

*Documents on Events
in Czechoslovakia*



SEPTEMBER 1968

VOLUME 11 / NO. 9 / 35 CENTS

Ten years of our journal

With this issue, readers, we enter the second decade of the publication of **Problems of Peace and Socialism**, theoretical and information journal of the Communist and Workers' parties, the first issue of which appeared in September 1958.

For the past ten years our journal, founded after the 1957 Moscow Meeting of Communist and Workers' parties, has been analyzing and assessing the basic processes in contemporary world development, contributing to the dissemination and further elaboration of Marxist-Leninist theory. The journal prints the Marxist-Leninist parties' viewpoints on the basic issues of the day, examines questions relating to the strategy and tactics of the Communist movement, the experience of the Communist and Workers' parties in their fight against war and imperialism, and against all manifestations of bourgeois ideology, for peace, democracy and socialism.

The journal publishes materials on important developments in the Communist parties and progressive organizations throughout the world, helping thereby to broaden the exchange of information and experience between them, to promote unity of the international Communist movement, and the elaboration by the parties of a common stand on common issues.

Recalling Lenin's words that "what the class-conscious worker cherishes first of all, and most of all, in every publication is its principled approach . . ." our Editorial Board is guided by this fundamental principle of Marxism-Leninism. As has been recognized in the Communist movement, steadfast loyalty to Marxism-Leninism, educating the working class and all working people in the spirit of proletarian internationalism, uncompromising struggle against bourgeois ideology—these are the guarantee of success in consolidating the positions of socialism and foiling the intrigues of imperialism. It is from this standpoint that the journal examines the current problems concerning the development of the socialist world system, the experience of combining the common principles of socialist construction with the national peculiarities of each country, the methods of perfecting the economic and social system in the socialist countries. It is from this standpoint that the journal covers the struggle of the working class in the capitalist countries, the growth of the national-liberation movement, the process of rallying all anti-imperialist forces.

In the ten years since its appearance the journal has gained for itself a worldwide circulation. Whereas its first issues were printed in 19 languages, today it is published in 26 languages and distributed in more than 100 countries, and in some of them even clandestinely.

Problems of Peace and Socialism considers it its duty actively to participate in collective discussion of the pressing problems of the day, to help give effect to the measures aimed at cementing the unity of the Communist movement.

The Editorial Board regularly sponsors exchanges of views on important socio-political issues. The Communist movement responded with interest to the international meeting devoted to the 30th anniversary of the Seventh Congress of the Communist International (October 1965), the symposium, "Africa: The National and Social Revolution" (October 1966), the international conference on "The Historical Significance of the Great October Socialist Revolution" (June 1967), the exchange of views on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the appearance of Vol. I of Marx's **Capital** and the 50th anniversary of the publication of Lenin's **Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism** (October 1967), and on the problems of the youth movement in the capitalist countries (June 1968).

The materials of the symposiums in which leading figures of the international Communist movement, progressive personalities and Marxist scholars participated, have been published in our journal and also in book form in several languages. As heretofore, the journal considers its paramount task collectively to examine the complex theoretical and practical problems of the international Communist movement.

On the occasion of the tenth anniversary of our journal, the Editorial Board sincerely thanks the fraternal parties, contributors, Party and public personalities, scholars and journalists for their active support and help. The Editorial Board will be most grateful to its readers for any remarks and suggestions concerning the content of **Problems of Peace and Socialism**. For its part, the Board will as in the past spare no effort to ensure that the journal continues, with still greater effect, to serve the cause of uniting the Communist movement and all anti-imperialist forces, to work for peace and socialism.

—Editorial Board
Problems of Peace and Socialism

WORKERS OF ALL
COUNTRIES, UNITE!

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

Theoretical and
Information Journal
of Communist and
Workers' Parties

SEPTEMBER, 1968
VOLUME 11
NUMBER 9

Authorized as Second
Class Mail, Post Office
Department, Ottawa and
for payment of postage
in cash. Printed in
Canada.

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW
is the North American
edition of the monthly
journal Problems of Peace
and Socialism published
in Prague. The North
American edition is
published by Progress
Books, 487 Adelaide St.
West, Toronto 2B, Ontario,
Canada.

Copyright © 1968 by
Progress Books, Canada.
All Rights Reserved.
SUBSCRIPTION RATES:
\$3.50 a year. Single
copies 35 cents. Bundle
of five or more, 25 cents
per copy. Outside
Canada, add 15 cents
exchange.

PROBLEMS OF PEACE
AND SOCIALISM is also
published in French,
Russian, Bulgarian,
Czech, Dutch, German,
Greek, Hungarian,
Italian, Japanese,
Mongolian, Polish,
Rumanian, Spanish,
Swedish and Vietnamese.
Subscriptions to these
may be obtained through
Progress Books,
487 Adelaide St. West,
Toronto, at \$3.50 a year.

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



WMR

CONTENTS

- 3 Documents on talks between Communist
and Workers' parties of socialist
countries**
- J. DUCLOS
- 9 Imperialism and forces opposing it**
- 15 Current problems of communist
movement**
- G. VIEIRA
- INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE OF COMMUNIST
PARTIES WILL PROMOTE UNITY
- 20 The world today**
- B. MAGNUSON
- J. GIBBONS
- J. PRAZSKY
- REALITY vs. ILLUSION
- DOLLAR DEMOCRACY IN ACTION
- WASHINGTON: TALK OF PEACE AND
PLANS OF ESCALATION
- 31 Our round table**
- ASIAN AND AFRICAN YOUTH:
BUILDING A NEW LIFE
- 49 The national-liberation movement today**
- G. BATAT, A. RASHAL,
M. HARMEL
- A. LERUMO
- VITAL TASKS OF THE ARAB
NATIONAL-LIBERATION MOVEMENT
- SOUTHERN AFRICA FIGHTS FOR FREEDOM
- 63 In the communist and workers' parties**
- V. MARISCHI
- S. ALVAREZ
- O. G.
- R. S.
- ARGENTINA: SITUATION AND WORKING-CLASS
STRUGGLES
- ONCE MORE ON CATHOLIC-COMMUNIST
ALLIANCE
- THE LENIN CENTENARY
- GERMAN COMMUNIST PARTY:
ALIVE AND FIGHTING
- 83 The battle of ideologies**
- L. ALTER
- ON MODERN BOURGEOIS POLITICAL ECONOMY
- 90 Science in our time**
- I. NORLUND,
I. NOVIK
- CYBERNETICS AND IDEOLOGY
- 97 Heroes of fight for peace and progress**
- J. BERNAL
M. CAMPOS
A. DUMONT
- SCIENTIST AND FIGHTER
A LIFE DEVOTED TO STRUGGLE
TRUE SON OF THE BELGIAN WORKING CLASS
- 102 Books and journals**
- S. WRONSKI
- DRAMATIC PAGE OF POLISH HISTORY
BRIEF NOTICES

RECEIPTS

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

1880

Documents on talks between Communist and Workers' parties of socialist countries

Recent events in Czechoslovakia attracted worldwide attention. Printed below are documents related to these events.

JOINT COMMUNIQUE ON MEETING OF POLITICAL BUREAU OF CC CPSU AND PRESIDUM OF CC CPC

A meeting of the Political Bureau of the CC CPSU and the Presidium of the CC CPC took place in Cierna nad Tisou over July 29 - August 1, 1968.

The meeting was attended:

for the CPSU, by L. I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CC CPSU; G. I. Voronov, A. N. Kosygin, K. T. Mazurov, A. J. Pelse, N. V. Podgorny, M. A. Suslov, A. N. Shelepin, P. Y. Shelest, members of the Political Bureau of the CC CPSU; P. N. Demichev, P. N. Masherov, alternate members of the Political Bureau of the CC CPSU; K. F. Katushev, B. N. Ponomaryov, secretaries of the CC CPSU;

for the CPC, by A. Dubcek, First Secretary of the CC CPC; F. Barbirek, V. Bilak, O. Cernik, D. Kolder, F. Kriegel, J. Piller, E. Rigo, J. Smrkovsky, J. Spacek, O. Svestka, members of the Presidium of the CC CPC; A. Kapek, J. Lenart, B. Simon, alternate members of the Presidium of the CC CPC; M. Jakes, Chairman, Central Control and Auditing Committee.

On the Czechoslovak side, the meeting

was attended also by L. Svoboda, President of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

During the meeting there was an extensive comradely exchange of views on questions of interest to both sides.

The participants in the meeting exchanged detailed information on the situation in their countries.

The meeting took place in an atmosphere of complete frankness, sincerity and mutual understanding and was directed toward searching for ways of developing and further strengthening the traditional friendly relations between our parties and peoples based on Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. In the course of the discussions the two delegations decided by mutual agreement to propose to the central committees of the Communist and Workers' parties of Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR and Poland holding a multilateral comradely meeting. These fraternal parties accepted the proposal.

The meeting of representatives of the BCP, HSWP, SUPG, PUWP, CPSU and CPC will be held in Bratislava on August 3, 1968.

STATEMENT OF COMMUNIST AND WORKERS' PARTIES OF THE SOCIALIST COUNTRIES

A conference of representatives of the Communist and Workers' parties of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, Hungarian People's Republic, German Democratic Republic, Polish People's Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Czechoslovak Socialist Republic took place in Bratislava on

August 3, 1968. The conference was attended:

For the Bulgarian Communist Party: T. Zhivkov, First Secretary of the CC, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the BPR; S. Todorov, member of the Political Bureau and secretary of the CC; P. Kuba-

dinsky, member of the Political Bureau, CC, Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the BPR.

For the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party: J. Kadar, First Secretary of the CC; J. Fock, member of the Political Bureau, Chairman of the Hungarian Revolutionary Workers' and Peasants' Government; Z. Komocsin, member of the Political Bureau and secretary of the CC.

For the Socialist Unity Party of Germany: W. Ulbricht, First Secretary of the CC, Chairman of the State Council of the GDR; W. Stoph, member of the Political Bureau, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the GDR; E. Honecker, member of the Political Bureau and secretary of the CC; H. Matern, member of the Political Bureau, Chairman of the Central Control Committee; G. Mittag, member of the Political Bureau and secretary of the CC; H. Axen, alternate member of the Political Bureau and secretary of the CC.

For the Polish United Workers' Party: W. Gomulka, First Secretary of the CC; J. Cyrankiewicz, member of the Political Bureau, CC, Chairman of the Council of Ministers; Z. Kliszko, member of the Political Bureau and secretary of the CC; A. Starewicz, secretary of the CC.

For the Communist Party of the Soviet Union: L. I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CC; N. V. Podgorny, member of the Political Bureau, Chairman of the Presidium, Supreme Soviet of the USSR; A. N. Kosygin, member of the Political Bureau, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR; M. A. Suslov, member of the Political Bureau and secretary of the CC; P. Y. Shelest, member of the Political Bureau, First Secretary of the CC, CP of the Ukraine; K. F. Katushev, secretary of the CC; B. N. Ponomarev, secretary of the CC.

For the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia: A. Dubcek, First Secretary of the CC; O. Cernik, member of the Presidium, Chairman of the Government of the CSSR; J. Smrkovsky, member of the Presidium, Chairman of the National Assembly of the CSSR; V. Bilak, member of the Presidium, First Secretary of the CC CP of Slovakia; J. Lenart, alternate member of the Presidium, secretary of the CC. On the Czechoslovak side, L. Svoboda, President of the CSSR, also took part in the conference.

Proceeding from the fact that the complicated international situation and the subversion by imperialism against peace and the security of nations, against the socialist

cause, call for closer unity of the socialist countries, and bearing in mind that the development of socialism poses new tasks whose solution necessitates a further pooling of efforts of the socialist countries, the representatives of the Communist and Workers' parties of the socialist countries found it necessary to convene this conference in Bratislava.

In the spirit of established traditions and in an atmosphere of frankness, allegiance to principle, and friendship, the brother parties discussed urgent problems of the struggle for socialism, further consolidation of the socialist community and the cohesion of the world Communist movement. They exchanged views on problems of the present international situation and on stepping up the fight against imperialism.

The representatives of the Communist and Workers' parties discussed ways of strengthening and promoting the fraternal cooperation of the socialist countries.

In the years which have passed since the defeat of fascism and the establishment of working-class power, the peoples of the European countries that have taken the socialist road have achieved victories in all spheres of public life. In these years the parties, overcoming difficulties and steadily improving their work, have in each country ensured the establishment of a powerful industry and the transformation of life in the countryside; they have brought about a steady rise in the standard of living and attained a flowering national culture. Millions of working people have been awakened to conscious political activity. Particularly good progress in building socialism and communism has been made by the Soviet Union. The international prestige of the socialist countries and their role in solving important problems of world politics have grown immensely.

To maintain, consolidate and safeguard these gains, won through heroic effort and devoted labor by each country, is the common internationalist duty of all the socialist countries. This is the unanimous opinion of all the participants in this conference, who expressed their unshakable determination to carry forward and uphold the gains of socialism in their countries and to win further success in building socialism.

Experience has convinced the brother parties that they can advance along the socialist road only if they are strictly and consistently guided by the general laws of building socialist society and, first of all, by enhancing the leading role of the working

class and its vanguard, the Communist parties. In so doing, each fraternal party takes into account national peculiarities and conditions, as it creatively solves the problems of socialist development.

Unswerving loyalty to Marxism-Leninism, education of the masses in the spirit of the ideas of socialism and proletarian internationalism, and uncompromising struggle against bourgeois ideology, against all anti-socialist forces, are an earnest of progress in consolidating the positions of socialism and in foiling imperialist intrigues.

The brother parties firmly and resolutely counterpose their indestructible solidarity and high vigilance to all the attempts of imperialism and other anti-communist forces to weaken the leading role of the working class and the Communist parties. They will never allow anyone to drive a wedge between the socialist states, to undermine the foundations of the socialist system. Fraternal friendship and cohesion in this sense are in line with the vital interests of our peoples and constitute a reliable basis for solving the socio-economic and political problems on which the Communist parties of our countries are working.

The brother parties regard it as their duty to strive continuously for greater political activity on the part of the working class, the peasantry, the intelligentsia, all working people, for all-round progress of the socialist system, the further development of socialist democracy and improvement of the style and methods of Party and government activity based on democratic centralism.

The manifold tasks of building socialist society in each of our countries can be fulfilled much more easily given mutual help and support.

Fraternal contacts expand and multiply the opportunities of each socialist country. The participants in the conference expressed their firm resolve to do all in their power in order to deepen all-round cooperation of their countries on the principles of equality, respect for sovereignty and national independence, territorial integrity, fraternal mutual assistance and solidarity.

The Communist and Workers' parties consider it a task of the first importance effectively to exploit the vast natural resources of their countries, using the latest achievements of science and technology and perfecting the forms and methods of socialist economic management, and thereby to expand the economy and raise the

standard of living. An effective method of achieving these noble objectives is economic cooperation between the socialist countries on a bilateral and multilateral basis. It is becoming ever more important to perfect the work of the Council of Mutual Economic Aid and to extend among the socialist countries cooperation and specialization in production, which makes it possible to make fuller use of the advantages of the international socialist division of labor.

In this connection, the urgency of an early economic conference at top level was reaffirmed.

The participants in the conference consider it their duty to alert the peoples to the imperialist policy of aggression which has made the international situation complicated and dangerous. In these conditions the fraternal parties of the socialist countries, guided by the need to strengthen universal peace and the security of the nations, to organize resolute resistance to the imperialist policy of aggression and uphold the principles of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, reaffirm their readiness to concert and coordinate their actions in the international arena.

The working class, the peasantry, the intelligentsia, all working people crave for peace and tranquility for their countries, for all men on earth. The socialist countries will continue to do everything to realize these cherished aspirations of the peoples. Our parties declare that in accomplishing this noble task they will continue to cooperate with all the Communist and Workers' parties, with all the progressive forces of the world in the fight for world peace, freedom, independence and social progress.

The Communist and Workers' parties of Bulgaria, Hungary, the German Democratic Republic, Poland, the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia again solemnly declare their unshakable resolve to continue to support the valiant people of Vietnam and to render them the necessary aid in their just fight against the U.S. invaders.

We are concerned over the fact that the situation in the Middle East remains tense as a result of the aggressive policy of the ruling circles of Israel. Our parties will do all in their power to ensure that the effects of the Israeli aggression are rectified on the basis of the resolution of the UN Security Council of November 22, 1967 and that the Israeli troops are withdrawn from the occupied Arab territories.

Assessing the situation in Europe, the

conference noted that the growing activity of the forces of revanchism, militarism and neo-Nazism in West Germany directly affects the security of the socialist states and endangers world peace. We will continue consistently to implement a coordinated policy on European affairs, in line with the common interests of the socialist countries and the interests of European security, and will resist all attempts to revise the results of the Second World War and to violate the frontiers established in Europe; we will continue to insist on the non-validity of the Munich agreement from the beginning; we will resolutely support the German Democratic Republic, the socialist state of the German working people which upholds peace; we will constantly support the Communist Party of Germany and all the forces fighting against militarism and revanchism, for democratic progress.

The Communist parties of the socialist countries express their resolve to work for a guaranteed European security, and reaffirm the principles of the Bucharest Declaration and the Statement of the Karlovy Vary Conference of European Communist and Workers' parties. They are willing to do all that may be necessary to convene a congress of the European nations to maintain peace on our continent. To prevent a violation of peace in Europe is decisive for preserving world peace. All our joint efforts will be aimed at attaining this goal, which meets the interests of all nations.

Now that the imperialist forces of the USA, the FRG and other countries are engaged in aggressive activity, persistently striving to weaken the socialist community, the representatives of the fraternal parties consider it necessary to re-emphasize the special importance of the Warsaw Treaty. This Treaty, concluded by socialist countries in reply to the admission to NATO, the aggressive imperialist bloc, of a revanchist West Germany, has been, and remains, a powerful factor for peace and the security of the European nations. It is an insurmountable obstacle to all who would like to revise the results of the Second World War. It reliably safeguards the achievements of socialism and the sovereignty and independence of the brother states. Its purpose is to consolidate European security and preserve world peace.

The present situation demands of us unflagging efforts to increase the defense po-

tential of each socialist state and of the entire socialist community, to strengthen political and military cooperation within the Warsaw Treaty Organization.

The participants in the conference regard it as their duty consistently to work for closer unity of the international Communist movement. They note that lately important work has been done to prepare for the new international conference of the Communist and Workers' parties. The fraternal parties highly appreciate this work and express their conviction that the coming conference will be a success and will make an important contribution to the consolidation of all the revolutionary forces of our time.

We are certain that the common Marxist-Leninist world outlook, the role of the Communist and Workers' parties as the vanguard and the guiding force of society, and the socialist foundations of the national economies of our states will continue to serve as effective factors for closer unity of the socialist countries, for their unity in the struggle for the grand common goals.

The parties attending the Bratislava Conference make this Statement being deeply convinced that the positions and views expressed therein are in keeping with the interests of all the fraternal countries and parties, with the cause of indestructible friendship between the peoples of our countries, with the interests of peace, democracy, national independence and socialism.

For the Bulgarian Communist Party— T. Zhivkov, S. Todorov, P. Kubadinsky.

For the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party—J. Kadar, J. Fock, Z. Komocsin.

For the Socialist Unity Party of Germany—W. Ulbricht, W. Stoph, E. Honecker, H. Matern, G. Mittag, H. Axen.

For the Polish United Workers' Party—W. Gomulka, J. Cyrankiewicz, Z. Kliszko, A. Starewicz.

For the Communist Party of the Soviet Union—L. Brezhnev, N. Podgorny, A. Kosygin, M. Suslov, P. Shelest, K. Katushev, B. Ponomarev.

For the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia—A. Dubcek, O. Cernik, J. Smrkovsky, V. Bilak, J. Lenart.

COMMUNIQUE ON SOVIET-CZECHOSLOVAK TALKS

Soviet-Czechoslovak talks were held in Moscow over August 23-26, 1968. Participating were:

For the Soviet side—L. I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CC CPSU; A. N. Kosygin, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, member of the Political Bureau of the CC CPSU; N. V. Podgorny, Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, member of the Political Bureau of the CC CPSU; G. I. Voronov, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the RSFSR, member of the Political Bureau of the CC CPSU; A. P. Kirilenko, member of the Political Bureau and secretary of the CC CPSU; D. S. Polyansky, First Deputy Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, member of the Political Bureau and secretary of the CC CPSU; M. A. Suslov, member of the Political Bureau and secretary of the CC CPSU; A. N. Shelepin, member of the Political Bureau of the CC CPSU, Chairman of the All-Union Council of Trade Unions; P. Y. Shelest, member of the Political Bureau of the CC CPSU, First Secretary of the CC, CP of the Ukraine; K. F. Katushev, secretary of the CC CPSU; B. N. Ponomarev, secretary of the CC CPSU; A. A. Grechko, Minister of Defense of the USSR; A. A. Gromyko, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the USSR.

For the Czechoslovak side—L. Svoboda, President of the CSSR; A. Dubcek, First Secretary of the CC CPC; J. Smrkovsky, Chairman of the National Assembly of the CSSR, member of the Presidium of the CC CPC; O. Cernik, Chairman of the Government of the CSSR, member of the Presidium of the CC CPC; V. Bilak, member of the Presidium of the CC CPC, First Secretary of the CC of the Communist Party of Slovakia; F. Barbirek, member of the Presidium of the CC CPC, Deputy Chairman of the Slovak National Council; J. Piller, member of the Presidium of the CC CPC; E. Rigo, member of the Presidium of the CC CPC; J. Spacek, member of the Presidium of the CC CPC; O. Svestka, member of the Presidium of the CC CPC; M. Jakes, Chairman of the Central Control and Auditing Commission of the CC CPC; J. Lenart, alternate member of the Presidium and secretary of the CC CPC; B. Simon, alternate member of the Presidium of the CC CPC; G. Husak, Deputy Chairman of the Government of the CSSR; A. Indra, secretary of the CC CPC; Z. Mlynar, secretary of the CC CPC; Colonel-General

M. Dzur, Minister of National Defense of the CSSR; B. Kucera, Minister of Justice of the CSSR; V. Koucky, Ambassador of the CSSR in the USSR.

During the talks the participants discussed—openly and in comradely fashion—questions relating to the present development of the international situation, the intensification of imperialist intrigues against the socialist countries, the situation in Czechoslovakia in the recent period and the temporary entry of the troops of the five socialist countries into the territory of the CSSR.

Both parties expressed firm conviction that in the present situation the important task is to implement the joint decisions adopted at Cierna nad Tisou and the postulates and principles formulated by the Bratislava Conference, as well as consistently to realize the practical steps flowing from the agreement reached during the negotiations.

The Soviet side declared that it appreciates and supports the position of the CPC and CSSR, which intends to proceed from the decisions taken by the January and May plenary meetings of the CC CPC with a view to improving the methods of leading society, promoting socialist democracy and strengthening the socialist system on the basis of Marxism-Leninism.

Agreement was reached on measures aimed at normalizing the situation in the CSSR as speedily as possible. The Czechoslovak leaders furnished information about the measures which they have planned to this end for the immediate future.

The Czechoslovak side stated that the entire activity of the Party and government bodies along all lines of leverage will be directed toward carrying out effective measures serving socialist power, the leading role of the working class and the Communist Party, the development and consolidation of friendly relations with the peoples of the Soviet Union and the socialist community as a whole.

The Soviet leaders, voicing the unanimously expressed desire of the peoples of the USSR for friendship and brotherhood with the peoples of socialist Czechoslovakia, reaffirmed their readiness for the broadest and most sincere cooperation on the principles of mutual respect, equality, territorial integrity, independence and socialist solidarity.

The troops of the allied countries, which have temporarily entered Czechoslovak ter-

ritory, will not interfere in the internal affairs of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic. Agreement was reached on the conditions for withdrawal of these troops from Czechoslovak territory with the normalization of the situation in the CSSR.

The Czechoslovak side announced that the Supreme Commander-in-Chief of the Czechoslovak Armed Forces had issued appropriate orders to prevent incidents and conflicts that might disturb the peace and public order. He had also instructed the military command of the CSSR to keep in touch with the command of the allied troops.

In connection with the discussion of what is called the situation in Czechoslovakia in the U.N. Security Council, the representatives of the CSSR declared that the Czechoslovak side had not requested the Security Council to include the matter on the agenda and insists on its being re-

moved from the agenda.

The leaders of the CPSU and the leaders of the CPC reaffirmed their determination steadfastly to pursue in the international arena a policy of promoting the solidarity of the socialist community and of maintaining peace and international security.

The Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia will continue resolutely to repulse the militarist, revenge-seeking and neo-nazi forces bent on revising the results of the Second World War and on violating the integrity of the frontiers existing in Europe. They reaffirmed their determination unfailingly to honor all their commitments under multilateral and bilateral treaties between the socialist countries, strengthen the defenses of the socialist community and enhance the effectiveness of the defensive Warsaw Treaty.

The talks proceeded in an atmosphere of frankness, comradeship and friendship.

RESOLUTION OF THE CC, CP OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA, ON THE RESULTS OF THE MOSCOW TALKS

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, meeting in joint session with the Central Control and Auditing Commission, with representatives of the delegates to the 14th Congress from all regions participating, heard a report by Comrade Alexander Dubcek, First Secretary of the CC, on the talks between the Presidium of the CC CPC and the Political Bureau of the CC CPSU in Moscow on August 26, 1968, a report by Ludvik Svoboda, President of the Republic, on these talks, and the record of the talks. On this basis the plenary meeting resolves:

1. To approve the stand taken by the Presidium of the Central Committee of the CPC at the Moscow talks and to agree with the stand taken by the Party leadership under Comrade Dubcek during these critical days.

2. To oblige all functionaries and members of the Central Committee, the Central Control and Auditing Commission and their agencies to be guided consistently in their political work by the conclusions reached

during the talks, conclusions which are a conditions for gradually normalizing the situation in the CSSR and relations with the five socialist countries of the Warsaw Treaty.

3. To instruct the Central Committee Presidium to prepare and submit a principled appraisal of post-January development with a view to preparing for the 14th Congress. The plenary meeting expressed complete confidence in the policy that has been pursued so far to promote socialism in our country, and is convinced that the Party leadership has the strength to bring the complicated situation under control.

4. To instruct the Central Committee Secretariat to prepare more extensive information as a basis for political work and to convey it to the activists of the Party, including those of local Party organizations.

5. To empower the CC Presidium to do everything to ensure the earliest possible withdrawal of foreign troops and to provide all the necessary conditions for implementing the post-January policy.

Imperialism and the forces opposing it

JACQUES DUCLOS

The setbacks inflicted on U.S. imperialism's vast war machine by the relatively small but heroic people of Vietnam, once already the victor—at the price of heavy sacrifice—in a colonial war, are unquestionably among the most portentous happenings of our time.

To those who either could not or would not see things in the true perspective, the American military and political defeats in Vietnam show that imperialism is no longer master of the world and cannot dispose of states and nations at will.

The U.S. political and military strategists did not, in effect, reckon with the Vietnamese nation, the men and women of that country, in their original plans. After Dien Bien Phu they made it their objective to suppress the national-liberation movement in the south of Vietnam in order to retain their grip on a region they considered strategically important for possible operations against the Asian socialist countries and the ex-colonial newly independent peoples.

What U.S. imperialism was after was to perpetuate its existing war bases in South east Asia and to set up new ones to secure control over areas rich in natural resources and at the same time play the part of world gendarme against the anti-imperialist forces.

This brought them into collision with two factors that they had at best underrated: the power of resistance of a nation wanting freedom and the power of solidarity that spread even among the Americans.

Washington's strategists thought they could bend the Vietnamese to their will by placing over them a submissive dictatorial regime. They formed a puppet army, staffed it with "advisers," then fell back with increasing frankness on armed intervention and, finally, "liquidated" the man they had

put at the helm, throwing their support behind other elements, which, however, the people also regard as traitors.

