations given on these pages are indicated in parentheses.

COMMENTATOR: It will hardly be an exaggeration to say that the problem of feeding the growing population of the world is one of the urgent issues of our time. Indeed, the attention of world public opinion has been drawn to this question by the continued controversy between the Malthusians, who prophesy poverty, hunger and war, unless man ceases to multiply, and their opponents, who, in the light of scientific and social progress, take an optimistic view of the future. It is highly indicative that more Malthusian and anti-Malthusian writings have been published throughout the world in the past fifteen years than during the preceding century and a half since the appearance of Malthus' *Essay on the Principle of Population* in 1798. Recently, according to press reports, 150 scientists from 19 countries asked the United Nations to include the population problem in the agenda of the General Assembly.

To examine the reasons for this flood of printed matter on the subject is obviously very much to the point. Is humanity really faced with the threat of overpopulation? Let us see what some recognized authorities have to say on the question.

S. G. STRUMILIN: The question indeed calls for a serious answer.

CHARLES GALTON DARWIN: I would say there's a great deal of indifference to the problem. I would say a good many experts face it but don't know what to do about it, and so turn away to other things, you see.

JOSUE DE CASTRO: Hunger plays a sinister role in the political and economic chaos of our time. This is something sociologists must at last recognize. Hitherto they have been concerned mainly with the indignation of the hungry at the relative prosperity of the well-fed and with the desperate fear of this indignation on the part of the latter. The world-wide poverty has divided humanity in two groups—those who have nothing to eat, and those who cannot sleep. The former, inhabiting the poorer countries, believe that their plight is aggravated by the economic oppression on the part of the great industrial powers. And in the richer areas of the world people cannot sleep because they are haunted by fear of the revolt of the poverty-stricken, and also because their conscience gives them no peace.

ALFRED SAUVY: I agree with my generous colleague as regards those who do not

eat, but have to differ with him as regards those who cannot sleep. No, M. de Castro, the burden of their conscience does not deprive them of peace of mind. They sleep, and sleep peacefully, if I may say so.

COMMENTATOR: Could you, perhaps, elucidate your point?

SAUVY: In order to make my meaning clearer, let me give you an imaginary example (but is it purely imaginary, after all?).

An American businessman comes home looking glum. His wife asks him if he is ill. "No, I'm all right." "Business worries?" "No, business is fine. It's something much worse. This morning I read an article by a famous scientist who says we'll all starve to death soon." The businessman cited some discouraging figures. Then, sitting down to a table laden with nutritious, if not dainty, dishes, the couple listen to an announcement over the radio that Congress has approved new allocations for curtailing farm production and disposing of food surpluses.

COMMENTATOR: This symbolic example epitomizes one of the paradoxes of an economic system which, while choked with so-called "surplus" food, dooms millions to malnutrition and poverty. But how can it be otherwise when profit is the only goal? For under these circumstances the volume of food production is determined, as Engels aptly put it, not by the number of hungry stomachs but by the number of purses able to pay.

JEAN FREVILLE: It seems to me that the time has come to examine the problem as a whole, to investigate the case of the neo-Malthusians, to put the evidence before the public and reveal the class interests behind their pseudo-scientific front.

What Will the World's Population Be in the Year 2000?

COMMENTATOR: I believe we can definitely accept two facts, for nobody has challenged them: that, as the data of the Food and Agricultural Organization indicate, roughly two-thirds of the world's population either suffer from chronic malnutrition or are literally starving, and that the overall population is rapidly growing. But suppose for a moment that hunger is to be banished from the world, will the growing population be ensured an abundance of the means of subsistence? In other words, can production increase faster than the population?

DARWIN: It can't! It can't!

JULIAN HUXLEY: You see, this is one of those awful things. When I first got interested in this, I was shocked to find that the rate of increase was some 76,000 a day. Then I had to write something about it a few years later and looked into the statistics and it was 91,000 a day. Now it's almost 140,000!

DARWIN: That's the net gain every twenty-four hours.

HUXLEY: Since we've been in this room, it has increased about 6,000 or 7,000. Unless we control it we will become, quite literally, the cancer of the whole planet.

SAUVY: What do these figures prove? Nothing. True, they are impressive, but they have no statistical value at all because they do not show the connection between two phenomena. Series of figures per hour, per diem, etc., have the effect of suggestion through repetition and impress one rather than inform. Here's another example: "An 80-centimeter layer of fertile soil has to feed more than 2,000 million people." These two figures are utterly incompatible because there is no indication of the area of this fertile layer. But the contrast between a big figure

and a modest one has the desired suggestive effect.

On the other hand, the anti-Malthusians pose the problem of Lake Constance: to what extent would its water level rise if the outlets were closed and humanity immersed in it? The answer, approximately 15 centimeters, impresses by the smallness of the figure. And since Lake Constance occupies an insignificant part of the earth's surface, the conclusion suggested would make it appear that the world still has an enormous amount of space for man. Any abuse of simplification has the effect of hypnotic suggestion.

COMMENTATOR: Since we have no intention of drowning mankind in Lake Constance merely to prove that the Malthusians are wrong, I suggest that in order to make our debate fruitful we should switch over from abstractions to facts. For example, is it possible to predict what the population of the world will be in, say, the year 2000?

DARWIN: 5,000 million.

SAUVY: The United Nations has made estimates of the global population up to the year 2000, based on three hypothetical birth rates. The picture is essentially the following:

Population, in millions				
		2000		
	1955	high birth rate	average birth rate	low birth rate
Africa	216	663	517	420
North America	182	326	312	274
Central America	58	219	198	147
South America	125	432	394	298
Asia (exclusive of the U.S.S.R.)	1,490	4,250	3,870	2,890
Europe (exclusive of the U.S.S.R.)	409	592	568	491
U.S.S.R.	197	395	379	333
Oceania	15	30	29	27
Total	2,692	6,907	6,267	4,880

COMMENTATOR: The world population thus promises to increase in the next forty years from 3,000 million to 5,000-7,000 million. On this score we may say there is unanimity.

It would, therefore, be useful to discuss how these 5,000-7,000 million are to be fed four decades from now.

CANNIBALISTIC CONFIDENCES

(No Comment Needed)

"Cannibalism has been an adjuster of the food supply to the population and of the population to the food supply. It is the only adjuster that has this double distinction. Furthermore, it tends to upgrade the diet. Historically it cannot be overlooked, but currently it cannot be discussed in polite society. This is a case where a social gain has been achieved at the expense of a nutritional loss."

Frank A. Pearson and Don Paarlberg, U.S. sociologists (Quotation from: Jacob Oser, *Must Men Starve?* New York, 1956).

* * *

"Vegetarianism is only a temporary solution to the world problem of nutrition. With the population of the globe continuing to grow, it is likely that the only alternative is cannibalism, which, apart from everything else,

possesses the virtue of solving the problem in two ways, providing, on the one hand, a new source of food, and, on the other, reducing the population of the Earth."

V. A. Sibly, President, British Vegetarian Society (Quotation retranslated from Oggi, June 5, 1952).

* * *

"I hold very strongly that there are too many people in this country already, and that this growth in the birth rate is nothing but a calamity. I know it is very inflammatory, but I think Herod was one of the great characters in history. He got rid of the babies. There are too many babies in this area, especially on Merseyside."

Thomas Barlow, Barlow and Jones (*The Times*, June 27, 1959).

Can the Earth Feed Its Population?

DARWIN: I said in a paper I read at Brown University recently that there is some evidence that they can keep going for 50 years, that we can make the ground yield twice as much as we do now. But we can't make it yield four times as much as we do now. But, mind you, more than half the world is starving now, I mean, undernourished now, so that it isn't so glorious, even that.

COMMENTATOR: In other words, you believe that instead of 2,000 million there will be 4,000 million hungry people in the year 2,000. I would say that is a rather gloomy prospect.

HUXLEY: If we do nothing to bring down the rate of increase, our grandchildren will live in a world of increasing misery and frustration.

COMMENTATOR: Yet I have found data in various authoritative sources indicating that even with the present agricultural techniques, the earth can feed considerably more people than our estimates for the year 2000. The British geographer L. Dudley Stamp mentions a figure of 10,000 million, and the German demographer F. Burgdorfer, from 6,200 million to 16,000 million.

FREVILLE: The expanding productive forces will steadily raise the limits of overpopulation.

COLIN CLARK: The really cardinal error of the Malthusians and neo-Malthusians arises from their practice of talking about the "capacity of countries to support population" as if it were fixed. It is, in fact, highly variable. Some five centuries ago the population inhabiting the land that now constitutes the U.S. and Canada was approaching one million, which gave them an average of seven and a half square miles of land per head, and it was not enough.

COMMENTATOR: If the Indian tribes of that time had had their own native Malthusians, these, too, probably would have claimed that population had reached its limits. It is a pity that no prognostications of the kind have come down to us.

SAUVY: There was another prophecy. It was made, I would like to stress, by a progressive author and no diehard conservative. I am referring to the Abbé Raynal, who said after visiting North America on the eve of the revolution: "It will be good if ten million people will some day make a secure livelihood in these provinces."

COMMENTATOR: And now the population is approaching 200 million! And according to estimates by Professor J. Spengler, they can feed 600 million. This is an object lesson for all forecasters!

CLARK: The earliest livestock farmers, much less demanding of land than the hunters, nevertheless required several hundred acres to feed each person. An African crop farmer now requires only a few acres to feed each person. Today the best agriculturists in Europe, the Dutch, produce a very good and varied diet on the equivalent of two-thirds of an acre of land per person. If all the land suitable for agriculture throughout the world were cultivated in this manner, assuming at the same time that the whole world eats as well as the most prosperous countries do now, provision could be made for twenty-eight billion people, or ten times the world's 1960 population.

COMMENTATOR: But isn't Holland an exception?

CLARK: If we took Japanese instead of Dutch standards of cultivation and of diet—after all, the Japanese are quite a healthy people—the world could provide for three or four times as many again. And even these standards are being constantly improved as the application of science to agriculture continues. The work now going on in agricultural laboratories shows that a man's food for the year could be grown on twenty-five square meters of land, if we really needed to do it.

DE CASTRO: Now that agricultural research has revealed a vast unused potential

in the land and we have the technical facilities for promoting agriculture not only in the desert and semi-desert zones but in the Arctic as well, the dilemma posed by the Malthusians is simply ridiculous.

COMMENTATOR: But what about the exhaustion of mineral resources? Will man come up against this problem as Charles Galton Darwin has predicted in his book *The Next Million Years*?

CLARK: Nor should people who would like to be considered well informed continue to express anxiety about the world's mineral resources. Sources of iron and aluminum are virtually limitless. Sellers of many metals are already worried by the ingenuity of engineers in devising substitutes.

DARWIN: I've been rather pessimistic about it, and I've been persuaded I was too pessimistic about it, and that there are possibilities of finding a good many substitutes. Some of my friends who know about that more than I do say that, if you can once start knocking down granite mountains, there is enough radioactivity in them and enough of other metals to last almost forever.

CLARK: So any anxieties about exhausting the resources of the world may be deferred for several centuries, however fast population increases. If world population really does go on increasing fast, our descendants, after some centuries, will have developed a level of wealth, technical skill, and complexity of industrial organization far beyond our understanding.

A MARXIST SOCIOLOGIST REFUTES MALTHUS

In the light of the constant stream of Malthusian propaganda in the reactionary press and the consequent need for Marxist works exposing it, A. Y. Popov's *Contemporary Malthusianism* (Moscow, 1960) is exceedingly timely.

Tracing the record of Malthusianism, the author draws on the wealth of theoretical arguments against this reactionary doctrine contained in the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin. The facts cited by Popov show that history has refuted Malthus' prophecies of gloom and has confirmed the Marxist-Leninist theory of social development.

Basing himself on the researches of eminent experts (J. Bernal, J. Boyd-Orr, H. Brown, V. R. Williams, K. A. Timiryazev, W. Hollitscher, and others) and generalizing the devel-

opment of the socialist mode of production, Popov demolishes the myth of overpopulation, exhaustion of natural resources, diminishing returns, and other Malthusian inventions. The book leaves no doubt that the Malthusian theory, far from being a scientific economic theory, has always served as a reactionary propaganda device designed to misrepresent the true state of affairs and divert the working people from class struggle in defense of their interests.

The author arrives at the conclusion that world production of the means of subsistence can increase at a rate many times greater than the population, and shows that while the capitalist system clearly cannot deliver the working people from poverty and hunger, socialism brings well-being and abundance.

A Non-Existent Dilemma

SAUVY: Soil cultivation as practised in Holland is not so much a matter of machines as of the agronomical and other knowledge of the farmers. Therefore, we have to begin with the youth, teach them to read, find teachers for them, and instruct them in farming methods. This obviously must be done, though it may take a generation or two, and in the meantime the population will grow, as will the returns from the soil in Holland.

COMMENTATOR: If I have understood you correctly, you do not question Professor Clark's calculations but wish to emphasize that the achievement of abundance is associated with serious economic and social difficulties. But these difficulties can be overcome.

SAUVY: Each country should be examined separately. How can an economically backward country ensure a faster increase of production than of population? How can it stimulate the former and not the latter? That is the economic problem.

COMMENTATOR: The experience of the socialist countries leaves no doubt that this problem, too, can be fully solved.

SAUVY: Two types of investments are needed to provide for a growing population: *economic investments* to raise productivity and improve living standards, and *demograph-*

ic investments to ensure the additional means of subsistence and cultural facilities required (schools, factories, new farmlands, hospitals). In practice these two types of investment are often not distinguished from one another, but a demarcation line can be drawn between them.

COMMENTATOR: How big would be the demographic investments?

SAUVY: Economists assume that an annual population growth of 1 per cent requires the investment of roughly 4 per cent of the national income (from 3 to 5 per cent). Accordingly, a 3 per cent annual increase in population would take about 12 per cent of the national income. In other words, a nation growing at this rate and increasing its national income by only 12 per cent could not improve its living standard and cultural level.

COMMENTATOR: But a 3 per cent annual increase in population is comparatively rare. As for investments, they could be 20 or even 25 per cent of the national income, as the experience of the socialist countries shows.

SAUVY: I shall give below the results of an unpublished estimate showing how the national income of a country where population is increasing by 2.5 per cent annually could be distributed, assuming the living standard remains stationary and assuming it rises at an annual rate of 2 per cent.

The magnitudes here are of course purely relative. The first column relates to "propa-

	Stationary living standard	Living standard improving 2% per annum
Consumption by children:		
a) with the population remaining unchanged	7.5	6.8
b) with the population increasing by 2.5 per cent	7.5	6.8
Consumption by the remainder of the non-working population (the aged, etc.)	11.0	10.0
Consumption by the gainfully employed population	64.0	58.4
Demographic investments	10.0	10.0
Economic investments	—	8.0
	100.0	100.0

gation in poverty." There is no genuine "solution" here, and yet the figures indicate that more than one-third of the product of the labor force goes for the maintenance of the children and other non-productive sections of the population as well as for demographic investments. In the second instance, assuming again that there is no aid from without, it

would be *necessary to economize on poverty itself*. To find the 8 per cent for economic investment, consumption would have to be curtailed by one-tenth. In order to make life better tomorrow inroads have to be made on what we have today.

HUXLEY: I was in Delhi this spring (1959) and one of the papers we were discussing

was by two American economists, Cole and Hoover, who had been called in to advise about industrialization. The point is that industrialization doesn't happen by itself. You've got to have a lot of capital investment and a lot of investment of energy and skill, and so on. And with every million extra people who are born, some of this capital and skill goes into feeding, housing and educating these people. These two economists, after going into the question very carefully, concluded that, unless India cuts its birth rate by around 50 per cent within about 35 years, they will never be able to industrialize.

COMMENTATOR: That is obviously a hasty conclusion. It seems to me that the 8 per cent of the national income stipulated in Professor Sauvy's hypothesis can be found in other ways. For example, by curtailing non-productive, parasitic consumption by the ruling class. Incidentally, Professor Sauvy, how big a percentage of the national income does such consumption swallow according to your estimates?

SAUVY: Eight per cent.

COMMENTATOR: In other words, at least as much as is required to improve the living standard of the population by two per cent annually, or more than double it in the lifetime of one generation. And that, too, is not the limit. Economic investments can be increased and, consequently, the living standard raised by channelling for this purpose the funds now spent on armaments, as well as by organizing the economy rationally. Lastly, the industrial powers should help the economically lagging areas of the world simply out of human solidarity.

HUXLEY: No, no. Cole and Hoover make it quite clear that if the population goes on increasing as fast as it is now, far from the money being sent to India helping them to industrialize, you get to the point of no return. One of the conditions would have to be that they would have a program, which India does, which Japan does, to reduce the rapidity of increase.

DARWIN: Yes, and that some of the aid would be given in the form of technical assistance, in the form of free contraceptives or expert advice and so on. I don't think it's compulsion.

CLARK: There is no need for pessimism. If the Indian rice grower obtained the same yield per acre as the Japanese, he could feed nearly four times as many people as he does now.

SAUVY: To limit aid to the underdeve-

loped countries to military subsidies and Malthusian advice is tragically puerile.

FREVILLE: The salvation of the Indian people lies in the ending of the feudal system, abolition of castes, division of the land, the socialist revolution, industrialization, and rapid increase of production.

COMMENTATOR: Hunger in India is primarily the legacy of colonialism.

CLARK: No political leader, however powerful, no economist, no matter how astute he might consider himself, has the right to interfere in questions connected with the birth rate. No right whatsoever! These questions should be solved in an entirely different way. It is the parents who have the right to demand of the prime ministers and economists that they organize the world so that children will have enough to eat.

COMMENTATOR: As I see it, it is imperative to draw a clear dividing line between Malthusianism and individual family planning. None of the participants in the discussion will, I think, object to parents drawing on medical science and planning their families as they wish. The state, in turn, is entitled to influence these individual wishes and pursue a population policy that would bring them into accord with the interests of society as a whole. But this has nothing in common with Malthusianism, which, apart from offering nothing but an illusory solution to social problems, is designed to divert attention from the only real solution, through development of the economy and reconstruction of society.

SAUVY: Intense economic effort presupposes a veritable social revolution within a country so that non-essential consumption should be replaced by large investments in money, materials and people — by intensive investment in improvement of the land and education of the people.

COMMENTATOR: I must admit that I cannot visualize any of this being done in a capitalist society, where the supreme incentive is not the good of the people but profit.

SAUVY: The underdeveloped countries are not obliged to repeat the mistakes of the capitalist countries. If the latter are unable to comprehend their own system, which perhaps has become too subtle, they should not be surprised to see others evince a marked preference for planning, a system outwardly more simple and more understandable in principle.

FREVILLE: I am convinced that what must be defended is not capitalism from the population, but the population from capitalism.

PRODUCTION CAN INCREASE FASTER THAN THE POPULATION!

	1953	1960	Increase in per cent
USSR			
Population (millions)	190	216	14
Power production (thousands of millions of kwh.)	134	292	118
Steel production (millions of tons)	38.1	65.3	71
Urban housing construction (millions of sq. m.)	29	85	193
Cultivated area (millions of hectares)	157.2	203	28
Gross grain harvest (thousands of millions of poods)	5	8.1	61
Milk production (millions of tons)	36.5	61.5	69
Meat production (millions of tons)	5.8	8.7	50

Every child born in the socialist society is regarded not as an "extra mouth to feed," but as a future worker who will be able in time to add to the well-being of society. "The more people we have, the stronger our country will be. Bourgeois ideologists have invented many cannibalistic theories, including the theory of overpopulation. They are considering how to cut the birth rate, to reduce the growth of population. In our country, comrades, things are different. Add another hundred million or so to our 200 million and even that would not be too much!" (N. S. Khrushchov).

Is the Growth of the Population a Boon?

COMMENTATOR: I think that we can already draw some conclusions from our exchange of views. *Firstly*, that man has sufficient natural, scientific and technological resources to be able to look confidently to the future for centuries without fear of overpopulation. *Secondly*, that the problems of providing an adequate food supply for the population of the economically backward countries can be solved through economic development, provided fundamental social reforms are effected. But, as is obvious to all, population growth is not an end in itself either for society or for its individual members. Far more important is whether it will promote social progress and the happiness of people.

HUXLEY: People just don't realize that babies born in this present year will, when the time comes for them to vote at the age of twenty-one, have one billion more people to vote about. Its absolutely appalling.

DARWIN: I fear, and it's a very great fear, that this country will begin to lose its liberty when the population gets big. But our liberties are already going. The liberty, simply, to

park your car. And the liberty to have a nice open space to go to.

HUXLEY: Surely if the freedom to have children is removed, all our liberties will go. I see no escape from it myself.

COMMENTATOR: I must confess I fail to understand you. An increase in the number of voters can terrify only those who seek to deceive them and plan to buy their votes. The less freedom there is for this type of person the greater the freedom of the masses.

If we examine the question from the standpoint of economic effect, we shall see that absolute growth of population and its increasing density are, as a rule, accompanied by more efficient division of labor and a relative reduction in per capita payments on the national debt as well as expenditure on maintaining the transport system, waterworks, cultural and administrative institutions, etc. It goes without saying, of course, that under capitalism growth of population, since the system cannot ensure adequate means of subsistence of all, is bound to bring about social changes which will sweep away such freedoms as the freedom to counterpose one's personal interests to the interests of society, the free-

dom of private enterprise, freedom to exploit others, etc. But I do not see why anyone should lament the passing of such "freedoms."

CLARK: Progress, toward a more productive economy, toward better and freer political forms, toward better education, science and culture, does not come easily or automatically. The forces opposing progress toward these desirable ends are always formidable. There are many examples to show that population growth provides a beneficial stimulus, often indeed is the only stimulus powerful enough to shake men out of their established ways and customs, and make them seek something better. This relationship between growth of population and progress holds true not only in the realm of fact, but also in the realm of ideas.

COMMENTATOR: It strikes me that what you say about population pressure holds true mainly in a sporadically developing society and loses its significance as soon as social development assumes a conscious and planned character.

CLARK: The country that did listen to Malthus, and began limiting its population in the early nineteenth century, was not Britain but France. As to its economic effects, Professor Sauvy made to the World Population Conference in 1954 a quite unanswerable statement about his country: if population limitation were the key to economic progress, he said, France should be the wealthiest country in the world by now.

SAUVY: Terminating growth of population has never resulted in the anticipated prosperity. The results have always been discouraging.

FREVILLE: Depopulated countries, like ancient Greece and Spain in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, have always fallen into decline and ruin. Holland, on the contrary, has benefited by density of population.

CLARK: The first people in Europe to feel the pressure of population upon a limited area of land were the Dutch, in the sixteenth century. This spurred them on to the astonishing achievements of fighting a successful war against Spain, the greatest power of that time, becoming the world's greatest maritime, commercial, and colonizing power, ranging the world to found New York, Cape Town, and Djakarta, importing most of their food supplies from the proceeds of their shipping

and commerce. In the same period they also produced some of the world's greatest art.

COMMENTATOR: The population, or, to be more precise, the working people, possessing definite knowledge and skills, plus the instruments of production, add up to the productive forces of a society. And in the long run it is the development of the latter that determines social progress. When this development comes up against barriers in the shape of moribund social relations, it sweeps them away through revolution. This happened in Holland too.

CLARK: Population limitation, therefore, whether or not it is good morals, is bad economics and bad politics. Those peoples, on the other hand, who courageously and intelligently face the challenge of population increase, will be rewarded by economic, political, and cultural progress to an extent beyond any limits that we can now foresee.

HUXLEY: I couldn't agree with you more. But you've got to face the appalling difficulties, that if you don't kill off the inefficient, the race will degenerate.

COMMENTATOR: We are, I think, diverging from the subject. But since such ideas are widespread, I should like to take the liberty of dispelling some unfounded fears. Recently Professor K. Sax, addressing a conference at the University of Minnesota, claimed that 10 per cent of the population of Europe was genetically subnormal, that the percentage is steadily increasing, and that this is reflected in the increase of mental disorders. I have made some calculations with a bearing on this which might be of interest. Assume for a moment that 10 per cent of the population of a hypothetical country really is hereditarily substandard, 20 per cent mixed, and 70 per cent of good stock, and that the birth rate in the first group is double that of the others. But, according to the laws of genetics, and taking into account the average statistical probability of mixed marriages, the proportion of the first two groups to the whole is bound to decline from generation to generation and the population increase will be accounted for by the third group. Consequently, the increase in the incidence of mental ailments will be due not to biological factors, but to social conditions. Instead of lamenting the elimination of natural selection, social relations which are inimical to man and cause mental and other social diseases must be abolished.

