WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW

PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM

DECEMBER 1962

VOL. 5, NO. 12

35 CENTS

WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!

DECEMBER, 1962
VOL. 5, NO. 12

World Marxist Review:
Problems of Peace and Socialism

Theoretical and Information Journal
of Communist and Workers' Parties

CONTENTS

The Policy of Peaceful Coexistence Proves Its Worth 3
B. N. PONOMARYOV: Some Problems of the Revolutionary Movement 9
L. CORVALAN: The Struggle for a People's Government in Chile 19
V. CODOVILLA: The Unity of the Popular Forces in Argentina is Growing 25
E. TUOMINEN: Parliamentary Activities of the Finnish Communists 32
R. PALME DUTT: No Place for Fascism in Britain! 38

IN THE COMMUNIST AND WORKERS' PARTIES

D. BOYEV: Bulgaria Looks Ahead; SAMI: Defending the Interests of the Working Class; R. DANELIUS: The Struggle for Democracy and Peace in West Berlin; M. IVANOV: More People Study Marxism-Leninism; M. LAB: Party Education in Czechoslovakia; P. COURTIEU: An Important Link in the Ideological Work of the French Communist Party; A. DE CARVALHO: The Link Between Party Education and Life; S. MARIN: Working in Semi-Legal Conditions; G. LERNIS: Political Training of Communists. Meetings of Central Committees 43

EXCHANGE OF VIEWS

PROBLEMS OF MODERN CAPITALISM

West European Common Market. The Position and Struggle of the Working Class. Summarized Contributions 58

REVIEWS

M. FERRARA: Togliatti on Problems of the Working-Class Movement 79
M. AMIN, G. MIRSKY: Old Colonialism in New Garb 82

COMMUNICATIONS AND COMMENT

L. INFELD: The Moral Responsibility of the Scientist 84
N. RASHID: New Republic in the Middle East 87
I. MONTAGU: Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament in Britain 89

AGAINST THE PERSECUTION OF DEMOCRATS

L. VASQUEZ: Free the Patriots in Paraguay; W.R.: Justice in the Hitler Fashion; J. PEREZ: Put an End to the Franco Terror; L. N'DIAYE: A Policy of National Betrayal 91
WORLD MARXIST REVIEW: Contents for 1962, Nos. 1-12 97

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, and for payment of postage in cash. 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, 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.

The Policy of Peaceful Coexistence Proves Its Worth

The past ten years have been years of far-reaching and irreversible change in the world balance between imperialist reaction and the forces of progress as embodied in the socialist world system and in the world-wide revolutionary liberation movement of the peoples.

Even the combined forces of world imperialism are no longer capable of preventing the steady advance of the liberation movement and the global triumph of socialism, as seen, for example, in the socialist revolution in Cuba, which stands out as a symbol of the peoples' liberation movement and the decline of imperialism. That the people of Cuba were able to take the reins of government into their own hands and uphold their gains in relatively adverse conditions highlights the fact that *the socialist world system and the peoples' liberation movement are asserting their superiority over the forces of imperialism not only on the overall global scale but on every continent, in every area of the world.*

1.

Imperialism is no longer in a position to change the world balance in its favor. It cannot reverse social development and restore the one-time might of capitalism or the colonial system. But it is still able—at the cost of its own destruction—to halt progress and throw humanity back for tens or perhaps hundreds of years by plunging the world into a nuclear holocaust.

The nations today have no more urgent task than that of preventing the nuclear annihilation of the human race. *There is no constructive alternative to the peaceful coexistence of the two systems. Peaceful coexistence, the principles of which are steadfastly observed by the socialist countries and the international Communist movement, corresponds to the interests of all peoples.*

Some imperialist ideologists equate peaceful coexistence with maintenance of the status quo. Every time a revolutionary upheaval sweeps away a reactionary regime or changes the political map of the world, they accuse the Commmunists of violating this principle. This they did also in the case of Cuba; according to them, the Cuban revolution upset the "natural" balance in the Western hemisphere which, presumably, is "out of bounds" to progressive, liberation movements.

Interpretations of this kind stem from lack of understanding, or, to be more exact, from a reluctance to understand the fundamental difference between peaceful coexistence and maintenance of the status quo.

The socialist countries have no desire whatever to impose their social system on any nation. Consequently, they reject not only world war and "export" of revolution as instruments of policy, but also the status quo principle, since the latter implies a world divided into spheres of influence, legalizing "export" of counter-revolution and, thereby, giving the imperialists a free hand to make short shrift of peoples who fight for their freedom.

Clearly, the socialist countries cannot agree to any division of the world into socialist and imperialist spheres of influence since this runs counter to the basic principles of their foreign policy, above all the principle of non-interference in the affairs of other countries. In any case the very idea of abiding by a political status quo is utterly unrealistic in a world undergoing revolutionary change. Nothing can prevent the peoples from reaching out to freedom, abolishing colonialism and taking the path of progress. No power on earth can stop more countries from breaking away from the capitalist system and taking the road of socialism in keeping with the march of history and the will of their people.

It is from the standpoint of the present world balance and the principle of peaceful coexistence that we should appraise the significance and the lessons of the international crisis caused by the provocative military action taken by U.S. imperialism against revolutionary Cuba.

2.

In October 1962 the aggressive actions of the U.S. imperialists, poised for armed intervention in Cuba brought mankind to the brink of nuclear world war.

The military crisis in the Caribbean, clearly, was not just a "local" conflict nor was it a "probing of strength" between two powers. It was the first direct clash, since the Second

World War, between the two world systems—imperialism and socialism, both organized in states possessing thermonuclear weapons. It was not a question of the prestige or interests of one or another power, even a Great Power, nor of a shift in the balance of strength between them. What was at stake was the fate of mankind, of civilization. A military conflict breaking out in the Caribbean would have instantly enveloped the world in the flames of a nuclear conflagration.

Hence the anxiety which gripped all people concerned with the interests of the nations and the fate of humanity. Humanists like Bertrand Russell appealed to the reason and conscience of statesmen. The non-aligned countries of Asia and Africa saw the gravity of the situation and did their utmost to set the machinery of the United Nations in motion. Lastly, the Western politicians themselves shuddered at the possible consequences of their provocation. Resolute and rapid action was needed to avert the catastrophe and save peace, to safeguard the very existence of the Cuban Republic. Such action was taken by the Soviet government, which displayed the utmost restraint, calm, firmness and wisdom. The stand taken by the Soviet Union, unanimously supported by all the peace-loving forces of the world, made it possible to save world peace and ensure Cuba's independence.

In the present situation the principles of peaceful coexistence, corresponding to the interests of all nations, are gaining the upper hand over naked force, and peaceful settlement of conflicts through negotiation is asserting its superiority in international relations—this is the main conclusion to be drawn from the Caribbean crisis.

Events have shown that the threat to peace emanates not from the socialist countries but from the imperialist reactionaries. *The allegations about "intrigues by world communism" are but the propaganda smokescreen designed to cover up the imperialist efforts to crush all democratic and liberation movements, to resist progress in any form and to meddle in the internal affairs of other countries.*

World imperialism, headed by the USA, seeks, in effect, to justify its striving to "export" counter-revolution everywhere by accusing the socialist countries of "exporting" revolution. This is the purpose of the U.S. doctrine of "local wars" which the Pentagon regards as the natural method of combating the national-liberation movement in Asia, Africa and Latin America. The basic tenets of this doctrine are tantamount to an admission that in the present conditions the United States, having assumed the ugly role of a world gendarme, hopes to arrest the revolutionary process by resorting directly to military intervention. The Pentagon strategists count on confronting their adversaries with the dilemma—either nuclear war or political and military capitulation in one or another area of the world.

The fruits of this aggressive policy are well known. The overthrow of the democratic government in Guatemala, the endless succession of provocations in West Berlin, the series of reactionary conspiracies in the Middle East and Latin America, civil war in Laos and naked military intervention in South Vietnam—all are examples of the punitive action taken by U.S. imperialism against the revolutionary and liberation movements in other countries. Each action of the kind, irrespective of its scale, contains a serious threat to peace. And understandably so. For in our time any encroachment on the freedom and independence of the peoples cannot but acquire an international character fraught with the danger of developing into an all-engulfing military conflict.

3.

The reason why revolutionary Cuba has become in recent times the object of continued military provocations on the part of U.S. imperialism, which, in its efforts to strangle the Cuban revolution, all but plunged humanity into a nuclear war, is perfectly clear.

Cuba has evoked the displeasure of the U.S imperialists because for them its indomitable people are a personification of both the powerful national-liberation movement and the victorious advance of socialism throughout the world, highlighting the impotence of world reaction and the doom of capitalism.

Every day of the Cuban revolution, every step taken by the people of Cuba along the path of social reform is a challenge to the imperialists, who had harbored the illusion that in Latin America the national-liberation movement had ended a century and a half ago; that socialism, being a purely "Eastern" phenomenon, would bypass the Western hemisphere; and, lastly, that in any case socialism can be "contained" by surrounding the USSR and the People's Democracies with a *cordon sanitaire* of military blocs and bases.

Cuba is the living proof that in our day and age the people of any country, be it large or small, located in the proximity of the other

socialist countries or remote from them, can free themselves from the imperialist yoke and win independence. It is this above all that makes the Cuban revolution so significant for the whole world.

Cuba is a case of socialism being chosen by a country which the U.S. rulers have always regarded as their most reliable "immediate hinterland," as practically another state of the Union separated from the mainland only by a strip of water. The Cuban revolution, challenging imperialism in an area which it regards as its own special bailiwick, is a thorn in the side for reactionaries the world over.

For the peoples of Latin America, on the other hand, the Island of Freedom is a beacon whose light penetrates to the most remote corners of the continent. Cuba's revolutionary example has given a new quality to the Latin American liberation movement, reinforcing its militant anti-imperialist character. It is an example that has made it especially clear to the Latin American peoples that U.S. imperialism is their main enemy and that any revolution on this continent, specific national features notwithstanding, is bound to come into conflict with the U.S. monopolies.

Defeat for the Cuban revolution would be a serious blow to all the patriotic and revolutionary forces in Latin America and a grave setback for the worldwide national-liberation movement. Hence the international scale of the Cuban solidarity movement. The crude provocation staged by Washington against this freedom-loving country has been condemned by people belonging to the most diverse classes all over the world, including people whose views are remote from or even hostile to socialism. The scale and effectiveness of the international solidarity with Cuba was a reflection of the new stage in the world liberation movement and the sweeping scale of the fight for peace the world over.

4.

The halting of U.S. aggression against Cuba was further confirmation of the correctness of the policy of peaceful coexistence and points up some valuable lessons.

To appreciate the historical connotation of the recent events one has only to ask what was the aim that lay behind the decision of U.S. imperialism to blockade Cuba.

It is now perfectly clear that the blockade was but the first phase and was to be followed by direct intervention with the aim of overthrowing the people's government, restoring capitalism and returning Cuba to imperialist bondage.

It is equally clear that it was the prime duty of world socialism to save socialist Cuba.

By pursuing a firm but flexible foreign policy, the socialist camp was able to do this. *The aggressive designs of U.S. imperialism were foiled and the revolutionary gains of the Cuban people preserved.* The world received further proof not only of the aggressiveness of U.S. imperialism but also of its inability to change the world balance.

Lastly, President Kennedy's assurance that provided certain conditions were met the USA would refrain from military intervention in Cuba, demonstrated the inability of U.S. imperialism to halt the world liberation movement. By resorting to the naval blockade and reconnaissance flights over the island in time of peace, the U.S. government trampled on international law, thereby discrediting itself politically in the eyes of the world. Even its NATO allies evinced reluctance to become a party to the Pentagon's military gambles.

In an attempt to save face, the U.S. imperialists now say that they gained their objectives by compelling the Soviet Union to remove its missiles from Cuba, and they go so far as to represent the peaceful settlement of the crisis as a victory for themselves. One can understand why the imperialists adopt this line, but why similar views should be expressed by some "well-wishers" of the Cuban revolution is not only strange but highly disturbing.

The Soviet Union agreed to withdraw its missiles only after President Kennedy had declared that the United States would not invade Cuba. True, the imperialists keep their pledges only to the extent they are compelled to do so by the peoples. But the security of revolutionary Cuba in its turn depends not so much on these promises, but on the firm resolve of the Cuban people to defend their gains, on the strength of the entire socialist system and on the solidarity of the world liberation movement.

There may also be some pseudo-revolutionaries who will lament the solution of the Cuban crisis as an unequal compromise, lending it a flavor of ignominy. History, however, will only laugh at such "arch-revolutionaries." As Lenin taught us, reasonable compromise is also an instrument of class struggle, an instrument which Communists must be able to handle. Lenin himself offered some brilliant examples on this score. Suffice to mention the Brest-Litovsk Peace of 1918. Comparing that

compromise with the compromise that ended the Cuban crisis, one cannot but rejoice to see how powerful socialism has become in these past decades. The compromise at Brest-Litovsk, let it be said, bore the hallmark of the weakness of the young Soviet state; it was a result of political maneuvering; whereas the present compromise is proof of the strength of the socialist world system, the result of its impact on history. Moreover, the thwarting of aggressive designs is but one aspect of the achievements of world socialism.

While not rejecting out of hand the possibility of compromise in certain situations, the Marxist-Leninists are always guided by the following principles: *first*, compromise is admissible only if it furthers the basic *strategic objective* of the emancipation movement—the worldwide victory of communism; *second*, concessions are justified only in particular, *tactical issues; third*, in all circumstances the compromise must be based on *mutual concessions*. The freedom and independence of a nation, obviously, are not negotiable; great as the blessing of peace is for man, they cannot be sacrificed even for the sake of preserving world peace. The agreement between the governments of the USSR and the USA which warded off the peril of nuclear war rests on all the foregoing principles. Consequently, the revolutionary gains of the Cuban people far from being jeopardized received added safeguards.

The preservation of world peace, as we know, does not depend on the good will of socialism alone; it calls for mutual concessions. In the given instance, too, peace was saved and nuclear war averted through concessions made by both sides.

The peaceful coexistence which the Communists advocate presupposes mutually acceptable agreements between the socialist and capitalist countries for the sake of maintaining world peace. In point of fact, coexistence would be impossible over any appreciable length of time without a negotiated settlement of the political conflicts that arise from time to time. The ultimate worldwide victory of socialism is something that cannot be accomplished overnight; it will be the end result of a prolonged process of revolutionary transformation of society, a process involving not advance alone but consolidation of the positions won. The socialist revolution, which makes heavy political demands on the leadership of the Communist and Workers' parties, presupposes ability to engage in broad and far-sighted political action and flanking movements which the short-sighted are liable to mistake for retreat. And even when it comes to actual concessions on both sides, the ultimate aim and the alternatives in the given situation must always be kept in mind. In the present case, refusal to enter into a compromise for the sake of false devotion to principle would have meant nuclear war. And this, clearly, would have been a crime against the socialist revolution, a crime which mankind would never forgive.

In less than half a century socialism has not only asserted its right to existence, it has become the ascendant socio-economic system of our time. Gone are the days when the working men rising in struggle against capitalism indeed had nothing to lose but their chains. Through selfless, heroic struggle the masses have won immense material, political and cultural gains, gains that are embodied in the socialist world system. Tomorrow the whole world and the civilization created by their labor will belong to the working people. Self-sacrifice and readiness to die for the cause of the people—qualities which we admire in the revolutionary movements of the past and present—have never been an end in themselves for the Communists. Today the coming of communism— the ultimate goal of the emancipation movement of the working people—is hastened not by martyrdom but chiefly by the example of emancipated creative labor, of the economic and cultural richness of the socialist system. To forfeit this would be downright adventurism and mockery of the heroism and sacrifice of our revolutionary forebears. Heroism is something more than "dying a glorious death." He who does not wish merely to parade his devotion to socialism and communism, but who really works for their triumph in his own country and throughout the world, he who cherishes what has already been built, will see to it that humanity is never embroiled in a nuclear war.

5.

Viewed in the light of the present situation and of the future, the outcome of the Cuban crisis is striking testimony to the triumph of the policy of peaceful coexistence, confirming as it does the general line of the international Communist movement adopted at its Moscow meetings of 1957 and 1960.

What conclusions should we draw from this crisis?

First, *the solution of the military crisis caused by the U.S. provocation against Cuba*

is conclusive proof of the Marxist-Leninist thesis that world war can be prevented in our time. Despite the direct confrontation of the USA and the USSR, despite the fact that the world was on the brink of a nuclear war, peace was preserved thanks to the wise and principled foreign policy of the Soviet Union and the active support accorded it by the worldwide emancipation movement. For the first time the rulers of the United States felt the breath of nuclear war and this had a sobering effect on them. Realizing that they had overreached themselves—and here due credit should be given to the Kennedy administration—they wisely yielded.

The thwarting of the U.S. aggressive designs against Cuba shows that the socialist countries are able to prevent "export" of counter-revolution to any continent. Henceforth no nation fighting for social and national liberation need feel that it has been left to wage a lone fight with world imperialism.

Lastly, *in the eyes of peace-loving people everywhere the prestige of the Soviet Union has grown immeasurably, while U.S. imperialism, which repels the peoples of all countries and frightens even its own allies by its aggressive provocations and gambles, is morally more isolated than ever.*

Having been brought face to face with the real and palpable danger of world nuclear war, no nation and no government can any longer be indifferent to the fate of peace. Even many capitalist statesmen and public leaders (including members of the U.S. ruling circles) who gambled on their "balance of terror" policy are now aware of the dangers of brinkmanship. This no doubt has in many respects cleared the way to a continued search for ways and means of bringing about of a détente and to a successful conclusion of negotiations on general and complete disarmament.

With the changed balance of forces and as the positions of the imperialist reactionaries grow weaker, the latter are pinning their hopes more and more not on their own strength but on discord in the world emancipation movement. All the more inadmissible then are the attempts—on the part of the Right-wing Social Democratic leaders, the revisionists, dogmatists, sectarians and other splitters—to divide the working class, to drive a wedge between the socialist countries, and to instigate the non-aligned states of Asia and Africa against them.

The imperialists, as events have shown, are finding it more and more difficult to unleash war. But this should not be a reason for complacency on the part of the peoples who yearn for peace. In the present situation, with the aggressive imperialist circles becoming increasingly isolated morally and politically, the latter may be tempted to confront the nations with a *fait accompli.* Consequently, the supreme task facing the peace-loving peoples is to see that military crises bearing the germs of world nuclear war are nipped in the bud, rather than to sit back and wait for them to be solved. The imperialists must be compelled to renounce war. And this imposes on the people of the neutral countries as well as of the imperialist powers (especially the USA, Federal Germany, France and Britain) a responsibility for peace no less than that resting on the people in the socialist countries. No people, no matter how difficult the conditions in which it is waging its liberation struggle, is exempt from this responsibility for the fate of peace, civilization and progress.

Both relaxation of international tension and prevention of world war directly depend on the work done by the peoples for peace. In our time the masses are exerting a growing influence on the march of events. Their responsibility for peace has grown accordingly. Experience teaches that when the masses take action for peace, against the aggressive imperialist policy, they can foil aggressive designs. Indeed, the strength of the peace movement derives above all from its mass scale. its militancy and degree of organization. Therefore, it is the internationalist duty of the Communists to be active organizers of the movement for peace and to open the people's eyes to the danger inherent in imperialist military gambles whatever guise they may assume.

6.

The concessions wrested from imperialism do not of course mean that it has lost its aggressive character and abandoned war as a means of attaining its ends. And to exclude the possibility of new military provocations against Cuba, for example, and to place too much faith in the assurances given by the United States government would be premature. The Cuban counter-revolutionaries and their high-ranking patrons in Washington have not ceased their intrigues against Cuba. The dark clouds over the Caribbean have not yet been dispersed and the danger of invasion still lurks. Vigilance will have to be displayed before the military and political designs of the aggressors will be foiled completely.

Cuba's safety, however, rests not only on any concessions on the part of the imperialists, but on the actual correlation of forces between the two world systems. Cuba, like other countries fighting for their independence, can rely on the fraternal aid of the socialist countries, and of the great socialist power, the Soviet Union. Revolutionary Cuba is not alone. She enjoys the ardent sympathy of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. Her people are joined in brotherhood with the closely-knit family of socialist nations, whose motto is "all for each and each for all."

In our time the forces standing for peace have been put to the test more than once. And each time they have come through stronger and more vigorous than before. Experience has shown that the forces of peace considerably outweigh the forces of war, and the counter-revolutionary sallies of imperialism have less chance of success. No such sally is allowed to pass with impunity, and after each provocation the sphere of imperialist influence becomes smaller.

The Communists, the entire international working-class movement, all peace-loving forces have considerable experience in working to avert another world war. This experience tells them, as the events in the Caribbean demonstrated, that peace cannot be ensured only by denunciations of imperialism, however loudly voiced. What is needed is redoubled efforts to unite all peace supporters into one grand anti-war front, joint action against the aggressive imperialist circles which still harbor plans for counter-revolutionary ventures and military provocations. The masses are coming to realize more and more how gravely peace is jeorpardized by the imperialist machinations, by any attempt to engineer "local" conflicts or to resolve the differences by force of arms.

Action for peace today means action to halt the arms drive, to prohibit the manufacture and testing of nuclear weapons, and to abolish all military bases on foreign territories. But the crowning achievement of all the efforts of the champions of peace should be general and complete disarmament. If this were achieved the world would have a permanent guarantee against war.

Man's future depends to a great extent on the lessons all nations and governments will draw from the recent military crisis. The principal conclusions are self-evident:

1. *The might of the socialist system as a whole and the unity of all socialist countries, their adherence to principle, their firmness combined with farsightedness constitute the chief obstacle to imperialist aggression.*

2. *The world Communist and working-class movement is a powerful force capable of rallying the masses of the people in defense of peace and to foil the aggressive designs of international reaction.*

3. *The non-aligned states carry increasing weight in international councils, and, more so today than ever before, are coming to see that peace is indivisible.*

4. *Popular condemnation of war has assumed such massive proportions that it is now possible to enlist in an organized peace movement all sections of society, the overwhelming majority of the population in all countries without exception, and to build a united anti-war front.*

The Communists take an optimistic view of the perspectives of world development. This optimism has its source in the achievements of the world revolutionary movement, the active struggle of the peoples for freedom, democracy and peace, in the certainty that the peoples will in the end choose the socialist system as the system that will guarantee them peace and progress in all spheres of endeavor. The power of attraction exerted by socialism is growing day by day. Its final victory is inevitable.

Some Problems of the Revolutionary Movement

B. N. Ponomaryov

A YEAR has passed since the Party founded by the great Lenin—a party with a proud record of achievement in the building of socialism — adopted its new program which charts the way to communism, man's cherished goal. The Program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is of worldwide significance because it is at once the theoretical summation of the key elements of the contemporary world revolutionary process and the blueprint for success in its decisive phase —that of building communism in the USSR and a mature socialist society in the People's Democracies.

In our days the world is the scene of a grand encounter between the forces of peace, democracy and communism and the forces of war, reaction and imperialism.

Never in history has the struggle for social regeneration been waged on such a scale as in our day. Moreover, it is being waged in the conditions of peace and peaceful competition between the two social systems, at a time when man's advance towards communism is steadily gaining momentum, when the economic, political and ideological forces of socialism are constantly growing and Marxism-Leninism is winning more and more adherents.

This is the basic trend of our time, a trend that asserts itself through bitter class struggle in rapidly changing conditions of revolutionary action. The motive forces of the world revolution are multiplying and gaining strength. Two interconnected processes are taking place. Inasmuch as the monopoly yoke weighs more and more heavily not only on the working class but also on the peasants, on professional people and the middle strata generally, a *united anti-monopoly front* is taking shape in the capitalist countries. And in the international arena there is a growing tendency towards a worldwide *anti-imperialist front*—uniting the socialist countries, the peoples that have won national independence and those still fighting for sovereignty, and the working class and all the democratic, progressive forces in the capitalist countries.

With the objective conditions for the development of the world socialist revolution becoming more favorable, the role of the subjective factor grows, and with it the responsibility of the Communists for the correctness of their policy, making it incumbent on them creatively to examine the conditions of struggle in order to improve all aspects of their political activity and tactics. Successful revolutionary action by the world Communist movement—the militant vanguard of mankind —depends above all on its unity.

1. Radical Change in the Conditions of Revolutionary Struggle

The existence of the powerful Soviet state and the socialist world system lays its imprint on the conditions in which the revolutionary movement is developing in all parts of the world. The organic connection between present social developments and the October Revolution, the victory of socialism in the USSR and the advance of the socialist world system is becoming increasingly apparent.

The Program of the CPSU elucidates the essence and forms of the revolutionizing influence exerted by the socialist world system on human development generally, and shows that this influence is most effective in the conditions of peaceful coexistence. The need for peaceful coexistence of countries with diametrically opposed social systems is particularly accentuated by the level of the modern productive forces, which have made it possible to create weapons of unprecedented destructive power. Prevention of nuclear war has become a precondition for carrying out the world socialist revolution in a way that would not jeopardize civilization and the very life of the nations, i.e., in a form in keeping with the interests of millions and with the humane character of our great teaching.

For this reason the CPSU and the other Marxist-Leninist parties base their general line of foreign policy on peaceful coexistence as the practical expression of the slogan proclaimed in the 1957 Declaration of the Communist and Workers' parties: action for peace

is the primary task of the Communists in all countries.

Delivering mankind from world war and abolishing exploitation and poverty on a world scale constitute the integral revolutionary aim of the Marxists-Leninists. Conscious of the reactionary and aggressive nature of imperialism, the Communists urge the peoples to display the utmost vigilance and to take resolute action against the warmongers headed by the U.S. reactionaries. The imperialists are preparing another world war, building military blocs, intensifying the arms drive and committing acts of aggression against revolutionary Cuba and other countries. They would be only too pleased to crush the peoples of the socialist countries. But imperialism no longer has its old strength. The heavy blows dealt by the socialist and national-liberation revolutions at the world imperialist system have undermined its ability to impose its will on the peoples and to crush revolutions by means of armed intervention.

Symptomatic from the standpoint of the development of the revolutionary movement is the defeat of the attempts made by U.S. imperialism to export counter-revolution to Cuba. From the day the Cuban revolution triumphed, the U.S. imperialists have tried hard to crush the new Cuba and to subordinate it once again to a reactionary regime. But the Cubans have foiled all the provocations, including the intervention by U.S. mercenaries in 1961. The lessons of this, however, seem to have been lost on Wall Street and the Pentagon, for in October they set about organizing open military intervention. In this inflammable situation the Soviet Union and the entire socialist camp once again demonstrated their strength. The wise and flexible policy displayed by the CPSU and the Cuban government and the protests of a world public opinion that had been outraged by the U.S. imperialist provocations — provocations that brought the world to the brink of world war —had their effect.

The threat hanging over the Cuban revolution was thus warded off again. Cuba continues its advance along the road chosen by its people — the socialist road. But it goes without saying that there can be no relaxation of vigilance in regard to U.S. imperialism or the other reactionary forces; action for the security of both Cuba and world peace must be intensified.

The solution of the Cuban crisis in the interests of peace and socialism is an inspiration to the revolutionary forces of the world, for it has shown that the days are gone when the imperialists could crush progressive movements, as was the case in Guatemala, and that the working class and the people generally, once they have defeated their exploiters and established a socialist system, can now confidently follow their chosen path.

A survey of the situation shows how much human society stands to gain from a durable peace. At a time when socialism is increasingly asserting its superiority and when new class alignments are taking shape in the capitalist countries, the banishing of world war from the life of society will enable the nations to achieve socialism at a minimum social and material cost, with the minimum sacrifice and suffering, and, in the final analysis, much more quickly.

Some people regard peaceful coexistence as a counterpoise to revolutionary struggle for the liberation of peoples and the emancipation of classes. This approach, however, is not justified by the facts of life, by the march of social development; it runs counter to Marxist-Leninist theory. Revolution, as we know, is always engendered by the objective requirements of social development. In our time of revolutionary change the logic of social development predetermines the necessity of transition to socialism. The motive force of this transition is the class struggle. Far from narrowing the arena of this struggle, peaceful coexistence gives it greater scope.

Though essentially indivisible, the revolutionary process has two aspects—internal and international. The two interweave and interact, and are governed by the general objective laws of the revolution. Yet each has its specific features, which determine the development and the forms of the class struggle. The task of the Marxist-Leninist parties is to disclose, substantiate and further those forms of the class struggle which at the given stage ensure the achievement of the revolutionary goals. *On the world scale, as the 1960 Statement of the Communist and Workers' parties points out, peaceful coexistence between states with differing social systems is such a form of the class struggle.*

What are the prospects of the revolutionary movement in the conditions of peaceful coexistence? Does this movement have the economic, political and ideological strength and means with which to carry on an unceasing offensive against capitalism and to lead all nations to socialism?

The transition to socialism in one or another country is effected by the national revolu-

tionary forces in the course of the class struggle which can take a wide variety of forms, including peaceful and non-peaceful. Peaceful coexistence of states with differing social systems provides greater opportunities for taking over power by peaceful means, but does not exclude non-peaceful forms of struggle whenever the situation demands this.

Experience has shown that the offensive of world socialism against the positions of world capitalism goes on incessantly in the conditions of peaceful coexistence. For *the socialist system possesses powerful economic, political and ideological levers for exerting a revolutionary influence on the course of social development.*

The main arena of the struggle between the two systems is competition in *the sphere of material production.* But the economic offensive of socialism differs fundamentally from the economic warfare often waged by the capitalists. Socialism rejects such imperialist methods as economic blockade, enslavement of countries and trade discrimination. Its economic challenge consists primarily in demonstrating the advantages of the new social relations. Peaceful competition resolves the world historic debate as to which is the better system, which of the two systems, the capitalist or the socialist, is capable of ensuring higher productivity of labor and a better life for all.

This, then, is the contest to which socialism has challenged capitalism. And there can be no doubt that socialism will win, thereby delivering a crushing blow to the entire system of capitalist relationships.

The creation of the powerful productive forces which will enable the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries to surpass world capitalism for production and ensure the highest standard of living, will in the not distant future signify the transformation of the socialist system into the decisive factor of world development. And this will hasten the abolition of exploitation throughout the world.

The socialist world system is waging a highly *effective political struggle* against reaction in the international arena. This struggle, too, differs fundamentally as regards both substance and methods from the imperialist policy of international brigandage. The imperialists interfere in the internal affairs of other countries, they try to export counter-revolution, they engineer coups in order to impose dictators on peoples by force of arms, they buy ministers and governments, and stop at nothing in their endeavor to halt social progress.

The policy of the socialist countries, on the contrary, precludes any interference in the internal affairs of other states. Their aim is to help the nations to safeguard their independence, to protect peace, and to facilitate the union of all progressive, democratic and peace-loving forces in a strong worldwide anti-imperialist front. The socialist countries influence the march of events by offering an example of better social organization. In this connection the further extension of socialist democracy is of particular significance. For it is in this sphere that the advantages of socialism stand out against the background of the crisis of bourgeois democracy and the monopoly drive towards dictatorial fascist methods of government.

Ideological struggle is highly important in the conditions of peaceful coexistence. It adds to the effectiveness of the economic and political methods of struggle for the worldwide victory of socialism. The more the ideas of the socialist world gain over the misanthropic ideology of capitalism and colonialism, the more united and confident will be the ranks of the peace fighters, the greater the safeguards of peaceful coexistence and the nearer the victory of socialism.

The growing economic power and the political and ideological prestige of socialism have changed the historical context of the class struggle, causing ever new contingents of working people to adopt socialist positions and altering the balance of forces in the struggle between progress and reaction.

The influence exerted by the Soviet Union on the revolutionary process is steadily growing. From its inception the world's first proletarian state has been a beacon lighting the way for all the oppressed. The creation of a socialist society and the elaboration — and practical verification — of the science of building socialism, the Soviet Union's decisive role in defeating fascism, its help in establishing and consolidating the People's Democracies and its role in protecting them against the imperialist beasts of prey — these are all aspects of the influence exerted by the Soviet system on the march of history. And today the USSR together with the other socialist countries is playing the main role in safeguarding humanity against the horrors of nuclear war. The Leninist Party regards the building of the world's first society of Peace, Labor, Freedom, Equality, Brotherhood and Happiness as the Soviet people's great inter-

nationalist task, a task corresponding to the interests of the entire socialist world system, the international proletariat and all humanity.

Peaceful coexistence, then, provides every opportunity for successful development of all revolutionary movements in our time, a time marked by the rapid growth of socialism and the weakening of the positions of capitalism all along the line.

Needless to say, under all circumstances it is the mass struggle of the working people, waged in forms corresponding to the national conditions and the concrete situation and guided by the general principles of the Marxist-Leninist theory of social development, that will bring about democratic and socialist changes in the capitalist countries.

2. The National-Liberation Movement at the Present Stage

Since the war, more than 50 former colonies have won independence. The biggest gain in the national-liberation struggle in recent times is the victory of the people of Algeria over the French colonialists. Important too were the liberation by the people of India of their ancient territories of Goa, Daman and Diu from the Portuguese yoke and the termination of Dutch colonial rule in West Irian as a result of the struggle waged by the Indonesian people. In Yemen revolution has swept away a despotic regime and is opening a new page in the life of that country. Thus the winds of freedom have reached the Arabian peninsula where feudal monarchies allied with the imperialist monopolies have kept the people in mediaeval slavery.

The post-war has shown that the better the prospects of peaceful co-existence (due to the growing strength of the Soviet Union and the socialist system as a whole), the more resounding and deep-going the breakdown of the colonial empires under the blows of the popular liberation movement. The connection is obvious.

What is most important is that the peoples who are fighting for their independence have the support of the socialist camp, which, as has been demonstrated time and again, is capable of rendering the help needed to prevent the export of counter-revolution.

The link between the successful national-liberation struggle and the growing strength and influence of socialism acquires greater significance at present when a central place in this struggle is taken by problems of a predominantly economic nature the solution of which is essential to ensure genuine independence.

The imperialists are resorting to a variety of political devices to preserve their influence in the newly independent countries. But their main stake is on the economic methods of neo-colonialism, closely linked with cold-war strategy. The capitalist world regards colonial policy as one aspect of its global strategy which is aimed at halting the march of history. This is evident from the increasing "internationalization" of colonial policy in recent years, with the imperialist powers combining in order jointly to maintain and consolidate their domination not only in the countries they have managed to entangle in aggressive military blocs but also in neutral countries through the European Common Market (16 African countries are already "associated" with it). Although this kind of "collective colonialism" does not do away with the inter-imperialist contradictions, it, like neo-colonialism in general, should be examined in the light of the main contradiction of our time and the new balance of forces in the world arena.

A feature of the Program of the CPSU, which makes it of prime importance for a correct understanding of the national-liberation movement and its further advance, is its assessment of this movement not as an ancillary or a reserve of the socialist revolution, but as an integral part of a worldwide struggle of which the end result will be the abolition of capitalism. The Program brings out the interweaving of the three great progressive movements of our time — the struggle for socialism, the national-liberation movement, and the peace movement. A slackening of any one of these movements will have a detrimental affect on the others. And, conversely, success in one accelerates social progress in general. In other words, it is in this converging of all the progressive movements into a common stream that the problem of national liberation can be finally solved. Hence it would be a mistake to assume that the struggle for peace and general disarmament has no bearing on the national-liberation movement; action for peace and disarmament not only has a positive bearing on that movement but is objectively linked with it.

Consolidation of peaceful coexistence and disarmament would mean abolishing all military blocs, including those which shackle the non-socialist world and serve as a channel for imperialist interference in the internal affairs of nations. Disarmament would mean

doing away with military bases and withdrawing foreign troops from national territories and alien fleets from territorial waters where they are stationed to support the local reactionaries. As a result of the weakening, and even more so with the elimination, of foreign military and political pressure, social contradictions would be solved on the basis of the balance of forces shaped in the normal course of the class struggle in each country. This would hasten the achievement of unity among the progressive forces and their victory.

The aid extended by the socialist countries helps to lay the material foundation for the genuine independence of peoples who have rid themselves of colonial rule. Moreover, it stimulates interest in socialism and engenders a desire to use socialist methods in order to build a thriving economy; it offiers moral support to the progressive forces in the newly-emerged states, promotes their unity and assists them in their search for the correct ways of national development. In these circumstances the growth of the working class and other progressive changes in the social structure as well as greater activity on the part of the entire population make it possible for all former colonies eventually to take the non-capitalist way. The peoples themselves will decide what path to take and when to take it.

An effective solution of these problems is offered by the state of national democracy uniting all the progressive forces from the national bourgeoisie, the intellectuals and the petty bourgeoisie to the working class, with the working class—as it awakens politically, becoming organized, eventually establishing its Marxist-Leninist party and building an alliance with the peasantry—playing a steadily increasing role in the social advance of the nation along the road of genuine progress, the road to socialism. The lanes converging on this road are many and varied, but that the peoples which are breaking with imperialism will step out along it sooner or later is inevitable.

It should be stressed that peaceful coexistence facilitates *all* forms of the liberation struggle.

General disarmament presupposes the abolition of national armaments by all countries—the capitalist as well as the socialist. If the colonialists are disarmed, it will be easier to dislodge them. And should they refuse to leave, the peoples will be justified in using force to eject them. Such action would be a just war of liberation. The same applies to resistance to imperialist encroachments on independence already won.

The peoples of many countries and territories are still under the colonial yoke. But they refuse to become reconciled to the continuation of this state of affairs. The people of Angola, for instance, supported by progressives everywhere, are waging an armed struggle against the Portuguese colonialists. The enslaved peoples of South Africa are intensifying their fight against a brutal dictatorship which is bent on crushing every semblance of freedom. In the other colonies, too, the imperialists have to exert every effort to remain in power; but these last bastions of colonialism are doomed, and they will collapse under the blows of the national-liberation movement. National freedom is the inalienable right of all peoples and they will win that right.

The socialist countries and the Communists all over the world will continue to aid and support the peoples who are waging an armed struggle against colonialism. Far from contradicting the concept of peaceful coexistence, this is an affirmation of that concept, since the issue at stake is respect for one of the basic principles of peaceful coexistence—the right of all peoples to order their own life as they see fit, to be masters in their own house.

Cuba has become a symbol of the victorious national-liberation movement of our time. The Cuban revolution, which triumphed in the conditions of peaceful coexistence, has withstood with honor the pressure exerted by U.S. imperialism. Cuba established its political independence by putting an end to foreign imperialist domination and by taking the way of genuinely revolutionary socio-economic change. Its leaders, headed by Fidel Castro, rallied the cream of the nation to the banner of Marxism-Leninism. The example set by revolutionary Cuba has won the admiration of progressives everywhere.

The time required for the national-liberation revolution to develop into the socialist revolution has been greatly reduced thanks to the impact of socialism on world development, to the numerical growth and better organization of the national detachments of the working class, to the increasing influence of the Communist forces and the aid rendered by the international working class.

Another new element is the greater influence wielded by the Communist parties in the national-liberation movement. Indeed, situations are arising in a number of countries when the ruling national bourgeoisie can no longer ignore the Communists but must reckon with the weight they carry with the masses.

There is yet another factor favoring the anti-colonial revolution that should be noted. Formerly the working class in the metropolitan countries and the developed capitalist countries generally was largely isolated from the working people of the colonies, and this weakened the workers' positions while making it easier for the colonialists to cope with the national-liberation movement. Today the working-class movement is siding more and more resolutely with the peoples upholding their independence. More than that, it is striking more powerful blows at capitalism at home, undermining its foundations and depriving it of opportunities to enslave other peoples. A united anti-imperialist front of the peoples is emerging. It is to this front that the future belongs.

3. The Growth of the Revolutionary Forces in the Capitalist Countries

In the strongholds of monopoly capitalism the working-class movement is the vanguard of the revolutionary forces. The developed capitalist countries now have some 160 million workers, more of whom are organized in their own political parties and trade unions than ever before. There are nearly three million Communists in these countries and trade union membership runs to some 60 million.

Here, too, peaceful coexistence has created a favorable climate for the development of the class struggle on an unprecedented scale. Whereas in the period from 1919 to 1939, 177,400 strikes took place with 80,800,000 workers involved, in 1946-1960 there were 247,400 strikes with 222,600,000 participants. During 1961-62 the strike wave and mass political actions reached a new high. In the first seven months of the current year more than 55,000,000 workers downed tools. The other sections of the working people are also displaying greater political activity.

The achievements of the USSR and the entire socialist world system have created highly favorable opportunities for disseminating the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, for uniting the working masses in the capitalist countries, broadening their political horizons, waging an active struggle for economic and political rights and for curbing and abolishing monopoly domination. Experience has shown that the working class and the working people generally can win their demands only through united, resolute action.

The more reactionary groups of monopoly capital see in an international detente a threat to their profits and their rule, and hence they are working to prevent any relaxation of the tension. But in doing so they come into sharp conflict with the vast majority of the population, including some sections of the capitalist class itself. At the same time the steadily growing concentration of capital is ruining millions of peasants and causing grave injury to the small and medium employers. This paves the way to the formation of broad alliances around the working class, to the emergence of that social force which is destined to carry out vitally necessary social reforms, to curb the monopolies, put an end to their rule and extend democracy. Although this social force is shaped under the democratic slogans of action for peace, disarmament, democracy, etc., it contains the germ of the politically organized force essential for carrying out the socialist revolution.

In the course of the struggle for peace the masses go through a political schooling, they become active in public life and aware of the responsibility of each individual for what is happening in the world. For peace is a political matter which appeals to the emotions and affects the interests of all, impelling people to seek strength through unity. And unity is a source of invincible strength. At this point, too, the struggle for peace and the struggle for socialism meet, for both peace and socialism have one enemy—imperialism, monopoly capitalism. Because of this the Communists are in the forefront of the peace partisans. We shall work to rally all honest people against war, to strengthen peace, N. S. Khrushchov said. For this will benefit the cause of the working class and the working people generally.

The experience gained in the fight for peace is helping the peoples to counteract and repulse the reactionaries and to uphold democracy. The setbacks suffered by fascism are a case in point.