Subsequently, the U.S. generals hoped to wipe out Vietnamese resistance by direct armed intervention in South Vietnam and by bombing the North. But their escalation has gradually led to a blind alley by virtue of the heroic resistance of the Vietnamese and the growing material and moral aid of the socialist countries, notably the Soviet Union, and the peoples of the world.

U.S. imperialism, it is true, has not drawn the proper lessons from its setbacks and persists in its aggression. But it has visibly lost confidence in victory, saving face being its main concern today.

While stepping up its escalation in Vietnam, U.S. imperialism is multiplying its direct and indirect, military and non-military interventions against peoples aspiring to freedom, and is generating thereby an increasing danger to world peace.

The facts show that the abortive escalation in Vietnam and the increasing aggressiveness of U.S. imperialism are the two essential aspects of the current international situation. Though they seem contradictory, both stem from the very substance of imperialism. Omnipotent before 1917, the imperialists divided and re-divided the world by war, but were powerless—both the allies and their adversaries—to destroy the young Soviet Republic either by armed intervention or economic blockade.

And the Second World War, too, far from destroying the Soviet Union, witnessed the emergence of the socialist world system, expansion of socialist gains, consolidation of the working-class movement in the capitalist states and a national-liberation movement that shattered the old colonial empires. Hence the imperialist ef-

forts to regain lost positions or at least avert further losses which accentuate the contradictions between imperialism and the peoples it wants to retain in its grip.

The situation in the other camp is entirely different. A mere dream at the turn of the century, socialism became a reality after the October Revolution first in the former tsarist empire and then, after the Soviet Army drove the nazi host back to Berlin, in a third of the world.

Fifty years ago, after the birth of the first socialist state, imperialism ceased to be the undivided master of the world. Now, when we have a powerful socialist camp and the fight of the peoples gravitates distinctly to socialism, when the liberated peoples of states that sprang up on the ruins of the colonial empires are embarking, with the aid of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, on the non-capitalist way, imperialism ceases to be the dominant element in world politics.

The dominant influence and role of the United States in the imperialist world system is being challenged by its European allies, who are turning into its rivals fighting for markets in the shrinking sphere of capitalist influence. No assessment of recent international events can overlook this general pattern.

This is the political climate in which the heroic Vietnamese gained the support not only of the socialist countries, but of peoples in capitalist and newly-free states. Not only is the U.S. aggressor opposed by the united forces of peace; it has to face up to a restrained, frequently critical, even condemnatory, attitude—whatever the reasons behind it—of its own capitalist partners.

These political circumstances are compelling imperialism as a whole, and U.S. imperialism particularly, try to turn back the clock. In doing so, paradoxically, it steps up its aggressive designs, accomplishing something like an "escape frontwards."

This general situation could not alone have caused the U.S. set-backs, brought about by the Vietnamese with their fighting traditions and a leadership that directs the struggle and administers crushing military defeats, while offering the people of South Vietnam a clear political perspective that redoubles their determination.

Fighting for independence and making the most of the relation of forces (unfavorable for the imperialists) the Vietnam patriots have by their success and thanks to the far-flung solidarity movement that rallied the peoples against the aggressor made

an invaluable contribution to the consolidation of the world's anti-imperialist, peace-loving forces.

* * *

The most striking feature of the present international situation is that the U.S. aggression in Vietnam initiated to block the national-liberation movement is producing the reverse effect of consolidating the anti-imperialist trend and the peace movement, and this also among the American people. While the U.S. rulers add to the war threat, the ranks of the peace fighters are swelling in all countries.

By betraying its true nature in the bloody Vietnam venture, imperialism's world policeman exposed himself for what he really is, and this even among those who had believed in the "humane mission" of the United States. It is easier of late by reason of the concrete facts to see the true substance of U.S. world policy, and to fight that policy.

This is why Nelson Rockefeller, billionaire and politician, had to admit the growth of reciprocal suspicion between the U.S. and the rest of the world. George W. Ball, another U.S. statesman, chimed in saying that the U.S. role as sole world gendarme is coming to an end.

The world is not what it was twenty years ago. The Israeli aggression in June 1967 and its international consequences have furnished the U.S. leaders with additional proof on that score.

A powerful anti-Arab propaganda campaign was launched throughout the world, especially in Europe, where the memory of the monstrous nazi crimes is still alive, whipping up generous sentiments that confounded the survivors of the anti-Semitic genocide with the reactionary rulers of the Israeli state.

Despite the extensive aid rendered to the United Arab Republic by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, the Israeli leaders and their Anglo-American allies evidently thought that the very manner in which they launched their military operations would assure them total victory.

But the aggression fell short of that mark. The progressive Arab regimes were not toppled as the American and Israeli leaders had hoped, and the peoples concerned drew useful lessons from the affair, with the Left forces gaining strength.

The material and political aid of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries coupled with the condemnatory stand of a large number of independent states, frustrated the expansionist designs of the Is-

raeli leaders and the aspirations of their Anglo-American allies who had hoped to restore their positions in the Middle East with the help of the "middleman aggressor."

The Security Council's opposition to the aggression reflects the changes of the past twenty years. Some years ago U.S. imperialism was still able to drape the U.N. flag over its aggression in Korea. This time it had to accept the Security Council resolution condemning the Israeli government and demanding the withdrawal of Israeli troops from occupied territory.

The consequences of the June 1967 events yield no evidence of developments favorable for the imperialist designs in the Middle East. On the contrary, the triumphant posture of the Israeli leaders is a poor disguise for the instability of their territorial seizures and the attendant difficulties, while world opinion, though diverted for a time, is not inclined to favor the invader. On the contrary, the progressive Arab regimes, intact after the aggression, have for the most part drawn lessons essential for their consolidation. And for another thing, the peoples that have thrown off the colonial yoke and have a vital stake in thwarting imperialism's neo-colonialist schemes, are seeing for themselves that the Soviet Union is a dependable partner and a trustworthy, loyal friend.

It may be in order to note in parentheses that in Africa, the focus of the collisions brought on by imperialism's neo-colonialist policies, the newly-independent states consider the Soviet Union as a trading partner whose strength and loyalty enables them, by and large, to avoid the selfish "aid" of various importunate "patrons" or at least mitigate the effects of their "patronage."

In 1960, the year when 17 African states proclaimed their independence, the Soviet Union had trade agreements with only five African countries. At present it has trade agreements with 24, trade based on equality and mutual advantage more than doubling by 1966 and totalling 519 million rubles.

It is quite safe to say that like Vietnam, despite the vast difference in conditions, the Middle East is a theatre where the imperialist aggressors are being defeated by the forces of peace, among whom the Soviet Union and other socialist countries are playing the decisive role.

* * *

The change in the relation of world forces and the setbacks of its "global strategy" have undermined U.S. imperialism's

positions on the American continent, which it still regards as its "private hunting ground," and in Western Europe as well, where its "leadership" is being seriously challenged and where a fierce scrimmage for supremacy has erupted between monopoly groups and countries.

Despite their provocative policy and blockade, the U.S. leaders in "their" part of the world have failed to destroy the Republic of Cuba, an object of their particular hate. What is more, they have to face in increasingly difficult circumstances the irrepressible urge of other Latin American nations for independence.

Their wish to dominate the countries of the American continent is creating fresh difficulties for the U.S. rulers, as the evolution of the Organization of American States (OAS) amply demonstrates.

True, the dollar, U.S. Marines and the CIA still enable the U.S. imperialists to maintain by bribery, brutal repressions and underhand plots the kind of "order" that suits the interests of the North American monopolies. U.S. "experts" still find, train and install in power mercenary politicians acting as cat's paws of their U.S. masters. True, too, the OAS is still a vast machine rubber-stamping and implementing Washington orders. But the wheels are beginning to creak. U.S. dominance in the OAS is less secure now under the impact of the revolutionary and democratic movement. Washington's dream of forging the inter-American system into a military bloc, of which it would control the levers of command, is encountering resistance unthinkable twenty years ago when the organization was founded.

And in relation to the projects of amending the OAS constitution, the United States has to deal with the clearly expressed intention of the Latin American countries to fling off U.S. guardianship. It is in this context that the significance of the people's struggle in Latin America should be assessed, and equally the fact that the U.S. imperialists are finding it increasingly difficult to employ means of compulsion. Their prestige in the Third World has dwindled, the criticism throughout the world is increasingly caustic, and opposition is also mounting at home.

The effect of the trade agreements concluded between the Soviet Union and a number of Latin American countries should not be taken lightly either. Objectively, they help the effort of the Latin American states to reject U.S. economic patronage.

* * *

The leading imperialist state has its hands full on the American continent, and its position in Europe is uneasy as well. The resolution adopted by the conference of European Communist and Workers' parties in Karlovy Vary stressed that "Europe...is still a disturbed area where the main forces of the imperialist camp and the socialist community confront each other." In this confrontation, imperialism has suffered a serious setback, for the cold war policy has been made obsolete by the joint effort of the peace forces and by the contradictions in the imperialist bloc.

The achievements of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries in various fields and the proposals in behalf of an active peace policy, have largely dissipated the myth of "communist aggressiveness" on which the imperialists based themselves in preparing for war.

This has enabled people in Western Europe misled by the post-war avalanche of anti-Soviet propaganda to realize at last that the socialist countries have a genuine desire for peace and peaceful coexistence, which has given impetus to the fight against the architects of war.

That German imperialism strengthened its economic and military positions with U.S. backing evoked legitimate alarm in a number of European capitalist countries troubled by Bonn's revenge-seeking expansionist plans, while the German Democratic Republic, the first peaceful state in German history, has gained considerable prestige by its foreign policy.

It may be added, too, that the increased aggressiveness of U.S. imperialism, the failure of its "global strategy" and the scuffle for world markets involving various monopoly groups, compel some of the Atlantic bloc countries to disavow the United States. With good reason, they are reluctant to be drawn into ventures against their own interests. Besides, they cannot help being alarmed by the increasing penetration of U.S. capital into the European economy.

The breakdown of the cold war policy, the Nato crisis and the difficulties in the Common Market are all determinative factors of current West-European politics. They also influence the European policy of the United States and the FRG, its main European ally.

That is the angle from which we should assess the contradictions of the European policy pursued by de Gaulle, who represents the interests of the big French monopoly groups.

On the other hand, the existing situation

offers new possibilities for the peace-loving forces to combat the prevailing threat of war. Faced by the crisis in Nato, the U.S. leaders resort to maneuvers and pressures (particularly economic) to avert the dissolution of that basic component of their global strategy. They are trying to help Britain enter the Common Market, for this would enable them to exert pressures on that body through a country largely dependent on them economically (as borne out once again during the recent sterling crisis) and commercially.

West German imperialism's "new policy" is, in effect, an attempt to mitigate the failure of policies pursued previously in complete subjection to the United States.

After the abortive attempt to gain access to atomic weapons through a "multilateral nuclear force," ex-nazi Kiesinger is trying to accomplish his task, set by German imperialism, by other means. He is eager to preserve the Atlantic Pact in the hope that sooner or later the leading role in it will fall to West Germany. And he is still hopeful that by strengthening contacts with Britain and France he may secure a "European nuclear force" in the structure of which the FRG would naturally play a dominant part. This explains Bonn's persistent efforts to block international control of atomic weapons and the disarmament plans advocated by the Soviet Union.

The French imperialist forces, for their part, are doing their utmost to protect the interests of the French monopoly groups poised to exploit the setbacks of their imperialist rivals in capturing world markets and desirous of playing a prominent role in Europe, the domain of the most powerful trusts.

That is what lies at the root of the contradictory aspects of Gaullist policy. The French government is encouraging the aggressive designs of the German revenge-seekers by refusing to recognize the GDR and by continuing the nuclear arms race, on the one hand, while seeking to play a positive part in such issues as the Vietnam war and the development of East-West contacts, on the other.

To be sure, U.S. imperialism is still the most powerful. Its reverses have created difficulties for it in dealing with its allies, who are at once its rivals, but it can still influence the policy of the European capitalist states in a manner suiting its own interest. Its policy of super-arming and extending the web of U.S. military bases is a continuous threat to peace.

On the European continent, in fact, it is

the revenge-seeking expansionist designs of the West German imperialists that present the greatest danger of a military explosion by virtue of the help and backing they get from the United States, whose aid they pay for by supporting U.S. aggressive policies (wherever they are not immediately involved in the U.S. actions, as in the Middle East or Vietnam).

"It is high time," says the Karlovy Vary declaration, "to secure new relations in Europe based on a genuine détente and mutual confidence."

International developments indicate that the failure of the cold war policy, the reverses of U.S. imperialist "global strategy," mounting contradictions in the imperialist camp, the increased defense potential of the socialist countries and their dynamic policy of peace create a situation favorable for the growth of the peace forces.

Closely connected with the changed correlation of economic, military and political forces is the important shift in European public opinion. To mention but one of the aspects in this shift, the events in France have borne out fully that, as the Karlovy Vary resolution pointed out, "concerted action by Communists and Socialists with Christians in matters of European security could favor the cause of peace on our continent."

That is the spirit in which the French Communists conduct their broad political campaign. They are determined to elucidate to the people that a government of democratic unity put at the helm by the will of the nation should not consent to any European supra-national government in which German revenge-seekers would, to a large extent, hold a position of dominance. This is a major point of difference between our Party and the other Left forces.

The first step to eliminate this difference was made on December 20, 1966, when our Party and the Federation of the Democratic and Socialist Left consisting of socialist and radical parties and various Left clubs and groups, stated in a joint agreement that both sides "oppose Germany's access to atomic weapons and pronounce themselves in favor of a European and international system of collective security and of recognizing the Oder-Neisse border."

The next step was taken on February 24, 1968. This time the parties noted in a joint statement that the Common Market was a "playground for cartels, trusts and international lobby groups." They agreed that it should be infused with "a new economic and social content . . . harmonizing with

the interests of the people" and that trade unions and workers' and farmers' organizations should be represented in it with "real rights," as well as the "political parties represented in the national parliaments." The agreement reiterated that "the reality of the German Democratic Republic should be recognized" and pronounced itself once more against the atomic arming of West Germany and in favor of the Oder-Neisse border.

Despite serious differences, an important advance was achieved in the course of the year towards joint action in support of European security. The significance of this is especially clear if we recall the attitude on this score of the European social-democratic movement immediately after the war.

It is a token of confidence essential in the fight of the pacific forces for an improvement of the European situation. As the Karlovy Vary resolution stressed, in this fight "we Communists . . . will spare no effort to build a system of collective security and establish inter-state relations ruling out the possibility of aggression and securing lasting peace in Europe and the world."

* * *

Suffering setback after setback in its "global strategy," U.S. imperialism is also losing ground in yet another field, one where it thought itself invulnerable after the Second World War: the arms race.

For years, preparing feverishly for war, U.S. imperialism based its foreign policy on nuclear intimidation. Mankind should be infinitely grateful to the peoples of the Soviet Union for enabling their country and the socialist camp as a whole, at a heavy cost to themselves, to produce a military power that forced the Pentagon into salutary reflections on the possible consequences of its "brinkmanship."

The socialist defense potential coupled with a firm and consistent policy aimed at an international détente and peace, and the struggle of the peace-loving peoples and states, have compelled imperialism to retreat.

The very signing of the nuclear non-proliferation treaty, to say nothing of its concrete significance, is an indication of the changes in the world of today. It is a long cry now from March 19, 1950, when the World Council of Peace called from Stockholm for a universal denunciation of nuclear weapons and for a nuclear ban. This appeal, you may recall, was signed by 500 million.

That first significant initiative of the peace movement founded the year before marked the birth of a force with which U.S. imperialism has had to reckon in earnest. The facts bore out the idea advanced in February 1949 on behalf of our Central Committee by Maurice Thorez: "It is a fact that the relation of forces in the world has changed. An immense anti-war movement is growing . . . War is neither fatally inevitable nor necessary."

This idea, as later event showed, was anything but wishful thinking. It did not attempt to dissipate the spirit of war with "invocations" about the possibility and necessity of averting it. On the contrary, it was based on a sober analysis of the visible changes in the correlation of forces. And its dissemination offered good prospects of combating the forces of war, providing scope for a massive struggle for peace, accelerating the process of change in favor of the anti-imperialist and peace-loving forces.

The analysis of the relation of world forces was made at a time when the U.S. imperialists called for an anti-Soviet crusade, scattering more war bases over the globe and hammering out against the socialist countries a pattern of aggressive alliances of states economically and politically dependent on the U.S. And subsequent developments proved that the analysis was correct.

In our time, too, any true analysis of the relation of forces and of the changes in the world since the 1950's, when the idea of the possibility of averting a nuclear disaster was first formulated, will reaffirm the fact that war is not necessary to end imperialism, that it is not fatally inevitable.

But just as 20 years ago peace is not fatally inevitable either.

Continuous efforts to consolidate the strength and cohesion of the anti-imperialist forces is the only way to maintain the correlation of forces favorable for socialism and peace.

* * *

This brief survey of the various "flash points" in the world of today shows that imperialism's international situation is far from bright. Imperialism is sapped by reverses and intrinsic contradictions.

For the first time, U.S. imperialism has had to cope simultaneously with economic

difficulties stemming from its aggressive policy and arms race, with increasing isolation in the world arena, and with a rapidly expanding protest movement at home.

The chances of preventing a world war have never been as good. But this in itself calls for redoubled vigilance and for a greater unity of the anti-imperialist, peace-loving forces in face of the increased aggressiveness of U.S. imperialism.

What is most essential is to consolidate unity in the world Communist movement, the main force of the anti-imperialist, peace-loving camp. Today, that is one of the chief tasks for us Communists, a task for which we shoulder an immense responsibility to all mankind.

The imperialists see their only hope of salvation in exploiting the differences in the socialist camp and the world Communist movement. They take advantage of these differences in trying to stem the popular advance to socialism. That explains the imperialist interference in Greece by the Central Intelligence Agency with the purpose of crushing the democratic movement and establishing a dictatorial regime, and the desperate U.S. efforts to split the anti-imperialist front whose achievements in the past 20 years have inflicted so many setbacks on the imperialist camp.

It is compulsively necessary, therefore, to secure the unity of Communists the world over on the basis of Marxist-Leninist principles and proletarian internationalism, because that is a crucial element of anti-imperialist unity.

As stressed in the 1960 Moscow Statement of 81 Communist and Workers' parties, "the interests of the struggle for the working-class cause demand of each Communist Party and of the great army of Communists of all countries ever-closer unity of will and action."

This is the idea on which the French Communist Party acted when its representative at the Budapest Meeting preparing a new world conference of Communist and Workers' parties declared: "We are deeply convinced that the new conference will redouble the power of the struggle waged by our parties against imperialism and create the best possible conditions for drawing into this struggle all the forces aspiring to independence, democracy, social progress and socialism."

International conference of Communist parties will promote unity

GILBERTO VIEIRA

Preparations for the international conference of Communist and Workers' parties are well under way, and the parties determined to coordinate their efforts in the struggle for the unity of the world Communist movement and for a united front of all anti-imperialist forces, are discussing important issues arising from the prospective agenda.

Parties adhering to consistently Marxist-Leninist positions have worked out an internationalist concept of the modern world, based on the solidarity of workers and all wage-earners, on the idea that the peoples must promote friendship and work for universal brotherhood in accordance with the principles set out by Marx and Engels in the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*.

The apologists of big monopoly capital exert themselves in utilizing the differences in the socialist camp and the world revolutionary movement. They disparage the call for unity issued by Marx and Engels and predict the demise of proletarian internationalism, pinning their hopes on extremist, irrational nationalist tendencies. But they are celebrating in vain: their hopes are built on transient things sure to be overcome in the process of the objective social growth, by the conscious struggle of internationalist contingents loyal to Marxism-Leninism in all countries. Our saying so does not mean that we are blind to the negative phenomena. We know that problems inherited from the past still exert a certain influence in countries of the

socialist system, for problems of that sort do not vanish automatically once socialism has been built. Moreover, imperialism has stepped up its subversive activities against the socialist countries, and Lenin's pointer that ultra-reactionaries center their designs on counterposing the interests of different peoples has never been more valid.

It is clear and obviously final that the Communist parties are not dependent on any centralized international organization. None of them could work under the direction of any center in this complex, multifarious and contradictory world going through the stormy epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism on a world scale, a transition, moreover, that follows many different patterns. Nor could the Communist parties be components of any polycentric system, because regional centers in continents or different parts of the globe would founder on the same insuperable subjective and objective obstacles that have turned the notion of a single center into a sheer utopia.

Speaking specifically of Latin America, it should be borne in mind that the Communist parties there came into being in different conditions, depending on the national peculiarities of each country. They emerged under the impact of the greatest event in world history — the October Revolution of 1917 — and the growth of the Soviet Union into the bulwark of victorious socialism, and their emergence depended on the growth and evolution of the working class in each of the coun-

tries concerned. By the time the Peoples' Democracies came into being in Eastern Europe as a result of the nazi defeat by the glorious Soviet Army with the support of the resistance movement in the nazi-occupied countries, and by the time the drawn-out liberation struggle of the Chinese nation culminated in the establishment of the People's Republic of China in 1949, the Latin American Communist parties had accumulated a certain amount of experience and gained distinctly-felt influence in their respective countries. All of them are national in form and internationalist in ideology, and are all entirely independent in conducting their policy and framing tactics.

Like all other Marxist-Leninist contingents of the world Communist movement, the Latin American Communist parties are genuinely patriotic, fighting tirelessly for the independence of their countries, for national progress and for better material and cultural conditions. We Latin American Communists have every reason to repeat what Lenin said years ago: "We love our language and our motherland, and most of all we work to elevate its laboring masses (i.e., nine-tenths of the population) to the conscious level of democrats and socialists."

Though fervently patriotic, the Latin American Communists are not nationalistic, for they reject the egoistic principle of exalting their country to the detriment of the lawful interests of other nations and are considerate of the aspirations of all peoples. They know that extreme nationalism is an evil, and they condemn all manifestations of great-power chauvinism and narrow nationalism.

Some of the trends in our countries describe themselves as nationalist, reflecting the interests and aspirations of different social strata, including the bourgeoisie. In certain circumstances, however, they make common cause with the Communists in various anti-imperialist undertakings. But for Communists this cooperation cannot be unconditional, regardless of the situation. Frequently, we have to stress by word and deed that our position is independent, opposing nationalist tendencies whenever the latter collide with the internationalist principles of workers' solidarity and respect for the rights of other peoples.

* * *

The rapid growth of the world Communist movement during the fight against

fascism and after the defeat of nazi Germany and her allies was accompanied by a few negative developments, among them the nationalist explosion in China, producing the Maoist ideology. This crisis, an ailment of growth, created new problems, chiefly accentuating the need for broader relations and more effective coordination between all Communist parties.

In recent years inter-party contacts and coordination have assumed different forms—bilateral meetings and international and regional conferences—all of them unquestionably useful. But they were insufficient. They have to be broadened, and not merely for the purpose of learning each other's point of view, but, chiefly, to thresh out a common stand in the fight for *world-wide united action*. Closer and more frequent contacts are needed, among other things, to secure more effective solidarity with the Vietnamese people who, having formed a patriotic front and combining all forms of struggle, are showing the world how the imperialist aggressor can be successfully resisted. Such contacts will also secure broader solidarity with the people of Cuba, who face the Yankee imperialist blockade.

The present situation is unsatisfactory to every genuine Communist. It calls for consistent efforts to secure fraternal relations between all Communist and Workers' parties striving for world Communist unity and a united front of all anti-imperialist forces.

All Communists are agreed that there can be no guiding and no guided parties in the world Communist movement. They reject all attempts by the leadership of any Communist party to impose its particular position on any other.

Yet there is a vital need to supplement mutual exchanges of experience with *comradely* argument. All misgivings and considerations of pride should be put aside, for what is needed is a favorable situation for those parties that think it desirable to set out constructively their point of view and opinion concerning other fraternal parties. This should not be regarded as impermissible interference.

* * *

Despite the dissociation of the Latin American countries, which benefited imperialism, the continent's Communist parties have always maintained friendly and fraternal relations. Their appraisal of world affairs coincides in the essential

details, they are united in the fight against U.S. imperialism, the common enemy, and promote in unison the principles of internationalism and revolutionary solidarity.

At no time did the Latin American Communists take orders from any party in matters concerning the unity of the world Communist movement, and their final conclusions were invariably based on their own experience.

This collective experience was summed up at the Havana conference of Latin American Communist parties in November 1964.

The conference produced a fruitful exchange of experience and common attitudes still of value for the world Communist movement. True, some of those who participated in framing these attitudes have not been entirely consistent in implementing them. But this does not detract from their fundamental significance, because the facts have proved them valid. The parties unanimously reaffirmed their determination to work actively for world Communist unity based on Marxist-Leninist principles and the guidelines of the 1957 and 1960 program documents.

The Havana resolution says that "unity is the basic guarantee of success in our anti-imperialist struggle for the national and social emancipation of all peoples, for world peace and the building of socialism and communism."

In view of the differences in the world Communist movement (which, as the resolution says, are fraught with the "danger of a split and play into the hands of our enemies, whose aggressiveness increases for this reason"), the Latin American Communist parties found it "necessary to apply all efforts to clearing the way for unity, to secure mutual understanding in the socialist camp, avoiding everything that may add to the danger of a split, impede fraternal constructive discussion and complicate fraternal action in a united front, in order to overcome the present differences and concentrate all energy on fighting the imperialist and other reactionary forces."

"It is essential," the resolution went on, "to proceed from coinciding viewpoints expressive of our common ideology, that of Marxism-Leninism, and to do everything in our power that unbreakable principled unity may prevail."

The resolution said that the conference of Latin American Communists "believes that unity in every party is an essential condition for the further development of

the revolutionary process in each country. All factional activity, therefore, whatever its nature and background, should be categorically condemned."

The resolution appealed for an end to open polemics in the form employed by some Chinese leaders, stressing that "appropriate channels should be found to resolve the problems in the fraternal spirit that should reign in the relations between Marxist-Leninist parties."

* * *

It will be recalled that the Havana conference appointed a commission of nine Latin American Communist leaders to forward to the CPSU and the Communist Party of China the Latin American parties' recommendation to secure the unity of the world Communist movement by means of bilateral or multilateral discussions, a conference or conferences of all the Marxist-Leninist parties.

It will not be amiss to say, without going into detail, that the commission called on the leaders of the CPSU in Moscow, and that the latter expressed full agreement with the resolution of the conference of Latin American Communist parties, adding that if it could, the CPSU would not hesitate to put its signature under that document.

After the CPSU had approved all the points of the resolution, the commission went to Peking where it exchanged opinions and discussed points of view with a delegation of the Communist Party of China. As a result of these exchanges, continued in talks with Mao Tse-tung, the Chinese leaders took the following stand:

a) The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China cannot terminate open polemics; it does not believe that polemics damage the interests of the world Communist movement;

b) the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China disagrees with the denunciation of factional activity contained in the resolution of the Latin American parties and will not abandon its decision to support persons which it considers anti-imperialist and revolutionary, though expelled from Communist parties. The Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party insists on their right to found new parties.

The Chinese leaders said in reference to multilateral conferences that they reject the March 1965 conference of the 26 Communist and Workers' parties comprising the preparatory committee for a world

conference, adding that in the event the conference took place, the split of the world Communist movement would become final. Speaking of the future world conference of Communist and Workers' parties, they pointed out that it would not serve unity unless an understanding was first reached on important questions of principle, no matter how long this took.

In view of this categorical disagreement of the Chinese leaders with the Latin American resolution, the commission decided to wind up its work and inform the Latin American Communist parties about its results in a special communique, copies of which were also made available to the CC CPSU and CC CPC.