WHY ARE THEY HUNGRY?

"Hard luck with stock and crops is one thing. Farmers know they have to face that, even with the most careful and scientific methods of working their places. But the thing that kills is the realization that good crops are worthless and that, now, crops and ordinary hard luck simply do not matter compared to the major tragedy of famine in the face of plenty.

"In that time (four years), off of the 180-acre farm which I had rented I have raised and marketed 1,520 tons of sugar beets. That would make 456,000 pounds of sugar. That is enough sugar to last four thousand people one year. Yet my family has been out of sugar for three days, and nothing to buy any with.

"I have fed and marketed 430 head of fat cattle. The meat that I put on those cattle would amount to 135,000 pounds of beef. That

is enough beef to last 2,076 people one year. And I haven't a bit of meat in the house, and nothing to buy any with.

"I have raised and marketed 1,200 head of hogs. That would make 240,000 pounds of pork. That is enough pork to last 3,000 people one year, and I am out of pork, lard and money.

"It all came about through no fault of my own, but by an economic system that is bleeding the people and giving the fat of the land to the gigantic corporations. And they have put in great machines and stolen from me, and millions of others, the chance to work to buy our little ones a crust."

Jerome Davis, *Capitalism and Its Culture*, Letter from a bankrupt farmer, pp. 463-465.

Is There a Limit to Population Increase?

DARWIN: But the chief consequence of having no natural selection seems to have been a doubling of numbers in fifty years. Does that not imply that, if this condition could be maintained, the net result would be ten billion a century hence, which would make the world distinctly crowded? I do not say that this crowded life would be impossible, but that is not the point, since it only postpones the evil day. As a mere matter of arithmetic, if man were to continue to multiply at his present rate for a thousand years, which is not a long time in human history, there would be at the end just enough standing room for us on the land surfaces of the earth.

COMMENTATOR: With production in the socialist countries increasing several times as fast as the population, the anxieties of the Malthusians are no less ludicrous than the despair of the woman in the Armenian folk tale who was beside herself for fear that her son might fall off a tree and hurt himself. The whole village wept for the unfortunate Kikos until it was learned by chance that the boy was still to be born. But it might be interesting, if only for the sake of curiosity, to ascertain whether there is a population ceiling.

SAUVY: A population that doubled every twenty-five years would increase a million-fold in five centuries; the descendants of the present 2,500 million inhabitants of the world

would then have at their disposal an area 45 centimeters square per capita. At the end of thirteen centuries the total weight of people would exceed that of the earth, including the atmosphere.

COMMENTATOR: Perhaps we should base our calculations on shorter spans of time, say 50 or 100 years?

STRUMILIN: Whatever time-span you take, increase in *geometrical progression* would, sooner or later, lead to a situation in which there just wouldn't be standing room.

COMMENTATOR: Obviously the assumption that the population will continue to double at regular intervals will lead us into absurdity.

FREVILLE: As Engels said, Euler's table applied to population has exactly the same value as the computation that compound interest on one penny since the beginning of our era at a rate doubling the principal every thirteen years would amount to the equivalent of a block of silver bigger than the globe.

COMMENTATOR: Here is one more example of the misuse of mathematical abstractions in relation to population. Some months ago the Western press reported that the physicist Heinz von Foerster, projecting into the future the curve of population growth in the past 2000 years "established" that on Friday, November 13, 2026, it would reach infinity and signify the end of the world. The

absurdity of this is patent, for regardless of how great the increase it can never reach infinity. Mathematical equations can at best describe social phenomena, but under no circumstances can they govern them.

Indeed, is the population of the world bound to double every 25, 50, 100 or more years? As far as I know, periods of rapid population growth in the past have been comparatively brief, alternating with far longer periods of stabilization. Rapid growth is characteristic of periods of transition to more advanced social and economic systems, when scientific and technological development is far in advance of the established social relations, family relationships included, and disrupts the traditional pattern of population growth. For example, the sharp decline in mortality, especially among children, is the result of scientific progress, while the present birth rate in the economically backward countries is to a certain extent a survival of the time when only a very small percentage of children lived to a mature age, when early marriage was prevalent and women were debarred from public life.

However, within a few generations equilibrium is bound to be established between the birth rate and the other aspects of the life of society. The prime factors making for this are the political and social emancipation of women, the achievement of genuine equality between men and women in all spheres of activity, secondary and higher education for women, the broadening of their horizons, their active participation in the economic and cultural life of society, etc., all of which is accompanied by later marriage and smaller families.

FREVILLE: The health services, which have reduced the mortality rate, will, after some time, have the same effect on the high birth rate.

COMMENTATOR: The natural increase of population is the difference between the birth rate and the death rate. And each of these is governed by different factors. If the mortality rate derives from the average longevity of the entire population, the birth rate depends on the percentage in the total of women from 15 to 44 able to bear children. Clearly, as the average span of life rises above 44, the percentage of mothers declines and the rate of increase tends to fall.

STRUMILIN: This approximation of the birth and death rates is the corollary of the lengthening of the human life span. True, the general mortality rate is so far kept down by

the increasing efficacy of the medical services and other welfare measures, especially in the socialist countries. Yet, paradoxically enough, all this concern for the human being increases the percentage of old people in the total population and, consequently, of those age groups in which the death rate is the highest. Therefore, the continuing decline in the death rate is beginning to lag behind the decline in the birth rate, and the two will eventually even up.

COMMENTATOR: Professor Strumlin, some time ago you estimated that in 275 years the population of the Soviet Union would become stabilized at 800 million, with the birth and death rates balanced at five per thousand and the average life span at 200 years. In time, the same may be expected to happen in other countries as well. The global population would then be stabilized at 12,000-15,000 million—a number which, as Professor Clark has shown, can be ensured an abundance of the means of subsistence even if agricultural techniques were to remain at the present level.

But since the above life-span estimate may seem over-optimistic to some readers, let me give another example. Let us assume that average longevity reaches 100 years as a result of victory over cancer and cardio-vascular diseases, and that in the course of a few generations the population of a country becomes evenly distributed over this age range. The death rate under the circumstances could not fall below 10 per thousand; as a matter of fact, since accidental deaths and infant mortality can hardly be completely eliminated, it would most likely be somewhere above 11. Women between 20 and 44 would surely account for some 12 per cent of the population. If the present number of births per 1,000 mothers in the USSR and the USA remained unchanged, the birth rate would drop to 12 per thousand. If we also take into account the fact that on the average 106 boys are born to every 100 girls, the population would hardly show any increase. Any subsequent growth would be due solely to further prolongation of the life span. Average longevity of 120 years would increase the population by 20 per cent, of 150 years, by 50 per cent, and of 200 years, by 100 per cent. Calculations beyond that are obviously pointless. It must be said, however, that in the interests of society the longer life expectancy should be accompanied by prolonging the period of able-bodied maturity to at least two-thirds of the life span.

Now that we have dispelled the specter of overpopulation, it remains for us to define our attitude to Malthusianism.

The Malthusian Bogey

DE CASTRO: The media now available for the dissemination of knowledge have helped the dispossessed masses to realize that hunger and poverty are not at all essential for maintaining equilibrium in the world. They know that thanks to scientific and technological progress a type of society has come into being in which poverty and hunger can be abolished.

SAUVY: Essentially, the Malthusians have sought a demographic solution that would above all provide an escape from the economic difficulties. Like Malthus himself, they are mainly concerned with putting off the painful moment when the rich will have to share their wealth.

DE CASTRO: It has been proved that Nature is by no means niggardly and that her resources are more than enough to satisfy all the wants of the world's population for many years to come. The reasons why so many receive so scanty a share of her gifts lie in human, or, rather, inhuman, civilization based on ruthless exploitation of the wealth of the colonies through a destructive economic system aimed at obtaining the raw materials required to ensure the prosperity of industry as cheaply as possible. Thus it must be admitted that the Malthusian theory completely contradicts the facts. Its gloomy predictions have no scientific foundations whatever. Malthus concocted his "theory" solely for the purpose of justifying exploitation and social injustice, as Professor Harold Bonner so cogently showed in his book *The Hungry Generations*. And precisely because of this it has so long been, as Southey aptly put it, the bible of the egoists and the idle rich.

FREVILLE: Malthus, the champion of class oppression, wanted to perpetuate the ancient law of the jungle, to condemn man to be devoured by man forever. The neo-Malthusians may threaten the world with their ludicrous thunderbolts, prophesy death and destruction for millions. But the future will be built without them and in spite of them. With the disappearance of classes and social barriers and the free development of science, boundless vistas will be opened before the coming generations. Nothing can halt the onward march of history, nothing can prevent the triumph of man.

STRUMILIN: Malthus' theory has been doubly refuted. His hypothesis that the means of subsistence increase only in arithmetical progression was tenable only in feudal conditions. The experience of the capitalist epoch shows that their growth proceeds in geometrical progression, while that of socialism indicates that the rate of development can be accelerated even more. Equally false is Malthus' basic premise that growth of population proceeds in *geometrical progression*. It has been proved in theory as well as in practice that the trend is towards a *diminishing* of tempo. And this radically changes the overall perspective.

In the conditions of socialism and communism, with the gradual elimination of all socio-economic limitations to population growth, the rate of increase, governed only by the laws of biology and physiology, will steadily decline. When the natural limit of longevity is reached the population will be stabilized. This is how we visualize the operation of the laws governing growth of population in communist society. Humanity, no longer trembling before an imaginary threat of overpopulation, will then improve *qualitatively*, for there are no limits to self-perfection.

FREVILLE: The men of the future, conscious of their aims and masters of their destiny, will be able to achieve a harmonious balance between the numbers of the population and its possibilities and requirements. Far from seeking to control the birth rate for the sake of preserving the old hierarchy and pursuing a reactionary, imperialist policy, they will regard it as a factor of equilibrium, planning and progress. There is every indication that human labor and genius, which have won so many victories, performed so many miracles, created so many wonderful machines, raised so many imperishable monuments, will also be able to build a society commensurate with their greatness, a society free from the slavery, war and hunger which have long been the scourges of mankind.

COMMENTATOR: It remains for me to thank you for your assistance in elucidating this problem which is of such vital interest to people everywhere. And if there is now more clarity on the question, and I believe there is, my way of conducting the discussion, for which I have not asked your permission, will have justified itself.

From a Nomadic to a Settled Life in Mongolia

Nyamyn Zhagvaral

The Mongolian People's Republic, a vast country in Central Asia, occupies an area of 1,500,000 square kilometers, consisting mainly of grassland and wooded hills, semi-desert areas and the desolate Gobi desert.

Livestock-breeding is the basic occupation. Mongolia holds first place in the world for number of cattle per capita of population. Soil cultivation is a recent development. Since they have no stable feed supply for their livestock, the arats, as the Mongolian herdsmen are known, are obliged to lead a nomadic life, making up to four migrations from place to place in the north and up to forty in the southern area.

In recent years, thanks to the economic progress, the agricultural co-operatives and the development of crop cultivation, the people have begun to switch from the old nomadic life to settled conditions. How is this being done? Dr. Nyamyn Zhagvaral, Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Mongolian People's Republic and economist by profession, tells us about this in the following article.

I

THE Mongolian people celebrated a red-letter date in July—the anniversary of the revolution of 1921. Big changes have taken place in the country in these forty years. Before the revolution Mongolia was a feudal colonial country. Since then, under the leadership of the People's Revolutionary Party, the people have got rid of the colonial yoke and with fraternal aid from the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are successfully building a socialist society.* Socialist production relations now prevail in all branches of material production, and the productive forces are developing at a rapid pace. Big revolutionary changes have taken place in agriculture, and a modern industry is being built. The Mongolia of the nomad herdsmen has been transformed into an agrarian-industrial country.

Organization of the arat households into cooperatives was completed in 1959 and our agriculture became a wholly socialist one. The twenty-nine state farms, 337 agricultural associations and 37 machine and stock-breeding stations are big socialist undertakings. Each of the state farms has an average of 19,400 head of cattle and 13,100 hectares of crop land; each of the associations has

about 48,000 head of publicly-owned livestock* and 180 hectares sown to crops. Most of the state farms are profitable undertakings, and the income as well as the production of the agricultural associations are increasing — their money income in 1960 rose by 62 per cent.

The herds, too, have grown considerably (now 24.2 head of cattle per capita). Measures are being taken to increase the productivity of animal husbandry; winter premises are being built for the animals, fodder laid in and veterinary services and other progressive methods of farming widely introduced.

On the whole, however, animal husbandry is still highly nomadic; it still depends largely on the vagaries of the climate, and its productivity is very low. Most of the rural population engaged in stock-breeding are nomads. A vital task of socialist reconstruction is to overcome this heritage of the feudal past.

Nomad life and nomad livestock-breeding are a consequence of the conditions obtaining in our republic. First among these are the climatic conditions. The difference between the various zones, the uneven relief, the scanty and uneven rainfall, the poor pas-

*This subject is examined in detail in the article by Y. Tsedenbal in *World Marxist Review* for March, 1961.

*In addition an average of 14,300 head of cattle in the associations are personally owned by the members.

ture and the droughts, and the frequent "dzouts," when a *hard crust of snow covers the grass*, compel the herdsmen to move at different seasons to where they can find the best pastures. In the past migration was the sole escape for the arat from natural calamities; it was a flight from disaster.

Then there were the *socio-economic conditions*. Only in the monasteries of feudal Mongolia was there any settled life. The merchants and moneylenders, usually foreigners, lived in the vicinity of the monasteries. Both the feudal chiefs and the arat serfs were nomads, which explains why Mongolian feudalism is sometimes described in literature as "nomad feudalism." The extensive nomad animal husbandry in pre-revolutionary Mongolia was conditioned by the extremely low level of development of the productive forces and by the subsistence character of the arat husbandry.

The nomadic way of life cannot be explained *purely* by climatic conditions. To do so would mean rejecting the possibility of going over to a settled life until nature had been radically changed. Neither does the explanation lie in socio-economic relations *alone*. It would be wrong to think that nomadic husbandry automatically ceases to exist with the abolition of the feudal system.

There can be no doubt that the feudal relations retarded the growth of the productive forces and perpetuated the nomadic way of life. The transition to a settled life would have been impossible had feudalism not been abolished. The green light to the transition was given by the revolution. No little time, material means and effort are needed after the revolution, and even after complete cooperation, before this problem is finally solved. And as the natural conditions have not changed, they have to be taken into account. We must create material prerequisites which will make livestock-breeding less dependent on these conditions and organize the transition to a settled way of life with due regard to the features of each zone.

A settled life does not mean that the arats merely stop being nomads. Any automatic cessation of migrations without adequate preparation would seriously harm the economy and the arats.

Much has been done since the revolution to end nomadic life. The building of towns, the creation of administrative centers, railway stations, state farms, workers' settle-

ments, the development of crop farming, laying in stocks of fodder and like measures were important steps in this direction. By 1956 about two-fifths of the population were living in permanently inhabited areas. Migrations were fewer and their direction and radius had changed. The arats in the northern areas began to build dwellings and live a semi-settled life.

But it was impossible to solve the problem radically within the framework of individual households. The cost of settling the hundreds of thousands of arats one by one or even in groups would have ruled it out. There was no fodder base, and no water supplies. The conditions were such that the arats had no choice but to continue their nomad life and use the pastures in various parts of the country.

Only with the completion of arat cooperation was it possible to think in terms of a settled life.

To settle hundreds of thousands of nomads is not, needless to say, an end in itself. The solution of this problem will enable us to turn to mechanization, science and modern methods; to increase agricultural output, consolidate the associations and raise the standard of living. *The complete transition to a settled life will be of vital importance for the final eradication of the survivals of the feudal past and for socialist construction in the countryside.*

In order to transfer the rural population to a settled life and to organize agriculture in the new conditions, the People's Revolutionary Party and the government are carrying out a series of measures.

What are these measures? We will examine the most important of them.

A vital condition is *crop raising and the creation of a stable fodder supply*. Crop cultivation links people to the land, so to speak, makes them live in one place. But that is not all. In the past the arats migrated mainly in search of pastures. Crop cultivation opens up the possibility of acquiring a permanent fodder base and thus of obviating the necessity to lead a nomadic life.

The People's Revolutionary Party and our government are devoting special attention to crop raising. This branch of agriculture, absolutely new to Mongolia, now accounts for 40 per cent of the total agricultural output. The state farms and the agricultural associations are receiving more and more tractors and other machines every year. Between 1948 and 1960 the number of trac-

tors increased 19.5 times, harvester combines over 40 times and tractor-drawn seeding machines nearly 39 times, etc. Crop growing now ranks second in importance to livestock-breeding.

In March 1959 the Central Committee of the Party set the task of developing 300,000 hectares of virgin land between 1959 and 1961, and of supplying the country's grain requirements from home production. This is a difficult and far from easy task if one bears in mind that at that time our arats had only just begun to engage in crop raising. All the resources were channeled in this direction. Hundreds of young men and women travelled to the new state farms on the virgin land. Help in developing them was rendered by the Soviet Union. The 300-odd Soviet experts who came to Mongolia at the request of our government helped to determine to what extent the virgin lands were suitable for cultivation and to train 3,000 machine operators in the space of two years.

The task of bringing under cultivation the 300,000 hectares of virgin land was completed by 1960 — i.e., ahead of schedule. This trebled the crop area, while the gross grain yield increased 5.5-fold. The state farms and the cooperatives reaped a good harvest. For the first time in its history our country fully met the demand for grain from home production, 268 kg. of grain being produced per capita in 1960 as against 53 in 1957. This year the crop area has been enlarged by 42 per cent. More potatoes and other vegetables, too, are being raised.

A cardinal requirement for solving the problem under review is to increase the area under fodder crops. Last year this area was enlarged 2.3 times. The third five-year plan (1961-65) envisages increasing the area under fodder crops (oats, vetches, corn, sugar beet, etc.) to 180,000 hectares.

Along with creating a stable fodder base the task is to provide shelter for the herds, and this is especially important for improving the stock and raising the productivity of animal husbandry.

We urgently need *more settlements*. In addition to the towns and the administrative centers in rural areas the farmsteads now being built by the agricultural associations are attracting settlers. These central settlements have schools, medical and veterinary centers, shops and procurement departments, recreation halls, public baths, and various farm buildings. Besides, the agricultural associations are building outlying settlements

for their team members, equipped with recreation centers, kiosks, medical and veterinary centers. Dairies and subsidiary enterprises are also being built.

Settlements of this kind are being established all over the country, including some parts of the Gobi Desert. Thus, the central and outlying settlements in South Gobi are growing into permanent settlement areas. In 1960 alone the associations built over 60 buildings in this area. All the agricultural associations there have electricity, and many of them have nurseries and kindergartens. Over half the animal husbandry teams have recreation centers.

Quarters for the cattle-breeding teams are being built in the Bulgan area alongside the central settlements of agricultural associations. Thirty-four per cent of the teams in this area have quarters which include recreation halls in addition to dwellings, baths, stores and other buildings.

Permanent dwellings play a big part in the transition to a settled mode of life. Houses are being built at a fairly rapid rate not only in areas of habitation, but in the pastures. In Bayan Ulegei, for example, some 90 per cent of the agricultural association members now live in houses which, although very simple and with no particular amenities, are nevertheless a great step forward towards settlement.

The yurt (tent) still comes in handy, and is even a must on the pastures.

Demarcation of the boundaries between farms and administrative districts is another essential for settlement. Until recently farms of a fixed area were unknown. Nor was there any fixed administrative demarcation.

With the organization of arat households into cooperatives in 1959, inter-cooperative boundaries were laid down for the first time; the state farms now average 136,000 hectares, while the agricultural associations average 334,000.

These measures have been of great importance, changing as they have the attitude towards the land — the basic source of wealth — promoting a more rational use of the pastures, and crop cultivation. They will do away with personal irresponsibility in the use of water and cattle premises, and will help to preserve the forests and make proper use of them. The laying out of the farms and their boundaries has encouraged the construction of farm buildings. These measures are a powerful incentive to a settled mode of life.

We must now go further — demarcate the land within the farms and associations. This will entail considerable effort and money. On the state farms the work will be more or less completed during the next five-year plan; in the agricultural associations it will, for the time being, be carried out in a simplified form. For a start, pastures, meadows and crop land will be allotted to the stock-breeding teams together with wells and barns; later on, seasonal pastures will be set aside for cattle as well as the necessary premises and wells.

Water supply, too, is an urgent matter, for one of the most cogent causes of the migrations is the need of water. Only two-thirds of our water requirements are covered, and in some areas only a third. On a third of the territory wells are the only source of water.

A thorough survey of the country's water resources is now being made and a water-development plan for the next ten to fifteen years is being drawn up. Pastures and fields will be irrigated on a big scale during the next five years.

With the completion of wholesale cooperation, new conditions have been created and great possibilities opened up for improving labor organization. Formerly the herdsmen roamed from place to place, each on his own in search of pasture, and each with several kinds of livestock. Now in the associations the herdsmen live in compact groups—several tents being pitched alongside one another. This makes for better grazing and accustoms the herdsmen to a settled life.

III

The natural and economic features of the different parts of the country, which vary greatly, have to be taken into account too. Mongolia is divided into a number of geographical zones and belts: alpine, upland-taiga, woodland-steppe and grassland zones, semi-desert and desert. Farming is mainly concentrated in the woodland-steppe zone. Industry is centered in the Ulan-Bator region and along the railway.

It is only natural, therefore, that the conditions under which the herdsmen are settling should differ. In the northern regions, for example, where most of the meadows are to be found, where crop raising is developing rapidly and there are many forests, part of the cattle will be maintained indoors during the winter season.

In the western regions the former nomads will find it most expedient to graze their flocks and herds on the distant pastures, as

is done in Kazakhstan and other districts of the Soviet Union. This is because two geographic zones adjoin in the West: on the one hand, high mountain ranges (Altai and Khangai), where the pastures can be used only in the summer months, and, on the other, the arid steppeland of lake depressions, where the heat and other factors are against summer grazing.

In the steppeland zone the pastures can be used all the year round, with the cattle being given additional forage during winter and spring. In the Gobi part of the country the herds will be maintained exclusively on the pastures. Stocks of fodder will be stored there, the pastures irrigated and other measures taken to encourage settlement and develop agriculture.

The transition to a settled life does not mean that all the livestock will go over to indoor maintenance. Pastoral animal husbandry will continue in most parts of the country after the herdsmen are settled.

Our task is to convert an extensive nomadic, purely pastoral animal husbandry into a skilled, pastoral, intensive animal husbandry. This means that we must create a stable fodder base, use the natural pastures more rationally, provide the herds with warm quarters, solve the water supply problem and introduce the latest scientific and technical achievements.

The government is rendering generous material, financial and organizational aid to the agricultural associations and their members in the transition to a settled life. The associations are granted credits for building, crop raising, machinery and other purposes. In most cases they receive timber and building materials free of charge, the government is sinking wells and the associations are helped to install small irrigation systems, etc. The machine and livestock-breeding stations and state farms play an important role in consolidating the associations and in organizing a settled mode of life for the herdsmen and their families.

We are encountering many difficulties in our efforts to settle the population. In part, the difficulties stem from the vastness of the territory, sparsity of population and poor communications, the suitability and quality of crop land, meadows and pasture. That is why the agricultural associations usually begin by ploughing up land in places chosen at random, without having any idea of the quality of the soil, often making mistakes and developing far from the best plots.

The transition to a settled mode of life in the Gobi area is a special problem, for there are no meadows, or fertile soil which could be cultivated. There are no forest tracts and water is found only at wells.

The nomad psychology is another problem. Survivals of the past are in places a hindrance in switching to a settled life; we have to acquaint the nomads with such simple arts as haymaking, crop raising, etc.

Our Party and our people realize that these are the inevitable difficulties of growth, that they cannot prevent the successful solution of the settlement problem. The fraternal socialist countries are rendering us important aid. Thus, the Soviet Union has given financial and technical aid. Soviet specialists are

helping us in developing the virgin lands and in surveying the country's water resources. The Chinese People's Republic is helping us to build irrigation systems, and Hungary to sink wells in the arid regions. Bulgaria has sent us the building specialists badly needed by the agricultural associations.