Fascism today is adopting a new guise even though its essence and the aims pursued by finance capitalism in fostering it remain unchanged. In such countries as France, Federal Germany, the USA, Italy, Japan, and of late also in Britain, the fascist movement is playing an important part in the overall machinery of the monopoly state, frequently serving as a shock force in the increasingly brazen drive against the already curtailed civil rights and freedoms.

The peoples are becoming aware of the link between fascism and the monopoly state and time and again in recent years they have

demonstrated their readiness to foil this conspiracy against democracy by united action. The democratic and socialist aims of the revolution are thus becoming intertwined more and more. By consistently taking the lead in the struggle for general democratic demands, the proletariat of the capitalist countries is already waging the struggle for socialism.

4. The Communists are the Leading Force of Our Time

No political movement has ever experienced trials comparable to those of the Communist movement. But no other movement has ever had such grand achievements to its credit.

Today the Communist movement is a powerful force consisting of nearly 90 revolutionary proletarian parties with 42,500,000 members and a following of hundreds of millions of working people.

In present conditions, when the world revolutionary process has undergone significant changes, when its motive forces have been multiplied and its forms enriched, the Communist parties attach the greatest importance to overcoming shortcomings in their activities, particularly those engendered by the personality cult. Working for the regeneration of society, the Communists constantly seek to improve their tactics and to achieve the unity of all progressive, anti-monopoly forces.

Above all they are striving to overcome the split in the working-class movement and to achieve unity of action between all parties and groups which have a working-class following. What is in question is primarily the attitude to be taken towards the Social Democrats. The Social Democratic movement now consists of various trends. There are those who are prepared to cooperate with the Communists and are close to them on many important issues. But there are also those who take a reformist stand of class conciliation, and some are dyed-in-the-wool anti-communists and defenders of capitalism.

This latter group includes many (but by no means all) Right-wing Social Democratic leaders, those who openly cooperate with the aggressive imperialist military alignments; some of them even helped to set up NATO and were the initiators of aggressive acts. Grovelling before the capitalists, these gentlemen have repudiated every socialist idea and have climbed onto the anti-communist bandwagon. This is evident in the new programs adopted in recent years by some Social Democratic parties and in particular from the Declaration of the Socialist International approved by its Council in June 1962. The farther Right-wing Social Democracy retreats from the ideals of the working-class movement, the more it merges with the bourgeois parties, losing its identity and independent outlook. But subservience to the bourgeoisie in matters of theory, surrender in questions of policy and renunciation of struggle for the vital interests of the working class and the colonial peoples are steadily eroding the reactionary wing of Social Democracy.

More than half a century has passed since the international working-class movement split into the revolutionary and opportunist wings. The revolutionary wing followed Lenin and achieved magnificent socialist victories. The opportunist wing, as represented by the Second International, followed Kautsky and his associates who, renouncing the struggle for the revolutionary overthrow of the old system, repudiated the dictatorship of the proletariat, thereby dooming themselves to political and ideological degeneration and causing many a bitter defeat for the working class. History has shown who was right 50 years ago.

The Communist parties criticize, as they have always done, the ideological positions and the opportunist practice of Right-wing Social Democracy, exposing those leaders who have openly sided with the bourgeoisie. But this is constructive criticism, prompted by the desire to show the harm done to the workers' movement by Right-wing Social Democracy and, by doing so, to pave the way to extensive contacts at all levels and to united action in every sphere where all trends aspiring to represent the working-class movement and democracy are duty bound to work together in order to defeat the reactionaries and warmongers.

International and internal conditions favor the growth of the Communist movement and the development of all the revolutionary elements in society. But it would be a mistake to see only the favorable factors and to ignore those that hold back the revolutionary process.

The bourgeoisie is perfecting its war machine, hoping to halt the advance of socialism with the combined strength of all the imperialist countries. It may resort to bloodshed in order to retain its supremacy. Lenin's words that the working class must "master *all* forms, or sides, of social activity without exception," that it must be "ready to pass from one form to another in the quickest and

most unexpected manner,"* are, therefore, more timely than ever.

The capitalist class, taught by the severe defeats it has suffered in the past 50 years, is resorting to social demagogy, political manipulations and more ingenious methods of suppressing mass movements. Considerable sections of the working class and other working people are still under its ideological influence.

There are, it is true, other unfavorable factors, but these are outweighed by the favorable ones; indeed, it is the latter that play the decisive role, accelerating the development of the socialist world revolution and hastening the triumph of socialism all over the world.

Reinforcing the unity of the Communist parties and overcoming opportunist wavering in them help to strengthen the world Communist movement and to cement its unity on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. And the stronger and more close-knit the ranks of the world Communist movement, the more confidently will each Party forge ahead and the easier will it be for it to ensure its own unity.

The traditions, the economic structure, the social problems and the class alignments in the different countries, even though they have much in common, all have their distinctive features. Clearly, then, in order to elaborate the correct strategy and tactics capable of ensuring victory it is essential to approach Marxist-Leninist theory creatively and to apply it correctly to the given conditions. There are, however, people who would draw from the correct principle of the unity and indivisibility of the world revolutionary process the incorrect conclusion that the forms and methods of struggle should be the same in all countries and in all conditions. Consequently, they ignore the specific conditions of struggle and do not thoroughly examine the real processes under way and the possible new forms of the revolutionary movement. The result usually is a tendency to fit the realities of life into a rigid pattern based solely on past experience. And this is fraught with the danger of losing touch with the masses, while on the international scale it engenders misunderstanding and mutual incomprehension between Communists.

Creative Marxists are opposed to the specific being regarded as something absolute. To ignore what has been discovered and verified in practice in other countries would result in discounting the general laws of the revolution and of building socialism; the sense of solidarity with the world Communist movement would be lost and the danger would arise of a tendency to evade one's internationalist duty.

Each Communist Party, needless to say, is free to decide all questions of domestic and foreign policy independently. But independence does not signify self-isolation, withdrawing into the shell of national interests. Study of the experience of fraternal parties is a guarantee against past mistakes, a guarantee of correct policy and of a creative approach to the tasks ahead.

The international Communist movement has accumulated a wealth of experience in collectively elaborating key questions of strategy and tactics. The Moscow Declaration and Statement are guides to action for all Marxist-Leninist parties. Indeed, strict adherence to these documents is their supreme international duty. Lenin, it will be recalled, time and again stressed the importance of the international responsibilities of each Party. And today, too, Lenin's counsel always to remember one's allegiance to the international family of Marxists, never to lose touch with it, always to strengthen it, remains the watchword of the fraternal parties.

History has shown that the problems of the revolution in the various countries can be fully and correctly solved only on the basis of a consistently international policy. If correctly understood, the interests of the nation and its working class never run counter to the interests of the international Communist movement. On the contrary, it is the combining of the two that constitutes the content of proletarian internationalism, that powerful moral and political factor in the struggle for socialism and universal progress.

The only correct policy is loyalty to Marxism-Leninism, utilizing everything of universal value in the experience of the various parties, enriching this experience and skilfully applying it in the national and historical conditions of one's own country.

In the light of the foregoing the harm caused by the anti-revolutionary splitting activity of the leaders of the Albanian Party of Labor is particularly apparent.

Beginning with unbridled criticism of the basic views of the Communist parties in 1960 —a criticism that had nothing in common with comradely discussion—and adopting an anti-Leninist position, the top group in the

*V. I. Lenin, **"Left-Wing" Communism, an Infantile Disorder.**

Albanian Party of Labor has been sinking deeper and deeper into dogmatism and nationalism, reaching a point which, in effect, borders on anti-communism.

In recent years this group has been mainly occupied with attacks on the Soviet Union, the CPSU, the world Communist movement and the documents adopted by this movement at its 1957 and 1960 meetings. While the CPSU and the other Communist parties and the socialist countries are conducting a genuine struggle all along the line against imperialism, pressing forward step by step against the economic, political and ideological positions of the capitalist world, the Albanian leaders are engaged in a shrill pseudo-revolutionary campaign of phrasemongering against these basic forces of the anti-imperialist struggle.

The Albanian leaders are trying to impel the socialist countries onto the path of adventurism in the struggle against imperialism; having repudiated in practice the agreed principles of peaceful coexistence, they are virtually seeking to provoke a nuclear world war. Such is the true face of the Albanian anti-Leninist grouping.

"We must," Lenin said, "combat revolutionary phrasemongering, we are simply compelled to combat it, so that one day it should not be said of us as the bitter truth: 'revolutionary phrasemongering about a revolutionary war brought about the defeat of the revolution.' "* Never were these words more timely than now.

Socialism is of course immeasurably stronger now than it was in 1918 when Lenin had to wage an unrelenting struggle against "revolutionary" phrasemongering. And while it is true that the Albanian grouping is powerless to exert any appreciable influence on the course of events, the perniciousness of its activities and views, nevertheless, should not be underestimated. Hence they must be exposed once and for all.

5. Some Conclusions

An overall survey of the revolutionary movement suggests the following conclusions:

1. The world revolution is developing in scope and depth. Peaceful competition between the two systems creates favorable conditions for its advance from success to success. Socialism is pressing forward on a global scale, whereas capitalism has irrevocably lost the initiative in the historical contest between the two social formations. The foundations of the capitalist system are crumbling in many areas of the globe.

Powerful blows are being struck at imperialism from all sides—by victorious socialism, by the proletariat of the capitalist countries, by the peoples who have overthrown colonialism and by the broad democratic movements opposed to monopoly domination.

The revolutionary forces are maturing everywhere and there is every reason to believe that the revolutionary process will steadily gain momentum. Upheavals there will be in all corners of the world; the process, though uneven, is irreversible.

2. The main strategic line of the international Communist movement in the present conditions, as set forth in the documents of the meetings of the fraternal parties and in the Program of the CPSU, is struggle to deliver the working people from all forms of exploitation and oppression, to secure the victory of socialism and to rid humanity of the incubus of thermonuclear war. The contribution of the CPSU to the solution of these tasks consists above all in building communism in the USSR.

The building of socialism and communism in the countries belonging to the socialist world system makes it possible:

—to win the economic competition with capitalism, to strengthen the community of socialist countries and to leave capitalism behind in all spheres of life;

—for the revolutionary forces in the imperialist countries to wage a still more vigorous struggle against capitalism;

—steadily to increase the aid to the newly-emerged national states in order to facilitate complete liberation from imperialist bondage and to promote social progress;

—for the forces of the socialist states and peace-loving people everywhere to guarantee humanity against world war.

All this, in the aggregate, is the strategic master plan of the offensive of international communism against imperialism.

3. The imperialist camp has lost considerable ground. But, still powerful, it is feverishly building up in preparation for world war. The weakening of the old world may increase its aggressiveness and spur it on to desperate gambles in foreign policy. But the leaders of the capitalist world are no longer confident of victory in another world war, as the chieftains of German fascism were when they launched the last war. They are well aware of the strength of socialism. As for

*V. I. Lenin. **On Revolutionary Phrasemongering.**

us Communists, we are confident that if the aggressors unleash war against the USSR, against socialism, they will be defeated and an end put to the capitalist system.

4. The Communist movement has become the most influential political force of our time. It extends to all continents and to nearly all the countries of the world. And it is continuing to grow, consolidating its strength, extending its influence and winning millions of new supporters.

5. The path of human progress is far from smooth. It is beset by many difficulties. The Communist and Workers' parties are working in extremely complex conditions. For the imperialist reactionaries stop at nothing in their efforts to retard the march of history, to discredit communism and to counteract Marxist-Leninist ideas. Although the general trend of the Communist movement, owing to the objective laws of human progress, is towards a strengthening of its positions, it would be dangerous to underestimate the possibilities still at the disposal of the reactionaries. Hence, combating anti-communism is one of the urgent tasks of the international Communist movement.

6. There still are revisionists and dogmatists in the international Communist movement. The revisionists have gone so far as to renounce the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism, while the dogmatists close their eyes to the radical changes that have taken place in the world and refuse to see the new conditions favoring the working-class and general liberation movement. Combating revisionism and dogmatism, national egoism and insularity is an important task of the Communist movement.

7. The realm of theory is of particular significance for the continued advance of the Communist movement. Lenin taught us that in order to choose the right way and the correct forms of the socialist revolution, of struggle for socialism, it is essential to pay unflagging attention to a profound and comprehensive analysis of the rapidly developing social processes, to draw the correct conclusions from this analysis, and to apply them at both the tactical and the strategic levels.

Guided by the principles set forth in the fundamental international documents of the modern Communist movement, the Communist parties, strengthening their positions among the masses, are confidently gathering their forces for new victories in the great battles ahead.

The Struggle for a People's Government in Chile

Luis Corvalan

THE MOVEMENT for national liberation is spreading rapidly throughout Latin America. In some of the countries it is already fairly well organized, and the militancy and political maturity of those taking part in it are on a high level. In Chile, for example, there is a working class with rich traditions of struggle and a Communist Party which has acquired not a little experience and which is closely linked with the masses. The more advanced of the poor and intermediate sections in the countryside, including the agricultural laborers, are organized in the National Federation of Peasants and Indian Population. All the forces of the Left, the Communist, Socialist, National Democratic and the National People's Vanguard parties, are united around a common program in the Popular Action front.

Besides, there are a large number of united front organizations conducting work among women, the youth, professional people and other sections. There is a close and growing understanding between Communists and Socialists. At the Third National Congress of the United Trade Union Center held in August, the Christian Democratic and Radical trade unions rejoined the center, which now unites working people of all political trends and organizations, including those belonging to the government parties. The Popular Action Front includes Marxists and non-Marxists, Catholics and Protestants, believers and non-believers. The Front parties take part in joint action with the Christian Democrats and with part of the Radicals.

The popular movement in Chile has a solid structure. It is cemented by the unity and the struggle of the working class, by the growing worker-peasant alliance, and by the close links between the working class and the urban petty bourgeoisie and part of the national bourgeoisie.

Conditions are becoming favorable for far-reaching changes in the country. The government finds itself in a blind alley; it is faced with financial difficulties such as the lack of funds to cover one-third of the state budget or to make good the balance of payments deficit which is also one-third, or more, of the foreign exchange reserves. The government is trying to overcome these difficulties by means of another devaluation, by an unrestricted emission of paper money, and by making new credit agreements and similar measures which can but aggravate the situation.

All the remedies proposed by the United States and used by the ruling classes with a view to putting things right have made things worse. The latest device of the imperialists is the so-called Alliance for Progress—Kennedy's plan for Latin America. Under this plan Chile is to get "aid" to the tune of $480 million by 1968. But in the same period considerably more money will flow out of the country in the shape of external debt. Very few people any longer believe in the good intentions of the Alliance for Progress. Voices of criticism and disillusionment are hushing up the hymns of praise.

The people, who more than once have experienced the consequences of the government's economic policy and for several years have suffered from a steadily declining standard of living, are stepping up their struggle. But neither the worsening conditions nor the efforts of the people to improve these conditions can in themselves bring about any change. The main thing is that the people are, increasingly, linking up their progressive aspirations with the struggle for an anti-imperialist, anti-oligarchy government. Hence the conviction that the way forward lies through a revolutionary reconstruction.

"In the course of many years," states the Program of the Communist Party of Chile, "the people of our country have accumulated useful experience; they have acquired the necessary general idea of each class and each party, and they have arrived at the conviction that the working class and the people themselves should take their destiny into their own hands."

The U.S. imperialists know that it is no longer possible to maintain the present situation in Latin America. Therefore, along with the Big Stick policy and the threat of military

intervention, they are resorting to new tactical devices in order to perpetuate the deception of the people and to reduce the pressure in the social boiler. They are raising, for example, the banner of agrarian reform but only in order to prevent the land from being transferred to those who till it; they aim at achieving this by merging the latifundia with capitalist farming, making this the basis of their agricultural policy. An agrarian reform of this kind is both historically backward and reactionary since it is spearheaded mainly against the peasant masses who are evicted, deprived of rights and turned into cheap labor for the new rural capitalists.

It is true that to a certain extent the reform could impinge also on the interests of the ulra - reactionary sections, the semi - feudal landlords. But this is something that doesn't worry the imperialists. In a desire to preserve their rule and prevent other peoples from taking the road of Cuba, the U.S. imperialists are ready to risk even certain friction with their traditional allies. This is the gist of the Alliance for Progress. The U.S. credits to the weakened ruling classes on our continent are conditional on each of the Latin American countries joining the Punta del Este agreement which contains the basic ideas of the Alliance for Progress.

Either because of their dire need of dollars or because they are aware of the hopelessness of their position, or perhaps for both reasons, the ruling classes in Chile are trying to accommodate themselves to the exigencies of the Alliance for Progress. However, the ultra-reactionary groups of the oligarchy, who play the main role in the government coalition, are resisting the new tactic inasmuch as it places them in a subordinate position both economically and politically.

Removal of the present ruling classes from power is the urgent demand presented by Chile's social development. Proceeding from this, the Twelfth Congress of our Party, held in March 1962, pointed out that the basic aim of the popular movement was to establish a government of the people. This aim has been enthusiastically welcomed by the masses and accepted by other parties belonging to the Popular Action Front. This, clearly, is a realistic aim, not wishful thinking. The masses see in the Front a militant coalition capable of winning power and performing the revolution which Chile needs. This Front was close to winning the 1958 presidential elections, and it has made considerable progress since then. Doubtless, the conditions are ripe for continuing the advance to power. But it is also clear that a possibility is not yet a reality. Not a few difficulties will have to be overcome on the way to victory, serious dangers will have to be encountered, more battles fought and won, and all democratic forces united under the banner of the Popular Action Front.

The U.S. imperialists and their allies in the country do not conceal their fear of the possible victory of the Chilean people, but neither do they make a secret of their countless maneuvers to prevent this victory. In this gamble they put their stakes on three trump cards: adoption of anti-democratic laws which would again drive the Communist Party underground and further restrict the electoral rights of the people; a military coup d'état; full or qualified support of the Christian Democrats' advent to power.

The likelihood of an ultra-reactionary coup is now the main danger in Chile. To combat this danger is the paramount duty of the revolutionaries. It should be said, however, that any attempt of a coup aimed at installing a fascist-type government will encounter serious difficulties. The overwhelming majority of the people are hostile to coups. The ruling parties extol what they call representative democracy, depicting Chile as a model democracy. This propaganda finds a response among the population, and the ruling classes, in the event of their taking the road of a coup, would encounter popular resistance and lose considerable support. In such circumstances an attempt at a coup might even accelerate a finale favorable for the people. That is why some sections of the ruling classes, not sure of success, prefer the way of anti-democratic laws or, in other words, of effecting a coup "within the framework of law." The majority of these classes, however, would be only too pleased if the Christian Democrats were to pull the chestnuts out of the fire for them.

The Christian Democratic Party is a considerable and growing force consisting of Catholics — professional people, manufacturers, shopkeepers, landowners, students and factory and office workers. Its social base has impelled it to oppose the reactionary governments and to act jointly with the Popular Front parties, including, of course, our Party. At the same time the Christian Democrats present themselves as the alternative to the "Communist danger." Their line in the sphere of home policy usually coincides with the interests of the people. But the purpose of this party is to act as a kind of lifeboat designed to save "Western civilization" in Chile.

It adopts a critical attitude with regard to imperialism, although it supports the policy of the Kennedy administration in Latin America. In a sense the Christian Democratic Party can be described as a reserve of imperialism in our country. But there is also a possibility that a section of it may align itself with the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal movement of the people.

Stepping up their anti-communist campaign, the dominant elements in the government coalition, donning the garb of a "democratic front," are angling to attract the Christian Democratic Party to the government bloc. The latter, however, preferring to keep at approximately an equal distance from both the Right and Left, would like to undermine the positions of both. But in perspective the Christian Democrats hope to secure the support of most of the Rights in the event of the interests of imperialism and reaction being threatened by the advance of the Left.

There are among the Christian Democrats those who favor mutual understanding with the Popular Action Front and even those who would lend support to a candidate of the Left. On the other hand, there are in the Front people who would like an understanding with the Christian Democrats even to the extent of nominating a candidacy far removed from the people's parties. The Communist Party's view is that the Christian Democratic Party should act jointly with the Popular Action Front, with both enjoying equal rights and obligations, in forming a future government. The question, then, is: what will be the main force in the probable agreement, which class will play the leading role, and how far-reaching will the changes be? It follows that we should work to achieve mutual understanding, but not at any cost. In all probability only a flexible attitude, which does not envisage any retreat, will enable us to win over some of the forces in the Christian Democratic camp.

The present balance of forces is characterized by the existence of three rival political groupings: the Popular Action Front uniting the main forces of the working class, part of the peasantry and urban petty bourgeoisie and a segment of the national bourgeoisie; the Conservative-Liberal pro-imperialist coalition including mainly the latifundist and finance oligarchy and part of the bourgeoisie; and the Christian Democrats supported chiefly by the petty bourgeoisie and by part of the national bourgeoisie.

The picture, of course, may change. We observe, for example, a tendency on the part of the bourgeois forces to regroup under Christian Democratic leadership or to form an alliance of Christian Democrats and Radicals which could cut into the currently decisive influence of the oligarchy. In this situation the bourgeoisie would have certain hopes and would be able to influence the national life in one way or another along the lines of improving the situation in the country.

We have, then, both good prospects and grave dangers. Some things, however, are already clear. On the one hand, it is obvious that domination by imperialism and the oligarchy in our country cannot be maintained in its present shape. On the other hand, the enemy will do all in his power to prevent the victory of the people, while the people's parties are determined to do all in their power to frustrate the reactionary intrigues aimed at preventing the formation of a government of national liberation.

When all is said and done there is no alternative but that offered by the Popular Action Front. It not only unites the more advanced sections of Chilean society but its program harmonizes with the aspirations of the people and with the objective demands of social development. Its program is anti-imperialist, anti-feudal and anti-monopoly. And only by implementing a program of this kind will the country be able to achieve progress.

THE COMMUNIST PARTY and also the other Front parties attach decisive significance to the presidential elections to be held in 1964. In the last general election in 1961 the Front polled nearly a third of the vote. Today its forces are growing, and the masses are better organized and more mature politically. The possibility of it getting a majority is now quite feasible.

A victory for the people in the presidential election, while in keeping with the national traditions and aspirations, would correspond also to what we can describe as the normal and most likely line of development. We do not forget, however, the Leninist idea expressed in the Moscow statement of the 81-Party meeting to the effect that the reactionary classes never relinquish power voluntarily and resort to every device in order to retain it. They are motivated solely by their class interests, and whenever they find it possible to do so, they turn their backs on their vaunted "Constitutional legality," or their "representative democracy" and the interests of the nation.

What we want to say is that it is impossible to predict the way things will go. Time,

as it passes, will say the last word. In this sense all we can say is that the election is a possible way, but a difficult way and fraught with danger and uncertainty; and while it is true that the peaceful way, understood as a victory for the people in the forthcoming election, corresponds, as we have said, to the traditions and aspirations of the nation, its concrete realization depends on a variety of factors, and above all on the balance between the popular forces and their enemies.

But it is not just a question of adopting the attitude of an outside observer with regard to the various alternatives. Our Party is taking an active part in the work to solve this question. It has always pursued a policy of exposing the dangers menacing the rights of the people, of rallying all the political forces against a reactionary coup and against any attempt to enforce anti-democratic laws. Our Party has expressed itself in favor of the peaceful path, for the argument to be resolved by the 1964 presidential elections, thus boldly challenging the ruling classes. Bearing in mind, however, that this does not depend on one side alone, the Party never forgets that the outcome of the struggle may well be decided in a different field. This shows the need to have in mind all forms of the struggle, but it rules out a double-pronged political approach.

While it is said quite correctly that the peaceful way is possible, the point is usually added that there may be another way, i.e., the non-peaceful, armed way, and that one should be prepared for this contingency. But the two possibilities cannot be placed on the agenda on one and the same plane. For this would lead not only to a dual orientation but simultaneously, owing to the existence of two lines, to political confusion. In our specific case this way of posing the matter would, apart from anything else, weaken the struggle in defense of democratic rights and for extending these rights, the fight against the repressions and against the danger of a fascist coup. In saying this we recognize that in certain circumstances the question may arise of directing the mass struggle along one or the other way. This way of posing the question is justified where there is a certain balance of operative factors impelling development towards one or another way and where, because of this, the situation is temporarily unstable. Argentina can, in our view, be taken as a typical example of this situation.

The Party has had to wage a consistent struggle against petty-bourgeois political adventurers who on several occasions tried to get the popular movement to plunge head over heels into the abyss, and who poured scorn on the idea about the possibility of a non-violent way.

From the fact that the revolution in Cuba came about as a result of armed struggle the conclusion is drawn at times that this is the sole way for all the countries of the continent. But one cannot pose the question in this way. The great service of Cuba is above all that it carried out a revolution thus demonstrating the possibility of breaking with imperialism in Latin America and of advancing towards socialism, that it showed that the triumph of the people's national liberation revolution and afterwards of the socialist revolution is not necessarily dependent on a world war.

As to the forms of the revolutionary struggle, history has proved that Fidel Castro was correct. Moreover, it can be safely said that the way taken in Cuba is, in its general outlines, the most likely one for other countries, possibly even for most of the countries of our continent. But one cannot be absolutely sure that *all* other countries will take the same road. To act on such an assumption could lead to the loss of the positions already won, and make it impossible to utilize other and real possibilities.

At the present level of development in Chile it can be affirmed that, objectively, the revolutionary process is developing along peaceful lines, the lines indicated by our Party. All the parties in the Popular Action Front agree on this. The political adventurers and dogmatists have been driven to the wall. The people simply ignore them. This was the fate, for example, that befell Clotario Blest, ex-president of the United Trade Union Center, who recently joined forces with the Trotskyites. At the last Congress of the Center Blest was not even re-elected to the leadership.

The ideological struggle against the dogmatists and political adventurers was of the utmost importance. But it would not have yielded fruit had it been waged on soil favoring the alchemists of the revolution, on the plane of "pure" theory. It has had tangible results solely because it was waged in the shape of specific revolutionary actions. It was in the day-to-day struggle that the Party proved the correctness, militancy and revolutionary character of its line.

Led by the Communist Party, the popular movement is fighting strongly. Solidarity strikes and strikes around economic issues,

which at times grow into political actions on a national scale, the seizure of land by thousands of people fighting for plots to build their own houses, the seizure of the land by hundreds of peasant and Indian families, the strikes fought by teachers, students and doctors, the closing of their shops by small shopkeepers, and other mass actions, all in defiance of the law, often assume an acute character.

It follows, then, that the peaceful way has nothing in common with passivity or juridical legality, that far from precluding class battles it presupposes them, battles which not infrequently reach a high degree of intensity. Hence this is not the way of adapting oneself to the circumstances while waiting for elections, but the way of consistent struggle, a way which, far from mitigating the class struggle, intensifies it.

Irrespective of the way things go—peaceful or non-peaceful—the main job of the Communists has always been to rally the masses, to develop and strengthen the unity and the struggle of the working class, and in the process of this struggle to unite around the proletariat the peasantry and all classes and groups which by virtue of the social contradictions can take their place on our side of the barricades. There can be no revolution—peaceful or non-peaceful—without organizing and developing a powerful mass movement.

Nobody can predict whether the revolution will be peaceful or violent, or the forms it will assume. Any cut-and-dried scheme can be shattered by events. History has furnished and will continue to furnish new examples with regard to the forms, methods and specific features of the revolutionary processes.

Lenin wrote: "We must bear in mind that any popular movement assumes an infinite variety of forms, is constantly developing new forms and discarding the old, and effecting modifications or new combinations of old and new forms. It is our duty to participate actively in this process of working out means and methods of struggle."*

Any underestimation of these principles can lead to sectarianism and dogmatism, and ultimately to defeat.

Our Party is conducting its work in keeping with these general ideas. It is preparing for victory by carrying out the numberless tasks of organizing the masses, uniting the democratic forces, and educating the people ideologically and politically. And this is being done in the course of the day-to-day actions. The Communists consider it their duty to further the revolutionary processes, to guide the masses and, together with them, to carry through the revolution. In many cases this calls for still greater effort in order to prepare for the decisive battles, to develop the revolutionary forces through action. The vanguard role of the Communists imposes on them the obligation always to fight alongside the masses. The revolutionary vanguard will not fulfil its role if it becomes passive or tails behind the masses, and also if it loses touch with the masses by going too far ahead. In this case there is a danger of falling into revolutionary phrasemongering and political adventurism.

Lenin wrote: "Victory cannot be won with the vanguard alone. To throw the vanguard alone into the decisive battle, before the whole class, before the broad masses have taken up a position either of direct support of the vanguard, or at least of benevolent neutrality towards it, and one in which they cannot possibly support the enemy, would be not merely folly but a crime. And in order that actually the whole class, that actually the broad masses of the working people and those oppressed by capital may take up such a position, propaganda and agitation alone are not enough. For this the masses must have their own political experience. Such is the fundamental law of all great revolutions . . ."*

On the other hand, we have had in our country situations which favored the overthrow of particular governments. In Chile, and in still greater measure in other Latin American countries, the governments rely on an extremely precarious social base. Not infrequently groups of conspirators, taking advantage of these situations, angle for the support of the people's parties and the mass organizations. The Communists are making their contribution to social and political progress. And when progress calls for the replacement of one or another government, the Communists throw themselves heart and soul into this task. But they are not obsessed by the idea of overthrowing governments. Before taking a decision they examine the situation, review the degree of organization and the sentiment of the masses, and also study the question of who will gain from the action and who will take over the reins of government.

Up till now all the attempts in our country at replacing governments through coups have

*V. I. Lenin, **Revolutionary Adventurism.**

*V. I. Lenin, **"Left-Wing" Communism, an Infantile Disorder.**

objectively entailed the danger of retreat in all spheres, and for this reason we have not countenanced these attempts. But we cannot rule out a different possibility, namely, that the situation may dictate a different perspective, above all the perspective that the coup may be carried out behind the back of the Party. In such circumstances we could not be passive, it would be our job to bring the masses into action so as to direct the course of events for the benefit of the people.

The aims of the Chilean revolution and the classes and social strata which act or can act for its realization — these are the things that determine its character as a popular, democratic, anti-imperialist, anti-feudal and anti-monopoly revolution of national and social liberation. The government which this revolution will place in power will bear the same character. It will be a people's government of the anti-imperialist coalition representing all the parties which have assisted in its formation, and in resolving the major questions of the day it will be guided by the unanimity principle.

The program of the Popular Action Front envisages a number of measures aimed at extending democracy in the country, at expanding the state sector of the economy so that it should become the dominant sector. And for this sector to play a progressive role and clear the way for independent economic advance, raise the standard of living and take the way of planning, one basic condition is indispensable, namely, that the working class in alliance with the peasantry act as the central factor and thus be in a position to determine the balance of forces in the people's government.

All the proposals contained in the program correspond to the tasks of the democratic revolution. When they have been implemented and when the working class becomes the leading force, the way to socialism will be cleared.

The fact that in our country, as elsewhere in Latin America, the forward-looking forces are posing the task of carrying out a national-liberation revolution, and that this revolution can simultaneously lead to socialism, is explained above all by the new situation in the world.

As the statement of the 81-Party meeting points out, *"the feature of the times is that the socialist world system is becoming the decisive factor in the development of society."*

The present balance of forces in the world is conducive to the success of any revolutionary process regardless of its immediate aims, whether it is the question of winning national and political independence or of building socialism. In this situation success will depend mainly on the level of national unity attained by the people of one or another country in the struggle for their revolution.

With the formation of a people's revolutionary government it will be necessary to determine the lines of its foreign policy.

Latin American experience convincingly shows that the existence of a people's government and the possibility of effecting revolutionary changes depend largely on the attitude taken by this government to imperialism, its relations with the socialist camp, and its stand with regard to the great problems of our time — the problem of war or peace and colonialism.

A revolution took place in Bolivia in 1952. A land reform was carried out, the tin mines were nationalized, the professional army was disbanded and the arms handed over to the workers and peasants. But during the ten years since then the revolution has hardly made any advance. The country is as backward and economically dependent as it has always been. This is explained chiefly by the fact that the rulers have clung to the old pro-Yankee anti-communist policy.

Cuba is a different matter. The fact that the Cuban revolution has reached heights that have astonished the world is due to the heroism of the Cuban people. But it is due also to the fact that the government has ended the old policy of treachery and kowtowing to imperialism, that it has boldly opposed imperialism and relied unhesitatingly on international solidarity and above all the aid of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries.

The need for the Popular Action Front to adopt a correct attitude to these problems from the standpoint of the future people's government made itself felt a few months ago when the differences on international issues set in between the Socialists and the Communists after a series of statements made by Comrade Raul Ampuero, General Secretary of the Socialist Party. These statements caused anxiety, especially in our Party, and were followed by important discussions between us and the Socialists. After switching the discussion to the practical plane we achieved satisfactory results. The majority in the Front favors a genuinely independent foreign policy of preserving world peace, of emancipation for all countries, and of relying

on international solidarity and the socialist world. At the end of October when the U.S. imperialists, having launched their aggressive actions against Cuba, brought the world to the brink of a nuclear war, the Front called upon all political organizations — peasant, student, women's, youth and others — to initiate joint struggle "against the U.S. reckless action against Cuba," and stressed that this struggle would also represent "defense of the freedom of all countries of America."

The Front is a political body based on mutual understanding between the Socialists and the Communists. Socialist-Communist unity and cooperation between all the parties of the Front are effected in all directions and on all sectors of the struggle. Each party, naturally, has its own policy, and it is understandable that now and again difficulties and differences will arise. But the main thing is that these are being removed, that we have a common policy, and that the common viewpoints predominate. This is the result of a long struggle for unity and of the consistent policy pursued by our Party.

The road towards a people's government, the road we have charted, necessitates much effort and, in particular, an effective policy on the part of a militant Marxist-Leninist party. The masses need a party to lead them. This calls for further strengthening our Party. Politically, our Party has reached maturity. It has grown numerically. In the past four years we have conducted a series of successful recruiting campaigns. But as yet the membership of the Party is relatively small compared with the influence it wields among the masses, with its responsibilities and prospects. Building it rapidly into a mass party is the urgent task to which we have dedicated ourselves in the conviction that its realization will greatly facilitate reaching our objective — that of establishing a people's government in the near future.

The Unity of the Popular Forces in Argentina Is Growing

Victorio Codovilla

IN recent months things in Argentina have gone from bad to worse.

The economy is in the throes of a crisis. Factories are being closed and shifts cut, farm production is declining, unemployment has reached mass proportions in both cities and rural areas, and more and more peasants are being driven off the land.

In the *social sphere* there has been a sharp deterioration in conditions. There is not a single trade union or section of the working people that has not had to take strike action this year against dismissals, for regular payment of wages, pensions and other benefits, or for wage increases to keep pace with the soaring prices.

The general strike of October-November 1961 was followed by two other general strikes; on May 29 this year more than 3,500,000 workers downed tools, and on August 1-2, nearly 5,000,000. Not only social and economic but also political demands were advanced.

Discontent is growing also in the villages, where the peasants are demanding price supports and a stop to evictions. The peasants have begun to seize the land of the big landlords.

Politically, the situation is marked by the extreme instability of the government.

The Anti-National Policy Aggravates the Crisis

It will be recalled that it was mainly the votes of the Peronists and the Communists, who represent a majority in the country, that ensured the victory of Frondizi and his Intransigent Radicals in the 1958 election. Frondizi had promised to abolish the oligarchic-imperialist system and to carry out far-reaching economic and social changes. But the moment he found himself in the presidency he launched out on a diametrically opposite course — a course laid down by the International Monetary Fund. The fiasco of the Frondizi government was, then, a fiasco for the policy imposed by the U.S. monopolies. By pursuing an anti-national policy the government lost popular support, and a situation arose where the mass actions of the working class and the people generally threatened its existence, and the formation of a genuinely

democratic government became a tangible possibility. The impressive victory of the working-class and popular forces rallied behind the Peronist candidates in the March 1962 general election left no doubt on this score.

The ultra-reactionary, fascist military elements upholding the interests of the landowning oligarchy, the big comprador bourgeoisie and the foreign, especially U.S., monopolies, replied with the March 29 coup. The object was not so much to overthrow the Frondizi government as to stem the rising tide of popular action which the government could no longer cope with. Armed force was used to impose on the country the International Monetary Fund's program of colonial subordination, unemployment and hunger.

The first socio-economic measures of the Guido government which took over from Frondizi were aimed at shifting the burden of the economic crisis onto the working class and the people generally. The transfer of national resources and industries to foreign monopolies was stepped up.

The Guido dictatorship is, on the whole, continuing the policy of the preceding government. Ostensibly seeking a solution to the structural crisis which they themselves have aggravated, the reactionaries want to return the country to colonial status. Kennedy's Alliance for Progress is designed to back up this policy of re-colonialization; we were perfectly right in calling it from the very outset an "Alliance for Regress and Colonialism." As to the nefarious activities of the U.S. Embassy, whose meddling in Argentina's internal political and economic affairs has never been so brazen as now, they are wholly geared to these colonialist aspirations.

As a result of this policy which runs counter to the national interest the contradictions racking the country are growing more and more acute. The root cause of the instability in Argentina's socio-economic and political life can be traced to the fact that the present economic crisis is not just a transient recession, it is part of the general crisis of the obsolete socio-economic system of a dependent country where capitalsm is developing unevenly owing to latifundism and the grip retained by the U.S., British and other West European monopolies on the key positions in its economy and finances.

The Struggle for a Democratic National Front at a New Stage

Argentina has reached a point when it is imperative to find a speedy solution to the basic contradiction rending it — the contradiction between the productive forces seeking outlets for expansion and the production relations hampering their growth.

In other words, the contradiction between the overwhelming majority of the population — the industrial and office workers, peasants, handicraftsmen, middle strata and the national bourgeoisie — on the one hand, and the landowning oligarchy, the big comprador bourgeoisie and the foreign monopolies, on the other, is deepening.

Contradictions between the imperialist powers, especially the USA and Britain, are also sharpening, with each striving to put its own agents in the saddle.

Added to this is the growing rivalry between the sabre-rattling military cliques angling for key positions in the government. The result is a process of differentiation in the armed forces. The unscrupulous policy of the reactionary and fascist-minded generals and admirals is encountering growing resistance on the part of a substantial section of the officers and even more so on the part of the rank and file. This involvement of the services in political life creates favorable conditions for a part of the officers breaking away together with the rank and file from the conspirators and even siding with the people in the course of the successive coups and counter-coups.

The working class and the people generally are beginning to realize that these contradictions can be solved only by waging a struggle against the landowning oligarchy, the imperialist monopolies and their hangers-on. That this applies also to the workers and other sections of society adhering to the Peronist movement is evident from their swing to the Left.

It was in the hope of checking this switch to the Left and of impelling the country towards fascism that the military plotters seized power on March 29. They dissolved Parliament, established government control over the political parties accepting the dictatorial regime, and banned Communist and Peronist political activity.

Our Party pointed out from the outset that it would be a grave mistake to overestimate the strength of the dictatorship and to underestimate the steadily growing potential of the working class and the masses in general. The growth of their militancy and political consciousness was clearly evident from the popular victory in the March 18 election, in which the Communists gave their support

to the Peronist candidates in order to defeat the reactionaries. During the election campaign our Party conducted extensive educational activity among the Peronist following, and thanks to our persistent efforts and explanatory work the resistance of the Peronist Right-wing was broken down and unity achieved with the rank and file. It was this that ensured the victory at the polls and created favorable conditions for even broader unity.

Subsequent events showed that the electoral victory had indeed opened a new page in the history of the popular movement in Argentina. The Peronist following compelled their hesitant leaders to shift their sights leftward. The turn, which Peron himself was compelled to approve, was welcomed not only by the rank and file, but also by those of their leaders with roots among the people. Indicative in this respect was a report delivered by one of these leaders, Andres Framini,* to his trade union explaining the political reasons for the turn and outlining a program for which the Peronist movement could work in alliance with the Communists and other revolutionary forces.

The notable thing about Framini's report was his approach to the problems of the popular movement from the standpoint of class struggle, not class collaboration. To resolve the crisis, he said, "sectarian attitudes should be discarded and every effort made to achieve unity of action between all sections of the people without exception." He proposed joint action around a 10-point program calling for "nationalization of the banks and the establishment of a centralized state banking system; state control of foreign trade; nationalization of the key branches of the economy (iron and steel, electric power, oil extraction and meat packing); a ban on direct and indirect export of capital; annulment of financial commitments undertaken behind the people's back; prohibition of the import of all goods competing with domestic products; expropriation of the landowning oligarchy without compensation; an end to commercial secrecy; strict control over the incomes of commercial firms, and planning with a view to the national interest, putting the most urgent things first and defining the minimum and maximum ouput proportions."

While emphasizing the significance of this standpoint, the Communists pointed out that the 10 points, though aimed at solving pressing national problems, did not take due account of the struggle of other people for national independence, democracy and peace and failed to call for trade, diplomatic and cultural relations with all countries, especially the socialist countries, which pursue a policy of building these relations on a mutually advantageous foundation.

The turn to the Left helped to cement the unity established in recent years with the Peronist rank and file through joint struggle for immediate economic, political and social demands.

Clearly, this could not have been achieved had it not been for the work conducted by the Communists over a long period in the Peronist trade unions, had our Party not consistently pursued a policy of unity while criticizing the policy of class collaboration advocated by the Peronist leaders, had it not differentiated between the social demagogy of these leaders and the social aspirations of their following. Consistent adherence to this course by the Party played an important role in bringing the Communists and the Peronists closer together for joint struggle not only for immediate demands but for a genuinely democratic, people's government.

In order better to appreciate the significance of the Left turn in Peronism and the difficulties still to be overcome in building Communist-Peronist united action, it should be borne in mind that the Peronist movement is not a homogeous movement, either socially or ideologically. In point of fact the turn to the Left under rank-and-file pressure revealed the contradictions between the Right and Left wings of this movement. The Right-wing consists mostly of bourgeois and petty bourgeois people, including even some landowners. These joined the movement and took over its leadership in order to impede revolutionary mass action and, at best, to effect a few superficial reforms, leaving the economic system and political superstructure intact. The Left, consisting mainly of people from the dispossessed sections of society, demands a radical reform of the economic system and the replacement of the present rulers by a democratic, anti-imperialist government.