This direct and specific experience has been valuable for the Latin American Communist parties. It showed who stood for the unity of the world Communist movement and who encouraged factional activity for professedly "ideological" but in fact purely nationalist reasons. This experience has benefited all the Latin American Communist parties and subsequently helped to iron out other difficulties in safeguarding the unity of the Latin American Communists.

* * *

In view of the situation in the world Communist movement, the Colombian Communists hold, first and foremost, that every possible effort should be made to secure lasting fraternal relations between the Communist and Workers' parties striving for unity, which means the vast majority.

Naturally, there are in the movement guided by Marxist-Leninist principles divergent trends, or at least different opinions, concerning the approach to some current problems. But there is also a spirit of unity and an increasing striving for united action.

A *dialogue*, a positive discussion based on mutual respect, is now under way between Catholics and Marxists. All the more reason is there to maintain that a *dialogue*, a fraternal comparison of different points of view, is needed between Communist parties.

Mutual respect is an important factor in every *dialogue*, conducive to positive results, however limited these may be at first. What we need is a favorable climate for discussing different views, for a critical and self-critical analysis of experience, for ideological struggle between Communists, provided it is clear from the outset that

all efforts are centered on helping, rather than defeating, those who hold a divergent view. What we need are normal exchanges of opinion on issues differently assessed by some Communist and Workers' parties.

It should be noted that this journal, *Problems of Peace and Socialism*, plays an important role in this inter-party exchange of opinion.

Mutual respect in the ideological struggle between Communists is neither concession nor eclecticism. Proletarian Leninist criticism of fraternal parties and their leaders may be vehement, but should never be of the destructive, often slanderous, pretty-bourgeois variety.

* * *

The Conference of Communist and Workers' parties scheduled for the end of the year by decision of the Consultative Meeting in Budapest can and must usher in a new stage in the fight for world Communist unity and a united anti-imperialist front.

A united front of all anti-imperialist forces is now the most urgent aim.

The imperialist system is on the downgrade. However, though it is losing positions, it is still a dangerous enemy of the peoples, still able to maneuver, to change tactics and, at the same time, stake on different trumps. Having jettisoned the old-style colonialism, it is now employing the more refined methods of neo-colonialism. As comrade Le Duan rightly observed, however, we should bear in mind that the "emergence of neo-colonialism speaks not of the strength, but of the weakness of imperialism."

To speed imperialism to its end, we need still greater unity of action by the socialist countries, the international working-class and the national-liberation movement.

Some comrades suggest that the world Communist movement should work out a global strategy of its own to counter the so-called global strategy of the U.S. imperialists. As we see it, strategy, which must never be fenced off from tactics, must be flexible. A single strategy and common tactics may be achieved through united action by the three main anti-imperialist forces of our time—the world socialist system, the international working class and the national-liberation movement.

No appeal or proclamation can produce a united anti-imperialist front, which will emerge through persevering, systematic and unexpectedly broad efforts, because it

has to embrace many different ideological trends, political formations, religious schools and social classes and groups. The central issue in the common program of this world front — determined struggle against imperialist aggression and oppression—could unite vast masses in all countries.

The task of building up a united anti-imperialist front is tied in closely with the effort to secure united action by Communist and Workers' parties. What it aims at is the unity of our movement in a new, higher stage.

Each success of united Communist ac-

tion will strengthen the united anti-imperialist front. Conversely, stagnation of any kind, let alone a partial retreat, in the fight for united Communist action would postpone the emergence of an anti-imperialist front.

In importance these tasks are equal, because they have to be fulfilled simultaneously.

We are convinced that the world conference of Communist and Workers' parties will fortify the dominant tendency towards world Communist unity, which will triumph despite distinctive traits and artificially stirred up differences.

Reality vs. illusion

(Canada's election, 1968)

BRUCE MAGNUSON

Millions of Canadian voters, somewhat dazed by the spectacular and colorful aspects of mass media electioneering, went to the polls and for the first time in over a decade, elected a majority Liberal government last June 25. For a great segment of the electorate, intoxicated by Pierre Elliot Trudeau's double promise of a Just Society and One United Canada, the election boiled down to simply a vote for or against the imaginary policies and ideas of Trudeau.

In the case of Pierre Elliot Trudeau's "Just Society" it is not necessary to stretch one's imagination very far to see the influence of presidential election campaigns across the border to the south. Going back in the imperialist era of U.S. politics there was: Theodore Roosevelt's "Square Deal"; Woodrow Wilson's "New Freedom"; Franklin Delano Roosevelt's "New Deal"; Harry S. Truman's "Fair Deal"; Dwight D. Eisenhower's "Crusade"; John F. Kennedy's "New Frontier" and Lyndon B. Johnson's "Great Society." But the essential thing to remember about all these various deals, etc. is that the exploiting society has not only remained but has acquired a deteriorating quality of extending poverty amidst affluence, growing bigotry, racial conflict, crime, violence and aggressive wars as part of its way of life.

Continentalism has replaced Canadian policy and Canadian national development. It ties our natural resources to the U.S. military and industrial complex, creates underdeveloped regions which in turn ac-

centuate the unevenness of capitalist economic development. Above all else, it undermines Canadian sovereignty.

William Kashtan, General Secretary of the Communist Party, in a report to its Central Committee in April of this year, put it this way:

"We must reverse this process before it is too late . . . If foreign capital is needed it should only be used under conditions conforming to the national interest of both English and French Canada . . . Government agencies should be established to set down the terms for all new foreign investments and to facilitate trade with all countries on a reciprocal basis in the interest of maximum economic growth and a rising standard of life for all Canadians . . . Canada today is sitting on a political volcano which could erupt at any time . . . Externally we face the threat of absorption by the United States. Internally we face the danger of a break-up of Canadian Confederation due to the stubborn refusal by the ruling class to resolve the crisis of relationship between English and French Canada in conformity with the democratic and national aspirations of the French Canadian people. As a result of all this, economic and social problems continue to multiply."

The June 25 election took place in conditions of economic uncertainty and growing instability, rising unemployment, rising prices and rents. The problems posed by poverty within a highly productive and generally affluent society with great cor-

porate and private wealth pointed up the growth of social contradictions and class discrimination.

The technological revolution and its consequences were by-passed by Mr. Trudeau and the capitalist parties during the campaign. What Mr. Trudeau has so far produced in the face of rising class battles and a growing strike movement is a hard line approach to workers and a soft line approach to corporate interests.

Talks about "fiscal responsibility," a "balanced budget" and refusal to pledge "long term intervention in the economy" mean in fact disregard for the economic and social problems, such as health and education, the urban financial crisis, lack of housing and rising unemployment. While blaming labor's demand for wage increases to compensate for rising living costs as a source of inflation, the government all but ignores monopoly profiteering and the effect on the Canadian economy of U.S. imperialist policies and their resultant pressure on the international monetary system.

The Communist Party warned early in the campaign that neither of the old capitalist parties—Liberal or Conservative—wedded as they are to the capitalist monopolies, could give the country the new policies which people longed for and needed so badly.

The Communist Party stated unequivocally that a majority Liberal or Conservative government following this election would be a setback for Canada and her people. Communists campaigned for the election of a large progressive block, including Communists, people who were determined to press for a new direction in the sphere of foreign and domestic policies.

The ruling circles energetically pursued the old line. Shortly after the 27th Parliament adjourned in April 1968 for the Liberal leadership convention, and before assumption of power by the newly elected Liberal leader, the Pearson government hastened to renew Canada's North American Air Defense (NORAD) pact with the United States. In this way the lame duck Pearson administration tied Canada for an extended term into the war plans of the United States military-industrial complex without any reference to parliament, in fact flouting its authority.

In addition to a heightened peril and insecurity for the country, this agreement has cost the Canadian taxpayers \$130 mil-

lion annually—money that could be much better used for sorely needed housing, schools and hospitals.

The direction of the Liberal economic and social policies is clearly indicated by the fact that while Canada spends \$85 per capita for military commitments and defense under NATO and NORAD, only 11c per capita is spent for public housing.

Moreover, the tax burden has continuously been shifted onto the wage and salary earners while corporate and private wealth escapes without a single cent of taxation on capital gains. For example, a wage and salary earner with a wife and two children making \$6,500 annually pays about \$633 in personal income tax. But a person who makes \$13,000 year, or twice this amount, from dividends paid by taxable Canadian corporations pays not one cent of this in tax on such income.

A decade or more of political instability and ferment (between 1958 and 1965, Parliament was dissolved four times and new elections were held) testified to growing dissatisfaction with the status quo, particularly in economic and foreign policy.

The 1960's have produced increased debate across the political spectrum in all parties, as well as numerous inquiries into the effects of Canada's branch-plant economy, increasing United States economic ownership and control and the consequent erosion of Canadian sovereignty.

Added to this is the growing concept of a bi-national Canada, which forced the government to appoint a so-called Bilingual and Bicultural Royal Commission. After years of study this Commission has produced two voluminous reports, with more to come. While this has reflected a forced recognition of the bicultural and bilingual issue in Canadian Confederation, the basic problem of recognizing its binational character is still unsolved. A new constitution, granting sovereign and equal status to the French-speaking and English-speaking nations that make up Confederation, would also remove many obstacles that now bedevil the relations between various levels of government in matters of social and economic policies.

IMAGES AND IDEAS

Pierre Elliot Trudeau's election, at his party's congress in April, as the Liberal leader in its own way reflected the growing desire for political change in the country. The ruling classes, more often referred to as "The Establishment" were conscious of this and wished to use this

sentiment for their own ends. Most other candidates were too much tarred with the old political brush, too closely and for far too long identified with the Establishment to become the needed point of attraction to a majority of Liberal delegates, and secondly and of even greater importance, to the voters at large in the subsequent election campaign.

Mr. Trudeau was chosen because in the view of the Establishment he would stand up to the growing demand for recognition and equality for the French Canadian nation within Canadian Confederation. He was chosen because, despite his seeming radical pose, big business had no reason to fear his policies.

On April 12, *Time* magazine declared that former finance minister Sharp's withdrawal from the leadership race and his support of Trudeau's candidacy gave Mr. Trudeau "sober financial respectability." It might also have added that Trudeau is a millionaire in his own right. *Times* magazine went on to declare that: "Mr. Trudeau's ideas are hardly of a sort to cause any panic in Bay Street" (a reference to Toronto's financial district) and that "no startling departures in policy are to be expected, that no change of direction from Lester B. Pearson's policies are likely." This, of course had its value in wooing corporate-business conservatism to the side of the chosen leader.

At the same time Mr. Trudeau's radical pose had inestimable value for the Liberal Party to attract support in the ranks of the young generation which seeks change, to eat into New Democratic Party support among wage and salary people and in the ranks of organized labor. The debonair appearance of Mr. Trudeau contrasted well with the austere image of Tory leader Robert Stanfield. In the end it all served to achieve that which had not been within grasp of the Liberal Party for much over a decade—majority government.

In the field of ideas, Mr. Trudeau carefully side-stepped the issue of Canadian independence by declaring his opposition to "economic nationalism." He expressed support for the Organization of American States (OAS) and for Canada joining this alliance. At the same time he opposed cessation of arms sales to the U.S. during the conduct of its aggressive war in Vietnam. Even if one allows for Trudeau's intimation about withdrawal of troops from West Germany and a possible recognition of the Chinese People's Republic while still retaining recognition of Chiang Kai Chek's

Formosa regime, his foreign policy declarations fell far short of a complete re-assessment so necessary in a changing world.

During the leadership race Mr. Trudeau made very clear that after the proclamation of medicare legislation already voted by Parliament, he was against any extension of the principle of universal social security. From now on social assistance should only be made available to the needy on the basis of a means test, and not as a universal right.

A veering towards continentalism in economic and foreign policy, no change in the direction of social and economic policy, a maintenance of the status quo in relation to French Canada—these attitudes did not suggest Mr. Trudeau was a man of change and with radical new policies in the way that the mass media built him up.

Of course, the mass media were building images rather than presenting and discussing ideas. The idea was to present their man as a human being first—warm, charming, intellectual and candid—and as a politician in the second place.

Nor must one ignore the fact that in relation to the right winger Mr. Winters, another leadership contestant, Mr. Trudeau did appear as a left winger in the leadership race. The image of Trudeau which the mass media conveyed stimulated "high hopes and expectations" from those who elected him at the Liberal Party convention. The young people and others who supported him want change and will expect more than empty gestures.

WHAT MADE AN ABSOLUTE LIBERAL MAJORITY POSSIBLE?

As to this question there is no single nor simple answer. Rather one has to look for a combination of conditions and circumstances. How a discredited capitalist party, committed to the status quo, could attract so many voters who sought change and something new in our political life, is most assuredly a fascinating subject for careful study. Here we shall only attempt to deal with some of the more obvious factors.

Above all, the image of the *man* rather than his party; the image of the politician, more than his ability and his ideas. The image of the Prime Minister, shaped and honed to razor-edge sharpness by the communications media, was carefully aimed to arouse the electors to the point of hypnotic exultation and thus create the right atmosphere for a Liberal majority. Success of this strategy depended, of course, upon the studied evasion of any discussion of the real

political issues facing the country and the people.

Perhaps of much greater significance was the absence of a strong and politically united movement, based upon a more highly conscious and socialist-oriented working class. Such a political force, armed with a compelling alternative program, could have broken through to the wage and salary earners with the issues involved and confounded the strategy of the Establishment.

The social democratic NDP (New Democratic Party) with official trade union backing, but with a bourgeois-liberal non-socialist philosophy, could not fulfill the task of an effective alternative.

The Communist Party—which alone raised the question of all-inclusive unity of the Left—faced rather formidable obstacles,

representation in a country like Canada with its regional disparities is a dangerous gamble with political stability.

Regional disparities did show up in their peculiar way in the voting pattern of the June 25 election. For example, Newfoundland on the eastern extreme voted in six Tories and only one Liberal. Maritime provinces did likewise. In Quebec, the Tories were all but liquidated as a federal party, with 55 Liberals elected and 16 Creditist MPs* leaving only four Conservatives. However, if even the French electoral system of de Gaulle had been used and a second-round voting had taken place, the result could have been far different.

Here is how Canada voted on June 25th, 1968:

As can be seen from the above, the Lib-

POPULAR VOTE

Party	1968	%	1965	%	Percent change
Liberals	3,566,990	45	3,099,519	40	+5
Conservatives	2,461,359	31	2,499,913	32	-1
NDP (Soc.-Dem.)	1,360,330	17	1,381,658	18	-1
Creditistes	359,161	5	359,438	5	unch.
Social Credit	61,492	1	282,454	4	-3
Others (incl. CP)	71,102	1	90,334	1	unch.
Total	7,880,434		7,713,316		

including discrimination in the trade unions, and is far too small to seriously affect the overall situation and the processes at work in such situations as the recent election campaign. It ran 14 candidates and carried on a relatively strong campaign that reached hundreds of thousands of voters and helped to bring much clarity on problems and perspectives.

The electoral system is most undemocratic, based as it is upon the single constituencies with the candidate receiving a majority of one being the winner. Recently a wave of criticism has been advanced against the system, particularly in French Canada (Quebec). Only 36 out of the 74 members of Parliament from Quebec received more than 50 percent of the votes.

The proposal for proportional representation is beginning to gain ground, as a fairer system for electing members to Parliament and Legislatures. It is a proposal fiercely resisted by the Establishment, which fears that it will open the way for smaller opposition parties to break through the barriers now put up by the traditional capitalist parties. One of the chief arguments advanced is that a system of proportional

MEMBERS ELECTED

Party	1968	1965	Change
Liberals	154	131	+23
Conservatives	72	97	-25
NDP	22	21	+1
Creditistes	15	9	+6
Social Credit	0	5	-5
Others	1	2	-1
Total	264 ¹	265	

*One more seat belongs to the Speaker.

erals, with 45 percent of the vote, gained about 60 percent of the seats in Parliament. In the particular system which governs Canadian elections, very few votes are needed when the contest is close to swing from one party to the other the extra votes needed to elect. Here is precisely where smaller parties and new parties have little or no chance at all.

The Liberals did not win anything like the landslide victory that Tory leader Diefenbaker scored in 1958. The significant thing was that it made some inroads into the NDP vote in urban centers of Ontario

*Those who split away from the Social Credit Party.

and British Columbia. At the same time, a close check on the polls will show that there was no appreciable swing of the labor vote to the Liberals, except in a few areas.

The demagogic appeal for "one united Canada" helped the Liberals gain at the expense of both NDP and Conservatives, as it appealed to national chauvinism in English Canada. An unprincipled, two-faced Tory policy towards the constitutional issue gained it nothing in French Canada. The NDP's unclear position likewise affected its vote. This was another factor making for Liberal gains in addition to the build-up of Trudeau as a new man who stood for radical change.

WHAT LIES AHEAD?

The election of Pierre Elliot Trudeau as Liberal leader and Prime Minister of Canada could conceivably bring in its train a set of circumstances which might lead to new openings for the left.

Internationally the deepening contradictions brought about by U.S. imperialism and its allies are creating difficulties for the Establishment. Growing pressures will develop for a shift in the direction of foreign policy, as also in economic and trade policy.

On the domestic scene labor troubles are increasing as the monopolies appear to be mounting an offensive to outlaw strikes in public services and to pave the way for stiffer resistance by private monopolies and individual employers to labor's demands. Wage guide lines, stiffer laws to

restrict freedom of association, and an all-out attack on fringe-benefits and transfer payments of all kinds, points in the direction of much greater strife between government and employers, on one side, and labor, on the other.

The incompatibility as between reality and pretense is bound to come to light more and more as time goes on. The Trudeau administration assumed office in conditions, not of stability, but of growing instability and uncertainty.

The Communist Party will continue to campaign for the following aims:

1. To achieve Canadian control of the economy by gradually nationalizing U.S. corporations in Canada.
2. The right of the French Canadian nation to sovereignty must be recognized as the only basis for a new Constitution that will keep Canada united.
3. Break completely from U.S. domination and adopt a wholly independent foreign policy.
4. Slash the arms budget and tax the rich so as to provide funds for an all-out war against poverty and poor and inadequate housing.
5. Strengthen democracy by guaranteeing the right to a job, an income and a skill, the right of workers to a say over introduction of technological change, of students to a say over education, to housewives and consumers in general a say over prices and quality of consumer products.

Dollar democracy in action

(the 1968 election campaign)

JOHN GIBBONS

Whoever wins the American Presidential election next November, whether Humphrey or Nixon, the man who has already lost it after four years in office, is Lyndon Baines Johnson.

The loss of public confidence in Johnson and the slump in his prestige recalls what Lincoln said to the effect that while an artful politician may be able to hoodwink a lot of people for quite a long time he cannot hoodwink all the people all the time.

Sooner or later the day of reckoning comes, and for Lyndon Johnson it dawned with the dreaded arrival of the current election year. And rather than face a much disillusioned public and the prospect of humiliating defeat he, early in the year, pleading ill health and weariness, announced that he would not be among the candidates in November.

To be fair to Johnson it should be said that when he triumphed so magnificently over Barry Goldwater in the 1964 election he inherited a long-standing and ever-deepening crisis of United States policy both at home and abroad.

That inheritance included the highly unpopular war in Vietnam, the rising struggle of the twenty-two million Negro people in the United States for a share in the Rights of Man, and the fearful growth of crime and violence in American society.

And if the 1964 contest between Johnson and Goldwater attracted attention far beyond the boundaries of the United States the main reason lay in the alarming blood and thunder speeches of the Republican candidate calling for still more fire and brimstone in Vietnam, in particular, and against communism generally.

In contrast to the strident war-cries of

Goldwater, Lyndon Johnson appeared like a dove before the war-weary people, holding out to them the olive branch of peace.

Pledging to work for peace in Vietnam, he at the same time proclaimed "war against poverty" at home, demolition of the ghettos in American cities and the creation of a Great Society which would end forever the era of crime and violence in the United States.

Such was the alluring promissory note with which Johnson wooed the voters in the 1964 election. And by and large the electorate accepted it as being genuine. But long before November 1968, when it would have to be honored, it had proved to be a dud cheque.

In Vietnam the Goldwater threat of fire and brimstone replaced Johnson's olive branch; in a hundred American cities troops and tanks were used to quell the revolt of the Negro people; the war against poverty was lost before it had even started, and crime and violence have so escalated that in the capital, Washington, terror-stricken residents shun the streets after nightfall.

With the assassination of Robert Kennedy and of Martin Luther King, Jr., the Johnsonian presidential era drew to its unhappy close; the crisis of American policy both at home and abroad had deepened and with such a record of failure what else could LBJ do but announce his abdication.

Richard Nixon, the Republican contender for the vacant throne, is no newcomer to the American political scene. A lawyer by profession, Nixon's entry into politics dates from the witch-hunting days of the late Senator Joseph McCarthy. In those halcyon days of Nixon's militant anti-communism it was his proud boast that he helped to kick

out of the government thousands of Communists. As a reward for this and much more unsavory work of its kind he was chosen by the Republican Party king-makers to be Eisenhower's running mate in the 1952 election. And for the next eight years, basking in the reflected glory of Ike, he reigned as Vice-President.

In 1960, as the Presidential nominee of the Republican Party, he was narrowly defeated by the late John F. Kennedy. It rarely happens that a man who has suffered defeat in a previous contest is chosen to bear the party's standard in a second essay.

But such is the dearth of anything like personable and winnable candidates in the Republican ranks these days, that is, men with a really good public image, that Nixon, with two terms of the Vice-Presidency to his credit and having run the late President to such a close finish in 1960, seemed the best choice. Others offered themselves—the multi-millionaire Rockefeller, Governor of New York, and Governor Reagan of California. But neither succeeded in making the necessary impact in the party.

In his public campaigning so far Nixon, now a seasoned veteran of 55, has assumed a more dove-like role. Not for him the wild ranting of Goldwater's campaign in 1964, which wrecked the reputation of the Republican Party. When questioned about his witch-hunting collaboration during the McCarthy era he pleads the "indiscretion" of the youthful greenhorn in politics. That, of course, merely signifies that in the late 1960's anti-communism is not the vote-catching ploy it was in the early 1950's. Now, he tells the public, the "era of confrontation" with communism is over, and we are "entering an era of regulation with Moscow and China."

But with regard to Vietnam he, despite the war-weariness of the American people, has little concrete to offer. He would prefer to see a thinning out of American troops and a thickening in of South Vietnam's puppet forces, and he would like to see a greater reliance on air and sea power, that is, still heavier bombing and shelling.

In private, however, the viewpoint of the elderly Nixon is much the same as that of the young Nixon of the McCarthy era. In an address to a closed meeting of Southern delegations at the Republican Party convention he implied that he would be prepared to use nuclear weapons against Vietnam. He would not, he declared, "tolerate a continued ground war of attrition in Vietnam." The United States, he went on, should "speak softly and carry a big stick."

The typical American politician to the fingertips, Nixon, chameleon-like, speaks with one voice behind closed doors, and with an entirely different voice in public.

For his Vice-President, should he be elected, Nixon, after gaining the Republican nomination for the Presidency, to the astonishment of most people, chose the little-known Governor Spiro Agnew of Maryland whom one of the journalists reporting the convention described as a "colorless nonentity."

The Republican Party is more of an election loser than it is a winner, having lost seven of the last nine elections. In the past it had considerable voting support among the rural population. But the elimination in the technical age of large numbers of the smaller farmers has greatly reduced its base. In the last 36 years it has been away out in the political wilderness apart from the eight years of the Eisenhower Presidency. Eisenhower, enjoying at the time immense popularity because of his record as Army Commander in Europe during the Second World War, and also because of his promise to take America out of the Korean war, was a sure winner for the Republicans.

Today, however, they badly need a personality, and the extreme paucity of personalities in their ranks explains their choice of Nixon to fill the "vacuum in leadership."

The main Democratic pre-convention contenders for the nomination were Vice-President Humphrey and Senator McCarthy. However, at the convention Humphrey, with 1,762 votes on the first ballot, was an easy winner. McCarthy polled 601 votes.

Humphrey, although handicapped in his questing for the nomination because of the obloquy surrounding Johnson for his failure to fulfil the 1964 pledge to end the war in Vietnam, had the support of most of the big city bosses, of Right-wing union leaders and of men in Big Business like Henry Ford II, some of the big oil magnates and more than a few of the big Wall Street financiers. In a word, the real king-makers in the party worked might and main for Humphrey.

Senator Eugene McCarthy had much greater public support because of his liberal views and consistent advocacy of withdrawing U.S. forces from Vietnam. At home he called for highest priority for "the release of the black people and the poor from bondage."

In his early campaigning, operating in a big way with voluntary, unpaid workers, he rallied considerable support, especially among young people and women voters. It is this image of peace-maker that gained for him such wide support among mothers and young people, that is, among those who suffer most from the war.

Another gentleman who has offered himself as an Independent candidate is George Wallace, ex-Governor of Alabama. A racist demagogue playing on the fears of all who oppose the Negro civil rights movement and an advocate of tough police measures against the Negro people, Wallace is gathering a support that is worrying the Democratic campaigners.

The Communist Party has nominated two candidates, Mrs. Charlene Mitchell, a thirty-eight year old Negro office employee, as Presidential candidate, and Mr. Michael Zagarelli, a youth leader, for the Vice-Presidency.

In the United States, where anti-communism is the gospel of the ruling class, the much harassed Communist Party is faced with a really Herculean task. In the current campaign the Party is working for unity on the broadest scale of the millions of Americans now on the move for peace, against racism and for economic justice.

Henry Winston, Chairman of the Party, sees the purpose of the campaigning in furthering the development of independent political action by these millions.

"We will support," he said, "every progressive tendency leading in the direction of an eventual mass break-away of workers, farmers, Negroes and middle-class from the two-party system into an anti-monopoly coalition."

The Party's decision to run candidates will enable it to appear before the people through the medium of television, radio and press.

In our technological age electioneering, like everything else, has undergone change. The old method of the public meeting has given way to the television appearances of the contending candidates. But television, with its networks privately owned, is an exceedingly costly matter.

In the 1964 election Goldwater's television expenditure exceeded fourteen million dollars; Johnson, however, televised his way into the White House for an expenditure of ten million dollars and the false promise of peace to voters who longed for an end to the bloodshed in Vietnam.

This year's brief but unsuccessful bid to

secure the Republican nomination cost Rockefeller something like six million dollars. And by the time the world will know the result of the 1968 contest the estimate is that the television networks will have pocketed the record sum of fifty million dollars from the rival candidates; the bulk of the money will come from the two main parties whose upper echelons, honeycombed with millionaires and multi-millionaires like the Rockefeller and Kennedy families, supply the all-important gold which, by a reversal of the alchemy of an earlier age, makes it possible for the visage of a smiling Nixon or a Humphrey to appear a hundred times in the course of the campaign in the homes of most families in the land.

And Nixon and Humphrey will certainly need all the television exposure they can get. For, being deeply compromised by their past records, they will be seen and heard by an electorate utterly weary of the costly and unwanted war in Vietnam, a war which is not only the longest in American history, but a war which, in the public thinking, has brought shame and disgrace on their country.

The difference between 1964 and 1968 is not likely to benefit Humphrey. Four years ago the Democrats were riding the crest of the wave, their ranks were solid and the electorate had responded warmly to the Johnsonian promise of an early and serious search for peace that would "bring our boys home" from Vietnam. The unfortunate Republicans, plagued by the irresponsible warmongering of the ill-starred Goldwater, were then floundering in the lower depths of their crushing electoral defeat.

Now the situations are reversed in the sense of a greater restraint and unity in the Republican ranks, while the Democratic ranks are split from top to bottom.

In a recent editorial on the leadership and policy dilemmas in the two main parties the *New York Times* commented: "The ones who are out of step plainly are not the people, but the established political leaders in both parties."