In solving the nomad problem, we are making wide use, with due regard to local conditions and features, of the rich experience acquired by the former nomadic peoples in Central Asia, Kazakhstan and Siberia in their transition to a settled way of life.

When settlement has been completed, it will signify a truly historic victory for socialism in the Mongolian People's Republic.

The United Nations: Its Possibilities and Reality

Ahmed El Maghrebi

OUR days are rich in political events of international significance. Revolutionary processes, changing the face of entire countries, are exerting an ever greater influence on world affairs.

The old world is trying to stem the tide of history. Social and political changes are not to the liking of the imperialist powers which oppose the right of nations freely to decide their destinies. In the postwar years the aggressive policy of the imperialists aimed against the socialist countries and the national-liberation movements has more than once brought the world to the brink of war.

In these circumstances the role of the United Nations, as an organization called upon to save mankind from the scourge of war, is particularly important. Its possibilities are greater than ever before. The approach of the autumn session of the General Assembly once again draws attention to the role of the United Nations, possible and real, in the matter of strengthening peace.

Principles and Practices

The very nature of international relations in our days calls for a universal organization, a guardian of peace. The question is whether the U.N. can be such an organization. A

glance at its Charter and its associated documents shows that it can.

The Charter proclaims such basic principles as equal rights and self-determination of peoples (Article 1, § 2), promotion and respect for human rights without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion (Article 1, § 3), settlement of all disputes by peaceful means and in conformity with the principles of international law (Article 1, § 1).

Article 2 of the Charter says that all member-nations shall refrain "from the threat or use of force." It proclaims "the sovereign equality" of all members, their "territorial integrity," "political independence," and precludes intervention "in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state."

In point of fact, the Charter is a judicial platform of peaceful coexistence. It calls on the member states to promote broad international co-operation and economic and social progress, equal rights for all and respect for human rights and basic freedoms.

The main purpose of the United Nations, according to the Charter, is to safeguard peace. In particular, the Charter charges the Security Council with primary responsibility

for the maintenance of international peace and security.

The unanimity principle in the Security Council flows logically from the principles proclaimed in the Charter. It precludes the *diktat* of any group of states in settling outstanding international issues, brings together different viewpoints and ensures the effectiveness of the decisions adopted by the Security Council.

Though the Charter contains principles useful for the cause of peace this does not mean that the United Nations carries out in full its role of *an organization for peaceful coexistence*. Emphasis on the need to adhere to principles, even the very best, is not enough. *Practical steps* must be taken to put them into effect.

Despite the progressive principles of the Charter, the United Nations did not play, in the first decade of its existence, the role it could and should have played. The leading positions in the various U.N. bodies are held by representatives of the Western bloc which has created in the international organization an atmosphere of arbitrariness, and which for a number of years has imposed on it, through the voting machine, what were essentially unlawful decisions.

As a result, until recently the idea of peaceful coexistence, the cornerstone of the United Nations, had almost no practical application and current international problems have found no solution within the framework of the United Nations.

The U.N. and Disarmament

In our days there is no issue more urgent than *disarmament*. People want to live without fear for their future and the future of their children.

"Disarmament," reads the Statement of the Meeting of the 81 Parties, "has now become a militant slogan of the people, a pressing historical necessity. By an active and resolute struggle the imperialists must be made to meet this demand of the people."

The U.N. Charter regards disarmament as one of the cardinal tasks facing the General Assembly and the Security Council. It cannot be said that the United Nations has not tackled this problem. It would be hard to say how many times the need to end the arms race has been proclaimed from its rostrum and how many resolutions on disarmament have been submitted to the General Assembly or its committees. But it must be frankly said

that no noticeable results have yet been achieved in this matter.

Of course, the fact that disarmament has been the subject of debate in the United Nations and that this debate has attracted wide attention has a certain useful significance. But we should not forget Lenin's words that on the issues of war and peace we want "a minimum of general statements, solemn pledges and florid formulae, and a maximum of simple, clear decisions and measures that would really lead to peace, or, better still, to complete removal of the danger of war."*

The U.N. members have a clear-cut and constructive basis upon which to discuss disarmament—the program of general and complete disarmament submitted by Premier Khrushchov to the XIVth General Assembly in September 1959 and approved by all delegates.

Had the U.N. members adopted a sound attitude to this program and had they shown good will it would have been possible to quickly find practical and acceptable ways of carrying it out. This, however, was not the case. At the XVth General Assembly the Soviet Union submitted a new proposal on disarmament. It took into account everything useful that had been suggested during the discussion of this issue in the various countries. But this proposal was opposed by the Western powers.

Maybe the West has produced some cogent arguments against the Soviet proposals and has proved that they are not realistic or that they contradict the cause of peace? No, they resorted to semantics, general phrases and, as usual, to vague promises. One can hardly find in the Western counter-proposals anything that would bring the disarmament problem nearer to a solution. At best, they boil down to control over armaments. Such is the gist of their proposals, which cannot be masked by minor changes in wording or the names of committees and commissions.

The delegations of many peace-loving countries also suggested practical ways of settling the disarmament problem. On November 17, 1960, the Indian delegation submitted to the Political Committee a draft resolution of 11 neutral countries calling for general and complete disarmament. The motion was supported by the Soviet Union and some other countries, but it proved unacceptable to the United States and its allies in the military blocs.

*From an Interview with a Correspondent of the *Observer* and *Manchester Guardian*, November 1922.

For centuries the people have dreamed of a world without wars and armaments. These dreams have been associated with a higher standard of living, deliverance from poverty and starvation and with labor for the benefit of the people. Every step in this direction deserves thorough consideration and support. Who if not the United Nations, an organization born out of the crucible of war that brought suffering to the world, should set itself the difficult but noble task of effecting disarmament? So far the United Nations has not justified the hopes of the people and has not solved this problem. The responsibility for this rests with the imperialist powers and their allies for whom their own interests are dearer than the aspirations of mankind.

The U.N. and the National-Liberation Movement

The struggle for peaceful coexistence is closely bound up with the struggle against colonialism.

The easing of world tensions would isolate the imperialists, make colonial wars even more intolerable in the eyes of public opinion, create the conditions for rallying people of diverse views against the colonial oppression and enable the socialist countries to provide more economic aid to the newly independent nations. East-West competition in the fields of economy and ideology would also bring great advantages to the young Afro-Asian states.

And, vice versa, the tension in international relations fosters anti-communism, which is invoked by the imperialist rulers as a cover for their aggressive actions. We can recall in this connection that the cold war and anti-communism have cost Morocco the setting up of U.S. military bases on her territory.

The struggle waged by the colonial and semi-colonial peoples reduces the reserves, narrows the sphere of influence and saps the military might of imperialism. It often forces the imperialists to make big concessions to the national-liberation movement. It is no secret, for instance, that the free countries of Africa owe their independence largely to the struggle of the Algerian people.

On the other hand, colonial wars and reprisals will continue as long as colonial rule exists. And in our days any aggressive action of the imperialists, any punitive operation in the colonies, is likely to spark off a world conflagration.

The United Nations can be used for stepping up the struggle against colonialism. In

a way, this possibility finds reflection in the work of the U.N. As a result of Soviet initiative, the XVth General Assembly adopted a Declaration on Granting Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The text was proposed after long debates by 43 Afro-Asian countries which, in this way, again demonstrated their constructive role in the United Nations. Now, after the adoption of the declaration, which, unfortunately, is not concrete on all points, it is essential to fix the time and carry out practical measures for *the complete abolition of the colonial system*.

The imperialists have obstructed and will continue to obstruct in every way the liberation of the colonies. Indicative in this respect are the results of the vote on the granting of independence to the colonies. In the course of the debate the United States, Britain, France, Belgium, Australia, Spain, Portugal, the Union of South Africa and the Dominican Republic actually opposed independence and abstained from voting. But though they are in the minority, the colonialists will not give up their positions without a struggle.

The example of Angola is instructive in this respect. The people of Angola, one of the few territories in Africa remaining under colonial yoke, are fighting for the implementation in their country of the principles proclaimed in the Declaration on Granting Independence to Colonial Countries. The General Assembly adopted a special resolution confirming that this Declaration bears direct relation to Angola and called on Portugal to grant independence to this colony.

But though Portugal is a member of the U.N., the Salazar government has ignored the resolution. What is more, it is waging a war of extermination against the people of Angola, it has sent planes and tanks, troops and gendarmes to Angola. Tens of thousands of Africans are held in concentration camps, and many patriots have been arrested and executed.

Why does Portugal act so flagrantly in violation of the Charter; why does she ignore the resolutions and challenge the U.N.? The point is that many of the Western powers, while denouncing Portugal from the U.N. rostrum and even voting against her, are directly encouraging her to commit new crimes against humanity.

The Struggle of the People Is a Key to Success

The events in Angola are a reminder of the need for active struggle by the peoples for the abolition of colonialism.

Only determined action can force the colonialists to retreat, and only continuous pressures from below will compel many African and Latin American governments to abandon the policy of conniving with the colonialists.

In other words, only mass action coupled with the efforts of the progressive forces within the United Nations will help translate into reality the clauses in the Charter calling for friendly and harmonious relations between the nations. And this applies not only to the anti-colonial struggle but also to a whole range of problems tackled by the U.N.

Imperialism will not be forced to retreat by negotiations and resolutions *alone*. It is incapable of observing moral obligations. This can only be achieved by pressure on the part of the people. Indeed, if we take a realistic attitude to the matter then neither the U.N. nor any other organization fighting for coexistence and peace can function effectively *without the support of the people*.

The United Nations would never have adopted the resolution on disarmament had not the peoples developed an active struggle against war. And, clearly, its resolutions will not be carried out unless the people continue this struggle.

It can be said that the positive aspects of U.N. activity are largely due to the pressure brought to bear on this organization by world public opinion, by the masses interested in strengthening peace and foiling the intrigues of the warmongers. Take, for example, such U.N. actions as the ending of the Anglo-French-Israeli aggression against Egypt, the resolutions on nuclear weapons and the termination of nuclear tests, the repeated General Assembly denunciations of apartheid in South Africa and the discussion of colonial problems. Every time these questions were raised and discussed the U.N. was the center of world public opinion, the center of attention of people of good will throughout the world. Were not the U.S. and British delegates anxious to support Portugal, their ally in the Atlantic bloc? But to advocate the colonialist policy openly is tantamount in our days to destroying one's prestige in the international arena.

An Instrument of Peace or an Instrument of Export of Counter-Revolution?

If we are to speak about what the U.N. should be, if it is to be an organization of peaceful coexistence worthy of its great tasks, then one point must be emphasized: it should

express the interests of the majority of mankind and not of one group of countries.

Until recently some of the international political organizations often functioned as more or less concealed instruments of the imperialist forces. At present opportunities are opening up for these organizations to serve the interests of the people, the majority of mankind. But for this certain conditions are needed. What are they?

The first is that the U.N. must be a *universal* organization, must embrace *all* states. But it is not yet an organization of this kind. A number of countries, People's China in the first place, are not as yet represented.

At the XVth General Assembly the question of China's representation was again blocked by the United States (42 votes against 34). This was due to the opportunism of some African and Asian delegates who abstained from voting, thus rendering a service to the West. As a result one-fourth of mankind is not represented in the United Nations.

But can the U.N. work effectively without China? Of course, not. No major international problem can be solved without taking into account the will of the Chinese people.

This problem is bound up with another one. Despite the new balance of forces in the world, the imperialist countries continue their policy of *diktat* in the U.N. As before, they dominate in the administrative apparatus of this organization. The post of Secretary-General is held by a lackey of the imperialists, Hammarskjold, who acts exclusively in the interests of the West. The role played by Hammarskjold in the murder of Patrice Lumumba and his comrades proved the justness of the criticism levelled by the Soviet Union at the U.N. and its apparatus and forcefully demonstrated the need for reorganizing the U.N. structure.

The partial successes gained by the imperialists in their struggle against the national-liberation movement, particularly in the Congo, are largely due to their making use of the U.N. The Western imperialists and their puppets used the United Nations flag to legalize the division of the Congo, disrupt its unity and isolate and split the lawful government headed by Antoine Gizenga. It can be said without exaggeration that on the Congo question, the U.N., in the person of its Secretary-General, served as *the shield of the colonialists*.

The domination of the imperialist countries in the U.N. apparatus is not an administrative but a political problem. The point is that the

United States and its allies take advantage of their hold on the U.N. apparatus for waging a *class struggle* against the socialist countries and the peoples liberating themselves from colonial rule. The U.N. is used by them for anti-Soviet and anti-socialist propaganda. The U.N. specialized agencies (the Economic and Social Council) and associated bodies (UNESCO and the International Labor Organization) are used as channels for spreading reactionary ideas in the underdeveloped countries. The West is trying to turn the U.N. into an instrument of anti-Soviet and anti-socialist pressure. The system of trusteeship has actually become a cover for colonialism. The West has sought to make the U.N. *an instrument for the export of counter-revolution*. The blue flag of this organization, the symbol of peace, has often been used by the imperialists as a screen for the cold-war policy, the arms race and overt aggression.

But is this situation normal? Does it conform to the present state of affairs in the world? The way out of this situation is set forth in the Soviet proposal for a collective executive body of the U.N. consisting of representatives of three main groupings of states: socialist, capitalist and neutral.

As the map of the world has changed so has the composition of the U.N. It has been joined by 16 young African countries and a number of Asian countries. Today, the United Nations embraces 99 states of which 24 are associated with the aggressive blocs of the Western powers, 9 belong to the socialist camp and 66 are non-committed countries. At this moment the U.N. reflects in much greater measure the real situation in the world arena, but it is not as yet a mirror of the modern world.

Its executive bodies must be adjusted in line with the actual correlation of forces in the world, while its decisions should reflect the interests of all groups of states.

There is no doubt that in the future there will arise the question of changing the composition of the Security Council, too, which no longer reflects the real situation and does not take due account of the weight of such countries as India or Indonesia.

It should be stressed that it is not only a matter of restoring justice to one or another state. The point is that the U.N. structure should be brought into line with the new balance of forces in the world and in the U.N. itself. The point is that the U.N. should be an effective instrument for *peaceful co-existence*.

The Communists and the U.N.

In their attitude to the U.N. the Communists in all countries proceed from the fact that implementation of the principles of peaceful coexistence should become the main direction of U.N. activity. They support all actions of the United Nations which are in line with this.

There are two wrong views about the U.N. in the working-class movement. The first, the reformist viewpoint, overestimates the role and possibilities of this organization. The reformists often claim that any interference by the working-class movement in U.N. affairs would undermine its foundations. It is not difficult to see that this view dampens the activity of the people and is designed to sabotage their struggle for translating the progressive possibilities of the U.N. into life.

The other, no less erroneous view, consists in underestimating the role and possibilities of the U.N. This view is shared by sectarian elements in the working-class movement. Since the West runs the United Nations, they say, we can expect nothing good from it, and that being so the working class should take no interest in the organization. It is not difficult to imagine the harm this view could bring to the cause of peace. The U.N. provides a platform which can be used in the interests of peace and the national-liberation movement. And now that the socialist countries have become a leading world factor, and that the correlation of forces in the world and in the U.N. has changed, these possibilities can and must be utilized by the working class.

The Communists oppose both the reformist and the sectarian views of the U.N. They neither exaggerate nor belittle its role in the fight for peace and against colonialism. They popularize the sound decisions of the U.N. But in doing so they warn the people against any illusions.

The U.N., they say, adopts good decisions sometimes. This is the result of your efforts, because your struggle facilitates the adoption of these decisions. But these decisions will be fruitless unless an active struggle is waged for carrying them into effect.

The Prospects of the U.N.

The destiny of the U.N. should be viewed in the light of the constantly changing correlation of forces on the world arena. The world has changed beyond recognition in the sixteen postwar years. A new balance of forces has arisen, social development has entered upon a

new stage. The socialist camp, numbering over 1,000,000,000 people, has grown immeasurably stronger; it is becoming the leading factor in world development. The productive forces and living standards in the socialist countries are steadily growing. The national-liberation struggle is shaking the strongholds of imperialism. New countries are breaking away from colonial dependence; the colonial system is disintegrating. The worldwide movement of the people against war and the arms race is gaining momentum. All this creates a favorable climate for implementing any U.N. measures aimed at ensuring peace.

The failure of the U.S. adventure in Cuba and of the U.S. imperialist policy in Laos, the stubborn resistance put up by the people in Latin America to Washington's aggressive plans and the increasing weight of the neutral countries show that it is becoming increasingly difficult to pursue a cold-war policy. The people who want to see the U.N. become an effective instrument of universal peace are exerting an ever increasing influence on international affairs.

The number of countries casting off the chains of colonialism and taking the road of independent development is growing in the U.N. Not all of them pursue a policy conforming to the genuine interests of their people. But this is a temporary phenomenon. The

growth of political consciousness of the African and Asian peoples, their increasing activity and desire for peace are the guarantee that more and more countries will pursue a consistent policy of peace and disarmament and in this way will change the balance of forces in the U.N. in favor of peace.

People throughout the world take a keen interest in the work of the U.N. This is explained by the fact that we firmly believe in the great potentialities of the U.N. and its ability to play a major positive role in present conditions.

The XVth General Assembly afforded proof of progress in U.N. activity. The scale and character of the debate at this session, the participation in it of many heads of government and the adoption of the Declaration on Granting Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples are, undoubtedly, positive facts testifying to the beginning of important changes in the United Nations.

It is not difficult to visualize the significance of these changes which would make the U.N. a genuinely democratic international organization. Translating this possibility into reality depends on the activity of the people in the U.N. member-countries. And this activity, in its turn, depends in large measure on us, the Communists.

**In the Communist
and Workers' Parties**

Venezuela: New Conditions Call for New Tactics

THE Third Congress of the Communist Party of Venezuela, held last March despite the terror, reviewed the political situation since the overthrow of the Perez Jimenez dictatorship and the advent to power of the Betancourt-Copei group, critically examined the Party's tactics and defined its attitude to the present government. Its decisions open up a new stage in the Party's struggle for democracy and national independence.

In its nearly eight years underground, the Communist Party has been in the forefront of the fight against the tyranny, working indefatigably to build a united front of anti-dictatorship forces. In 1957, on the initiative of the Communist Party and the Republican-Democratic Union, a Patriotic Junta of four parties was formed—the Communist Party, the Republican-Democratic Union, Democratic Action, and the Copei Party, the party of the big bourgeoisie. The Junta led the fight in the events that followed.

Early in 1958 the dictatorship was overthrown by the joint action of patriotic and democratic forces and from that moment, as the Political Declaration of the Third Congress points out, "there began a period of revolutionary upsurge which is still gathering momentum . . . being galvanized from day-to-day by the vital needs of our people, the militancy and the political consciousness of their organized vanguard and the harmonious development and growing might of the socialist camp, whose scientific, technical, political, economic and cultural victories are a constant stimulus to all national-liberation movements."

The general election held in 1958 brought Betancourt to power, his former prestige as a "fighter for democracy and the independence of his country" playing no little part in this. At one stage in his career Betancourt opposed imperialist domination and even wrote books on this theme. But by the time he came to power he had become the man of the monopolies. President Romulo Betancourt now persecutes the author Romulo Betancourt. He has even banned his own book, *Venezuela y petroleo*, which has been withdrawn from sale.

The many who voted for him thought the new government would apply itself to solving the

country's problems—carry out an agrarian reform, abolish unemployment, reduce the cost of living, safeguard national sovereignty from the imperialist monopolies, etc. But they were disappointed.

Betancourt's government did nothing of the kind. The results of his two years in office have been disastrous for the people. Jesus Faria, General Secretary of the Communist Party, told the Third Congress these facts: sixty per cent of the total investments made by U.S. monopoly capital in Latin America is in Venezuela. Foreign capital owns over 40 per cent of all the capital invested in the country. The total profit netted by the imperialists has exceeded the total investment over a period of 40 years, thus giving rise to an ever-increasing outflow of capital and preventing internal accumulation. The oil and mining industries alone provide the American monopolies with over 50 per cent of the profit which they pump out of the Latin American countries. "This gives us the 'privilege'," Jesus Faria said, "of being a country which, with a population of seven million, pays out more profits to foreign capitalists than all the other countries of Latin America taken together."

The agrarian reform has been a farce. President Betancourt announced that one million hectares of land would be distributed over a period of four years, i.e., an average of 250,000 hectares a year. This is less than was distributed in 1959, before the promulgation of the agrarian reform law. This year the Agrarian Bank will grant credits to only one per cent of the peasants. The agrarian reform is not directed against the big latifundists, as the Peasant Federation demanded, but aims at settling idle lands and the purchase of expensive farms which the peasants are not in a position to buy. Credits are granted to the big ranchers and owners of coffee plantations.

The number of unemployed stood at 150,000 on February 1, 1959; it is now 300,000, and is still going up.

The result is dissatisfaction with government policy. To suppress any manifestation of the dissatisfaction the Betancourt government has resorted to repression. "Over ten thousand revolutionaries," the Political Declaration states, "have been thrown

into prison during the past two years. Punitive detachments have raided and plundered tens of thousands of homes. Nearly a hundred killed, hundreds wounded, constitutional guarantees abrogated, the opposition press gagged, mass political activity prohibited, trade union headquarters raided, members of the Left Revolutionary Movement and of the Communist Party victimized, an attack on the university, and persecution of university students and secondary school pupils—such is the list of unsavory actions perpetrated by the Betancourt-Copei group during its two years of rule.”

Up until October 1960, however, that is, until it became clear that the government had irrevocably taken the path of reaction and betrayal, the Communist Party firmly adhered to the principle of national unity and supported the Betancourt government, while pressing for a change in policy. The Party declared at that time that it “was ready, should the contingency arise, to stand by the lawful regime and the government formed in accordance with the sovereign will of the people . . . provided the government acted democratically and unanimously, implementing the program promised to the masses.”

The experience of the past three years has shown that “the forces inimical to democratic and independent development have acted with consummate cunning. Utilizing their connections and position in the state apparatus and their influence among the political parties, they have been able, despite the overthrow of the dictatorship, to safeguard their economic interests, divide the people, place obstacles in the way of the mass movement and again curtail democratic liberties.”

The Left in the Betancourt party (Democratic Action), who broke with him and formed the Left Revolutionary Movement, and the Republican-Democratic Union have withdrawn from the government coalition. At present the government represents only the reactionary pro-imperialist bourgeoisie and the latifundists.

A meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party held last October urged that action should be taken to defeat the government and form a democratic and patriotic government.

The Third Congress endorsed this line as correct. “It is necessary,” the Political Declaration says, “to form a government which would conform to the interests of the working people, the peasants, the youth and the progressive bourgeoisie, identify itself with the national and democratic demands and lead the country to prosperity, national independence and democratic unity.”

The Party has always stressed unity of the masses in the struggle for their rights. In its report to the Congress, the Central Committee noted that this line was correct, but that after

the overthrow of the dictatorship it needed revising with a view to focussing attention on the cardinal issue—that of political power. The change was made, but it did not go far enough and it was belated. After the popular victory new aims—objectives within the bounds of democratic development and national liberation—should have been put before the unity movement; and it was essential to improve guidance of the progressive forces. More vigor should have been displayed in summoning the people to action. This would have facilitated their struggle for structural reforms. The Party made the mistake of underestimating the subversive activity of the hostile classes in the unity movement, of not exposing it earlier. These mistakes stemmed from an overestimation of our own forces and an underestimation of the enemy’s, and from under-rating the value of potential allies, with the result that we adopted an overbearing attitude to them.

Prevented from using the press to explain its standpoint to the people, the Party could not launch a large-scale propaganda campaign to expose the government slander. Contact between the central and lower organizations also was loose and irregular, and this led to blunders in directing Party activity. Nor was there a clear-cut stand on the methods to be used in the struggle.

Hence, the Congress pointed out, the Party should improve its organization in order to be ready for any eventuality; it should raise the political level of its members and of as many working people as possible, support the policy of alliance and work for a united democratic national front. It should try to neutralize the forces who cannot join this front now, and isolate the enemy; the people should know exactly what they are fighting for in every action; the Party should be cool in the face of provocations and at times of a revolutionary upsurge, and thoroughly study the art of revolution. The Congress called for trade union unity, for strengthening the worker-peasant alliance, for adherence to the Leninist standards of Party life and Party democracy; it called for closer contact with the people, for stronger Party unity. It pointed to the need for resolute action to combat the Right opportunists and revisionists, sectarianism and dogmatism.