The leftward swing alarmed the reactionaries. To stem the process, the U.S. ambassador hastened to resume contacts with the Peronist Right, making vague promises that he would persuade the government to stop persecuting the Peronists and allow them to put up candidates in the elections; he even went so far as to pledge support to a pos-

*Framini is General Secretary of the Textile Workers' Union and one of the leaders of the General Confederation of Labor.

sible Peronist government, on the condition, of course, that they rejected united action with the Communists and committed themselves to defense of the "Western and Christian world." But since the inducements offered by the U.S. ambassador and the leaders of the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties, especially the Christian Democrats, appeal only to the Peronist Right wing, this only deepens the contradictions between them and the Left.

Nothing can stop the leftward shift on the part of the working-class and other sections of the Peronist movement and the leaders expressing their mood. But for all that the Right still exerts an influence, especially when it comes to setting up a joint body to head the popular and workers' front. The Communist Party on its part has made it clear that unless such a leading center is speedily established it will be impossible to make headway either in the struggle for immediate demands or in the overall fight for a genuinely democratic government.

Although the democratic forces are numerically strong and the organized working class is not lacking in determination, they are not yet able to tip the scales since they have no permanent united front and their joint actions are still of a sporadic nature. Therein lies the weakness of the Argentine working-class and the democratic movement.

Our Party has always held that radical changes can be brought about only through a democratic agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution. And this requires united action on the part of the working class and all other sections of the nation interested in these changes. What is needed is a national democratic front against the oligarchy and imperialism and for peace. Whatever its official name might be, the core of the front should consist of the organized political forces acting jointly, namely, the Communist, Peronist and Socialist Vanguard parties, the Popular Movement, the Intransigents and other parties and democratic anti-imperialist groups, the trade unions, the youth organizations affiliated to the various parties, the students' associations, movements of intellectuals and others. The Left turn in Peronism unquestionably favors the creation of such a front.

Considerable progress has been made in consolidating united action of the working class and the people generally.

- A coordinating committee consisting of representatives of the Peronist trade unions and the Trade Union Unity and Coordination Movement led by the Communists and other trade unionists has been set up to organize and direct the struggle for immediate economic demands, democratic rights and national independence. Peronist-led unions have established contact with the World Federation of Trade Unions and the Latin American trade union movement. And prominent Peronist leaders have taken part in delegations to Cuba and to the World Congress for General Disarmament and Peace.

- The trade unions are increasingly supporting the peasant movements, the workers in many instances concluding united action agreements with the peasants. For example, the small sugar-cane growers and plantation workers in Tucuman Province have arranged for joint struggle for common demands.

- An inter-party committee has been formed consisting of representatives of the Communist, Peronist and Socialist Vanguard parties, the Popular Movement, the National Movement of Intransigents, and other anti-imperialist trends which have broken with the old bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties.

- Thanks to Peronist participation, mass movements such as the peace movement, the Cuban solidarity movement, the Human Rights League and the Women's Union have grown stronger.

- A united action agreement has been concluded by the women's organizations affiliated to the Left political parties.

- An influential united movement of working and student youth, known as the National Committee of Youth Organizations, has been formed. With all the Left trends participating, it embraces the majority of the organized youth.

- The extension of united action made it possible to hold public demonstrations and to conduct such militant actions as the general strike of August 1-2, the Tucuman sugar workers' and sugar-cane growers' strike, and the women's demonstrations against the high cost of living in Buenos Aires and other cities.

But in order to develop the joint actions into solid unity of the democratic national front it is imperative to have at the head of the General Confederation of Labor and the other unions men capable of giving expression to the militant sentiment of the working class.

In recent times joint action committees have been springing up in the factories, in residential areas, in the schools and universities. The task now is to set up such committees all over the country. So far, however, the work

is lagging in the rural localities, especially in the peasant organizations.

Our Party has stressed that in working for unity the main thing is to establish a single leadership for the action committees at local, district and province levels. A joint national committee would be a center of attraction to which more and more democratic anti-imperialist groups would gravitate.

In the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties the lines are being more clearly drawn between the Right and Left, between those sections which have surrendered to imperialism and those who want to join the anti-imperialist and anti-oligarchy movement.

While the Right leaders of these parties are looking to rigged elections as a way out of the crisis, considerable sections of the national bourgeoisie and the petty bourgeoisie — the majority of their following — seek a solution through unity with the working class.

Thus favorable conditions are taking shape for the establishement of a democratic national and social liberation front uniting all the patriotic forces for struggle for such common aims as a genuinely democratic people's government, civil rights, better living and working conditions, agrarian reform, the independent development of industry, educational advance, national independence and peace.

The working class and the people generally are becoming more and more aware of the need for a government of a new type, a government based on a democratic coalition opposed to imperialism and championing peace, with the working class playing the leading role in this coalition. The new element in the present situation is that we are passing over from the stage of propaganda in favor of such a coalition to its practical realization.

The Communist Party advocates the formation of a bloc of all the forces opposed to our main adversary. It believes that this coalition should include also the national bourgeoisie, i.e., those capitalists whose interests conflict with the interests of the big landowners and the monopolies. But at the same time we point out that whenever the national bourgeoisie has had a share in the government, it has shied away from resolute action against the big landowners and the imperialists. The measures that it took were half-hearted; in some cases they actually helped to enlarge the latifundia and played into the hands of the imperialist monopolies.

Therefore, in view of the dual nature of the national bourgeoisie, which is at once both revolutionary and conciliatory, we hold that while it has a part to play in the patriotic progressive bloc, it is incapable of leading it. If it were allowed to assume leadership, the revolution would be doomed to defeat. For the democratic, agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution to triumph, the working class, joined in a firm alliance with the peasant masses and guided by its vanguard—the Communist Party—must be the leading force in the patriotic bloc.

The Guido government, representing an insignificant minority of the population and torn by inner contradictions, owes its existence to armed force. It cannot remain in the saddle for long. And if the "gorillas"* in the armed forces were to step in and set up an even more terroristic dictatorship, they too would not be able to hold the reins for any length of time.

The fascist regime in Argentina is sitting on a volcano which sooner or later will erupt and shake the moribund system. The subterranean fires are stoked by the working class and the people generally on whom the lessons of the recent past have not been lost and who are awakening to the fact that, in the event of recurring coups, they will have to come out into the streets and take action, not only to prevent the establishment of a fascist dictatorship, but to win a state of a new type —a democratic, people's state.

The Road to a People's Government

The lesson to be drawn from this process is that it is necessary in all conditions and under all circumstances to proceed from the Leninist precept that the masses learn from experience and that it is the task of the Communists to help them acquire that experience and direct them on to the right path. That is why, when Peron took power and formed his own trade unions, our Party instructed its members to join them. Inasmuch as the workers, the peasants and the masses generally do not become politically conscious overnight or as a result of bombastic phrase-mongering, but solely from their own experience, our Party felt that its main task was to extend fraternal assistance to the masses who had fallen under the influence of Peronism, and to imbue them with confidence in their own strength, in the power of their own organization and their own vanguard, the

*A military clique notorious for its brutal suppression during General Aramburu's administration of the working class movement, and especially for its persecution of the Peronists.

Communist Party. This policy, pursued patiently and persistently over a long period and under extremely adverse conditions, is yielding fruit in the shape of the turn to the Left on the part of Peronism.

We attach much importance to the participation of the Peronists in the process of uniting the anti-oligarchy and anti-imperialist forces. The Peronist movement is influential among the people, especially among the workers. United action by the Communists and Peronists is the key to anti-imperialist unity.

Good relations between the Peronists and the Communists in the struggle for common demands help to combat erroneous ideas among the Peronists, help them to grasp the basic elements of the policy and tactics of the Communists.

The meeting of the Central Committee of our Party held last July pointed out that "the dialectics of development are bound to lead the workers and the mass following of the Peronists to positions coinciding with those of the Communists, i.e., to gradual assimilation of the Marxist-Leninist teaching. We should proceed from the assumption that this will be a rapid process, and the faster it develops the more the Communists will hasten its progress. Thus the moment will come when the turn of the Peronist movement to the Left will result in its fusing with out Party and with the other Left forces, such as the Socialist-Vanguardists, on the basis of equality. In this way we shall get a powerful united party of the working class and all the people, a party founded on the principles of Marxism-Leninism, a party which will ensure victory over the landlord oligarchy, the imperialist monopolies and comprador capital, solve the problem of the agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution and confidently steer a course toward socialism. This is the perspective that should guide us in our work."

The moment is approaching in the Argentine when it will be necessary to go over from partial battles for immediate demands to general mass struggle for the conquest of political power by peaceful or non-peaceful means.

As is indicated in the decisions of our Central Committee, our line even before the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU was to create favorable conditions for taking over power by peaceful means, through mass actions not excluding the electoral struggle, or by non-peaceful means in the event of the ruling circles barring the way to the peaceful conquest of power.

To work for the peaceful way does not mean sitting with folded hands and waiting for the regime to collapse. The peaceful way presupposes constant action by the masses, struggle for immediate economic, social and political demands regarded as a component part of the general struggle for power. The work of organizing and rallying the masses, of leading the mass movement is a hard and, at times, a wearying job. It does not yield immediate results. In other words, a certain amount of time is required before quantity turns into quality, as has been the case with the Peronist movement. However, there is no other way of ensuring victory for the people.

Some comrades put the question this way: we agree that mass struggle ultimately decides everything, but is it not possible to accelerate the process by guerilla warfare? Is this not the shortest way? It would indeed be the shortest way if it were accomplished by mass action, but in order to get the masses to take this way they must know from their own experience that it is the one they must follow.

Growth and Consolidation of the Communist Party an Earnest of Victory

Our Party is working under extremely arduous conditions. It was outlawed and persecuted in every way by the Frondizi government, and since then the reactionary, fascist measures against it have been intensified. The Guido government has adopted an anti-Communist decree whereby anyone found guilty of circulating Communist and anti-imperialist ideas is liable to a term of imprisonment ranging from 30 days to 10 years, and to fines from 5,000 to one million pesos. Our members are being subjected to the most outrageous persecution; hundreds of people — Communists, Peronists and others —have been thrown into prison on charges of political and trade union activity. Denied the right of defense, they are being tortured in police dungeons, some of them to death.

The growing reprisals, however, are powerless to undermine the support accorded our Party and our youth organizations by the working people, the students, intellectuals, professionals and middle sections. All who share the ideals of democracy, social justice, progress, national independence and peace are beginning to realize that our Party's participation in the popular struggle, in the democratic, anti-imperialist coalition is the guarantee of victory.

The repressive measures cannot stop the consolidation of our Party or check the flow of new members into its ranks. Nor can they prevent our press from being circulated. *Nuesta Palabra,* the official organ of our Party, published clandestinely, appears regularly each week in tens of thousands of copies. The theoretical and political journal *Nueva Era,* also published in secret, appears every month as before. *Problems of Peace and Socialism* is reprinted in the Argentine and our quarterly *Cuadernos de Culture* comes out twice a month. Nor can the reprisals prevent the printing of our newspapers in the provinces, in the enterprises, or the circulation of our leaflets, pamphlets and books. For example, a pamphlet containing the text of the main report at the July meeting of the Central Committee was published in more than 300,000 copies. Despite the difficulties, we are continuing to publish the works of Lenin in the Spanish language, 26 volumes of which have appeared to date.

How, it might be asked, is it possible in these arduous conditions for the Party to publish and circulate so much literature? We are able to do so firstly because of our experience of underground work. Our Party has been working under these conditions almost without interruption since 1930. Secondly, because our Party maintains close contact with the masses. The reactionaries can, and do, inflict blows on us, but they are powerless to sever our ties with the masses.

We have made it our aim to educate the working people in the Marxist-Leninist spirit, to organize for political study groups outside the Party. This will help to free the working people, and especially those who follow the Peronists, from the influence of bourgeois ideology, and enable them to master Marxism-Leninism. It will enable us to raise the political consciousness of the masses to the level of that of the Communists. And, lastly, it will hasten the day when a united party of the proletariat founded on the Marxist-Leninist ideology will be formed. This implies further strengthening the Party organizationally and ideologically to enable it to strike deep roots among the working class and the people generally, to draw thousands of new members into its ranks and teach them the tactics and immortal ideas of Marxism-Leninism.

The Communists consider it one of their principal tasks to organize and extend the struggle for peace, and to render every support to the Cuban socialist revolution, which is constantly threatened by U.S. imperialist aggression.

While the oligarchy and the imperialists in Argentina are striving to stabilize the fascist-type regime, the upsurge of the working class struggle and the popular democratic movement is preventing this. Our working class is numerous, highly-concentrated and well organized. That is why neither the reactionary dictatorial government which overthrew Peron in the 1955 coup, nor the Frondizi government, nor the present dictatorial regime have been able to destroy the trade unions. More and more the working class is becoming the leading force in the national democratic movement.

The Argentine Communists know that they are entering a period of sharp struggle in which, together with the workers and the mass Peronist following, with the Socialist-Vanguardists and other sections, they will come to grips with an oligarchy and imperialist reaction driven to frenzy by the success of the revolutionary forces. But the prospect of victory for the working class and its allies in this struggle will multiply our strength a hundredfold and inspire us with the confidence that we shall pass the test with honor.

Parliamentary Activity of the Finnish Communists

Erkki Tuominen

AT present the possibilities of using Parliament as an instrument of class struggle have notably increased in some countries and, given certain conditions, Parliament can become the arena of positive action by the democratic forces with a view to gaining reforms in the interests of the masses.

The working class today carries far more weight than in the past, and the extra-parliamentary struggle in some countries is a force that can influence the policy of the ruling circles as well as the attitude of the opportunists in the workers' organizations. The middle sections of the population, exploited and ruined more and more by the monopolies, are impelled toward alliance with the working class against monopoly capital. In these conditions the working class and its vanguard, the Communist Party, have the opportunity of uniting broad sections of the people to combat the monopolies and to wrest major economic and political concessions from the bourgeoisie.

Another factor which the ruling classes have to reckon with is the growing influence exerted by the socialist camp, the new balance of forces on the world arena and particularly the position of the countries that have cast off the colonial yoke. The danger of nuclear annihilation impels some of the more sober-minded sections of the bourgeoisie, too, to support the popular effort for peace.

Today the bourgeoisie can no longer restrict the electoral rights of the working people as easily as in the past. In many countries universal suffrage has been won. The very composition of Parliament, too, in some capitalist countries is a sign of the times.

In countries like the United States, Iran and many others the working people do not have their true representatives in Parliament. But in some capitalist countries they do succeed in sending to Parliament genuine champions of the people, Communists among them. Thanks to united working-class action it is possible to form parliamentary coalitions of Communists and other workers' representatives which can prevent the consolidation of reactionary majorities. And although the Communists are not in the majority, they are nevertheless sometimes able to secure the adoption of proposals favoring the working people.

Prior to the Second World War, when the Popular Front existed in France and Spain, the working people in these countries secured the adoption of laws aimed at meeting their pressing needs. Today, too, broad democratic mass movements have compelled the parliaments of some countries to introduce legislation satisfynig the demands of the working people.

These changes, of course, do not alter the nature of the capitalist state. It remains the dictatorship of monopoly capitalism. Hence, genuine democracy can be won only through the revolutionary reorganization of society after the working class assumes power. Moreover, the monopolies are doing their utmost to deprive the people of their hard-won rights and to establish totalitarian regimes either by abolishing the parliamentary system altogether or by stripping it of real power and turning it into an instrument of the moneybags. In France, for instance, the rights of Parliament have been substantially curtailed and one-man rule established. An attempt was made by the Italian ruling classes — true, without success — to introduce a reactionary electoral law infringing the rights of the working people of Italy. In other NATO countries the monopoly bourgeoisie have been seeking, through the medium of all kinds of "supra-national" bodies, to remove vital questions of a social and political nature from parliamentary jurisdiction.

However, notwithstanding all the efforts of the reaction to encroach on the social and political gains of the working people, the activity of the masses is steadily mounting, forcing the bourgeoisie to make concessions.

In these circumstances, the Communists are seeking to make the fullest use of the bourgeois democratic institutions to fight mono-

poly capital and uphold the interests of the workers. This is all the more noteworthy since the reformists who used to pride themselves on their use of "legal" channels of combating capitalism, have now virtually abandoned any parliamentary action that might jeopardize the monopolies. The Communists alone consistently adhere to the best traditions of parliamentary and extra-parliamentary working-class struggle. Moreover, proceeding from the new conditions, the Communists do not confine themselves to using Parliament as a platform for exposing the capitalist system, they are advancing specific demands such as agrarian reform, a program to combat unemployment, etc. They believe that it is both possible and essential to fight for extending the powers of Parliament, turning it into a working body, ensuring its sovereignty and democratic function, and even vesting it with the right of effective control over the executive bodies.

The Communists, declares the Statement of the meeting of the 81 Communist and Workers' parties, ". . . are waging a selfless struggle, doing everything already in the present conditions, without waiting until socialism triumphs, to defend the interests of the working class and the people, improve their living conditions and extend the democratic rights and freedoms of the people."

Our Party laid particular emphasis on this thesis at its Twelfth Congress in 1960. With socialism as its objective, it declared, the Party at the same time wages a persistent struggle for demands which can be realized today, under capitalism. A clear-cut Communist policy of fighting for the needs of the working people facilitates the task of drawing the masses into political life on an increasing scale and provides the Communists with a foundation on which to conduct their parliamentary struggle.

Parliament can be used (given, of course, effective joint action by the democratic forces outside it) to further the cause of peace, to fight for ending the arms race and for the development of a peace economy.

A successful parliamentary struggle by the Communists on behalf of the working people helps to free the masses from the influence of the bourgeois parties and to unite them on the basis of the program demands of the Communist Party.

The Communists regard the parliamentary and extra-parliamentary struggle for the vital demands of the working masses as a factor preparing the ground for radical changes in the social system. As the Moscow Statement points out: "Relying on the majority of the people and resolutely rebuffing the opportunist elements incapable of relinquishing the policy of compromise with the capitalists and landlords, the working class can defeat the reactionary, anti-popular forces, secure a firm majority in Parliament, transform Parliament from an instrument serving the class interests of the bourgeoisie into an instrument serving the working people, launch an extra-parliamentary mass struggle, smash the resistance of the reactionary forces and create the necessary conditions for peaceful realization of the socialist revolution. This will be possible only by broad and ceaseless development of the class struggle of the workers, peasant masses and the urban middle strata against big monopoly capital, against reaction, for profound social reforms, for peace and socialism."

As the Communists step up their activity in Parliament, agreements and alliances with the other parliamentary groups, provisional or permanent, on specific or on general issues (without any departure from principle), can be of great importance. When the government has an unstable majority the Communist Party is in a position to build up an alignment of forces ensuring majority support for democratic reforms.

But important though these agreements and the general parliamentary activity of the Communists are (criticism of government measures and of motions introduced by bourgeois and opportunist parties, interpellations, submitting draft bills, etc.), this activity will not be fruitful unless it is linked with the people's movement, with active day-to-day mass struggle outside Parliament, in the enterprises and in the villages. Vigorous actions of the working people alone can lead to a differentiation of alignments within the various political parties and groups, to the isolation within these parties and groups of the more conservative elements, and the establishment of a united front of all progressive forces. The experience gained by our Party clearly shows the importance of combining every step taken by the parliamentary group with the general mass struggle.

The Communists won a resounding victory in the parliamentary elections immediately after the Second World War. The Democratic Alliance (People's Democrats), to which the Communist Party is affiliated, won 49 seats, i.e., as many as the Agrarian and Social Democratic parties each. On the initiative of

the Communists, the parliamentary groups of these parties agreed to the formation of a three-party government for the purpose of carrying out a broad democratic program in domestic and foreign policy. This program provided for the establishment of firm friendship with other countries, primarily with the Soviet Union, democratic reorganization of the state administration, tax and social security reforms, and even envisaged a solution of the nationalization problem. Shortly afterwards, however, because of the pressure of big capital, the Social Democratic and Agrarian groups changed their attitude and the agreement was cancelled. In the subsequent elections the reactionaries gained a majority.

As was noted at the Eighth Congress of the Party in 1948, one of the reasons why the reactionaries were able to consolidate their positions was that Communist activity in Parliament and in the government was not sufficiently fortified by mass action. The agreement reached between the three parliamentary groups provided only a formal basis for cooperation, but it was not backed up by actions by the mass following of these parties which could have prevented the Agrarian and Social Democratic groups from evading the vital terms of the agreement. The parliamentary work of the Democratic Alliance at that time was limited to the struggle inside Parliament. It failed to combine its efforts sufficiently with those of the masses, with the fight for democratic reforms on the basis of the tripartite agreement.

The decisions of our Party Congress helped the Communists and the Democratic Alliance to reorganize their work. In view of the situation prevailing at that time (the government's turn to the Right, the introduction of measures lowering the living standard of the working people, and the deterioration of relations with the Soviet Union, etc.), the Communists and the Democratic Alliance in Parliament exposed the danger to the workers contained in the relations between the Coalition Party, the main party of monopoly capital, and the Right-wing leaders of the Social Democratic Party. From the rostrum of Parliament the Communists and People's Democrats explained their program to the masses, and primarily the chief slogan of their election program — the fight for democracy, for bread and peace. On the other hand, the work in the Diet was now closely bound up with the extra-parliamentary struggle. The task was to exert pressure on the majority in Parliament through extra-parliamentary activity, to utilize every available opportunity to secure the adoption by the Diet of laws that would benefit the working people.

Exposing the dangerous turn in the relations between Finland and the Soviet Union and stressing the threat created thereby to the national interests, the Democratic Alliance group in Parliament called for a debate on this question which attracted attention far beyond the boundaries of our country. True, the government got a vote of confidence, but the debate was a serious warning to the Social Democratic government and its reactionary patrons. The continued deterioration of Finnish-Soviet relations alarmed broad sections of the population, including Agrarian and Social Democratic Party supporters, and the latter were forced to heed the voice of the Communists.

The measures taken by the Social Democratic Party to undermine the workers' struggle for wage increases to meet the rising cost of living caused popular dissatisfaction to mount.

In order to hamstring the fight for higher wages, the government, by cutting wage rates, provoked a strike at the Kemi lumber mill. Police and troops were brought in to crush the strike. In the ensuing clash two workers were killed and many injured. The strikers were accused of plotting a rebellion. Hundreds of workers were taken to police stations for interrogation and 116 were prosecuted.

This incident had repercussions throughout the country. Mass meetings were held all over Finland with the people demanding an end to the violence and the release of the arrested workers. The Democratic Alliance group in Parliament immediately sent a delegation to Kemi, a step which greatly heartened the workers there. It then submitted a motion charging several members of the government and other officials with staging a provocation and demanded that legal proceedings be instituted against them.

The debate on the charges brought by the Democratic Alliance against the government strongly influenced the struggle waged by the workers in Kemi and helped to spread the protest movement. The Communist Party proclaimed a solidarity campaign. The government's prestige was badly damaged by the affair and it was compelled to introduce an amnesty bill. The bill, however, was patently inadequate, so the Democratic Alliance submitted its own bill which took account of the rights of the strikers. The workers strong-

ly supported this bill. Even some bourgeois deputies felt compelled to criticize the government's attitude to the Kemi strikers. The government had to withdraw its bill and draft a new, slightly improved version. In the end the Parliament adopted a third bill introduced by the Agrarian Union completely exonerating the workers. The Kemi workers had won the day. After this victory, 50 per cent of the Kemi electorate cast their votes for the Democratic Alliance, and it is not without reason that the Rights now characterized Kemi as a "red" stronghold.

This was the first time since the breach of the tripartite agreement on cooperation that the Democratic Alliance had fought a serious parliamentary battle in conjunction with the extra-parliamentary struggle of the working masses. The outcome of this action raised the prestige of the Communist Party and the Democratic Alliance as a whole and improved the opportunities for joint action by Social Democratic and Communist workers.

This was strikingly manifested in the course of the fight against unemployment. The government, taking advantage of its extensive powers, had shifted the financial burden of creating jobs for the unemployed onto the shoulders of the municipal councils, and moreover stipulated that the conditions on the public works schemes were to be inferior to those in industry.

The Communist Party launched a vigorous campaign in defense of the unemployed, and a big part of this work fell to the lot of the parliamentary group. In the debate in the Diet the Democratic Alliance deputies proposed that measures to combat unemployment be considered the prime duty of the state and that the cost of providing employment should be borne chiefly by the big employers. This struggle was supported outside the Diet (at the public works sites, in the municipal councils and in the factories). And inasmuch as the People's Democrats were the only group in Parliament which championed the just demands of the unemployed and the interests of the municipal councils, faith in the Communist Party began to grow among the working people. Joint action in defense of the common interests developed among the unemployed workers belonging to different parties.

In order to fight the ultra-Rights, the Kekkonen government of those days was obliged to seek the support of the People's Democrats. This prevented monopoly capital from presenting a solid anti-communist front. The government normalized relations with the Soviet Union and concluded a long-term (five-year) trade agreement with that country. It also signed the Stockholm Appeal, which called for prohibition of nuclear weapons, thereby incurring the displeasure of the ultra-Rights. In the sphere of domestic policy the government abandoned the use of force to suppress strikes and workers' demonstrations, although it continued to guard the interests of monopoly capital: prices continued to rise, rents soared, the tax burden increased, a "wage freeze" was introduced, etc. The treachery of the Right-wing Social Democratic leaders strengthened the hand of the reactionaries in Parliament, while the growing dissatisfaction of the workers led to one cabinet crisis after another.

The growing complexity of the situation has demanded a flexibility in parliamentary tactics on the part of the Communists. The Democratic Alliance has been more and more active in submitting proposals which have become key issues in the struggle for the rights and interests of the workers, peasants and other sections of the population. The Communist Party is making more use of Parliament for attaining the objectives of its program.

Its proposals as a rule are submitted mainly in the form of bills on nationalization, land reform, measures to combat unemployment, tax reform, temporary disability insurance, minimum wages, etc., and are clearly aimed at curbing the power of monopoly capital, broadening the democratic rights of the working people and safeguarding their vital interests.

Through the press, pamphlets and leaflets, and with the help of active supporters, the proposals are explained to the population at large. Here, however, we have encountered difficulties. The trouble is that many workers have little faith in the possibility of these proposals being realized through the medium of the Diet. The attitude that Parliament is a "talking-shop" which at best occupies itself with trivialities and is incapable of solving major issues is an extremely tenacious one.

Our Party has made it its aim to overcome this distrust of Parliament as a vehicle for the solution of problems affecting the working people. We proceeded from the assumption that the sooner the people realized that Parliament can be used on their behalf, the more vigorously they would fight for the proposals submitted by the People's Democrats and against the reactionaries.

In several instances (as for example in the case of the bill on land reform) the motions

introduced in Parliament stimulated the extra-parliamentary struggle of the workers.

Toward the end of 1959 small peasant households in Finland numbered 346,000 or 87 per cent of the total. Monopoly capital and the big landowners did their best to squeeze out the small holders. Through the medium of the courts they succeeded in annulling some of the decisions adopted by the commission on land distribution on the basis of which new farms had been established.

In these circumstances the land reform bill submitted by the Democratic Alliance developed into a big program issue which won the support of a good section of the small farmers who exerted pressure on the Agrarians in the Parliament and on the government. They demanded that the annulment of decisions made on the distribution of land be discontinued and that additional allotments be granted to farmers with small plots of land. As a result, the government was compelled to introduce corresponding bills in Parliament.

The extra-parliamentary action of the small farmers and the approach of the parliamentary elections caused the Social Democrats to change their tactics and agree to the adoption of a law on the agrarian question. After the elections, however, they joined the deputies of the Right in voting it down. The Democratic Alliance again introduced its land reform bill with certain amendments, which took into account the wishes of the small farmers. The new bill met with an enthusiastic response among the small peasants who sent dozens of deputations and hundreds of letters to the various parliamentary groups setting forth the smallholders demands and voicing approval of the Democratic Alliance's initiative.

In an attempt to mollify the peasants the government advanced its own solution of the land problem. Both bills were debated simultaneously. Although the law finally adopted differs in many respects from that introduced by the People's Democrats, it can be safely said that the support it received from the peasants had its effect.

The struggle for land added substantially to the prestige of the Communists and the People's Democrats in the countryside. That struggle is still going on. Further mass action is contemplated to demand an increase in the size of allotments and an improvement in the status of the smallholders, and a rapprochement between the workers and the small farmers is clearly taking shape.

Another illuminating example of how the initiative of the People's Democrats, regarded at first as a purely propaganda move, has gradually become the goal of extra-parliamentary mass action is provided by the struggle on unemployment.

Upholding the interests of the working people, the Democratic Alliance introduced bills calling for public works for the unemployed and for unemployment insurance. Being of too general a nature, however, these bills were regarded by the workers as mere propaganda at first, but after having been concretized, they gave impetus to powerful mass actions by the unemployed who brought pressure to bear primarily on the municipal councils which had the task of providing jobs. The result was that in many cases the municipal councils supported the actions taken by the unemployed to exert pressure on the parliament and the government. Hundreds of deputations and thousands of letters to the Diet and the government finally impelled the latter to introduce the employment bill. Although the new law did not justify the hopes of the workers and the municipal councils, it nevertheless did improve the position of the unemployed, and its adoption was a definite retreat on the part of the government.

The state and the municipal councils had spent thousands of millions of marks annually on relief work for the unemployed, yet the numbers of jobless remained high. At the same time, the tax burden grew heavier. Our Party carried on work among the masses, showing them that the monopolies were to blame for the unemployment and the high cost of living. The demand for unemployment insurance began to win increasing support from the employed workers. It was backed also by the Social Democratic opposition which formed an independent party in 1957. The Right-wing Social Democrats, after their defeat in the general election in 1958, likewise declared in favor of a law on unemployment insurance. The People's Democrats were the biggest group in Parliament, and together with the Social Democrats they constituted the majority. Thus victory on this issue in the Diet appeared to be a foregone conclusion.

The struggle grew more and more acute. Some trade unions, especially the builders' and food workers' unions led by the Communists, launched a campaign in support of the demands advanced by the parliamentary group. The Social Democratic leadership of the Central Trade Union Federation, although it disapproved of extra-parliamentary action,

was forced to take a stand in favor of compulsory unemployment insurance. This induced the government to submit an unemployment insurance bill in the spring of 1959. At the same time all the proposals made on this question were submitted for debate.

The discussion went through numerous stages. But in the meantime mass actions outside Parliament continued. The organizations of the Communist Party and of the Democratic Alliance as well as the Communist deputies kept the working people informed of the progress of the discussion. The majority in the Diet, which was joined along with the Left parties by the Agrarian Union, approved the bill with certain amendments. As a result of the pressure brought to bear on the President and the Agrarian Union by the Right wing, however, further discussion of the bill was adjourned until after the next elections.

Nevertheless, the action taken by the masses, including the agricultural workers and small farmers (to whom the new law also applied in some measure inasmuch as it provided for unemployment insurance for all persons who worked not less than 100 days in the year) forced the employers to make concessions which they would not otherwise have made.

The mass support for the People's Democrats has brought about a situation in the Diet in which both the Right and Left in the Social Democratic Party are now obliged to endorse the legislative initiative of the Communists on many issues.

The working people have begun openly to voice their dissatisfaction with the Social Democrats for their failure to secure the adoption of laws expressing the interests of the people, despite the fact that the 1958 election gave them (together with the People's Democrats) a majority in Parliament.

Although this pressure on the Social Democrats has not always taken the form of direct mass action outside Parliament, it has, nevertheless, influenced the work in the Diet, giving rise willy-nilly on occasion to some form of cooperation in the struggle for social reforms. Several laws giving the working people certain advantages have been adopted of late, e.g., a new law on annual holidays for all wage-earners the duration of which has now been fixed at from three to four weeks depending on length of service.

In the 1962 general election the bourgeois parties gained a majority in the Diet, thus creating a big obstacle to the achievement of the reforms vitally needed by the working people.

The reason for the frequent failure to compel the Rights to retreat in the Diet is to be sought in the inadequate mass action outside Parliament. And this in turn is due to the lack of unity in the ranks of the working class.

Although developments in recent years have given the workers convincing proof of the need for united action, the Right-wing Social Democrats are bitterly opposed to any cooperation with the Communists, slanderously alleging that such cooperation would weaken the Social Democratic Party. But the growing strength and influence of the Communist Party is clear evidence that our Party is doing everything in its power to uphold the interests and rights of all workers. On the other hand, the split in the Social Democratic Party and the perpetual dissension in its ranks are the result of the policy of its leaders who, disregarding the interests of the working people, are in effect working hand in hand with the reactionary bourgeoisie.

Owing to the efforts of the Right-wing Social Democrats, the Central Trade Union Federation is doing nothing to organize the extra-parliamentary struggle for far-reaching reforms, although experience has shown that the active participation of the unions is essential for the success of the struggle inside Parliament. Hence the most important task today is for the Social Democratic and Communist workers to take joint action in defense of their common interests. A united working class and a united trade union movement are indispensable for winning far-reaching concessions in the Diet and for curbing the monopoly bourgeoisie.

No Place for Fascism in Britain!

R. Palme Dutt

NINETEEN years ago, at the Moscow Conference in 1943, the Allied Governments, including the British government, pledged themselves that "fascism in all its evil influences and emanations shall be utterly destroyed."

Seventeen years ago, in the Crimea "Declaration on Europe" in 1945, the same powers pledged themselves throughout Europe to "destroy the last vestiges of nazism and fascism."

Today, during the late summer and early autumn of 1962, widespread indignation has been aroused in Britain by the government-tolerated revival of openly proclaimed fascist and Nazi demonstrations and provocations, with massive police protection and with wholesale arrests of anti-fascists, in London and other leading centers of Britain.

It is not surprising that this series of incidents gave rise to widespread public clamor, equally in Parliament, in the press, throughout the labor movement, and in all sections of public opinion, including some rank-and-file Conservatives.

While the scale of the present attempted resurgence and relatively petty organizations in Britain (in contrast to the scale of neo-Nazism in Germany and France or neo-fascism in Italy and Japan) should not be exaggerated, and the vigor of the healthy popular anti-fascist response has delivered a certain check and given the government pause, these manifestations and their possible future significance merit some careful attention: as a symptom of the present unstable economic-political situation in Britain; as a link with the considerable development of internationally organized and government encouraged neo-Nazism throughout the Western world in the present period; as a barometer of the present political trends of the Tory government, the Common Market Tories, the state apparatus of the Home Office and the law courts, and also of trends within the Labor Party.

Why This Present Resurgence of Fascism in Britain?

The manifestations of fascist resurgence in Britain cannot be separated from the present economic-political situation in Britain. The economic situation has proved discouraging, with a marked loss of ground by Britain in relation to other capitalist powers.

In international politics Britain has been pushed more and more back by the simultaneous pressure of the United States and of the West European bloc, while the political complexion of the Conservative MacMillan-Butler government renders it unwilling to take the obvious alternative course of closer relations with the socialist world, which alone could restore a measure of independent role to Britain.

The older Dominions, formerly the most staunch, have now expressed open revolt over the prospects of Britain's entry into the Common Market, declaring that this would not only break the economic ties of the Commonwealth through the ending of imperial preference, but would also throw doubt on any future continuation of the political links, since Britain would cease to be a sovereign power. The newer Afro-Asian members are drawn to differing lines of policy. In East and Central Africa all the maneuvering skill of the British imperialists has found no solution yet to the contradictions, while in the Congo the United States now exercises open pressure through the United Nations for the surrender of the British-Belgian interests of the Union Minière.

At the same time at home the conditions of the majority of the people, including the middle strata, have worsened, with the sharp rise in prices, the credit squeeze, dismissals and increased unemployment, alongside the government offensive for "restraint" of wages and salaries.

Under these conditions political support for the Conservative government has slumped. The old electoral success slogan "You Never Had It So Good" is now only repeated with satirical bitterness. The Conservative vote in by-elections this year has fallen to 27 per cent of those voting. A large proportion of former Conservative voters are in revolt and are expressing their dissatisfaction, not merely by abstaining as previously, but by seeking a political alternative to vote for. This dissentient Conservative vote has gone so far not to the Labor Party, but mainly to the Liberal Party.

It is evident that this situation, if there should be further worsening of the economic situation and discrediting of the government and existing dominant parliametary parties, and failure of the labor movement to give effective voice to popular dissatisfaction, could provide a potential breeding ground for the development of fascist trends and organizations.

British Fascist Organizations Today

The border-line between Right-wing Toryism and fascism has always been narrow. When it came to the internment of fascists during the war (under very comfortable conditions on the Isle of Man) the Conservative M.P. Captain Ramsay was among those interned; while the son of the prominent Conservative Cabinet Minister, Amery, was among those who went over to Hitler during the war to broadcast for Hitler and endeavor to recruit British soldier prisoners to enlist for Hitler.

Similarly the present leader of the British Nazi Party, Colin Jordan, was formerly a prominent spokesman of the Empire Loyalists, the extreme Right-wing Tory organization.

Hence any survey of present-day fascist trends in Britain would need to take into account not only the openly and self-proclaimed fascist organizations but also the extreme Right-wing Tory organizations such as the League of Empire Loyalists (active in creating disturbances at official Tory meetings, as well as at Left meetings), the "Intelligence Digest" grouping of De Courcy, the ramifications of Moral Re-Armament, the anti-trade union "freedom" organizations of Martell, especially the "National Fellowship" (founded in 1956), publishing a list of sponsors studded with earls and marquesses and admirals and Vice-Marshals, and the "Free Press Society" associated with the *New Daily*.

The direct fascist organizations at the present time comprise three (always capable of splitting, formation of new groups, etc.):

(1) the *British Union* of Sir Oswald Mosley, originally founded in 1931 under the title "New Party" as a "Left" breakaway from the Labor Party, with the participation of Strachey and others dissatisfied with the passivity of the Labor Government of 1929-31 before the unemployment crisis, and transformed in 1932 into the "British Union of Fascists" linked with Hitler and Mussolini. It was notorious for gangsterism and thuggery activities during the nineteen-thirties. Mosley was originally a Conservative M.P., very wealthy (£60,000 from his grandfather and the lion's share in land worth £247,000, as well as through his first wife, the daughter of Earl Curzon, £28, 000 from her grandfather, the Chicago millionaire, Levi Z. Leiter). For a short time he was a Labor Cabinet Minister. Hitler was best man at his second marriage in 1936. The Home Secretary, Chuter Ede, stated in Parliament on June 6, 1946, that documents captured from the enemy revealed that Mosley was paid £60,000 a year by Mussolini.

After the war, when Mosley and his associates came out from internment, the title of their organization dropped "Fascists" and kept "British Union." But Mosley said in 1945: "I have not changed my political ideas one inch. I do not retract anything that I have said or stood for in the past" (*Sunday Pictorial 2.12.45*).

The program was modified to drop public anti-semitism (continued in practice) and concentrate on the "United Europe" or "Eurafrica" line, in accordance with the similar development of reaction and neo-Nazism in Western Europe.

This is still the principal fascist organization, closely linked through Mosley with ruling class circles, and always treated with deference by the government, the law courts and the police. But an aging organization, with no mass appeal at present.

(2) the *British National Party* led by Andrew Fountaine, a wealthy landowner. Formed in the beginning of 1960 from the amalgamation of the previous "White Defense League" and "National Labor Party," both active in promoting racial riots against colored people in London and elsewhere. Fountaine was previously a Tory candidate for a Lancashire constituency. The program of objects of the British National Party states that it "fights to free Britain from Jewish dominance and the colored influx."

(3) the *National Socialist Party* of Colin Jordan, a Coventry schoolmaster, formed as a breakaway from the British National Party. Jordan, initially active in the Empire Loyalists, became National Organizer of the British National Party until he broke away to found his separate organization. A minute organization (estimated 40 members during this recent period), but significant as openly proclaiming Hitler and Nazism as the model, and organizationally linked with Neo-Nazism in the United States and West Germany, as shown in the week-end "international" conference held on August 7 at Guiting Power (Gloucestershire), with proclamation of Jor-

dan as "World Fuehrer." It claims "wealthy backers." Among them is Mrs. Leese, widow of Arnold Leese, founder of the Imperial Fascist League, who gave the headquarters rent free and admitted to giving over £1,000 a year (*People* 12. 8. 62). A police raid on the headquarters revealed stormtrooper uniforms and weapons. Police proceedings followed in respect of breach of the Public Order Act. Jordan, Tindall and others were sentenced to varying terms of imprisonment. The court proceedings, it should be said, were only initiated after heavy protests had been made from all political quarters to the Government.

Platform of Contemporary Fascism in Britain

Certain changes and adaptations in the platform of contemporary fascism in Britain are worth noting.

During the thirties the main line of fascist agitation and propaganda was "super-nationalism" and "super-patriotism," "Britain First" and "Our Empire," and on this basis opposition to "foreign entanglements," "Jewish finance" and sacrifice of Britain to "foreign investments."

Thus the "Ten Points of British Union" (*Action* 19. 9. 39) declared: "British Union is loyal to King, Country and Empire. Our watchword is 'Britain First' and we are determined to build a Nation and an Empire worthy of Patriots . . . British Union will build a self-contained Empire insulated from the international struggle for markets. Within this Empire we can produce all the goods, foodstuffs and raw materials we require. . . We will exclude the cheap foreign goods which displace British labor and reduce wages. To build a self-contained Empire with the motto 'Mind Britain's Business' is the only way to avoid foreign entanglements and foreign war . . ."

In short, these slogans were the exact opposite of the present program of entering into the West European Common Market and political federation at the expense of the Empire.

After the war Mosleyite Fascism recognized the necessity to present a new program. Hitler and Mussolini could no longer be paraded as the successful model of the future. Before the war Mosley's programmatic book had been called *Greater Britain*. After the war his new book was entitled *The Alternative*, published in 1947, followed by *Europe: Faith and Plan* in 1958. His general thesis became that the war had been an unnecessary war— the "Brothers' War"— and had bankrupted Britain and the Empire. The task was now declared to be to unite with "Europe" (i.e., capitalist West Europe) into a "European" nation with a single Parliament and Prime Minister. This "Europe" should get food and raw materials out of Africa, dividing the whole of Africa, by a kind of extension of Verwoerd's Apartheid, into a territorially separate "White Africa" (obviously containing all the valuable territory for minerals and profitable cultivation) and "Black Africa" (equivalent to Verwoerd's overcrowded poverty-stricken reserves, from which to draw African labor for the White mine-owners and plantation owners).