In these circumstances it is not surprising that voices should be heard calling for a new party; this new party is envisaged as a broad coalition representative of the millions of Americans presently dissatisfied and frustrated with the traditional two-party system; it would be a party in which the working people could have confidence, the young people, the Black people and the poor people.

At its recent National Convention in New

York the Communist Party said that "all progressives should help build and consolidate the existing third-party organizations to the end that there will be guaranteed in the 1968 elections a viable presidential ticket as an alternative to the two major party candidates."

This outlook, it went on, makes indispensable a cooperative position towards groupings and individuals within the two-party system now considering possible third ticket action.

The idea of "third ticket action" is catching on. In New York the Convention of the Freedom and Peace Party decided to campaign in support of nominating Dr. Benjamin Spock, well-known peace champion,

for the Presidency, and Mrs. Coretta King, widow of Martin Luther King, for the Vice-Presidency. Freedom and Peace groups in Pennsylvania, Michigan, California and in other states are actively campaigning along third ticket lines.

This rising mass movement for a new, broad political alignment in the United States presents a formidable challenge to the long standing two-party monopoly of political life.

It may well be that in the course of time this people's coalition will provide the answer to the grave crisis which they have brought upon the people of the United States.

Washington: talk of peace and plans of escalation

Here is how *U.S. News and World Report* described the sentiment prevalent among various groups of Americans in Vietnam.

"Talk to the Americans—in Saigon or out in the countryside—and you hear top military and civilian officials continuing to echo an optimistic Administration line about "steady progress."

"Talk to the lower echelons—officers and enlisted men, career employees and civilians on temporary contracts—and you hear a different story. At this level, the U.S. effort in Vietnam is talked about openly and frankly as a lost cause. . . . The career soldiers are looking for diplomats in Paris to end America's agony in Vietnam. They are almost cheering them on to find some way out."

This estimate also fits the respective groups of Americans at home.

However, U.S. diplomats at the official Party meetings are unconcerned about the "lower echelons" and in no hurry "to end America's agony in Vietnam" by means of a fair political solution.

It is safe to assume that the U.S. rulers (at least those who think realistically) are aware of the stalemate of Johnson's Vietnam adventure. Yet they are blinded by hatred for the liberation effort in Indochina and persist in justifying their imperialist aggression, seeking a military solution or a political accommodation consistent with the interests of the U.S. monopolies and prejudicial to the national interests of the Vietnamese.

On and off, U.S. diplomats at the Paris talks endeavor to vindicate the Vietnam war by references, of all things, to the 1954 Geneva Agreements, which, they claim, the United States is fighting to defend. *Nhan Dan*, organ of the Vietnam Workers' Party, describes this political sleight of hand in the following terms:

"The main method of the United States is still the same—to say black is white, presenting the fight waged by the Vietnamese in North and South against the

U.S. aggression in defense of the basic principles of the Geneva Agreements as a 'violation' of these Agreements and, at once, to make out that the aggressive U.S. policy and the outrageous U.S. violations of the Geneva Agreements are consistent with the Agreements."

The biased Washington interpretation of the Geneva Agreements is meant to conceal U.S. aggressiveness, to isolate the South Vietnam freedom fighters, hem in Vietnam's struggle against aggression, prolong the country's division in the hope of perpetuating the U.S. presence in South Vietnam, and thus gain what the U.S. failed to gain on the field of battle.

While professing "to accept as a basis" the 1954 Geneva Agreements in resolving the Vietnam problem, the U.S. Government actually spurns all the provisions of the final declaration of July 21, 1954, accepted at the time by the U.S. spokesman. Take the following examples:

Point 4 of the declaration prohibits access to Vietnam of foreign troops and foreign military personnel, as well as all weapons and ammunition. Yet today more than half a million U.S. soldiers and more than 60,000 allied troops are in Vietnam fighting a war against the people of that country.

According to *Point 5*, no foreign military bases should be maintained in Vietnam, whereas dozens of U.S. air, naval and other bases are in operation.

This disproves Washington's willingness to "accept as a basis" the Geneva Agreements in resolving the problem. Besides, in the 14 years since the Agreements were signed, U.S. officials have scorned them time and again in their public utterances. South Vietnam's puppet Prime Minister Nguyen Cao Ky, too, in a television appearance recently on the anniversary of the Agreements appealed "to all patriots to wipe out the blot imposed on us by the Communists 14 years ago."

U.S. official reluctance to achieve a fair

solution, the desire to consolidate in South Vietnam at any price, was amply reaffirmed at President Johnson's meeting with South Vietnam's puppet President Nguyen Van Thieu in Honolulu at the end of July. The U.S. press was true to form in trying to prevail on world opinion that a search for a peaceful solution highlighted the Honolulu parleys.

In fact, however, the Johnson-Thieu communique laid the accent on shoring up the puppet Saigon government and its armed forces. Inasmuch as the mobilization law was passed at the end of May, the communique said, it should be expected that the total strength of the armed forces would pass the 800,000 mark by the end of the year. . . . It should also be expected that auxiliary and paramilitary formations, such as the police and the self-defense forces, will increase by 200,000 men towards the end of 1968. President Johnson declared that he was encouraged by these efforts.

As we see, "the search for a peaceful solution" centers again on stepping up the war. U.S. troops and their foreign helpers, totalling 600,000, are to be complemented by a million-strong puppet army re-equipped with the latest U.S. arms (provided for in the communique).

The section in the communique on pacification reveals what the U.S. rulers mean by "peace." It stipulates respect for the territorial integrity of the Vietnam Republic, that is, the puppet South Vietnam state constituted unlawfully by the French occupation authorities in 1948 in territory seized from the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and reconstituted in 1955 under Ngo Dinh Diem, a U.S. protégé, who thwarted, with the help of U.S. advisers and arms, the peaceful reunification envisaged in the Geneva Agreements. No mention is made of respect for the territorial integrity of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. On the contrary, President Johnson spoke in no uncertain terms of continued violations of its sovereignty and of further aggression. *New York Times* correspondent Gene Roberts reported Johnson as scoffing at rumors that a bombing halt and U.S. withdrawal had been discussed in Honolulu.

The section also contained the demand for the withdrawal from South Vietnam of military and subversive forces sent from the North. Yet, one would think, the logic of things requires the removal of U.S. troops and their satellites before any de-

mand is made about Northern forces (if any) withdrawing. However, the communique follows its own imperialist logic: the presence of U.S. occupation troops in South Vietnam is declared "lawful" and they will stay until the Vietnamese cease their struggle.

Or take the Honolulu "variants" of the further course of the official Paris talks between the DRV and USA. Thieu wanted Johnson's assurances that the Paris meeting will not affect the existence of the puppet regime, a firm opponent of a peaceful accommodation involving the patriotic forces fighting against the U.S. intervention. Before going to meet Johnson, Thieu declared that he would never consent to a coalition government with the National Liberation Front and other patriotic South Vietnam organizations. That he has borne out by deeds. In July, a Saigon military tribunal sentenced to death in absentia ten leaders of the Union of National, Democratic and Peace-Loving Forces, which it accused of "treason" and "subversion of state security" for demanding a coalition regime, withdrawal of U.S. troops and a neutralist policy.

Assurances were easily obtained in Honolulu that the United States would continue its aggression. Johnson told Thieu, according to the *New York Times*, that his administration would not seek any contacts with the National Liberation Front and that it did not support the idea of a coalition government as a step to peace. On getting this pledge, the "parliament" in Saigon "recommended" the United States (obviously at the latter's bidding) to walk out on the Paris meeting if the liberation forces continue resisting the invader.

The farce with Johnson's Honolulu assurances and Saigon "recommendations" was intended to misguide U.S. opinion concerning Washington's negative posture. As observed by a spokesman of the DRV delegation in Paris, the Honolulu meetings reveal U.S. intentions to step up the aggression in Vietnam. "By so doing," the spokesman said, "the U.S. Government impedes progress in Paris."

"In face of our serious approach and our just position at the Paris talks," said DRV President Ho Chi Minh in a statement on the 14th anniversary of the Geneva Agreements, "the U.S. spokesmen continue brazenly and quite groundlessly to call for 'reciprocity' ". Evidently, the U.S. imperialists are still reluctant to abandon their criminal aggressive war and want to hold on

to the southern part of our country, seeking to prolong the division of our motherland."

President Ho Chi Minh amplified: "Our people want peace, but genuine peace can be secured only by achieving complete independence and freedom. We adhere to a very fair and entirely clear position: if

the U.S. imperialists stop their aggressive war against our country, if they stop bombing and shelling North Vietnam, if they withdraw their troops and the troops of their satellites from South Vietnam, and if they let our nation settle its own internal affairs, peace will be instantly restored."

Jan PRAZSKY

OUR ROUND TABLE

Asian and African youth: building a new life

At the Ninth World Festival of Youth and Students in Sofia, Bulgaria, representatives of this journal met Asian and African youth leaders to exchange views on the role played by the youth, particularly young intellectuals, in the anti-imperialist struggle and in building a new life in the Asian and African developing countries.

Speakers at the round-table discussion included *da Silva*, Secretary of the Students Union of ANGOLA; *Johnny Makatini*, Director of the Youth and Students Section, African National Congress, SOUTH AFRICA; *Bacde Souleymane*, representative of the Youth for African Democratic Revolution, REPUBLIC OF GUINEA; *Majidi Khosro*, representative of the youth section, People's Party of IRAN; *C. K. Chandrappan*, General Secretary, All-India Youth Federation, INDIA; *Ishak Khatib*, Member of the Executive Federation, Committee of Democratic Youth, JORDAN; *George Toubi*, Secretary of the Young Communist League, ISRAEL; *Nobuhide Imai*, Vice-Chairman, Central Committee, Democratic Youth League of JAPAN; *Panicos Peonides*, Chairman of the United Democratic Youth of CYPRUS; *Vicienne Vounkaxa*, Organizational Secretary, Youth Section, Neo Lao Hak Sat, LAOS; *Nassim Daher*, representative of the Democratic Youth of LEBANON; *Maria Ait Ounkhir*, representative,

Youth Section, Party of Liberation and Socialism, MOROCCO; *Arcanjo Faustino*, National Union of Students, MOZAMBIQUE; *Ba Aliou*, representative, General Students Union of SENEGAL; *Samakratna*, Secretary, Youth League, CEYLON; *Yacoub Garro*, President, Democratic Youth Union of SYRIA; *Ahmed Brahim*, representative, Progressive Students of Tunisia; *Moofid Chehab*, First Secretary, Socialist Youth Organization, UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC, and *Mustapha*, representative of the Student Union of ALGERIA.

Also among the speakers was *L. El Kholy*, Editor-in-Chief, *At-Talia*, journal of the Arab Socialist Union, UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC.

Problems of Peace and Socialism was represented by Comrades *A. Gedo*, HUNGARY; *G. Batal*, LEBANON; *A. Dansoko*, SENEGAL, and *A. Salem*, JORDAN.

The symposium discussed current problems of the youth movement in Asian and African countries in a constructive comradely spirit. A survey of opinion follows.

THE YOUTH: FIGHTERS AND BUILDERS

George Batal (PPS) noted in the introductory speech that everywhere the youth today is more active as a key factor in the fight for progress, democracy, social

and national liberation. For all revolutionaries and, naturally, for Marxists, therefore, a close study of the life, struggle and specifics of the youth, of its reactions to the various social processes, is a matter of prime importance.

While focussing attention on the Asian and African youth movement, speakers pointed to its close connection with the youth struggle in the rest of the world.

Ishak Khatib (Jordan) pointed out that recent youth unrest in France, West Germany, Italy, Spain and the United States attracted public attention to the role played by the youth in the general struggle against imperialism, for democracy, peace and socialism. That role, though often misinterpreted, he said, is universally recognized. The Western capitalist press condemns the youth, arguing that youth is by nature inclined to be subversive, to oppose authority and the established order. The ultra left, on the other hand, exaggerates the role of the youth, counterposing it to the working class and spurning the progressive front led by the proletariat, whose division would harm both the youth and students, and the workers.

The youth, a broad and heterogeneous social group with only age, and sometimes enthusiasm, as a common characteristic, has divergent class interests and different ideologies; hence, it plays a different role from country to country, depending on the prevailing class relationship, the level of the productive forces and the existing relations of production. Young people in socialist and capitalist countries play entirely different roles. What is more, due to the uneven development of capitalism youth in the highly developed capitalist countries occupies an entirely different place than that of the colonial or underdeveloped countries.

It was stressed, however, that youth movements in the developed capitalist states and the Asian and African countries have a common feature: they are increasingly critical of imperialism and capitalism. *A. Dansoko* (PPS) noted that in the underdeveloped world young intellectuals are active not only in fighting for national liberation in the classic sense, but also more articulate in their fight for the alternative to capitalism as an economic and political system.

While pinpointing common features, speakers also defined the specifics of the Asian and African youth movement. *Johnny Makatini* (South Africa) maintained

that the youth in the Asian and African countries differed from that of Europe. The difference, he said, was that in Africa and Asia the problem of youth participation was more clear-cut, because the class of oppressors usually represented a foreign country, the economic interests of a foreign power.

Panicos Peonides (Cyprus) corroborated this point of view.

Ishak Khatib observed that Asian and African youth played a prominent part in the fight for national independence and social progress. In the colonies, none but the younger generation, born during or after the Second World War, has had access to education, learning thereby of various revolutionary ideas and progressive movements. In Jordan, for example, people in the over-40 age group were 80 per cent illiterate, while illiteracy in the under-40 group keeps shrinking and is now less than 20 per cent. It is natural, therefore, that in most developing countries political movements and parties were initiated by young men. Unlike the youth in the industrially developed capitalist states—affected by antagonistic class interests and the anarcho-nihilist theories current in this time of the technological revolution, generating a sense of alienation—the youth in the developing countries plays a far more tangible role and has a much broader basis for cohesion.

* * *

What is the social background of the modern Asian and African youth? Is it a homogenous body or a conglomerate of different groups?

Speakers from Lebanon, Tunisia, Syria, Guinea, the United Arab Republic, and others expressed their points of view on this score. *Nassim Daher* (Lebanon) said, for one, that these questions should be approached from a class angle, taking into account all the characteristics of the youth. None but the class approach could be forward-looking, covering not only the social background, but also the place the young people in question would occupy in public life and production in the near future. In the Asian and African countries, he added, youth holds a highly prominent place and shoulders heavy responsibilities. However, he said, it is a stone's throw from this thesis to a myth: whatever place the youth occupies in a nation's life, it cannot act effectively unless it works in the framework of the party of renovation, the revolutionary party, the party Engels called the party of the young.

Ahmed Brahim of Tunisia said it was essential to disprove the bourgeois concept of a so-called conflict of generations, which allegedly abolished the class struggle. Whatever the bourgeois propagandists may say to the contrary, youth is not a homogeneous or abstract entity dissociated from social realities and from the existing social relations of production. The bourgeoisie is trying to isolate the youth by flattery from the social forces that have an objective stake in eliminating capitalism. By exaggerating the role of the youth, by attributing to it a special revolutionary quality, some bourgeois ideologists addressing the revolutionary forces advocate adventurist ideas bound to lead to ultimate defeat.

Many of the interventions drew attention to the common feature of the various generations of fighters for national independence and social progress. At the same time, they pointed to the specifics of the present phase of the youth struggle in the independent Asian and African countries, a phase in which the tasks of social revolution are forging to the fore.

The role of the youth in political, economic and social affairs, Yacoub Garro (Syria) said, is continuously increasing. For one thing, the youth bears the brunt of the armed struggle against imperialism in Vietnam, Angola, Mozambique and the Israeli-occupied Arab territories.

The first and second generations of fighters in the newly-free countries, the speaker held, aspire in common to liberating their country from foreign rule or influence and achieving true national independence. But in the new conditions, when the transition from capitalism to socialism has become the main feature of the times, when the power of attraction and the influence of socialist ideas is growing, when colonial regimes collapse under the impact of the national-liberation movement and the working class in the capitalist countries heads broad actions against the monopolies, the youth movement has acquired a new social anti-capitalist content.

The young fighters are aware that socialism is the shortest and most dependable way of eliminating the remnants of colonialism and building a new life. Non-proletarian strata embracing socialism and fighting for its ideals, though often combining socialist ideas with religious and nationalist notions, are steadily growing in number.

In Syria, for example, years of class struggle have resulted in deep-going social and economic reconstruction. It is safe to

say that, by and large, the youth of the Baath Party played a progressive role in this process, turning the tables on the rightist elements who had founded that party. This does not mean to say, however, that the reconstruction was not influenced by the working class and its party. Although the young intellectuals played an important part, the working youth, too, gained in importance as the social processes unfolded and the weight of the working class became increasingly felt.

The young people of Syria participate in the progressive changes, they try to deepen them and to pave the political and economic way to the country's embarking on socialism. The youth sees its prime task of the day in eliminating the consequences of the Israeli aggression and liberating the occupied Arab lands.

According to Moofid Chehab, UAR, the role of the youth should be viewed in the context of the developing countries passing through two basic stages, that of national revolution and political independence and that of economic and socialist reconstruction.

Experience shows, he said, that young people are a highly militant element during the phase of national revolution. This was true in Cuba, Algeria, and Guinea, and today it is true of Vietnam and Palestine.

In the second phase, the youth of the newly-free countries participates in two basic tasks: first, in securing a high level of revolutionary effort to overcome the economic backwardness traceable to colonialism and, second, in searching for and framing appropriate economic and social relations and forms of organizing society based on the maximum possible justice in human relations and on the maximum productivity in economy. This calls for immense vitality and a certain minimum of technical and scientific experience.

The Socialist Youth Organization, Chehab said, was formed two years ago with the purpose of disseminating socialist ideas, promoting revolution, helping build a new society and extending democracy.

A. Dansoko observed that youth problems should be viewed against the crisis corroding the old social relations in the Asian and African countries, a crisis giving rise to many new important factors. In Africa, for example, the patriarchal and tribal structure is crumbling by virtue of the capitalist incursion into traditional society and the growth of the national-liberation struggle. New values are gaining currency, and the influence of world so-

cialism is increasing. Urbanization sees young people moving from villages to towns, where many cannot find jobs. As a result, they only add to the distressed bidonville population. Nearly everywhere, therefore, the youth and the forces working for change tread common ground at times of acute political crises, and tend to converge. That is true of the Congo (Brazzaville), Dahomey and other countries.

Da Silva of Angola who amplified on this idea, said that his party is campaigning against fetishism and polygamy. While a certain amount of resistance is observed among the older people, the young are more willing to cast off traditionalism and accept the scientific outlook. Older people also resist efforts to destroy tribalism, wishing to retain some of the privileges related to it. Problems of that sort do not arise with respect to the youth.

The speaker pointed out, for example, that until 1961 the headman, the traditional chief of a village community, handled all local problems. But when the struggle began and Portuguese reprisals followed, the logic of events reduced the headman's importance. In areas of the armed struggle the traditional chief holds but third or fourth place in the village hierarchy. Often, a young commander stands at the top, heading the resistance movement against Portuguese oppression, while the traditional chief is, so to speak, reduced to the ranks.

Speakers from Angola and Mozambique described the *fight waged by the youth against Portuguese colonial rule*.

In Angola, da Silva stressed, young people comprise more than 50 per cent of the population. The fact that many of them are members of our political organizations, he said, injected a specific spirit into the movement. More than 90 per cent of the men in the armed forces are in the 15-25 age group, and political cadres are mostly people of 30-35. Even the leaders of the top military and political body of the People's Movement for the Liberation of Angola are young men. This shows, da Silva concluded, that the youth plays a vanguard role, taking direct part in the armed struggle and in the administration of areas under our control. The political workers are young, so is the medical personnel and the primary school teachers in the liberated areas.

The youth of Mozambique, too, plays an outstanding role in the fight for the coun-

try's full liberation. According to Arcanjo Faustino, the youth and students exerted a strong influence on the political leaders and helped create a united front against Portuguese colonialism, the people's bitterest enemy. In 1962, the leaders of the main patriotic parties formed the Liberation Front of Mozambique, in which the youth and students are fighting effectively for freedom.

Both speakers noted that young people spurned colonialist attempts to turn them against their people and split the Liberation Front. Portuguese colonialism, Faustino pointed out, had hoped to use the young people and students to prolong the oppression and exploitation. The Portuguese regime tried to oppose the youth to the rest of the African population, laying the accent on the fact that the young people had an education. But the Mozambique youth rejected this propaganda, knowing that they were part of their people and refusing to be used by the Portuguese imperialists.

In the past six years students and other young people responded magnificently to the cause of liberation, interrupting their studies to fight for freedom and to participate in building a new life in areas under the control of the Liberation Front.

* * *

Bacde Souleymane (Republic of Guinea) spoke at length about *the tasks of the African youth in fighting against neo-colonialism and consolidating national independence and social progress*.

Colonialism, being a regime of oppression and exploitation, he said, generates a sense of protest among the youth. That is perfectly natural, especially where the youth is organized, united and equipped with a revolutionary ideology. Throughout the world, he added, young people act vigorously against neo-colonialist schemes.

Africa, he said, was the theatre of a victorious liberation struggle, resulting in the emergence of many independent states. Yet it is clear that the fight for national liberation is but the first and easiest phase, preceding the second, more difficult and complex phase of consolidating political independence and eliminating the consequences of colonialism. In the first phase, all national forces tend to concert their efforts in the fight for independence, their common aim. This unity is easily achieved because the common external enemy is easily discernible. Differences arise when

the time comes to opt for the way of further development.

Gradually, two antagonistic camps take shape: the capitalists and puppets, on the one hand, and the revolutionary youth, on the other. Some people of the older generation, brought up in colonial schools, had their outlook moulded by reactionary education. Some are inclined to remain in the service of colonialism and imperialism and look for Africa's future to the West. It is their milieu that produces the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie, who wish nothing better than to replace the colonialists and appropriate for their egoistic ends the fruits of the people's struggle.

The youth, on the other hand, which by its nature seeks justice and espouses ideas of progress, rejects neo-colonialism. Seeing the imperialist tactics in Vietnam, Mozambique, Angola, in so-called Portuguese Guinea, Latin America and other regions of the world, the youth is eager to participate in revolutionary reconstruction and is not content with but a formally conquered freedom. What it wants is genuine independence, social equality and real democracy.

Youth for African Democratic Revolution (YADR), *Souleymane* pointed out, takes an active part in working out the programs for Guinea's national revival. The youth movement, he added, is rightly known as the forward wing of the Democratic Party, standing in the vanguard in all areas—economics, culture and sports.

Members of the YADR participate in building schools and medical centers, and economic projects generally, seeking to help the country overcome its backwardness. Culturally, the youth movement is preoccupied at the moment with creating a militant original theatre in the context of the general revival of national art, scorned and abused by the colonialists. Politically, the organization centers its efforts on ideological training and guards the revolutionary gains by participation in the people's militia and the students' national movement.

The youth movement is represented in the leadership of the trade unions and in the National Assembly. Many young people hold key posts in the government and the economic administration. The youth has become an active force, conscious of its responsibilities and united by the revolutionary program of the Democratic Party of Guinea.

C. K. Chandrappan, referring to the his-

tory of his country, India, showed how the youth are becoming revolutionary-minded, joining the ranks of fighters against neo-colonialism and domestic reaction.

The most important task of the youth movement in the developing countries today, he said, is to rouse the youth against imperialism and neo-colonialism, against monopoly and the survivals of feudalism.

When the national liberation movement in India gained strength young people and students were enabled to organize. Having acquired a clearer political outlook, they went into action for freedom. Twenty years after the country had won independence the situation changed tremendously. The promises which the leaders of the national liberation movement had given to the people, saying they would build a new India and a new life, were not kept. That is why students and other young people are coming to see their tasks in a new light, to realize that they must organize to vindicate their rights.

This awareness expressed itself in their actions during the latter half of the sixties. An unprecedented wave of student action swept the country. Along with other democratic segments of the people, the youth began an organized fight for a democratic alternative to the existing political system.

At the 1967 general election one-third of the electorate was under 30 years of age. The overwhelming majority of the youth was against the ruling National Congress party. There were two opposed trends. In some states, where the reactionary parties held strong positions and where the other forces could not effectively resist them, the youth voted for them. Elsewhere the democratic parties were strong enough and so the youth voted Left. Young people seeking change generally voted for the opposition parties without looking into their programs. This shows that they lacked a clear-cut alternative.

The situation is different now. The people, especially the younger generation, are coming to realize that only a democratic alternative to the regime of the ruling party can help them solve the country's pressing problems.

* * *

Delegates from Japan, Jordan and Iran told about the activities of progressive youth in their countries.

Japan, said *Nobuhide Imai*, holds a special place among the countries of Asia and

Africa. It is a highly developed imperialist country ranking third in the capitalist world with regard to GNP. However, it is dominated by the United States, which uses it for its policy of aggression in the Far East and in Vietnam.

That is why the Tenth National Congress of the Democratic Youth League of Japan, held in September 1967, formulated the following six fundamental tasks:

1. To combat aggression, national oppression, the revival of militarism, and exploitation and plunder by U.S. imperialism; to fight for independence, democracy, peace and neutrality for Japan.

2. To fight for economic and cultural demands which, if met, would enable young people to engage in independent activities comprising study, cultural pursuits, recreation and sports.

3. To study Marxism-Leninism, summarize knowledge at the highest level achieved by science and spread this knowledge among the youth, who make up a substantial proportion of the working class.

4. To strengthen autonomous youth organizations and make them the driving force of a youth front that will be a component of the national democratic front and will be based on the unity of young people in town and country.

5. To strive for international unity of action, for a more solid united front of the world youth against the U.S. imperialist aggression in Vietnam, for the progress of the international democratic youth movement.

6. To support the actions and demands of the Japanese youth and build up a militant Youth League with hundreds of thousands of members, one that will form the axis of the united youth front.

The delegate spoke of the progress of the struggle against the U.S. aggression in Vietnam, against Japanese involvement in that war, for the abolition of the U.S. military bases, against atomic submarines calling at Japanese ports, for the return of Okinawa to Japan and the abrogation of the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty.

The youth of Japan are very active in the Liberate the People of South Vietnam campaign. A total in excess of 100m. yen has been collected to date in aid to Vietnam, of which 20m. yen, or 60,000 dollars, was contributed by young people. The first shipment of supplies from the Japanese people, including the youth, arrived in Hanoi last July.

Nobuhide Imai then dealt with some other aspects of the activity of the Youth League. The League supports the economic, social, cultural and other demands of the youth. Young people are hard hit by low wages and the growing prices of manufactured goods—an effect of the policy pursued by the Japanese-U.S. reactionaries. This is why the League tries to make common cause with other youth organizations and the trade unions in the enterprises and in residential neighborhoods. The Singing Voices of Japan movement, now comprising millions of young men and women, is a result of twenty years' effort—with the cooperation of the Democratic Youth League—in workshops and neighborhoods and on the campus.

Ishak Khatib told his audience about the specific tasks of the youth of Jordan, a sizable part of which is occupied by Israeli troops.

Daily terror compels young people in the occupied areas to flee; Israel wants to clear these areas of their native population to "preserve the Jewish character of the state," as Moshe Dayan phrased it.

Mass arrests are the most salient characteristic of the occupation regime. Over 7,000 people were put in jail, and 2,000 of them, mostly persons under 30 years of age, are still behind bars. Other measures in use are curfews announced for indefinite periods, massive repressions, the destruction of villages and towns, exile, steps leading to economic stagnation.

All the classes and strata of society have a vital interest in the liberation of the occupied territory. Young people play an important part in this by organizing actions ranging from strikes and boycotts and demonstrations to physical resistance. The youth of Jordan realize that the occupied areas cannot be freed without a sustained fight against imperialism and a change in the present half-hearted policies of the government, that to win freedom it is necessary to mobilize the masses and lead them into action for changes, for democratic rights, for increasing cooperation with the socialist countries, particularly the Soviet Union.