Charting the Party’s line, the Congress stated: “We pose the question of realizing our slogan for a democratic and patriotic government within the framework of the Constitution, but it may be that things will develop in another way. For our part we do not reject the possibility that the policy we uphold will be realized in the best way, for the benefit of the country and the people, but neither do we exclude the possibility of giving our people

the better government they deserve even at the cost of sacrifice and grim struggle."

To achieve this aim, the Political Declaration points out, we must intensify our criticism of hidebound reactionaries in the ruling parties, draw the people's attention to schemes which, possibly, are being devised at this moment to prevent power passing to the democratic forces in the 1964 general election.

The Congress indicated the basic aims of the struggle at the present stage: restoration of constitutional guarantees; a speedy agrarian reform; a national and patriotic policy in respect of the oil and mining companies; support for Cuba, which is threatened by North American imperialism.

The Congress emphasized that by its policy the government was undermining its own position. In striving to impose the will of its masters—the U.S. monopolies and the Venezuelan big bourgeoisie—the government was depriving the people of one gain after another. Only a few hours after the adoption of the Constitution, President Betancourt suspended it and abrogated its guarantees.

One of the most vulnerable points of the policy pursued by the ruling defeatist group is that, in serving the interests of the North Americans, it comes into conflict not only with the people, but also with those bourgeois groups interested in developing the national economy. These groups might be attracted by a party similar to that of the Communist Party. Important, too, is the fact that the demagoguery about agrarian reform will soon cease to have any effect, sooner or later the peasants will realize that their interests are diametrically opposed to those of the treacherous defeatist group.

The Congress noted that the democratic forces were not sufficiently united, warned that the enemy would constantly resort to violence to achieve his ends and called for vigilance in view of possible attempts at military coups for "there are militarists who have not lost hope of returning to power."

The Congress thus thoroughly analyzed the home situation and drew up a program of action in the struggle for democracy and national independence. Post-Congress developments have confirmed the correctness of this program.

Barely two months after the Congress the Betancourt government again showed itself to be the instrument of the monopolies and incapable of solving the country's problems. On May 4 Betancourt sent a message to the National Congress in which he for the first time admitted what the Communists had long been saying, namely, that the country was in a state of administrative and financial chaos, in the throes of a severe crisis. The responsibility for this state of affairs, he

claimed, lay with the ten-year dictatorship of Perez Jimenez.

Commenting on this message and on the government plans for overcoming the crisis, the Central Committee of the Communist Party gave the real reason for the crisis: "The Betancourt-Copei government is serving the economic interests which supported the dictatorship. When, therefore, this government states there is a crisis and puts forward plans for overcoming it, the main burden is laid on the working people."

The brazenness of the President's plan is astounding. He proposes to devalue the currency, which will mean the dollar going up to 4.70 bolivars. Income taxes will soar. People earning 1,100 bolivars a month, for example, instead of paying the present five-bolivar tax will pay nearly 50 bolivars. Cutting down the staff of civil servants will add to the unemployed. The government, furthermore, intends to ask for a foreign loan of \$500 million, which will bring the national debt up to nearly 7,000 million bolivars, not counting interest. Prices of essentials will rise sharply, and the standard of living will decline by at least 30 per cent. The income of the oil monopolies will not be affected. Betancourt calls the income tax increase a "small sacrifice." The people call his plan the "hunger plan," and do not propose to take this plunder sitting down. A Communist Party call to the people states in part:

"Venezuelans! More urgently today than ever before we need a radical change in Venezuelan policy, a government with a majority of democratic, nationalist and patriotic forces working resolutely and indefatigably to overcome the present difficulties, a government which would restore to the people their rights and freedoms, resist the foreign monopolies with patriotic firmness—especially in oil and mining—carry out the agrarian reform demanded by the landless peasants, establish trade and diplomatic relations with the socialist countries, resolutely set about solving the oil problem. . . ."

Meeting with opposition to its plans, the Betancourt government is trying to weaken the resistance, to split the trade unions and to remove elected Communists from their leadership, to divide the peasants and turn the forces now combating the "hunger plan" against the Communists. But even a "victory" of the government which seeks to implement its "hunger plan" would signify its defeat. This plan will weaken still more the reactionary front and strengthen the front of democracy and national independence. The final victory will be won by those who take the path outlined by the Communists of Venezuela.

El VELAZCO

Great Britain: Party Building Year

COMMUNIST parties in the capitalist countries in Western Europe where Social Democracy is strong face special problems in taking the steps which can put them on the road of developing into mass organizations.

There can be no such development without a mass political line, a policy which can result in a broad movement of the people. In our conditions this presupposes the correct relationship of the Communist Party with the broad labor movement. Equally important, however, are the systematic political and organizational steps to develop the Party.

These are the considerations which lay behind the decision of the 27th National Congress of our Party to launch a Year of Party Building.

This, the most ambitious political project undertaken by the Party for many years, is not just a recruiting campaign: its aims are expressed in the main slogans — "Build Britain's Party of Peace and Socialism," "Build the Communist Party for a Socialist Labor Movement." Its success, the Party has stressed, is essential for the political situation now facing the left and progressive movement, for peace, and for the defeat of the Tories.

Two main reasons have made it possible to launch our Party Building Year: (a) the modest, but increasing gains in membership of the Party (1,500 last year) and the YCL (1,000 in the past year), and in the circulation of the *Daily Worker*, as well as in sales of Marxist literature; these advances have prepared the way and created the mood in the Party for further advances; (b) the political situation, which is causing many thousands of people, especially the youth, to think about politics in a new way, creating real possibilities for an important advance of the Party.

At the first meeting of the newly elected Executive Committee held in the middle of May, the decision was taken to launch the Year of Party Building from June 1, 1961, to May 31, 1962. The public declaration was made in the *Daily Worker* and the Party press. Meetings of active Party comrades have been held in all districts since, where the proposal has been welcomed with enthusiasm and confidence.

The campaign decided on is an all-embracing effort; to increase the membership of the Party and the circulation of the *Daily Worker*; to strengthen the Young Communist League and our organization among the students; and to improve radically the electoral position and political influence of the Party.

Our big aim is to end the position where only a few active members participate in campaigns, and to win the whole membership and all Party organizations to take part to some degree or another in the Party Building Year. This means we attempt to win every Party member to become a Party Builder, and that individual effort is made alongside the public mass campaign to build the Party. We want also to extend the base of the Party — to open up new areas, new branches and new sections, and to make also a significant advance in the membership of the YCL.

Events since our Congress, internationally and in Britain, especially developments in the labor movement, have confirmed the analysis made by the Congress and shown both the urgency of the policy adopted and the growing opportunities for carrying it into effect. Even before the Party Building Year commenced, recruiting showed an upward trend. In April and May over 600 applications for membership were received. In the first six weeks of the campaign we made 874 new members, so that today the membership is over 29,000.

In the local elections during these months 420 Communist candidates were put forward — the highest number since 1949. Their aggregate vote was 112,000, also the highest for twelve years. Twenty-eight candidates were successful, a net gain of four, and also all our candidates secured higher votes than previously, some failing to win seats by only a few votes. These results were the first steps in carrying out our Congress resolution calling for greater electoral activity as essential for increasing the Party's political influence.

Sales of the *Daily Worker* are also rising, with a gain of 1,300 new daily readers since May 1. An important step forward has been enlarging the Saturday issue of the paper to six pages (normally four). At the weekend Party branches now sell, by street canvassing, pitches, etc., some 19,000 extra copies apart from those regularly sold through newsagents; and these extra sales have shown an increase though it will require consistent efforts to maintain and extend the increase.

The basis of the whole effort will be the mass work and campaigning throughout the year, on the decisions of the 27th National Congress. In the first place, the fight to save mankind from a third world war; to secure the renunciation by Britain of the manufacture and use of nuclear weapons; withdrawal from NATO and other war alliances and the closing of foreign bases in Britain; disarmament; the admission of the Chinese People's Republic to UNO; peaceful coexistence; and

strengthening the activity of the labor movement and peace organizations to secure these aims. Bound up with the fight for peace is the mobilization of support for the national-liberation movements to win political independence and to resist new forms of economic and political domination. At home, the rallying of the working-class movement for resistance to the Tory offensive against living standards, and a counter-attack for higher wages, shorter hours, and improved social services.

In the first months of the campaign, therefore, the Party is increasing its fight against nuclear weapons and nuclear strategy, against the Polaris and all American and German bases in Britain, and doing all it can to maintain support for the policy of the Scarborough Labor Party Conference, against the Right-wing policy of Gaitskell and any so-called "compromise" policy which in essence restates the Gaitskell line.

The first mass public campaign materials produced include 450,000 copies of a penny folder for British independence against American and German bases, and 150,000 leaflets on the Common Market, now a central issue of political controversy in Britain. In July, the Party organized poster parades and marches on these issues in all the main centers.

In developing this mass activity, we are keeping to the fore the issue of working-class unity; to rally the whole Left to defeat the Right; to work for unity of the labor movement and the ending of bans directed against the Communists, for building a progressive alliance; and through it all, to explain publicly and develop in practice the role of the Party.

We will bring forward in the campaign the ideological question of communism generally—both to challenge and combat the Tory and Right-wing Labor effort to stoke up the cold war, and to popularize the positive advances and social victories of communism. The Party has produced a multi-colored pictorial presentation of its basic program, *The British Road to Socialism*, in 100,000 copies.

It is in order to ensure the full development of our activity on all these issues that the idea of stages in the campaign has been adopted. This is not an organizational approach, but is dictated by our political objectives—there is of course no artificial watertight separation between the stages.

The first stage, June to September, is the summer period of open-air campaigning. Its essential features are factory gate and other open-air meetings; the aim is 1,000 factory gate meetings. Plans also include poster campaigns, marches and open-air rallies, special sales of the *Daily Worker* and *Challenge*, and Party literature.

The second stage, late September to early December, covers the September Trades Union Congress and October Labor Party Conference, and is the period of autumn campaigning: indoor rallies in all districts, and the maximum possible number of smaller meetings, including many in towns, villages and wards where at present we have no Party organizations. A film dealing with the Party is being made.

A highlight in this period will be the outstanding decisions of the 22nd Congress of the CPSU in October, which will capture popular imagination.

The third stage, December and January, is the period of annual re-registration of the membership: this year it will serve to consolidate the progress made to date. It will be linked with the maximum public activity and presentation of the Party's aims and outlook, intensified individual recruiting efforts.

The fourth stage, February to May 1962, is the period of the municipal elections, the holding of district congresses of the Party, and May Day marches and celebrations. In this period there will also be the final rallies, public meetings, factory invitation meetings, and open-air marches and rallies in the main districts.

We hope that these measures will result in a net increase of 20 per cent in Party membership. We called for 500 Party volunteers to give the campaign a send-off in the month of June by attempting individually to recruit a new member. Actually 720 comrades enrolled as volunteers, and in the first few weeks of the campaign we made 320 new members.

Today the *Daily Worker* is the only daily paper in Britain not in millionaire hands. The progress made in extending the daily sales of the paper shows the increasing support for the Party's policy. In Britain, the *Daily Worker* circulation is much wider than Party membership. The aim is to make it wider still. In the course of the year, the greatest efforts will be made to get all Left and progressive people in the movement to read the paper daily or at the weekends. Politically this is important if a really sound basis is to be laid both for mass political action and Party recruitment on a wide scale.

A developing Communist Party needs a virile and extending Young Communist League. In fact, however, YCL membership is very small, despite the encouraging advance last year. In very many areas where the Party is organized, there is no YCL at all. The aims adopted here would roughly almost double the YCL membership by June next year. This, while an advance, would still be unsatisfactory. A Party Youth Week will be organized

in October on a national scale, during which efforts will be made to extend and cement the YCL organizations.

Despite the modest advances in the Party's electoral vote this year, it is still small. The British electoral system makes for great difficulties here. Despite this, big advances can and must be made both in increasing our total vote in the local elections and in winning seats. There is no doubt that next year will see a very big increase in the number of candidates and particular attention is being paid to the parliamentary constituencies where we have Party candidates. It is clear that constituencies where we intend to have candidates, and also the best local wards, should be concentrated on with a view to large-scale recruiting to the Party.

The Party's political influence and membership differs widely in different areas. In some areas where our votes, influence and membership are relatively high, aims of doubling the membership have been adopted. In such areas the Party can already take important steps in the direction of becoming a mass organization. This will give us rich experience in methods of work and organization for the future of the whole Party. In other areas the advance will be more difficult and more modest. But such advances will be just as important and necessary for the Party's future. We are stressing the need to form new branches, however small to start with, in dozens of new towns and villages and in the rural areas.

Of the greatest importance is the development of Party organization in the factories; there are hundreds of factories where we have one, two or three members, but no organized branch. The Party's political influence has always been based largely on the activity and record of its members in the factories, in the pits and in the trade unions. This effort to increase greatly the number of factory branches will take a lot of work and time, but is indispensable for success. A very important development here has been the participation of the factory branches in the Party's electoral work, and this will now be increased.

Special approaches are being made in the course of the year to teachers, architects, scientists, people in the arts, and professional people generally. A noteworthy feature of British life at the moment is the increasing political and trade union activity of such sections. In this connection the university students are particularly important. The Party is making some progress here. Big efforts will be made for it is clear that if the Party can build among the university students,

the basis will be laid for a big expansion of Party membership among the intellectuals in three or four years' time, as the student graduates take up their professional work.

In order to ensure the steady growth of the Party, attention must be paid to the problem of fluctuation of membership, in order to reduce avoidable losses. Fluctuation is still too high and could be cut. The average dues-paying membership in 1960 was 85 per cent of the total, varying in different districts from 63 per cent to 95 per cent. This brings out the big differences in the organizational methods, the quality of branch life, and how the annual exchange of cards is handled by different districts. The problem, however, is political as well as organizational. Making recruits to the Party is only the first step; it is essential to help them to become Communists, to ensure their political education, and to bring them into the political and social life of the Party.

An important step is the training and development of leading cadres in the Party branches. Alongside the Party's public campaign, steps are being taken to carry out an educational program for branch cadres. A series of weekend courses has been arranged for the principal districts and the near-by smaller districts, with the first concentration on branch secretaries: some 300 comrades will go through these courses during the year, on the basis of a specially prepared syllabus.

In all districts week-night classes are being organized for branch secretaries and branch committee members; and encouragement is being given to all branches to organize educational classes, discussion and self-study. A national school for selected branch secretaries is also being prepared. The Executive Committee will have a special discussion on these problems soon.

Political education in Marxism is essential, too, to consolidate any advances we win. The next meeting of the Executive Committee will consider proposals for the Party education year to coincide with the Party building year. The aim will be to increase the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary understanding of the Party as a whole.

No one underestimates the magnitude of what the Party is being asked to do in this year's campaign, or the effort needed to achieve the results aimed at. What is envisaged is in fact the first big step towards transforming the Party into the mass force called for by the decisions of our 27th National Party Congress, and so urgently needed for the mobilization of the British labor movement in the struggle for peace and socialism.

John GOLLAN

Communist Party of Indonesia: Strengthen National Unity

THE general line of Indonesian state policy is set forth in the Political Manifesto, first outlined by President Sukarno in a speech on August 17, 1959, and subsequently elucidated and elaborated by the Supreme Advisory Council and finally adopted by the Provisional People's Consultative Assembly.

The Political Manifesto deals with the basic problems of the Indonesian revolution. It points out that "the main enemies of the Indonesian revolution are imperialism and feudalism; the task of the revolution is not to establish the political power of one class, group or party, but the political power of the whole people, a gotong-rojong (literally: get-together, or coalition) government opposed to autocracy or dictatorship, both military and personal; the main force of the revolution is not one class, group or party, but the whole people, and above all the working class and the peasants, who are consistently anti-imperialist and anti-feudal; the character of the revolution is national-democratic and its aim is socialism, not capitalism."

Indonesia's socio-political life is marked by a sharp struggle between the supporters of the Political Manifesto and its opponents. In the vanguard of the former are the Communist Party and other progressive, patriotic forces.

Working for the implementation of the Manifesto, the progressive forces have launched a joint offensive against the survivals of colonialism and the reactionary groups and organizations. The Masjumi Party, the rightist Socialist Party and the so-called Democratic League, all opposed to the Manifesto, have been dissolved by presidential order and their adherents removed from important positions in the state apparatus and the economic and cultural spheres.

It should be noted, however, that the social base of the ultra-reactionary forces—imperialism, feudalism, compradorism and bureaucratic capitalism—has not yet been abolished. Though weakened by the dissolution of the reactionary parties, they still exist. Resorting to tactical maneuvering, the reactionaries are now trying to infiltrate the other parties. Besides, conditions still exist for the emergence of other reactionary forces, which would act in a different way. They pretend that they agree with the Manifesto, while actually they are doing their utmost to prevent its realization. Above all they are opposed to the close co-operation of the three leading political trends—

the nationalist, Communist and religious—in the NASAKOM (abbreviation compounded by the first syllables of the words "nasionalis," "agama" and "komunis," meaning nationalists, religion and Communists). The cooperation of these three trends is a guarantee of the realization of the Manifesto and the democratic, progressive development of the country. Recent events indicate that in spite of the frenzied resistance of the reactionaries and certain other difficulties, there has been a definite leftward shift in Indonesia's political life. Some democratic reforms in the political system and governmental structure have been carried out, such as the formation of the gotong-rojong Parliament based on the co-operation of the leading patriotic parties.

At the plenary meeting of its Central Committee held last December, the Communist Party noted that the adoption by the Provisional People's Consultative Assembly of the policy statement "General Line of State Policy" and the National Development Plan for 1961-1968 was a major victory for the people which would give new impetus to their struggle to abolish the foothold of imperialism and the survivals of feudalism and to democratize Indonesian society.

The Party holds that the National Development Plan accords to a certain extent with the national-democratic, anti-imperialist and anti-feudal character of the Indonesian revolution. The plan rejects foreign capital investments and lays the emphasis on land and reform, promotion of agriculture, industrialization, and, what is exceedingly important, further development of heavy industry. Moreover, it assigns the leading place in the economy to the state sector.

The Party has also pointed to a number of conditions essential for the successful implementation of the Assembly decisions. Revolutionary national unity should be consolidated and the state machinery brought into accord with the spirit of the Assembly decisions; the state sector in the economy strengthened and the land reform carried out; popular enthusiasm stimulated by developing diverse forms of public initiative and guaranteeing the exercise of democratic liberties; a broad discussion of the Assembly decisions conducted among the masses, and cadres of patriots and democrats striving for socialism trained to carry out the tasks of the National Development Plan.

In the recent period considerable progress has been made in building the National Front. Political cooperation has been broadened in the form of the NASAKOM. Political links have been strengthened with various functional groups, both organized and unorganized, in the National Front. The worker-peasant alliance has been cemented in the course of the struggle to carry out the Division of the Harvest Law and the land reform stipulated in the Basic Agrarian Law.

The Party constantly reminds its members that without strengthening the National Front the contradiction between the Indonesian people and imperialism cannot be solved. Here we have in mind the liberation of West Irian, still occupied by the Dutch, and the struggle against foreign subversion and interference, against attempts to involve Indonesia in military blocs, and against foreign monopoly capital.

Decisive for the consolidation of the National Front is the stand taken by the peasantry. The Party has made some progress in the countryside, especially since its last Congress. More Party workers now go to the rural areas to help organize the peasants and to train cadres from their midst, at the same time learning from their own experience that the Party must under all circumstances rely on the agricultural laborers and poor peasants. Otherwise the peasant movement cannot develop as it should along consistently revolutionary lines.

Our work in the countryside is greatly facilitated by the fact that the Land Reform and Division of Harvest bills for which the peasants fought so long have now become the official policy of the government. Implementation of these laws will,

undoubtedly, be a major achievement. However, the extent to which they will be carried out in favor of the peasants, especially the landless and poor peasants, will depend on the political consciousness and organization of the peasants themselves. The revolutionary peasant movement should help the government enforce these laws in the spirit of the President's speech of August 17, 1960, when he said: "The land must belong to the peasants, to those who till it, and not to those who sit idle and grow fat on the sweat of those who work it!"

The Party has always stressed that no progressive law can be carried out as it should be unless the peasants themselves fight for it steadfastly. Land reform, too, can be achieved only if it is based on the principle: "The peasants must liberate themselves from the landlords."

The imperialists and reactionaries generally, driven to frenzy by the successes of the Communist Party and other progressive forces, are seeking to create difficulties wherever they can for the Party and other democratic organizations. They engage in subversive activities aimed at worsening the economic situation. They want to rob the people of their gains and to prevent them from winning new ones. And they slander our Party and deliberately misrepresent its constructive criticism of the government.

But the Communist Party is exerting every effort to remove the barriers to national unity and frustrate the schemes of the reactionaries. Its ties with the masses are growing, as is evident from the steady influx of new members.

RAHMAT

The Key Task of the Czechoslovak Communist Party

THE victory of socialist production relations in the Czechoslovak countryside has created the conditions for turning agriculture into a highly mechanized and highly productive branch of the national economy. The subject was discussed by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia at a meeting in June.

Antonin Novotny, First Secretary of the Party, pointed out that the task in the countryside was to raise the level of agriculture to that of industry by 1970. This, of course, does not imply that the share of agriculture in the national income will equal the share of industry. The aim is to make the most efficient use of the natural conditions of the

country and to bring farming into conformity with the requirements of balanced and harmonious development towards communism as regards general level, technical equipment, organization of labor, skills, and production costs.

Novotny emphasized that a country with a highly-developed, technologically up-to-date, automated industry in which the organization of labor is being steadily improved cannot allow its agriculture to fall short of these standards and retain, even if its overall character is socialist, many survivals of small commodity production.

Unless the discrepancy between agriculture and industry is done away with, it will be impossible to

build a highly-developed socialist society, create the prerequisites for transition to communism and eliminate the essential distinctions between town and country.

All-round electrification and mechanization are now the order of the day. Extensive use will be made of fertilizers, irrigation, scientific methods, and the experience of the working class in organizing industrial production. These measures taken together are a guarantee of a highly productive agriculture.

The advancement of socialist agriculture to a higher plane calls for long-range planning of rural development. The nature of agricultural labor will change and this, in addition to increasing production, will facilitate the shaping of a new, socialist mode of rural life. Large-scale socialist farming will give impetus to the cultural revolution in the countryside and provide the material foundation for extensive political education work aimed at deepening the socialist consciousness of the members of cooperatives and stimulating their activity in both production and public life.

The Party and the government have approved measures designed to ensure that the funds allocated for farm buildings and new dwellings, cultural and public service premises, schools, hospitals, roads and gasworks and for general electrification are used effectively and according to plan to meet the requirements of large-scale production as well as the personal needs of the farmers and industrial workers living in the villages.

The equalization of the levels of industry and agriculture will take place against a background of rapid growth in all branches of the national economy. The object is to elevate farming not to the present level of industry, but to the level projected for 1970. Consequently, more rapid progress is to be ensured in agriculture. The Central Committee stressed that *all efforts must be directed at achieving this substantial advance*. For unless this is done it will be impossible to eliminate the basic disproportion in our economy — the disproportion between agriculture and industry. *The Communist Party regards the development of agriculture as a task of national importance, the key to further progress.*

Fulfilment of this task will be ensured by substantially increasing the material resources and investments earmarked for the purpose in the third five-year plan. The Party also counts on tapping latent reserves which will further accelerate agricultural development.

To bring agriculture to the level of industry by 1970 is undoubtedly a difficult and complex task. A prime condition for its fulfilment is better organizational work to ensure consistent implementation of the Party directives. With this in view, the

Party has sent experienced and politically alert organizers to work in the national committees and agricultural cooperatives.

The role of the national committees must also be enhanced to carry out the tasks. The Central Committee has stressed the need to abide by democratic centralism, which presupposes strengthening the role of the central leadership, participation by the working people in management and extending the powers of local bodies.

The new demarcation of administrative areas effected in 1960 and the granting of greater powers to the national committees will help in realizing the tasks confronting agriculture.