Thus the Mosleyites have become the most vociferous champions of the Common Market and "European Idea" beloved of MacMillan and Heath, and claim to have espoused it first. Mosley, who is given publicity for his "ideas" in the leading Conservative press, professes now to be opposed to anti-semitism and in respect of colored people proclaims support of the principle of the Conservative government's Immigration Act policy—to deport them. The latter line is obvious color bar incitement; while the professed denial of anti-semitism was sufficiently exposed by the choice of the most crowded quarters of Jewish inhabitants to stage provocative marches. In practice Mosley's lieutenants continue to make racialism and anti-semitism their main propaganda. "There is no doubt about the anti-semitism," wrote the journalist Dudley Barker after attending a series of meetings of the principal Mosleyite speakers, "it is the stock-in-trade of the Fascist street meetings" (*Daily Herald*, 26. 10. 49).

The other two organizations openly make anti-semitism and racialism their explicit platform and their main propaganda.

Government and Tory Attitude to Fascism in Britain

In the experience of all countries the advance of fascism has invariably taken place, not by its own support, but by the connivance and practical support from the ruling authorities and state machine, alongside financial backing. Mussolini's "March on Rome" took place in a *wagon-lit* by invitation of King Victor Emmanuel; Hitler was placed in power by President Hindenburg after his voting support had collapsed; Petain-Darlan established Vichy fascism in France from above.

Hence the importance of the attitude of the Tory government, the Home Office and the official press to the attempted revival of fascism in Britain.

This government party has followed two main lines: 1) to insist on the right of "freedom of speech" for fascism; 2) to deplore anti-fascist mass protest at fascist meetings as "mob violence" and a threat to "freedom of speech." The massing of large police concentrations to force acceptance of fascist provocation on the people is conducted in accordance with this alleged doctrine of "free speech."

No attempt is made to reconcile this position to the wartime pledges in signed documents of the British government.

Faced with a torrent of questions in Parliament after the disorders provoked by fascism in London, Manchester and Dudley, the Home Secretary, Brooke, replied on August 2 by giving a certificate of blamelessness to fascism and throwing all blame on the anti-fascists: "In the case of the meetings arranged by the Union Movement the disorder did not result from any words uttered at the meetings by those who organized them, but from the determination of others to prevent the meetings being held . . . However much we abhor and despise certain views . . . the use of physical violence as a means of preventing them from being expressed is not a reaction that can be tolerated."

In vain Conservative as well as Labor M.P.s pointed out that the deliberate anti-semitic and racialist provocation of the fascists could not be confused with "free speech." Sir Robert Cary, Conservative M.P. for a Manchester constituency, said: "Authors of such meetings who go to the point of assembly led by drums, are using a Hitler technique. When the assembly points are, as in Manchester on Sunday, in close proximity to one of the greatest Jewish populations in Britain, and a settled colored community of no less than 12,000 persons, it is taking a grave risk with public order." Therefore he asked the Home Secretary to instruct local authorities to "disallow such meetings." This was supported by the Labor M.P. for another Manchester constituency, Will Griffiths: "The points made by Sir Robert Cary were widely shared in Manchester. One of the things which was the sheerest provocation was marching by people who supported racial doctrines through areas where there was a settled Jewish and colored population. If this was something about which the law did not permit the government to take action, the law should be amended as soon as possible."

But the Home Secretary remained adamant: "We do not want to create a situation where meetings planned by anybody can be frustrated by some newspaper or periodical announcing in advance that if a meeting is held they will break it up."

While protest was expressed in some newspapers, the leading Conservative press took a similar line. The *Times* in an editorial on August 3 condemned the universal popular protests at fascist provocation as "censorship by mob violence" and called for "exemplary sentences" against the anti-fascist demonstrators. On August 2 the *Times* published conspicuously in its correspondence columns a lengthy letter from Mosley, in which he threw out a challenge to his opponents to quote a single sentence from his speeches over forty years which could be construed as racial incitement, and boasted that no opponent had been able to quote such a sentence. When correspondents wrote in to quote glaring examples of such racial and anti-semitic incitement by Mosley, reported in the *Times'* own files, the editorship of the *Times* discovered that "extreme pressure on space" rendered it impossible to print the letters or any answer to Mosley's challenge. On August 25 the same newspaper returned in an editorial on "Freedom of Speech" to the same theme to oppose any ban on racial incitement. The same line was taken by other leading Conservative organs and by the City organ, the *Economist*.

On the other hand, the demand for action grew to such heights, including from London Borough Councils acutely concerned, and finally from the London County Council by a unanimous resolution moved by the Labor Party leader and seconded by the Conservative Party leader, that the Home Secretary was compelled to move, and to ban the three fascist meetings in Trafalgar Square during the coming weeks. But as always, this action, when finally forced, was drawn up in such terms as to create a weapon against the democratic movement and against democratic rights. The ban was declared to be, not on grounds of fascist racial incitement, but on grounds of "inconvenience" to "holiday makers" in Trafalgar Square at this time of year. This ground, it was emphasized, could be used against any other meeting in Trafalgar Square: "The Minister proposes to follow the same policy for the time being in dealing with any other application for the use of the Square which seems likely to cause grave inconvenience to the public."

Immediately after, a ban was similarly imposed on a meeting of non-violent protesters

against racialism, called by the "Yellow Star" Association (in commemoration of the Jewish victims of Hitler), headed by an East End clergyman. Thus the Home Office was seeking, as usual, to utilize the lever of fascism, in order to cut down the democratic right, won by generations of struggle, of public meeting in Trafalgar Square.

The Fight Against Fascist Provocation

All experience of the past forty years has shown that the strength and unity of the working class and democratic movement is decisive for the defeat of the offensive of fascism, just as its absence makes possible the victory of fascism. Especially important in this respect has been the role of Social Democracy and the question of the united front. In Germany it was Social Democracy, controlling the majority of the working class, which by its refusal of the united front against fascism, preaching of passivity before fascism, and concentration of its offensive against the militant working class and communism, made possible the victory of Hitler. Similarly in France in 1940 the majority of the Socialist deputies, after banning the Communist Party, voted the emergency powers of Petain, and in 1958 by the refusal of the united front surrendered to the military threat and voted in the personal dictatorship of de Gaulle. On the other hand, in 1934 the United Front, Socialist and Communist, in Paris barred the way to the fascist assault. In London in 1936 the mass united strength of the working class in action, despite the hostile attitude of the Right-wing Labor and trade union leadership, barred the way to Mosley.

In the present phase of attempted fascist resurgence in Britain the most positive feature has been the promptness of the healthy popular response and action to prevent the revival of fascism in Britain. This was equally conspicuous in strong centers of the organized working class movement, as in East London and in Manchester, and in such a remote rural area as the village of Guiting Power, where the action was based, not on previous political organization, but on popular feeling and ex-servicemen's memories of the war against fascism. Had there not been this active resistance, had the Home Office and police objectives been successful to compel the people to accept fascist marches and provocations, the fascist gangs would be today strutting the streets of London and other cities of Britain.

The indignation in the widest circles with regard to the fascist provocations has found expression in the demand for a legal ban on racial incitement, either through an amendment to the Public Order Act, or through legislation for this purpose, already proposed in a bill drafted by the Labor M.P. Fenner Brockway, with wide all-party support, and in another bill drafted by a Conservative M.P., Thomas Iremonger. The Labor Party has declared support in principle for the Brockway bill, although it has not pressed for the necessary parliamentary facilities for its adoption. Similarly the unanimous resolution of the London County Council, adopted on August 10 and supported equally by the Labor and Conservative members, was a very important sign, expressing the demand to the government: "to consider amending the law so that incitement to violence by persons advocating racial discrimination and hatred may become a criminal offence."

At the same time in this initial phase we cannot be blind to weaknesses still existing in the development of the democratic front against fascism. The Labor Party and Trades Union Congress top leadership has in fact played no part. In the fire of questions and protests in Parliament on August 2, the only intervention on behalf of the Labor Front Bench was, not to reinforce the demand for a ban, but, in the speech of the Deputy leader, George Brown, to emphasize that "we have a duty to the police" and to demand that what he called "the hoodlum element" among those protesting against fascism "ought to be severely dealt with." Similarly the old familiar calls for passivity, "stay at home," "dissolve fascism with laughter," etc., have reappeared from various quarters, also in the labor movement, proclaiming hostility to fascism. This line was also offered during the thirties before the war, despite the experience of Germany, Austria and France, but was fortunately not successful in breaking the mass resistance to Mosley. During the war the appeal "to laugh off Hitler and Mussolini" was temporarily silenced.

In the present situation of the gathering of the democratic front against a fascist revival the concrete demand which can unite the broadest support is the demand for a legislative ban on racial and anti-semitic incitement. In the words of the Communist Party Political Committee statement on Aug 3: "The demand must increase from every side: Ban all fascist and racial incitement and end the provocation of these fascist meetings and marches." And again on August 15: "The only way to solve this question is for the government to make

the preaching anywhere of race hatred and fascist provocation a criminal offence. The campaign to compel such legislation should be stepped up in every way."

At the same time this campaign for the necessary legislation needs to be accompanied by the development of the broadest united anti-fascist mass movement in all the towns and regions where fascism endeavors to stage its provocations.

In the Communist and Workers' Parties

Bulgaria Looks Ahead

THE Eighth Congress of the Bulgarian Communist Party held in November was attended by over a thousand delegates representing a membership of more than half a million.

The Congress was a demonstration of the unity of the Party, its fidelity to Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. The delegates denounced the anti-Party action of the group of factionalists—Chervenkov, Yugov and others who had grossly violated socialist legality at the time of the personality cult and tried to disrupt the Party — and approved the measures taken by the Central Committee with regard to these persons.

The report delivered on behalf of the Central Committee by First Secretary Todor Zhivkov described the work done in laying the material and technical foundation of socialism and outlined perspectives of passing over to communism.

The Congress noted that the third five-year plan had been fulfilled in three years. This had made it possible to launch the fourth five-year plan in 1961, two years ahead of schedule.

Rapidly developing its socialist economy and culture, Bulgaria has now outstripped many countries, including a number of developed capitalist states. This rapid development, the logical outcome of the onward march of socialism, is proof of the superiority of the socialist system over the capitalist.

Thanks to this development, said Comrade Zhivkov, Bulgaria is no longer separated from communism by tens of years. Today we can say with full justification, just as our Soviet brothers say, that history has entrusted the present generation with the task of initiating the building of the higher phase of communist society.

Congress set forth the basic lines of development for the next two decades — to complete the building of the material and technical base of socialism and gradually to pass over to building the material and technical base of communism, to develop and perfect socialist public relations, to enhance the communist consciousness of the people, and to satisfy more fully their material and cultural needs.

The main indices of the country's development for 1961-80 show that Bulgaria will march ahead with seven-league strides, at a rate inconceivable in any capitalist country. In 1980 the national income will increase approximately fivefold compared with 1960. Industrial output will increase roughly sevenfold, with the mean annual rate of growth at about 10 percent. In view of the need rapidly to develop power resources, it is envisaged to increase coal output from 17,147,000 tons in 1960 to 80-85 million tons in 1980, oil from 200,000 tons to four million tons, power production approximately to 50,000-55,000 million kwh.

The country will have to resolve the problem of producing its own iron and steel to meet the requirements of the economy. It is planned to increase pig-iron output from 192,000 tons in 1960 to 4-4.5 million tons in 1980, steel from 253,000 tons to 4-4.5 million tons, rolled metal from 193,000 tons to roughly four million tons. Output of the engineering industry will rise 16-17-fold, and of the chemical industry approximately 25-fold. Consumer-goods production will increase from a value of 2,603 million levs in 1960 to roughly 13,000 million in 1980.

In the 20-year period the Party and the government will continue their efforts to turn agriculture into a highly-productive and profitable branch of the economy. Gross agricultural output will have risen 2.5-fold by 1980.

The consumption fund will rise roughly fivefold between 1961-80.

By the end of 1965 eight-year compulsory education will be introduced throughout the country, and by 1980 secondary education will be

obligatory. The number of students in 1980 is expected to reach 220,000, compared with 55,000 in 1960. Scientific personnel will be in the vicinity of 35,000 in 1980 (6,000 in 1960).

The number of qualified specialists in the national economy is expected to rise to 450,000 in 1980 (against 117,200 in 1960), including engineers to 150,000.

By 1980, 75 per cent of the children under three years of age will be provided with accommodation in nurseries, and practically all children between three and seven will be catered for in kindergartens. The government will gradually provide all the expenditure for the maintenance of children and school pupils, beginning with the provision of textbooks and aids free of charge, free breakfasts and ultimately free dinners and clothes.

By the middle of the second decade there will be free meals for workers engaged in arduous and harmful jobs, and by 1980 free meals will be provided for all working people.

Working hours will be steadily reduced. It is planned to pass over from the present 46-hour week to a 40-hour week by 1970 and to a 30-hour week by 1980 in the case of workers in arduous and harmful jobs and a 36-hour week for all other workers. Paid annual holidays will be extended.

By 1970 the housing shortage will have been solved in the main on a national scale, and by 1980 each member of the family will have an average of 16 sq.m. of dwelling space.

The delegates unanimously endorsed the directives for the 20-year development plan. New Party Rules were also approved.

* * *

The Congress, attended also by representatives of 65 fraternal parties, was an impressive demonstration of the unity of the international Communist and working-class movement, of its growing strength.

Many delegates and representatives of the fraternal parties spoke about the struggle for peace and security of the nations. They warmly approved the Leninist policy of peace, the wise and resolute actions of the Soviet government which, during the Cuban crisis caused by the U.S. aggression, saved the world from the threat of nuclear catastrophe.

Comrade Blas Roca, member of the secretariat of the national leadership of the United Revolutionary Organizations of Cuba, who spoke at the Congress, expressed gratitude to the Soviet Union for its help and support of the Cuban people in their struggle against the aggressor.

The Cuban people, said Blas Roca, have boundless faith in the Soviet Union, in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, in the Soviet government and in the Soviet people.

Fraternal delegates emphasized in their speeches that in the conditions of intensified struggle between socialism and imperialism it is the main internationalist duty of each Marxist-Leninist party to strengthen proletarian solidarity and the unity of the international Communist movement.

Comrade Wu Hsiu-chuan, head of the delegation of the Communist Party of China, expressed disagreement with that section of Comrade Zhivkov's report in which he criticized the splitting activities of the leadership of the Albanian Party of Labor. Representatives of other fraternal parties speaking at the Congress denounced the attitude of the leadership of the Albanian Party of Labor, characterizing it as a gross violation of the principles laid down in the Declaration and Statement of the Moscow meetings of the Communist and Workers' parties, as a departure from the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

Representatives of the fraternal parties stressed that the historic documents of the Moscow meetings had withstood the test of time and that persistent implementation of the principles and ideas of these documents would guarantee further success for the international Communist movement, would further its unity.

Dimitr BOYEV

Defending the Interests of the Working Class

AN immediate and urgent task of the Iraqi Communist Party is to activate the struggle of the working class in defense of its vital interests. During the last three years — since the Kassem government embarked on an anti-democratic path — both the government and the employers have engaged in bitter attacks on the working people. Unemployment has risen and the cost of living has soared, while wages have either remained as before or have been cut. According to official figures real wages of unskilled laborers who make up the ma-

jority of the working class have declined threefold. Thousands have been victimized because of trade union activity. The elections for trade union committees were crudely falsified.

The workers, however, have stood firm despite the reactionary pressure. In this period of retreat of the democratic movement they have used different means of struggle, including strikes, demonstrations and picketing. Particularly militant were the struggles waged by the workers on the railways and in the oil industry, in the cigarette factories and by truck drivers. Between February and August 1962 ten major strikes were fought. For two weeks in the summer over 7,000 workers in Baghdad protested against the ban imposed on a number of trade unions. In some instances the government and the employers were compelled to make concessions.

Unfortunately, however, in this period our Party organizations among the workers did not correctly estimate the significance of the economic struggles of the working people. This adversely affected the working-class movement and caused injury to the national-liberation struggle of our people. Some comrades, misunderstanding the interconnection between the national struggle to safeguard the independence of the republic and the economic struggle of the working class, maintained that any encouragement to the latter would jeopardize the movement to safeguard national independnece and make it impossible to unite all the patriotic forces among the masses and in the government. They feared that the independent struggle of the working class would alarm the national bourgeoisie and, ultimately, push the government onto an anti-democratic path, and that this would considerably weaken the movement against imperialism and in defense of national independence.

The leadership of our Party, discussing recently the role of the economic struggle of the working class, criticized and rejected these erroneous views.

It is common knowledge that since the victory of the revolution in July 1958 our Party has subordinated its entire activity to the task of safeguarding independence and building a broad national front. The Party leadership has emphasized that this was, and still is, correct. But this must not mean that we adopt a passive attitude in regard to the interests of the working people and refuse to lead them in the struggle for these interests. The fronts of the struggle are different but interconnected. The economic struggles can greatly help in rallying the working people to uphold national independence. To shun leadership of the economic struggle means to dampen the ardor of the working class in the political struggle. The economic struggle must be so organized that the masses consciously take part in it. Encouragement of the initiative shown by the masses is a basic condition for expanding the struggle in defense of independence.

The Party leadership rejected the view fairly widespread among the members that the workers have become "passive" and that it is difficult to work among them. This view is refuted by the struggle of the working class which has never ceased during these years.

Hence any talk about "passivity" among the working class is tantamount to ignoring the struggle of the working class. The task of the Communist Party is to uphold the interests of the working class and to enhance its leading role in the democratic and national movement.

The comrades adhering to erroneous views proceeded from an incorrect ideological premise. They took the period of the revolutionary tide (the first year of the revolution) as the yardstick for measuring the militancy of the working class. Naturally, if we were to base ourselves on this criterion, we would certainly conclude that the working class was "passive." But when we take into account the actual struggles which the working class has waged and is still waging, and when we bear in mind the objective conditions which caused it temporarily to retreat, we see that the working class is ready to fight.

It should be said that many of the strikes in recent years were spontaneous actions, and only after they had broken out did our organizations react and provide leadership. This, surely, is proof that the question is not one of the workers' "passivity" but of the sectarian mistakes which should be frankly admitted and vigorously combated.

The Political Bureau of the Party has summarized the discussion on the role of the working class in special directives issued to all Party organizations. These directives call upon our organizations to take up the urgent issues in the given factory and to find forms of struggle which correspond to the degree of consciousness and preparedness of the workers. It would be inexpedient to put forward a common slogan for all the workers in a plant employing workers belonging to different categories. The directives point to the need for considerable propaganda before action is taken and urge the members to be flexible and vigilant in order to switch to other means of struggle whenever necessary.

The economic struggle, the directives continue, should be adequately linked with the basic demands of the trade unions (above all on wages) and should take into consideration the general political situation.

Special attention is given to the need for working class unity. Although most of the unions are dominated by yes-men of the government, the Communists should work for unity at the rank-and-file level, through consistent struggle on behalf of the workers. In this struggle they can, and should, act jointly with all groups of workers for it would be wrong to ignore those workers still influenced by the reactionaries and the bourgeoisie. These struggles will expose and isolate the agents of the employers and the government.

Fulfilment of these directives will be of vital significance for strengthening the positions of the Party among the masses. The correct policy will ensure to the working class and its Party a leading role both in the democratic mass movement and in the national movement generally.

SAMI

The Struggle for Democracy and Peace in West Berlin

THE persistent struggle of the German Democratic Republic, the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries for a German peace treaty and a peaceful settlement of the West Berlin issue, and the work of the Socialist Unity Party have yielded fruit — the contours of definite changes in West Berlin are clearly delineated.

Only a few years ago proposals for a peaceful settlement of the West Berlin issue encountered misunderstanding and were rejected out of hand. Today our arguments on some of the questions have a more telling effect and are received with understanding by different groups of the population; at the same time there is growing criticism of the unrealistic and dangerous policy carried out at the top levels of the parties represented in the West Berlin Senate. This became obvious after August 13, 1961, when the authorities in West Berlin, supported by the West German militarists, staged a series of provocations — from cold-war demonstrations to direct attacks on the border with the use of explosives. Shouting "Down with the wall!" they launched an hysterical campaign against the GDR, which reached peak in August this year with provocations by Right-wing and fascist elements in Kreuzberg, Neukoelln and Wedding along the border of the GDR. It will be recalled that things reached the stage of assaulting representatives of the U.S. occupation authorities and Soviet sentries at the Soviet war memorial in the Tiergarten. These reckless actions were the subject of discussion among the working class and other sections of the population in West Berlin in the course of which the question was put thus:

either continuation of the front-line city policy fraught with the final risk (war)

or a return to normalcy through a peaceful settlement.

Workers, members of the production councils and trade union officials in the Siemens, AEG, Orenstein and Koppel, AEG Turbine, Osram, Lindner, and other enterprises denounced both the provocations and the provocateurs; they did so because it was felt that peace had been gravely endangered by these criminal actions.

In talks with our comrades the West Berliners expressed their desire to see peace and order in the city. They were wholly opposed to the provocations along the border which could lead to a military conflict in West Berlin. This view was voiced by factory workers, intellectuals, shopkeepers and industrialists; it was voiced by people far from our Party and even those who completely disagreed with us on other aspects of our policy. During the talks we found that many people were not at all clear about the idea of making West Berlin a demilitarized and neutral free city. While ready to grant that sooner or later a peace treaty and a West Berlin settlement would have to be negotiated, they did not appreciate that this would rid West Berlin of its present dangers, help to lessen the international tension and ensure a normal life for its people.

It is indicative that prompted by the desire for objective information — in order to see how things really stand — many West Berliners visit our office and ask for clarification on what the demilitarized, neutral and free city would look like.

These facts give an idea of the questioning and the reassessment now taking place among the people. The process is a complex and contradictory one. Even those who disagree with the policy of the Senate have not yet fully grasped that West Berlin has been turned into a NATO stronghold, a seed-bed of provocation against the GDR and the other socialist countries. Many tend to regard the provocations along the GDR border and the attacks on the city railroad as excesses on the part of irresponsible elements and not as deliberately conceived acts of aggression determined by the policy of the front-line city as an outpost of the cold war.

West Berliners in their majority still think that peace, calm and security will come as a gift from the gods, a result of diplomatic talks, that its achievement is not their business. They still do not see the need to act to preserve peace and, if necessary, to make some sacrifice (which, compared with the horrors they would experience in the event of a military conflict, would be a mere flea-bite).

This attitude prevents the working people from taking action and creates a favorable soil for the propaganda of the enemies of peaceful settlement.

The West Berlin authorities claim that the U.S., British and French occupation forces are there to defend the freedom and security of the city. Another argument is the claim that as a free city West Berlin would no longer be viable. Many think that all supplies and contracts would be discontinued with the demilitarized, neutral city, that all links with West Germany and other capitalist countries would be cut. This apprehension exists despite the fact that, because of the policy of the front-line city and of the fluctuations in economic life in the Federal Republic, investments and contracts in West Berlin have noticeably shrunk; the real danger is that should this policy be continued West Berlin may decline to the status of a dying city.

The Socialist Unity Party explains that, with the status of a free city, West Berlin will regain genuine peace, freedom and security, that along with maintaining economic and trade relations with the Federal Republic and other capitalist countries, it will also be in a position to develop its relations with the crisis-free socialist world market.

In order to prevent these sensible views from spreading and to counteract the growing discontent with Senate policy, the leaders of the Christian Democratic and the Social Democratic parties have opened all the sluice gates of slander against the GDR. Largely responsible themselves for the economic damage caused to the GDR before August 13, 1961 (when the border was still open), they are now seizing on the consequences of the damage to incite West Berliners against the GDR.

Since West Berlin is located on the territory of the GDR, the workers there not infrequently win concessions merely by threatening to take action. Unable to use the usual demagogy to explain the concessions made to "cool the hotheads," the Senate retaliates by trampling on the rights and liberties guaranteed by the Constitution of 1950, by exerting political and economic pressure, and by intimidating the opposition. In the space of one year 250 members of our Party and other progressives were victimized and expelled from the trade unions for actively upholding a policy of peace. Our Party is denied premises for meetings and other activities and our newspaper *Die Wahrheit* is subject to constant harassment.

These reprisals are taken against all who reject the front-line city policy and favor a policy of lessening the tension and normalizing the situation in West Berlin. The large group of students who attended the Helsinki youth festival have been subjected to monstrous persecution.

But no matter how hard the enemies of peace try to intimidate the people and deceive them, they are powerless to stop the questioning. An indication of the trouble they have run into was a secret meeting held a few weeks ago by the West Berlin Social Democratic leaders.

At meetings of Social Democratic organizations members have expressed the view that the present leadership is pursuing a wrong policy. Had there not been so many diehards in the Senate we would long have had normal relations with the German Democratic Republic, they say. This sentiment is so strong in the Social Democratic Party that the Brandt group is now trying to give the impression that the policy has been changed. After inflaming the fascist hoodlums at the wall with speeches filled with hatred for the GDR, Brandt has been forced publicly to dissociate himself from the troublemakers.

Simultaneously, the Right-wing Social Democrats are clamoring for the Bundestag, in defiance of all law, to hold sessions in West Berlin, seeking to convert the city into part of the Federal Republic and to preserve the occupation regime. Brandt would like sanction for this utterly unrealistic policy through a "plebiscite" in West Berlin. In this way, in both home and foreign policy, the Brandt group has

a common line with Adenauer's Christian Democratic Union and, to all intents and purposes, pursues a Strauss-inspired policy. As before, it supports NATO and the arms drive and opposes any rapprochement between the two German states and the transformation of West Berlin into a free city.

In addition to the Brandt group there are two other trends in the West Berlin Social Democratic Party. One denounces the arms race and the emergency laws, favors peaceful coexistence and is toying with the idea of talks between the West Berlin Senate and the GDR government.

The other group, steadily approaching a sound policy, holds that the establishment of normal relations between West Berlin and the GDR is vital to the city and its population.

If those Social Democrats in opposition were armed with the concept of action for peace, they could isolate the Brandt men and, jointly with the branches of the Socialist Unity Party in West Berlin, carry out a sensible and realistic policy aimed at lessening the tension and at negotiations with the GDR government.

In an open letter to the members of the Social Democratic Party in West Berlin, the Socialist Unity Party urged them to cast into the dustbin the discredited policy of the front-line city. We expose the maneuvering of the Brandt group and explain that the signing of a peace treaty, making West Berlin a free city and negotiating with the GDR government harmonize with the vital interests of most SDP members, electors and supporters.

We link action for peace and making West Berlin a free city with the fight for the democratic principles of the West Berlin Constitution adopted in September 1950; we demand for the Socialist Unity Party in West Berlin the same rights to which all other parties are entitled. This includes the opportunity freely to advocate our policy at public meetings, on TV and over the radio, as well as the right freely to print and circulate our newspaper *Die Wahrheit.*

Our efforts are directed at accelerating the process of reassessment now under way among workers and other groups of the population, at helping them to realize the need for action for peace, to draw our fellow-workers among the Social Democrats into joint action on behalf of the West Berlin population.

The draft program for the Sixth Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany states in part:

"The German Democratic Republic is an important factor for peace in Central Europe. It is a bastion against West German revenge-seekers and militarists — the forces of war and death."

Relying on the German Democratic Republic — the first worker-peasant state in German history—we shall carry on the fight for a peace treaty and a West Berlin settlement.

H. DANELIUS

PARTY EDUCATION

MORE PEOPLE STUDY MARXISM-LENINISM

MILLIONS of Soviet workers and collective farmers, engineers and technicians, scientists and educators, members of the Communist Party and non-members, are studying Marxism-Leninism and applying it in practice.

In the 1961-62 study year more than 22,500,000 people, 3,400,000 more than in the previous year, attended political classes, circles and schools. Seventy per cent of the enrollment were non-Party people.

The current study year, which began in October, reveals the growing interest in the study of Marxist-Leninist theory and in the problems of building communism. In the Ukraine the enrollment in the Party education system is 4,600,000, and in Moscow, more than 1,700,000, including over one million non-members.

This year the classes and seminars on the history of the CPSU, philosophy, political economy and practical economics will make a deeper study of the theoretical propositions put forward at the Twenty-Second Congress of the CPSU.

Roughly one-third of the time in the classes on economics is allocated to production matters in industry and agriculture.

Classes on economics are being arranged for collective-farm chairmen, state-farm directors and section managers, brigade leaders and secretaries of rural Party organizations. The subjects taught include organizational and economic problems and also questions of theory and Party policy.

The Party committees are placing much em-

phasis on systematic theoretical training of functionaries. The Central Committees of the Communist parties of the Republics and the territorial, regional, city and district committees are arranging seminars for leading Party, administrative, trade union and Young Communist League functionaries; the seminars will study and discuss problems of Marxist-Leninist theory, Party organization, state administration and economic management with a view to improving the methods of Party and economic leadership.

In general political education is being conducted on a considerably wider scale than before. To combine ideological education with professional training, Party policy in the spheres of both domestic and foreign affairs is being included in the curricula of technical courses and classes, and in the schools for innovators in industry, in crop raising and in animal husbandry. The number of classes and schools in residential neighborhoods is also being increased. In the Sverdlov District of Moscow, for example, in response to requests from the people, about 200 classes, twice the number for last year, have been arranged.

Last year some Party organizations assigned a large number of Party members, and also non-Party people, who could very well have studied independently, to classes and political schools. This caused a certain formalism in the work, discouraging independent study and initiative. Now the emphasis is on self-study as the basic method of mastering Marxism-Leninism. The classes and elementary political schools now take in as a rule those who have not finished secondary school; people with a secondary or higher education study independently. More seminars are being established where people studying independently can get together from time to time to exchange views. In Novosibirsk, for instance, the Party branches have set up an extra 240 seminars. Regular consultations and lecturers are also arranged.

The People's Universities, staffed by voluntary tutors — scientists, writers and artists — are an effective channel for disseminating Marxist-Leninist ideology and knowledge in a wide range of subjects from aesthetics to the latest achievements in science and technology and the practical accomplishments of the best workers. These universities, of which there already are more than 6,400, give courses of lectures, conduct seminars and debates and arrange excursions to exhibitions and leading plants. The range of instruction is being widened to meet the broader interests of the public. In Moscow, for example, there are people's universities of technological progress and economics, culture, atheism, law and production experience — more than 200 in all with an enrollment of tens of thousands.

The effectiveness of the Party education and the extent to which it is linked with the practical work of building communism depend above all on the tutors and lecturers. Hence the Party committees attach prime importance to training the teaching personnel and improving the methods of instruction. Last year there were 1,165,000 tutors, of whom more than 200,000 were Party, administrative, trade union or Young Communist League functionaries. This year the number has been increased considerably to meet the requirements of the extended network of schools and study groups. Besides Party functionaries, more than 33,000 of the best workers and collective farmers are engaged in this work. To give them qualified theoretical and methodological assistance, the Party committees are organizing permanent seminars for tutors.

M. IVANOV

PARTY EDUCATION IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

IN recent years progress has been registered in the educational work conducted by the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. Whereas in the 1956-57 study year less than one million people (including 135,000 non-Party people) were enrolled in the Party education system, last year the number exceeded 1,900,000, including nearly 650,000 non-Party people. Nearly 40 per cent of the total enrollment attended political economy and practical economics circles, evening schools and seminars. Many members studied the history of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and the CPSU. Of late there has been a quickening of interest in foreign policy matters.

Summing up the results of past work in this sphere, the Central Committee of the Party recently introduced a number of changes in the education system with a view to a more effective study of Marxism-Leninism and linking it more closely with practice. Party education, the Central Committee pointed out, should be geared to the tasks of the day, and also to the perspectives of socialist development. Every Communist should have a thorough knowledge of Marxist-Leninist theory, be

familiar with the current policy of the Party and the tasks of the international Communist movement, and possess adequate professional knowledge. An important place is accorded to study of the decisions of the Party.

Experience has shown the need for further differentiation in the forms of political education. This year facilities are being provided to meet the requirements of all categories of students, namely:

—the top functionaries of central, regional, city and district organizations;

—people who have recently joined the Party, probationer members, activists of the Youth League, and non-Party activists who wish to join the Party;

—all other members and non-Party people.

For functionaries (totalling more than 500,000) the basic form is independent study. They also attend evening classes, universities of Marxism-Leninism, or seminars and conferences on economics and theory.

Much attention is paid to educating the 365,000 new members and candidate members admitted into the Party in the past four years. These younger Communists will study the fundamentals of political knowledge, the history of the Party, the program documents of the international Communist and working-class movement, and the fundamentals of socialism and communism, the forms of study depending on their general education and political grounding.

Most suitable for the rest of the membership as well as for the non-Party activists are the seminars and lectures which will add to their theoretical knowledge. For the most advanced, study groups are being organized to take up urgent problems of building socialism and communism, in particular, questions of the socialist economy.

A great deal of Marxist-Leninist literature is being published to help the students. Many of the classics of Marxism, documents of the international Communist movement, textbooks and other study aids have been put out in large editions. Other textbooks being published are the *History of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, The Economics of Czechoslovak Industry* and *The Economics of Czechoslovak Agriculture.* The Soviet textbooks *Political Economy, Fundamentals of Marxist Philosophy, Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism, History of the CPSU, Fundamentals of Marxist-Leninist Aesthetics,* etc., have been translated into Czech.

The number of tutors is being increased from year to year. Enlisted for this work are mostly leading functionaries of Party, governmental and economic bodies, i.e., people with a good theoretical grounding and rich practical experience. Of the 150,000 now working as lecturers and tutors, nearly 60 per cent have been active in the Party for more than 10 years. More than 45 per cent are industrial workers, engineers or technicians.

In addition to the permanent schools, classes and seminars, lectures and talks will be given and special meetings held to familiarize the public with the principles of Marxism-Leninism and the policy of the Party and to elucidate the pressing issues of the day.

In the course of the preparations for the Twelfth Congress of the Party, scheduled for December, the study will be concentrated on the draft of the new Rules and the document on the perspectives of socialism in Czechoslovakia. The Congress decisions will be the basic subject of study in 1963. *Miroslav LAB*

AN IMPORTANT LINK IN THE IDEOLOGICAL WORK OF THE FRENCH COMMUNIST PARTY

IDEOLOGICAL education of its members has always been one of the main concerns of the French Communist Party. In recent years, and especially after the Sixteenth Congress held in May 1961, our Party has made headway in this sphere. There has been a big increase in the enrollment in all types of schools, more "new universities" where workers and intellectuals study Marxism-Leninism have been opened (their student body has doubled in the past two years), more lectures and seminars have been arranged and the quality of the instruction improved. While noting these achievements, the Central Committee, at its meeting last June, stressed the need to devote still more attention to the ideological education of the members.

A sharpening of the class struggle in general and in the sphere of ideology in particular is a feature of our times. Aware that its positions have been seriously undermined, and alarmed by the achievements of socialism, the monopoly bourgeoisie is mustering every means at its disposal to retain its hold on the masses, to paralyze the democratic forces and to divert them from tackling the urgent problems confronting the country.

Capitalist propaganda has resorted to a refurbished variant of the "people's capitalism" and the "third way" myths. It consists in eulo-

gizing the "political democracy" of the capitalist system while granting the economic advantages of socialism. And since France has its economic plan and nationalized industries, it is, allegedly, effecting a "fusion" of the two systems; hence, the socialist revolution is unnecessary. The emphasis is on "planning" as a panacea for all ills while making no mention of the abolition of capitalism or the socialization of the means of production and distribution.

Then there is the drive to distort socialist reality. Since the economic, social and cultural achievements of the socialist countries cannot be denied, the question of freedom is made the hobby-horse. The price of the social and economic achievements of the socialist countries, it is said, is freedom. "Socialism," its enemies aver, "forgets the human element." They identify democracy with formal democracy, misrepresent the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat and ignore the concept of the state of the whole people. The myth of "red imperialism" is spread far and wide, while cosmopolitan "Europeanism" is boosted in every way to vindicate the aggressive cold-war policy and the arms drive.

At the same time an attack has been mounted against the Communist parties and their theory. The Communists are being pressed to accept the falsehood that the antagonistic classes are drawing closer together as a result of some revolution taking place in capitalism. They are urged to give up the defense of the small producers (as "archaic elements doomed to perish") and to renounce their policy of uniting all the non-monopoly sections of the population against monopoly capital. And they are advised to reject the idea of the leading role of the working class and to abandon — "for the sake of peaceful coexistence" — the very idea of revolution.

The Gaullist government and its official sociologists, the capitalist press, the army, the Church and the organizations dependent on it (in particular the Catholc trade unions), the Right-wing Socialists and the revisionists have all joined forces in this broad offensive against Communist ideology.

Clearly, in these circumstances the task confronting the working class—the task of abolishing the authoritarian government and establishing genuine democracy — cannot be accomplished without a great deal of organizational, political and ideological work by the Party. Only the Communist Party guided by Marxist-Leninist theory can expose the propaganda offensive of the de Gaulle government and other champions of capitalism, give proper guidance to the struggle of the working class and the people, channel their efforts in the right direction and draw them into political action for peace, democracy and socialism. In the light of this, Lenin's words that the struggle on the ideological front is every bit as important as struggle on the economic and political fronts are pertinent today.

* * *

Assessing the results achieved in Party education, the Central Committee stressed the importance of *extending it to embrace all members*, of improving the theoretical training not only of the functionaries, but of the entire membership, above all of the factory workers, peasants, women and the youth.

Success in the struggle for peace, democracy and socialism depends on the organizational, political and ideological work of the Party branches, and, in the final analysis, on the activity of each member. In view of this, the Central Committee places particular emphasis on educational work in the branches, elaborating the point made at the Fifteenth Congress that the branch is not only called upon to carry out the decisions of the Party but to be a *center for the ideological education of the members.*

A useful educational role is played by the branch meetings where theory is compared with practice through discussion of political and ideological questions in connection with the tasks of the Party. The Central Committee considers it essential to heighten the educational value of *each* branch meeting and also to hold from time to time *special* meetings devoted to examining ideological and political questions in the light of the basic documents of the Party and the international Communist movement.

So far these documents (for instance, reports to our congresses) have not been studied thoroughly enough in the localities, and this has prevented the all-out enlistment of all Party members in active ideological struggle, has interfered with organizing this work and, consequently, has retarded the strengthening of the Party.

It is proposed to link the study of Party documents with the overall requirements of the political struggle and the issues that loom largest at the given moment. In order to help the branches to hold such special meetings, our Party bulletin *Vie du Parti* will regularly publish talking points setting forth our views and refuting the arguments of our enemies. Lists of recommended reading will also be published.

Since the beginning of the study year an extensive campaign has been under way to carry

out this decision. Many branches have already taken the initial step of holding meetings to discuss problems relating to the struggle against capitalist exploitation, for democracy, and our views on unity. The Party press in general and the *Vie du Parti* in particular make a point of reviewing and popularizing the experience gained in this work.

The Central Committee also decided to organize *Marxist-Leninist courses* in as many places as possible in each federation. These courses, which will take up pressing issues, will be open to all members and obligatory for all members of branch bureaus.

At the same time all other forms of ideological and political work in the branches and self-study by members are encouraged (lectures, seminars and other activities sponsored by the federation and district committees).

While paying more attention than before to the mass forms of Party education, the Central Committee is not slackening efforts in the matter of training the functionaries.

Indicative of the activity in this sphere is that in the period from September 1961 to August 1962 the enrollment at the one- and four-month national schools increased by 40 per cent, while the number of federation and district schools and also their enrollment grew by 50 per cent. In the course of the 1962-63 study year it is proposed at least to double the attendance at the short-time and full-time national and federation schools as compared with 1960-61. A still *bigger* increase is planned for the district schools in which instruction is based on six textbooks put out by the Central Educational Commission.

The Party attaches particular importance to the district schools since they embrace members at the local level where the policies of the Party are carried out. Since it is difficult to organize these schools from the center, we are working to popularize the initiative of those district committees which have set up five, seven and more schools since the beginning of the study year (for instance, the Romilly, Bagneux, Aubervilliers and Nanterre committees). It is recommended to federation and district organizations 1) to arrange for the schools to be as near as possible to the branches (one for each big branch or for several smaller ones); 2) to fix the most convenient time for the classes (in the evenings, at the weekend, in the afternoon, three days running, etc.); 3) to attend to the systematic training of tutors.

In keeping with the decisions of the Sixteenth Congress, we are seeking to enrol in these schools members working in the factories (especially those with bad working conditions, unskilled workers, etc.), peasants, women (above all, working women) and the youth. The number of women workers attending federation and local schools has increased by 30 per cent during the past year.

Experience shows that members working in factories as well as women and rural Communists find it easier to study at schools especially organized for them, and more and more of these schools are being opened. The Rhone federation, for instance, has conducted weekly classes for members employed at the Berliet plant. All told 94 local schools have been established in 24 federations for members working in factories. Last winter permanent nine-day schools for rural members were held in federations where agriculture predominates.

Women, too, are being increasingly drawn into political study through special schools. Some of these are permanent schools, moving from one locality to another, others are held periodically on a federation scale (with classes in the afternoon or in the evenings), and still others function on a local scale, mostly in the afternoon.

To encourage self-study among the cadres, the Central Committee has recommended to the federation and district committees to organize *classes* to help those studying theory independently. The purpose of these classes is to promote more profound study of the most urgent theoretical problems.

While extending the scope of Party educational work, we are at the same time seeking to make it more *effective*. And with this in view we are concentrating on a number of cardinal tasks.

Above all we want closely to combine study and practical work so as to ensure a higher theoretical level and to impart to the study a more militant character. Much has been done since 1956 to root out formalism and dogmatism. But we are not relaxing our efforts in this direction and are basing our educational work on the decisions and theses of the recent congresses of our Party and on the documents of the international Communist movement, especially the 81-Party Statement and the Program of the CPSU. The object of our educational work is to help carry out the tasks posed by the Fifteenth and Sixteenth congresses of our Party.