In Iran, Majidi Khosro pointed out, the youth live and fight in exceedingly difficult conditions. Unemployment is particularly high among young people. Eighty per cent of the population are illiterate. There are few schools and hardly any vocational schools. It is almost as difficult to enter university as to travel to the moon. Young

people lack educational and sports facilities and there are no libraries, cinemas or theatres for them.

Every effort is made to block the protest movement of the young generation. The prisons are filled with students. On orders from the dictator — the Shah — military courts sentence young people to death or long-term imprisonment. Nevertheless, the youth are beginning to realize that the only way out is to fight. They meet therefore in factory, field or street and fight against imperialism. Their goal is complete national and social emancipation.

* * *

The role of young intellectuals and national cadres in the Afro-Asian countries was dealt with by speakers from Algeria, Morocco, Syria, Tunisia, Senegal and the Lebanon.

It is quite obvious, said *Nassir Daher*, that the national cadres trained in colonial days, far from appreciating the demand for independence, resist all reform. This is why in the new independent countries that have taken a new road the training of personnel is one of the fundamental problems. It is not a key issue, however. If we treated it as a key issue we might lose sight of the context, of the realities and needs of the country, for to train politically uncommitted personnel would be an unscientific approach. The training of personnel acquires its full significance when treated as part of the overall development policy based mainly on national requirements and the interests of the masses. In short, it is intimately linked with the entire system of social organization. It is not a question of graduating so-and-so many diplomaed specialists but of training cadres devoted to the cause of their people. Otherwise we witness things like the brain drain from Asia and Africa, the bureaucratization of the administrative apparatus, and so on.

This idea was supported by *Ahmed Brahim*, who said that in his country, Tunisia, skilled personnel are extolled as architects of politics. The governing circles are always trying to lure young people with high positions. The corruption campaign is aimed chiefly at the students, whose petty-bourgeois origin fosters a technocratic and self-seeking mentality. However, the extension of the social base of the students, the government's effort to prevent them from uniting in democratic organizations, and the students' growing awareness of the aspirations of the people have led to

the rise of a broad democratic student movement.

Yacoub Garro stressed that the training of national personnel is highly important in those countries that have embarked on social progress, since this personnel takes an active part in consolidating progressive regimes and in foiling the economic sabotage that elements linked with the bourgeoisie are trying to carry on.

The socialist countries help re-educate old and train new national cadres. Those who return from a socialist country upon completing a course of training are full of enthusiasm and eager to contribute to the progress of their country. Not so with those trained in a capitalist country. The monopolies do their best to bribe them and keep them in the West. To make those

The Patrice Lumumba University of Friendship Among Peoples, which trains specialists for the developing countries, was founded in 1960. So far it has graduated 2,000 specialists and at present it has 3,000 students.

Eighty percent of the students from the developing countries who are enrolled in Soviet universities study natural science, medicine, engineering or agriculture.

who do return to their countries their true servitors, they inculcate cosmopolitan and pro-imperialist ideas in them.

Ba Aliou of Senegal touched on another aspect of the problem of young specialists coming home after studies abroad. It is wrong, in his view, to suggest that young African specialists refuse of their own accord to return to their countries upon completing their studies. The phenomenon is often due to the lack of democratic freedoms and genuine democracy in the country concerned. Most African students abroad take part in the fight against the neo-colonial regimes in their countries and are almost invariably persecuted and imprisoned when they go home. They are forced to continue their political fight wherever they can. This is not to say, however, that their aim is to stay abroad forever.

Ba Aliou believes that in his country students are politically the most conscious section of the youth. But the students cannot, by virtue of their social standing, be treated as a social class since they have

Almost half of the doctors in British public hospitals today are Indians, Pakistanis or Burmans. India alone has "supplied" Britain with 1,500 doctors. Numerous African and Asian specialists settle in West Germany, France, Belgium and other capitalist countries of Europe. About as many settle in the United States, where over 4,000 research workers and engineers from Asia took jobs between 1956 and 1963. About 10 percent of the Arab students in the United States stay there and become American citizens.

no share in the production process. The intellectual youth, including politically active students, are objectively closer to the working class, whose interests they try to defend.

A similar view on the political way of thinking of young intellectuals was voiced by *Mustapha* of Algeria. The youth, especially young intellectuals, he said, are beginning to realize the need to follow the road of economic and social progress. While they occasionally have a vague idea of new perspectives, they know well enough which road they *must not follow*. They realize that they must not follow a capitalist road, and so they look for a different road, even though they do not always find it. Young intellectuals are becoming increasingly sensitive to the poverty of the masses. Pondering this state of affairs, many of them take sides with the working class.

THE FORMATION OF ANTI-IMPERIALIST CONSCIOUSNESS

A problem of first importance, *Maria Ait Ounkhir* of Morocco pointed out, is to arouse the political consciousness of the Afro-Asian youth belonging to the exploited classes. These young people are vaguely anti-imperialist and well aware that they live in an economically underdeveloped area of the globe. It is a fact, however, that the awakening of political consciousness is a limited development.

We consider, said *Da Silva* of Angola that in our country the subjective factors are particularly important and that growing political consciousness can become the main motive force of our struggle. That is why our organization—the People's Movement for a Free Angola—attaches great importance to making young people politic-

ally aware and to forming strong political and cultural organizations.

The participants in the forum analyzed the principal factors for the formation of the anti-imperialist consciousness of the youth in Asia and Africa. *Nassim Daher* of the Lebanon said that anti-imperialist consciousness is developing under the impact of social reality, which transcends national bounds and reflects the great problems of our time and the class struggle going on all over the world. This struggle shows the following characteristics:

1. The countries of Asia and Africa are faced with challenging problems. The capitalist system cannot solve them. The youth realize that backwardness is the reverse of the capitalist coin, a result of continuous plunder by the big monopolies and the imperialist powers, which today are headed by U.S. imperialism.

2. The aggressiveness of imperialism in Vietnam, Palestine, the Middle East and everywhere else is an obvious proof of the contradictions rending the imperialist camp and of the inability of this camp to offer historically new solutions. This aggressiveness is also a reflection of fear of the retreat of big capital and the dwindling of its forces in the face of the great achievements of the socialist countries and the growing national liberation movement, which is assuming an increasingly progressive socio-economic character.

3. The experience of socialism plays the part of an example, a model, for the developing countries, specifically for their youth. Particularly important is the experience of the Soviet Asian republics.

4. The struggle of the working class in the developed countries is invariably and extensively supported by all the peoples fighting a common enemy, imperialism, and contributes to the national liberation movement.

5. The problems of preserving peace and curbing imperialist aggressiveness, above all in Vietnam, and the problem of the anti-imperialist front have a bearing on the Afro-Asian countries and therefore cause concern to their youth.

Thus the development of anti-imperialist consciousness reflects the level attained by the class struggle between the new world of socialism and the dying world of capitalism. Hence the causes of growing anti-imperialist consciousness are not limited nor internal but concern all peoples, first of all those that are fighting. To these

peoples, especially to their youth, the capitalist development of their countries is inseparable from imperialism. It follows that to fight against imperialism means opposing the road of capitalist development. The anti-imperialist struggle has come to mean renunciation of the capitalist social system itself.

Yacoub Garro of Syria, speaking of important factors in the progress of the youth movement in Asia and Africa, stressed that the fight of the people of Vietnam has become a symbol of heroism and supreme devotion to the country, a living embodiment of the ideals of the youth. It has fostered anti-imperialist consciousness and shown the necessity and importance of the solidarity of young people throughout the world against imperialism and the forces of war and aggression. It has also made the peoples more internationalist.

Speakers pointed out that in many countries the anti-imperialist consciousness of the youth has been shaping under the influence of concrete struggles against the colonialist forces.

Mustapha of Algeria said that the social development of his country is considerably influenced by such peculiarities as, for example, the national liberation struggle which the people, including the youth, had to wage over a long period, peculiarities which undoubtedly made the Algerian youth more anti-imperialist and more aware of the fact that imperialism is the common enemy of the peoples.

With independence won, the formation of the political consciousness of the youth in each country begins to be influenced by new factors. Ahmed Brahim of Tunisia believes that the level of young people's anti-imperialist consciousness is determined by the degree of maturity of the organized progressive forces in each country. The national liberation movement today is merging with the movement for social emancipation as the peoples become aware that their political independence is of value only if coupled with real economic independence on non-capitalist lines, a stage on the road to socialism.

Speakers noted that the growth of young people's anti-imperialist consciousness is still far from being up to the level of the anti-imperialist actions the younger generation takes. C. K. Chandrappan of India voiced his concern about this. We live, he said, at a time when the youth of the world are becoming more united against imperialism and neo-colonialism. The experience of the movement, which has assumed vast

scope in the United States and the developed capitalist countries of Europe and Asia, shows that it takes primarily the form of opposition to nuclear war and of solidarity with the people of Vietnam. The strongest anti-imperialist movement in Asia is in Japan, the most developed capitalist country of the area. It is there that youth and students are particularly active on this front. During the Israeli aggression against the Arab countries anti-imperialist action surged high in all Asian and African countries. But it was less strong than the mass movement in the developed capitalist countries against capitalism.

* * *

The participants in the forum examined the *obstacles to the growth of the anti-imperialist consciousness and united action of the youth.*

Nassim Daher said that the progress of the youth movement cannot always be described as upward and that it is a complex phenomenon.

First of all, the rejection of capitalism in the objective conditions of the developing countries, which are characterized by the numerical and political weakness of the working class and where class differentiation has yet to attain an adequate degree, does not lead straight to a correct understanding of the meaning of socialism and its necessity. This, needless to say, tells on the level of anti-imperialist consciousness. And then there are the neo-colonialist intrigues, anti-communism in every form and, specifically, anti-Sovietism, various indirect means of pressure by imperialist propaganda, including so-called aid, regional problems, survivals of the colonial period, and so on. All this tends to reduce the anti-imperialist, and hence the socialist, consciousness of most of the young people.

Another factor affecting this consciousness is that the choice made by the youth of these countries occurred within a historically brief period. Colonialism did not fall a hundred years ago, and so the youth movement in these countries has not yet gained sufficient experience and maturity. Lastly, the weakness of political and mass organizations in the Afro-Asian countries tells too.

El Kholy of the UAR said that at a time when socialism has become a world-wide phenomenon, the appeal of Marxism extends both to the working class and, increasingly, to non-proletarian strata of bourgeois origin. This is particularly no-

ticeable in the African and Asian countries and it accounts for the important fact that there is an influx of ideologically immature non-proletarian elements into the movement. This is how petty-bourgeois ideas make their way into the socialist movement.

At the same time, the speaker went on, we are witnessing extraordinary progress

in science and technology, which have achieved a high level in the capitalist and the socialist countries. This enhances the importance of the white-collar worker. The new states, striving for rapid progress, are compelled to use new technologies in social conditions that are unsuitable for it, with the result that the petty bourgeoisie and its thinking are carrying increasing

TABLE 1

POPULATION UNDER 24 IN SOME REGIONS OF THE WORLD*

		1960	1965	1970	1975	1980
AFRICA	Total population (000)	272,879	306,173	345,949	393,257	448,869
	Population under 24 (000)	170,353	191,145	216,129	243,985	281,137
	% %	62.4	62.4	62.7	62.5	62.6
EAST ASIA	Total population (000)	793,363	850,476	909,833	973,700	1,038,250
	Population under 24 (000)	415,767	442,560	469,166	492,792	509,771
	% %	52.4	52	51.6	50.6	49.1
SOUTH ASIA	Total population (000)	857,807	966,336	1,089,983	1,223,816	1,365,714
	Population under 24 (000)	506,534	573,112	650,486	732,562	811,468
	% %	59	59.3	59.7	59.8	59.4
WESTERN EUROPE	Total population (000)	134,536	139,456	143,766	147,876	151,845
	Population under 24 (000)	51,234	52,491	54,244	54,688	55,992
	% %	38.1	37.6	37.7	37	36.9

*Based on UNESCO figures.

TABLE 2

EDUCATIONAL STANDARDS*

Continent	Total countries and territories covered in survey	Number of countries with different primary education standards (%) for school-age population			Ratio of students of all levels to total population (%)
		60% and up	40-59%	Under 40%	
World	188	94	46	48	14.6
Africa	52	8	12	32	8.6
America	47	35	10	2	19.7
Asia	34	10	16	11	13.0
Europe	34	26	6	2	17.1

*Based on 1961-62 UNESCO figures.

TABLE 3

ADULT ILLITERACY IN SOME REGIONS OF THE WORLD*

Region	Total adult population (15 years of age and up) in 000	Adult illiterates (000)	Illiterate population (%)
World	1,881,300	740,000	39.3
Africa	149,600	121,900	81.5
East Asia (incl. Japan)	480,100	203,400	42.4
South Asia	502,900	340,800	67.8
Europe	470,700	27,200	5.8

*Based on 1960 UNESCO figures.

TABLE 4

DISTRIBUTION OF AFRO-ASIAN STUDENTS BY LINES OF SPECIALIZATION*

Country	Total of students	Humanities and social sciences	Natural sciences and engineering	Medicine	Agric. sciences	Percentage studying the humanities and social sciences
Algeria	5,926	2,896	1,407	1,299	110	48.9
Dahomey	34	34				100
Ghana	2,985	1,835	865	208	69	61.5
Guinea	460	58	277	111	14	12.6
Ivory Coast	1,566	1,231	280	55		78.6
Malagasy Rep.	2,199	1,607	901	126	65	73.1
Mali	164	164				100
Nigeria	6,722	4,011	1,449	532	584	59.7
UAR	160,671	89,629	33,433	16,485	21,124	55.7
Tunisia	4,892	3,477	1,021	224	170	71.7
Burma	18,414	10,017	6,683	1,624	170	54.4
Cambodia	5,851	3,737	246	483	65	63.9
Ceylon	5,706	2,872	1,236	1,481	117	50.3
Syria	29,156	23,959	2,526	1,183	289	82.2
India	1,207,511	692,285	414,485	48,494	36,089	57.3
Lebanon	17,052	14,205	1,616	1,082	149	83.3
Malaysia	7,086	5,464	1,163	193	123	77.1
Jordan	1,475	1,350	41		84	91.5
Afghanistan	3,054	1,527	694	667	166	50
Pakistan	95,258	66,875	19,428	5,199	3,756	70.2

*Based on UNESCO data for 1963-65.

weight in spite of the strong pro-socialist trends in these countries.

Summing up the impediments to the growth of anti-imperialist consciousness, *Panicos Peonides* of Cyprus spoke of two kinds of factors. First of all there are the results of internal development, economic factors leading to the strengthening of the bourgeoisie, factors indicating the inability of the progressive forces at home to influence development, political factors like the formation of groups and parties contending for power, etc. Secondly, there are external

factors in the form of the economic, political and ideological influence of the capitalist world. This influence is exerted in the most diverse ways: directly, through political and economic interference, and indirectly, by means of radio, television, films, literature, and the introduction of imperialist methods into the training of the national intelligentsia.

In our country, said *Mustapha* of Algeria, the reactionaries rarely take an open stand against revolutionary principles. They prefer devious routes. Here is an example.

The Islamic communes and secret sects which the National Liberation Front ruthlessly weeded out during the liberation war have been developing again for some time. As we know the extent to which these sects have developed, we may say that it is a question of attempts to revive feudalism and tribal concepts of society.

Speakers stressed that young people become more anti-imperialist and politically mature as they fight. *Johnny Makatini*, speaking of South Africa's experience, said that at first the consciousness of the youth could not be described as entirely anti-imperialist but as the fight goes on this consciousness is increasing. This is apparently because the ideals cherished by young people in the early period of their development are trampled underfoot by the imperialist forces. True, these forces often go out of their way to protest their allegiance to ideas that are near and dear to the youth. This explains why young people in a country fulfilling the historic mission of winning national independence and freedom may at first look to the imperialist forces because they have been misled through systematic attempts to dupe the younger generation. This error does not last long, however, for as soon as the struggle assumes an organized character the youth discover that it is the imperialist forces that have reduced the people to their present plight. And it is this important fact that helps young people to develop anti-imperialist consciousness.

Ba Aliou of Senegal pointed out that anti-imperialist consciousness is anything but an abstract concept. It is influenced by both young people's objective conditions of life and the international situation. The struggle of the Vietnamese people, the fighters of "Portuguese" Guinea and the people of Mozambique against U.S. imperialism and Portuguese colonialism are an important factor in arousing young people. In these circumstances the anti-imperialist consciousness of young people is promoted through propaganda in militant mass organizations whose principal object is to bring all young people into the anti-imperialist fight.

Nobuhide Imai of Japan said that in his country the rapid political, ideological and organizational consolidation of the Democratic Youth League is a result of grim battles over the last few years. The League insists on the necessity for teaching young people to see the connection between the ways and means of realizing their demands

and the demands of the people and the ways and means of fighting for independence, peace, democracy and neutrality, combining the political tasks of the country with important everyday demands. The course of the revolutionary struggle everywhere shows that fighting youth display great revolutionary energy when they are aware of the connection between their future and the future of their country.

FIGHT AGAINST BOURGEOIS IDEOLOGY

The battles of ideologies is today the main factor in shaping the consciousness of young people, said *Mustapha*. Seeking to prevent growth of anti-imperialist consciousness, the imperialists rely principally on ideological struggle, which thus assumes decisive significance not only in the general context of the fight of the revolutionary forces, but also as far as the youth are concerned.

The speakers noted that imperialism is very active in the ideological field, trying to prevent formation of the national self-consciousness of the peoples regaining their freedom and the assimilation of socialist ideas by them. *Maria Ait Ounkhir* said that the imperialists were conducting an ideological offensive in her country. As part of this offensive, they are setting up "cultural centers," propagating myths about "Moroccan unity," "the foreign character of communism" or its "adaption to Moroccan reality," vilifying socialist countries and misrepresenting the state of things in the Communist movement—all this with the aim of generating political confusion and indecision, which is taken advantage of by leftist and opportunist elements.

P. Peonides called attention to the danger of the spread of bourgeois ideology. It is necessary, he said, to define with greater precision the character of bourgeois ideology and the ways of its penetration into our countries. Its influence is felt in many ways. It is not just the cynical anti-human ideology of the Pentagon which is hated and rejected by the people. In the hundreds of years of its existence capitalism has developed a way of thinking and conduct which leads the people and the youth especially away from the path of struggle and prevents formation of a progressive mentality. The capitalist information media propound abstract slogans of "genuine" freedom, "true" development of the individual.

Our youth, especially young intellectuals, fall under the influence of such slogans. The ideas of individualism, of isolation from society are penetrating more and more the minds of our people, our intellectuals. We should not conceal the growing appeal of the image of an individual sacrificing his life for his own cause. This sort of individualism plays objectively, psychologically into the hands of the extremist forces, the ultra-left political forces which are doing tremendous harm to our movement.

There is a tendency among the youth to search for symbols of individualism and not common principles of struggle. This undermines the struggle from within, weakens the progressive forces and tremendously complicates our actions. Our common task is to bring back the individual to society, enabling him to make his contribution to social development.

Quite naturally, *Mustapha* said, imperialism is aware of the factors that mould the conscience of the youth, and tries to neutralize them in its global strategy of anti-popular struggle. It is establishing its cultural centers all over the world, designed to spread imperialist ideas often couched in "scientific" terminology. It wants young people to grow up as its servitors. In the case of those developing countries where the position of the revolutionary forces is least favorable, the imperialists, those of the United States in particular, finance the education of young people in the metropolitan countries, subjecting them to ideological indoctrination.

Peonides noted that the influence of imperialist ideology is strongest where the national culture is not sufficiently developed, which is characteristic of mostly newly-free countries.

The participants in the exchange cited numerous examples to show how imperialism, taking advantage of the absence of a material base for the development of culture and education in the young countries, is carrying out its ideological infiltration.

C. K. Chandrappan pointed to the intensification of the neo-colonial offensive in the field of education and culture. Not long ago, he said, the government of India proposed a new scheme in the field of education, to be carried out with the cooperation of the U.S. government. A so-called Indo-U.S. Foundation for Education was set up, designed, it was said, to promote the development of education in the country. But the progressive section of our

society rightly judged it to be part of the U.S. neo-colonialist ideological offensive. We launched a protest movement, especially among the students, and ultimately popular resentment forced the abandonment of the scheme. However, pro-imperialist elements are still trying to infiltrate our youth and student organizations. The recent revelations by a former CIA man in *Ramparts* magazine show that the CIA is out to establish control over youth organizations.

In South Africa, *J. Makatini* said, the missionaries are very active in the higher schools, where they hold forth on freedom, equality and democracy being the rule of the people, for the people and by the people. But a confrontation of study programs with reality impels young people to challenge the political system in their country, based on an alliance of imperialism and domestic reaction.

One of the directions of the ideological offensive of imperialism was discussed by *A. Brahim*. On the cultural plane, he said, admiration is expressed of so-called Western values and scorn for the national culture. The methods employed by the ruling circles to estrange the Tunisian people from the other Arab peoples are many: the pursuit of a pro-French policy, of which Bourghiba has become an exponent together with other African leaders of "moderate persuasion" like Senghor and Houphouet-Boigny; U.S. infiltration in all fields of culture; discrimination against progressive artists; the provision of facilities to the Americans, who run a huge "cultural center" in Tunis, for holding public meetings to vindicate their aggressive policy in Vietnam. Quite naturally, the people and youth of Tunisia refuse to support such policies of the country's rulers.

Peonides pointed out that the ideological penetration of imperialism is not always properly rebuffed. We are not active enough, he said, and when ideology is not on the offensive it retreats. Take an example: our cinema houses show, for the most part, American, British, Greek, French, Italian and other films from the capitalist world. At the same time our public knows nothing about the cinematography of the socialist countries. Only one Soviet film was shown in Cyprus in 1967, and none from the other socialist countries. But we all know the highly important role the cinema plays in the underdeveloped countries. The same applies to television and in many respects to literature. Pocket

books, illustrations of doubtful value, crime, sex and horror books flood our markets, but there are no Soviet books, no books by progressive authors there. Our poets know only Elliot as the top figure in poetry. Very few people—poets, mostly—know Mayakovsky. They know him by name but not his work.

All this creates an atmosphere that drowns out real art, disillusion our writers and makes our young people think that the public does not need real art. So why write for the public. So our writers begin to create purely subjective art or just drift with the stream. These are serious problems, and we must face them squarely and react promptly to them.

As for the countries under the influence of neo-capitalism, *Ba Aliou* said, development of national culture is possible there only after genuine national liberation. Only then can genuine national culture created by the masses really develop. This viewpoint was supported by *Mustapha*, who said it is impossible to develop national culture without an irreconcilable struggle against imperialism. It is true that young people do not immediately realize imperialism's pernicious influence on culture. But sooner or later it becomes clear to them that a stubborn struggle against imperialism must be waged to ensure the development of national revolutionary culture and education.

CONSOLIDATION OF OUR RANKS IS THE EARNEST OF SUCCESS

If we are to advance, *Nassim Daher* stressed, we must before all else direct the struggle of the youth within a definite organizational framework, beginning with a mass organization and ending with an advanced revolutionary party.

The importance of organizationally consolidating the youth movement in the Afro-Asian countries and the complexity of this task, the need to overcome a number of obstacles, such as the traditional order, that have arisen in the past ten years or relatively recently—all these questions have been discussed by the participants in the symposium.

The mass organizations in many countries of Asia and Africa are in the initial stages of development and do not as yet enjoy the necessary popularity, he went on to say. These mass organizations have to contend with many difficulties due to a number of factors and particularly those associated with the social structure of the newly-independent countries, their low lev-

el of intersocial contacts. The main difficulties, in the opinion of the speaker, are:

1. The absence of militant traditions in the youth organizations, which makes their work difficult and necessitates training cadres capable of taking more active actions and giving political leadership.

2. The existence of social forces that prevent broad sections of the youth participating in the reconstruction of their countries' economic and social life, in the struggle in mass organizations.

3. The weak concentration of workers, the fact that the youth are not united, also hamper the growth of mass organizations.

4. And the last, but by no means least important factor—the constant intrigues of the imperialists in all spheres: cultural, social and economic. Imperialism preaches indifference to struggle, to political action. It sows fear of organization and particularly tries, through its propaganda, to confuse the minds of the youth, to sow distrust in the mass struggle and its ultimate aims. The state bodies of the reactionary regimes are acting in the same direction.

Many participants in the symposium agreed, in one form or another, with the aforementioned analysis of the reasons for the organizational weaknesses of the youth movement in Asia and Africa.

One has the impression that in some countries (as, for instance, in Senegal, where even before independence was achieved an organized youth movement existed which decisively influenced the African states under French rule) the youth movement is on the ebb, is shutting itself up in its own shell and going back to the lower forms of organization, said *A. Dansoko*. Even those who really want to find a way of giving expression to the aspirations of the youth, who for many years have been trying to find organizational forms that would appeal to the youth and evoke their enthusiasm, notice this. The reasons for this could be:

1. It is not excluded that after having won independence the feelings and aspirations of the youth are still unconscious, still have to manifest and clarify themselves, i.e., find their relationship to the political struggle.

2. Government repressions too have played a very big role. Besides, up to a certain time neo-colonialism is veiled, which makes it difficult to elaborate concrete organizational forms of struggle against neo-colonial power.

We must therefore, *A. Dansoko* stressed,

make a deeper study of the factors that will inspire the youth, so numerous in our countries, to join the struggle in increasing numbers on the side of the progressive forces and against neo-colonialism.

One of the most important means of uniting the youth in progressive organizations is the right kind of propaganda. And yet, noted *Panicos Peonides*, the point is that although we are frequently politically strong, ideologically we are not so strong. The two go together, political action and ideological, but they are not always identical. We do not want our youth movement, continued the speaker, to turn into a small fraction of politically mature, politically advanced people. But there is such a danger if the work of the youth organizations is going to be just a repetition of the work of the party organizations. Socialist, Marxist ideas are in all cases stronger than the ideas implanted by capitalism. The thing is to find effective means of passing on these ideas, and not only the political ones coming from the socialist world, but also the ideas that form a new human being. We firmly believe in the victory of our forces, we believe in the strength of the socialist world and the Soviet Union, friendship with whom we consider the main guarantee of the success of our common struggle.

To really develop ideological work among the youth, to give the movement of the young generation a clear perspective and orientation, we must correctly resolve the question of relations between the party and the youth organization.

We believe, said *Ba Aliou*, that a youth organization that does not have a correct political line will not be able to train political cadres capable of carrying on the struggle to the end. The existence of a Marxist-Leninist party is essential for development of the struggle in the mass organizations. No matter how militant the spirit of the youth, youth organizations and, in particular, student organizations can have a correct line, can clearly dissociate themselves from reformist organizations, only if their activity is directed by true Marxist-Leninists.

However, the need for the youth organizations to have a clear ideological orientation should not be understood narrowly, dogmatically. Such an approach which, unfortunately, still exists, makes work among the youth dry and uninteresting, vitiates those very youth issues which

arouse the most immediate, lively interest of young people.

In his contribution, *El Kholy* spoke of the struggle against dogmatism, against isolationism from reality. We are clear as to our aims. We have methodology. We have the possibility to strengthen the influence of socialism throughout the world. But this means that we must approach the problems of the youth more actively and boldly, see them not as we would like to see them, but as they are in reality, as the youth see them. In times of revolution the youth movement is, as a rule, a progressive, Left and sound movement. We should turn it into a positive factor, all the more so since reaction is trying to win it over to its side. We can achieve our aim only through an objective and realistically democratic dialogue. We should explain and convince and not hurl accusations. That is the easiest of all. But what is more difficult and more important is to understand.

The participants of the meeting discussed the numerous problems connected with youth work and stressed that this work must meet the real and not the imaginary requirements of young people, the requirements of today and not of yesterday.