The Central Committee also stressed the need to combat at all levels any manifestation of arm-chair methods of leadership, in particular the predilection for endless conferences. The emphasis is laid on organizational work and efficient utilization of all the facilities and institutions at the disposal of the national committees. In this way more working people can be drawn into economic management and state administration, and the national committees, as elected bodies of popular government, made the decisive organizational factor in agriculture.

State purchases of farm produce have been put on a new footing and the purchase prices co-ordinated. This will provide added incentives to the agricultural enterprises and the members of the cooperative farms. Moreover, the co-operatives have acquired a large number of farm machines from the machine and tractor stations. Last year many agricultural co-operatives were amalgamated to form bigger farms. The large areas make possible a more efficient use of machinery and up-to-date methods. Some of the state farms were reduced in size—roughly to the size of the amalgamated co-operatives. This is in line with our plans for the development of the socialist society and its future organizational structure.

Numerous experts and organizers are now working in the rural areas. An important role in the villages is also played by the members of the national committees and of their subcommittees. Taken together, these constitute a powerful force which should be given proper guidance and fully utilized. Hence the Central Committee enjoined the Party district committees to work systematically among the activists and to direct their efforts to promote agricultural production, to secure the fulfilment and overfulfilment of plans, and to raise the political level of the working people in the rural areas.

With a view to strengthening centralized leadership and verifying fulfilment of decisions at all levels, a Central Control and Statistical Board is to

be established. This marks another step in the development of democratic centralism in both state administration and economic management.

The alliance of the workers and peasants has been cemented with the victory of socialism in the countryside. The peasants united in co-operatives constitute a new, socialist class which came into being in the process of reorganizing the village along co-operative lines. Today its socialist character is becoming still more pronounced. Moreover, the working class plays a big role in rural life. The members of the co-operatives are closely connected with the working class, if only because practically every peasant family has some member working

in industry. This facilitates the spread of the progressive influence of the working class among the peasantry.

In the building of a developed socialist society, and with the growth of large-scale socialist production and the consolidation of socialist relations of production in the countryside, the distinctions between the working class and the co-operative peasants will diminish and eventually disappear. A close-knit classless society of working people endowed with those qualities of the working class which make it the most progressive class will take shape.

F.H.

The Korean Party of Labor on the Eve of Its Fourth Congress

THE Fourth Congress of the Party of Labor is to open in Pyongyang on September 11. The agenda will include the report of the Central Committee, the seven-year economic plan, and elections of the Party's leading bodies.

The Congress will be an historic occasion for the people of Korea. It will meet at a time when the working people are engaged in all-out effort to fulfil the seven-year plan which will be a decisive step forward in industrialization, and when the country is effecting a momentous leap ahead in its political, economic and cultural development.

Far-reaching changes have taken place in the republic in the five years since the previous Congress. The first five-year plan, the basic task of which was to lay the foundations of a socialist industry, was fulfilled for industrial output in two and a half years. The building of co-operatives in agriculture and the reorganization of private industry and trade along socialist lines—the most difficult tasks of socialist construction — were successfully completed in 1958. The Korean People's Democratic Republic is now an industrial-agrarian country, a country with developed heavy and light industries. Excellent progress has been registered in the sphere of education and culture generally. Universal compulsory seven-year education has been introduced, and more than a quarter of the entire population is studying in various educational establishments, which include 78 higher schools. Tuition is free and a considerable part of the student body receives state scholarships. The population enjoys free medical services, and the material and cultural standard are rising.

In the period since the last congress the ideological and organizational unity of the Party has been

reinforced. Its members are devoted to the cause of communism, and its contact with the masses has been strengthened. The attention paid to communist education, to popularizing the revolutionary traditions, has raised the political level and strengthened the morale of both the Party members and the people generally, who are now taking a more active part in political life. The Party is steadily improving its methods of work to keep up with the needs of the times.

The gains won by the Korean people under the leadership of the Party provide the solid foundation for accelerating the building of socialism in the Korean People's Democratic Republic and hastening the peaceful unification of Korea. The coming congress will sum up these achievements and define further lines of development.

The announcement of the date of the congress—the congress of victors, as it has been called—has evoked a wave of political and labor enthusiasm. A mass movement for increased production and economy of raw material and finances is widespread in industry. The workers have pledged to fulfil the annual plan by the opening of the congress. The personnel of the Kim Chak Iron and Steel Works, for instance, are living up to their pledge to turn out 80,000 tons of steel over and above plan. The peasants are determined to bring in one million tons more grain than last year. The "Chullima" movement for high productivity is spreading in industry, with work teams and enterprises vying with one another for the title of a "Chullima" collective.

The Party branches are now busy preparing for the congress. Steps have been taken to strengthen the leading bodies, to improve organizational and

ideological work, to increase the numbers and improve the training of the activists, to heighten the vanguard role of the Communists, and to rally all sections of the people still more solidly behind the

Party. The Party and the people look forward to the coming congress, firmly resolved to achieve still greater success in building socialism and in the struggle for unification of the country.

From the Experience of Publishing Activity

ARGENTINA

DESPITE difficulties, the Communist Party of Argentina conducts extensive educational work and is successfully circulating Marxist-Leninist literature.

In 1960 the "Anteo" Publishing House put out 53 books and pamphlets on political subjects in a total of 750,000 copies. This is an impressive figure especially if we bear in mind the reprisals and the fact that the printshops are under systematic surveillance by the police.

Although all Party publications are distributed through the branches because the authorities prevent communist literature from being sold at kiosks and in bookshops, more books are sold and the journals are printed in bigger editions. The circulation of *Nueva Era*, theoretical journal of the Central Committee, doubled last year. Sales of *Problems of Peace and Socialism* have gone up by 90 per cent. Some publications, for example, the pamphlets *Khrushchov Addresses the People of Argentina*; *Cuba—the Land of Revolution*; and *The Anti-Feudal and Anti-Imperialist Revolution in Cuba* sold in 100,000, 35,000 and 45,000 copies respectively.

It should be pointed out that 88 per cent of the cost of the books and pamphlets put out by "Anteo" during the past ten years was met by readers.

An exchange of views on the subject of improving ideological work held last year proved very useful. One of the aims of the exchange was to ensure better literature sales. Literature circulation, it was stressed, was an important matter for all members of the Party and not just for the literature committees.

Since the exchange, literature sales have gone up in some areas. Many branches held special meetings, arranged selling campaigns and assessed their benefits.

As an example we can mention the Buenos Aires Party committee. Its secretary, Victor Larralde, member of the Executive Committee of the Party, pays close attention to circulation meetings and has attended many of them. The district committees, too, regard literature sales as part of their work. As a result sales have gone up. The readership of *Nueva Era* has risen by 90 per cent and of *Problems of Peace and Socialism* by 130 per cent. The sales of this journal in the factories have nearly trebled.

In our books and pamphlets we give the lie to the anti-communist slanders. A pamphlet entitled *Anti-Communism—A Policy of the Reactionaries and Traitors* demonstrates, on the basis of facts, that the Communist Party is a truly national force that has emerged from the depth of the people, whereas its adversaries are agents of feudal and imperialist interests.

We encounter numerous difficulties in popularizing our publications. We cannot advertise in commercial newspapers and on radio and television. But the reactionaries cannot prevent us from popularizing our literature in the Party press, in some 50 factory bulletins and 20 district bulletins. Moreover, we print thousands of leaflets to advertise our books and pamphlets. Some books and some of the articles in *Problems of Peace and Socialism* are recommended for Party schools and classes. This, too, helps literature sales.

Jose BERMUDEZ

GREAT BRITAIN

IN addition to a daily newspaper, weekly and monthly journals, the British Communist

Party publishes a sizable amount of Marxist literature. The printed matter is discussed and prepared by the economic, cultural, international and other committees of the Executive Committee. Since the Twenty-Sixth Congress in March 1959, the Party's Press and Propaganda Department has put out 17 pamphlets and 28 leaflets in editions of over 270,000 and three million copies respectively. The Party also prints materials for propagandists and new members, talks for workers, and literature for women.

The fight for peace holds first place among the international problems. This is the subject of the booklet *A Prospect of Peace*, written by J. D. Bernal, scientist and peace champion. In this work Bernal expounds in popular form the main ideas of his *World Without War*. *The German Menace*, a pamphlet written by John Gollan, General Secretary of the Party, is also devoted to the fight for peace. The collection, *Peace or War*, has aroused wide interest.

The Communist Party's support for the Congo people found expression in the pamphlet by R. Palme Dutt *Defend the Congo*. Early this year the

leaflet *Africa 1960* brought out the significance of the anti-imperialist movement in Africa. In his *Empire Today* (from the *Socialism Today Series*) Idris Cox expresses the Tory line and the attitude of the Right-wing Labor leaders who try to argue that the old British imperialism is a thing of the past. The book, *Africa: The Roots of Revolt*, by Jack Woddis, is the first of a two-volume work (a second volume, *Africa: The Lion Awakes*, will appear this year). Woddis elucidates in particular an important but insufficiently studied question — the growth of an African working class.

Combating the disruptive tactics of the Right-wing Labor leaders is an important aspect of the work of the Communist Party, and it should be said that it has done much in this respect. The advance registered by the Left at last years' Trades Union Congress and the Labor Party Conference at Scarborough was generally recognized as being due in no small measure to consistent activity of the Party. A notable role was played, for example, by John Gollan's pamphlet *The Labor Party and the Bomb*.

Another Gollan pamphlet that aroused interest was *Gaitskell or Socialism*. Written after the Scarborough Conference, the pamphlet called for unity of all the progressive forces. "We are at a turning point in Labor Party history," it says. "The battle is on. Its outcome will decide Labor's future." Branch meetings on this pamphlet were attended by many sympathizers and people interested in the future of the working-class movement.

Freedom, a pamphlet written by Brian Simon explodes the "free world" myth. Simon shows that the so-called free world, which includes parliamentary democracies and the Franco, Salazar and other dictatorships, is united by one thing — the "freedom" of capitalists to exploit workers. The working class has won rights in hard battles, and socialism alone can give it genuine and lasting freedom. The booklet by John Lewis, *Socialism and the Individual*, is a very useful weapon with which to combat the ideologists of capitalism.

The "Welfare State" is another favorite theme of bourgeois and Right-wing Labor spokesmen. This claim is examined by Katherine Hood in her *Room at the Bottom*. The pamphlet deals with one of the more painful issues of the "affluent society," namely, pensions. The author shows the suffering and plights of the old-age pensioners amid the seeming abundance. The Party weekly *World News* described this book as "a little gold mine of information."

In *Woman Today—Her Job, Family and Future* Molly Keith writes about the bad housing conditions, the injustices and hardships suffered by far too many families.

A prominent place among the Party publications is occupied by pamphlets on economic subjects which provide rich material for active trade unionists and Party propagandists. Among them are the pamphlets—*Wages, Strikes and Shop-Stewards*, *The Building Industry Changes Its Face*, and many others. The economic committee of the Executive Committee puts out a quarterly *Economic Bulletin*. A pamphlet by Alan Brown, *The Money Game*, shows where the profit comes from and where it goes. It shows, for example, that the average weekly profit made by a worker for the Ford bosses and shareholders is £14 8s. 0d.

Hymie Fagan's *Nationalization* answers the question whether the 1945 nationalization was, as is often claimed by the Right-wing critics, a failure and shows that despite the difficulties the nationalized industries have made headway. The railways are being modernized and the coal industry, in an almost hopeless condition before, has achieved a record in capitalist Europe for productivity per worker.

The Party engages also in research. One of its more recent works *The Life and Times of James Connolly*, by Desmond Greaves, is devoted to the famous revolutionary socialist produced by Ireland. The book *Health and Humanity*, by S. and V. Leff, is a detailed study of the advance of medicine and shows how capitalism hinders its full utilization for the benefit of man.

Studies in the History of Education, 1780-1870, by Brian Simon, examines a question hitherto the domain of bourgeois historians. The author helps those who are working for educational reform to understand the historical class roots of the Tory attitude to education.

The circulation of Marxist literature is not an easy matter in a country with a powerful capitalist press. Still, headway is being made. And not the last role in this respect is played by the Party's efforts to ensure that its pamphlets and books are written in plain language, that they raise questions of concern to the people and supply the answers.

Michael STRANG

DENMARK

LAND og Folk, the Communist newspaper, is the successor to the small weekly *Solidarit* which first appeared in 1911 and continued publication until 1920 when it merged with another workers' weekly and became known as *Arbejderbladet*. This was the Communist Party paper which began as a daily in 1934.

Collections among Party members, readers and sympathizers have long been the source ensuring the publication of the paper. The fund was opened in 1936. The Party called on its sympathizers and supporters, who in those days received little more

than the subsistence minimum, to send monthly donations to the fund.

In 1941 the Communist Party was banned and its property, including the newspaper, confiscated. After the liberation this property was not restored to the Party. But the donations to its press in 1945-46 were such that adversaries were astonished. Some two million kroner were collected among the workers.

In 1947 the fund appeared again, but the newspaper was now called *Land og Folk*. There were new elements in the organization of the fund: numerous, though often small, permanent groups of "fund supporters" include people from different walks of life, among them unemployed and pensioners. Our slogan is: "Collect from each but on a purely voluntary basis!"

How do these permanent groups function? Formed by the Party branches they elect a leader whose

job is to gain monthly contributors and to ensure regular donations. The contributor is given, as an acknowledgement, a special stamp ranging in value from 1 to 2, 5, 10 and 25 kroner. The money thus collected is handed over on a certain day each month to the Fund Administration.

The Administration sums up the results of the campaign and the amount donated by each group is published in the paper.

Regular contributors receive a small card for their stamp-receipts. At the end of the year when the twelve pages of the card are filled the holder qualifies for a copy of a picture by a famous Danish painter.

Total monthly donations range from 20,000 to 30,000 kroner. Between 300,000-400,000 kroner are collected during the special campaign held annually.

Helge KIERULFF

Ideological Discussions

DAS KLEINE VOLKSBLATT, published by the Austrian clericals, is gravely disturbed by the fact that Yuri Gagarin's space flight "seems to have confirmed once again the theory that the communist system is superior to the countries of the free world." The word "seems" in this commentary highlights the reluctance of this organ of the leading party of the Austrian bourgeoisie to face reality and to acknowledge what is accepted as an incontrovertible fact by progressives everywhere. The paper fears that the exploit of the Soviet Communist might be also recognized as a victory for the materialist world outlook since "they (the Communists—K.S.) seek to use it as proof that there are no divine barriers, no spheres which man with his spiritual powers and material resources cannot penetrate."

Anxiety on this score is characteristic not only of the Austrian clericals. Recently the *Osservatore Romano*, the Vatican organ, made a point of stressing that the Catholic Church welcomed Gagarin's achievement inasmuch as scientific progress proves the existence of God, who created man as "a free and rational being." The clerical circles are thus trying to capitalize on the scientific accomplishments of our time and prove that there is no contradiction between science and religion.

The Communist Party of Austria is organizing lectures and other educational activities to expose the fallacy of the ideas spread by the proponents of clericalism. Recently, for instance, *Weg und Ziel*, the Party's theoretical monthly, sponsored a lecture by Professor Walter Hollitscher, Com-

munist philosopher, on the theme "Marxism and Religion," in which he showed that anti-scientific concepts that amount to sheer mockery of human intelligence make up the very fabric of religion. Professor Hollitscher mentioned a recent radio talk by a Catholic savant who discussed in all seriousness such questions as the sex of the angels, whether they need food, and so on. When addressing intellectuals, however, the Church resorts to idealistic interpretations of the findings of contemporary science.

Professor Hollitscher's lecture was attended by an audience of several hundred, mostly young people, a good one-third of whom were opponents of Marxism. When the lecture was over, many asked for the floor and a lively discussion followed. The erudition of the lecturer and the convincing way in which he stated his case made a deep impression even on those who did not share his views.

Many other examples could be cited showing how widespread is the interest in ideological questions, especially among young people. Working men and women are also interested in learning more about the achievements of the socialist countries. Ever since the launching of the first sputnik people have ceased to take anti-communist propaganda at its face value, they want to find out for themselves the secret of the accomplishments of socialism which came as a complete surprise to so many in the West. In view of this, the Central Committee of the Party has organized lectures throughout the country on the themes:

"What is Marxism, Capitalism, Socialism, Communism, Freedom?" (based on Franz Marek's pamphlet published under the same title), "Marxism and Religion," "Democracy, Dictatorship and Freedom," "The Liberation Struggle of the Colonial Peoples," "Are the Austrians Germans?" etc. These lectures which attract large audiences are followed as a rule by lively discussions and debates with opponents of Marxism.

In Upper Austria, where our Party is still comparatively weak, ten public lectures attended by nearly 900 people have been given recently on the subject "Marxism and Religion." The audiences consisted largely of young people, mostly far removed from the Party. In Urfahr a lecture arranged in the town hall was attended by many secondary school pupils accompanied by their philosophy teacher, who came prepared to challenge the lecturer. In Ried, the headmaster and teachers of a secondary school took part in the discussion; the impression was such that people asked that more lectures be arranged. In Linz nearly 100 railway car-shop workers came to a lecture straight from work.

At the last Party Congress the Secretary of the Upper Austria organization of the Party, Kammerstaetter, described the recent growth of clerical influence in that area. The clerical elements, aided by the Right Socialist burgomaster of Linz, are forcing school children to attend church. And in the state-owned VOEST metallurgical works there are "worker-priests" who engage in religious propaganda among the workers. This, Kammerstaetter pointed out, makes the lectures on "Marxism and Religion" more important from the standpoint of combating reactionary ideas.

"In the sphere of spiritual life a growing threat is presented by the influence of clericalism, for which the cultural policy of the Socialist Party has provided opportunities that are evoking more

and more indignation," the Communist Party Congress pointed out in its resolution "For peace, democracy and socialism." Many sincere Socialists disagree with their leaders' policy of kowtowing to the Church, a policy contrary to the traditions of the Austrian working-class movement. At a discussion arranged in Vienna an old Socialist took the floor to welcome the anti-religious educational work of the Communists and to call for united action against clericalism.

Alarmed by the effectiveness of this educational work, the reactionaries are taking counter-measures. Frequently clergymen, members of the Catholic Action, Catholic students, teachers and even secondary school pupils who have been specially primed are sent to break up our lecture meetings. The press, too, has been mobilized: the church paper *Linzer Kirchenblatt* published a completely distorted report of a lecture given in Gmunden, Upper Austria. The lecturer, however, was able to make use of the law of libel to force the newspaper to print a retraction. Such setbacks suffered by the reactionaries tend to increase the popularity of our lectures and meetings. Catholics who come to them often suggest continuing the discussion after the lecture is over and ask what literature to read in order to make a deeper study of Marxism.

"The non-Marxist, of course, is not won over to Marxism by one lecture," the journal *Weg und Ziel* said, commenting on the importance of lectures. "But there is no doubt that the general impression he gets is that Marxism has many convincing arguments in its favor. Socialism is proving its superiority in the most diverse spheres of public life. . . . Though they still reach a comparatively small number of people, our lectures and lecture cycles too are proof of the tremendous force of attraction exerted by Marxism."

Karl SACHER

Pages from History

Symbol of the Fight Against Militarism and War

(90th Anniversary of the Birth of Karl Liebknecht)

EARLY in 1919, when Noske's counter-revolutionary units were holding Berlin in the grip of the white terror, the *Rote Fahne*, organ of the newly-founded Communist Party of Germany, printed an article by Karl Liebknecht, headed "In Spite of Everything." Written shortly before its author was murdered by the reactionaries, it is characteristic of Karl Liebknecht, the revolutionary leader of the German working class, fearless fighter against German militarism and imperialist war.

The last lines Liebknecht was ever to write strike this optimistic and prophetic note: "But our ship sails proudly and steadily along the straight course towards its goal. And regardless of whether we shall live to see it reach the goal, our program will live; it will triumph in a world of liberated mankind. In spite of everything!"*

The son of Wilhelm Liebknecht, distinguished German working-class leader and colleague of Marx, Karl Liebknecht personified all that was best in the German working class.

Though he lived at a time when opportunism was widespread in the German and Western European labor movement, Liebknecht, in common with Rosa Luxemburg, Franz Mehring, Clara Zetkin and Wilhelm Pieck, staunchly upheld revolutionary Marxism. These were the leaders who created the Communist Party of Germany, the vanguard of the German working class.

"The name of Karl Liebknecht," wrote Lenin, "is known to workers in all lands. Everywhere... that name is a symbol of a leader's devotion to the interests of the proletariat, loyalty to the socialist revolution. That name is a symbol of truly sincere, truly relentless struggle against capitalism, a struggle prepared for any sacrifice. That name is a symbol of implacable struggle against imperialism not in words but in deeds."**

The program for which Karl Liebknecht fought and for which he gave his life is today being translated into reality over one-fourth of the

globe. The socialist world system is becoming the decisive factor in the development of human society.

Part of the territory of the German nation—the German Democratic Republic—belongs to the community of socialist peoples. In this state, the first socialist state in German history, the goal to which Liebknecht aspired has been reached.

Speaking of Prussian militarism in his book *Militarism and Anti-Militarism*, Karl Liebknecht wrote that it embodied "the worst and most dangerous" of all forms of militarism, that the militarist policy was "an insane threat to all our cultural values, being fraught with the danger of military conflicts on a world scale."

Liebknecht urged the German working class to fight against militarism, to fight it to the death. His whole life was dedicated to this struggle. Shortly before the first world war, he exposed the machinations of the German armament makers, revealing how Krupp, the cannon king, had bribed top officials and army officers to obtain information on the design of weapons produced by rival firms. He wrote of the inhuman treatment of army recruits and flayed the barracks-square bullies and their brutal methods of implanting discipline.

When the first world war broke out, Liebknecht unhesitatingly sided with those who opposed the imperialist slaughter. In contrast to the opportunists who called for "defense of the fatherland" he tried to open the eyes of the German workers to the real danger. "The main enemy of the German people," he wrote, "is here in Germany. It is German imperialism, the German war party, German secret diplomacy. The German people must fight this enemy in their own land..."*

During the revolution in Germany in November 1918, Karl Liebknecht stood at the head of the revolutionary workers and soldiers. The program of action of the Lefts led by Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg demanded confiscation of the

*Karl Liebknecht, *Selected Speeches, Letters and Essays*. Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1952, p. 530.

**From a *Letter to the Workers of Europe and America*.

*Karl Liebknecht, *Selected Speeches, Letters and Essays*, p. 301.

property of the war criminals, monopolists and junkers, abolition of the material base of German imperialism and militarism and the establishment of a revolutionary government of workers and soldiers.

The demands which Liebknecht and his comrades inscribed on their banner have been realized in the German Democratic Republic which was established after the Soviet army smashed the Hitler military machine. The imperialist and militarist forces were not merely ousted, they were uprooted.

The working class of the GDR, under the leadership of its Marxist-Leninist Party and in alliance with the other sections of the population, has established a peaceful and democratic system and is now building socialism. Here the cause to which Karl Liebknecht devoted his life has triumphed. Here men and women are living and working in the spirit of Karl Liebknecht for the happiness and prosperity of the nation.

In striking contrast is the situation in the Western part of Germany, where the goal Karl Liebknecht aspired to has yet to be attained. There the imperialist and militarist forces have again succeeded in gaining the ascendancy with the help of American dollars and the imperialist occupation forces and with the support of the Right-wing Social Democratic leaders, who are doing their best to keep the working class divided.

The leading positions in that state of the "free world" are held by men who are responsible for the murder of millions of people, men like Oberlaender, Globke and Co. On June 29 a law was passed in West Germany extending the rights enjoyed by the ex-soldiers of the Wehrmacht to the SS-men. According to this law, the killers who formed the Death's Head division and other SS units "have the right to social security."

Bonn likes to advertise itself as a "constitutional state." This type of "constitutional state" was exposed by Karl Liebknecht half a century ago. In a speech in Stuttgart, he said: "How do matters stand in Germany with regard to the constitutional state? On closer scrutiny we find that it is enough to scrape the surface lightly to find a police state protruding at every corner."* Liebknecht might well have been describing the situation in present-day West Germany, where the authorities, armed with the emergency law, are arresting anyone suspected of membership in the Communist Party, summarily removing progressives from the production councils, and persecuting intellectuals who stand for peace and against atomic armament. And all in the name of "democracy and freedom."

*Karl Liebknecht, *Collected Speeches and Articles*. Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1960, Vol. II, p. 19.