In view of the intensified ideological struggle and the frenzied attacks against socialism by its open and disguised enemies, the Party considers it essential *more actively to refute* the bourgeois (Gaullist), reformist and revisionist

views. The tutors should take due account of the political and ideological grounding of those attending the classes, and make wider use of *visual methods of instruction* (films, excursions, etc.). Work is now under way to improve study aids along these lines, especially those intended for elementary schools.

Of major importance is *improvement of the organization and guidance* of Party education work.

The members of the Central Committee will render more assistance to the federations. Moreover, the Central Committee has decided to meet from time to time for the specific purpose of making a thorough study of the problems of the day. It also urges the federation and district committees to exercise stricter political control over the educational work and to guide it more effectively.

Inasmuch as the effectiveness of educational work largely depends on the qualifications of the tutors, our Party gives priority to the theoretical and methodological training of teachers for schools of all levels. Such training is given at schools of a general type and at special courses. Today we have both in the center and in the federations hundreds of qualified teachers. The projected extension of education work, however, makes it necessary to increase the number. With this in view, courses for tutors are held from time to time on a national as well as a federation scale.

In some districts and even in some federations the Party committees have not made anyone responsible for education, with the result that this work is conducted haphazardly or not at all. To remedy this and to ensure systematic ideological education it has been decided that every federation and district committee shall appoint a comrade to take charge of this work.

Paul COURTIEAU

THE LINK BETWEEN PARTY EDUCATION AND LIFE

IN THE past the Communist Party of Brazil paid insufficient attention to the ideological education of its members. The new political line charted by the recent national convention and the comparatively rapid growth of the Party, however, have brought the need to reorganize and intensify our activities in this sphere very much to the fore.

As the first step in this direction we made a thorough assessment of the experience gained in 1958 and 1959 with a view to combining Marxist-Leninist theoretical education with study of the situation in the country and thereby helping to carry out the new line. A special department was established to work out a plan for study circles and to draw up courses of lectures.

Emphasis was placed on educating the activists and the younger members. Above all it was necessary to clarify the key issues of national life as well as the policy, the principles and the character of the Marxist-Leninist Party of the working class. That is how the study circles which we call "primary courses" were organized. These circles consist of seven lessons dealing with the economic and political situation in the country, the nature of our epoch, the new line of the Party and the vanguard role of the Communists in the workers' struggle. The first hour of each lesson is devoted to an exposition of the subject, while the second hour or so is given over to discussion. Theses on all the subjects are prepared in advance as aids to the students and collected in a booklet of under 100 pages. Primary courses of this kind now function all over the country. In December 1961, 400 activists in Guanabara and 1,250 in Sao Paulo took the course. According to the plan for 1962, study courses of this type will function in the Party organizations in all the states.

A "secondary course," arranged for the intermediate Party cadres and tutors, is divided into four parts of 20 lessons. Part one, theory, consists of two lessons on historical materialism and four on political economy. Part two deals with the contemporary situation: one lesson on the character of our epoch, three on the economic structure of the country and one on its political and social structure. Part three consists of five lessons on the political line of the Party. The last part is devoted exclusively to the Party, its theory, organizational principles, the significance of the Party for the working people, the ideological struggle now taking place, and a critical examination of the trends hampering the correct application of the political line laid down by the national congress.

As distinct from the primary courses, the lessons in the secondary course are conducted under the direct guidance of the Party's Central Educational Department in close contact with the corresponding departments in the various states. Toward the end of the year we contemplate decentralizing the leadership of this form of study. The secondary

courses first began to function in December 1961; in the first half of that year they were attended by some 200 people. At present these courses function only in Guanabara and Sao Paulo and are attended by activists from other states.

Special attention is devoted to training tutors who lead the studies in the secondary course. There are two forms of such training; one providing for intensive study every day of the week, and the other, a kind of evening school with two or three classes a week. Special courses were arranged for students during the long vacations.

We have no possibility at present of expanding our work in this sphere; we can only strive to consolidate what we have accomplished to date.

In order to familiarize the new activists with the policy of the Party, the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism, and the economic and political problems facing Brazil today, we are organizing a series of lectures on these subjects. For those who feel they need something more than the secondary course provides (although it gives a good grounding for independent study) there are lectures on dialectical materialism (nine in all) as well as seminars and discussions on problems pertaining to the national economy and politics.

Although the scope of this educational work is still quite modest it serves not only Communists but non-Party student youth and intellectuals generally. In Guanabara, for example, a series of lectures and impromptu debates on national problems and the policy of the Communist Party were organized for this category of student. Lectures on the Cuban revolution and the Twenty-Second Congress of the CPSU have become quite common. A series of lectures (from three to eight) on philosophical subjects was delivered in various states in collaboration with the faculties of local universities. Courses in the history of the trade union movement and on Brazilian economy and politics have been arranged in several trade union organizations.

The choice of tutors and lecturers for all these courses and study circles is by no means a simple task, nor is it easy to keep them adequately supplied with the literature needed. The high cost of books (owing to the exchange rates imposed by the International Monetary Fund) makes it difficult for people to acquire libraries of their own. Hence we encourage any initiative taken toward building up libraries in the primary, district and regional Party organizations.

While the work of our classes and lectures is far from perfect, this regular, planned activity is, nevertheless, contributing in no small measure to an understanding and implementation of the policy and the program of our Party.

Apolonio DE CARVALHO

WORKING IN SEMI-LEGAL CONDITIONS

IN KEEPING with the decisions of its Ninth Congress (April 1962) the People's Vanguard Party of Costa Rica is working to raise the ideological and political level of its members and to popularize Marxism-Leninism. It was only in the past two years that this work began to acquire its rightful place in the life of the Party. In the past only sporadic efforts were made to train students and Party functionaries theoretically. Now we are doing this work in a more systematic and more organized way. In doing this we have to overcome not a few difficulties caused by the status of semi-legality in which the Party finds itself.

Study classes for Party members are being held throughout the country. In the San José Province the classes are conducted at branch level. The 20 classes in this province have an attendance of 580. The classes are supplemented by lectures. The Carmen Lyra branch has organized a class which studies materials published in *World Marxist Review*.

The lecture method is the basic form of study in the classes. A course of 20 lectures (three a week) on the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism was held in the Heredia Province. Where necessary, special classes are arranged for probation members to study the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism. The elementary course consists of five lectures—one a week.

In the provincial and municipal centers activists attend short courses in preparation for the National School. Two groups of students have completed this school in which the course runs for four weeks. Subjects taught include dialectical and historical materialism, political economy and the theory and tactics of the international Communist movement. In keeping with a decision of the Ninth Congress all Central Committee members are

obliged to complete this course. A campaign to raise funds for the school is carried out by members and sympathizers.

To acquaint the members with a more thorough knowledge of the organizational structure of the Party, of its propaganda methods, and also with a view to exchanging experience, the Party committees in the provinces have arranged seminars and schools to which members of the branches are delegated. There are, in addition, special courses of political study for trade union functionaries, peasant activists and students. Peasant members attend an elementary course fitted into one week. Classes are also arranged for Party sympathizers.

At the request of the National University students the Cultural Commission of the Party organized classes during the summer vacation on dialectical and historical materialism, political economy and the theory and tactics of the international Communist movement. The classes were supplemented by lectures on current problems of home and international politics. Classes are also organized for secondary school pupils. A course of five lectures on the life of Marx and Engels proved very popular.

The Party has stepped up its publishing activity, issuing regularly a weekly newspaper, a bulletin, a journal and pamphlets. One of the branches, for example, printed a pamphlet *On Communist Ethics* which was well received by readers. The circulation of the Party's paper has risen considerably. The Party, anxious to see these publications circulated not only among members and supporters, has recommended to the branches to find ways and means of bringing the ideas and policy of the Party to the masses.

Political education is hampered by what might be termed a cultural blockade, by a kind of isolation of the country — the result of pressure exerted by the U.S. Embassy and military mission. To bring books and journals from abroad into Costa Rica is almost impossible. Our Party has done much to break this blockade which dooms the country to backwardness and ignorance.

We recently printed the *Communist Manifesto*, a summary of the CPSU Program, and the pamphlet *Ten Years of Struggle by the People's Vanguard Party*. The Cultural Commission of the Party has prepared a *Revolutionary Almanac* listing the outstanding dates to which lectures and articles in the press should be devoted.

This activity is helping us to carry out the task set at the Ninth Congress — to double our membership in the next two years.

S. MARIN

POLITICAL TRAINING OF COMMUNISTS

TWO YEARS ago when Cyprus was proclaimed a republic and the AKEL Party regained its legal status, one of the problems was to raise the level of political education of both functionaries and rank-and-file members. The Ninth Congress of the Party held in 1960 called for a "sharp turn in educational work." An education bureau was formed and instructed to plan and organize education facilities for all members, including members of the leading committees. The plan provided for lectures, for local schools and one national school, and also for classes for the central leadership. Curricula were worked out and literature recommended for those engaging in self-study.

What are the first results of this educational activity? All members have attended a cycle of 16 lectures on the current problems of the theory and policy of the Party, such as political and organizational work of the branches, the AKEL Program and the Statement of the 81 Communist and Workers' parties. These lectures, and especially the concluding one, helped to explain the problems facing Cyprus in the light of the experience gained by the international Communist movement. Attention was paid to training tutors for the branches. Of no small importance is the fact that the Party is now in a position to circulate, in thousands of copies, the materials of the international Communist movement. In addition to pamphlets and the magazine *Neos Democratis*, the theoretical organ of our Party, we also distribute *Problems of Peace and Socialism*. This rich material is amply used both in lectures and in self-study.

In the towns and villages in all five districts of the island we conduct classes on international and home policy. In 1961 they were attended by approximately a thousand people. The setting up of district schools proved to be a more difficult matter, due largely to the lack of tutors. In 1960 only one such school was opened in the Nicosia district and was attended by 15 activists. In 1961, however,

with the establishment of the central school which trains the necessary cadres, schools were opened in all the districts and attendance rose to 100. Their curricula include Marxist-Leninist theory, with the emphasis on political economy, and current problems. An initial drawback in the working of the schools was that the students were not freed from their Party work. Some leaders underestimated the significance of study. Now, however, activists attending the schools are freed from all other assignments.

The central school was attended in 1961 by nine members of the Central Committee from all the districts. For the duration of the course (two months) they were released from their professional and Party duties. They studied the political economy of capitalism, the theory and tactics of the international Communist movement, and attended lectures on the general political line and tactics of AKEL. Our intention is that all the leading cadres shall attend this school which we regard as the first step towards establishing a Marxist institute in our country.

In 1961 two seminars were organized for members of the Central Committee: one on the Statement of the 81 Communist and Workers' parties, the other on the social structure in Cyprus.

The Tenth Congress of the Party, while positively assessing the work done in the past two years in the sphere of Party education, pointed to the shortcomings in organizing the schools and stressed the need to encourage self-study. The Party has issued aids for those studying individually and has supplied the libraries of the district committees with additional Marxist-Leninist literature.

A program for extending education work has been worked out, and today the Party is successfully coping with the tasks set by its Tenth Congress.

G. LERNIS

Meetings of Central Committees

Communist Party of Japan

A MEETING of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Japan, held in October, discussed the report on Party building made by Comrade Kenji Miyamoto, member of the Presidium and General Secretary of the Central Committee. The meeting unanimously endorsed the report and adopted a corresponding resolution.

Both the report and the resolution contain a detailed analysis of the political and economic situation in the country, and set forth the immediate aims of the struggle and the tasks of the Communists.

The meeting called upon the membership quickly to complete the tasks advanced in the two-year Party-building, press circulation, and Party education plan. According to the plan membership should be raised to 150,000, readers of *Akahata* to 200,000, and of its Sunday edition to 600,000.

The resolution speaks of the following points:

a) *Press Circulation*

In order to multiply the number of readers of the Party papers, the branches and committees at all levels should have regular plans for extending the circulation, and, in carrying out these plans, should not put the burden of the work only on the bodies responsible for circulation. Every reader of the Party newspapers and journals should be treasured, the daily contact with readers should be strengthened, and they should be helped to develop politically. In circulating the Party press the Party members should be careful not to expose the readers to reprisals at their place of work. The quality of the press should be improved, and it should be brought into closer contact with life.

b) *Building the Party*

The members should be thoroughly conversant with the state of affairs in their localities, should know the people active in the mass organizations and together with them conduct work among the masses, including propaganda and educational work. It is the duty of Communists to improve the internal life of the Party, to see to it that no members are lost, ensure democratic methods in the branches, get all members to speak at meetings and to ensure that each has a Party assignment. It is essential to combine the mass work conducted by the factory branches with the work to protect the branches against enemy attacks. Haste as well as a cut-and-dried approach to Party matters should be avoided; what is needed is painstaking work among the masses with an eye to our long-

range aims. The work of building the Party in factory and office, in educational establishments, in the rural and urban areas should be combined with efforts to extend the ranks of the mass organizations.

c) *Educating the Membership*

The task here is to encourage self-study, bearing in mind the political level of each member. The Party committees at all levels should have their own educational networks so that the functionaries can study either independently or in evening classes and in schools. All rank-and-file members without exception should attend classes to study the Program and Rules of the Party, the report submitted by the C.C. to the Congress and the decisions of the Central Committee. In this respect special attention should be paid to the branch secretaries and members of the branch committees. They should attend district and prefectural Party schools. To ensure the correct methods of leadership by Party functionaries and activists and to develop their capabilities, it is most essential that they make a thorough study of the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism.

The meeting also set a new task—that of improving the style of Party work.

If these tasks are carried out, the resolution pointed out, the Communist Party of Japan will be able further to cement its unity on the basis of a militant, active, sound, regenerated and conscious discipline and in a spirit of comradeship.

Itaru YONEHARA

Among Our Contributors

BORIS N. PONOMARYOV: Secretary, Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

LUIZ CORVALAN: General Secretary, Communist Party of Chile.

VICTORIO CODOVILLA: Member of the Executive Committee and the Secretariat, Communist Party of Argentina.

ERKKI TUOMINEN: Member of the Political Bureau, Communist Party of Finland.

R. PALME DUTT: Vice-President, Communist Party of Great Britain.

PAUL COURTIEU: Member of the Central Committee, French Communist Party.

LEOPOLD INFELD: Polish scientist, Member of the Presidium, World Peace Council.

Exchange of Views

Problems of Modern Capitalism

In our previous issue we printed some of the contributions made at the exchange of views on modern capitalism, held under the joint auspices of WORLD MARXIST REVIEW *(Problems of Peace and Socialism) and the Moscow Institute of World Economy and International Relations. The exchange, held in Moscow over August 27—September 3, was attended by Marxist scholars from many countries. Besides the problems of state-monopoly capitalism, the subject of last month's contributions, the speakers discussed European integration and the conditions and struggle of the working class in the capitalist countries. With the elucidation of these points, we conclude the printing of the materials of the exchange.*

2. WEST-EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET

ITS ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL ASPECTS

TURNING to the economic integration now taking place in Western Europe, the speakers expressed the view that is was the most significant development in the economy of capitalism in recent years.

The Common Market, said Academian Arzumanyan (USSR), in addition to being a product of the development of state-monopoly capitalism, is an attempt to respond in a constructive way to the advance of the socialist world system, to create a new instrument with which to combat socialism.

In analyzing the current form of monopoly integration, said A. Rumyantsev, chief editor of *World Marxist Review*, we should sort out those components whose interaction makes up the picture as a whole.

First of all, what is its *material base?* It consists, as I see it, in a concentration and centralization of capital transcending the boundaries of the separate countries and signifying the internationalization of the productive forces.

The socio-economic content of the Common Market can be characterized as an interstate agreement for the mobilization of all the resources of the integrating countries in the interests of monopoly capitalism.

It is essential, too, to single out the *specific historical conditions* which determine the shape taken by associations of this kind. It is clear that the process of integration is influenced by two kinds of contradictions: contradictions between the two world systems and those between the various groups of imperialists.

The reactionary and aggressive *political nature* of the inter-state monopoly alliances merits special attention. These alliances are spearheaded against the socialist countries, the working class and national-liberation movements.

"The theoretical dismemberment of these elements," Rumyantsev said, "is important both from the standpoint of scientific cognition of the processes under review and from the standpoint of criticizing the bourgeois apologists of integration, and also from the standpoint of the practical needs of the working-class movement."

1.

As long as capitalism held undivided sway over the world, the growth of the capitalist market took place under the impact of two processes: capitalist development in depth, i.e., the growth of capitalist production on a given territory, and its expansion in breadth, i.e., extending capitalist domination to new territories.

This state of affairs changed with the onset of the general crisis of capitalism. With Russia falling out of the capitalist system, the area dominated by capitalism shrank, but it was still able to develop both in depth and in breadth. During the first stage of the

---

Transcript by the staff of the journal **World Marxist Review** and **World Economy and International Relations.**

general crisis of capitalism division and redivision of the colonies, including those processes effected by world war, still remained the principal form of the division and redivision of the world market. Nowadays, with the existence of the socialist world system plus the national-liberation revolutions, this form has become extremely dangerous and practically impossible.

However, the capitalist market continues to develop in depth, i.e., along the lines of a growing socialization of production, specialization and coordination, creating new branches and deepening the international division of labor. At the same time these processes are intensifying the *objective trend towards internationalization of economic relations* and are bursting out beyond the national-economic borders.

These points were pursued by D. Sokolow (Poland), E. Sereni (Italy), E. Khmelnitskaya (USSR), O. Taufer (Czechoslovakia) and others, who pointed out that the expansion of the productive forces, the enlarging of the enterprises, automation and standardization of production objectively impel the different countries towards closer economic relations and integration, especially in Europe which is highly industrialized but split up by national boundaries.

However, the speakers emphasized, in the prewar and immediately after the war the monopolies and the capitalist governments erected numerous political, trade and currency barriers in the way of world economic relations. Today, faced with the growth of socialism, the big monopolies are taking the way of uniting their countries economically.

The monopoly capitalists, said D. Sokolow, are becoming increasingly aware that capitalism's struggle for survival will continue to be waged on an economic footing. This naturally affects the economic policy of the capitalist states. The integration, then, is the outcome of the two interwoven trends; first, the current expansion of the productive forces which intensifies the internationalization of economic relations, and second, the evolution of state-monopoly capitalism at the third stage of the general crisis of capitalism. Indeed, if the objective development of the productive forces calls for the economic integration of the various countries, none but the state can open up the national economic frontiers and none but the supra-national bodies can regulate economic development on the scale of a group of countries.

The West European integration, it was pointed out, is a state-monopoly association of the finance oligarchy of the six countries, designed to divide and redivide the capitalist world market, an attempt on the part of monopoly capitalism to "reconcile" the private capitalist form of production relations with the productive forces which have outgrown the national boundaries, and to keep these forces, which are imperatively calling for the transition to socialism, within the capitalist, state-monopoly framework. Because of these contradictions, stated I. Lemin (USSR), Gy. Gonczol (Hungary), O. Taufer and D. Sokolow, the trend towards economic integration has, right from the inception of the EEC, come up against the irreconcilable contradiction of the forms and aims imposed on it by the monopolies. This poses a question of fundamental importance, that of the economic reality of the Common Market.

This point was discussed by P. Joye (Belgium), A. Bechin (USSR), D. Sokolow and others; the reality of the EEC, it was pointed out, consists not so much in the tasks proclaimed in the Treaty of Rome being resolved today or tomorrow, but in the fact that it has already entered international economic relations as a new and important factor in capitalism and its internal contradictions.

The Treaty of Rome is being implemented not smoothly, but in sharp struggle between the EEC members. It may well be that some articles of the Treaty will never be completely carried out. Still, said P. Joye, the Common Market is a reality with which we have to reckon, a reality which, in a way, is irreversible. The Common Market, it is true, may be replaced by something else, but in no circumstances will this "something else" be a return to the situation which existed prior to 1958. To a certain extent, although in an antagonistic and contradictory way, it extends the boundaries for expansion of productive forces in the interests of the monopolies.

The facilitating of the flow of goods from one West European country to another, said O. Taufer, is bound to find reflection also in the sphere of production. The growth of the market enables the monopolies to make better use of production capacities, while the new setting in which the competition takes place will act as a stimulus to rationalization, to higher productivity of labor and its intensification. At the same time new enterprises are being built.

The accelerated concentration and centralization of capital—these are at once the motive force of the integration and its consequence. For me, Taufer continued, this is the

real manifestation of the integration of the economy of Western Europe.

The problem of markets is of paramount importance in this respect, said Academian E. Varga (USSR). Varga's paper examined the question of markets from the standpoint of a theoretical integration of: a) two industrially developed countries and b) one industrially developed country and another economically backward. In other words, he examined two variants of integration—the Common Market, on the one hand, and the "association" of the EEC countries and their former colonies, on the other.

In the first case, in Varga's opinion, we get what usually takes place under capitalism during recovery and boom: the demand for the goods produced in Departments I and II will grow for the time being. "But the processes which cause this expansion will, in the ultimate, lead to a crisis of overproduction and to a contraction of the market . . . Therefore one can hardly expect any permanent or even prolonged increase of production in the integrated countries."

MONOPOLY "INTEGRATION" AND INTERNATIONALIZATION OF THE PRODUCTIVE FORCES COMMON MARKET AND BUSINESS SITUATION

In the second case, says Varga, the integration will accelerate the creation of a capitalist market in the economically backward country, but the market expansion in both parts of the association will have very definite limits. "It will cease as soon as the producers of goods for their own consumption become producers for the capitalist market." As for Eurafrica specifically, it, according to Varga, is unlikely to lead to "any significant expansion of the capitalist market."

Varga's contribution, because of its topical nature, was followed by a lively discussion. "One of the basic concepts underlying the integration," said Gy. Gonczol, "is the idea that the antagonism between the home and the external market will die, so to speak, a natural death. But no Common Market can overcome this antagonism and abolish the international competition or even mitigate it. In any case this is not the purpose of the integration; on the contrary, the aim of the Common Market is to free the international competition from all obstacles. The Market accelerates the building of excess production capacities and makes possible an accelerated accumulation of capital in the areas of this unit, but by doing so it intensifies the competition for external markets. The new aspect of the market problem is that the Common Market and all the partial successes of the integration bring with them a keener competitive struggle."

There can be no doubt, speakers pointed out, that the Common Market countries have greatly eased the restrictions on trade, but abolition of tariffs is not yet economic unity, nor does it solve the market problem. But this does not mean that the integration is simply an adding up of the national markets, that it cannot further the economic growth of the integrated territories.

"Comrade Varga's hypotheses," said A. Mileikovsky (USSR), "are certainly interesting, but one cannot agree that the adding up of the national markets yields merely their arithmetical sum, producing no new quality and causing no expansion of the market."

Varga has correctly emphasized the limits to the expansion of an integrated market arising from monopoly integration, said E Sereni. And we should speak about this limitation in our arguments with those who sow illusions about an expanding market in the conditions of monopoly capitalism. But I agree with Mileikovsky when he says that excessive theoretical abstraction is likely to lead to our losing sight of the growth of the market, at least on a restricted scale, which we cannot fail to see and which we should bear in mind.

Arguable too is the Varga thesis about the market, given the integration of a developed and an underdeveloped country, because of its excessive abstraction from the vital socio-political factors associated with this process; without these factors one can hardly visualize the nature of the basic consequences of the economic "association" of ex-colonies and imperialist countries.

Speakers turned to the views in articles in the monopoly press to the effect that the integration is the "magic means" which explains the relatively rapid economic growth of the Common Market countries. It is true, they said, that in recent years industrial production in the Six has grown more rapidly than in Britain and the USA. But to see the main reason for this in the creation and functioning of the EEC would be tantamount to turning the question upside down. The Common Market is not the cause of the high level of business activity, it is rather the

general economic situation in postwar Europe which has resulted in accelerated economic growth in the EEC countries compared with the other parts of the capitalist world.

It should be borne in mind that at the time the EEC was taking shape, it included countries in which, apart altogether from the Market, industry was rapidly expanding and that the rate of the expansion, far from quickening, began to slow down during the existence of the EEC.

On the other hand, said H. Claude (France), a review of the world economic situation shows that since the end of the 1940's Japan, like the main Common Market countries, has experienced a boom and, what is more, the rate of industrial growth in Japan has been definitely higher than in Europe. Clearly this parallel evolution and the rapid growth cannot be put down to the Common Market, they must have a common reason in the similarity of the conditions in which Japan, West Germany, Italy and France found themselves after the Second World War. In these countries, in which the machinery of production had been destroyed and disorganized by the war, the postwar rehabilitation took place at a slower rate than was the case in the United States and Britain which emerged from the conflict with their industrial base either intact or even expanded. Hence the irregularity in the cycle of capitalist reproduction between these two groups of capitalist countries. The countries in which civilian production was launched almost immediately (the USA and Britain) entered the stage of instability and stagnation after 1953, while in other countries production maintained a rapid growth. It is this difference in the economic and political conditions inherited from the war, a difference that affected the nature of the cycle in the capitalist countries, and not the formation of the Common Market, which explains basically the contrast between the economic situation in Italy, West Germany and France in recent years and that in the USA and Britain.

Further proof is furnished by the example of Belgium which at the time of joining the Market developed along practically the same lines as Britain by virtue of the same reasons.

This example was cited by P. Joye. After the formation of the Common Market, he said, Belgium's industrial production increased only nine per cent, i.e., less than in Britain and in the Scandinavian countries and much less than in Austria, not to mention Japan. This is explained chiefly by the fact that Belgium, whose production potential was scarcely affected by the war, has largely preserved its traditional structure of the economy, and for this reason reminds one more of the position of Britain than that of West Germany, Italy and France.

There is nothing extraordinary about the present rates of industrial growth in the EEC. The EEC, the speakers pointed out, has not yet experienced an economic crisis, and this, judging by everything, can hardly be regarded as a remote perspective. The Common Market, while ensuring substantial advantages to the big monopolies of Western Europe and expanding their sphere of operation, has, in one way or another, prolonged the upward phase of business activity, which, without the Market, might have been of briefer duration. In any case the situation that had set in in 1962 showed the limits of this influence. And the economy of the German Federal Republic is a striking example in this respect.

"If," said D. Sokolow, "the Common Market has been able to resolve some of its problems on the basis of accelerated development, then in the none-too-distant future it will have to tackle the same problems in a situation of slowdown."

2.

How has the monopoly integration changed capitalism? A number of interesting points were made on this score.

Integration, said Taufer, is a specific product of capitalism in the second and third stages of its general crisis. It is not, nor can it be, a question of modifying capitalism through integration, but of the continuation of its state-monopoly form on an international scale. It is a matter of building a "Europe of the trusts," the typical features of which will be international centralization and concentration of industry and capital, taking over and ousting the small and medium producers and intensified exploitation of the working class.

A. Bechin posed this question: what are the specific features of the integration as expressed in the Common Market, what are the international economic relationships of this grouping as distinct from the other forms of international economic relations in the epoch of imperialism and the general crisis of capitalism? Naturally, he said, these forms cannot be isolated from each other, nor can they be counterposed to one another. But it is necessary to establish the specific forms of the economic relationships between the Common Market countries and also be-

tween this group and the rest of the capitalist world.

What are these forms?

The first thing is that after a long period during which the capitalist countries fenced themselves of from one another with high tariffs, by restricting the export and repatriation of capital, currency controls, etc., steps are now being taken first to lower and later to abolish tariffs inside the grouping, remove the restrictions on imports, and so on. While the Common Market countries shield themselves from the external world with a barrier of customs tariffs and restrictions on some imports, inside this grouping quota restrictions on import of manufactures have been practically eliminated. The Treaty of Rome contains a number of points providing for the free movement of capital, profits, etc. A common trade policy of the member countries spearheaded against other states is being worked out. Steps of this kind pressuppose direct state participation in international economic relations and new forms of state-monopoly capitalism.

Combining the resources of monopoly capital, said D. Sokolow, cannot but assume the form of international agreement. Too many threads bind the monopolies in each country to their "own" state for them to enter into international agreements without the state. The same idea was emphasized by N. Freed (Canada): "While in the past agreements were entered into between cartels, today agreements are entered into between governments. This new development is one of the forms of expression of state-monopoly capitalism." N. Freed and others pointed out that two antagonistic tendencies are at work within the EEC—one tends to unite them, the other tends to tear them apart; the latter will assert itself and will in the future, no doubt, become the dominant tendency.

NEW FORMS OF STATE-MONOPOLY CAPITALISM INTER-IMPERIALIST CONTRADICTIONS IN AND AROUND THE COMMON MARKET

"Fear of socialism unites the capitalists," Freed continued, "but in spite of this class unity, each monopoly strives to strengthen its own position at the expense of the other. The strongest monopoly emerges victorious. Just as during the period of agreements between cartels so today agreements between various state-monopoly capitalist governments depend on the relative strength of the contending forces—if one gains the other must lose. It cannot be otherwise."

The inter-imperialist struggle developing in and around the Common Market, the speakers emphasized, merits our scrutiny. It is necessary to take into account its peculiarities in defining the strategy and tactics of the Communist parties, bearing in mind Lenin's words that differences between the imperialists can be a useful ally of the working class.

The EEC is a tangle of the inner contradictions of its members, chiefly its principal members, France and Federal Germany.

West German imperialism, said G. Ehler (FRG), which began by using the EEC to ensure its domination in Western Europe, primarily in the economic sphere, is now aspiring to political and military domination. It would like its strength to determine its weight in the EEC, Ehler went on. But a result of the strengthening of German imperialism is that the contradictions between the imperialist states of Western Europe have been further exacerbated. The French imperialists do not want to renounce their strong positions in the political and military fields. De Gaulle would like to use the Bonn-Paris axis for his own ends.

With Britain joining the Market the contradictions would become more pronounced. And if the West German monopolies favor Britain's entry, this, on the one hand, is because they are anxious to support the plans of U.S. imperialism and, on the other, because they believe that they are so strong economically that they can gain the upper hand in the competitive struggle against the British monopolies and extend their markets and spheres of influence.

In this way, the inter-imperialist rivalry has acquired new properties not only in the EEC but also in the relationships between the integrated and non-integrated parts of the capitalist world. The European integration has resulted in a sharpening of relations on the scale of the entire imperialist camp, unprecedented throughout the postwar, and above all in the relations between Western Europe and the USA. This problem was thoroughly debated.

In the postwar, speakers pointed out, economic growth in Western Europe was much more rapid than in the United States. The West European countries have outstripped the USA for rate of industrial growth, capital investment and exports. In recent years these countries together with Japan have accounted

for the lion's share of the growth of industrial production and export in the capitalist world. A redistribution of the gold reserves has taken place in favor of Europe and to the detriment of the United States. Small wonder, therefore, that having recovered from the aftermath of the war and the immediate postwar years, the West European, and primarily the West German, monopolies began to compete with the overseas monopolies.

This point was examined in a paper sent to the conference by J. Budish, as American economist. The essence of the Budish argument is as follows. Having made the cold war the pillar of their expansionist grand design, the United States monopolists naturally desired to bring about a combination of the monopolistic combines of all imperialist countries, including those of the Common Market, into one Holy Alliance against progressive ideas at home and the socialist sector of the world. From that point of view, such a combination of the monopolies of the six countries of the Common Market appealed to the U.S. monopolies as a desired development. On the other hand, the Common Market carried with it a definite threat that it might develop into another center of industrial and economic power, rivaling that of the United States, and limiting its expansion opportunities and markets.

For the monopoly combines of the six West European countries the Common Market, on the one hand, was a means of shaking off U.S. economic hegemony and strengthening their competitive position vis-a-vis the United States, no less than a means of combating labor and socialism. The effect of the insoluble contradiction of European imperialism left an opening for U.S. imperialism to exert pressure on the Common Market monopolists to modify their policy to an extent that the United States could continue to maintain relatively stronger positions in the European markets.

All such mutual concessions on the part of the U.S. and the rival monopolies of the Common Market, made grudgingly, are of a temporary nature and subject to the shifts in the balance of power which are inevitable under the law of the uneven development of capitalist countries.

U.S. state-monopoly capitalism, according to Budish, sought a way out of this insoluble contradiction, first in the export of capital to Western Europe, establishing there branch plants which would have access duty free to the Common Market area. The other remedy sought by the Kennedy Administration is an agreement between the United States and the European Economic Community for a mutual reduction of tariffs. But that would at best merely mitigate the effects of the Common Market tariff wall. It would not eliminate it.

To fail to see the possibility and the existence of sharp contradictions between the monopolies of the Common Market and the USA and to regard the European monopolies as merely a subsidiary of the latter, said E. Sereni, would mean seriously to underestimate the profoundity of the old and new contradictions eroding the stability of the capitalist camp.

The striving of the West European bourgeoisie to become independent of the United States, said T. Timofeyev (USSR), has its limits. The U.S. and, let us say, the French monopolies have common class interests. The latter recognize U.S. leadership on the major issues of the struggle against socialism. But at the same time the changes in the balance of forces between the USA and the EEC are indisputable. Take the formation of the Paris-Bonn axis as opposed to the Anglo-Saxon bloc.

Timofeyev expressed the view that it would be wrong to take 1938, a crisis year, as the starting point in assessing the present positions of the USA in the capitalist economy; to do so would give a blurred picture, because it would exaggerate the economic might of the USA. It would be more correct to take 1929, i.e., when the capitalist economy reached peak in the inter-war years. Such a comparison would confirm the conclusion that the economic positions of the USA have been weakened. Of course, the scale of this weakening should not be exaggerated. The United States is still the leading force of the imperialist camp. But, having passed its zenith, it has entered the stage of decline. The leading position of the United States is no longer absolute, weakened as it is in the inter-imperialist struggle against Western Europe and Japan.

This point was discussed by I. Yonehara (Japan) who mentioned other aspects of it. Although the share of the United States in the industrial production and foreign trade of the capitalist world has substantially declined and is now close to the 1929 level, he said, one should bear in mind that the export of capital from the United States has largely increased compared with that time. Nor should one forget that the financial power of U.S. imperialism deriving from its monopoly of raw material resources has also in-

creased compared with 1929. In the present international situation when the contradictions between socialism and imperialism outweigh those between the imperialist countries, the leading position of the USA in the capitalist world has remained unchanged both politically and militarily. But I would stress, the speaker went on, that economically, too, its leading position has not changed.

I do not deny, continued Yonehara, that in recent years the positions of the United States have weakened and that the internal contradictions in the capitalist camp have grown sharper. But it is necessary clearly to visualize the character of these contradictions and the degree of their sharpness. Our task is to pin-point the specific forms in which the law of uneven development under capitalism operates today. The importance of doing this is all the greater, especially if we grant that such a form of its manifestation as an inter-imperialist war is hardly likely. Here we should emphasize that the political, military and economic alliance of the imperialist powers is a form of the stronger imperialist countries subordinating the weaker.

The problem of the political leadership of and the economic weight carried by the United States in the capitalist world was examined by other speakers. Most expressed the view that the absolute might of U.S. imperialism surpassed that of any of the West European countries and also that of the prewar United States itself. The reactionary role played by this country has likewise grown considerably. This is indisputable. But also indisputable is another aspect of the problem—the weakening of the positions of U.S. imperialism in the past 10 years both as compared with the might of the socialist world system and in the competitive struggle on the capitalist market.

J. Schmidt (GDR) pointed to the dialectical interaction of politics and economics in connection with this problem.

"When Washington," he said, "exerted pressure on Britain to do something about joining the European Economic Community, U.S. Treasury Secretary Douglas Dillon stated in a press interview that the United States favored Britain's joining and the resultant strengthening of the EEC *even if this were to the detriment of the U.S. economy.*

"This statement by a member of the U.S. government," Schmidt went on to say, "illustrates what we understand by the priority of politics over economics in this third stage of the general crisis of capitalism: the fact that in certain circumstances the finance oligarchy, put on the defensive by the growing strength of the socialist world system, acts from the standpoint of the entire imperialist system of profits even when to do so runs counter to the particular interests of individual monopolies in the matter of obtaining profits."

3.

The entry of imperialism into the phase of decline and doom poses the question of its very existence as a system. In the effort to "save" moribund capitalism, to prolong the life of capitalism and its own rule over society, the finance oligarchy is bent on arresting the world revolutionary process at all costs, counterposing to it a combined front of the monopolies, the militarists and other reactionaries. "One result of the success of socialism in the competition between the two systems," said A. Mileikovsky, "is that the class solidarity of the bourgeoisie has grown. The imperialists are trying to create a kind of free masonry with which to combat socialism." "Little Europe" is envisaged as a new form of the class solidarity of the bourgeoisie summoned to life by the new problems which imperialism has encountered. "European integration is an attempt by the monopolies to save the capitalist system," said B. Zacharescu (Rumania).

It is not fortuitous that the first attempts to create a "united Europe" were along military and political lines the pivot of which was, and is, the aggressive NATO bloc. Nor is it fortuitous that the Common Market itself bears the distinct imprint of militarism, to which G. Ehler, L. Lemin and others pointed.

Our analysis would be one-sided, said G. Ehler, were we to discuss only the economic efforts of the West European imperialists in general and German imperialism in particular. West German imperialism is using the EEC and other integration agreements as a springboard from which to attain its military and political aims. The speaker recalled that way back in 1952 Adenauer declared in the Bundestag: "We shall be able to recover Berlin and the German East only through a united Europe."

German imperialism, said Ehler, has used every phase of the West European integration to increase its military power to the maximum.

The reactionary political bias of the common Market is evident not only in regard to the socialist states but also to the economically backward countries. The economic and political interests of the imperialist powers are closely intertwined in this direction.

It is indisputable, said Tim Buck (Canada), that the imperialists will strive to preserve their dominant positions in the economies of the newly-independent countries and to secure domination in some in which they did not have if before. Integration is one of the main forms in which monopoly capital penetrates into the economies of newly-independent countries. The internationalization of important sectors of the production of such countries, in what is casuistically termed "partnership with foreign capital," is one of the main threats to their national independence.

Eurafrica, for example, speakers emphasized, is a new form of colonialism, collective colonialism, an attempt to keep the newly-independent countries in economic bondage and to bind them to the political associations of the imperialists.

The policy of monopoly integration also threatens the national independence of some of the European countries. This point was made by K. Oesterling (Denmark): "The growing economic subjugation of Denmark by the big monopolies of Western Europe will, doubtlessly, lead to closer political relations with the Common Market countries and thus to its further political subordination. De facto, if not de jure, this in all probability will signify the end of Denmark's national sovereignty and result in the country's loss of independence although nominally it will preserve the independence of its national institutions such as Parliament, government, etc. . . ."

Denmark, Oesterling went on, occupies an important strategic position, the significance of which is emphasized by the existence of a joint Danish-West German military command. Denmark's entry into the Common Market signifies a new threat to its security and to peace.

The complex of antagonisms, which have either been intensified or engendered by the integration, include a sharpening of class struggle in the economic and political fields.

"The more the EEC develops and the more the economy becomes militarized," stressed G. Ehler, "the fiercer the attacks of the monopolies on wages, salaries and social gains, and the greater the efforts on their part to shift the burden of the growing competitive struggle

A NEW FORM OF CLASS SOLIDARITY OF THE BOURGEOISIE

and militarization onto the working people." This aspect, mentioned by T. Watanabe (Japan), E. Tuominen (Finland), J. Gomez (Spain) and V. Lyubimova (USSR), is the most attractive for the monopolies of the countries which still remain outside the Community but which are closely following the struggle between labor and capital in the EEC.

The promise of improved conditions for the peasants contained in the Treaty of Rome, said T. Vladigerov (Bulgaria) and V. Martynov (USSR), has proved to be a bluff.

Examining the effects of the integration on the peasants in Western Europe, Vladigerov made the following points:

1. Integration is an important lever for strengthening the big capitalist farms at the expense of small and medium peasant households, for intensifying exploitation.

2. The interlinking of the big banks and the monopolies with agrarian capital and landed property is fraught with grave consequences for the peasants and other small producers. Extending its links with large-scale farming through the intertwining of basic capital and landed property, monopoly capitalism deepens not only the contradiction between labor and capital but also that between big and small producers.

3. In this process the class character of the state-monopoly measures in agriculture taken by the Common Market stands out in ever bolder relief.

4. In the light of this most of the provisions of the Treaty of Rome have become a myth despite the fact that the integration as an international organization of the finance oligarchy is a reality.

The political effect of the monopoly integration, said G. Ehler, H. Claude and E. Sereni, is evident in restrictions on democracy and in the increased role of the so-called supranational bodies—the men of the big monopolies decide things in the backrooms without undue publicity.

The monopoly integration is designed, to restrict and emasculate the functions of the institutions of representative democracy in the particular countries and even to deprive these countries of some of their basic prerogatives, said E. Peggio (Italy). In West Germany and France the parliamentary sys-

tem has been virtually replaced by authoritarian power. In other countries the right of the parliaments to decide basic issues is challenged by the decisions taken by these parliaments to carry through European economic integration. In Italy, for example, the Confederation of Industrialists claims that the program of anti-monopoly economic development runs counter to the Common Market treaty and is incompatible with economic integration. The supra-national bodies supervising this process are not subject to democratic control and act as the direct spokesmen for the big finance groups and government bodies which are ruled more by the monopolies than by democratic institutions.

The facts show that the monopoly integration is fraught with grave economic and political consequences for many sections of the working class, the urban middle sections and small and even middle bourgeoisie.

4.

In their struggle against the Common Market the Communists, speakers emphasized, do not confine themselves merely to exposing its negative aspects. The working class and the Communist parties advance their own alternative to the imperialist integration. Proceeding from the experience of their countries, speakers described the lines along which this alternative is being worked out.

The French Communist Party, said H. Claude, combines the internal struggle for democracy with the struggle against the Common Market, railying all the social groups affected by the anti-national policy of big capital — the working class, working peasants, the middle sections, the small and middle bourgeoisie. It has advanced the task of ending the Gaullist regime and the dictatorship of the monopolies and of establishing genuine democracy which has never yet existed in France, a democracy for the people and not for the finance oligarchy, a democracy the basis of which will be nationalization of the monopolies. This democracy will be a stage on the road to a higher democracy, socialist democracy; for France it will signify a decisive break with the past and present and will open wide the door to the future. The establishment of genuine democracy in France and in the other West European countries will usher in the perspective of a Europe fully liberated from the dictatorship of monopoly capital.