In our organization, said *P. Peonides*, there is a big flow of teenagers, youngsters of the age of 15, 16 and 17. The young people come to us instinctively, instinctively our young people are anti-imperialistically minded. It is after the age of 20 that the big problems start, the big problems of combating the influences of imperialist ideology. But we are looking to the future; we need more ideological weapons and we need new forms, more flexible forms of work among the youth.

In our organizational work, continued the speaker, we attach much significance to cultural work. We have noticed, for example, that many musical groups of modern music are created among the youngsters. We organized a big competition of these musical groups and gathered in a big stadium 5,000 young people and about 20 musical groups; we gave prizes to the best ones and in this way took under our own auspices a new movement which is gathering momentum among the youth. We are now trying to supply these musical groups with popular songs and songs which are sung in America by the peace marchers; we are trying to give to these musical groups the music of the new trend which has been created by Mikis Theodorakis. We also organize groups of theatri-

cal fans, groups of young tourists, exhibitions of our young painters.

We attach exceptional importance to the aesthetical education of the youth, *Peonides* noted. This, combined with our propaganda and political work, our political actions, will give good results.

The sports movement, noted many speakers, is coming to play an important part in the activity of the youth organizations. Our youth league, said *N. Imai*, plays the main role in the sports movement of the youth. Beginning with 1963 we hold annual sports festivals on a national and international scale. Close to a million young people are involved in this movement.

* * *

Many of the speakers noted that the problem of organizing the students is of a specific character. On the one hand, it is easier to do so since they are objectively united by common professional interests and live in the same milieu. On the other, the differences in social origin and living conditions are more strongly evident among the student body than anywhere else.

The role played by the student organizations in a number of countries, said *N. Daher*, clearly shows that university students and secondary school pupils have more possibilities for action and, consequently, are better organized. The student organizations enjoy the support of the student mass and therefore play a certain political role.

Daher went on to say that broad sections of the student youth are interested in political life, in the fight for their demands, in the anti-imperialist and anti-colonial struggle. However, he stressed, refusal to recognize social discipline, frequently characteristic of student organizations, does not necessarily lead to struggle; such refusal is not revolution. On the contrary, unless it is directed towards revolutionary organization such refusal can lead to nowhere, to hopelessness and, consequently, serve the interests of those who want to slow down the march of history.

N. Imai spoke in detail about the experience and problems of the student movement in Japan. The All-Japan Federation of Student Autonomies which was established in 1948, he said, has consistently fought for the independence and peace of the fatherland and for university autonomy, academic freedom and a better life

for students. But in 1960, during the upsurge of the historical struggle against the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty, the Federation's leadership was seized by Trotskyites who, in effect, destroyed the Federation by a series of provocative actions. Exploiting the petty-bourgeois radicalism among some sections of the students and under the clever policy of the reactionary forces nurturing them, the Trotskyites are continuing their destructive maneuvers.

The democratic student movement of Japan, fighting against these Trotskyite destructive measures, reconstructed the Federation in December 1964 in accordance with its constitution, rallying in its ranks more than 70 per cent of the student autonomies in Japan. In the process of this reconstruction of the Federation, attention was centered on reconstructing the units of our Democratic Youth League and developing them into strong organizations deeply rooted in the student mass.

The reconstructed Student Federation firmly upholds the position of strengthening solidarity with the world youth and students fighting for national independence, peace, social progress, and for the development of united actions. The reconstructed Federation is the only national federation of student autonomies.

The students of Tunisia are actively fighting for their rights. In the past two years, said *A. Brahim*, there has been one student demonstration after another directed, first and foremost, against the Tunisian government's pro-American policy and for the restoration of democratic liberties. The students are hounded by the police. The Tunisian government hopes to frighten the students, intellectuals and progressive sections of the Tunisian people and to prevent them from coming out in support of the people of Vietnam, the peoples of Africa, Asia and Latin America who are fighting for national independence.

* * *

The participants in the symposium dealt at length with the question of unity of the youth movement on a national scale. The problem is an extremely complex one and is being tackled in each country in accordance with the specific features of its history and the present situation.

In Syria, for example, said *Y. Garro*, there is one main youth organization—the League of Democratic Youth. This organization arose 19 years ago and played an important role in rallying the youth to tackle the important tasks facing the

country. The League has its branches in all parts of the country; it is fighting to develop class consciousness among the youth, to mould a generation dedicated to their country and who are conscious of their responsibility for the fate of the progressive reforms in the country. We seek, stressed the speaker, to rally the youth to help liquidate the consequences of the Israeli aggression and give effect to the demands of the youth, to organize the leisure of young people, to develop their artistic and cultural talents.

At present another youth organization is being established in Syria—the Organization of Revolutionary Youth, which is associated with the Baath Party. We consider that each one of these organizations should be allowed freedom of action but at the same time try to promote coordination and cooperation on the basis of mutual recognition and respect. The question of uniting the youth organizations can be studied in the course of common struggle and achieved through the unification of other progressive forces.

The influence of the reactionary parties is still strong among the Indian youth and students, said C. K. Chandrappan. Many sections of the youth are in general disillusioned and a considerable part of them is not organized. The democratic and Left parties still have to formulate a common approach to the youth and student problems. To overcome the influence of the reactionary parties in the present conditions of India, it is absolutely necessary to have a united democratic, Left-oriented youth organization with a clear perspective of struggle against imperialism and the growing monopolies, against the survivals of feudalism. In this broadly united youth movement of Left forces the Communist youth should play the vanguard role.

N. Imai spoke of the great importance his youth organization attaches to establishing a broad youth front, and particularly to cooperation and joint actions with all the democratic youth organizations, including the Socialist Youth League and youth sections of the labor unions.

Although different politically and ideologically, from our League, SOHYO (General Council of Trade Unions of Japan), the Socialist Party and Socialist Youth League uphold the tasks against the U.S. aggression in Vietnam and the policies of war and aggression by U.S. imperialism, against the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty, as well as a series of positive tasks for inde-

pendence, peace, democracy and a better life.

We have been actively working for the advance of joint actions based on these common tasks, the speaker went on to say. At the same time, while attaching importance to the stand of equality of each organization participating in joint action, we have criticized such sectionalist and splitting tendencies, deeply rooted among the Social-Democrats, as denial of equality and imposing points of disagreement.

We uphold the following three points: it is essential to consider the important joint demands of the Japanese people, including the youth, as the underlying principles of the movement; it is essential to establish relations between the interested organizations on a basis of equality; it is essential to expel from our ranks by joint efforts splitting and undermining elements, including Trotskyites.

After much discussion and struggle these three points were unanimously supported by SOHYO and the Socialist Youth League. This victory crowned the struggle of recent years, a struggle waged for unity by the Japanese people and the youth.

Our Federation stands in the van of the youth struggle; it has enlisted many new members in recent years. Its membership today is tenfold that announced at the Sixth National Congress in 1960. What we want is to increase our membership to several hundred thousand in the nearest possible future. The circulation of our central organ has increased steeply of late and now amounts to 300,000. In sum, the Democratic Youth Federation is an important section of the country's democratic front, and, naturally, of the youth and student movement.

Souleymane spoke about the creation of a unitarian youth organization in countries following the non-capitalist way under the leadership of united revolutionary democratic parties. In Guinea, he said, there is only one youth organization (Youth for African Democratic Revolution), embracing all young people between the ages of 7 and 25. Before independence, he said, the youth joined numerous ethnic, tribal and regional organizations. To end this confusion, all young people were organized in village committees or by districts of 8,000 population. There are regional, district and national executive committees.

Youth unity, speakers stressed, was not an aim in itself. It was a means, but a most rational and effective one to achieve

ing the main aims, for cohesion helps the youth to conduct its struggle more successfully against imperialism and participate in building a new society, working for its specific interests.

In Jordan, said *Ishak Khatib*, the youth and students are part of the united front of Western and Eastern Jordan, fighting for the implementation of the provisional program aimed at ending the Israeli occupation, maintaining Jordan's territorial integrity and creating the rudiments for independent economic and political development. The strong influence wielded in the united front by the Communist Party helps the youth and students to assess the present stage of the struggle from an internationalist angle and to overcome the chauvinist approach to the Arab-Israel conflict, a conflict that in substance amounts to a confrontation of the forces of progress and freedom, on the one hand, and the forces of reaction and imperialism, on the other.

The potential of the youth is very great, said *Nassim Daher*, and its efforts are aimed at progress and democracy. What the youth needs is unity and organization, and it is up to the revolutionary parties to respond to this demand, for without them the young people will be exposed to imperialism, which is increasingly aggressive.

* * *

The participants in the symposium noted that the youth movement in the countries of Asia and Africa was, as a rule, an active component of the progressive anti-imperialist forces, that this movement was to an ever greater degree feeling the impact of the ideas of scientific communism which is transforming the world. They further noted that it was the task of revolutionaries in every possible way to help develop and unite the youth movement, to promote its energy in the interests of the anti-imperialist struggle, in the interests of progress, peace and socialism.

Vital tasks of the Arab national-liberation movement

**GEORGES BATAL, AMJAD RASHAD,
MOHAMMED HARMEL**

The doctrine on national-liberation revolutions is one of the most important components of Marxism-Leninism, doubly significant at the present time when far-reaching profoundly revolutionary changes are in progress in all spheres and peoples liberated from colonialism face the choice of the path assuring their economic and political independence. In this fight for national revival, scientific socialism lights the way to sovereignty and social progress.

The Arab Communist and Workers' Parties, comprising a contingent of the world Communist movement, are active in the national-liberation movement, applying Marxist-Leninist theory to the conditions prevailing in the Arab world. It was on the strength of this theory that the Arab Communists issued a statement, "Vital Tasks of the Arab National-Liberation Movement in Eliminating the Consequences of the Imperialist-Israeli Aggression," the upshot of the exchange of views in July 1968 on the general situation a year after the June 1967 war.

Both the conference and the resultant joint statement are important. The tasks of the liberation movement a year after the imperialist-backed aggression were defined on the basis of a profound analysis, examining the reasons for the defeat, as well as the achievements of the movement, and producing a clear answer to the burning questions posed by the Arab peoples.

Obviously, the statement will have a positive effect for the fight of the Arab peoples and for the consolidation of all progressive anti-imperialist forces.

AGGRESSION CONTINUES

The Communist parties inferred from the present situation that *the aggression is continuing*. "Throughout the past year Israel has continued to raid the neighboring Arab countries, especially Jordan," the statement said. "Israel's Zionist rulers resort increasingly to fascist methods against the Arab population in the occupied territories. They pursue a deliberate policy of driving Arabs from their homes, with a view to resettling the land belonging to Arabs with Jewish immigrants. They advance all kinds of territorial and expansionist claims, spurning the UN and Security Council resolutions, world opinion and international law."

This Israeli aggression must be halted, because it is a threat to world peace and security. The Arab Communists emphasized on this score that "Israel would never have perpetrated its criminal acts without the support of the United States. These acts endanger the Arab national-liberation movement and gravely imperil peace in the area and in the rest of the world."

That the social content of the national-liberation movement has deepened is one of the most striking features of our time. The statement contains new assessments on that score.

"The successes of the Arab national-liberation movement, highlighted by the emergence of progressive regimes in the Arab world," it said, "are proving that the social content of the movement has deepened and that its national and political tasks are interlaced with economic

and social tasks of a distinctly anti-capitalist complexion; the successes were attained by virtue of the specifics of our time, highlighted by the transition from capitalism to socialism; they were attained by virtue of the emergence of the socialist world system, by virtue of its strength, and because it exerts great power of attraction and serves as an inspiring example to all people of labor; they were attained by virtue of the struggle of the working class and its Communist and Workers' parties. Also, they stem from the fact that the capitalist way cannot resolve the problems of developing countries. It should be stressed, too, that all the victories were attained in an environment of peaceful coexistence.

"The emergence of progressive regimes in Egypt, Syria and other countries makes them allies of the socialist states, notably the Soviet Union. This alliance has by now transcended merely moral relationships and is producing solid political, economic, military, cultural and technical relations, a source of still broader and still more effective aid for the Arab national-liberation movement. Furthermore, the alliance has given added weight to the movement in the world revolutionary process as part of the worldwide movement for national liberation. Besides, it has forged the Arab liberation movement into a more effective element in the joint struggle against colonialism and imperialism, the struggle for peace, redoubling its efforts to resolve the contradiction between capitalism and socialism, the main contradiction in the modern world, in favor of socialism.

"These victories, backed by all the forces of freedom, progress and socialism, were among the main reasons that prompted international imperialism in general, and U.S. imperialism in particular, to aid Israel in its aggression."

Examining the nature and the motive forces of the aggression, the statement said: "The aggression let loose on the Arab countries on June 5 was neither accidental nor isolated. It took place at a time when imperialism mounted a series of direct and indirect attacks on the freedom and independence of many Asian, African and Latin American countries, in the wake of the fascist coup in Greece and the stepped up subversive activities against the socialist countries. The Israeli aggressors and their imperialist masters took advantage of the favorable situation, which they had created in collaboration with pro-imperialist Arab reactionaries by provoking internal con-

flicts and clashes in some Arab countries. In Yemen, for example, they provided arms and encouraged those trying to overwhelm the republic and restore the monarchy. In Iraq, they tried to complicate the solution of the Kurdish question, advocating a policy of repressions against the Kurds fighting for their legitimate national rights, including autonomy within the framework of the Republic of Iraq. By their projects of an Islam Pact they provoked and intimidated the progressive forces, and intrigued against them by inciting differences between them. Also, they made the most of the shortcomings in the Arab countries, especially those with progressive regimes.

"To justify the aggression in the eyes of the world, imperialists and the Israeli rulers exploited the unrealistic approach of some nationalist groups to the Palestine problem, the excesses and irresponsible statements of individual leaders and certain Arab information media.

"Imperialist and Zionist propaganda endeavors to present the imperialist aggression as a move forced on Israel, whose existence was said to have been endangered. The facts show clearly, however, that the aggression was a deliberate act against the Arab national-liberation movement, prepared and encouraged by U.S. imperialism with the collaboration of West German and British imperialism. As for Israel, it was the tool used in executing it. The aggression was a new dangerous feature in the general pattern of imperialist policy, aimed at subverting the progressive growth of the Arab states and halting the Arab struggle for liberation. It was also a serious manifestation of the increased aggressiveness of imperialism, notably that of the United States, and a part of the general strategic line of direct and indirect interventions followed by the imperialists in recent years.

"The Middle East events were, in substance, a collision between the imperialist forces striking at the Arab national-liberation movement, and the Arab forces aspiring to independence, democracy and progress and working to defend their existence and extend the achievements of their peoples, eliminate the imperialist positions still extant in the Arab countries and regain possession of the sources of wealth that are rightfully theirs."

Imperialism resorted to arms because its policy of pressure and plotting had failed. The Arab peoples had made considerable headway despite the colonialist intrigues.

Direct imperialist domination had been eliminated in most of the Arab countries, and where it still existed the peoples fought staunchly to overcome it. Countries like Egypt and Syria had set out on new paths, striking out against the remnants of feudalism and against big business, and effecting deep-going economic and social reforms.

The main purpose of the aggression, the statement noted, was "to overthrow the progressive regimes in the United Arab Republic and in Syria, because their development and consolidation, which threatened to undermine the imperialist positions and the reactionary regimes in other Arab states, evoked fear among the imperialists and their agents. Other aims were to crush the Arab national-liberation movement, regain the lost positions and make the future more secure for the oil monopolies."

What the aggressors also aimed at was to prejudice Soviet-Arab friendship, always the foremost factor in the growth of the Arab national-liberation movement.

In the context of the organic and historical link between Zionism and imperialism, this colonialist plan fitted in with Israel's craving for territorial expansion, for building a greater Israel at the expense of the neighboring Arab lands and settling the Palestinian problem in Israel's interest against the interests of the Arabs, particularly those of Palestine. The June 1967 aggression and Israel's subsequent policy only serve to bear out that Israel has been an imperialist tool throughout its history.

The aggressors failed in their ultimate aims, the statement observed, despite the losses inflicted on the Arab countries. What prevented them from succeeding was the role played by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. Equally decisive in preserving the progressive regimes was the people's stand against imperialism and Zionism. In sum, this blocked the road to the reactionary forces, especially in the United Arab Republic.

But, the statement pointed out, the defeat laid bare many military deficiencies. The armies of the Arab countries with progressive regimes had modern arms, but used them unskilfully; the standard of leadership was low; there were doubtful and treacherous elements, and coordination between the armies was lacking. Israel, on the other hand, had a well-gearred war machine. Furthermore, it profited from the disdain shown by the Arab countries for its military strength.

The defeat revealed the defect in the work of the progressive regimes in Syria and the UAR. It revealed, too, that the policy of the other Arab governments had hindered mobilization and prevented the use of available resources.

The statement analyzed the defects and mistakes that had a bearing on the outcome of the June war. This applied primarily to the Arab countries with progressive regimes, where:

"a. The socio-economic measures and deep-going changes were not backed up with appropriate political steps; as a result, the people, above all the working class, who stood to gain the most, were deprived of the opportunity to participate actively in either political leadership or control of production.

"b. Restriction of democratic freedoms, the ban on progressive political organizations, above all the Communist Party, complicated political and social cooperation between these forces in some acceptable form.

"c. The machinery of state inherited from the past was not purged thoroughly enough of extreme reactionary and mercenary elements, and of people belonging to the feudal class or the class of big capitalists; this complicated and prejudiced many measures, leading to the growth of bureaucracy and corruption, and encouraging anti-democratic trends. It also affected military affairs, especially in the United Arab Republic, where plotters hostile to the progressive policy retained important posts. These elements formed the nucleus of the military bureaucracy that played a disgraceful role, displaying weakness and incompetence, some of them behaving treacherously in the June actions and, after the defeat, organizing a reactionary plot against the existing regime.

"d. A guarded attitude still remained with relation to the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, who support our national-liberation struggle and are the most loyal and sincere friends of the Arabs. Some hesitation was observed in establishing durable and extensive economic, cultural, political and military ties with these countries."

Of the other Arab countries, the statement said:

"a. In the past Arab countries with reactionary regimes (e.g., Saudi Arabia) had coordinated their policy with that of the imperialist states; there was ceaseless plotting against progressive regimes and inter-

ference in the affairs of other Arab states, aimed at entangling them in imperialist alliances and plans; this interference sometimes took the form of armed interventions against the national-liberation movement (as in the case of Yemen); all this made the countries in question a factor that facilitated both the aggression and the defeat.

"b. The pro-imperialist policy of the rulers of Arab countries not directly dominated by imperialism, the policy of persecuting or restricting the progressive national forces, especially the Communists, prevented them from mobilizing their potential and fulfilling their role in the common struggle.

"c. Imperialist hostility towards the progressive regimes and the Arab liberation movement in general, the influence exerted by the imperialists on the rulers of Arab states with reactionary regimes, and the intrigues of world Zionism—this, in the aggregate, was the main reason why the differences between Arab countries were acute, hindering Arab solidarity in the fight against aggression and the aggressors."

AFTER A YEAR: ISRAEL ISOLATED, ARABS RECOVERING

"The Israeli rulers and their imperialist masters," the statement said, "imagined that military victory would be followed by victories in other areas. But this illusion was short-lived. . . .

"All the efforts of the Israeli rulers, similar to those of 1948, to effect a forcible emigration of Arab citizens from captured lands and to whip up defeatist sentiment, have failed. All their violence and oppression, aimed at preventing popular resistance to conquest and occupation, have equally failed. . . .

"In Jordan, the object of endless aggression, the tenacity of the people and the growing spirit of resistance prevents the aggressors from achieving their aims, centered on compelling Jordan to bow to the imperialist and Zionist plans.

"In other parts of the Arab world, the peoples reaffirmed their determination to stand their ground, to prevent a new defeat and to eliminate the consequences of the aggression. They are agreed that the way to achieve this is for the progressive forces to concert their actions, learn from past experience, and without delay tackle the defects, weaknesses and obstacles revealed during the sneak aggression, creat-

ing the conditions necessary for eliminating its consequences."

Some headway has been made in this, but much remains to be done, especially at home, above all in the countries with progressive regimes.

During the past year Israel's isolation has become more complete. Many countries are changing their attitude to the Middle East crisis and giving more support to the fight of the Arab peoples. Israel is contributing to its own isolation in the world by its brutal methods of dealing with the population in the occupied areas, voicing its expansionist claims and ignoring the United Nations and Security Council resolutions and international law.

The stand of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, of the forces of progress and socialism led by the Communist Parties, including the Communist Party of Israel, helped to expose Israel's aggressive nature. Also helpful in this respect is the realistic and flexible policy now adopted by the United Arab Republic.

The statement stressed that developments since the aggression confirm the objective scientific study of classes and social strata in the Arab countries, their role and the role of the various political organizations. The events showed that the role of the workers and their parties has increased in the Arab world in general and each Arab country in particular. The statement pointed out that the working class and its Party injected a new social content into the Arab national-liberation movement.

"The economic and social achievements and changes attained or underway in some Arab countries, and the events taking place in the world," the statement emphasized, "offer the working class, its Marxist-Leninist parties and its other organizations extensive opportunities for participating in resolving the Arab problems, extending the scope of the progressive social measures, and leading their countries forward to socialism. This will broaden and consolidate the role of the other progressive strata."

TWO DANGEROUS TRENDS

The statement called attention to two dangerous trends surfacing in the Arab national-liberation movement.

It pointed out, among other things, that "the military defeat and its consequences are a new important factor in the political and social differentiation underway in the Arab world. Two dangerous trends have appeared in the context of this process in the progressive all-Arab movement, and if

either of them wins, it will, in effect, emasculate the mass movement and obscure the progressive social and national tasks."

What are these trends?

The first is "the romantic and reckless course advocated by progressive national patriotic elements of the petty bourgeoisie, horrified by the military defeat, as a result of which, lacking a scientific theory of social growth, they have lost their capacity to see the future in clear perspective; their political organizations have fallen apart and their faith in the masses, in their revolutionary activity, has diminished. For this reason, they have put forward slogans negating organized mass struggles; as an alternative to broad political action and the use of all forms and methods of struggle, they offer only one method, while some of the extreme reactionary and doubtful elements encourage this adventurous trend materially and morally in the hope of inhibiting the mass struggle.

"However, despite the patriotic sentiment that impels the vast majority of its exponents, this trend does not take fully into account the designs of imperialism and Israel, although it devotes due importance to the Palestine problem. From the standpoint of the national and revolutionary movement in the Arab world, therefore, and from the standpoint of the Palestine problem as well, the call of the exponents of this reckless trend to separate the Palestine issue from the Arab national-liberation movement is entirely incorrect and, consequently, so is the slogan that Palestinians should fight their battle alone on the lame pretext that the Palestine movements are "independent" and need no "patronage." Although the Palestine problem concerns chiefly the Arabs of Palestine, it also concerns the peoples of all the Arab countries, because it is part of their common struggle against imperialism and Zionism.

"On the other hand, while denying all other forms and concentrating on just one method of struggle, while ignoring the situation and the relation of strength, especially after the defeat, this trend enables the imperialists, the Israeli rulers and the pro-imperialist reactionaries, to undermine the progressive regimes, to hit out at the entire Arab national-liberation movement, and this after it had stood its ground thanks to the consciousness of the masses, to their struggle, to the concerted effort of the world's progressive forces, to the ma-

terial and political support of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. Our experience since June 1967 shows that our various forms and methods of political struggle are anything but outdated, that they can still yield the desired results, both as concerns aiding the progressive regimes economically and militarily, mobilizing the people, isolating Israel and its patrons in the international arena and marshalling support for the just Arab cause among the broadest possible sections of democratic world opinion."

The second dangerous trend is defined as "a rightist defeatist tendency rejecting progressive social reconstruction on the plea of 'national survival.' In effect, this plea is merely a screen for the class interests of social groups either already affected by progressive social measures or anticipating their detrimental effects for them should the United Arab Republic and Syria continue along the chosen path. Exponents of this trend obscure the fact that national tasks, including that of eliminating the consequences of the aggression, and the social tasks of the modern Arab national-liberation movement, are two sides of the same revolutionary process and that any attempt to abandon tasks related to either of the two sides will prejudice the revolutionary process as a whole.

"Exponents of this trend are inclined to justify mutual understanding with U.S. imperialism, to come to terms with it on the excuse that the United States holds the key to the Middle East crisis. They are inclined to vindicate the aggressive policy conducted in concert with the United States against the Arab countries by West Germany and Britain, which render material, political and military aid to Israel.

"Some rightist elements exaggerate the implications of the stand in the Middle East crisis of the French rulers, who, after all, represent monopoly interests. They impede a proper appreciation of the French position in the context of the growing contradictions between the imperialist powers, which, by the way, the Arab liberation movement can and should utilize to its advantage. They want cooperation with France to prejudice relations between the Arab countries, on the one hand, and the Soviet Union and other socialist states, on the other. Some progressive Arab forces fall into the trap set by this political dodge." The statement amplified: "Both these trends, the reckless and the defeatist, no matter how far apart their sources may be,

are detrimental to the national-liberation movement and the social progress of the Arab states."

CALL FOR UNITY AND UNITED ACTION

After analyzing the main problem, that of eliminating the consequences of the aggression, the conference turned its attention to other related problems of the national-democratic revolution and the prospects of development towards socialism. It defined the tasks paving the way for new important achievements. Imbued with the spirit of unity, the statement calls on all progressive forces to act jointly for the fulfilment of these tasks.

The Arab national-liberation movement, it pointed out, should redouble its efforts internationally and on an all-Arab scale. Its prime tasks *abroad* are:

1. To step up the struggle "against imperialism and Zionism in all political and economic areas by eliminating imperialism's economic, political and strategic positions, including the dismantling of military bases and withdrawal of the U.S. Sixth Fleet from the Mediterranean, by exposing and combating the plans and alliances of neo-colonialism. To work for greater solidarity between the Arab national-liberation movement and all peoples fighting against colonialism and imperialism, against direct and indirect aggression; to work for greater solidarity with the people of Vietnam fighting for the independence of their country and its territorial integrity against the American aggressors, their allies and henchmen, for an end to the aggressive war waged by the United States against Vietnam."

2. To work for the "implementation of the Security Council resolution of November 22, 1967, as an important step towards settling the Middle East conflict and achieving a just peace securing Arab rights in Palestine, including the rights of the refugees."

3. To expose the crimes committed by Israel, encouraged by U.S. imperialism, against the civilian population in occupied Arab territory; to expose the aggressive plans still nursed by the Zionist rulers with the object of continuing their expansionist policy at the expense of the Arab states; to appeal to democratic world opinion in order to strengthen solidarity with the Arab peoples and compel Israel and its masters to retreat and fulfil the U.N. reso-

lution calling for the withdrawal of troops from territories occupied as a result of the June 5 aggression.

4. To reinvigorate to the maximum "political, economic, cultural and military relations with the Soviet Union, which restored the military potential of the progressive Arab countries by compensating all the losses they had suffered. To strengthen friendly ties with the other socialist states which have at all times stood firmly by the Arab peoples and, especially, during times of trial; to recognize the friendly German Democratic Republic, which supports the just Arab cause and plays an important role in the fight for lasting peace and security in Europe and the rest of the world, against the revival of the nazi peril; to strengthen ties with the world's democratic and peace-seeking organizations, above all with the Communist parties, which, by adhering to internationalism, played an outstanding role in mobilizing world opinion in support of the just Arab cause."

5. To repulse "the ideological offensive of neo-colonialism and its reactionary allies, which employ various information media (press, radio, television) and cultural organizations to malign the progressive regimes and progressive national forces, distort their policy and denigrate their prestige, falsify the history, culture and cultural legacy of the Arab peoples, and implant a spirit of gloom, submission and defeatism. To fight for the banning of imperialist cultural organizations and to make education and information media serve the cause of Arab national liberation. The Arab Communist and Workers' parties are combating the frantic imperialist ideological offensive, exposing all trends distorting Marxist-Leninist theory, both those of the Right opportunist element and those of the adventurous "Left" element that spread anarchist and neo-Trotskyist views and slander the world Communist movement and the Arab Communist parties.