Stressing that militarism and imperialism are the chief enemies of the working class in the fight for democracy and socialism. Karl Liebknecht resolutely combated those revisionist forces in the Social Democratic Party who sided with militarism. He argued passionately against Noske and Schippel, the Social Democratic deputies in the Reichstag, when on the eve of the first world war they deceived the people by scouting the danger of militarism. And when the war broke out, he relentlessly exposed the Social Democratic leaders who gave their support to the predatory schemes of the German militarists and imperialists.

If the "defenders of the fatherland," against whom Karl Liebknecht fought so vigorously in 1914, cloaked their support of the imperialist policy of German militarism in opportunist phrasemongering, today Brandt, Wehner and their associates in West Germany have openly embraced the cause of the Bonn atom-maniacs and revanchists and are furthering the plans for atomic war harbored by West German militarists.

But while the West German rulers, aided by the Brandts and Wehners in the SDPG and by a frantic anti-communist campaign, have managed to mislead a good part of the population and some of the working class as well, there are forces in the Adenauer state which are raising the banner of struggle against militarism, and are acting in the spirit of Karl Liebknecht.

Thousands of people took part in the Easter marches against the atomic armament of the West German army, carrying slogans saying: "Bonn Wants Atomic Weapons — We Want Disarmament," "Atomic Missiles are Death Magnets!" On May Day tens of thousands of workers carrying red banners and wearing red carnations in their buttonholes demonstrated against atomic armament and the emergency bill in Munich, Hanover, Bremen and other West German cities under the slogans: "Away with Missiles, Down with Strauss!," "Down with Atomic Weapons and Death — Give Us Cheap Bread Instead!" Resistance to militarism is growing also among the West German intellectuals.

These forces are steadily growing in strength and numbers. Under the leadership of the working class and with the German Democratic Republic at their side, they will be able to curb militarism and imperialism in West Germany.

The 90th anniversary of Karl Liebknecht's birth is an occasion for all progressives in both East and West Germany to multiply their efforts to put an end once and for all to the domination of the revenge-crazy militarists and imperialists in West Germany.

The proposal of the Soviet government for the conclusion of a peace treaty with both German states, set forth trenchantly by Khrushchov in a number of speeches, opens bright prospects to the German people in this respect. Walter Ulbricht has pointed out that the peace treaty "would be of benefit to everyone interested in peace. It would prevent Germany from becoming the breeding

ground of another war."

The task of safeguarding peace in Germany, and hence peace throughout Europe, is a worthy tribute to the memory of Karl Liebknecht whose life was a model of courageous, self-sacrificing struggle against imperialist war, for the happiness and peace of the German people.

Karl OLBE

Exchange of Views

Crises and the Working People*

Role of the Class Struggle in Economic Development

ANTONIO PESENTI
(Italy)

THE economists who have taken part in the discussion in *World Marxist Review* on the features of modern crises have, I think, arrived at the following general conclusions:

First, the economic cycle continues to be the inevitable form of extended capitalist reproduction also in the present stage of capitalism;

Second, as a result of the operation of the law of uneven development of capitalism and the breach in the unity of the world market, the development of the cycle differs from country to country;

Third, important changes can be observed in the pattern of the cycle.

These changes are in large measure explained by the fact that the reproduction process is taking place at a definite stage in the general crisis of capitalism—the stage of the transition from capitalism to socialism. This stage is characterized

by the predominant role of socialism in the world and its growing influence on the world market;

by the existence and development of a group of countries which have freed themselves from colonial oppression and are exerting an ever greater influence on international economic relations;

by the intensification of the class struggle in the capitalist countries and the fact that the working class has openly set itself the imminent aim of coming to power.

In a number of capitalist countries the working class is already a leading force in social development, counterposing its solutions for major econ-

omic and political problems to those of the ruling capitalist class.

The experience of the struggle waged by the Italian working class and its vanguard, the Communist Party, the leaders of the masses, is striking evidence of the impact of the class struggle on economic development and hence on capitalist reproduction. While we accentuate this aspect, we do not disregard the importance of other factors influencing both the development of the cycle in Italy and the economic situation in other capitalist countries. Neither do we believe that the Italian experience is appropriate to other capitalist countries where the economic, social and political conditions are different.

Features of the Cycle in Italy and the Attitude of the Communists

Annual rates of growth of industrial production and the national income have been rather high in Italy during the past ten years. The volume of industrial production increased on an average of nine per cent per year, and the national income grew at an average rate of 5.4 per cent during 1951-59, and was 6.6 per cent in 1960. Other economic indices, too, testify to the considerable growth of production. There were, of course, times when the rate of growth slowed down, but prolonged stagnation, to say nothing of depression, has not been seen. What we have, therefore, is a special kind of cycle, a steadily ascending curve.

The specific lines along which the Italian economy is developing cannot be understood without taking

*Continued from No. 7, 1961.

into account a number of objective conditions. There is a big and as yet unused potential for capitalist development in Italy. We have a numerous army of unemployed, new sources of fuel have been discovered and are being exploited, obsolete economic structures, already done away with in other capitalist countries, are being abolished.

But the rapid growth of production in the recent period cannot be explained by the operation of these factors alone. For all of them have obtained in the country before. It is due first and foremost to the struggle waged by the working people and the Communist Party against dominant capitalist groups. But, since the growth took place under the aegis of the latter, the development was inadequate, it intensified the disproportions, and was accompanied by a sharpening of the economic and social contradictions.

The course of action pursued by the Communist Party in all spheres of social life and nearly always with the support of the Socialist Party and the General Confederation of Labor, was to put before the people a positive solution of urgent problems, a solution which would promote the democratic movement. The Communist Party and the working class counterposed their solutions to those proposed by the ruling capitalist circles and their yes-men. This policy heightened the class consciousness and militancy of the working people.

Combating all deviations, primarily those of a corporative nature, the Party worked to combine the partial and general tasks, to fuse them into a single general line, differing fundamentally from ruling class policy. It explained to the people the prospects which would be opened up to them by the conquest of power, pointed out the Italian road to socialism. Acting in this way as the indirect leading force of social and economic progress, the Party forced the ruling class to reckon to some extent with the demands and the will of the people.

It was precisely because our policy was more in line with reality that the Party gained in strength at all stages of the economic cycle and became particularly strong in areas and branches of production where the standard of living is higher and conditions generally better. The Party never adopted a wait-and-see attitude. It has never held the view, for example, that some problems concern only the ruling class. The Party members have always kept their feet on the ground, paying due regard to the changes to which their activity also contributed. With the laws of dialectics constantly in mind, the Party has engaged in militant activity in all spheres of public life.

The Communist Party has never indulged in predicting when and where a crisis would erupt and, needless to say, has never led the people to

expect economic catastrophe of the type of the 1929-33 crisis. On the contrary, it has done its best to nip in the bud notions of this kind which, it avers, would diminish rather than heighten the militancy of the masses. And this attitude, far from causing difficulties in the struggle, contributed to its success.

The boom never caused us misgivings, for we knew well that the contradictions of capitalism do not disappear during a boom, but become sharper, more obvious and more intolerable to the working people. Our task is to disclose them, explain their essence and propose a way of overcoming them.

It has always been clear to us that our efforts to safeguard popular interests might objectively favor economic development of the capitalist type. For the Italian economy is capitalist in structure, and the capitalists are the ruling class. But this development, we held, leading as it does to the sharpening of capitalist contradictions, should create more favorable conditions for our struggle, help the Party to forge ahead and extend its influence.

In 1945, immediately after the end of the war, the Communists led the work of rehabilitation. They proposed a democratic rehabilitation based on the nationalization of the power enterprises and big monopolies, the establishment of councils to run these enterprises and the strengthening of other democratic institutions. We were strongly opposed to restoration along capitalist lines, which was what the ruling classes wanted—and what they succeeded in achieving with U.S. aid.

In 1950 the Communists helped to draw up the "Labor Plan" advanced by the General Confederation of Labor. This plan, the first serious attempt to abolish unemployment, set forth a clear-cut program for the development of production. The demand for structural reforms it contained was essentially political in purport. Our anti-monopoly struggle aimed at achieving agrarian reform, a new system of agricultural agreements, help for the small and medium-sized producer, and higher wages. "Strikes in reverse"* were common at that time, and local plans for economic revival were being drawn up everywhere. This helped the people to see a concrete way of replacing the rule of the capitalists and forced the latter to reckon with the people's demands.

The Christian-Democratic government had to take some of the country's major needs into account. In 1954 it put forward the "Vanoni plan," a ten-year development scheme. This scheme, reactionary in content, did not affect monopoly

*Meaning occupation by workers of enterprises which the owners wanted to close. By keeping production going, however, the workers prevented closure.

power and proposed increasing accumulations and capital investment by freezing wages and for this reason was criticized and rejected by the Communists. Still, it was the first concerted attempt by the government to find a solution to two of our gravest problems—large-scale unemployment and the extreme economic and social backwardness of the South—and it was the outcome of popular pressure. We have always been aware that under capitalism even progressive measures such as taking over unused land, agrarian reform, maintaining the wage level, increasing the purchasing power of the people and combating monopoly prices stimulate a more intensive capitalist development. Thus even the limited agrarian reform increased the purchasing power of the population in some areas, stimulated the demand for means of production and increased output for the market. In capitalist society these factors give rise to intensive development of the processes of capitalist reproduction, promote industrial growth, and increase profits and capital investments by the more powerful capitalist groups. The class struggle, even if it develops only around wages, is one of the most important incentives to growth of the organic composition of capital and technological innovations. Industry developed rapidly in Italy between the years 1900-1915 and in recent times: *i.e., in the periods of the greatest class struggles and the biggest popular victories*. Under the fascist dictatorship, on the other hand, there was a prolonged slump and the national income grew at the exceedingly low rate of 0.8 per cent per annum. It is against this general background of class struggle that our attitude towards state capitalism should be examined.

State Capitalism: Its Place and Significance

Many Marxist economists agree that state capitalism is the most important phenomenon in modern capitalist economy, and that its development is one of the major causes for the changes now under way in capitalist reproduction and, hence, in the economic cycle.

I think that the general term "state capitalism" is sometimes understood as a combination of heterogeneous phenomena varying in impact and requiring different approaches. To elicit its correct meaning state capitalism should be studied not in the abstract but concretely, dialectically. We are reminded of this in the Statement of the 81 Communist and Workers' Parties, where a clear distinction is made between *state capitalism* in the former colonial countries and *state-monopoly capitalism* in the advanced capitalist countries. The distinction is obvious. It lies first and foremost in the features of state capitalism in the newly emerged countries, in the peculiarities of the young states. But there should also be a dialectical

approach to state capitalism in the imperialist countries, and a study made of the concrete situation, which is never static but changes constantly as a result of the class struggle.

State capitalism can be used in a variety of ways, its role depending on the relationship of forces in the process of the class struggle. It should be borne in mind that two different things are often implied in speaking of state capitalism. The first is the capitalist state's intervention in the economy through an economic policy *indirectly* influencing production. The second is state ownership of the means of production, and this, in our opinion, signifies genuine state capitalism, *i.e., direct* state intervention in the production processes.

What is the essential difference between these two things? No indirect intervention in production can change the operation of economic laws of capitalism, in particular the law of profit. Hence this intervention is *always* to the advantage of the capitalists.

In the broad sense state intervention envisages the use both of the old economic policy (taxes, duties, state appropriation, etc.) and new methods, which are characteristic of imperialism and which have become possible owing to the concentration of production in monopoly hands (manipulation of the money market, regulation of the bank rate, accumulations, market control, bonuses, subsidies, etc.). There can be no question that all these measures are spearheaded at achieving one objective: to make the capitalist enterprises profitable, to guarantee an average rate of profit and to scotch any tendency to reduce this rate. By lowering the bank rate and pursuing a cheap money policy, the total surplus value is merely redistributed among the capitalists. Fixing minimum prices and granting subsidies and bonuses lead to the same results.

Even the social measures of the capitalist state (fixing a minimum wage, pensions for greater numbers of people, etc.) are subordinated to the profit motive, for they expand and stabilize consumption. And stable consumption becomes more of a necessity for the capitalist enterprises because the modern technology adds substantially to costs if there is any slowing down or intermission in production. The operation of objective laws of capitalist reproduction in the epoch of imperialism leads to state economic measures benefiting not the small and medium firms but the big monopoly groupings.

This does not mean that the working class should adopt a passive attitude to state economic intervention. It is seeking to *compel* the ruling class and its state to employ those means of influencing the economy which would be in greater accord

with the interests of the people. The working class wants the state allocations to be made on a territorial basis, wants cuts in military spending, more money for public education, a social insurance system and public works. It wants taxes to be levied on rents and profits, not on wages; it wants taxation of the ultra rich, not of the very poor.

These movements are both of an economic and political significance. Not only do they influence the process of capitalist reproduction, they draw the people into the struggle for clear-cut objectives. The same aim is pursued by the actions against tariffs designed to safeguard monopoly profits, and against the granting of favorable export terms to the monopoly groups, for a reduction of monopoly prices and for control over them, for more houses, for aid not to the big landed proprietors and capitalists but to the small manufacturers and landowners.

These measures can be carried out within the framework of the capitalist system of production. They are not structural reforms, and do not change economic laws or the trend of capitalist development. An example is the government's scheme to develop the South (the southern provinces of Italy and the islands). For the past century, as we know, the gap widened between the economic and social situation in the South and that in the North. I shall not touch here on the causes which engendered this process, or on Antonio Gramsci's analysis of them. I would like only to point out that it was the natural result of capitalist development and conformed to the internal laws of capitalism. The "South" became a major problem long ago. It is now an urgent national problem calling for rapid solution.

Immediately after the defeat of fascism the people in the South occupied the unused lands and succeeded in getting a restricted agrarian reform based on the expropriation of land owned by the big latifundists. Later, the government promulgated a complex code of laws germane to the development of the South. They boiled down to stimulating capital investment by means of tax reductions and granting credits on favorable terms. The government set up a "South Department"—a body with the job of organizing public works, and encouraging land improvement, road building and housing, i.e., of putting up what the economists now call "infrastructures." At that time we pointed out the class essence of these state measures and their limitations, stressing that their implementation would engender a peculiar kind of export of capital from North to South which would impoverish the South even more, for the profits would flow to the North where the big monopoly groups are located. Even more capital

and labor would be absorbed by the North with the result that the gap between North and South would widen. The resulting economic development could only be a capitalist development, based on the law of profit. It would merely lower the extra-enterprise costs of capitalists, add to their profits and aggravate the economic and social contradictions.

The experience of the past decade has confirmed the conclusions made by the Communists. The South's share in the national income dropped from 24 to 21 per cent. As the South has no modern industry many of its newly-built roads and other public projects are not properly utilized. The South of Italy is today rightly called the "graveyard of the infrastructures."

The Communists counterpose their solution of the southern problem to the capitalist plans. Their points are: agrarian reform; economic and organizational means for developing the peasant farms; encouragement of initiative by the local authorities in industrial expansion and construction; large-scale capital investments in new industrial projects. A struggle was launched on the basis of these demands and is continuing to the present day. Some results have already been achieved. A big oil-processing plant of the National Hydrocarbons Corporation (ENI), using local methane, has been set up in Gela, and a metallurgical works is under construction in Taranto. State-owned enterprises are being enlarged in other districts of the South.

The Communists say that, in contrast to state intervention, genuine state capitalism, i.e., state ownership of the means of production, together with structural reforms, could be an important means of modifying the capitalist cycle. It can do so because it is not motivated by the need to subordinate itself to the law of profit under all circumstances, and in some cases can even counteract it. State capital investments, for example, can be made not wholly in the economic interests of an enterprise, but out of political considerations, irrespective of whether or not they furnish immediate returns. State-owned enterprises can be run along different economic lines than private capitalist enterprises. Under certain circumstances, therefore, state-owned enterprises can operate in an anti-monopolist direction.

The role of the state sector depends, of course, on the balance of forces in the class struggle. For state capitalism, as we see it, is often merely a means of maintaining the rate of profit. Transfer to the state of transport, insurance companies, banks and the non-remunerative branches of industry, the fixed capital of which the monopolies find it unprofitable to renew, means as a rule bigger profits for the privately-owned enterprises.

This is achieved both by means of tariffs, which benefit the monopolies by reducing their production costs, and by excluding the surplus value created in the low-profit enterprises from the total surplus value distributed among the capitalists. These aspects of state-monopoly capitalism are more pronounced in Italy than in other countries. A large proportion of state capitalist property was created under fascism. To rescue the big enterprises and banks from bankruptcy during the profound economic crisis, the fascist government bought up their shares. Thus the state became the chief shareholder in enterprises of such key industries as electric power, metallurgy, shipbuilding, etc. There was no nationalization in Italy on the pattern of that which took place in France, Britain and other Western European countries under the pressure of the working people. But the way in which state property originated in Italy *did not hinder* the working-class movement from realizing its significance.

After the war state-owned corporations were established such as ENI, in whose hands are concentrated all the state enterprises in the oil industry (prospecting, gas-mains, processing). The following table shows the share of state-owned property in the economy:

**The Share of State-Controlled Enterprises
in Total National Production
(percentage)**

Electric power	26
Methane	95
Oil	22
Steel	54
Pig iron	85
Shipbuilding	a) 75 b) 61
Engines	35
Electrical engineering	16
Automobiles	12.5
Cement	11
Industrial equipment	4
Services	
Radio and television	100
Telephone	100
Air transport	100
Maritime transport	13

a) Production capacity. b) Actual production.

The working-class movement wants to see state ownership used to curb the monopolies, encourage expansion of production and exert a democratic and progressive influence on the life of society. It is, in effect, fighting to change the essence of state ownership. The working class, furthermore, wants nationalization—envisaged by the Constitution—of the power and other big monopoly-owned enterprises. This struggle, aimed at achieving

genuine structural reforms, has yielded quite considerable results in both the economic and the political spheres. It has made the people more conscious of the monopolies and has helped to unite them more closely under the leadership of the Communist Party.

I shall dwell on only a few of the results. A Ministry of State Participation has been established to coordinate the work of the state-owned enterprises. The Ministry will submit a program and budget to parliament each year for approval. A reading of the latest report made by this Ministry a few months ago shows that the working people's demands in their day-to-day struggle, headed by the Communists, are being taken into consideration—at least in words—even by the top people in the Christian Democratic Party. But words, too, signify something, for they are evidence that the ruling circles *are obliged* to take into account the growing anti-monopoly and anti-capitalist sentiment of the people. The report mentions the coordinated and autonomous activity of the state-owned enterprises, the criterion of which should be not private interests, but economic expediency, in view of the need for a more balanced economic development from both the territorial and social standpoint. The Ministry's program provides for large-scale capital investments during the next few years, especially in the South and in other poorly-developed areas. These investments will stimulate economic development, help to combat tendencies leading to stagnation or a cyclical crisis.

As a result of our activities parliament has undertaken to withdraw the state-controlled enterprises from the Confederation of Italian Industrialists—a nationwide association of capitalists. This was a heavy blow to the capitalists, who protested and even complained to the Constitutional Court. Thus the organizational unity of the capitalists was broken and the results of the division are now being felt in the struggle for higher wages. Not only did state-controlled enterprises show less resistance to claims for higher wages, but it was easier to win other demands concerning working-class conditions generally, rights, jobs, etc. This has weakened the monopoly front.

A number of other examples could be cited. Under pressure of the working people ENI's activities began to take on an anti-monopoly character and, though restricted and obstructed in every way, yielded some results. By signing agreements with underdeveloped oil-producing countries on more advantageous terms than those offered by the private monopolies, ENI competed effectively with the "seven sisters"—the seven big international monopoly groupings—on the world market. It also bought oil products from the USSR with the result that petrol prices fell and the monopoly

groups were dealt a blow. The corporation has built big oil-processing plants in Ravenna and Gela, a development which has made it possible to reduce — although not enough — prices for chemical fertilizers; this action evoked a protest from the big Montecatini monopoly.

These examples demonstrate why we believe that genuine state capitalism, i.e., activities of state-owned enterprises, should be distinguished from a state intervention limited to a general economic policy. State intervention is determined by the economic laws of capitalism, and it is doubtful whether it can ever become anti-monopoly. State ownership, comprising an integral part of the whole mechanism of reproduction, can, under certain circumstances, be an effective weapon in the anti-monopoly struggle and in modifying the cycle.

But the circumstances do not come of their own volition. They depend on the scale of the class struggle, on the political orientation which the Communist Party imparts to this struggle.

* * *

According as socialism and the national-liberation movement make a greater impact on the economic life of modern capitalist society, the influence exerted by the class struggle on capitalist reproduction increases. At the present stage the class struggle is acquiring a predominant significance, first and foremost, because the working class is, increasingly, coming to the fore as the leading force in all spheres of social life—even in those countries where it is not yet in power. The working class counterposes its solutions to those of the ruling class, openly strives to become the ruling class, constantly asserts its will and demonstrates its ability to assume leadership and run things. So that even where it is not yet in power, the working class paves the way for democratic solutions and forces the bourgeoisie and its governmental bodies to take account of the demands of the working people.

The Italian Communist Party constantly reiterates its firm intention to form a government of the working people, a government which would clear the way for socialism; the Party elaborates and upholds its policy, which differs fundamentally from that of the ruling class. An example of the positive activity of the Communists is furnished by the budget debate in the Senate, when the budget of the Ministry of State Participation was also discussed. The Communist senators submitted a minority memorandum which they counterposed to the report of the government majority, and which mapped out a course of democratic economic

development. The Communists showed that the policy pursued by the Ministry for the Budget was identical with that of the big monopoly groups.

The Communist Party representative said in conclusion: "We, the representatives of the Opposition, are here not only to act against crying injustices, harmful measures and grave shortcomings; we are here not only to expose your activities, to strip them of their covering of demagoguery, but to counterpose to your policy—here in Parliament and throughout the country—a new and different policy of economic development, a democratic policy that conforms to the interests of the people, a policy that will reinforce the democratic institutions. It is our task to show the people a concrete alternative. The working class and the people generally no longer wish to be mute shadows of the ruling capitalists. They want to be active participants in the economic and social renovation of our country. They are affirming this right of theirs, their mature awareness, in field and factory, in the offices, schools, and Parliament. They demand that all the provisions of the Constitution be observed, that structural reforms be carried through, that the reins of government be transferred to the working people so that Italy should become a real republic, a republic based on labor, and, in a peaceful and consistent way, reach socialism—a more humane, and more just social system which would ensure freedom and economic progress for all.

"Our memorandum and our speeches concretely and clearly indicated the measures of economic policy which we consider essential so that the economic development formally taking place with your agreement and under your leadership, but in reality under the leadership of the ruling monopoly groups, a development which can but aggravate the economic and social antagonisms in our country and represents a constantly growing threat to our republican and democratic institutions and our freedom, can be replaced by a more rapid, intensive, balanced and harmonious economic advance promoting the well-being of the people, all Italian citizens, and capable of consolidating and developing our democratic institutions. Should you disregard these demands the people of Italy will give their answer and, what is more, sooner than you expect."

To sum up, I would like to emphasize that the specific features of the economic cycle in Italy cannot be correctly and comprehensively explained unless we take into account the growing impact of the class struggle waged by the working people headed by the Italian Communist Party on the processes of extended capitalist reproduction.

Reviews

“Press Lords Vs. Press Freedom”

THE so-called free world is constantly boasting about its “free, independent, non-party” press. “A free press in a free society,” as the British Prime Minister put it recently in a speech in Parliament. But how free is the press? Whose bandwagon do the journalists ride, and whose interests do they represent?

These questions are answered in the pamphlet *Press Lords vs. Press Freedom* published recently in London. Its author is George Matthews, member of the Executive Committee of the British Communist Party and editor of the *Daily Worker*.

At the present time, Matthews writes, three men—Lord Rothermere, Lord Beaverbrook and Mr. Cecil King—decide what four out of five readers of the so-called “popular” papers in Great Britain shall read. This is freedom, of course, says the author, but for whom? For the press lords to print what they like, and for the millions of Britishers to read what is dished out to them.

Immense power to influence men’s minds and mould public opinion has been seized by the press monopolists. The very concept of democracy has been reduced to a farce, and the proud boast that “we live in a democratic society with government of the people, by the people, for the people” now has a richly ironical flavor. “What the proprietorship of these papers aim at is power, and power without responsibility,” Stanley Baldwin once said when some of the Conservative press lords of his day were going too far in their efforts to make and unmake cabinets. A similar view was held by the late Aneurin Bevan who called the British press “the most prostituted in the world.”