E. Peggio pointed to some of the aspects of the struggle for democracy in the new conditions, conditions characterized by the existence of the so-called supra-national bodies. The aim of the working-class struggle in each country, he said, should be to uphold and extend democracy and abolish any political discrimination in the bodies guiding the process of integration. It is impossible to tolerate the situation, for example, when the Italian Parliament in appointing its representatives to these bodies bars Communist deputies and senators, despite the fact that the Communist Party has some 200 members of Parliament, i.e., many times more than the Social Democratic, Republican or Liberal parties which, nevertheless, are represented in the Common Market bodies. It is also necessary to carry out a resolute struggle for the right of the national parliaments to be kept informed of the decisions and functioning of the supra-national bodies in charge of the Common Market and to be able to debate these decisions.

The resistance to the anti-national decisions adopted by the EEC "supreme bodies," the speakers pointed out, can become a powerful weapon for rallying the sound forces of the nations in the struggle against the "Europe of the trusts."

An important aspect of the struggle against the imperialist integration, it was pointed out, is the fight to prevent territorial expansion of the Common Market. Thus, monopoly capital in Spain, said J. Gomez, is anxious to integrate with the Common Market because it fears a democratic revolution in the country, even though it is in an extremely unfavorable position vis-a-vis the powerful international trusts

A DEMOCRATIC ALTERNATIVE TO MONOPOLY INTEGRATION—FOR COORDINATING THE ACTIONS OF THE WORKING PEOPLE ON AN INTERNATIONAL SCALE

dominating the EEC. Similarly, other speakers emphasized, the entry into the EEC of neutral Sweden, Austria and Switzerland would undermine and discredit their neutrality.

The question of Britain's joining the Market has become a kind of stepping-stone in the struggle between the progressive and reactionary forces in Europe and elsewhere. The point is, stressed Oesterling, that in the event of the efforts to keep Britain out being successful, this would basically change the situation

in a number of the smaller countries, Denmark in particular, in favor of the forces that are against these countries joining the EEC. There is hardly any need to say that U.S. imperialism's designs with regard to the Common Market are decisively linked with Britain's joining, hence a blow here against the imperialist integration would have far-reaching consequences for the entire complex of imperialist relationships.

The progressive forces in the countries which have not yet been drawn into the Common Market are faced with specific tasks. "It is necessary," said Oesterling, "to have a program which would unite the movement. Refusal to join the Market cannot be the sole basis of this program. After all, refusal to join is but a rejection of the wrong way. And for the movement to advance it is necessary to have a positive long-range program, a democratic alternative which could lead to a further uniting of forces." For many countries, including a small country like Denmark, the call for an active and independent foreign trade policy shows a concrete way of combating the Common Market, he said.

In this connection the initiative displayed by the Soviet government and the Council for Mutual Economic Aid in calling for an International Trade Conference and for an International Trading Organization was highly appraised. The speakers stressed the constructive thesis advanced by Khruschov concerning the possibility of economic cooperation and peaceful economic competition between the economic associations of states with differing social systems. "The significance of these proposals," said E. Sereni, "seems obvious to me both theoretically and in the sense of practical aims." Interesting points in this respect were made by D. Sokolow who examined the present state of the economic relations between the member countries of the Council for Mutual Aid and the European Economic Community and the prospects for the future.

Others in varying ways suggested that every effort should be made to secure the widest publicity for these proposals and their early realization.

Speakers pointed to the need for a variety of forms and methods of struggle against the monopoly integration and its consequences, and stressed that in the new situation there were good opportunities for action by the working class and its allies. Thus, S. Aaronovitch pointed to the need to draw a distinction between associations of monopolies and agreements between governments. Monopoly association and penetration proceed continually and under cover, concealed from public view. But government agreements often have to be made before the entire body of public opinion. Such agreements may require parliamentary ratification, for example, and this can lead to a wide debate. In such circumstances the role of the class struggle, the ability to bring democratic institutions into play may decide the fate of such agreements. This can apply not only to economic agreements as on tariffs, for example, but also on questions of the future of West Berlin, the re-arming of West Germany, etc. We can envisage political explosions that can divide the Common Market countries right down the middle, concluded Aaronovitch.

The objective conditions in the various countries give rise, naturally, to different tactical slogans against the plotting of the trusts. But, speakers emphasized, if these distinctions and their objective conditioning are mentioned at all, this is done not in order to make them absolute or to exaggerate what is specific to the particular country, but in order to provide a better understanding of the conditions in which the national units of the working class are carrying on the fight, of how they find effective and more expedient forms of the struggle in keeping with the interests of the international working-class movement as a whole.

"The struggle against the monopolies and their economic integration," said E. Peggio, "cannot develop only within the national framework, hence the working-class alternative to the Common Market should have an international character."

The employers in many Common Market countries, speakers pointed out, are seeking to even out standards of living in the respective countries by adapting them to the lowest level. This tendency should be vigorously combated and the gains won by the working people in some countries extended to the others. In connection with the migration of workers from one Common Market country to another, said E. Ambartsumov (*World Marxist Review*), the struggle for the interests of the West European working class as a whole comes to the forefront. So far no "Western Europe of the working class" has been counterposed to the "Western Europe of the trusts." Working-class actions on a national scale are already eroding the capitalist system, and one can easily imagine the immense power of actions by the West European proletariat as a whole or of its various sections. The slogan of Marx and Engels — "Workers

of all lands, unite!"—acquires particular urgency and power.

The trade unions and international trade union solidarity can play a particularly important part in working out a democratic alternative to the Common Market, in elaborating new, more effective methods of the struggle, said Ambartsumov.

In the fight for democracy in the Common Market bodies (just as in any other fight which will take place inside the Community), said P. Joye, we should stress the importance of united action by the working class and, above all, by the trade unions, including those affiliated to the different international federations. We Belgians are extremely sensitive on this question because in our country not only the Communists but also many Socialists—active trade unionists—realize the importance of labor acting in a united way in the "Europe of the trusts" against the monopolies and the employers' organizations which have agreed to coordinate their actions. The fact that our most influential trade union body—the General Federation of Labor—is affiliated to the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions does not mean that it does not include genuine trade unions engaged in the class struggle. And more than once prominent trade unionists (Left Socialists with great prestige) have called for closer relations between all the trade union bodies in the Common Market countries, including the general confederations of labor in France and Italy. Of course, big difficulties will have to be overcome, but this does not mean that they are insurmountable.

This idea was taken up by E. Peggio, who said: "Trade union actions merging with the general struggle against the monopolies and for extending democrary, can bridge the gulf between the various national and international trade union bodies. But the coordination of working-class action spearheaded against the monopoly economic integration cannot be confined solely to trade union activity. This coordination should embrace also the political sphere, hence it necessitates closer contact between the Communist parties of the integrating countries. In my view," said Peggio, "we should work to achieve a permanent political coordination of working-class struggle against monopoly integration."

International working-class unity is the main but not the sole force which can be counterposed to the "Europe of the trusts." International unity of the working class, said Oesterling, is needed as the basis for international anti-monopoly unity. It is necessary to take into account all the contradictions engendered by the integration, including inter-monopoly contradictions. This presupposes solutions that will make it possible to prosecute the struggle against the Common Market by uniting all the forces opposed to it, and which will signify a step towards the ultimate solution — international socialist cooperation.

D. Sokolow expressed this idea as follows: "Rallying the masses to prevent the economic integration from being used against the interests of progress and peace, to place it in the service of society as a whole, the working class will find the ways and means of winning over also the middle sections to the side of progress and democracy, thereby contributing to the political isolation of monopoly capital."

It is above all the working class, speakers emphasized, that is in the van against imperialist exploitation, against the aggressive foreign policy and reactionary home policy of monopoly integration in its West European variant. However, the changes taking place in the structure and forms of capitalism are steadily modifying the conditions of this struggle. And so the third part of the exchange of views examined the conditions and struggle of the working class in the developed capitalist countries.

3. THE POSITION AND STRUGGLE OF THE WORKING CLASS

THEORY. NEW PHENOMENA. PERSPECTIVES.

SPEAKERS were unanimous in saying that at the present stage of the general crisis of capitalism a correct assessment of the position and the struggle of the working class is possible only in the light of the influence exerted by the socialist camp on the internal processes in capitalist society.

The main content of our epoch is the transition from capitalism to socialism in the process of which the socialist system is emerging as the decisive factor of social development. Hence in studying the present position of the working class in the capitalist countries it is not enough to analyze the laws governing the

capitalist mode of production. It is necessary to take into account the growing impact of world socialism on the minds of the masses in the capitalist world, on the development of the class struggle and its results and, finally, on the position of the working people.

1.

It goes without saying that the influence exerted by world socialism does not and cannot alter the nature of capitalism or its economic laws. As the speakers emphasized, the general law of capitalist accumulation and the concomitant deterioration of the conditions of the proletariat still operates. But Marx in his time foresaw the possibility of the laws of capitalism being modified under the influence, among other things, of the class struggle waged by the proletariat. In our time, when the balance of forces between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat has radically changed and the tide is ebbing for the exploiting classes both on a world scale and in the separate capitalist countries, the significance of these modifying circumstances vastly increases. The democratic and socialist struggle of the working class and the working masses generally, as E. Sereni stressed in his contribution, also represented today an important objective factor determining the concrete manifestation of the laws of capitalism.

"No Marxist of course can doubt," he said, "that the blind laws of capitalism generally and state-monopoly capitalism in particular tend toward the plunder of the masses, toward augmenting super-profits and intensifying the domination of the big monopoly groups. But if we proceed exclusively from this very general and perfectly valid premise we shall not, I fear, be able to advance a single step along the road to realistic and effective struggle against such domination."

Recognizing the change in the balance of world forces in favor of socialism and the narrowing of the sphere of operation of the laws of capitalism, the revisionists aver that this automatically and inexorably leads to a change in the nature of the capitalist system, to its steady and peaceful evolution towards socialism. The Right-wing Social Democrats and the revisionists often point to the gains won by the working class in an attempt to prove that the capitalist system in the Western countries is gradually being transformed into something resembling socialism, that the capitalist state is becoming a "welfare state." "It is here that the dividing line between revolutionary Marxist and all manner of apologists of 'neo-capitalism' can be drawn," observed T. Timofeyev. "The revisionists and the reformists depict the concessions wrested from the monopolists as an inherent product of modern capitalism. For Marxist-Leninists, who judge by the facts, it is obvious that the employers are promoted not by a mythical 'good will,' but that their concessions are primarily the result of pressure from without, of the intensified class struggle and the capitalists' fear of revolution. But being compulsory, concessions wrung from the capitalists in the social and economic sphere are not enduring: the working class is obliged to wage a determined struggle to prevent the monopolies from cancelling them out."

Imperialist spokesmen, expatiating on the subject of the "welfare state," assert that the Marxist-Leninist view on the growing exploitation of the working-class is no longer valid. "The method commonly used to 'prove' the alleged anachronism of this view," said T. Postolache (Rumania), "is that of a dual falsification: on the one hand, to falsify the facts, and, on the other, to distort in the crudest fashion the Marxist-Leninist theory on the conditions of the working class under capitalism. For example, the thesis that wages must continuously decline is attributed to Marxism-Leninism."

The dogmatic approach to this problem fares no better. The dogmatists, blind to the new factors that have emerged in the world revolutionary process, maintain that working-class conditions are steadily deteriorating, that there is a continuous process of absolute impoverishment, a decline in real wages, a steady downgrading of the workers, and that their living standard in the mid-20th century is lower than that of the 19th and even the 18th century. Such a conception, said H. Winston (USA), is a caricature of Marxism. It is obvious that such assertions can only disarm and demoralize the working class. By using arguments completely divorced from real life, by ignoring the facts and underestimating the growing impact of world socialism on the struggle of the proletariat and on the position of the bourgeoisie (which is doing everything in its power to stave off revolutionary action by the workers and to preserve capitalism), the dogmatists are causing the Communist movement grave harm. This explains why so much attention was paid by H. Winston, T. Postolache, T. Timofeyev, V. Lyubimova and other speakers to criticizing oversimplified interpretations of Marxist theory on this question.

"Marx, Engels and Lenin in many of their works objected to vulgarization and a primitive interpretation of the question of the absolute

worsening of the conditions of the working class," said V. Lyubimova. "Marx, when he discovered and formulated the economic laws governing the tendency for the conditions of the working class to grow worse under capitalism, pointed also to the opposite tendency engendered above all by the class struggle of the proletariat. In his critique of the draft of the Erfurt Social Democratic program, Engels objected to the formulation: 'the *poverty* of the proletarians . . . will constantly increase', and stressed that in such absolute terms this was incorrect. 'The organization of the workers and their mounting resistance may possibly raise a certain barrier to the *growth of poverty*', he wrote. 'But what in all probability will increase is the *insecurity of their existence.*'" Lyubimova also recalled an extremely significant remark by Lenin in this connection.

She said: "In his 'Remarks on the Committee's Draft Programme' (1902) Lenin, referring to the words 'growth of poverty of every description,' wrote that these words had been borrowed not quite aptly from his own draft. 'I did not speak about the *growth* of poverty,' he wrote. '"Poverty of every description" includes "absolute" poverty as well. The reference to the *poverty of the masses* should therefore be worded somewhat differently.'" In the course of the discussion, the speakers referred to Lenin's formulation of this problem as cited in the Program of the CPSU which states: "Crises and periods of industrial stagnation . . .are even more ruinous to small producers, they increase the dependence of wage-labor on capital and lead more rapidly to a relative, and sometimes an absolute, deterioration of the conditions of the working class."

T. Postolache, V. Lyubimova, I. Lemin and others stressed that unconditional and categorical denial of the possibility of a rising standard of living for the workers was tantamount to denying the development of the chief element of the productive forces in capitalist society, namely, the working class. It was, moreover, tantamount also to rejecting the law formulated by Lenin according to which as society develops, its requirements, including those of the workers, likewise grow. The requirements of the working class grow along with the growth of the social character of production, with the development of technology, science and culture, with a broadening of exchange on a national and international plane. That is why Marx pointed out that the value of labor power includes the value of the means of subsistence which are necessary for the maintenance of the worker and his family, as well as the socio-historical element — the cost of satisfying the needs of the worker and his family conditioned by his social environment.

That the capitalist mode of production, capitalist society which causes the growth of these demands, cannot satisfy them fully is another matter, speakers pointed out. But this does not refute the basic law governing the value of labor power.

Hence, to regard impoverishment as an undeviating process which takes place in all capitalist countries at all stages and in identical forms is alien to Marxism-Leninism. Modern capitalist reality offers any amount of evidence pointing to both the relative and absolute deterioration of the position of the working class. But, on the other hand, it also

AGAINST FALSIFICATION AND VULGARIZATION OF MARXISM
SOME TENDENCIES IN THE CHANGES IN THE VALUE OF LABOR POWER

testifies that the lowering of the living standard where it does occur, takes place unevenly, at different times in different countries, branches of industry, economic areas, and affects different sections of the working class. "If imperialist domination in the colonial and underdeveloped countries has led to the absolute increase in poverty and destitution in the literal sense, in the developed capitalist countries the worsening of the conditions of the working class is manifested in different forms" (T. Postolache).

"State-monopoly capitalism," H. Winston said, "at times makes concessions to labor because the highly-developed capitalist countries continue to exploit the underdeveloped nations and peoples, including colonial peoples newly-freed . . . The rise in real wages in the main capitalist countries after the war was to some degree conditioned by the stagnant and extremely low wages and misery of the peasants in the underdeveloped countries and the high rate of profits extracted from them."

In the postwar years fear of revolution combined with pressure from the working-class movement forced the bourgeoisie to make partial concessions in the matter of wages, social welfare and working conditions. While noting this, the speakers at the same time showed that the increase in real wages against the background of rising production and

profits was negligible, lagging far behind the greatly increased material and cultural needs of the working class. All this makes short shrift of the claims of the apologists of monopoly capitalism that capitalism has "changed," that it has experienced "regeneration," has become "democratic" and that some sort of "income revolution" has taken place.

There is an obvious gap, said Winston, between the volume of goods and services needed by the workers for the extended reproduction of their labor power under prevailing social and historical conditions and the wages actually paid to them at less than value. This gap can widen not only when real wages decline but when they remain at the same level.

It is a well known fact that the value of labor power is in inverse proportion to the productivity of labor in the production of consumer goods and services: the higher the productivity of labor the cheaper (other things being equal) they become, and this, consequently, leads to a decline in the value of labor power. On the other hand, the development of the productive forces is accompanied by an extension of the range of goods and services needed for the reproduction of labor power, i.e., an increase in the needs of the workers which must be satisfied, if only partially, for the labor power to measure up to the demands placed on it by the employers. For example, modern technology demands of the worker a level of general and special knowledge that was not needed, say, a century ago.

What is the net result of the operation of these opposing tendencies? This question, which is undoubtedly of both theoretical interest and practical value, was examined in detail. T. Postolache, V. Lyubimova, H. Winstion and other speakers dwelt on it.

Modern capitalist production, it was noted, is marked by an unparalleled intensification of the labor processes, with the monopolies devising the most ingenious systems of labor organization and wages to squeeze the maximum out of the workers. It is not by chance that speed-up is one of the most fiercely contested issues between the working class and monopoly capital. The intensification of labor increases the quantity of products needed to restore working capacity. But this is not all, since the main trend in the postwar years, especially with the advent of automation, has been an increasing drain on the *nervous energy* of the worker. In these circumstances, T. Postolache stressed, a number of new demands essential for the reproduction of labor power have arisen: longer paid vacations, increased appropriations for the health services, etc., and this also raises the value of labor power. "The problem of real and not only legislative reduction of working hours," said H. Jourdain (France), "is more urgent and pressing today than it was in the latter half of last century. Despite the fact that we are living in the nuclear age, the age of electronics and automation, monopoly capital fiercely resists these demands . . . A similar situation prevails in the United States as well, in spite of the fact that that country has about 10 million wholly or partially unemployed. Never before has the super-exploitation of the workers in the full sense reached such a level, never has it assumed such refined forms as under state-monopoly capitalism, and primarily in the big monopoly enterprises with high concentration of production and employing the latest technological devices. The moment the worker enters the factory gates he is at once caught up in the relentless machine of capitalist production and has hardly the time even to exchange a word with his fellow workers throughout the working-day."

The general conclusion reached was that the value of labor power had risen in the postwar primarily as a result of the intensification of labor.

As a sign of the indirect recognition of this fact by the ruling classes the speakers pointed to the steady rise in the so-called "standard" family budgets published in the capitalist countries. For example, the Heller Budget (USA) rose 20 per cent between 1953 and 1960, while the cost of living index increased only 11 per cent. Concerning the average wages, numerous examples were cited showing how the income of most workers in many countries fell short of these budgets, which included by no means all the requirements of the workers and their families. The widening gap between the value of labor power and real wages is one of the main indices pointing to the worsening conditions of the working class in the capitalist countries.

H. Jourdain, H. Winston and J. Eaton drew attention to the fact that with the decline in economic activity and the growing competition on the world capitalist market the monopolies in the United States, Britain, Federal Germany, France and other countries have been trying to launch a broad offensive on the living standards and the social gains of the working class. The main role in this respect has been assumed by the capitalist state, the faithful servant of monopoly capital. Representatives of the monopolies who hold key positions in the government interfere in labor relations in order to keep wages down.

Increasing interference by the monopoly tycoons who wield power is determined by objective internal factors corresponding to the present stage of monopoly capitalism. Labor relations under capitalism are also affected by the economic and political struggle of the working people, as well as by the pressure exerted by the advance of socialism. At the same time, it was pointed out, the latest offensive of the finance oligarchy is added confirmation that the social gains of the workers in the capitalist world are extremely unstable and that the workers are forced to wage a determined struggle not only to extend but to preserve them.

History shows that capitalism is incapable of guaranteeing full employment. This means that by no means every able-bodied man and woman receives wages. Capitalism dooms millions to complete or partial unemployment, and the cost of supporting them is borne directly or indirectly by the active army of labor, cutting into the income of the workers' families. Despite the innumerable pledges given by the capitalist politicians, unemployment (although less today than before the war) continues to affect large segments of the working class.

The technological revolution has opened boundless opportunities for harnessing the forces of Nature and perfecting methods of production. But, as was pointed out, under capitalism this leads to a further aggravation of the employment problem, thus demonstrating that the production relations of capitalist society have outlived their time. And the employment trends, strikingly manifested today in the United States, are liable in time to appear in other capitalist countries as well.

The worst victims of the unemployment are the middle-aged who cannot stand up to the pace of capitalist exploitation, and the youth just entering production. T. Postolache cited data of the International Labor Organization showing that unemployment among young people under 20 was as a rule twice as high as that for all workers. Winston spoke of the growing feeling of insecurity which haunts millions of families due to rising unemployment even amid boom conditions. The same idea was developed by Jourdain. In this period of intensive concentration of capital and monopoly integration on an international scale, he said, in the period of acute competition, the insecurity felt by the working people in the main capitalist countries of Western Europe is rising. This aspect of impoverishment takes the form mainly of the workers' fear of being unable to find a job, professional insecurity, fear of wage cuts.

Many speakers dwelt on the *conditions of the peasantry*, the chief ally of the working class in its struggle against the dictatorship of monopoly capital. V. Martynov, for example, spoke of the progress in agricultural production which has changed the conditions of the peasants and farmers in many respects. In the first place, a technological revolution in farm production has been or is being effected in the developed capitalist countries, a revolution which is breaking down the small property relationships in the countryside, greatly accelerating the capitalist development in agriculture and threatening the very existence of the small and middle peasants thus causing growing dissatisfaction among them. Secondly,

GROWING INSECURITY NEW STAGE OF MONOPOLY DOMINATION IN AGRICULTURE

the grip of monopoly capital on the countryside has tightened; it is penetrating farther and farther and in the most diverse forms into the sphere of agricultural production. The chief form of this penetration is the so-called "vertical integration," combining all or most of the elements of production and distribution (from planting the crop to its sale) under the control of the big monopolies. In a sense it can be said that the monopoly domination of agriculture has entered a new stage. A study of the modern methods of monopoly capital in agriculture should help the working class and the peasantry to find more effective forms of combating the monopolies and to advance slogans on the peasant question which would better reflect the specific features of the present situation.

The growth of the monopolies as a result of the concentration and centralization of production and capital and the development of state-monopoly capitalism, the arms race, the social and economic consequences of the technological revolution and of the integration — all are factors which tend to worsen the condition of the working people. But at the same time favorable international and internal conditions have been created for the masses to fight for their vital interests.

2.

The international working class and the socialist world system which it has brought

into being are now in a position to dictate their own terms (peaceful coexistence, peaceful economic competition of the two systems) to their class adversary on the international arena, terms which are in the interests of the working people. At the same time, the new balance of world forces cannot but affect the forms of the basic antagonism of capitalist society, namely, the struggle between labor and capital, both in the course of the daily struggles of the workers for their economic and social demands and in periods of mass revolutionary action.

As T. Timofeyev put it, clarity on the question of the consequences of this radical change in the correlation of class forces in favor of socialism is "a key issue in contemporary world economics and politics, in the strategy and tactics of the working-class movement." Stressing the importance of the thesis that world socialism has become the decisive factor in social development, speakers spoke about the need for a profound and thorough analysis of the way in which the socialist camp influences the processes now taking place in the non-socialist world and of the effects of this influence.

This influence does not obviate the need for class struggle in the capitalist countries, it merely extends its scope and augments the forces of the revolutionary working class movement.

The question as to what should be the principal demand advanced by the working class in the struggle for its immediate interests evoked a lively discussion.

In the present situation, said H. Jourdain, higher wages is the paramount demand. Housing, education, vocational training, rest, recreation, culture, etc., are undoubtedly important, he said. But for these things the worker must have enough wages. A high cost of living is typical of present-day capitalism, and the purchasing power of the masses is caught between the low level of real wages and the soaring prices. Hence the worker has to work harder and longer to make ends meet.

S. Aaronovitch, who agreed with Jourdain, observed that in Britain, where there is a considerable underemployment of productive capacity and where the prospects for 1963 are of a further downturn in capital investment, the fight for higher wages and salaries, the struggle for expanding popular consumption is closely bound up with the fight for full employment. In Britain all but the monopolists are interested in maintaining full employment, and in the circumstances of today this is a class, national and democratic demand. It is more vital than ever, he said, to connect it with overall state policy and direction.

H. Winston spoke of the concessions which the workers have won since the war even from the big monopoly concerns—concessions, one might add, which are being steadily reduced to nought by the rise in taxation and the inflation caused by the cold-war policy and the arms race. In order to be able to compete with their European rivals, now organized in the Common Market, and especially Federal Germany, the U.S. monopolies are attacking wages, thus sharpening the antagonism between labor and capital. But the most destructive by-product of capitalism in the United States today, Winston said, is unemployment, which remains higher after each crisis. Even the executive council of the AFL-CIO at its meeting in August decided to launch a drive for the 35-hour week as the only remedy for the chronic unemployment. The administration has battled fiercely against labor's growing insistence that a 35-hour week be legalized, and the Secretary of Labor threatened that the administration would fight any attempt by labor to work for this much-needed reduction of hours.

There is growing recognition among the workers, Winston said, that the cold war policy of monopoly capital and the Kennedy administration is inimical to their real interests and the interests of the vast majority of the people.

P. Joye said that in his opinion there was no need to argue about what should come first —wages or other economic demands. As a matter of fact, the demand of the worker is for a better life, and for this he must have decent wages. Hence it is necessary to fight for higher wages. "But this does not mean," he went on, "that under certain circumstances other demands cannot become a strong rallying force especially in the developed capitalist countries. It is the development of the capitalist society—intensified exploitation, on the one hand, and the workers' consciousness of their own strength, on the other—that gives rise to new demands and new requirements, so that the desire for a better life is expressed in a number of demands which cannot be satisfied merely by wage increases."

To illustrate his point, P. Joye cited examples showing how the Belgian workers in the post-war years have fought for demands not directly connected with wages (the big strikes of 1956 for a 45-hour working week, the metalworkers' strike in 1959 for higher pay for holidays, etc.). Particularly interesting, he said, was the experience gained in the general strike in the winter of 1960-61 in which about a million took

part. The government measures which sparked off the strike by no means affected the interests of all the workers. The majority rallied to the struggle because they saw the strike as the only means of combating the reactionary course taken by the government. Moreover, the most powerful and active strike action occurred in areas where wages were highest. From this we can conclude, Joye stressed, that the most highly skilled and best paid workers are not necessarily the least militant.

The same point was made by other speakers. "The partial victories won by the working class do not lessen the intensity of its struggle," said T. Postolache. "Experience shows that nowadays success is the point of departure for new class actions and that as often as not the better-paid workers are the most active in these actions."

A thorough survey of the subject was made by E. Sereni. The socialization of labor under capitalism, he said, inevitably raises the economic and political struggle of the working masses to a level at which that struggle can no longer be limited to a struggle for higher wages but must embrace the sphere of state investments, finance, trade and economic policy generally. These are questions which the working class cannot afford to disregard, otherwise they will be decided to the detriment of its interests through the blind operation of the laws of imperialism.

Modern capitalism, speakers noted, is developing as state-monopoly capitalism and is imparting new features to the class contradictions and the class struggle. State interference in the relations between labor and capital in favor of the latter has sharply increased. "The working class is being confronted more and more often not only with the individual capitalists but with the capitalist state, its police, and its bureaucratic machine," said V. Lyubimova. "In their wage struggle the workers are constantly coming into conflict with the capitalist state since wage controls exist directly or indirectly in most countries."

The capitalist state, observed H. Jourdain, has always helped the capitalists to resist wage demands, but at present it is the policy for the government to take the regulation of wages completely into its own hands. The Prime Minister himself decides whether wages need to be raised, whether they can be raised and if so, to what extent. The close interweaving of politics and economics which is to be observed in the conditions of the Common Market, said Jourdain, explains why any struggle waged by the working class today assumes a definite political character,

The workers come up against the machinery of state in the sphere of social welfare, taxation, the trade unions, collective bargaining, etc. During strikes, demonstrations, and meetings they clash with the police, and sometimes with the military machine of the capitalist state. As a result, the *economic struggle is developing* more and more *into the political struggle.*

Speakers also drew attention to another aspect of the link between struggle for immediate demands and political struggle. In many countries the capitalist state, which is a big property owner serving the interests of the private monopolies, introduces rigorous "efficiency" methods in the nationalized enterprises, communications services, and in some branches of the state and administrative apparatus. Here the resistance of the workers is directed against the measures taken by the state as such.

THE PRINCIPAL DEMAND IN THE ECONOMIC STRUGGLE OF THE WORKING CLASS THE ECONOMIC STRUGGLE DEVELOPS INTO POLITICAL STRUGGLE

Class contradictions, which today take the form of contradictions between the workers and the combined forces of the monopolies and the state, are manifiested on a wider scale and in sharper forms, striking harder than ever at the foundations of capitalism.

On the other hand, the activity of monopoly capital and the state subordinated to it is inimical to the interests not only of the workers but of the masses generally, and this is an objective basis for uniting the efforts of the progressive elements of the nation in a joint democratic, anti-monopoly struggle.

Fearing the advance of the popular masses toward peace, democracy and socialism, the finance oligarchy has taken the path of forming international economic blocs.

One of the objects of the European Economic Community, where the Bonn militarists play the main role, is joint defense of the interests of monopoly capital of the Six against the anti-monopoly, democratic movement headed by the working class. As V. Cheprakov (USSR) pointed out, these blocs merely extend the area of the struggle against monopoly capitalism; they involve in this struggle the population of the few "quiet places" still left in the world, and ever bigger sections of the working class

and peasantry, the small and middle bourgeoisie. But since many matters affecting the vital interests of the non-monopoly strata (wages and social benefits, prices of farm products, the fate of industry in some places, etc.) come under the jurisdiction of the "supranational" bodies (e.g., the Council of Ministers and the Commission of the EEC), state-monopoly capitalism itself objectively confronts the masses with the task of resolving these issues at the international level, through political struggle, both national and international.

Now that socialism is becoming the decisive factor of world development, and with the gulf between the finance oligarchy and the main population groups widening, real opportunities are created for the latter to unite in a single anti-monopoly front. The growing influence of the Communist parties and the ideological bankruptcy of reformism provide a solid basis for realizing these opportunities. Aaronovitch, Eaton, Sereni, Joye, Winston, Postolache, Timofeyev, Lyubimova and Martynov spoke about the various aspects of the democratic program which the Communists are advancing in the struggle against the monopolies for general democratic objectives.

PLATFORM OF THE ANTI-MONOPOLY STRUGGLE FOR UNITY OF THE WORKING CLASS AND ALL DEMOCRATIC FORCES

"There are many issues on which there is great dissatisfaction," said J. Eaton, "and millions in Britain feel the need for what we here call an 'anti-monopoly democratic alternative' though these are not the terms in which they express this need to themselves and, in particular, many are not clear that the monopolies are the main target to be attacked. But such a program is in accordance with the aspirations of the masses of the people in Britain."

Agreeing with the previous speaker, E. Sereni observed that at the initial stages of this struggle for the democratic alternative, its anti-capitalist, socialist objectives will not of course be clearly perceived by everyone. It can and will be joined by millions of working people in whose minds the need for such struggle is associated only with combating the immediate and daily results of the policy of state-monopoly capital. "But the weight of state-monopoly capitalism in the structure of modern capitalism is already so great that in the course of the struggle the anti-monopoly consciousness of the masses is bound to grow into anti-capitalist consciousness; into the pattern of their democratic struggle new, socialist motifs will be interwoven, and the question of the conquest of power by the working class will then come to the fore."

Can this alternative be realized within a monopoly capitalist society? Certainly substantial reforms can be won, J. Eaton said. "We fully agree," he stressed, "that the existence of the socialist world system has created new conditions which make it possible to achieve through working-class struggle in the capitalist countries results which go beyond the scope of ordinary reforms."

"In the new situation," said T. Postolache, "the working class in many countries can compel the bourgeoisie, even before capitalism is overthrown, to introduce measures which, going beyond the scope of ordinary reforms, are vitally essential both to the working class and its struggle for the triumph of the revolution, for socialism, and to the great majority of the population. One result of these possible reforms would be a higher standard of living. General and complete disarmament with its tremendous social and economic possibilities, nationalization of extensive sectors of industry and democratic management, agrarian and fiscal anti-monopoly reforms, substantial increases in state allocations for the social services—all these can now be realized although under capitalism it is not easy to do so." But this, Postolache stressed, would not change the essence of capitalism, and the possibility of securing better conditions for the working class would continue to be restricted by the value of labor power, and such things as crises, unemployment, etc. The general democratic struggle of the masses is part and parcel of the fight for socialism. A radical improvement in the life of the people can be achieved only by abolishing the political and economic power of the bourgeoisie.

All the issues of social progress, said J. Eaton, are related to the "democratic alternative." But the military expenditure of the imperialist states places a heavy burden on the working sections of the population and this is true of Britain as well. Hence peace and disarmament is clearly the central plank of the "democratic alternative." Working for peace, Eaton stressed, is working for man's future. To carry the fight against war to its logical conclusion means abolishing the foundations of class society, since, as all history shows, war is the direct outcome of the division of society into classes. "Obviously to win successes in such a fight is not easy," Eaton said.

"But if such successes are won, who could say that Britain, or indeed the world would be the same place afterwards?" Eaton stressed the important role which broad economic relations between countries with differing social systems could play in consolidating peace.

In a written contribution, J. M. Budish stated: "It is the task of all progressives in the United States to unite in a powerful anti-monopoly alliance with a view to bringing about the necessary drastic change in government policies, to replace the cold war by a policy of coexistence, to use fiscal and monetary policies to enable poor farmers to maintain themselves on the land, to shorten the working hours and supply jobs to the unemployed, to nationalize such industries as have proved themselves incapable of maintaining production at a reasonable rate of capacity, to divert the greater part of the vast expenditures on piling up useless arms for the expansion of social security and necessary public services such as education, health and sanitation, housing, etc. This program can serve as a firm foundation for an anti-monopoly alliance of the whole people, and provide a real solution of the problems confronting the nation."

"The Communist Party of Great Britain," said S. Aaronovitch, "has recently put forward for discussion a 10-point anti-monopoly program. It calls not only for an extension of nationalization but also for the dismantling of certain types of monopolies."

In advancing their programs, it was emphasized, the Communists do not make their plans dependent on economic crises. They know that it is necessary to fight effectively for the workers' rights at all phases of the capitalist cycle. Speakers cited examples showing how the working-class movement in a number of countries had won successes at times of relative economic prosperity; moreover the influence of the Communists had grown.

In this connection P. Joye dwelt on the question of the inter-relation between the struggle for a better life for the working people and the peaceful transition to socialism. He voiced the opinion that in those countries of Western Europe with old democratic traditions and where the working class is well organized one can visualize the prospect of a peaceful transition to socialism with the support of the vast majority of the population, provided, he said, the reactionaries did not resort to fascism. The peaceful way would make it easier to effect social changes that would enable the working people of these countries to enjoy the fruits of technological progress.

A worsening of the position of the working people, said P. Joye, is by no means a precondition for the transition to socialism. That, he declared, will be the end result of the growing struggle of the working class which will have an increasingly bigger role to play in managing the affairs of the country. As they gain more victories the working people will advance new demands, encountering resistance on the part of the monopolies and restricted by the boundaries raised by the capitalist system, for capitalism has limited possibilities of developing production and can offer the people less than socialism can. The comparisons which the working people are bound to make between the two social systems and their potentialities will be decisive. And the more people learn from their own experience to appreciate the advantages of socialism, he said, the more resolutely they will fight for it.

The unity of the working class, unity of all the forces of the anti-monopoly movement on a national and international scale is imperative for the success of the struggle for the immediate and ultimate goals of the working class, for realizing the democratic alternative. This idea was expressed in many of the contributions.

Stressing the importance of overcoming the split in the working-class movement, speakers drew attention to the fact that in order to isolate monopoly capital it is essential to strengthen the international unity of the working people, for this is the foundation on which the international unity of all the anti-monopoly forces rests. The merging of the various groups of state-monopoly capital on an international scale, H. Jourdain pointed out, necessitates closer coordination of the struggle of the international working-class movement. Inasmuch as the monopolies are striving for domination in all spheres, he continued, it is important to give the most serious attention to raising the level of ideological, political and economic struggle in the enterprises and wherever the masses of the working class are concentrated. The fight against monopoly capital must be waged simultaneously from "above" and from "below."

This idea—the need to intensify the struggle against monopoly capital—was the keynote of all the contributions. It is only in struggle that the working-class movement can benefit from the opportunities now available.

A. Rumyantsev, summing up, said that the discussion had been fruitful and valuable.

THE FIGHT FOR DEMOCRACY AND THE FIGHT FOR SOCIALISM

(From the Concluding Remarks of Academician Arzumanyan)

Our exchange of views has attracted the attention of world public opinion. And understandably so. For the problems we are discussing are of first-rate importance. Our sessions have been widely commented upon in the press in the socialist states, and in the newspapers of the Communist and Workers' parties in the capitalist countries. Nor can we complain of any lack of attention by the capitalist press to our seminar. This, too, is not surprising. Our adversaries know that such a representative and fruitful exchange of views among Marxist-Leninists will be closely followed by the working people everywhere, that it demonstrates the constructive force of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism and reveals the impotence of modern capitalist ideology. What worries the capitalist press most of all is our examination of the problems associated with the Common Market.

The leitmotif of their commentaries on our gathering is that the Common Market is undermining the world revolutionary process, that it is retarding the economic development of the socialist countries. The bourgeois commentators are deliberately standing the whole question on its head. In point of fact it is they and not we who have sounded the alarm.

Only reactionary dreamers could think in terms of the Common Market becoming an instrument that will unite the whole capitalist world and undermine our advance. The imperialists, no matter how desperately they might try, are powerless to arrest the building of socialism and communism, to hold back the world revolutionary movement.

At the same time it should not be forgotten that the Common Market is a new development, something that would have been out of the question before the Second World War, although even then state-monoply capitalism had reached a high level and the trend was toward the internationalization of the economy. Why was this so? Because the division and re-division of world markets had been effected mainly by wars between the imperialist powers as a result of which colonial possessions and spheres of capital investment were recarved and the political map of the world changed.

At present this way of dividing the world markets has become too dangerous, and well-nigh impossible, for imperialism. But the nature of the imperialist powers is such that they are perpetually searching for new markets. Integration is another form of carving up the world market, one that is bound to sharpen the contradictions between the imperialist countries and groups.

In discussing state-monopoly capitalism, the speakers devoted particular attention to nationalization. We are all agreed that nationalization, though the monopolies use it in their own interests, is an important weapon for the working class in its struggle against state-monopoly capital, against the finance oligarchy. The latter dreads nationalization and resists it tooth and nail.

Nor is it fortuitous that in some countries such open champions of capitalist interests as the Right-wing Social Democrats oppose nationalization. Today the demand for nationalization, I believe, marks the dividing line between the forces of the Right and Left. Reactionary and reformist elements, including some Right Socialists, are opposed to nationalization, the Left is fighting for it.

Communists do not approach the problems of nationalization from a narrow, purely utilitarian point of view. They seek nationalization not in order to wring minor concessions from the capitalists in one or another industry or in a single enterprise. Their program documents stress the need for an anti-monopoly coalition which would strive to oust the monopolies and end the domination of the finance oligarchy. For this it is necessary to advance slogans that will rally the masses to fight for a revolutionary solution of this question.

Besides the working class, a big role is played in some Western countries by the peasantry and the urban middle sections; the finance oligarchy is trying to mislead these strata, to divert them from the struggle against the monopolies and set them in opposition to the working class. In these circumstances our slogans should reflect the vital interests not only of the working class but also of the peasantry and the urban middle sections. One slogan is nationalization.

Is it possible to advance slogans of a transient nature when there is no actual revolutionary situation? It seems to me that slogans of this kind have already been advanced. After all, can the call for the regeneration of democracy be regarded as an ordinary slogan of struggle for a particular concession from the

bourgeoisie? Or the demand for nationalization? These slogans rouse the masses to fight for aims which go far beyond the bounds of ordinary reforms. Can this give rise to reformist illusions? It may. But even if it should, the illusions are bound to disappear in the course of the class struggle.

What objectives do we pursue in working for far-reaching democratic reforms? Primarily, to curb the power of the monopolies and abolish the finance oligarchy. Is this realistic? Of course it is. It will not yet mean the abolition of capitalism and the victory of socialism. But it will be an important step along the road to socialism. All the people, with few exceptions, can be won for the struggle to oust the monopolies in the course of which an anti-monopoly coalition can be formed. And on this basis the political army of the socialist revolution could be built. This makes it incumbent upon us to regard the struggle for democracy as a paramount task of the working class, an essential condition for achieving our ultimate object—socialism.

GENERAL DEMOCRATIC AND CLASS DEMANDS

SUMMARY OF THE CONTRIBUTIONS BY:

S. Aaronovitch (Britain)

We can see the broad basis of opposition that is arising against Britain's entry into the Common Market. Note that not only the governments of Canada, Australia and New Zealand have stated their opposition, but also the governments of India and Ghana. That is to say, considerable forces outside Britain are opposing Britain's entry. Within the British big bourgeoisie, though the dominant force favors entry, there are influential groups who are opposed, and recently we have had the very important decision of the National Farmers' Union to oppose Britain's entry. This is the more interesting as, by and large, the NFU is dominated by the big farmers. In addition, within the working-class movement, opposition is growing.

For our Party, the fight against Britain's entry is a fundamental democratic, national as well as a class fight. It is our view that we can prevent Britain joining the Common Market. It depends on the extent of the popular struggle, and here we will be encouraged by every manifestation of struggle against the consequences of the Common Market coming from within the Six.

A victory for the anti-Common Market in Britain would help all the forces fighting the Common Market in Western Europe. It would contribute to the fight of the peoples of the underdeveloped countries and of the smaller states against the political, military and economic blocs being organized by imperialism.

Our strategy is: to extend the class struggle, develop the broad democratic movement and further undermine the mass base of the Tory Party; in the course of this movement, to generate a new policy and direction for the organized working class and thus isolate the Right wing; and build the Communist Party as vital for the leadership of the movement.