6. To expose and "combat the Zionist movement on a scientific basis in cooperation with all Communist and Workers' parties and all progressive forces, combating colonialism and imperialism; this is an urgent task more important than ever. The treacherous imperialist aggression by Israel only proves the immensity of the danger of the Zionist movement which, clothed in the garb of a bearer of progress and freedom and pretending to be the sufferer, has spread its tentacles. The Zionist movement,

as its history shows, thrives on chauvinism and racialism, merging thereby with the nazi concepts of racial and national exclusiveness. It strives to divide the labor movement and separate Jewish workers from workers of other nationalities. It is a part of imperialism and serves as a tool of world imperialism, particularly U.S. imperialism, which directs it both immediately and by means of its ties with Israel against the Arab and world national-liberation movement, using it to split the international working-class movement, in subversive provocative actions, and for espionage against the socialist countries."

On an *all-Arab scale and in the individual Arab countries*, the statement stressed it is essential:

1. To help "the masses of people, particularly the workers, to play their part in the struggle, to lift all restrictions on the democratic and trade union rights of the people; to afford all national and progressive forces, without discrimination, the opportunity to pursue political and organizational activities in rallying the people and guiding them in eliminating the consequences of the aggression. . . . The prime task facing all national and progressive forces, not just the Communists, is to counteract imperialist and reactionary efforts to carry on the anti-communist policy, the policy of discrediting and slandering the main and the stoutest contingent of the Arab national-liberation movement

"This calls for determined efforts to end the policy of arrests and reprisals against the Communists and other national and progressive forces in Iraq, Algeria, Tunisia, Saudi Arabia, etc., to secure the release of political prisoners, that is, patriots and progressives, including Communists, so that they may with their people participate in the fight against imperialism, Israel and reaction."

"Freedom of action by Communist parties," the statement said, "is essential to strengthen the anti-imperialist and anti-Zionist movement and assure the removal of obstacles to progress.

"It calls for ending the policy of suspicion and hostility towards Communist and progressive forces in the countries with progressive regimes, ending the policy of keeping Communists and progressive forces out of the national fronts and out of political activity, ending the policy of persecution and ideological quarantine.

"This will create favorable conditions for cooperation by all national and progressive

forces, for rallying all forces with a stake in national independence and social progress in each Arab country and in the Arab world as a whole.

"The alliance of national and progressive forces is objectively based on the coinciding interests of the classes and social strata from which they come in carrying out the tasks of the national-democratic revolution, that is, in actions aimed at completing radical reforms, particularly agrarian reform in the interest of the poor and middle peasants, with the latter's support and participation."

The conference also urged support for all that has been done "in the UAR and Syria to purge the machinery of state of reactionary and corrupt elements, and work for deepening and expediting this process; to remove members of the reactionary classes, saboteurs and bribe-takers in these two countries and in Algeria from posts of leadership in the nationalized enterprises and enterprises of the state sector, who should be replaced by progressives concerned about the growth of these enterprises and their effective contribution to the development of the national economy. The trade unions should be afforded the opportunity to control these enterprises. It is equally essential to modernize and improve legislation, repealing all regulations that impede the free development of national and progressive forces or obstruct progressive political, economic and social growth."

Furthermore, the statement said, every encouragement should be given to "national development in the Syrian Arab Republic, strengthening it and combating all reactionary activity and plotting; it is necessary to strengthen and extend in all spheres and at all levels cooperation between the Baath Party, the ruling party in Syria, and the Syrian Communist Party. Also important is cooperation by all national forces, groups and elements in a broad progressive national front, because, as the facts show, a national front is the best form for securing unity and cohesion in the fight against colonialism, imperialism and Zionism, in defending national and popular gains and continuing the advance to social progress.

"Arab Communist and Workers' parties, which have always taken guidance in their policy and practical work in the supreme interests of their respective countries," the statement said, "will continue to act in unison in organizing bilateral and multilateral meetings with other political, na-

tional and progressive forces and organization to hammer out agreement on the key problems facing our peoples."

The Arab Communists consider it their duty "to combat all conservative and reactionary trends obstructing the progressive regimes in their economic work and rejecting their economic and social gains. The process of building strengthens the progressive regimes, adding to their political, economic and military might in frustrating the designs of world imperialism and Israel. It is essential, therefore, to rely more firmly and extensively on the class forces chiefly interested in revolution, particularly the working class, the peasant masses and the revolutionary intelligentsia."

The Communists advocate "full political, economic and military coordination between the UAR and Syria, strengthening Arab solidarity in order to utilize all possibilities available in the Arab countries for eliminating the consequences of aggression . . . purging the armies of the Arab countries with progressive regimes of reactionary, suspicious and defeatist elements, members of the feudal class and the class of big capitalists; enhancing the military skill and education in the ranks in a spirit of hostility to imperialism and reaction and a spirit of devoted service to the country, in defense of national and social gains."

The statement emphasized that "by virtue of Jordan's geographical situation and the fact that a considerable part of its territory is occupied, and also because it is more closely associated with the Palestine problem and continuously raided with the aim of compelling it to surrender, Jordan is especially important, for it plays a prominent role in combating the aggression and takes part in eliminating its consequences. In Jordan it is essential to work

for a government of national unity, whose tasks would be to grant democratic rights, arm with Soviet help, and strengthen Arab solidarity against the occupation, imperialism and Zionism; Jordan needs a government which would by its structure and policy stimulate and support the fight of the people in the occupied areas."

The statement goes on to say that "the Arab Communist and Workers' parties, acting in the interests of Iraq's national development, the interests of the Arab national-liberation movement, support the stand on the Kurdish problem of the Communist Party of Iraq, which demands an end to the national oppression of Kurds and restoration of their lawful national rights based on autonomy within the Republic. The Arab Communist and Workers' parties call on all progressive and national forces in the Arab world to support this line in order to strengthen the front of national-democratic, anti-imperialist and anti-Zionist forces in Iraq, so that its fraternal people can contribute fully to the efforts aimed at eliminating the consequences of the aggression."

The conference advocated continued struggle "against the reactionary and dictatorial regimes in the Arab world, for the establishment of democratic, national forms of government opposed to imperialism, reaction and Zionism."

On the strength of their experience, more people in the Arab countries are gravitating to the Marxist-Leninist parties, the true defenders and representatives of the working class and the people. Thousands now see scientific socialism as the sole teaching showing the right way. The viability of this teaching is borne out by history and current developments.

Southern Africa fights for freedom

A. LERUMO

Since August 1967 the struggle for the liberation of Southern Africa has entered a new phase: one of vital importance for Africa and for the world. In Zimbabwe, armed conflict began between, on the one hand, the freedom-fighters of the fighting alliance of the African National Congress (South Africa) and the Zimbabwe African People's Union; on the other, the combined military-police forces of Rhodesia and the Republic of South Africa.

The Smith and Vorster regimes try to minimize the importance of these clashes, concealing the heavy casualties they suffered, and spreading the impression that what was occurring were "terrorist raids" by "infiltrators" from Zambia. But developments have given the lie to these false reports. Particularly since the sustained offensive which began in March this year it has become evident that the ZAPU-ANC freedom-fighters have established themselves deep within Zimbabwe, far from the Zambesi river which marks the frontier with Zambia. They met with an enthusiastic reception from the masses in Rhodesia and are constantly recruiting, arming and training fresh forces from the population. They have displayed the highest degree of courage and generalship in their clashes with the oppressors' forces. It will not be long before the guerrillas of *Umkhonto we Sizwe* (Spear of the Nation), the South African liberation army, commence operations within the Republic of South Africa, the main stronghold of imperialism and racism on the African continent.

To appreciate fully the significance of these events, we should view them against the background of the whole "Unliberated South" of Africa—all the countries still under Portuguese colonialism or white minority dictatorships. It is increasingly clear that, though every country has its own specific features and problems, the

entire area must be looked upon as a strategic whole, with ever-closer collusion between the oppressors—the "Unholy Alliance" of Vorster-Salazar-Smith—and correspondingly firmer unity and cooperation between the national-liberation movements.

The area comprises the Portuguese colonies of Guinea-Bissau, Angola and Mozambique; the British colony of Rhodesia (Zimbabwe) under the illegal, breakaway Smith regime; the Republic of South Africa under the fascist, white minority government of Vorster; and the Republic's illegally-seized colony South-West Africa, a former League of Nations Mandated Territory.

THE PORTUGUESE COLONIES

The Portuguese-occupied countries of Africa are practically the last remnants of a vast colonial empire that grew and flourished long before the era of modern monopoly capitalism and once extended as far as Brazil. Now Portugal's Asian empire has all but disappeared; Goa has been liberated and Macao is a colony only by sufferance on the part of Peking. Under the aging dictator Salazar who rules by the PIDE secret police, Portugal is one of the most backward countries in Europe.

Portuguese fascism has been enabled to survive largely by virtue of the fabulous wealth extracted from the African colonies and the fierce exploitation, under conditions virtually indistinguishable from slavery, of the African population.

For several years now, Portuguese fascism has been facing a mounting tide of armed resistance in the African colonies. In Guinea-Bissau the people's armed forces directed by PAIGC (African Independence Party of Guinea and Cape Verde) under the leadership of Amilcar Cabral

control a major part of the country, and have established their own economic, educational and other institutions.

Over 80,000 Portuguese troops are engaged in fighting in Angola against the MPLA (People's Movement for the Liberation of Angola, led by Augustino Neto) and in Mozambique against FRELIMO (Front for Mozambique Liberation whose president is Eduardo Mondlane). Portugal is able to continue in this war only because of the arms and support given to her by her NATO allies and by the Republic of South Africa. Britain, West Germany, France, Belgium and other imperialist powers have heavy investments in Portugal and are deeply involved militarily. There are permanent West German and United States military missions in Lisbon, and according to U. Simango, vice-president of FRELIMO, Bonn has over 15,000 troops stationed in the country.

Portugal has the closest links with the fascist Republic of South Africa, both military and economic. The Portuguese government has a long-standing agreement to provide 100,000 African laborers to work on the Witwatersrand gold mines. In return the South African government ships 47 percent of its traffic through Lourenco Marques in Mozambique. Regular meetings are held between Portuguese and South African military leaders to coordinate their planning and strategy.

The African wars are costing Portugal a burden in money (estimated at well over £125,000 a day) and casualties which she cannot afford indefinitely to sustain. In spite of the support given by her allies, she is steadily losing her wars in Africa. A spreading area of Angola is occupied by guerrillas, and in Mozambique FRELIMO now controls the two northern provinces of Cabo Delgado and Nyasa.

In January 1968 Dr. Salazar openly admitted:

"If the troubles in Angola and Mozambique continue very much longer they will diminish and destroy our ability to carry on."

ZIMBABWE

The crisis in Zimbabwe was precipitated by the so-called unilateral declaration of independence by the Rhodesia Front government headed by Ian Smith. By this act the racists sought to strengthen the domination they had secured on the basis of the disgracefully undemocratic 1961 constitution. This constitution, approved by the Conservative British government of the

day, placed political power in the hands of the white exploiter minority—about one twentieth of the total population (approximately 200,000 out of four million.)

Yet the British Labor government bears a very heavy share of the responsibility for the situation that has been allowed to develop. When Smith threatened to break away, Wilson made disapproving noises about "rebellion"—but promised that Britain would not use force in Rhodesia. This was a go-ahead signal for the white minority regime in Salisbury. Meanwhile at that very time the British government were using force in a vain effort to quell the liberation movement in Aden.

The reaction of the British government to Smith's illegal usurpation of power was to call on the United Nations for "sanctions"—although for many years Britain has opposed the use of economic sanctions against the Republic of South Africa for its violation of the U.N. Charter, and continues to do so.

The sanctions have proved largely ineffective. This is because in practice they have been openly flouted by a number of imperialist countries, and above all by the Republic of South Africa, which has to a very great extent made good all the deficiencies which Rhodesia would have suffered. This enormous "hole" in the sanctions mandatory wall could only be closed by making the sanction mandatory with appropriate measures against countries and firms engaged in contraband traffic with the "rebels." but this is something which imperialism, and in particular Britain, both Labor and Conservative, is not prepared to consider. South Africa is now Britain's second-biggest trading partner, and the United Kingdom is not prepared to countenance a confrontation with the Republic.

This grotesque farce has served very largely to undermine any remaining illusions in Africa concerning either the United Nations or Britain's intentions in relation to Rhodesia. Smith's "rebellion" is now in its third year: a few relatively minor clashes with the advance parties of guerrillas have done much more to shake it than all the British threats, "talks," declarations and phoney sanctions. In fact the regime would have collapsed by now were it not for the powerful reinforcements of arms and men which Smith called for and received from the Republic of South Africa.

This in itself was a confession and a proof that Rhodesia is not "independent" at all. Economically, politically and mili-

tarily it is a dependency of the fascist Republic in the South; a buffer zone for the South African regime of apartheid.

FASCIST SOUTH AFRICA

The major partner in the Unholy Alliance of Portuguese colonialism and white oligarchies of Southern Africa is the fascist Republic of South Africa—known as the Union of South Africa until 1961. In addition to its well-known position as a major gold and diamond producer, South Africa has a higher level of industrial development than the rest of the Continent combined. With a white population of about three million, enjoying a monopoly of citizenship rights and economic opportunities, from which has emerged a powerful capitalist class, South Africa itself is not an under-developed colony but an imperialist state. It has illegally annexed the mandated territory of South-West Africa; it dominates the neighboring territories of Lesotho and Botswana—former British colonies which a century of colonial rule has left without any substantial socio-economic progress—and Swaziland which under the bill passed by the Commons is to attain independence from Britain in September this year.

South African imperialism extends its tentacles far to the North. From Johannesburg, giant financial, mining and other monopolies control the economies of Rhodesia, Malawi and a number of other African countries, especially in the field of minerals. For example, the huge Anglo-American Corporation of South Africa, headed by Harry Oppenheimer, has close links and interlocking directorships with mining concerns elsewhere on the Continent. Oppenheimer himself is Chairman of Tanganyika Concessions, the British South Africa company and Rhodesian Anglo-American (Zimbabwe); the Rhokana Corporation and Mufulira Copper Mines (Zambia).

The principal source of the enormous wealth of the South African monopoly bourgeoisie and their imperialist partners in Britain, America and elsewhere, is twofold. Firstly, the abundant mineral resources of the country; secondly, the fierce colonial-type exploitation of the labor power of the indigenous African majority. Wage rates for African miners are scandalously low—about one-fifteenth, on the average, of that paid to white miners. This can take place only in a country where Africans enjoy no citizenship rights but

live under arbitrary rule and brutal terror.

Under these conditions the South African gold-mining companies are able to extract gold from low-grade ore which it would not be profitable to mine in any other country. It is precisely to maintain this ferocious exploitation that—backed by international imperialism—the alliance of monopoly capitalism and big farmers which rules the country has driven the African population from their native soil and proletarianized them; has subjected them to a monstrous regime of national and social oppression. It is this structure which the world knows as “apartheid,” and which the South African Communist Party, in its program, has properly characterized as “colonialism of a special type.”

UNITED FRONT OF NATIONAL LIBERATION

The main opposition to this atrocious system of racist oppression and exploitation, which has been condemned in every country in the world consists of the united front of national liberation which has developed and formed in the specific historic conditions of struggle in South Africa.

The popular forces representing the interests of the majority have never had an opportunity of acting within the framework of parliamentary democracy. There is a rivalry in Parliament between the two basic reactionary parties of the exploiter minority—the ruling Nationalist Party and the United Party, now in “opposition” to the former one.

The real forces of South African democracy exist outside this parody of a parliament, among the voteless non-white majority; they include the national liberation organizations of the African people, the Indian and Colored communities, the revolutionary labor movement and a few dedicated democrats. The main partner in the united liberation front is the African National Congress, representing the majority of the population.

Formed in 1912 with the object of uniting the African peoples of the country into a nation and regaining their birthright to land and freedom, the ANC has gained steadily in militancy and revolutionary vision and determination over the years. During the fifties it formed an enduring alliance with the South African Indian Congress (established by Gandhi during his years in South Africa before the First World War), the Colored People's Congress, the Congress of Democrats and the

Congress of Trade Unions—the only trade union federation open to all workers without color discrimination. This Congress alliance conducted a whole series of mass activities, including a number of political general strikes, the Campaign of Defiance of Unjust Laws, and the great Congress of the People on June 26, 1955. At this notable gathering, comprising delegates from every corner of the country, was adopted the famous Freedom Charter—the revolutionary common program of the liberation movement. The Charter demands the abolition of all forms of race discrimination and the establishment of equal rights and opportunities in every field. To secure these rights it calls for the common ownership of the main means of production and the redistribution of the land among those who till it.

The South African Communist Party—which has now been illegal for eighteen years—fully supports and participates in the Congress Alliance. It has, in its own Program, accepted the Freedom Charter as embodying the immediate and essential demands of the working class, together with other democratic sections of the population.

The reaction of the ruling class and the Nationalist government to all the peaceful mass actions of the fifties was to let loose a wave of repression against the resistance movement. The African National Congress was banned in 1960. Tens of thousands of leading men and women in the national liberation, trade union and Communist movement have been proscribed, debarred from political activity, imprisoned, exiled, tortured and murdered. Public meetings are forbidden and all consistently democratic newspapers and publications declared illegal.

THE PATH OF ARMED REVOLUTION

It was these harsh experiences and not any preconceived theories about methods of struggle which convinced the people of South Africa that there was no road to the ending of their oppression and the winning of their aspirations except that of armed struggle. In 1961 leaders of the ANC and the Communist Party began to build up a fighting force, *Umkhonto we Sizwe*, which announced its arrival on the scene with a series of acts of sabotage directed at state installations throughout the country.

The enemy struck back savagely. Not

a few reverses were encountered, among which will be remembered the capture of a leadership group of the resistance at Rivonia and the subsequent trial of Sisulu, Mandela, Mbeki, Kathrada, Goldberg and others and their condemnation to life imprisonment; the capture of Bram Fischer after a year of underground work; the execution of the patriot Mini, and many other workers' leaders.

The patriotic and democratic forces within the country were not deterred. Patiently, and learning from their mistakes, they set to work to regroup and to undertake the difficult and complicated tasks involved in the political and military training of the people's armed forces and their equipment with modern weapons.

The entry of highly trained and competent guerrillas into Zimbabwe and the resurgence of meticulously planned and daring propaganda and other activities by the ANC, the Communist Party and allied underground movements in Johannesburg, Cape Town, Durban, Port Elizabeth and other centers is a clear indication that the people's forces are once again on the offensive. There will be no turning back from the path that has been embarked upon, no matter how long and costly it may prove.

There are no doubts on this score. O. R. Tambo, acting President-General of the African National Congress and—since the tragic death last year of Chief A. J. Lutuli—leader of liberation movement, told the U.N. Special Committee on Apartheid recently in Stockholm that the African people were prepared to lose millions of men in the war to wipe out minority white rule.

Much has been written about the powerful military forces at the disposal of the South African government. Despite the U.N. Security Council ban on the sale of arms to the Apartheid regime—which is openly defied by France and other imperialist governments—military expenditure is at an all-time high. British, French, Belgian, American and other firms have cooperated in establishing armaments factories in the country. Nor are these steps towards militarization of the economy confined to conventional weapons. The Afro-Asian Solidarity Committee in the GDR has published materials relating to collaboration between the Bonn and Pretoria regimes in the production of nuclear weapons and poison gases. Recently the Portuguese Atomic Energy Commission sent a top-level delegation to South Africa on an undisclosed mission; they were followed shortly by the

head of a huge French enterprise specializing in nuclear warheads.

DIFFICULT TASK THAT CAN BE SOLVED

The fight for the overthrow of the colonialist system in South Africa is a formidable undertaking. We do not need to be reminded that the ruling class is rich, armed with a highly organized police and military apparatus, backed not only by the biggest exploiter group of white settlers in Africa but also by the imperialist countries.

As a matter of fact the national liberation movement in this country is faced with a task which has faced no other movement of this kind. In all the wars of liberation until now, the people's forces have been concerned with the task of expelling the West European or North American invaders and their political administration, not with challenging the existence of the imperialist state machinery as such. But because of the special position of South African imperialism, the victory of the national liberation revolution is inconceivable without the liquidation of the South African imperialist state itself.

It is precisely such factors which account for the exceptionally prolonged, bitter and costly character of the liberation struggle in this country, and which fittingly answer superficial critics who sometimes "reprimand" our people for allegedly "lagging behind" in slavery while the rest of the continent has achieved political independence.

As compared with the position of foreign imperialists in their confrontation with far-away colonies, the ruling class can rely on short, well-developed internal lines of communication; it does not have to transport its troops and supplies by air and sea over long distances; it has over many years developed a harsh and apparently effective system of internal repression, censorship, bribery, indoctrination and terror.

This, however, does not mean that the South African imperialist state is the impregnable and stable fortress of white supremacy, as its upholders believe. The very structure of the state contains profound and irremediable factors of conflict, instability and turbulence.

The very industries, agriculture, communications, and other assets are manned by a majority of non-white workers—Africans alone comprise two-thirds of the labor force, and the proportion is growing, des-

pite frenzied efforts by the government to extend immigration from Europe.

As Oliver Tambo said in his inspiring Call to develop revolutionary action earlier this year:

"We . . . do not imagine that the defeat of imperialism in Southern Africa will be quick or easy. We realize it will be long-drawn and bloody. But we are confident of the final outcome. As our forces drive deeper into the south, we have no doubt that they will be joined not by some but by the whole African nation; by the oppressed minorities, the Indian and Colored people; and by an increasing number of White democrats. The battle lines have been drawn. There can be but one way out: victory over the fascist oppressors and the establishment of a democratic state in South Africa."

INTERNATIONAL IMPORTANCE OF OUR STRUGGLE

The fight for the liberation of Southern Africa is of great importance for world peace and progress, and in the first place for the peoples of the entire continent of Africa.

The ever-increasing militarization of the economy of the Republic and its huge military expenditure is not only directed towards repressing internal rebellion. It is also an instrument of external aggression.

Fascist South Africa poses the same sort of threat to the African states as did Hitler Germany to Europe thirty years ago.

Already the Republic has committed an act of aggression by annexing South-West Africa. Effective counter-action by the United Nations was blocked by the imperialist countries.

South Africa is committing aggression by sending troops into Rhodesia to help the rebel Smith regime. As Rhodesia is legally a British colony, this is of course an invasion of British territory by a foreign power. But the British government does nothing about it, and even continues improving its business and other relations with Pretoria.

Both the Salisbury and Pretoria regimes have repeatedly threatened military measures against Zambia in retaliation for allegedly harboring infiltrators and "terrorists." South African Defense Minister Botha spoke approvingly in Parliament of Israel's aggressive raids into Jordan, which he said was analogous to South Africa's position in relation to Zambia.

Thus, South African fascism is not only a moral abomination which has been repeatedly condemned at international gatherings and in every corner of the world. It is also a serious and immediate danger to African and to world peace.

The oppressed peoples of Southern Africa have been greatly encouraged and inspired by innumerable examples of international solidarity. Such bodies as the Anti-Apartheid Movements in many countries, the World Campaign for the Release of South African political prisoners, the Defense and Aid Fund, have done invaluable work. Democratic playwrights refuse to allow their plays to be performed before segregated audiences in South Africa; freedom-loving sportsmen refuse to participate in events involving Apartheid teams—the recent decision to overrule Brundage and his coterie and bar South Africa from the Mexico Olympics was a strong blow at the racists. Obedient to United Nations recommendations, nearly all the African and Asian countries and all the Socialist coun-

tries have broken off diplomatic and commercial relations with the “leper of the world”—Apartheid South Africa.

As the struggle in Southern Africa mounts in intensity there is a need to step up solidarity actions in every possible way. The white supremacists must be quarantined and cut off from the imperialist countries which help sustain their rule. Every means must be found to render all necessary material assistance to the heroic African revolutionaries on the battlefields of Southern Africa.

Aid to the South African patriots is a noble task facing all progressive, anti-imperialist and democratic forces in the world. The fraternal Communist and Workers' parties, which have always shown keen sympathy and understanding of the problems of the Southern African liberation movement and the South African Communist Party, will surely give the problems of our struggle the attention they merit in their discussions and activities.

Argentina: situation and working-class struggles

VICENTE MARISCHI

The working-class and trade union movement in Argentina has entered on a new phase characterized by growing mass struggles and resistance to the military fascist dictatorship, a greater desire for unity, and efforts to establish alliances and to have this active resistance coordinated by a single leading center. This process is paving the way for a national democratic front of forces opposed to the dictatorship and seeking radical changes in the country.

The result is a sharpening conflict between the two fundamental and mutually opposed trends in the labor movement. One, supported by successive governments, advocates class cooperation, submission to the interests of monopoly, and bourgeois nationalism. This trend consists chiefly of Right-wing Peronist leaders. The other trend is striving to make the masses really class-conscious and aware of their strength and of the independent and leading role they can and should play in shaping the fortunes of the country. This trend is represented by the Communists, militant workers and others, above all by the collaborator Peronists associated in the MUCS (Movement for Trade Union Unity and Coordination) active inside the General Confederation of Labor and in the various trade unions.

This new phase, which dovetails with the situation throughout Latin America and the rest of the world, places a special responsibility on the leaders of the democratic, popular and anti-imperialist move-

ment, specifically the labor movement and, above all, on the Communists. The fact is that important groups of working people are assuming a more independent attitude towards their leaders, especially their Peronist leaders, as they search for ways of winning their economic and social demands and of bringing about radical changes in national life. And these are tasks that only the Communist Party can help the masses to accomplish.

MEASURES BY THE DICTATORSHIP AGAINST THE WORKING PEOPLE

A military dictatorship of the corporative-fascist type, headed by General Juan Carlos Onganía, has been in power since June 28, 1966. It is totally subservient to the monopolies, particularly those of the United States, and to the big landowners and capitalists whose profits have been soaring, while the people have been sinking deeper into poverty. The period of dictatorship has been marked by social retrogression, economic depression, and persecution, imperialist neo-colonialism and growth of the oligarchy.

As for the working class, the regime has been trying to give it a "new deal" by (1) putting on its shoulders the bulk of the burden of a crisis; (2) forcing it to confine itself to defense of its social gains to divert it from seeking greater rights and gains that would endanger the capitalist regime; (3) blocking the development of a united trade union movement indepen-

dent of the state and the employers.

The dictatorship has frozen collective bargaining for two years, up to January 1969, and set a 15 per cent limit on wage increases for the same period, whereas inflation, accelerated by the government, in particular through three consecutive devaluations of the peso, has sent the cost of living soaring. In the first 18 months of the military regime, the cost of living rose by 70 per cent over June 1966.

There is virtually no eight-hour day because people are compelled to work much longer to bridge the gap between prices and wages. Things are made worse by the monopoly concentration, which has ruined small and medium manufacturers and merchants, closed numerous enterprises and left tens of thousands jobless.

Out of the nine million able-bodied inhabitants, nearly one million are totally or partially unemployed. By mandate of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund the regime wants to carry out an "administrative rationalization" program envisaging the dismissal of 100,000 civil servants, or about 10 per cent of the total public administration personnel. Another factor tending to swell the ranks of the unemployed is the modernization of the big enterprises owned chiefly by American monopolies.

Working conditions have deteriorated for dockers, railwaymen, oil-workers, power-industry workers, in addition to underground transport workers, iron and steel workers, miners and other categories.

In less than two years, the regime has passed a series of decrees and laws abolishing elementary constitutional rights and gains, many of them half a century old.