Nobody elected Rothermere, Beaverbrook or King, Matthews points out. They are responsible to no one but themselves. They cannot be dismissed whatever harm they might do. They won this exclusive right by defeating their competitors in the jungles of monopoly capitalism, and creating their own newspaper empires.

Empires of Newsprint

Matthews lists these vast empires which embrace the daily, Sunday, national and provincial newspapers and magazines, newsprint and television interests, empires which at present rule in London, on Fleet Street, under the dome of St. Paul’s.

Cecil Harmsworth King is the head of the concern which publishes the *Daily Mirror*, the *Sunday*

Pictorial, *Women’s Weekly*, *Women’s Mirror* and 130 other magazines and journals. After Matthews’ booklet appeared, the struggle between King and Thomson over Odhams Press which combined 215 periodicals, ended in victory for King who thereby acquired the *Daily Herald*, the *People*, *Sporting Life*, *Woman*, *Woman’s Own*, *Woman’s Realm*, *Today* and *Housewife*. King now owns a huge enterprise with a capital of nearly £100,000,000, publishing daily newspapers with a total circulation of over 6,000,000, plus Sunday newspapers with a circulation of 11,000,000, as well as magazines.

The King empire extends beyond the boundaries of the United Kingdom. It owns newspapers in Ghana, Nigeria and British Guiana. King also controls the £58,000,000 newsprint firm of Albert E. Reed, the second largest in Britain, and has a controlling interest in Anglo-Canadian Pulp and Paper Mills. The biggest publishing monopoly not only in British history but in the entire history of printing, the King group is squeezing out its weaker competitors.

Roy Thomson, even after his defeat in the fight for Odhams Press, remains a powerful figure in the press world. His £26,500,000 concern includes the *Sunday Times*, the *Scotsman* and an influential and profitable group of provincial newspapers. Thomson publishes a total of 85 newspapers and is the owner of Scottish Television. More than two-thirds of the overall circulation of all British newspapers is concentrated in the hands of King and Thomson.

Lord Rothermere controls Associated Newspapers Ltd., a £20,000,000 firm which publishes the *Daily Mail*, the *Daily Sketch*, the *London Evening News*, *Sunday Dispatch*, and a chain of evening papers in Bristol, Cheltenham, Derby, Grimsby, Scunthorpe, Gloucester, Hull, Leicester, Lincoln, Stoke-on-Trent and Swansea, with a combined circulation of six million. Lord Rothermere also heads the Newspaper Proprietors’ Association, the most influential organization on Fleet Street.

Lord Beaverbrook is the owner of the *Daily Express*, the *Sunday Express*, *Evening Standard* and the *Evening Citizen* (Glasgow). His £11,400,000 group sells five million newspapers daily and 3,500,000 at week-ends.

The *News of the World* is a “lone wolf,” as the author put it, but one with a solid capital of £9,600,000 and the biggest circulation of any paper

in Britain (6,700,000). This group also publishes sport and TV magazines, owns the Berrows concern in Worcestershire and Herefordshire with two evening papers and a string of weeklies.

Too powerful financially to swallow each other, these rival groups are obliged to conclude deals with one another. The sharks stop devouring each other for a time in order to dispose of the small fry. The absolute reduction in the number of newspapers published is accompanied by the concentration of newspaper ownership in fewer and fewer hands. Less newspapers but bigger circulation is the dominant trend in the press today. The number of newspapers in Britain has dropped from 200 to 125 in the past 40 years. The King group is now closing down many more newspapers and magazines. On May 27 the *Daily Worker* reported that *Woman's Illustrated* and *Woman's Companion* were folding up and that *Woman's Day* and *Woman's Own* were being merged. Subscribers to women's magazines in Britain have a diminishing number to choose from. (Less newspapers are being published in other capitalist countries as well. In France the number of dailies dropped from 236 to 135 between 1938 and 1955. In the United States between 1910 and 1952 the number of dailies fell by 31.8 per cent, while circulation rose by 125 per cent.)

The monopoly of the press and other media for influencing men's minds is assuming the proportions of a national danger. The Labor Party, while it did sponsor the nationalization of a few branches of material production, never seriously sought to do the same in the ideological sphere. The solution of this problem is to be found in the program of the British Communist Party, *The British Road to Socialism*: "... the millionaire-owned national press, the principal means by which the monopolists keep their hold over the minds of the people, will be taken out of the hands of its present owners and transferred to national and local democratic organizations."

Profits and Propaganda

Nowhere in the capitalist world is the newspaper and magazine market so glutted as in Britain. The per capita circulation in Britain is nearly twice that of the United States, and three times that of France. What is the aim of the press tycoons, Matthews asks. Chiefly, to make money, and make money they most certainly do. King's annual profits (before the Odhams take-over) have been running at the rate of £6,500,000. Thomson and Odhams have both netted £4 million a year, Rothermere, £3,500,000 and Beaverbrook, around £2 million. Besides this, King, Thomson, Rothermere and the *News of the World* group have big investments in commercial television with its advertising

revenue of up to £78,000,000 a year, which net them fabulous profits. And these profits are still rising.

The second purpose of the press monopolies is propaganda for the capitalist system. Some newspaper proprietors make no secret of the fact. "I run the paper purely for the purpose of making propaganda, and with no other motive," declared Lord Beaverbrook some time ago to a Royal Commission on the Press.

The newspaper monopolies are the sworn enemies of the working people. Socialism is anathema to them. Fleet Street pours abuse on strikers and their trade unions if the latter support the strike. But if the union leaders oppose the strike the millionaire press lauds them to the skies.

The monopoly press deliberately misinforms its readers about the situation in the socialist countries and does its best to "hot up" the cold war. The press bears a heavy responsibility for the cold war, the arms drive, Britain's subservience to the United States and the gradual loss of her independence. The struggle of the colonial people for independence is distorted and misrepresented in the same unscrupulous way. The people are described as "terrorists" while the armed forces of the colonialists are "the forces of law and order." Liberation movements anywhere in the world are branded by the capitalist press as "communist conspiracies" and the result of Moscow intrigues.

This unsavory mess of reactionary politics, Matthews continues, is served up by most of the papers in a sauce of sex and sensationalism. This is "justified" on the grounds that "it's what the public wants." But its chief purpose, of course, is to boost circulation. Some monopoly papers, says the author, will descend to the sewer and muck about in it if there is money for them at the bottom.

Who Pays the Piper?

Matthews ridicules the argument of those who claim that there is press freedom in Britain and hence "anyone can start a newspaper." True enough, he says, there is no law against starting a newspaper. All you need to begin with is about £4 million. And your money will go down the drain unless you have the support of big business advertisers. No newspaper today can survive on the price it charges for its copies. In the year ending June 30, 1960, Beaverbrook Newspapers Limited received £13,300,000 from the sales of newspapers and other publications, while costs exceeded £27,200,000. The huge loss was covered by advertising amounting to £15,500,000, so that the firm wound up the year with a handsome profit. Advertising is being concentrated more and more in the big circulation papers, and this in turn increases the

tendency to mergers or closing down of publications with less circulation.

The influence of big business on the press is thus exerted in two main ways, Matthews points out. First, the press itself is big business, part of the general monopoly capitalist set-up, connected by a thousand threads with the great industrial and financial combines; and second, in the dependence of newspapers on the big commercial firms which spend nearly £200,000,000 on press advertising each year. And since "he who pays the piper calls the tune," this naturally gives the advertisers vast power.

Birds of a Feather

Bourgeois journalists in other Western countries may object that their press is in a different position from that of Britain. How little truth there is in this assertion may be seen from the facts and figures presented by Professor Basil Spuru in his book *The Poisoners*,* a basic study of the imperialist press.

He shows that the bourgeois press in the capitalist world of today, chiefly in the United States, Britain, France and Federal Germany, is the monopoly of a handful of multi-millionaires. The press, radio and television have indeed become a sort of "public opinion" industry. The bourgeois press today, Spuru writes, is a "Maedchen fuer alles" for the monopolies and the finance oligarchies.

The bulk of the French capitalist press is owned by the "200 families". The newspaper monopolies control nearly 80 per cent of the total circulation of all French newspapers and periodicals.

Behind the bulk of the bourgeois press in Federal Germany stand 300 multi-millionaires, bankers and industrialists. In 1955, according to the Berlin Press Institute, 54 big corporations published 445 newspapers, or 30.4 per cent of the total number of newspapers appearing in West Germany. The biggest newspaper and magazine firm is the Springer group which owns three daily and two weekly newspapers and three magazines. The circulation of the Springer newspapers was four million in 1957, or one-fourth of the total for all of West Germany. American subsidies have laid their imprint on the entire bourgeois press of Federal Germany. The huge U.S. loans extended through private and state channels for the revival of the West German press are repayable only if one or another newspaper is found wanting in "loyalty" to the United States.

In the United States itself five newspaper concerns control one-fourth of the total circulation of

the daily press. Spuru describes Hearst as "America's Public Enemy Number 1", the McCormick-Patterson combine as "a den of poisoners in American journalism", Scripps-Howard as "the front line of the cold war", and the magazine publishers as "venomous spiders".

Big business, writes Spuru, controls the leading newspapers and magazines through the influential members of banking and industrial firms who sit on the editorial boards of newspapers and publishing firms. The same big business supplies the newspapers and magazines, through a centralized agency, with a good portion of the articles they publish. The U.S. National Association of Manufacturers, an organization which unites the top industrialists, those who account for 80 per cent of the total output and employ 75 per cent of the total labor force in the United States, has a sort of propaganda committee of its own. This committee has vast funds at its disposal and plays a substantial role in formulating U.S. foreign and domestic policy. It sends unsigned propaganda material (articles for newspapers and radio, outlines of speeches for trade union leaders, cartoons and advertisements) to all newspapers, magazines and broadcasting companies. The chief object of these handouts is to win support for draft laws submitted by the monopoly interests, to convince the public that the millionaires have made their fortunes by "honest labor", to give news with a monopoly slant, etc. All the palaver about the objective approach of the newspaper proprietors to news coverage is a downright lie designed to deceive the gullible.

The press monopoly is a huge octopus that has enmeshed the public mind in its vast tentacles and is choking it to death. It exercises an ever stronger hold over the minds of people in Italy and Belgium, in Austria and Canada, in Sweden and Holland, in Brazil and Mexico, in Argentina and Japan. In Brazil, for example, 28 daily papers, 5 magazines, a news agency, 17 radio stations and two television stations belong to a single tycoon. In Japan the four principal newspapers account for 48.5 per cent of the entire circulation of all daily newspapers. The Australian press is being more and more monopolized by the four big British newspaper trusts.

The trustification of the press, a process which is to be observed in all the capitalist countries, is the chief cause of the degradation of the bourgeois press. This degradation, Professor Spuru points out, is a reflection of the general crisis of bourgeois culture that is a feature of the epoch of imperialism. It is not merely a symptom of a decaying society, it performs a definite function corresponding to the class interests of the imperialists. By spreading lies, bourgeois journalism is serving

*B. Spuru, Giftmischer. Beitrage zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der zeitgenoessischen buergerlichen Journalistik. Berlin, Kongress-Verlag, 1960, 459 pp.

these class interests of the imperialists which are maintained not only by means of political and economic power but by duping and deceiving the masses as well.

A study of the bourgeois press today reveals the vast amount of space given to all kinds of sensations, murders, court chronicles, adventures of retired monarchs and the more salacious details about the lives of film stars. "Sensations, sex, crime and pornography of all kinds," writes Spuru, "is the bait on the ideological hook of reaction." The banal and the trivial dull the minds of the readers, the irrational and the decadent lure them into a world of illusion remote from harsh reality, far removed from the class struggle. The overwhelming majority of bourgeois journalists are wage workers. But a good number of them—and this applies chiefly to the "yellow press" — differ from the ordinary proletarian in that they not only sell their labor power but their convictions, their views and, finally, their conscience. The position of these journalists was aptly summed up by Ralph Bayer, one-time editor of the *Los Angeles Record*, who said that theirs was the despicable role of paid poisoners.

Professor Spuru quotes the comments of a large number of bourgeois press writers concerning the absence of freedom in the press of the capitalist world. For example, Lowell Mollet, former publisher of the *Washington Daily News*, used to say that freedom of the press is the privilege enjoyed by the newspaper proprietors and their ilk. Freedom of the press, he said, is property. And as Engels said "all other privileges pale before the privilege of property".

In 1956 the German public opinion institute in Frankfurt-on-the-Main conducted a poll on "the extent of press freedom" in Federal Germany. The questionnaire was answered by 723 editors of 585 West German daily papers. In the opinion of 35 per cent of those polled the greatest threat to the freedom of the press emanates from the government and the authorities, 50 per cent saw the danger as coming from the industrial corporations and the banks. As many as 70 per cent of the editors were of the opinion that the freedom of the press was threatened by the big advertisers. It should be remembered that most of the editors polled were by no means progressive in their views, two-thirds of them were in favor of restricting the freedom of the press for political or "ethical" reasons. The organs of the press in the West today, writes Professor Spuru, "are not the old-time capitalist newspapers which still endeavored with some success to preserve the appearance of independent journalism. They are huge enterprises, mammoth concerns, regular public opinion factories, news industries, advertising plantations against

which, so long as capitalist conditions exist, there are not and in most cases cannot be any effective means of resistance apart from the revolutionary labor press" (p. 15).

"Daily Worker" — the People's Paper

The only newspaper in Britain which is independent of the monopolies is the *Daily Worker*, writes George Matthews in conclusion. The newspaper of the British workers cannot be swallowed up by the capitalist sharks, it cannot be merged or closed down. Not all the millions of the Kings or the Thomsons can buy it.

Like any other paper, Matthews points out, there is a gap between *Daily Worker* sales income and the cost of production. But in the case of the workers' paper advertising fills only a small part of this gap. Sixpences and shillings from factories, mines, rail depots, offices and streets all over Britain flow in every month to the *Daily Worker* Fighting Fund and add up to £40,000 a year necessary to keep the paper going. It is thanks to this support from its readers that the newspaper has been able to survive for thirty-one years.

The *Daily Worker* has had a hard struggle ever since it was founded on January 1, 1930. It has been repeatedly fined, banned and discriminated against by the authorities. Its staff members have been placed under police surveillance. It is subjected either to vicious slander or a conspiracy of silence by the bourgeois press, boycotted by the news agencies and the advertisers and banned from commercial television on the grounds that it is "political" while other papers are allegedly not.

Despite this discrimination, the *Daily Worker* circulation rose by 2,000 between April 1960 and April 1961 and at present stands at nearly 80,000 copies. The paper differs from other British newspapers in one important respect: it reflects the interests of the working class. It is an independent newspaper in the full sense of the word. It defends the interests of the workers who are fighting for jobs and higher wages, of old-age pensioners, the youth and many other categories of workers. The *Daily Worker* is distinguished for its truthful reporting, it organizes, leads and stimulates mass campaigns for peace and social progress.

The *Daily Worker* flings a bold challenge not only to the forces of reaction and war, but to one of the chief weapons of those forces, namely, the monopoly press. V. Matveyev, the former London correspondent of *Izvestia*, in his book *The Fleet Street Empire* says that although the *Daily Worker* represents only a small island in the ocean of the hostile press, it is in reality an impregnable fortress which strikes fearless and telling blows at the Fleet Street Empire.

A high tribute was paid to the *Daily Worker* at the 27th Congress of the British Communist Party last April. In his report to the Congress, John Gollan stated that for the progressive movement to succeed it needs a daily voice, an organizing and directing medium. The *Daily Worker* is both of these. The struggle for independent working-class expression

is bound up with winning a mass circulation for the *Daily Worker*. The political future of Britain, the future of the British progressive movement depends in large measure on the success of this struggle.

Kola ULAGI

A Sober View of Bonn Policy

ALL IS LOST* is the title of a book by the well-known West German journalist Erich Kuby. Kuby is not a Communist. He is not even a sympathiser. But while he does not subscribe to socialism he is frankly anti-Bonn in his views and highly critical of many aspects of the home and foreign policy pursued by the Federal German government. Much of his reasoning shows a realistic approach to the present world situation and a sober appraisal of the state of affairs in the Federal Republic. This has earned him the disapproval of the powers that be. He is constantly slandered in the press and branded as a "trouble-maker", and his activities as editor of opposition newspapers have been obstructed in every way. But no argument has ever been disproved by persecution, and malice is anything but a wise counsellor in politics.

Nor is Kuby's a "lone voice" in West Germany. Bonn's reactionary policies are arousing more and more opposition on the part of some of the most distinguished West German intellectuals, writers and journalists, scientists and artists, among them the prominent journalist Walter Dirks, the theologist Helmut Gollwitzer and the social democratic economist Fritz Baade, to mention a few. The frank and sober views expressed publicly by these intellectuals are evidence of the sharpening contradictions between the social forces in West Germany which stand for peace and democracy and the revanchism, militarism and anti-democratic course which is the political "credo" of the FRG.

The Bonn leaders, who have made it their purpose to extirpate the last vestiges of democracy and revive fascism in Federal Germany and who have placed their stakes on a third world war, have reached a dead end. The swift economic development, the internal political stability and constructive peaceful foreign policy of the socialist countries are not only compelling the governments of the imperialist states to accept the idea of peaceful coexistence but are a stimulus to the working class and the public generally in their efforts to curb the proponents and instigators of war. Warning

voices are making themselves heard ever more insistently in the states ruled by monopoly capital, and vigorous actions to stop the war policy and the onslaught on democratic liberties are more and more the order of the day.

Kuby's book, a collection of newspaper and magazine articles, as well as excerpts from his diary covering the period from 1944 to 1960, gives the reader a slice of modern history as seen by a German bourgeois intellectual, democrat and humanist who has given much thought to the future of Germany and the world.

The German Question

Kuby speaks of the German Democratic Republic as of the second German state. "The GDR must be recognized," he declares (p. 236). This, however, implies that all plans for the "reunification" of the German Democratic Republic and Federal Germany by force of arms must first be abandoned.

Kuby condemns the unscrupulous methods of Bonn propaganda against the GDR, describing them as "sheer madness". Giving a political appraisal of the propaganda tricks employed by Bonn to distort the situation in the GDR, he stresses that a section of the cold war front passes through Germany and that "only within the German nation (and none other) could the cold war be conducted in such a way as to give rise to a total front" (p. 185).

Kuby's attitude to the first German state of workers and peasants is not altogether free from prejudice, as can be seen from his anti-communist reservations (for example, he regards the educational program and the DEFA film studio production plans as evidence of the "absence" of full freedom in the GDR). Nevertheless there is a fundamental difference between Kuby's approach and the senseless attitude of the Bonn politicians who declare that the GDR does not exist simply because they do not like it. Kuby recognizes the existence of the two German states and the difference in principle between these two states, and he demands that a solution of the German problem be sought through national compromise.

*Erich Kuby, *Alles im Eimer. Siegt Hitler bei Bonn?* Stuttgart, Henry Goverts Verlag, 1960, 256 pp.

Bonn's Anti-Democratic Policy

Kuby is quite right when he says that the aggressive foreign policy pursued by the Bonn rulers cannot be considered apart from their internal policy of destroying democratic rights and liberties, that the atomic war policy and emergency legislation are twin brothers. "Bad times are approaching," he writes in the introduction to the book, "but those in power who think in terms of 'friend or foe', i.e., who essentially possess the fascist mentality, have always reacted to bad times by tightening the screws inside the country" (p. 13). A very dangerous offensive against the remnants of democracy is being launched in West Germany, the purpose of which is to be able legally to remove all opposition, writes the author. A widely ramified system of police surveillance on a national scale has been set up in the FGR in which foreign counter-intelligence is collaborating with the West German secret police.

In many of the articles he has written since 1957 Kuby has criticized the anti-democratic policy of the Adenauer government. He speaks with irony of "the faint whiff of democracy" that hovers over the "FGR landscape". He considers the "banning of the Communist Party a political folly, one of those restrictions of freedom which accompany any emergency situation, real or imaginary" (p. 193).

The ruling clique, headed by Adenauer, is unprincipled, Kuby writes, its principles are limited to anti-communism. The Bonn state is a state of emergency and other laws aimed at concentrating power in the hands of the few who rule by *diktat* and whose prime concern is to procure atom bombs at all costs.

Kuby describes Adenauer as a politician devoid of all moral scruples and utterly lacking in a sense of historical perspective. This is the man, he says, who has prevented the Germans from pursuing a policy of reunion in the interests of the nation and taking the path of compromise and peace.

The position of the Bonn authorities bears out the appraisal given in the Statement of the Moscow Meeting of the 81 Communist and Workers' Parties which points out that the threat to peace and the security of the European nations from West German imperialism is increasing.

Let Those Who Stand For Peace Win

No one can predict, writes Kuby, when the seeds planted by Bonn, with the connivance, consent and direct support of the West, will bear fruit. There are grounds for assuming that it will take time. The ripening of seeds such as these is fraught with disaster for the world but primarily for the aggressors themselves.

For war will mean the "end of Western Europe, the end of Germany", and "our war means our

end", writes Kuby. Everything depends on whether mankind will stop this madness before it leads to catastrophe. In Kuby's opinion "a minimal program of reason and peace" should be worked out, and the leading group of West German monopolies deprived of all hope of ever being able to cook their revanchist mess in the cauldron of world anti-communism. "As a German and a European," he writes, "it is my task to counteract the mad pace of war preparations" (p. 94).

As early as 1949, when the plans to build up an army were still hardly more than a whisper in West German government circles, Kuby wrote: "We declared often enough, and with good grounds, that we are opposed to armaments" (p. 57). A few years later when the West German militarists had already built up their army and were demanding "effective weapons" (read: atomic weapons), he strongly opposed this move. Kuby fully supports the idea of general and complete disarmament and the creation of an atom-free zone in the center of Europe. There is only one course for us, he says, and that is unconditional neutrality.

A major obstacle to a peaceful settlement, in the author's opinion, is West Berlin which "in the conditions of the cold war is a colossal danger, and in the event of a real war will mean nothing at all for the West. No one who wants peace can be satisfied with the present status of Berlin" (p. 95). Remilitarization will not bring success to Bonn, and the existence of the Bundeswehr does nothing to strengthen West Germany. In the interests of German reunion it would be far better if there were no German soldiers at all.

Kuby does not subscribe to the West's propaganda claim that the aim of communism is "world revolution". "I should like to make my position quite clear," he says. "If it is indeed true that communism will achieve world domination unless the West defeats it in a war and if it is true that communism wants peace because it needs peace, then I say: let it win . . . *May he who wins in peace be the winner!*" (p. 252. My italics—H.K.).

This conclusion, far-reaching though it is, does not imply agreement with the communist ideology or recognition of the social set-up in the socialist countries. Kuby reaches that conclusion as a humanist and a peace champion. He regards the anti-communism of the Bonn proponents of atomic war as "inhuman" and "incompatible with Western democratic or, even more, with Christian concepts" (p. 251). He is searching for a social system and a state that would accord with his basic convictions.

Of course the book should be read critically. The author is inclined to take a gloomy if not negative view of the prospects of organizing a broad national movement in West Germany for peace and basic democratic rights. His pessimistic attitude

to the working class is particularly regrettable. On the other hand, this pessimism is offset by his unequivocal condemnation of the fatal policy of Adenauer and Strauss and by his constructive proposals for safeguarding peace in Europe. In this respect his book will stimulate the popular movement in West Germany and help to direct it along progressive lines.

Erich Kuby is undoubtedly one of those West German intellectuals who are seeking an alternative to war through peace and negotiation. He is one of those humanist thinkers whose courageous actions are helping to unite the peace-loving and democratic forces in West Germany.

H. KOLBE

Communications and Comment

The Habsburgs Again . . .

(Apropos of a Dangerous Scheme Being Hatched by the Enemies of Peace in Europe)

ON June 5, Otto Habsburg, now a resident of Western Germany, sent to the Austrian government a "declaration of loyalty" making a show of renouncing his claim to the throne once occupied by his father. This was patently an underhand maneuver designed to evade the legal obstacles preventing this stooge of international reaction from settling down in Austria, which, the Communist Party of Austria has pointed out, he wants to do "in order to help unite the reactionary forces within the country and intensify the cold war against states that once were part of the Austro-Hungarian empire."