That is why the question of the relation of national democratic demands to class demands is so important.

E. Sereni (Italy)

The fight for independence and national sovereignty and the struggle for democracy are part and parcel of the struggle which the working class of each country should wage against the Common Market. But this struggle would be devoid of perspective if we limited ourselves to the narrow national soil, and if the working class renounced its intention to make its weight felt in shaping the foreign policy of the imperialist states.

Needless to say, we do not recognize any, even the slightest, progressive content in monopoly integration, but of course the struggle against this integration would not have any perspective were it oriented on the past and not on the future which, doubtlessly belongs to the extensive and far-reaching development of cooperation between the peoples and the national economies of all countries, minus the discrimination which the Common Market intensifies so much.

I think that if we succeed in developing the day-to-day struggles of the working class and the people as a whole against the monopolies and the monopoly integration in each country; if we manage correctly to coordinate the struggle of the working class of our countries with the struggle of the working class in the socialist countries; if with the broad anti-monopoly front we compel the Common Market governments to carry out a policy of normal, non-discriminatory economic relations with all countries without exception, and in particular

with the socialist countries, then an important and decisive step will have been made towards that democratic alternative to the monopoly integration to which we have referred.

In our times the content and the aims of a general democratic character in any struggle waged by the masses inevitably interwine with content and aims of a socialist character and grow into the latter. When speaking about a democratic alternative to the Common Market we bear in mind that *complete* economic integration, with equal rights and benefits for all countries, big and small, can be brought about only under socialism. But we also know that in stressing now the democratic character of our alternative we are emphasizing the extremely broad character of the class alliances of the anti-monopoly coalition which we can and must build in order to achieve the aims of our struggle; those sections of the population whose anti-monopoly and democratic awareness has not yet developed into anti-capitalist, socialist awareness, will also take part in this coalition which is called upon to rally around the working class all those who are affected by the monopoly integration.

Reviews

Togliatti on Problems of the Working-Class Movement

THIS volume* of selected articles and speeches by Palmiro Togliatti is an important contribution to a study of the ideological and political questions now being discussed in the Italian Communist Party and the international working-class movement.

In a brief preface explaining the choice of articles, the author dwells mainly on the reasons why it is essential further to elucidate from a Marxist standpoint the problems brought to the fore by the condemnation of the personality cult at the Twentieth and Twenty-Second congresses of the CPSU.

Referring to some of the criticism of the interview he gave some time ago to the Italian journal *Nouvi argomenti* (which is reprinted in full in the volume and furnishes an answer to some of the questions arising from criticism of the Stalin cult), Togliatti writes: ". . . the purpose of that article was precisely to refute the arguments of those who inferred and who still like to infer from the criticism of the personality cult that the nature of Soviet society and the Soviet system have changed, that they have lost their democratic and socialist character. The idea running through all my articles on this question, the main point of all the opinions I have expressed on the subject consists precisely in repudiating that conclusion which I consider to be wrong both politically and historically. This basic idea permeates the articles in the present volume. However, this contention cannot be upheld and the false anti-communist conclusion repudiated without properly assessing all that has been said and repeated from the highest tribunes about Stalin's activity, all the exposures of the grave errors, the incorrect theories and distressing violations of law for which he is now known to have been responsible. Correctly to combine these two things—such grave criticism and simultaneously affirmation of the constant democratic and socialist character of Soviet society—this is the question for which a consistent, convincing and correct answer must be given in order to provide a solid foundation for our ideological orientation and internationalist convictions and our activity" (p. 9).

Referring to the fact that criticism of the violations of law and exposure of the tragic consequences of the Stalin cult continued with unabated force at the Twenty-Second Congress of the CPSU as well, Togliatti declares that we must not permit ourselves to "ignore or minimize the gravity and extent of this criticism, these charges and denunciations on the grounds that the facts exposed had but slightly affected the overall complex of social life. It is not enough to say this. It must be demonstrated. And it cannot be demonstrated without passing from criticism and denunciation to an examination of the economic, political and cultural conditions existing at that time, without establishing the link between the one and the other, revealing the interdependence and contradictions thus brought to light and without defining on this basis the limits that must be defined in substance, in form and in time" (p. 10).

*Palmiro Togliatti, **Problemi del movimento operaio internazionale 1956-1961. Rome,** Editori Riuniti, 1962, 410 pp.

In accordance with this methodological premise, the book reproduces articles written by Togliatti between 1956 and 1961 in which he elucidated for Party members and democratic public opinion generally some of the complex historical, political and moral problems arising from the denunciation of the personality cult and from the Hungarian events of November 1956. A prominent place is occupied by the interview he gave in May 1956 to the journal *Nuovi argomenti*. Reading this interview today, six years later, one finds that the points it raises have lost none of their timeliness; and this is true equally of the method of analysis, closely linked as it is with Marxist historical research and its pre-occupation with the deeper motives of history and not only with the immediate cause and effect of the errors and deviations arising from the personality cult in the USSR and other countries.

The questions examined in Togliatti's articles and speeches on this subject have by no means been exhausted by the political and ideological discussion now in progress in the Italian working-class movement. And the decisions of the Central Committee of the Czechoslovak Communist Party on eradicating the survivals of the personality cult, together with the decision of the Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party of August 1962 on the reasons for the expulsion of Rakosi and Gero, have again focussed the attention of the Italian working-class and democratic movement on the difficulties accompanying the building of socialism and the relationship between these difficulties and the struggle against the personality cult and its consequences. Hence, appearing on the eve of the Tenth Congress of the Italian Communist Party and at a time when a vigorous debate is taking place with the Socialist Party, the book on the personality cult and on socialist democracy is a valuable contribution, both theoretical and political, to the systematic historical and ideological discussion on problems of the working-class movement.

The purpose of the book is to help clarify certain questions which in the past few years have claimed the attention of the working-class movement and those broad sections of democratic opinion which regard the Italian Communist Party, the USSR and the socialist countries with confidence and whose support is founded increasingly on an intelligent Marxist understanding of developments. Among the more advanced sections of the working class and middle strata in Italy and Europe, who under the impact of Marxist teaching and the lessons of history are arriving at a dialectical understanding of reality, there is an insistent demand for constant and constructive discussion of the reasons for the successes and failures in the struggle for socialism and communism. The many debates in the Party, in the trade unions and in the country generally show that this is true not only of the militants, but also and in particular of the youth, who seek in Marxism and its application to reality a theoretical and practical model to follow in order to overcome the limitations of bourgeois idealism and the capitalist system. In this search, which has not of course been without its mistakes, it is easy to observe that the more the Party members, and especially the youth, admire the progress made by the socialist countries in their peaceful competition with capitalism in the sphere of science, industry and culture, the greater their need not only to understand the reasons for these achievements but also to perceive the obstacles that must be removed to ensure further progress. We have in mind the honest and impassioned questing which should not be confused with the empty chatter of our adversaries. For this has been a questing, a debate on facts and episodes in the history of socialism which the Communists and the youth regard as part of their own lives and on which they feel it their duty and their right to receive a convincing answer—and not only in order to be better equipped to fight an adversary who is growing ever more subtle and experienced, but because they feel that without clear and conclusive proof, without rational argument not limited simply to an enumeration of denunciations, but probing deep down to the sources—without this, active mass struggle not only against anti-communism but also for communism is seriously weakened. The fact that in all his writings between 1956 and 1961 Togliatti insisted that there must be no divergence between principles and actions, between the objective analysis of reality and its class evaluation, shows that in its persistent efforts to form new contacts with the masses and the new generation, the Italian Communist Party did not evade this search but, on the contrary, took an active part in it and did everything to steer it in the right direction. And this was done not by means of inept propaganda or harsh and doctrinaire pronouncements, but by a courageous analysis of the facts. This stand which our Party adopted immediately after the Twentieth Congress and before the tragic events in Hungary in 1956 served to neutralize the offensive and the speculation of our opponents. And what is even more important, this position took much of the sting out of the dogmatic and revisionist attacks levelled against the USSR and the Communist parties in the

working-class movement, and made it possible after the lapse of several years to win back substantial forces of the intelligentsia and the workers who now give the Italian Communist Party credit for having participated in the debate not formally and perfunctorily but with a sense of national and international responsibility and impartiality.

Another feature of this volume is the stress laid on the permanent ideological and political relation between the stand taken on separate problems of socialism (viz., the struggle against the personality cult and the study of its historical causes) and the general line of the Italian Communist Party. In this sense an examination of the basic political lines adhered to by the Party (the fight to build up a party of a new type, to define the conditions for affirming the "Italian road to socialism," for a peace policy, and for a "turn to the Left" in Italy) is convincing proof that the Italian Communists pursue their own independent policy based on a correct understanding of proletarian internationalism. The book contains a number of speeches made at meetings of the Central Committee of the Party and articles published in *Rinascita* and *L'Unita* in which the organic unity between what appear to be totally unrelated questions can be easily traced. The Party's stand on the content of socialist democracy as it was set forth in the course of the debate on the cult is clearly expressed in the pages elucidating the Party's views on the "Italian road to socialism," on "the multi-party system," on the democratic and socialist significance of the struggle of the Italian Communists for the Republican Constitution of 1947. The book subjects to a critical and self-critical Marxist examination a number of questions which came to the fore in the period 1956-1961, not spontaneously, as a result of some "turn" imposed from without, but as the fruit of the experience of more than ten years of democratic struggle conducted by the Party from the moment it reappeared on the political scene after the great battles of the underground period and the anti-fascist resistance.

Hence for anyone who wishes to obtain a clear idea of the position of the Party on the basic questions of the political situation in Italy this book is a must, all the more so if one wishes to obtain a clear understanding and not a hasty and doctrinaire judgment of the general policy of the Italian Communists. The opportunist, reformist and revisionist distortions of the "Italian road," understood as purely the "parliamentary road," are examined and sharply censured. Of particular interest in this respect is the article published in *Pravda* on March 7, 1956 (pp. 19-26), and the excerpt from Togliatti's speech at the meeting of the Central Committee of the Party on June 24, 1956 (pp. 157-159). "I wish," he said in the above mentioned speech, "to correct those comrades who have asserted that the Italian road to socialism is the peaceful, parliamentary road and nothing more. This is not so . . . The Italian road to socialism is that road which takes into account conditions already achieved and victories already won. Inasmuch as these victories have already laid a broad basis for democratic advance, the Italian road envisages development along democratic lines, on the basis of strengthening democracy and developing it toward definite profound social changes . . . We must remember what Lenin said about the illusory nature of bourgeois democracy. At present we are in a position to utilize some and indeed most of these elements of bourgeois democracy, i.e., we are in a position to create a genuinely democratic foundation on which the struggle for socialism can be successfully waged as foreseen by the classics of Marxism. But to create that foundation, and to make it solid and broad, a determined effort on the part of the masses and extensive action throughout the country are essential."

Closely linked with this dialectical concept of the struggle for socialism in Italy are other theses of a theoretical and practical nature, as for example the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat and its diverse aspects (p. 148 et seq.), the question of the People's Front (p. 142), the need for open discussion when faced with disagreement on principle (p.155), the need for Party guidance in the sphere of culture and the boundaries of such guidance (p. 237 et seq.), critique of extremism (p. 376), the attitude of the Communists to the Marshall Plan (p. 188), the relationship between the concept of freedom and the class approach (p.189 et seq.), the relations between the Communist parties at the present stage and bilateral contacts (pp. 229-230), proletarian internationalism and the obligations arising therefrom (p. 231 et seq.), etc.

Togliatti reverts again and again to these latter questions in order to demonstrate the necessity for the international unity of the Communist movement and to find the forms and methods capable of enhancing the strength and viability of this unity. "The system of bilateral relations," he writes, "is a prerequisite of autonomy. But it must be applied seriously and thoughtfully, taking into account the peculiarities of the present situation. Bilateral relations presuppose first of all mutual under-

standing and mutual respect; they should permit of, and indeed encourage, friendly criticism which would pose problems and stimulate their thorough examination. Any return to the system of relations already denounced and discarded, no matter who tries to bring it about, is unthinkable as is interference in the internal affairs of other parties, turning criticism into attack, sowing confusion and disrespect, prejudicial distrust, overt and covert support of factional strife—the cause of the violation of unity in other parties or the movement as a whole . . .

"We are all of us conscious that a deeper and sounder knowledge of the problems on whose solution we in the various countries are working, sometimes by different methods, is essential through the medium of contacts between the different contingents of our great international movement. We are opposed to the revival of a centralized leadership in any form. On the other hand, we do not exclude, but on the contrary, we heartily welcome international meetings between the representatives of the parties in the different countries for the purpose not of drafting decisions obligatory for all but of ascertaining mutual positions and thereby strengthening the unity of the movement—for we consider this to be of great value for all of us in examining problems of vital importance and of comparing the means by which we propose to solve these problems in the different situations" (pp. 230-231).

This brief enumeration of some of the subjects examined in the book gives an idea of the ground it covers. Its merit, we feel, lies not only in the answers it furnishes, but in the questions it raises. In this sense it belongs to that rare category of creative Marxist contributions which, without obtrusive schematicism or moralizing, stimulate the interest and mind of the Party militant and the general reader.

Maurizio FERRARA

Old Colonialism in New Garb

THE steady growth of the forces of world socialism, the disintegration of the colonial system, the awakening to a new life of hundreds of millions of people in the East and the emergence of independent states in Asia and Africa have resulted in an entirely new situation in the world. Imperialism, caught in the throes of a grave crisis, finds itself faced with new and vexing problems. Reluctant to refrain from colonial exploitation of backward peoples, to forfeit the profits derived from the plunder of Asia, Africa and Latin America, the imperialists are forced to adapt their colonial policy to the changed conditions. These are the questions dealt with by K. Brutents in his book *Against the Ideology of Modern Colonialism.**

While the main purpose of the book is to expose the ideology of latter-day colonialism, the author examines other questions, such as bourgeois nationalism, the paths and perspectives of economic development in the Afro-Asian countries, the nature of American "aid," the help given by the socialist countries in promoting the economic advance of the underdeveloped countries, etc.

What makes this book especially timely is its treatment of the ideology of colonialism in its direct relation to the policy pursued by the imperialists vis-à-vis the newly-emerging countries. Ideological expansion is a component of the political strategy of imperialism in the Afro-Asian world, and any change in policy is invariably reflected in that ideology. Formerly, Brutents shows, the task of "conditioning the natives" was entrusted to the missionaries. Colonialist ideology was designed to influence the population of the metropolitan countries: that is how racialism became a basic feature of that ideology. Today imperialist ideology has another target—the population of the liberated countries, the former colonies and, primarily, the national bourgeoisie, with whom the colonialists are endeavoring to establish contact.

On the whole, however, the ideological indoctrination of the Asian and African peoples plays a far greater role today than in the colonial period, when imperialist positions in the colonies were maintained by sheer force. The author cites the revealing comment made by the American professor E. Reschauer. Since, according to the professor, the military lever of politics is so limited and the economic lever so slow and uncertain, it is necessary to resort to the third strategic weapon—ideology—which in many respects is the most important of the three (p. 61). Without relinquishing force and aggression, imperialism aims at capturing the minds of the Afro-Asian people. Colonialist ideology is obliged to reckon with the new social forces that have emerged in the former colonies, to take cognizance of the specific features of the classes for whom the "new approach" is designed, and it is in this context that Brutents examines it. "Formerly," he writes, " colonialism and racial superiority were preached with

*K. Brutents. **Protiv ideologii sovremyonnogo kolonializma.** Moscow, Socekgiz, 1961, 358 pp.

a cynical frankness. Today it is the spirit of 'paternalism' and 'patronage', carefully camouflaged by democratic phraseology but clearly discernible nonetheless."

Turning to the question of nationalism in the Asian and African countries, Brutents describes it as the "ideology and policy of the bourgeoisie which, regarding the nation as the highest, eternal form of social unity in which the interests of all are harmoniously blended, seeks to identify the class aspirations of the bourgeoisie with the national interest."

Criticizing the basic ideological principles of nationalism, Brutents shows that in the present conditions it has a certain progressive significance.

The feature of Afro-Asian nationalism is its anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist trend (characteristic of the given stage of development of these countries); it is "the nationalism of nations which, as a rule, are still in the process of formation, nations which are going through the stage of national democratic reforms, national awakening and building national statehood. Inasmuch as the establishment of nationhood is taking place in struggle against feudalism and imperialism, the national principle here is still revolutionary, and the idea of 'supra-class' national unity—one of the basic elements of bourgeois nationalism—is simultaneously directed against feudal and imperialist reaction." (p. 230-231.)

Nationalism in the Asian and African countries is of a contradictory nature. While it weakens imperialism, it is used also for other purposes. "Taking advantage of the fact that some of the interests of the people and the bourgeoisie coincide for a time, the ideologists of nationalism seek to elevate this coincidence to an absolute category, depicting the interests of the bourgeoisie as the interests of the nation, glossing over the social contradictions and justifying the exploitation of the working people by the needs of 'national progress.' At the same time, national unity is equated with broad class collaboration" (p. 230).

Much space is devoted to the dual nature of the Afro-Asian national bourgeoisie and its ideology. Examining its economic policy, its aims and interests, the author points out that the main line of bourgeois policy is toward *independent capitalist* development and economic independence. Even the policy of compromise with foreign capital does not, in Brutents' opinion, signify abandonment of this course but is merely a half-hearted indecisive attempt to oust private foreign capital.

This, however, does not mean that the author ignores the other side of the picture or that he minimizes the negative consequences of the domination of the national bourgeoisie in the countries which have won political independence (India, for example). An analysis of the home policy of the bourgeoisie leads the author to the conclusion: "The narrow class tendencies characteristic of the internal policy of the national bourgeoisie engender serious contradictions between the national goals toward which the bourgeoisie is striving — independence, overcoming the backwardness — and the methods used to reach those goals, which can be attained only with the active participation of the masses. In large measure these methods, inimical to the working people, are dictated by fear of the masses . . . The national bourgeoisie seeks to solve the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal problems by confining them within the limits of their own narrow class interests . . . it is incapable of carrying the national-democratic anti-imperialist revolution *to completion*" (pp. 228-229).

This paramount contradiction between the *necessity* to consummate the national-democratic revolution and the *inability* of the bourgeoisie to do so creates the objective prerequisites for the revolution to be led by broader and more radically-minded social forces. In other words, the most advanced class will inevitably play the dominant role in the final stage of the revolution, although this by no means rules out the participation of the national bourgeoisie in an anti-imperialist coalition; on the contrary, it presupposes cooperation with them, inasmuch as their contradictions with imperialism, far from abating, will sharpen. And Brutents is right in saying that "cooperation with the national bourgeoisie in the struggle against imperialism is a basic task of the working class and its parties in the Afro-Asian countries" (p. 24).

What is the aim of the imperialists in the underdeveloped countries today? Their strategy consists in preserving what has always been the basic element of colonialism, namely, the discrepancy between the level of development of the productive forces in the imperialist countries and that in the newly-liberated countries (p. 282). Hence the support given by the imperialists to all forms of social and political reaction in these countries as a counterweight to the forces of democracy and national liberation and to the growing contacts between these countries and the socialist world. The author shows that this is essentially the purpose both of the military alliances such as SEATO and the so-called "aid." For the sake of their strategic objective, the imperialists, fearing above all that the underdeveloped countries might

take the socialist road, are prepared to sacrifice some forms of colonial relations while preserving "their basic content, namely, the exploitation of the economically backward peoples by the industrially developed imperialist powers" (p. 282). In this connection the system of "free enterprise"imposed on the newly-liberated countries boils down in practice to an attempt to "keep these countries in subjection, although in a new form" (p. 266), for, as experience shows, the capitalist road does not exclude foreign monopoly domination. ". . . Progress on the basis of capitalism is possible within certain restricted limits. But this will not solve any of the basic national problems" (p. 312).

A point to which one might take exception is the author's claim that "imperialism cannot exist without exploiting colonies" (p. 32). Yet, as he himself demonstrates elsewhere, underdeveloped countries, whether colonies or sovereign states, remain the object of imperialist exploitation insofar as their economy depends on the monopolies and so long as the unequal capitalist international division of labor exists. The number of colonies is rapidly diminishing and may possibly disappear altogether before long, but does this mean that imperialism will cease to exist? Certainly not. Imperialism can exist without colonies but it cannot exist without the colonial or semi-colonial exploitation of the economically backward countries, without that "global backwoods" referred to in the Program of the CPSU.

K. Brutents' book can be recommended as an exhaustive study of a number of important and hitherto inadequately investigated problems and will undoubtedly be of interest to a wide circle of readers.

Mustapha AMIN, Georgi MIRSKY

Communications and Comment

The Moral Responsibility of the Scientist

WHAT is the scientists' attitude with regard to nuclear war?

They made the atomic and hydrogen bombs, and made the missiles capable of delivering them to any point in the world. But what do they think about the possibility of war? And what are they doing to prevent it?

Scientists, like all other people, hold different views on this vital question. Let us examine some of these views as expressed in letters and scientific publications and at meetings.

The biggest role is played by the scientists associated with the Pugwash movement. What is this movement?

In the spring of 1955 I received a letter from Bertrand Russell inviting me to sign an appeal against nuclear war. Einstein and several others had already given their signatures. On the whole I thought it was good, although I had doubts concerning some of the wording. Nevertheless I felt it would be more useful to sign it at once rather than to suggest some trifling amendments. And so I signed without delay.

Shortly afterwards the U.S. industrialist Cyrus Eaton, a pleasant and cultured man, took an interest in the appeal and invited the group who had signed it to discuss disarmament at his place in Pugwash, Nova Scotia, Canada, whence the name given to the series of conferences that was to follow. So far ten such meetings have been held in various countries, the last two in Britain. The ninth was in Cambridge and the tenth in London, in autumn this year.

The ninth conference primarily discussed disarmament, international détente and other political questions. A prominent part among the more than 70 participants was played by the Soviet, U.S. and British delegates. The Soviet delegation included such distinguished scientists as A. V. Topchiev, Vice-President of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Academician I. E. Tamm, Nobel Prize winner, and Academician N. N. Bogolyubov, mathematician and physicist and Lenin Prize winner. From the USA came I. Raby, Nobel Prize winner, and President Kennedy's scientific advisers. Britain was represented by C. Powell, also a Nobel Prize winner and one of those who signed the original Russell-Einstein appeal. The secretary of the Pugwash committee is Professor J. Rotblat, physicist, who likewise signed the original appeal. Professor Rotblat, incidentally, was born and educated in Poland; he recently revisited his native land.

The tenth Pugwash conference, held in one of the big London hotels, was attended by a bigger number of scientists—nearly 250. How the movement has grown—from a dozen scientists to 250!

The London conference was devoted to questions of culture, bringing scientists closer together, and aid to the underdeveloped countries. It was opened by Lord Hailsham, British Minister in charge of scientific matters. Bertrand Russell addressed the opening session. In 1955 when he drew up the appeal I had described him as venerable—he was then 83. Now, at 90, he looked like a proud old eagle. He held himself erect and spoke with dignity and eloquence as he reviewed the history and aims of the Pugwash movement. It was an honor to sit beside him as one of the "fathers" of the movement.

The most dramatic moments occurred during the discussion not of cultural questions but of political issues. As is known, the test ban negotiations have been blocked by U.S. insistence on on-the-site control of underground tests, whereas the USSR holds that these can be detected without inspection. The Soviet and American scientists held long consultations on these questions. At one of the sessions Academician Tamm suggested seismographic control using automatic devices which could be installed in any number of places. In the age of cybernetics neither the USA nor the USSR would have any difficulty in making automatic devices for detecting tests on each other's territory. This is a suggestion which might be of great help to the political leaders, who have been examining the question for years.

The Pugwash conferences, then, can play a useful political role. This is a movement which represents the scientists' conscience, and each of its meetings can be said to be a step forward in the cause of preserving peace and furthering friendship between peoples.

Some scientists, such as Bernal and researchers from the socialist countries, occupy a left-of-center position in the movement. Others clearly gravitate to the Right. But we all are united by a desire to prevent war and to achieve agreement and friendship between East and West, differences in social systems notwithstanding.

But there are also those who stand aloof from the Pugwash movement. I should like to dwell on them in greater detail. First, there is C. P. Snow. I knew him when he was still a young scientist in Cambridge just launching out on a writing career. Today he has made a name for himself as one of the leading writers in Britain. Snow was scheduled to speak at the last Pugwash conference in London but illness prevented him from attending.

Snow's attitude to the questions of war and peace may be judged from his book *Science and Government* in which he portrayed two types of scientists. Both are now dead, and one can, therefore, record their mutual hostility and their role in the Second World War. One was Tizard, the other, Lindemann.

Tizard, while he could hardly be called a great scientist, knew the value of science. Britain owed to him its civil defense organization and the radar installations which protected it against the Nazi air-raids. As a man, Lindemann was the more interesting of the two. His like is to be found in all countries. He held a professorship in Oxford for which he had been recommended by Tizard, a friend who was to become an enemy. If Lindemann's name were erased from the history of science, the picture would not change one iota. I personally have never come across a scientific work by him. All I know about him is that he wrote a book on popular science; and I remember, too, an annihilating review of it by Born, the eminent physicist. Lindemann was a snob. Set on winning the favor of influential people, he sought the company of lords and politicians to whom he was the "Prof." Somehow or other he made the acquaintance of Churchill, who came to trust him implicitly. And this signified that Tizard's star was now in decline. Lindemann, who took his place as Churchill's scientific adviser, was elevated to the peerage as Lord Cherwell. It is difficult to say how much sooner the war might have ended had it not been for Lindemann. For Lindemann, the advocate of the massive air strike against the densely-populated German cities, persuaded Churchill that this was the speediest way to defeat Germany. This policy delayed the opening of the second front. Since Lindemann and Churchill believed that the saturation bombing alone would bring Germany to its knees, the British and U.S. effort was exerted chiefly in this direction.

What lesson can we draw from this?

Every country has had and will have its Lindemanns—pseudo-scientists who revel in political influence, or genuine scientists whose scientific ability is greatly exceeded by their political ambitions.

But let us return to the scientists who, united by the desire to avert nuclear war, are getting together in the Pugwash movement. This movement represents a way of

thinking shared by many. Who have remained outside it? Let us now take those who stand to the Right of Pugwash. Typical of these is Professor Teller, a Hungarian who left his country long ago.

Roughly speaking, there are two types of scientists. There is the slow-thinking type, the man who perseveres doggedly and probes deeply into the subject of his investigation. Such was Einstein, a scientist in the best sense of the word. Then there is the other type, the man who thinks with lightning speed, flitting from one theme to another. Nobody can match this type in debate. He astounds one by his erudition and mental agility. Teller is a physicist of this calibre.

Were Einstein's name to be deleted from physics, this science would not be what it is today. But were Teller's name to be crossed out, physics would not be changed. I knew Teller in the United States only slightly, but I was always put off by his verbosity, by his constant state of tension and by his ultra-Right philosophy.

Not long ago Teller, who has been described as the "father" of the H-bomb, wrote a book called *The Legacy of Hiroshima.*

The first part of this book traces the history of the H-bomb. The author claims that he was always right, that his foresight never failed him, that he never made a mistake. What a joy it must be to have such a high opinion of oneself! The rest of the book hinges on two premises which most scientists of other countries reject. These premises are:

1. The Soviet Union intends to attack the United States. If it does not do so, it will be because it fears retaliation. Therefore we Americans must arm and be prepared to deliver a counter-blow that would destroy the USSR should it attack. Hence the unceasing arms drive.

2. We cannot agree to stop underground nuclear tests. Contrary to the opinion of other scientists, Teller holds that such tests cannot be detected. He claims that the USSR conducted many such tests in secret at the time when the USA refrained from testing.

From these irrational premises Teller draws conclusions of which only a scientist who has closed his eyes to reality and who lives in the realm of his own fantasy is capable. For example, Teller fancies that nuclear war can be confined to the territory of one country. In the last pages of his book he adopts the tone of the Judean prophets handing down the word of God: "We should have plans and stockpiles so that after an all-out attack, we could recover. If we are adequately prepared, the attack will never come. We should abandon all plans to deter Communist expansion with the threat of massive retaliation. We should, however, maintain secure retaliatory forces to make sure that any all-out attack against our nation could be answered with a crushing counterblow. We should be prepared to respond to limited aggression at the same level at which the attack is made. We can and should limit the area and aims of such conflicts. We cannot and must not try to limit the use of weapons."

And so on in the same vein.

The book left me with a feeling of depression which it took days to shake off. Fortunately, only a handful of scientists agree with Teller. And their influence is steadily declining; as a matter of fact, it is already almost nil.

If Teller's book strikes us as somewhat pathological, H. Kahn's *On Thermonuclear War* is downright revolting. As a scientist this gentleman is completely unknown to me, although I am told that he is an eminent military expert. In his introduction, Kahn mentions other experts of whom I have never heard. As a matter of fact, it would not be worth while mentioning the book at all were it not for the fact that it is a compilation of lectures delivered by Kahn at Princeton. It is a colossus of 651 pages and, what is most important, it was put out in 1960 by the Princeton University Press in the United States and the Oxford University Press in Britain. Written in a pseudo-scientific manner, it is incredibly dull. Here are typical passages: "Reliable deterrence is much more difficult to find than had been supposed in the past," and we are able "to threaten to initiate a war ourselves—unpleasant though this sounds and is."

Fortunately, Teller and Kahn are the exceptions. The Pugwash movement is more representative of the moral make-up of scientists, for although their views on social issues may differ, the overwhelming majority of them share the opinion voiced at the tenth conference in London. It was formulated thus: "We, scientists from 35 countries, gathered at the tenth Pugwash conference devoted to the theme 'Science and International Problems', are united in the opinion that the scientific revolution has faced the world with a fundamentally new situation when man has unprecedented possibilities to build or to destroy. We have come to London moved by the desire to do everything in our power that science should be a blessing and not a curse for the human race." *Leopold INFELD*

New Republic in the Middle East

(Letter from Yemen)

EVER since September 27, when the Yemeni army overthrew the monarchy and proclaimed the Yemeni Arab Republic, this small country on the Arabian peninsula has claimed the attention of the world public. The announcement, which was met with enthusiasm by the vast majority of the population and with sympathy by the other Arab peoples and all peace-loving countries, caused consternation among the British and American imperialists and their Arab agents in Jordania and Saudi Arabia who hastened to organize an armed intervention against the new republic.

Yemen is a country with an ancient culture. In distant times the territory of what is Yemen today was occupied by several slave-owning states, which had a highly-developed system of irrigation and employed agricultural techniques that were advanced for their time. The fertile soil combined with favorable climatic conditions in the highlands and an excellent irrigation system earned Yemen in ancient times the name of "Arabia the Blessed."

But until recently there was nothing in this country to justify that description. The regime which existed in Yemen for nearly a thousand years was violently opposed to social reforms of any kind, with the result that development was seriously retarded. The country was ruled by the Imam, i.e., leader of the Saiyids, the dominant Moslem sect. His authority was absolute. He had complete control over the treasury in addition to the vast personal wealth inherited from his forebears.

Before the revolution Yemen was a backward agrarian country where feudal relations predominated and considerable survivals of tribalism remained. The main occupation was agriculture. Nearly all the land belonged to feudal landlords. The biggest landowners were the Imam himself and members of the royal dynasty; they owned more than a quarter of the most fertile land. The fellahs, who make up the bulk of the population, lived in abject poverty. Eighty per cent of them, landless, were share-croppers held in virtual bondage by the landowners who appropriated as much as three-fourths of their crop as payment for the land.

Industry is largely of the handicraft type. A Yemeni working class is only beginning to emerge. At this stage it consists mainly of dockers and workers employed in small enterprises and workshops.

Under the old regime the country had no schools or hospitals and no modern cultural institutions. Ninety-five per cent of the population was illiterate. Taxation weighed heavily on the people. Suffice it to say that out of an annual state revenue of 30 million riyals, 28,500,000 were obtained through taxation. Added to the hardships suffered by the population was the total lack of human rights. The spectacle of men in chains being led through the streets and lashed with whips was common. People were beheaded on public squares and the severed heads exhibited on trees. But the most outrageous aspect of life in Yemen before the revolution was that of slavery.

In the midst of these ugly survivals of mediaevalism, the monarchy in recent years had opened the doors wide to the foreign monopolies, particularly American, according them all kinds of privileges to the detriment of the national interest.

The National Charter published by the Popular Democratic Federation* described the situation in Yemen on the eve of the revolution thus: "Under the existing conditions there are no guarantees for safeguarding national independence. Political independence may become a screen concealing economic dependence on the foreign monopolies. Millions live under the constant threat of starvation, death or emigration . . ."

The democratic forces in Yemen and Aden (formerly part of Yemeni territory seized by Britain in the mid-19th century) called for a struggle against the despotism of the monarchy, for strengthening national independence, for democratic freedoms and a democratic regime.

Our people waged a struggle simultaneously against the British colonialists and against the Yemeni feudal monarchy. The years 1921, 1928, 1936 and 1948 witnessed the outbreak of uprisings and revolts against the rule of the imams who clung to the mediaeval traditions. These rebellions were crushed by armed force. But the march of history could not be halted. The establishment of a modern army to protect the feudal regime required trained officers and specialists who could handle

*The Popular Democratic Federation, formed in 1961, united the progressive forces of Yemen and Aden. The National Charter published by the Federation states that it is "guided by the ideas of scientific socialism."

modern weapons, tanks and aircraft. Young men had to be sent abroad to acquire the necessary knowledge and experience. On returning home these young people were horrified and dismayed by the barbarous conditions in their native land and the contrast between the civilization they had left and the mediaeval backwardness of the Yemeni. They refused to become reconciled with the poverty and oppression. The sentiment of the young officers was shared by the soldiers recruited from among the peasants. In these circumstances the army became the most revolutionary force against the monarchy.

In 1955 the officers rose in revolt, but without success. Four years later, in 1959, supported by a number of tribes, they endeavored to bring pressure to bear on the Imam and to induce him to agree to political and social reforms. But this attempt, too, ended in failure. These actions were ruthlessly suppressed.

The revolution of September 27 transformed the Yemen from a feudal absolutist state into a republic which is fighting both against colonialism and against its own social and economic backwardness.

The first steps taken by the republic were to free 3,000 political prisoners, abolish the survivals of slavery, reorganize the army, and put an end to tribal and caste discrimination. Despite the difficulties caused by the foreign intervention, the government introduced a number of measures designed to improve conditions. The so-called sanitation tax was abolished and initial steps taken to introduce free medical care. Four cultural centers have been opened in the bigger towns. To appreciate this properly it should be recalled that before the revolution there were no theaters or cinemas and no newspapers or books were published.

The government plans to introduce an agrarian reform law. So far the estates owned by the Imam and the royal family have been confiscated, and organizations are being set up to enable the peasants to make use of agricultural implements provided by the state. The government has also announced its intention to build schools, hospitals and modern enterprises.

As regards foreign policy, the government has declared it will pursue a policy of positive neutrality and combat "imperialism and all forms of foreign interference." In protest against U.S. hostility toward the republic, it recently prohibited oil prospecting by U.S. companies on Yemeni territory.

The influence of the Yemeni revolution is felt in Saudi Arabia and in the southern part of the Arabian peninsula where the last colonies in the Arab East are situated. In Aden, for example, demonstrations have been held in support of the revolution and against foreign military intervention.

The National Liberation Front of Saudi Arabia has warmly welcomed the Yemeni revolution, condemning the military action taken against it by the Saudi rulers and urging the people to take action to stop the intervention.

The events in Yemen have helped to unite the patriotic opposition in Saudi Arabia, where the two leading progressive organizations—The National Liberation Front and the Arab Liberation Front—recently joined forces to form the Arab National Liberation Front.

Fearing the effect of the Yemeni example on the peoples of the Arabian peninsula, the U.S. imperialists, relying on their military bases in Dahran and Aden, are mustering their forces against our revolution. Alarmed, too, are King Saud and his ally in Jordan, King Hussein; they have good reason indeed to fear for their thrones. This fear of the growth of the national-liberation movement has prompted the reactionary forces to combine. But their efforts to strangle the newly-born Yemeni republic are meeting with stubborn resistance on the part of our people.

Yemen is not alone in its fight for freedom and independence. Most of the Arab countries have recognized the new government. So have the Soviet Union and other socialist and peace-loving countries, making it clear that they are against any aggressive action aimed at suppressing Yemen's independence. This has greatly assisted our people in their national-liberation struggle.

The democratic forces in Yemen have defined the urgent and fundamental tasks that must be solved in the course of the revolution. In an appeal dated September 29, the Popular Democratic Federation declared that "the basic urgent task of the Yemeni people is to safeguard our young republic and guarantee that it will follow the path of national independent development, economic independence, social progress and democracy." The appeal reaffirms the basic slogans, advanced by the democratic forces before the revolution, calling for the confiscation of lands belonging to the royal family and its retinue, for democratic rights, renunciation of treaties and agreements inimical to national independence, especially in the sphere of the economy, and the conclusion of an economic agreement with

the Soviet Union. Another plank in the program is resolute struggle "against the foreign monopolies and banks and also against the plans for U.S. 'aid' in the guise of which U.S. imperialism, hand in hand with British imperialism and Arab reactionaries, is intriguing against our national-democratic revolution and our young republic."

The appeal calls for a central bank, a state sector in the economy, encouragement to national capital, land to the peasants, and for a general election to choose a Constituent Assembly; this Assembly would adopt a democratic constitution and thus ensure formation of a government responsible to a parliament elected by universal suffrage.

The democratic forces of Yemen call on all the people, all patriots to be on the alert. Foreign and internal intrigues, they stress, will fail if the cooperation between the army and the people and the unity of the patriotic forces are maintained and consolidated.

The revolution in Yemen is further proof that the colonial system is doomed.

Nazar RASHID

Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament in Britain

I SHOULD like the opportunity to add a small note to Comrade Zagladin's account of the World Congress for General Disarmament and Peace,* which otherwise might unintentionally give a wrong impression of the British movement "Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament."

In this account it is stated that "the British peace fighters belonging to the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament hope to make disarmament possible by appealing to the conscience of the British government and persuading it to give up the arms race."

This might give the impression that the Campaign consists wholly of pacifists and that it cherishes impractical illusions about the possibility of a "change of heart" by such a government, confining its methods to exhortations and appeals to its better nature. The Campaign is in fact a wide movement, excluding no one in Britain who is opposed to nuclear weapons and desires to see the country abandon them, enjoying support not only among pacifists, but among wide sections of the people, especially the Labor and Trade Union movement. It is safe to say that there is no supporter of the World Council of Peace in Britain who is not also an active supporter of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament. Professor Bernal, himself, incidentally, is a member of its National Council.

It would be correct to say that both its leadership and the great majority of its supporters are well aware of the political problems involved in securing nuclear disarmament; well aware that a change in government policy can only result from pressure by the masses of the people or a change of the government itself, of the consequent need to rouse the people and to win the Labor movement to the need and possibility of nuclear disarmament.

That its efforts in these directions are not confined to simple appeals to the government's conscience, are amply demonstrated by the actions on Holy Loch against the Polaris submarines, and by its innumerable public meetings and marches—above all the annual Aldermaston Marches which have been the largest and most massive expression of popular demand for nuclear disarmament anywhere in Europe, while its political progress is indicated by the still-growing vote for nuclear disarmament in the trade unions and Labor Party, which have already won the majority at the Labor Party Conference once and may yet achieve a decisive effect.

Comrade Zagladin truly records that several CND members, prominent and humble, who took the floor in plenary session, or in commissions, expressed the view that "both sides" are equally to blame for the impasse in negotiating disarmament and wished to appeal to all countries to renounce nuclear weapons unilaterally. But it must be understood that the CND is a loose *movement*, not a disciplined organization with a precise membership, constitution, rules and credo. The ranks of its members and supporters also include many who regard the former opinion as mistaken, even harmful, for the reasons Comrade Zagladin well expresses, and who do not regard it as intelligent to propose the unilateral disarmament of either USSR or USA.

The CND has one simple,uniting principle—that it seeks nuclear disarmament by all countries and urges Britain to set the example. Some (including pacifists) urge the latter on moral grounds, others—not necessarily pacifists, but persons of plain common sense—on the obvious ground that nuclear weapons

*The reference is to the article by V. Zagladin "A Triumph for the Idea of Peace" published in our issue No. 9.

and nuclear bases plainly increase Britain's attraction as a target, and so its insecurity. *Sanity*, the CND organ, in its July 1962 issue, reporting the Annual Conference, states: "The debate on the new Policy Statement for 1962/3 involved the choice by the Conference of one of two alternative paragraphs. One especially committed the campaign to 'call on each nuclear power' to renounce nuclear weapons unilaterally. The *Alternative* (my italics—*I.M.)* favored by the Executive, presented unilateral disarmament by Britain as 'hastening a multilateral agreement'."

This is the text endorsed by a large majority: "We want multilateral and general disarmament. Meanwhile, Britain's conscience cannot be salved by waiting for other nations. Unilateral renunciation of nuclear weapons is both a moral duty in itself and the greatest contribution that Britain can make to transforming the atmosphere at Geneva and hastening a multilateral agreement. She should call on each nuclear power to do likewise." The significance of this text is further emphasized by *Sanity*, which quoted *(loc. sit.)* Canon Collins as urging that advocacy of unilateral disarmament by the United States and the Soviet Union is "wholly unrealistic," and Fenner Brockway, M.P., "speaking for the Parliamentary CND Group" as saying "We must continue to demand unilateral disarmament by Britain, but if the world is to be saved at all, it will be by international disarmament."

Comrade Zagladin quite properly assesses the speeches and contributions of some CND spokesmen and supporters at the Congress, but it is impossible to appreciate and evaluate at their true significance the progress, mass support for and possible future role of the CND in Britain without understanding that it is a wide and active body, by no means exclusively pacifist.

It is this unity around the simple principle of peace and nuclear disarmament, despite discord of many views, and so far maintained in spite of the many splitting tendencies with which workers for peace are familiar, which has been a factor in its growth and perhaps contains useful lessons. *Ivor MONTAGU*

* * *

I have read Ivor Montagu's letter with interest and thank him for the additional information it contains.