The declaration failed to get enough support in the government and was turned down. But, as Vice-Chancellor Pittermann said at the Socialist Party congress, this was "but the opening move," for the reactionaries have not given up their search, with the connivance of People's Party leaders, for legal loopholes that would enable them to smuggle Otto Habsburg into the country. The "Habsburg question," therefore, remains a threat to Austrian neutrality as well as to peace in Europe.

I

After the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy in 1918, popular pressure forced the Habsburgs to abdicate. Later the members of the dynasty were exiled in ignominy as sharing direct responsibility for the First World War. By the Constitutional Act of April 3, 1919, the rights of the House of Habsburg-Lorraine to the Austrian throne were annulled for all time, its property was confiscated and the members of the dynasty, who would not submit to the laws of the republic and renounce their claims, were exiled. This enactment was reaffirmed in Article 10 of the Austrian

State Treaty signed on May 15, 1955, which gave it the status of an international commitment assumed by neutral Austria.

Ever since 1919 repeated plots have been hatched to restore Habsburg rule in Austria, Hungary and throughout the Danube zone. Since the Second World War these schemes have dovetailed with the intrigues of the enemies of peace in Europe.

The present projects to bring the Habsburg scion back to the Austrian political scene have a direct bearing on the sharp differentiation now taking place within the Austrian bourgeoisie and the exacerbation of the crisis that has gripped the ruling People's Party. That part of the bourgeoisie which is represented by the Right wing of the People's Party looks to joining forces with West Germany, believing that the time has come to set a course, with the backing of Bonn, towards one-man rule, to put through reactionary amendments to the Constitution, introduce authoritarian "readjustments" to parliamentary democracy, and tighten the screws on the working class. The danger looms of a bourgeois coalition government of the extreme Right formed by the People's Party and the so-called Freedom Party,* or a one-man dictatorship with Otto Habsburg playing the part of a de Gaulle. This possibility was discussed quite openly last autumn by the Linzer Volksblatt, one of the People's Party's provincial mouthpieces, with references to the "instructive" example of France.

It would be a mistake to attribute the pro-Habsburg orientation of the Rights in the People's Party only to internal political considerations. The pretender's political role is determined by the strength

*This party is the Austrian political agency of West German monopoly capital. It pursues a Greater-Germany and neo-fascist line and is headed mostly by former bigwigs of the Nazi party.

and influence of his foreign patrons. Who are these patrons? The answer to this question reveals how a political adventurer like Otto Habsburg who has no popular support worth mentioning has acquired the weight to negotiate with the Austrian government and to conduct an official correspondence with Bonn, Washington and the Vatican.

II

In 1950 an organization known as the European Documentation and Information Center, something in the nature of an international agency of reactionary monarchist and clerical elements, was founded in Madrid and Otto Habsburg was made its head.

His deputy in the leadership of the Center is Hans-Joachim von Merkat, a Bonn minister and Adenauer's right-hand man. The members of the board include Bundestag Vice-President Jaeger, who is also editor-in-chief of the Christian Democrat *Rheinischer Merkur*, Prince Georg von Waldburg zur Zeil, a relative of the pretender and leader of Bonn revanchist organizations, and Archbishop Schaeufele of Freiburg. Both the Center and the Habsburg propaganda are financed by the Pferdenges and Strassoldo banking house of Cologne.

The active support for Otto Habsburg on the part of the Bonn rulers is explained primarily by their expansionist policy, by the desire to extend their influence to South and South-East Europe. No small place has been allotted in the revanchist schemes of Adenauer and Co. to the Habsburg "Greater-Austria" idea of a "supra-national Danube Federation." The West German imperialist strategists are out to help Otto Habsburg establish his political control over Austria and scuttle her neutrality.

The West German *Industriekurier* stated in February 1959 that "Otto Habsburg is a monarch without real power. But the day will come when, to carry out his ideas, he will have to rely on power factors. Such factors are, in his view, all the Western powers, which want to see a non-communist new order in the Danube area. He is looking forward to the moment when after the clash of the two worlds the element of a non-communist order will be sought for in the Danube zone. To take advantage of the opportunities arising in such an event and to be on hand, the emperor's son wants to return to Vienna."

The Hungarian counter-revolutionary émigrés have played an important part, especially after the events of October 1956, in the schemes to galvanize the Habsburgs into political life.

In Paris, London, Brussels and other West European cities, with official representatives of the corresponding governments looking on, Otto Habs-

burg has gathered the top leaders of the reactionary émigrés around him and acted as if he were the "King of Hungary in exile."

These subversive activities are supported above all by the Vatican. Vatican circles are also behind the scheme hatched by international reaction to use Austria's neutral position on the frontier between the capitalist and the socialist worlds as a springboard for "infiltrating" the neighboring socialist countries by means of propaganda and espionage. Hence the vigorous support given by the Holy See to the fantastic designs of Otto Habsburg, who, to the Papal Secretariat of State, is still "His Imperial Majesty," despite the diplomatic relations between the Vatican and the Austrian Republic.

Since 1942 Otto Habsburg has also served time and again as a tool of U.S. foreign policy.

III

The danger which the return of Otto Habsburg to Austria would present to European peace can hardly be overestimated. As a matter of fact, the pretender has made no secret of the aims he and his backers are pursuing.

From 1950 to 1955 he conducted, in league with Bonn, a violent campaign to prevent the conclusion of the Austrian State Treaty. After the Treaty was signed and Austria's perpetual neutrality proclaimed, he repeatedly professed to recognize this neutrality, prompted, of course, by his sponsors. What these assurances were worth was revealed by the theses he circulated among his supporters in the autumn of 1955. Here we read:

"It should not be forgotten that the State Treaty is only the beginning of political developments. History has shown that diplomatic instruments employed at the beginning of a process are soon discarded in the course of subsequent developments. Moreover, in our time treaties are not long-lived, as is evident from the changes made in the Italian peace treaty. Nor should it be forgotten that the three Western powers were opposed to Article 10. Hence we shall not encounter difficulties in the United States, Britain or France when our hour strikes."

The Habsburg foreign-policy program envisages, besides discarding neutrality, provocations against neighboring states. It speaks of "forming a Danube Federation headed by a monarch" and the "return" of the Sudeten Germans and all "exiles from the East" to their "native parts."

Broad sections of the public in Austria harbor no illusions as to what the appearance of Otto Habsburg in the country and his active participation in political life would mean.

"Otto Habsburg's public statements give us ample grounds to assume that he will not be a loyal

citizen of the republic," the Socialist deputy Strasser has said. "Therefore we cannot believe what he says." Strasser added that the Habsburg plan for the "liberation" of Eastern Europe and the Balkans would be tantamount to war with the Soviet Union. "Thus whenever the Habsburg question is raised Austria's security is put in jeopardy. The return of Otto Habsburg would create in our part of the world an area of high tension where a single spark would be enough to set off another universal explosion."

Another aspect of the Habsburg danger is highlighted by the Left Socialist Josef Hindels who stressed the role restoration would play in implementing the plans of the reactionary bourgeoisie against the working class. "All the more gratifying, then, is it to see that not only the Socialists but also that many of the Christian trade unionists belonging to the People's Party are taking a strong stand against the commotion over Habsburg," Hindels wrote in *Arbeiter Zeitung*.

The leaders of the Socialist Party have not always taken this view. On the contrary, in 1958-59, Oskar Helmer, the former Socialist Minister of the Interior, together with Federal Chancellor Raab, corresponded for months with Otto Habsburg concerning his return and the restoration to the dynasty of their nationalized property. And on December 5, 1958, the party's General Secretary, Probst, declared in Parliament: "If Dr. Otto Habsburg makes a formal declaration renouncing the throne, he is free to return without any other conditions." Now, however, the leadership of the Socialist Party have abandoned their original position in view of the mass movement initiated by the Communists against the Habsburg danger.

The Communist Party has taken a clear-cut stand on the issue from the very beginning, drawing the attention of the public in Austria and elsewhere to the threat the monarchist conspiracy holds for peace and Austria's independence. The only voices raised in Parliament in 1958 against the return of the Habsburgs under any circumstances were those of the Communist deputies.

When the question came to the fore again following the Raab-Adenauer-Habsburg meeting in Munich last summer, Johann Koplenig, Chairman of the Communist Party, declared at a conference of provincial and district secretaries:

"It is not by chance that the Habsburg question is raised at this particular time, when the imperialists are out to aggravate the international situation. Otto Habsburg is not the unfortunate exile he is depicted to be, but a figure in the cold war, a figure whom the imperialist circles of the United States and West Germany seek to use against the socialist countries, and primarily against our neighbors. Habsburg is also a tool of the Vatican and

the reactionary clergy in their offensive against the working class and the democratic rights of the people. Even if we assume that his return is not an immediate prospect, the propaganda campaign conducted throughout the country around this issue is a reality that should not be underestimated.

"The resolutions passed at the enterprises show that a united front can be built up in the course of the struggle against the Habsburg provocations and an atmosphere created in which there would be a powerful outburst of protest against the return of the Habsburgs or the restoration of their property should these actually become the order of the day . . ."

The response which the struggle waged by the Communist Party has found among the democratic and republican-minded public can be judged by the rebuff to the monarchist sallies. During the celebrations last November of "Emperor Otto's birthday," for instance, the people took vigorous action under the leadership of the Party. In Klagenfurt the "celebration" was broken up to shouts of "Long live the republic!" before it had a chance to start. In Vienna, where the monarchists gathered in a concert hall, the Minister of the Interior and the Chief of Police (both Socialists) sent some 1,000 police to protect them, all in the name of "democratic freedoms." Despite these precautions, the monarchist show failed most ignominiously, eclipsed by a republican counter-demonstration in which thousands took part, including a large number of young people who distinguished themselves by offering heroic resistance to the police brutality. A feature of this and other anti-Habsburg demonstrations was the active part played by young Socialists and trade unionists in defiance of the strict ban laid by the Socialist Party leadership on participation in the anti-monarchist movement. Young people belonging to the Catholic anti-fascist resistance movement joined in the demonstration in Vienna. Large demonstrations led by the Communists took place also in Linz.

The anti-monarchist struggle waged by the Communists is in the best traditions of the Austrian labor movement. These traditions are so deep-seated among Socialists generally that the Communist initiative continues to have a powerful effect on the Socialist workers and on the attitude of the Socialist Party itself. This is evident also from the fact that following the stormy anti-Habsburg demonstrations, the Socialist Minister for Foreign Affairs, Dr. Kreisky, found it necessary to declare that "the dangerous machinations of the reactionaries must be closely watched, and the attempts made by Otto Habsburg to become the Austrian Chancellor of Justice* must not be underestimated."

*This proposed post of a "supreme arbiter" has no basis whatever in the Federal Constitution and has been invented by the reactionary circles to accommodate Otto Habsburg.

"It would be a fatal illusion to think that Habsburg and the forces behind him will acknowledge defeat," *Volksstimme*, the central organ of the Communist Party, said in its comment on the rejection of the pretender's "declaration of loyalty."

The stand of the People's Party, bordering on treason, can only encourage them. The fight against the Habsburg danger must therefore not be allowed to lag.

Leopold GRUENEWALD

Against the Persecution of Democrats

ARBITRARY ACTION OF THE U.S. AUTHORITIES

TO the accompaniment of President Kennedy's eloquent disquisitions on the subject of "democracy," "the revival of revolutionary traditions," and America's desire to "defend freedom," the U.S. authorities have adopted decisions which are a challenge to democracy, freedom and elementary human rights.

Having nothing with which to counter the ideas of communism, the U.S. rulers have decided to use police methods in the battle of ideas. On June 5 the U.S. Supreme Court, by a five-four vote, adopted decisions which, in effect, outlaw the Communist Party of the United States and aim at intimidating and terrorizing anyone who ventures to raise his voice against monopoly rule, against the reactionary policy of the government.

What is the purport of this anti-democratic move?

The Supreme Court decision makes membership in the Communist Party a criminal offense and empowers the authorities to prosecute Communists and send them to jail. Anyone found guilty of being a member of the Communist Party will be liable to a long term of imprisonment or a heavy fine, or both.

Under the Supreme Court ruling the Communist Party of the United States must register with the Department of Justice as an "agent of a foreign power." The registration procedure involves submitting a complete list of its members and a report on the Party's finances. All Party publications and literature are declared "Communist propaganda" and hence illegal. The authorities are given the right to examine all mail addressed to Party members. No Communist is entitled to receive a passport for foreign travel.

The penalty for failure to register is \$10,000 or five years' imprisonment for every day of non-compliance.

The responsibility for this unprecedented decision rests with the Kennedy administration. The decision could never have been taken had the government, and specifically Attorney-General Robert Kennedy, the President's brother, not pressed the issue.

This has been the signal for an outburst of anti-communist hysteria on the part of the lunatic

fringe of reactionaries. On June 12, Republican Congressman Pillion submitted the draft of a joint resolution of the Senate and the House of Representatives to the effect that the U.S. Congress officially announces that the United States is at war with the Communist parties all over the world and that the U.S. solemnly pledges to use all its resources to defeat and destroy the Communist parties of the world. Next day Republican Congressman Donald Bruce submitted another resolution urging Congress to proclaim a crusade against the world Communist movement.

The next step was a New York State court decision depriving Communist Party members of the right to unemployment benefits. However, the illegality of this move was so obvious that the Supreme Court had to rule against it.

In September a New York State law sponsored by Governor Rockefeller depriving Communist Party members of their driving license goes into effect.

This new wave of anti-communist hysteria is the product of the fear engendered in the American reactionaries by the victories of socialism in all spheres. It signifies another all-out offensive by big capital against all progressive and democratic organizations, against all who do not agree with the government's policies. Organizations combating race discrimination, demanding disarmament, peaceful coexistence and lasting peace can be charged with "collaborating with the Communists" and hence are liable to prosecution. Among the organizations already officially regarded as "Communist" are the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born, Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade, the Council of American-Soviet Friendship and the Washington Pension Fund.

"Under the guise of anti-communism," says the statement of the National Executive of the U.S. Communist Party, "and the hoary 'foreign agents' canard, the Attorney-General tries to conceal the fact that the enforcement of this law means the liquidation of the Bill of Rights and the attempted suppression of every movement in this country for peace, social progress and democracy."

The American Communists have no intention of submitting to this threat to their Party. *They have categorically refused to comply with the Supreme Court ruling.*

"If the bare majority of the Court and the reactionary forces for whom they speak," Gus Hall, General Secretary of the U.S. Communist Party, declared in a press statement, "think that in this way it can intimidate the Communist Party of the United States and prevent it from carrying on its clear and present duty to defend democracy and peace, it is seriously mistaken."

"The Communist Party is a legal political party operating within the framework of the U.S. Constitution, and it would be derelict in its duty to the American people if it did not fight vigorously for its full legal rights and existence. It will continue to do its duty to the American people by alerting them as sharply as it can to the dangers inherent in this court action—dangers to the very base and fabric of democracy in our country."

The latest attack on the democratic liberties and constitutional rights of citizens has caused justifiable alarm among wide sections of the American public. Many capitalist newspapers, by no means sympathetic to the Communists, have sharply criticized the government's measures. The *St. Louis Post Dispatch*, for instance, points out editorially that the Supreme Court decision undermines freedom. The newspaper quite correctly observes that if the Bill of Rights is infringed in order to prosecute Communists, other liberties are thereby jeopardized.

The Supreme Court decision has evoked angry comment in other countries. In a special message addressed to the U.S. Communists, Maurice Thorez, Secretary-General of the French Communist Party, vigorously condemned the action of the U.S. authorities and expressed the solidarity of the Communists and all working people and democrats of France with the American Communists. The Political Committee of the British Communist Party urged "all trade union and labor organizations, democratic

and peace organizations, and all supporters of democracy to bring immediate pressure to bear on the U.S. government."

The public protest has had its effect. On June 23 a stay of execution was granted until autumn. The reactionaries have had to retreat. But the threat hanging over the U.S. Communist Party has not been removed. The task now is to press for annulment of the Supreme Court decisions.

Another important victory for the democratic forces was President Kennedy's decision to release Henry Winston, Secretary of the National Committee of the Communist Party. The five years' struggle conducted by progressives in America and throughout the world, has thus been crowned with success.

The anti-communist slander and the persecution of the Communist Party and progressives in the United States are alarming symptoms. The history of imperialism shows that persecution and terror against patriots are usually the prelude to more outrageous crimes and, as often as not, the prelude to aggressive sallies by reaction on the world arena.

The recent developments in the United States are all the more disquieting because they are not isolated instances. Reprisals against Communists are on the increase throughout the so-called "free world." The reprisals range from open terror to denial of visas to delegations of Communist parties from the socialist countries invited to party congresses and conferences in the West. All this suggests that the new wave of anti-communist hysteria is an international move conceived in the secret councils of NATO, SEATO, CENTO and the other aggressive organizations under Washington aegis.

Progressives everywhere are replying to the anti-democratic "crusade" of world reaction against the Communist movement by heightening their vigilance, cementing their ranks, and intensifying the struggle against the imperialist reactionaries.

Joe SHERIFF

FREEDOM FOR POLITICAL PRISONERS IN THE UAR

COMMUNISTS and other democrats held in Syrian prisons, especially those confined in the Mezze Fortress in Damascus, are again being subjected to torture more brutal than anything endured throughout their more than two years' imprisonment.

Nasser's gendarmes are trying to force political prisoners to sign statements denouncing the Communist Party and declaring their loyalty to his regime. "The law will not help you," is the grim threat of the Nasser torturers, "no court will

handle your case. Don't expect to be treated like other prisoners or that you will have the benefit of the law. Either you sign the statement or you die."

Those who refuse to sign are savagely beaten, starved and subjected to cruel torture: forced to stand on one leg with arms upraised for six hours at a time, strung up by the legs for several hours and tortured with needles and electric shocks.

This savagery against Communists and other democrats in Syria is part of the campaign to

crush the growing struggle against the UAR regime. Nasser's design is to intimidate his political opponents, isolate them and prevent the Communists from co-operating with the other democratic forces.

It is symptomatic that the anti-communist drive in the UAR coincided with an exchange of messages between Kennedy and Nasser, and with loans received by the UAR from the United States, Britain, Italy and the Federal German Republic. The terror was intensified after Nasser's rapprochement with the imperialist stooge King Hussein who

has publicly urged the UAR President to step up anti-communist measures.

The latest wave of repressions has evoked indignation in Syria. Demonstrations are being held under the slogans "Free the Political Prisoners!," "Down with the Dictatorship!" The campaign of solidarity with the political prisoners is spreading also to the other Arab countries.

The solidarity of all honest people, all friends of peace and freedom with the courageous political prisoners is an invaluable source of support to the democratic movement in Syria.

Ahmad SABER

MARTINIQUE IS FIGHTING

BRUTAL colonial exploitation and discrimination against the native population are the features of the situation on Martinique. The working people of this small island are fighting for national self-government, against class oppression and exploitation.

Enraged by this struggle, the colonial authorities and the French police have used repressions against the fighters for freedom and decent conditions of life. Several young men arrested for participation in the December 1959 anti-colonial demonstrations are in prison to this day.

The Communist Party of Martinique—the champion of the native population — is particularly victimized. The authorities confiscate the Party paper *Justice*, sometimes even for reprinting items published in metropolitan newspapers. Camille Silvestre, the Party's General Secretary, and Armand Nicolas, Secretary of the C.C., were condemned by the criminal court in Fort-de-France to a year's imprisonment, a fine of a million and a half francs each and deprived of civil and political rights for life. Their sole "crime" was that they fought for democratic reforms and for the abolition of the colonial regime.

In March and April of this year, agricultural laborers came out on strike for higher wages. They were joined by dockers and by factory and office workers.

Infuriated by the magnitude of the strike movement, the planters and employers recruited the services of provocateurs. The police took advantage of the clashes between the strikers and provocateurs to arrest large numbers of workers. Many were arrested in Lamentin.

The Lamentin workers staged a powerful demonstration demanding the release of the arrested strikers. Although it was a peaceful demonstration of people demanding only one thing: bread for their hungry children and the release of their comrades, the colonial authorities opened fire on the unarmed crowd, killing three and wounding twenty-five.

This brutality, however, failed to stop the strike movement. Dockers in Fort-de-France and the workers in other towns expressed their solidarity with the Lamentin demonstrators.

The Communist Party resolutely protested against the shooting in Lamentin. It demanded the recall of the prefect responsible for the shooting, and the immediate withdrawal from Martinique of the French punitive units.

The Communist Party calls upon the people, irrespective of their political views, to continue the fight for self-government by joining in the struggle with the working class, the vanguard and the main force of the anti-colonial front.

Arthur MERCAN

NEW BOOKS

(Books are printed in the language of the country of publication;
the titles here are given in English)

- Black Africa*. Paris, Editions de la Nouvelle Critique, 1961, 237 pp. (Recherches Internationales, No. 22).
- P. Delon. *Christian Syndicalism in France*. Paris, Editions Sociales, 1961, 90 pp.
- J. Mervart and others. *The Competition Between Socialism and Capitalism*. Prague, Orbis, 1961, 247 pp.
- G. Andras. *A Criticism of Modern Revisionism in Philosophy*. Budapest, Kossuth Konyvkiado, 1961, 369 pp.
- G. Trevisani. *Essays on the History of the Italian Working-Class Movement (From the First International till the End of the Century)*. Milan, "Avanti", 1960, 318 pp.
- F. Bonte. *German Militarism and France*. Paris, Editions Sociales, 1961, 242 pp.
- L. F. Ilyichov, V. I. Snastin, V. I. Yevdokimov. *Party Propaganda and the Present Time*. Moscow, Gospolitizdat, 1961, 87 pp.
- A "Program" Without a World Outlook? Against the Philosophical Basis of the Goedesberg Program of the SDPG. Institute of Social Sciences, C.C., SUPG. Department of Philosophy. Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1961, 146 pp.
- M. A. Moskalev. *The Program of the Communist Party as Elaborated by V. I. Lenin*. Moscow, "Higher School", 1961, 176 pp.
- M. Egretaud. *Reality of the Algerian Nation*. Paris, Editions Sociales, 1961, 313 pp.
- J. Lewis. *Socialism and the Individual*. London, Lawrence & Wishart, 1961, 87 pp.
- J. Sedlak. *Socialism and Peaceful Coexistence*. Prague, Statni nakladatelstvi politicke literatury, 1961, 297 pp.
- J. Eaton. *Socialism in the Nuclear Age*. London, Lawrence & Wishart, 1961, 191 pp.
- Sources of Modern Revisionism and its Essence (Collection of Articles)*. Moscow, Moscow University Publishing House, 1961, 415 pp.
- A. Livi. *Soviet Youth*. Turin, Einaudi, 1961, 158 pp.
- J. Kadar. *A Strong People's Government Signifies an Independent Hungary. Speeches and Articles*. Budapest, Corvina Verlag, 1961, 250 pp. (In German.)
- S. Mlynar. *The Theory of Socialist Democracy*. Prague, Statni nakladatelstvi politicke literatury, 1961, 206 pp.
- A. Barjonet. *What Is Pauperisation*, Paris, Editions Sociales, 1961, 102 pp.
- W. Seidel-Hoeppner. *Wilhelm Weitling, First Communist Theorist and Agitator in Germany*. Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1961, 207 pp.
-

THE NEWLY
ESTABLISHED FIRM:

WORLD BOOKS

747 Broadway
New York 3, New York

Carries all of the Marxist classics published to-date.

Books from the Soviet Union, People's China, Canada and other lands.

Sole Distributor of and Subscription Service for the WORLD MARXIST
REVIEW in the U.S.A.

Books on American history, Labor, the Negro People's movement and
general literature.

Book orders promptly filled.

Subscription rate for the World Marxist Review is:

\$5.00 for 18 issues; \$3.50 for 12 issues. Single copies 35 cents

Fill in subscription blank below:

WORLD BOOKS
747 Broadway,
New York 3, New York

Please enter my subscription to WORLD MARXIST REVIEW for issues.

Enclosed find \$.....

Name

Address

City Zone # State

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,
Geneva

RUSSIAN EDITION:
Stradisko pro rozsirovani 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,
Vorosmartyter 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

ROMANIAN EDITION:

Directia Difuzarii Presii,
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 bao 32,
Hai Ba Trung, Hà-nôi