At the same time I would like to say that the article "A Triumph for the Idea of Peace" was not intended to give a characterization of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament as a whole. As we know, in translating from one language to another the subtleties of one or other point may not be fully conveyed, and it may well be that it is this that has given rise to doubt. Be that as it may, Comrade Montagu's amplification of the position of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament will, I am sure, be read with interest by readers who, like all of us, follow closely the progress of the CND. *V. ZAGLADIN*

Against the Persecution of Democrats

FREE THE PATRIOTS IN PARAGUAY!

THE police commissariat in Asuncion, capital of Paraguay, is opposite the Palace of Justice. One has only to cross the street to get into the courtyard of the commissariat where eight men are languishing in a damp and dark cell. The President of the Supreme Court is well aware that these men are unlawfully detained. For, over a year ago, in October 1961, the court, which "tried" one of the eight — Antonio Maidana—delivered its verdict which said: "The accused Antonio Maidana, having served his term, shall be released. . ." In addition to the court's order there is also the report of the police chief of November 7, 1961, saying that Maidana had been discharged from custody. But to this day Antonio Maidana and his comrades remain in jail.

Truckling to dictator Stroessner, the police and the judiciary are trampling on the laws of the country. For example, article 28 of the Constitution states that "cleanliness and hygienic standards must be observed in prisons. Torture and corporal punishment in any form are prohibited." But for all that hundreds of Paraguayan patriots held in prisons and concentration camps are subjected to inhuman torture. The inmates of a prison for common criminals located in the vicinity of a concentration camp for political prisoners, unable to bear the screams of pain heard from the camp, have actually petitioned the Organization of American States to interfere and demand that the Paraguayan authorities stop the torture of political prisoners.

Antonio Maidana and his comrades too have been tortured. The eight are kept in a dark cell six square meters in area with no ventillation; they are not permitted to read or write and no one, not even a doctor, is allowed to visit them. Antonio Maidana is gravely ill, his eyes and throat being affected. Julio Rojas suffers from a serious intestinal disorder and Ananias Maidana is ill with tuberculosis.

Paraguay is a signatory to the Declaration of Human Rights, Article 19 of which states that the individual is entitled to his views and has the right freely to express them. Yet the Paraguayan government, oblivious to its signature, has adopted a series of laws banning political parties, and keeps Antonio Maidana, Julio Rojas and Ananias Maidana in prison solely because they are Communists.

The dictator clings to power contrary to the will of the people. A lackey of the U.S. imperialists and the local oligarchy, he tramples upon his country's Constitution and on international declarations.

But there is one force in the world which both the dictator and his bosses fear. This force is world public opinion. In 1961 the Communist Party of Paraguay addressed all the delegations which attended the Twenty-Second Congress of the CPSU with a call to organize a campaign in their countries for the release of Antonio Maidana and the other Communists in Paraguay. In February this year Paraguayans opposed to the dictatorship issued the same call through *World Marxist Review* to all Communist and Workers' parties, to all champions of national independence, democracy and peace. The result was that campaigns in defense of Maidana and his comrades were launched in many countries.

The demand for the release of Antonio Maidana, for repeal of the repressive laws, for ending the torture and closing the concentration camps resounded from the rostrum of the Fifth Congress of the World Federation of Trade Unions which denounced the criminal actions of the Stroessner dictatorship. *L'Unita*, organ of the Italian Communist Party, raised its voice in defense of Maidana. One thousand Paraguayan personalities living in exile signed a letter to Stroessner urging the release of Maidana and his comrades. The campaign for the release of the patriots has been joined by the progressive press of Latin America.

As a result of this campaign the police, who tried to conceal the whereabouts of the three patriots in order to murder them secretly, were compelled to disclose the place of their confinement.

The worldwide indignation is cogently expressed in a telegram signed by public personalities in many countries and addressed to General Stroessner. "In keeping with the principles of the Declaration of Human Rights," the telegram reads, "we demand the release of the Paraguayan patriots whom your government keeps in confinement on charges of political and trade union activity. We demand fulfilment of the court injunction ordering the release of Antonio Maidana who, although his sentence has expired, is still kept in jail." The telegram was signed by people prominent in public life in the United States, Italy, Britain, India, Australia and in a number of Latin American

countries, and also by 46 Uruguayan M.P.s and 11 Senators.

Teachers' and other unions in Chile, Uruguay and Brazil are waging an active struggle for the release of Maidana and his comrades.

Last May a deputation from the United Trade Union Center and the Teachers' Federation of Chile travelled to Asuncion and presented to Edgar Insfran, Minister of the Interior, the demand of the Chilean working people for the release of the patriots. The Minister told the deputation that his government would release the Communists in the event of any other government offering them political asylum.

About the same time a deputation from the Uruguayan Teachers' Federation was told by Insfran that the government would give "favorable" consideration to the release of Antonio Maidana, Julio Rojas and Ananias Maidana on condition that they leave the continent and that their fares are paid in advance.

In August came a deputation from the Brazilian Association for Solidarity with the People of Paraguay with the same purpose. But when the Uruguayan teachers were informed that the Czechoslovak government would grant asylum to the three Communists and the Czechoslovak Teachers' Federation had agreed to pay the fares to Prague, the Paraguayan authorities stalled, saying that the Maidana case "had been transferred to the highest spheres of the government" and that the latter, "bearing in mind the internal situation," was not in a position to discuss it now.

The dictator is twisting and turning, pleading the need to consider "the internal situation." But this situation will not change so long as the country is ruled by a dictatorship. It is not fortuitous that in the past 20 years the country has been in a "state of siege" practically without interruption.

An appeal issued by the Communist Party of Paraguay declares that "as a condition for granting loans, the U.S. imperialists insist that Stroessner hold presidential elections in 1963 with some semblance of legality . . . In view of this the Stroessner government now has to pay more heed to the demands in defense of political prisoners. Although the dictatorship seeks to keep Maidana in prison, a powerful movement at home and abroad can secure his release."

Despite the maneuvering of the dictator, the powerful pressure of world public opinion will, undoubtedly, wrest Antonio Maidana, Julio Rojas and Ananias Maidana from the clutches of the tyranny.

Antonio Maidana and his comrades shall be free!

Liborio VASQUEZ

JUSTICE IN THE HITLER FASHION

THE name of the German Communist Karl Schabrod is known far beyond the borders of the Federal Republic. In 1933 he was arrested by the Nazis and sentenced to life imprisonment. The defeat of fascism in 1945, however, restored him to freedom. Then in July 1962, the veteran anti-fascist again found himself behind bars. Schabrod declared in court: "The sole purpose of my political activity is to serve my people. I am, therefore, an enemy of the dangerous atomic policy pursued by the Federal government, a policy which is a light-minded playing with death . . . The question at issue today is the preservation of peace, the survival of all of us, the victory of the future."

The fate that has befallen Schabrod is not something fortuitous in the practice of the Bonn judiciary. Sentenced with him was Emil Sander, an active resistance fighter. Peter Umland, a former prisoner of the Nazi concentration camps and a trade union functionary, is also in jail. Umland suffers from cancer. But even though he is mortally ill, the Bonn jailers refuse to let him out of their hands.

Ludwig Landwehr, ex-prisoner of Buchenwald and chairman of the Association of Victims of Nazi Persecution in Lower Saxony, was arrested last summer. Landwehr had publicly exposed two former SS men who took part in killing Ernst Thaelmann, leader of the German working class. However, it was not the assassins but their accuser who found himself in jail. Public indignation was such that in a few months after his arrest Landwehr had to be released. But the arrest warrant has not been cancelled, it has only been postponed.

The reprisals against democrats have acquired the character of naked terror and lawlessness. Schabrod, Sander and Landwehr were, in effect, punished for exercising the rights granted them by the Constitution. The fact that they were nominated in the general election and that they made political exposures in the legal press was qualified by the court as "a danger to the state."

The same charges were levelled against a group of Communists in Hamburg. During the trial the judge admitted that "as people they

were beyond reproach," that the views which they expressed during the election campaign "would, perhaps, be approved by many of us here," that their association with the Communist Party "has not been proved." Yet they were sentenced to imprisonment merely because they made no secret of their Communist convictions.

The lawlessness with regard to the Communist Party reduces to nought the last vestiges of constitutional democracy in West Germany. The outrageous case of *Der Spiegel*, the biggest bourgeois magazine in the Federal Republic, is proof of this. Towards the end of October the magazine's publisher, two editors and their deputies were arrested and charged with "high treason." The editorial offices and the homes of the arrested were raided and searched by the police. In a special statement Max Reimann, First Secretary of the Communist Party, denounced this act of terror as "a coup which with lightning speed has revealed in the eyes of Germany and the whole world how matters stand in the Bonn state with regard to the freedom of opinion and conscience, freedom of speech and the printed word." The West German press reported that Defense Minister Strauss insolently threatened some of the Social Democratic members of the Bundestag, saying that prison and the gallows had long been awaiting them.

The trial of the Association of the Victims of Nazi Persecution, engineered by the Bonn authorities with a view to outlawing this organization, is also indicative of the offensive now being waged by the reactionaries. Needless to say, it has evoked indignation far beyond the boundaries of the Federal Republic. Not in a single country of Europe, except for those states with fascist regimes, are former resistance fighters denied the right to have their own organization.

The cynicism of the Bonn authorities is such that the Nazi criminals who, under public pressure, are being put on trial for killing dozens, hundreds and even thousands of people, are being acquitted. For instance, the former Nazi officer Leibbrand who shot 26 Italian workers in 1944, was found "not guilty." Also acquitted was Duesenschoen, former deputy commandant of the Fulsbuettel concentration camp, who personally tortured prisoners. In recent years 37 of the 57 leading Gestapo men accused of murders and torture have been acquitted; the same is true of 25 of the 37 former Nazis accused of crimes against humanity.

Many of the Nazi killers are administering "justice" in the Federal Republic. The domination of the ex-Nazis is such that last spring a certain Fraenkel, who under Hitler had the job of examining court sentences, was appointed general prosecutor. It was this Fraenkel who endorsed dozens of death sentences and insisted on capital punishment even when the Nazi judges were undecided. The Bonn government had to renounce the services of the hangman exposed by the GDR lawyers, but even the West German press admits that "the Fraenkels are everywhere" in the Republic. Three quarters of the 11,600 West German judges worked in the Nazi judiciary. Today they are again sending anti-fascists, Communists and liberals to prison, tomorrow they may start to behead, hang and shoot.

The German Committee for Defense of Human Rights has appealed to the parliaments of the anti-Hitler coalition countries urging them to act to prevent the criminal violence with which the Federal Republic is trampling on the ideals of this coalition. This call must be heard.

W. R.

PUT AN END TO THE FRANCO TERROR!

ANOTHER name has been added to the list of Franco victims. On November 7 Franco's political police—known in Spain as the "social-political brigade" —arrested in Madrid Julian Grimau, member of the C.C. of the Communist Party and veteran fighter for the rights of the working people. Grimau was subjected to brutal torture. To conceal their crime the torturers threw their victim from the balcony of the police headquarters in an attempt to simulate suicide.

Grimau did not die, however, and in an extremely serious condition was taken to the hospital in the Carabanchel prison.

This crime aroused a storm of protests in Spain and abroad. The Executive Committee of the Communist Party appealed to the people of Spain and to world public opinion to act in the name of humanity and conscience against the brutalities of the Franco regime which has made torture the customary method of the secret police.

A wave of protests swept the country.

The Communist Party of Spain and the United Socialist Party of Catalonia issued a call to all Spaniards urging them to collect signatures to the demand for the release of Grimau, to uphold the rights of the working class and

the people as a whole.

In London and Paris crowds gathered outside the Spanish embassies to express their indignation. Posters and placards said: "Hands Off Julian Grimau!" "Down with Political Repressions!", "Amnesty!", "Freedom!" "Down with Butcher Franco!" The demonstration in London lasted throughout the night.

The protest movement is growing. In Britain calls to save the life of Grimau came from the Executive Committee of the Communist Party, the International Brigade Association and Friends of Republican Spain.

Bertrand Russell also denounced the terror. In a letter to the Spanish ambassador in London he asked that harassing of honest people be stopped. Torture, penal servitude, a hunger regime in the prisons, exile and maltreatment, he wrote, are methods which cannot be applied by people in their right senses or by intelligent authorities.

In the list of the victims of Franco is an endless number of names of fighters for the freedom of the Spanish people, members of various political parties and groups.

In a radio broadcast transmitted by the Independent Spain radio station, Santiago Carrillo, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Spain, said: "I appeal to all Spaniards, both of the Left and the Right. It is no longer possible to tolerate in silence the government torturing people with whose ideas one may or may not agree, but who honestly uphold their ideas, risking their lives and exercising every effort to achieve victory for these ideas in a peaceful way, despite the fact that the regime constantly impels them to violence, to having recourse to the principle 'an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth'."

On behalf of the Communist Party, Comrade Carrillo urged the working people, the intellectuals, clergy and patriots in the armed forces to demand legal guarantees for Grimau and all prisoners. He demanded that the gangs of assassins known as the "social-political brigade" be disbanded, the special tribunals abolished and the political prisoners amnestied.

Julian Grimau must be free! Through the magazine *World Marxist Review* the Spanish Communists appeal to all friends of democracy, all who believe in the rights of man to act in defense of Julian Grimau and the other victims of Franco.

The Franco terror must be ended!

Jose PEREZ

A POLICY OF NATIONAL BETRAYAL

(Letter from Dakar)

SINCE the disintegration of the Mali Federation (on August 20, 1960) arbitrary rule and police terror practised by Senghor and Dia have been the lot of the people of Senegal.

Not satisfied with promulgating a series of anti-democratic laws designed to abolish normal political life in the country, the government has instituted a special tribunal to deal with "political crimes." This tribunal has sentenced one of our comrades, Malick Kamara, to two years' imprisonment. It has also condemned to long-term imprisonment and penal servitude innocent people charged with taking part in the so-called fourth "anti-national conspiracy," a conspiracy engineered by the authorities early this year.

Elementary rights have wiped out, the democratic press is suppressed, and patriotic organizations are harassed and persecuted in every way. Policie provocations and unlawful arrests are commonplace. Two of our comrades, Papa N'Diaye and Amadou Gaye, were recently arrested and jailed without any legal grounds whatsoever. Comrade Madické Wade, who only recently served a year in prison, has again been unlawfully arrested. The same thing has happened to Alla Kane from Diourbel. Many other patriots who refuse to become reconciled to the policy of national betrayal are in jail.

The patriots, conscious of the danger which the policy of the present government spells for the country, are sparing no effort to build up a broad united front for independence which will form a government of national unity. In carrying out this task the solidarity of the international working-class movement and of democrats everywhere is called upon to play its part.

Lamine N'DIAYE

NEW BOOKS

(Books listed here are in the language of the country of publication; the titles are given in English)

H. Aptheker. *American Foreign Policy and the Cold War.* New York, New Century Publishers, 1962. 416 pp.

A. Arzumanyan. *Krizis mirovogo kapitalizma na sovremyonnom etape.* (Crisis of World Capitalism at the Present Stage.) Moscow, USSR Academy of Sciences Publishing House, 1962. 147 pp.

G. Badrus. *Miscarea de eliberare nationala.* (The National-Liberation Movement: Current Problems and Perspectives.) Bucharest, Editura politica, 1962. 111 pp.

M. Cornforth. *Dialectical Materialism: an Introduction.* Vol. 2: Historical Materialism. 2nd revised edition. London, Lawrence and Wishart, 1962. 148 pp.

I. Ceterchi. *Republica Populara Romina — stat socialist.* (Rumanian People's Republic—a Socialist State.) Bucharest, Editura politica, 1962. 359 pp.

Ekonomicheskoye sorevnovaniye sotsializma s kapitalizmom. (The Economic Competition Between Socialism and Capitalism.) Edited by V. A. Zhamin. Moscow, Sotsekgiz, 1962. 502 pp.

C. H. Hermansson. *Monopol och storkapital.* (Monopolies and Big Capital.) Stockholm, Arbetarkultur, 1962.

K. M. Kasradze. *Ocherk istorii programmy KPSS.* (Essay on the History of the CPSU Program.) Moscow, Gospolitizdat, 1962. 400 pp.

N. S. Khrushchov. *Stroitelstvo kommunizma v SSSR i razvitive selskogo khozyaistva.* (Building Communism in the USSR and the Development of Agriculture.) Reports and speeches. Vol. 2. February 1955-January 1958. Moscow, Gospolitizdat, 1962.

I. M. Krivoguz. *"Spartak" i obrazovaniye kommunisticheskoy Partii Germanii.* ("The Spartacus League" and the Foundation of the Communist Party of Germany.) Moscow, Gospolitizdat, 1962. 239 pp.

V. I. Lenin. *Complete Works.* 5th Ed. Vol. 33. "The State and Revolution," "Marxism on the State." Moscow, Gospolitizdat, 1962.

V. I. Lenin. *Complete Works.* 5th Ed. Vol. 34. July 10 (23)—October 24 (November 6), 1917. Moscow, Gospolitizdat, 1962.

V. I. Lenin. *Marxismus und Staat.* (Marxism and the State.) Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1962. 144 pp.

A. L. Morton. *The Life and Ideas of Robert Owen.* London, Lawrence and Wishart, 1962. 187 pp.

Prehled nejnovejsich dejin. 1917-1939. (A Review of Modern History. 1917-1939.) Vol. 1, 1917-1929. Prague, Nakladatelstvi politicke literatury, 1962. 501 pp.

V. Roman. *Stiinta si tehnica in epoca trecerii societatii de la capitalism la comunism.* (Science and Technology in the Epoch of the Transition from Capitalism to Communism.) Bucharest, Editura stiintifica, 1962. 442 pp.

Teorie wzrostu ekonomicznego a wspolczesny kapitalizm. (Theories of Economic Growth and Modern Capitalism.) Symposium edited by Professor J. Zawadzki and A. Lukasiewicz. Warsaw, Ksiazka i Wiedza, 1962, 610 pp.

P. Togliatti. *La formazione del gruppo dirigente del PCI negli anni 1923-1924.* (Formation of the Leading Group of the Italian Communist Party in 1923-1924.) Rome, Editori Riuniti, 1962.

P. Vaillant-Couturier. *Vers des lendemains qui chantent.* (Towards a Bright Future.) Selected Works. Paris, Editions sociales, 1962, 317 pp.

J. Zielinski. *"Big Business."* Warsaw, Ksiazka i Wiedza, 1962. 264 pp.

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW
Problems of Peace and Socialism

CONTENTS FOR 1962
(Nos. 1-12)

EDITORIALS

	No.	Page
Fascism Must Be Extirpated!	4	3
"Integration" of Monopoly Capital—Some New Developments	7	16
The Only Way to Peace	9	19
The Policy of Peaceful Coexistence Proves Its Worth	12	3
The Revolutionary Platform of the International Communist Movement	11	33

ARTICLES

	No.	Page
ABDELKADER—The Struggle for National Independence and Disarmament	6	18
D. N. AIDIT—Party Building and Mass Work	9	29
J. ALI—The Iraqi Communist Party and the Kurdish Question	8	19
E. ARAB-OGLY—Victims of the Capitalist Moloch	8	48
Y. ARBATOV—Leninism and the Revolutionary Force of Socialist Example	4	25
J. AUERHAN—Automation and Man	6	48
AZIZ, ABDELKADER, ADNAN—The True and the False Friends of the Arab People	5	38
H. BARRIOS KLEE—Changes in the Making in Guatemala	11	27
E. BERLINGUER—Some Aspects of the Development of the Italian Communist Party	7	33
L. BOUHALI—The Building of Communism and the Liberation Struggles of the Arab Peoples	1	20
O. BRUNO—Practice and Truth	3	38
J. R. CAMPBELL—Britain and the Common Market	7	27
S. CARRILLO—The Working Class Paves the Way to Freedom for Spain	8	3
E. CHE GUEVARA—Cuba and the "Kennedy Plan"	2	33
V. CODOVILLA—The Unity of the Popular Forces in Argentina is Growing	12	25
E. CORRENS—National Front of Democratic Germany in the Struggle for a Peace Treaty and Socialist Construction	3	19
L. CORVALAN—The Struggle for a People's Government in Chile	12	19
A. CUNHAL—New Stage in the Anti-Salazar Struggle	3	3
S. CVALO—Some Aspects of the Problem of Building Mass Communist Parties	8	33
H. FAGAN—Why They Failed	1	46
P. FRIEDLAENDER, H. SCHILLING—West German Imperialism—Bulwark of Colonialism	4	18
L. GATOVSKY—From Socialist to Communist Distribution	2	10
A. GHOSH —Some Features of the Indian Situation	2	17
A. GHOSH —The Liberation of Goa	3	9

	No.	Page
F. GLAUBAUF—The Fight for Democratic Education in Austria	6	54
J. GOLLAN—The Program of the CPSU and the Perspectives of Capitalism in Britain	5	9
J. GOLLAN—Britain: Results of the Party Building Year	9	24
B. GRUSHIN—A Glimpse into the Future	10	25
A. GUERRA BORGES, E. MORA VALVERDE—Some Problems of Economic Integration of Central America	6	40
C. GULIAN—Moral Bankrupts	8	41
F. HAVLICEK—Perspectives of Socialist Society in Czechoslovakia	9	35
J. HENDRYCH—The Twenty-Second Congress of the CPSU and the Development of the Socialist World System	1	12
E. HENRI—Who Finances Anti-Communism?	2	46
K. HERMANSSON—Swedish Social Democracy and Socialism	2	40
J. KANAPA—Pope John XXIII's Encyclical Is a Manifesto of State-Monopoly Capitalism	1	34
J. KANAPA—General and Complete Disarmament Is the Urgent Need of our Time	5	23
G. KAR—The Socialist Revolution—Peaceful and Non-Peaceful	5	30
N. S. KHRUSHCHOV—Vital Questions of the Development of the Socialist World System	9	3
F. R. KOZLOV—CPSU—the Party of the Entire People	6	3
J. LEDWOHN—The Fight for the Trade Unions in Federal Germany	9	43
L. LONGO—New Point in the Political History of Italy	5	17
MAMUN—Peaceful Coexistence and the National-Liberation Struggle	10	3
S. MIKUNIS—Israel's Problems, Our Struggle and Its Perspectives	6	32
A. MITIL—The Working Class and the "Integration" of Monopoly Capital	8	25
L. MORRIS—The Canadian Communist Party and the National Interests of the Country	6	26
P. MOTTA LIMA—Marxism-Leninism and Its Influence on Cultural Life in Brazil	10	19
I. MUSTAFA—The Communist Party of Sudan in the Struggle for Independent Democratic Development of the Country	8	11
A. NATTA, G. PAJETTA—The Struggle for Socialism in Italy	11	21
S. NOSAKA—For an Independent, Democratic Japan	2	28
A. NOVOTNY—Socialism in the Historical Offensive	11	3
K. OESTERLING—Peace and the People	7	37
R. PALME DUTT—Neo-Colonialism and British Imperialism	4	10
R. PALME DUTT—No Place for Fascism in Britain!	12	38
E. PAPAIOANNOU—The People of Cyprus in the Struggle for Freedom and Social Advance	3	13
D. PARTSALIDIS—The Communist Party of Greece in the Struggle for Democratic Change	1	26
B. PONOMARYOV—Champion of Peace and Socialism	7	8
B. PONOMARYOV—Some Problems of the Revolutionary Movement	12	9
A. RAPACKI—Socialist Diplomacy of Peace in the World Arena	6	12
V. RUDIN—Triumph of the Leninist Principles of Party Life	2	3
A. RUMYANTSEV—Our Common Ideological Weapon	1	3
S. RYERSON—The American "Way of Life": Some Illusions—and Realities	3	26
E. SZYR—The Science of Socialist Economic Management	10	7
M. THOREZ—Epoch of Great Revolutionary Change	11	9
E. TUOMINEN—Parliamentary Activities of the Finnish Communists	12	32

	No.	Page
W. ULBRICHT—The Historical Task of the GDR and the Future of Germany	7	3
WILL MAC LORIN—The Bourgeoisie in Senegal and Neo-Colonialism	10	14
J. WODDIS—Role of the African Working Class in the National-Liberation Movement	7	44
K. YANAGIDA—Freedom and the Onward March of Knowledge	4	33
V. ZAGLADIN—The Economic Competition Between Socialism and Capitalism—A Perspective View	5	46
V. ZAGLADIN—A Triumph for the Idea of Peace	9	49
Y. ZHILIN—The Program of Communism and the Theoretical Bankruptcy of Social Democracy	1	42
In Memory of Ajoy Gumar Ghosh	2	68

WMR COMMENTARIES

	No.	Page
S. ANDERSEN—A Political Blind Alley	5	7
J. ARMSTRONG—"Global Poker" Versus Grand Strategy	6	59
G. ARMSTRONG—Lest the Guns Go Off	8	54
A. M. BARTZ—Politics, the Trade Unions and the Communists	6	63
O. BROWN—What Is Behind the Taiwan "Shop-Window"	7	53
O. BROWN—The Foundations of Colonialism are Crumbling	8	56
M. CAMPOS—"New" Policy and Old Allies	6	62
M. RICO—The Way to Trade Union Unity	5	5
M. SADOUN—The Cease-Fire in Algeria	5	3
B. SANCHEZ—The Ground Is Shaking in Spain	6	67
M. STANLEY—Lessons of the Stock Market Slump	7	51

WMR INTERVIEWS

Trade Unions and the Struggle for Socialism

Replies to our questions are given by: FRANTISEK ZUPKA, THAN DANG TUEN, JESUS SOTO DIAZ, RAGNAR ANDERSSON, JEAN BRETEAU, ANDREAS ZUARTHIDIS, KHACHATUR ARA, SOICHI HOSOI, MICHAEL IMOUDU, MOSES MABHIDA, SINFOROSO CABRERA ROMERO, ANTONIO PEREIRA DOS SANTOS	3	33
	4	40

EXCHANGE OF VIEWS

The Communist Movement and the Youth

Contributions by: S. NISHIZAWA (Japan), H. CAMPUSANO (Chile), J. ANGENFORT (Federal Republic of Germany), S. MITRA (India), S. ALVARES (Spain)	1	66
K. OESTERLING (Denmark), W. WACHS (Austria), E. ABDELKADER (Algeria), H. GURALNICK (Canada), G. AL-HAIDARI (Iraq), W. SNELL (Finland), P. MOTTA LIMA (Brazil), M. JAFFAR (Sudan)	2	69

Conference of Marxist Sociologists

(Report of Round-Table Talks in the Editorial Office of **World Marxist Review**)	2	78

Crises and the Working People

	No.	Page
Contributions by: A. RUMYANTSEV, J. SCHMIDT, R. BELLAMY, L. URBAN, A. PESENTI, S. MENSHIKOV, O. REINHOLD, H. TAMMER, Y. BAREL, Y. OSTROVITYANOV, A. MANUKYAN, E. POZZO, G. MAURISCHAT, E. BERT, E. ARAB-OGLY, A. SOBOLEV, E. AMBARTSUMOV	3	60

Paths of Development of Newly-Emergent Countries

Contributions by A. BELAL (Morocco), J. WODDIS (Britain), E. O. ABDELKADER (Algeria), R. LEDDA (Italy), G. Kim (USSR), P. G. ALBERDI (Argentina)	4	62
BLAS ROCA (Cuba), K. DOBREV (Bulgaria), P. TLALE (South African Republic)	5	66
P. MOTTA LIMA (Brazil), S. NADER (Lebanon), H. SUPARDAN, OEI HAI DJUN (Indonesia), J. CADEMARTORI (Chile)	6	77
B. ZACHARESCU (Rumania), A. AVANESYAN (Iran), G. HANSEN (GDR), C. CAMPOS (Guatemala), Y. BOCHKARYOV (USSR), Z. MAZYAR (Iran)	7	70

The Role of Women in Modern Society

Contributions by: A. RUMYANTSEV (WMR), MOLLY KEITH (Britain), CARLOS LOPEZ (Guatemala), ANNIE S. BULLER (Canada)	7	77
A. HODINOVA-SPURNA (Czechoslovakia), MAASJE SIWI (Indonesia), ALICJA MUSIALOWA (Poland), JULIETA CAMPUSANO (Chile), MANIGEE MEHREGEN (Iran)	8	73
HENRIETTA ROUGET (Switzerland), SANTIAGO ALVARES (Spain), AMADOR ADAYA (Honduras), GIGLIA TEDESCO (Italy), NONNA MURAVYOVA (USSR), INKERI LEHTINEN (Finland), ROSA SCHULZ (Federal Germany), LENE BERG (German Democratic Republic), ROSA PANTALEON (Argentina), MADALEINE COLIN (France), ANNIE O. AVERINK (Holland), ANNA KARLOVSKA (Czechoslovakia), ABDALLAH LAYACHI (Morocco), AISHA AMIR (Sudan), KHADICHA SULEIMANOVA (USSR), RADA TODOROVA (Bulgaria), ZOFIA STAROS (Poland)	10	47

Anti-Communism—the Enemy of Mankind

Contributions by: A. RUMYANTSEV (WMR), W. KASHTAN (Canada), G. COGNIOT (France)	8	79
PETER KERRIGAN (Britain), ITARU YONEHARA (Japan), ULISES RIVERA URBINA (Mexico), JOAQUIN MORENO DIAZ (Colombia), ARDESHIR AVANESYAN (Iran), ABDELKADER EL OUAHRANI (Algeria)	9	70
HORST HEMBERGER (GDR), PEDRO MOTTA LIMA (Brazil), A. LERUMO (Republic of South Africa), WILL MAC LORIN (Senegal), HENRY WINSTON (USA), Materials on Anti-Communism in the USA, ERNESTO GIUDICI (Argentina), GUSTAVO MACHADO (Venezuela), CARLOS LOPEZ (Guatemala), INDRAJIT GUPTA (India), ERNST HENRI (USSR), HANS BAYER (GDR), ERKKI TUOMINEN (Finland)	10	67
SIEGFRIED SCHULTZ (Federal Germany), AZIZ AL-HAJJ (Iraq), ARNOST KOLMAN (Czechoslovakia), VALENTINO GERRATANA (Italy), ANDREJ SIRACKY (Czechoslovakia), ERHARD ALBRECHT (GDR), WALTER HOLLITSCHER (Austria), A. I. PASHKOV (USSR), RUDI GOGUEL (GDR), E. P. SITKOVSKY (USSR), NIKOLAI IRIBAJAKOV (Bulgaria), ERNST MENERT (Czechoslovakia), VICTOR JOANNES (France), A. I. SOBOLEV (WMR)	11	52

Problems of Modern Capitalism

	No.	Page
Socialism and the Changes in Capitalist Society. New Developments in Capitalism. State-Monopoly Capitalism	11	72
West European Common Market. The Position and Struggle of the Working Class. Summarized Contributions	12	58

IN THE COMMUNIST AND WORKERS' PARTIES

A. G.—Lessons Must Be Drawn from the 1962 Elections	8	68
P. AURA—Selling Democratic Newspapers and Journals	2	62
L. BAILLOT—France: Higher Educational Establishments in the Anti-Fascist Struggle	5	63
M. BERTOU—France: the Condition of Government Employees and the Work of the Communist Party	3	52
L. BIANCI—Ideological Training of Italian Party Cadres	3	50
D. BOYEV—Bulgaria Looks Ahead	12	43
G. BROOKS—British Communist Party: the Force of Printed Propaganda	10	38
J. BURLES—France: the Factory Party Branches	4	49
A. CARVALHO—The Link Between Party Education and Life	12	53
F. CLAVAUD—Work of the Communists in the Countryside	7	57
J. COHEN—Britain: Party Education	8	67
P. COURTIEU—An Important Link in the Ideological Work of the French Communist Party	12	50
H. DANELIUS—The Struggle for Democracy and Peace in West Berlin	12	46
D. O.—Against the Ruin of the Japanese Peasants	11	43
F. EDELMAN—From the Experience of the Women's Movement in Argentina	3	46
S. FUENTES—Current Tasks of the Communists in Honduras	6	68
J. GONZALEZ—Chile: Successful Recruitment Campaign	5	60
N. ISCARO—Argentina: Party Work in Factories in Buenos Aires	4	51
M. IVANOV—Moulding the New Man Is the General Line of Ideological Work	2	55
M. IVANOV—More People Study Marxism-Leninism	12	48
I. JARVINEN—Communists in the Countryside	2	60
G. JEFFARES—National Conference of the Irish Workers' League	7	64
M. KHALDEYEV—More District Activists	8	59
KIM HO SEN—Fourth Congress of the Korean Party of Labor	1	61
T. KOISTINEN—Communists Uphold the Interests of the Workers	2	57
M. LAB—Communist Education of the Youth in Czechoslovakia	1	59
M. LAB—New Rules of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia	10	41
M. LAB—Party Education in Czechoslovakia	12	49
K. LANGE—Growing Influence of Communists in West German Factories	5	58
E. LATH—Peace and Socialism — the Vital Cause of Women in the German Democratic Republic	3	48
W. LAUCHLAN—Britain: Communist Factory Conference	5	57
A. LEPPANEN—A Neighborhood Party Organization	2	59
G. LERNIS—Political Training of Communists	12	55
W. L'HUILLIER—The Work of Communist Councillors in France	9	61
C. MARIGHELLA—Struggle for Democratic Reforms, for Legalization of the Communist Party in Brazil	5	55
S. MARIN—Working in Semi-Legal Conditions	12	54
M. MAZI—Italian Communists Counter Bourgeois Propaganda	6	72
M. C.—In the Fight for Unity	9	64
M. O.—Problems of the Women's Movement and the Policy of the Communist Party of Japan	3	47

	No.	Page
A. MOD—Party Education in the Helsinki-Uusimaa Area	2	60
P. NERON—Position of Artisans and Shopkeepers and the Policy of the French Communist Party	7	60
S. REGALADO—From the Experience of the Underground Work of the Communist Party of Venezuela	1	57
J. ROBERTS—Party Education in Australia	10	39
V. SAMARETS—Active Helpers of a Factory Party Committee	8	61
A. SAMARIN—People's Universities	8	62
SAMI—Upholding the Interests of the Working Class	12	44
E. SANNA—Italy: Results of the Municipal Elections and the Struggle for a Real Opening to the Left	9	67
K. P. SILVA—Ceylon: Communist Party Safeguards National Interests	5	61
S. SIIVONEN—Unity of Action Can Be Extended	2	61
V. TELLO—The People's Party of Panama Unfurls the Banner of Patriotism	6	70
C. THUNBORG—Sweden: A Party Branch Forges Ahead	4	53
E. VILLATORO—Guatemalan Party of Labor Strengthens Links with the Masses	5	59
G. VITALE—The Cooperative Movement in the Countryside and the Policy of the Italian Communist Party	4	54
Z. WROBLEWSKI—Party Work in the Higher Schools of People's Poland	4	57
N. YEGORYCHEV—Encouraging Members' Initiative	8	58
Ceylon Communist Party's Views on Studying the Experience of the CPSU	6	71
Changes in the Work of Party Branches in Cuba	8	70
The Common Market—an Instrument of the Monopolies	7	55
Communist Party of Venezuela Combats Onslaught of Reaction	7	63
Communists Review the Situation in Brazil	11	40
Communists Throughout the World Support the Valiant Fight of the U.S. Communist Party	2	54
Documents of the Communist Party of the USA	5	53
Fortieth Anniversary of the Japanese Communist Party	7	54
Founding Congress of the Communist Party of Lesotho (Basutoland)	9	66
General Approval of the Decisions of the Twenty-Second Congress of the CPSU	1	52
Help to the Countryside	11	46
New Program of the Algerian Communist Party	9	57
Party Activists	11	46
Party Congresses (Denmark, Indonesia, Costa Rica)	8	62
A Party of the People	5	52
The Program for Struggle of the Communists of Tunisia	7	66
Program of the South African Communist Party	10	33
Twentieth Anniversary of the Polish Workers' Party	3	58

REVIEWS

	No.	Page
M. AMIN, G. MIRSKY—Old Colonialism in New Garb	12	82
A. M. BARTZ—Tartuffe, Fourth Act	1	80
P. BELLEFROID—May Gardens Bloom Where Prisons Now Stand	2	82
I. COX—Focus on Africa	3	83
M. FERRARA—Togliatti on Problems of the Working-Class Movement	12	79
N. FREED—A New Marxist Journal	9	82
G. GERASIMOV—Word of the Future	2	84
G. GERASIMOV—The First Glimmerings	5	75
J. GIBBONS—Exporters of Counter-Revolution	7	84

	No.	Page
J. GIBBONS—A Transatlantic Dialogue	10	88
G. GREIS—The Last Frontiers of Freedom	1	80
G. GREIS—The Cold War — A Product of Anti-Communism	3	80
L. JANOSSY—The Legacy of Hiroshima	8	90
Y. KARYAKIN—Allen Dulles Instead of Karl Marx	4	82
R. MATHIEU—The Lessons of the Popular Front	4	79
G. MUELLER—Brownshirts in Black Jackets and Striped Pants	5	73
D. OSTRYANIN, V. YEVDOKIMENKO—A Champion of the Truth	10	90
V. PAVLAT—Capitalist "Integration" and Its Ideologists	9	79
A. POMOGAYEV—In the Front Lines of the Fight for Communism	6	84
B. SANCHEZ—Voice of the Mexican Communists	9	83
W. SCHULTZ—The Program of the CPSU and the Poverty of Its Critics	7	86
V. M. VANDENHOVE—Professor Guelfat's Conclusions	6	87
J. WODDIS—The Rape of Africa	11	87

COMMUNICATIONS AND COMMENT

S. ALI—Events in Iraqi Kurdistan	3	84
A. F.—The People of Iran Fight On	4	89
R. BOND—New Trends in British Cinema	6	89
H. CLAUDE—Economic Development and the Class Struggle	5	76
E. A.—In the Backwash of Capitalist Ideology	5	88
E. J.—Anti-Communist Conference	3	90
H. FAGAN—Labor Party Conference	11	89
W. GREY—West Irian Shall Be Free	2	87
K. HASIM—The ARAMCO	5	87
A. HASSAN—The Liberation Struggle is Growing	7	90
R. IBARBURU—The People Defend Democracy	1	88
L. INFELD—The Moral Responsibility of the Scientist	12	84
S. JAWAD—Interference in the Guise of Sympathy	6	92
V. KAJE—The Western "Answer"	2	85
R. KENT—Smoke the Calumet Together	9	84
F. MEYER—Apropos of the German Social Democratic Congress	8	93
I. MONTAGU—Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament in Britain	12	89
O. NEUMANN—Letters from Prison	10	92
T. NIKOLAIDIS—Greece Gives Rebuff to Fascists	9	86
M. OKOYE—Communism and African Perspectives	3	86
A. PESENTI—Reply to Comrade Henri Claude	5	82
P. H.—New Obstacles on the Road to Independence	7	88
F. PICACHO—Honduras: The People's Will Cannot be Broken	4	90
N. RASHID—New Republic in the Middle East	12	87
J. RIVERA—Albizu Campos — Symbol of Puerto Rico's Struggle for Independence	1	83
A. RUMYANTSEV—Under Cover of Devotion to Principle	4	86
V. TOMM—Attention — Sedition	6	91
V. -M. VANDENHOVE—General Disarmament, Not "Balance of Terror"	4	87
I. T. A. WALLACE-JOHNSON—Let the People of Sierra Leone Decide	1	85
V. ZAKHAROVA—Much Ado about Nothing	3	89
As Specific as a Bullet	1	88
Meeting of the Fraternal Parties of France and Senegal	9	89

PAGES FROM HISTORY

A. ARDEKANI—National Hero of the People of Iran 10 94

AGAINST THE PERSECUTION OF DEMOCRATS

A. ARDEKANI—Stop the Latest Wave of Terror in Iran 1 91
A. DE COSTA—The Lives of Portuguese Anti-Fascists Are in Danger 2 91
A. CUNHAL—The Courage of the Portuguese Communists 11 90
D. S.—Stronger than Death 6 93
R. GAUTHIER—The People of Haiti Are Fighting for Freedom 6 93
F. IBRAHIM—In King Hussein's Dungeons 10 97
G. LERNIS—"It Is Forbidden . . ." 10 98
P. LINARES—Raise Your Voice in Defense of Antonio Maidana and His Comrades! 2 89
E. G. MANCERA—The Will of the People of Venezuela Cannot Be Broken! 5 91
J. MEDEIROS—A Valiant Son of Angola Free Again 9 90
J. MURPHY—Why Was Hyman Lumer Arrested? 1 91
L. N'DIAYE—A Policy of National Betrayal 12 94
G. NICOLE—The People of the Congo Will Win! 3 93
J. PEREZ—Put an End to the Franco Terror! 12 93
S. PEREZ—Arrests and Torture Will Not Break the Spirit of the Argentine People 8 95
PERICLES—The Imperialists Organize Terrorism 8 96
S. REGALADO—Crimes of the Venezuelan Government 9 90
J. RIFF—Terror in Portuguese Guinea 6 94
W. SCHULTZ—The Peace Movement Cannot Be Halted 8 97
R. SINAY—Reactionary Intrigues in Argentina Must Be Foiled 11 93
I. SUMAR—The People Will Smash Salazar's Fascist Regime 8 98
G. UNZUETA—Freedom for D. A. Siqueiros! 1 90
K. VALKE—Another Outrage by the Bonn Rulers 6 94
V. -M. VANDENHOVE—France: Fascism Will Not Pass! 3 92
V. VARDINOJANNIS, E. DIPLOS—A Letter from Greek Political Prisoners 5 91
L. VASQUEZ—Free the Patriots in Paraguay! 12 91
P. VERGES—Colonizers on the Rampage 1 89
V. M.—In Defense of Democratic Rights 7 91
W. R.—Justice in the Hitler Fashion 12 92
J. WRIGHT—Solidarity with the Communist Party of the USA 3 91
J. WRIGHT—Latest Intrigues of U.S. Reaction 4 91
Appeal to World Public Opinion 2 90
For a Peaceful Solution of the Kurdistan Question 7 92
Jordan: Protest Against Atrocities 5 90
The Shadow of McCarthy over Mexico 7 91