The right to strike and to collective bargaining have been replaced by compulsory arbitration. The subsistence minimum with a sliding scale, recognized by the Constitution and national legislation, was abolished by means of the wage freeze. Building workers have been deprived of all protection against arbitrary dismissal, and the law on dismissal was amended to leave out many provisions safeguarding the rights of employees. The pension system has been modified and the pension age raised, everything progressive in the welfare system is being eliminated.

Whenever a labor organization protests against this policy the regime resorts to repression. Over twenty unions and national federations have been penalized, in-

cluding the railwaymen's union and the federations of chemical, sugar industry and communications workers.

Democratic rights have been wiped out, and thousands of workers and students have served prison terms and many more are still behind bars.

The government is ranged behind the neo-colonialist and aggressive policy of the United States. An indication of this dependence was the recent visit to Saigon by top military leaders and, earlier, the shipment of medical supplies and wheat to Saigon for the invasion army. Our Party condemned these moves as the preliminary to a still bigger contribution to the American war in Vietnam, as a step that may well be followed by the dispatch of Argentine troops. It is not accidental that Argentine spokesmen in the OAS and UN echo the propositions of the State Department and the Pentagon.

These are all elements of the general policy of the Ongania government, a policy subjected to fundamental analysis by the Seventh National Conference of our Party in April 1967. The Communist Party alone has right from the beginning denounced this reactionary policy of the regime.

DEFEATISM OF THE RIGHT-WING PERONISTS AND "INDEPENDENTS"

In pursuing its policy and implementing fascist-like measures, the Ongania government tried to impose on the working class and the people a social truce, a pause in political activity for at least two years. It believed that this purpose had been achieved with the dissolution of constitutional bodies and political parties, the stripping of national life of all democratic and progressive elements and, above all, in view of the complicity of the Right-wing Peronist leaders and the "Independents" in the labor movement.

Prior to June 28, 1966, these leaders, instead of alerting the masses, minimized the danger or contributed to the threat of a coup—assuming that they had not pledged support to the conspirators. When the latter overthrew the bourgeois-liberal government of Arturo Illia, the "Independents" advanced the slogan "watch and hope." Their aim was to create among the workers the illusion that power was now in the hands of a government that would uphold their interests. Counselling "hopeful" expectation, they refused to organize a movement of active solidarity with the

union of railwaymen, dockers, sugar industry workers and others, who were fighting in defense of their gains and for higher wages, or with the students, peasants and some groups of the bourgeoisie who likewise were defending themselves against the attacks of the new power.

Subsequently, when it became impossible to turn a deaf ear to the demands of the rank and file, who insisted on action, these leaders had no choice but to vote, in February 1967, for a plan of action, only to sabotage it afterwards and finally to torpedo it after the general strike of March 1, 1967, when the fight had just begun.

Obviously, these maneuvers have exposed them in the eyes of the masses, who are displaying a growing aversion to the "tactical readjustments" of their union bosses. Rather than back the aspirations of the working people and fight for them, these men prefer collusion with the military clique and other "authorities," that is, the employers, the church and the spokesmen of U.S. imperialism.

LABOR RESISTANCE TO THE DICTATORSHIP

Yet the masses have become more active and, as our Party had foreseen, are moving leftward, even though with occasional zigzags due to the vacillation and treachery of many of the leaders.

This radicalization process is evident from the results of the election of workers' delegates in the enterprises and in the GCL unions, in which victory often goes to the joint lists of left Peronists, Communists, Popular Radicals, Socialists and Independents in the face of pressure and many a fraud on the part of the government and the employers. It is also indicative that strikes, most of them called by local organizations, have continued despite the drastic measures against them.

The stevedores' strike, from October to December 1966, was one of the most important actions the dictatorship had to face in its early phase. It was called in protest against amendments to the labor code won by the unions through years of struggle. The Communists, who were in the forefront of the fighters belonging to other political trends, organized the entire struggle "on the go," overcoming the vacillation of the union leadership. They set up coordination and solidarity committees at work places and in residential neighborhoods with a view to uniting the strikers and

their families in a single front. The Union of Argentine women and the Women's Committee of the Movement for Trade Union Unity conducted valuable work among the strikers' wives.

The GCL leadership's tactic of isolating this powerful strike movement, coupled with repressive measures by the government and the employers, defeated the movement. Nevertheless, the regime is intent on preventing new action, knowing that the Communist Party has gained influence and achieved better organization in the unions. Not long ago it sentenced Eustaquio Tolosa, General Secretary of the Stevedores' Union, to five years' imprisonment merely because during the strike he had called for international proletarian solidarity. The Communists urged the formation of solidarity committees at work places and in the GCL to secure the immediate release of Tolosa and other union and political leaders and to uphold the principle of international working-class solidarity.

Workers in the sugar industry whom the regime had deprived of jobs, railwaymen whose gains are reduced by the new labor code, and numerous others launched campaigns involving over three million working people, in particular in support of the GCL Action Plan of March 1967.

The working class has gained much experience, in these two years of the Onganía dictatorship, through partial and general strikes, occupation of factories, street demonstrations, clashes with the police, etc. The workers now realize the need for joint action in the enterprises and in the unions, for broader unity of the democratic and patriotic forces as proposed by the Communists.

SETTING UP COORDINATING COMMITTEES

Learning from experience, the masses adopt common organizational forms. Coordinating committees have sprung up in various unions, at both national and provincial levels, and in areas with large concentrations of workers they are being set up in important spheres of trade union activity—on building sites, on the railways, in the iron and steel industry, and communications. Cooperation between Peronist and Communist workers is growing also at the lower levels.

Experience tells the working people that they can win some socio-economic improvements and some democratic freedoms

through struggle; but it teaches them also that the regime can nullify their gains unless they ally themselves with other democratic and progressive forces opposed to the dictatorship, first of all with the peasants, unless they fight in common for genuinely democratic people's rule.

Recent history has recorded many important joint actions by the Argentine working class and the various democratic and anti-imperialist forces, such as the protest against the U.S. imperialist invasion of the Dominican Republic. The people condemned that aggression and insisted that Argentina refuse to send troops.

The GCL leaders, especially the Right-wing Peronists, trying to discourage the working people, have repeatedly shirked the task of uniting the anti-imperialist forces in a single front headed by the organized working class.

It is against the will of these leaders that coordinating centers have begun to emerge, such as the action committee at the Amalia sugar refinery in the north of the country, the Economic Defense Committee in the San Luis, San Juan and Mendoza provinces, the western Cordilleras, and others. All these committees embrace the trade unions, political parties, peasant, student and housewives' movements, clergymen, cultural and educational workers, and other social forces.

The Seventh National Conference of our Party advanced the task of strengthening and extending the unity committees in the enterprises and of forming them where they are still lacking, so as to strive in common for a change in the alignment of trade union forces in favor of the supporters of a united GCL adhering to the principles of class struggle and trade union democracy, and independent of the employers and the government.

THE GCL CONGRESS: A POWERFUL BLOW TO THE REGIME AND ITS AGENTS

The dictatorship, for its part, set out to impose on the trade union movement at all costs a "social pact" between labor and capital, and to make the GCL completely subservient to the regime's policies. In this it was backed by the Right-wing Peronist leadership. Having betrayed the Action Plan of March 1967, the defeatist elements showed their hand more clearly.

In the guise of "participation syndicalism," that is, a syndicalism of capitulation

and alliance between labor and capital, and anti-communism, the Right leaders of Peronism and the "Independents" renounced all forms of struggle and proceeded to collaborate openly with the dictatorship. In the Railwaymen's Union, whose legitimate leadership, consisting of Peronists, Communists and Independents, was removed by decree, and in other unions, numerous Right leaders—Peronists and Independents—entered into the service of the dictatorship.

Last March these leaders convened the National Congress of the GCL to approve what the regime demanded. But the sentiment and the will of the masses and numerous officials, especially in the middle echelons, were entirely different. Our Party and the MUCS called on the working people and these officials to establish a common anti-collaborationist trade union front to save the GCL and the unions, to make them completely independent of the government and the employers. To this end they proposed, as pointed out by the Seventh National Conference of our Party, putting forward "new union leaders irrespective of the trend they represent, provided they are militant and upright people loyal to the working class, the people and the nation."

The GCL congress met in March as scheduled. But its results were far from what the dictatorship and its agents had expected, despite the fact that efforts of the Right Peronist and Independent leaders to overcome the anti-collaborationist movement that grew out of the congress. The pressure of the masses proved stronger than that of these defeatist leaders, whose designs were foiled.

The congress, reflecting the indignation and the aspirations of factory workers, denounced the dictatorship and its collaborationist agents, reaffirmed the unions' striving for complete independence from the government and the employers, approved an action program against the regime and the collaborationists, and resolved that the GCL should form a broad National Resistance Front against the dictatorship.

These decisions were in harmony with the fundamental demands of our Party, especially the demand for a broad democratic and anti-imperialist front against the regime to unite in action under a single leadership all the forces advocating overthrow of the dictatorship in favor of a new government, which the Communists visualize as a broad democratic coalition capable

of ensuring effective development in every sphere of national life.

THE SPLITTING POLICY OF THE REGIME AND ITS AGENTS EXPOSED

When their plans had fallen through, the collaborationist leaders, encouraged by the regime and violating all the statutory standards of the GCL, refused to recognize the March congress and fixed a new congress for the end of May which formalized a parallel GCL. Contrary to the action platform approved by the March congress, they maintain that the dictatorship should be "the acme of Argentine understanding." And while the parallel congress in May put forward a long list of demands, the list closed with soliciting an audience with the President of the Republic and cabinet members and tried to classify as "good" or "bad" the leaders of the ruling camarilla, as if their policy depended on the will of this or that minister rather than being prompted by the interests of the oligarchies and the monopolies.

The group of Right leaders who formed the parallel GCL succeeded in winning the support of such important unions as those of the iron and steel, garment-making, meat-packing and agricultural workers, the employees of national oil companies, and others. However, this list is not enough to estimate the alignment of forces. It should be borne in mind that many of the union leaders qualified for their posts by means of fraud, that important opposition movements are developing in the unions they lead and that many of the provincial branches of these unions have declared for the GCL as it emerged from the March congress. Besides, there are objective circumstances aggravating the contradiction between the defeatist policy of these leaders and the activity of the unions. One of these is that the dictatorship sticks at nothing to press forward the program of the monopolies and does not spare even the unions led by its agents and by the collaborationists.

The leaders of a dozen unions refused to attend even the parallel congress because they are so strongly committed to the regime that they dare not criticize official policy.

Anyone who analyzes the new situation in the Argentine working-class movement with due regard to these circumstances will see that the GCL brought into being at the March congress is the sole organization

which can represent the working people and make trade union unity on class principles possible. This GCL enjoys growing support, particularly in its regional sections all over the country, and in the local organizations, as well as in an important body of political and popular forces. In response to its appeal to attend May Day meetings, thousands of working people, representatives of political parties, students, peasants and others demonstrated in Buenos Aires, Tucuman, Rosario, Cordova and elsewhere. The anti-dictatorial attitude of the GCL made for a new upsurge in the strike movement, shown by the actions in numerous enterprises and unions (Alba Dyestuffs, San Lorenzo Ceramics, the Amalia sugar refinery, Automobile Mechanics, etc.).

We should note, however, that the leadership of this GCL and its more authoritative members are still in thrall to sectarian prejudices. They will have no Communists, MUCS people or other partisans of the class struggle on their national secretariat. True, they make good statements about unity but their actions smack of discrimination, which reduces the chances of ridding the leadership of collaborationists. Recently the union of national oil workers, headed by one of the leading collaborationists, held elections to renew the leadership. The trend siding with the anti-collaborationist Peronist leadership rejected the proposal for a joint list, so that the votes of the union majority were dispersed and the collaborationist leader won the election. The unity list won 11,900 votes and the official list, 12,100. It is important to stress, however, that the unity list was supported by several branch organizations of the biggest unions in the country.

The Peronist trend in the GCL leadership plainly shows social-Christian leanings. This new form of sectarianism in the trade union movement was criticized by our Party and the MUCS, which advocate unity between believers and non-believers and at the same time firmly uphold the class principles of the labor movement. These principles mean, first of all, waging a class struggle and not seeking class collaboration, which is the main theory of the social-Christian doctrine.

These contradictions notwithstanding, the resolutions of the GCL congress, the program set forth in the document issued by the new leadership on the occasion of May Day, and the appeal to hold a national demonstration on June 28, 1968, the sec-

ond anniversary of the Ongania coup, constitute a new stage in the life of the workers and the nation. On that day, strikes and demonstrations took place in many cities. Many people were wounded and hundreds were jailed. The democratic parties, students and the masses expressed their solidarity with the demonstrators and strikers. A statement in support of the working people's actions was issued by a GCL-sponsored conference of representatives of political parties. In Cordova, for instance, the demonstration was headed by the deposed President, Dr. Illia (a Radical), GCL General Secretary Ongaro (a Peronist), and leaders of the Communist Party, other parties and Catholic organizations.

Despite the sectarian prejudices of the new GCL leaders, the principle of unity is gradually asserting itself in the Confederation and in its member unions. It is not only in factories or local union organizations that joint lists win. Unity is spreading to the leaderships of the regional organizations of the GCL and to the national federations.

These are positive developments, for the future of the Argentine trade union movement belongs to them.

EXECUTING THE PROGRAM OF THE GCL CONGRESS

On June 2, 1968, the Central Committee of our Party analyzed the situation in the country and the prospects. It put on record that in its two years in power the dictatorship, far from becoming stronger, has weakened and that the conflict between factions forming it has gained in bitterness.

The second anniversary of the dictatorship coincides with a rise in the strike movement. Students come out into the streets to demand restoration of their rights and insist on a university within reach of the people. Tenant farmers oppose the massive evictions to be effected under the new agrarian laws imposed by the Ongania government. Small shopkeepers closed their shops for 24 hours, to say nothing of other protest actions against the rent reform. National industries come out against monopoly infiltration. Political parties upholding the interests of the people are resuming their activity even though the regime has decreed their dissolution.

All this may be said to indicate a crisis of the system, whose supporters are fighting tooth and nail, and will continue to fight, to preserve it. Meanwhile the situation is becoming favorable for the masses to go

over from the mere expression of discontent to an active fight against government policy.

The weak point of this process is, however, that there is no unity of action and that a national coordinating center which would unite, mobilize and guide the diverse forces in a national resistance front is still lacking.

Many people are beginning to appreciate this fundamental issue, which we Communists have been doing our best to elucidate. In connection with the June 28 demonstration the GCL launched an appeal to the unions and to the students and other citizens, to work out a program of joint action. The GCL demands a 40 per cent increase in wages, and that pensions be brought into line with the increased cost of living; it identified itself with the tenant farmers and insists on the release of E. Tolosa and other jailed leaders; it demands the re-establishment of democratic freedoms and the legitimate union leadership, and expresses solidarity with the students and their demands for a university of and for the people; it wants to win the prompt restoration of constitutional rights and sovereignty and that the changes desired by the country be effected according to the will of the people.

Most Argentinians are agreed on points such as these. All indications are (and our Party is working accordingly) that the conditions for a broad front against the dictatorship—a front to be led by the organized working-class—are there. It will be for this front to end the dictatorship and form a provisional government based on a broad democratic coalition and representing all the anti-dictator forces without exception: civilians and the military, believers and atheists, Communists, Peronists, Radicals, Socialists, Christian Democrats, Progressive Democrats and Independents united on a minimum program. Our Party considers that this provisional government, as well as carrying out the program of the front, should convene, at a date agreed in common, a Constituent Assembly which, by means of proportional representation, would ensure representation for the progressive forces of the country. The Assembly should give our country the economic and political structures the people are demanding.

ALL CHANGE WILL RESULT FROM MASS ACTION

The policy and tactics of our Party are based on the idea that all revolutionary

change in the country will be the result of mass action, as will be the winning of power, whatever the forms and methods used in the struggle. The Communists must therefore center their activity in the trade union movement in the enterprises. They must organize and rally the working people in town and country through joint anti-collaboration committees, which should begin by uniting the foremost contingents and then go on to the vast majority of the working class.

The first task of these local centers will be to organize the struggle for immediate economic and social demands, which should enable them to gain influence among the working class generally and then link up their struggle with the general struggle for a new regime. We think it is through the so-called smaller issues that the masses learn to know people and policy, to appreciate the advantages of our policy and tactics, our organizational principles, the qualities of our active members, our unrelenting fight for the complete restoration of trade union democracy and unity based on class principles, and come to realize that the theory and practice of class cooperation necessarily lead to an unprincipled truce.

Our Party and the MUCS encourage the fight for a general 40 per cent rise in wages without raising the prices of necessities, because this fight brings the masses face to face with their exploiters and can mobilize the labor movement to attain this vital objective.

Unlike the ultra-Left adventurers and Right opportunists, we Communists fully support the fight for economic demands while continuing to make clear to the proletariat that under capitalism it will never rid itself of wage slavery. However, Marx wrote over a century ago that the working class should not stop defending itself against the abuses of capital and should use every opportunity to improve its conditions. If in its daily conflicts with capital it were to yield in cowardly fashion, Marx pointed out, it would make itself unfit for other movements of greater scope.

We try to organize the working people on the basis of their own experience in solving concrete problems. We put forward specific action platforms for working women and youth, whose role in production is growing constantly.

Lastly, we try to ensure that the joint committees—both those already functioning and those being set up—proceed from

a common concept of class unity and the broadest democracy, and that they constantly consult the working people, for this is how a vast network of interconnected mass organizations can be brought into being at different union levels to isolate the defeatist leaders, convince the wavering and rally the more active fighters and enhance the efficiency of the entire labor movement.

THE COMMUNIST PARTY AND THE MASSES INFLUENCED BY PERONISM

The working people, especially those under Peronist influence, learning from their own experience and with the fraternal aid of Communists, are beginning to show greater independence and to oppose negative attitudes on the part of their leaders. Nevertheless, many of them have yet to realize what their class party should really be like if it is to lead them to final victory. They still follow the Peronists because they do not quite realize the nationalist and bourgeois essence of the Peronist doctrine.

The imperialists and the ruling classes are doing their utmost to prevent the masses from seeing through this doctrine. Ever since the downfall of Peron, each government has tried to maintain the positions gained by Peronism and its leaders, particularly in the unions. Their invariable object has been to check the development of class consciousness in the labor movement. This has always been a class problem, hence all the governments after Peron, the present government included, have tried to keep Communist influence out of the labor movement, to isolate the Communists from the masses influenced by Peronism and to deny them a share in leading the unions. To this end all sorts of stratagems, maneuvers and frauds have been used (and the present dictatorship has carried this "tradition" further) in combination with repressive measures, to the point of ousting Communists from the unions at the instigation of the employers, who, for their part, victimized them. This made it easier for the Peronist leaders to maintain their influence in the unions.

The Right Peronist leaders have responded by implanting bourgeois nationalist ideas in the working class. Now that the masses are looking for a way out, the ideological struggle is of particular importance. First of all, we must refute the arguments of the Rights in the unions and at the same

time enlighten our friends and allies. We must wage this ideological battle on the basis of everyday realities and in strict accordance with principle.

All our efforts are directed towards this goal. We try to make more effective use of Party publications, above all *Nuestra Palabra*, which in the two years of dictatorship has never failed to appear, and *Nueva*

Era, the theoretical journal of the Central Committee, plus *Revista Internacional (Problems of Peace and Socialism)* and MUCS publications—the monthly *Unidad Sindical* and current documents and leaflets. We also pay much attention to factory papers, which enable us promptly and effectively to convey our opinion to every factory worker.

Once more on Catholic-Communist alliance *

(new experience)

SANTIAGO ALVAREZ

I.

On April 30 and May 1 Spain was swept by mass actions organized by workers' commissions.

Hundreds of thousands of Spaniards went on strike in Madrid and in dozens of other towns. Despite police interference, numerous meetings and demonstrations took place.

The police occupied factories and strategic points in the main cities, turning them into besieged fortresses. The government alerted the army.**

As a result, the action for economic demands and democratic rights developed into a major political battle against the regime.

A feature of this battle was the militancy of the working people. In Madrid, Catalonia, the Asturias and elsewhere demonstrators clashed with the police, forcing them to retreat.

Our Party attaches great political importance to this. While striving to prevent unnecessary clashes with the police, we are

doing our best to stimulate the fighting spirit of the people.

The demonstrators included students, intellectuals, office employees, professional people and in some regions of the South and Catalonia, also agricultural laborers. The actions of young workers and students stood out for magnitude, revolutionary enthusiasm and militancy. In some places small shop-keepers also expressed their solidarity.

Our Party considers that these hundreds of thousands of demonstrators constitute the vanguard of the labor and democratic movement, which the people support in various ways, and that a new and important step has been made towards the general strike, which remains at the center of our revolutionary perspective.

The events of April 30 and May 1 showed that the workers' commissions are already able to organize and coordinate struggle on a nationwide scale and that they represent a united labor and socio-political movement which, expressing the vital interests of the workers and the people, acts on behalf of all democratic forces. The authority of the workers' commissions has grown—not only because they took part in the actions of the above-mentioned social and popular forces, but also because they were openly supported by other political groups, among

*This article covers the period since the publication of an article on the same subject in *World Marxist Review* No. 6, 1966.

**Mention should also be made of the imprisonment of prominent workers' commissions' leaders, among them Marcelino Camacho and Julian Ariza, and about a thousand leaders of the new labor movement, who were arrested in Madrid and in the provinces on the eve of these actions.

them Socialist and Catalan and Basque nationalist democrats.* Thus the leading role of the working class with respect to what our Party calls "the alliance of the forces of labor and culture," which has gained considerably in strength in the course of the struggle, is already manifesting itself in practice.

This enables us to stress once again the importance of the alliance of Communists and progressive Catholics. "We note with gratification," Comrade Carrillo said in a talk with a group of Party members, "that fighting shoulder to shoulder with us are Catholics who are friendly to the working class, anxious to see an end to the dictatorship and, like the Communists, want to abolish exploitation of man by man."

Is this a subjective opinion or an objective appraisal of the situation?

We already had occasion to speak about the participation of Catholics, jointly with Communists and other representatives of the working people, in the workers' commissions. But the progressive Catholic movement has been taking part in all the socio-political struggles of the past two years too, helping to expand them.

One of the most positive developments of the last two years was the creation of young workers' commissions in which Catholic youth cooperate and vie with young Communists in setting examples of militancy and revolutionary enthusiasm.

And what is the situation among the students?

Because of their struggle, unity and creative application of the experience of the new workers' movement, a remarkable democratic movement emerged which did away consecutively with the fascist University Union and the government-imposed Professional Association of Students and Student Association, setting up, instead, a new organization known as the Democratic Student Union.

A mass movement, it has organized numerous strikes and demonstrations, including the first general university strike in 1967, when barricades appeared in Madrid, Santiago and other cities and the striking students defeated the authorities' attempts to split the movement by means of repression.

Under the slogan of worker-student unity

*The role of the workers' commissions as the spokesman of the new Spanish labor movement is undeniable. Even Social-Democratic leaders like Guy Mollet acknowledge this and disapprove of the attitude of the leaders of the Spanish Socialist Workers' Party in exile who continue to ignore the workers' commissions.

students take part in actions organized by workers' commissions and fight for the establishment of a democratic trade union, for democracy and for a revolutionary transformation of society, demonstrating thereby that the student movement is an important part of the alliance of the forces of labor and culture.

No one contests the role of the Communist Party in this movement. But one should not overlook the contribution of progressive Catholics, specifically the Catholic Student Youth, which closely cooperates with Communist students and other groups. It will be recalled that the first DSU organization in Barcelona was set up with the help of Capuchin monks from Sarria who allowed the constituent assembly to be held in their monastery.

A process similar to that taking place among the workers and students is to be observed among writers, poets, journalists, artists, etc., whose activity, although unorganized, is of no lesser importance. In this movement the cooperation of Communists and Catholic progressives is manifested vividly in actions against repressions, for an amnesty, for freedom of speech, press and creative work and for other freedoms. Our journal *Realidad* prints Catholic views on problems of the dialogue, while Communists can state their opinion in some Catholic publications.

Joint actions by Communists and Catholics have done much to stimulate the democratic movement of lawyers, doctors, architects, engineers, school teachers, technicians, etc., evidence of which is the activity of the legal aid bureaus set up by lawyers to protect the workers' interests, the efforts in some regions to provide legal aid to peasants, and the work conducted by the associations or movements of young doctors, technicians and teachers.

Young priests play an important role in the peasant movement, especially in the Asturias, Santander, Galicia and Catalonia. Peasants' demonstrations are often headed not only by Communists and other anti-Franco fighters, but also by young priests who resolutely stand up for the poor, defying the wrath of the authorities and their superiors. Some young priests not only read and discuss Communist publications but familiarize peasants with them. The idea that "the land belongs to those who till it" has taken deep root in the progressive Catholic movement.

Catholics take part also in the national-democratic movement inspired and support-

ed by the Communists, fighting against the regime with its rigid bureaucratic centralism, for the national democratic freedoms of Catalonia, the Basque country and Galicia, including the freedom of national languages and cultures. Some Galician priests have voiced solidarity with the hundreds of Catalan and Basque veterans of this struggle.

Catholics and Communists cooperate in the movement of small manufacturers and shopkeepers, considerable groups of which are concentrated in Madrid, Las Palmas, Barcelona and Valencia.

The degree of involvement of women in the struggle of the working class and the people is evidenced by their mass participation in the recent actions, especially the demonstrations of April 30 and May 1. Catholics have contributed to the development of the women's movement, which has acquired considerable strength in Madrid, the Canary Islands, Barcelona and elsewhere and is beginning to be coordinated on a nationwide scale.

There are many priests among the protestors against the U.S. war in Vietnam, and in the civic commissions which have been formed in Madrid, Barcelona, Seville, Valencia, Zaragoza, La Coruna and other cities.

As we see, progressive Catholics are fighting today on all fronts of the mass democratic movement in our country. Their activity is acquiring a new quality, and greater responsibility devolves on them in direct connection with the development of the mass struggle and the growth of the political role of the Communists, who head this struggle.

Not everything goes smoothly, of course. Many conflicts are engendered by the attitude of the church hierarchy, which is seeking to keep Catholics away from the popular struggle. But then, no alliance of disparate forces has ever been built without complications. Difficulties arise, and they are overcome in the course of the struggle, on the basis of respect for the independence of mass organizations and defense of the interests of the people. On the other hand, this alliance of Communists and Catholics is not official; it is being forged in joint actions in the factories, universities and villages, during court trials and in prisons. And today this alliance is not only "a cornerstone of unity of the new Spanish working-class movement"; it not only enables us to note that "Catholic students are also taking part in the student

struggle." It is a *cornerstone of our entire mass democratic movement.*

This brings to mind Engels' words about points of convergence between early Christianity and the socialist labor movement. "Both Christianity and labor socialism," he wrote, "were haunted and persecuted; their followers were held in contempt and treated according to exceptional laws, the former as enemies of humankind, the latter as enemies of the state, religion, the family and public order." These points of convergence have changed—not only because history does not stand still, but also because common struggle and common sacrifices are laying the foundations of a solid political alliance which can bring nearer the establishment of a new social system.

II.

Countless facts can be cited to prove this. Special mention should be made of priests' demonstrations, in particular the demonstration of 200 priests, among them Jesuits and Capuchins, outside the Barcelona police headquarters, to protest against the persecution of participants in the student movement. The demonstration stirred the whole country and brought on a direct clash between the priests and the hierarchy.

Three days after the demonstration 150 clergymen from all Catalan dioceses, priests, Jesuits and Benedictines among them, assembled at the residence of the Barcelona archbishop to protest against police violence, voice solidarity with the previous demonstrations and condemn the attitude of their superiors. From pulpits and in clandestine publications, priests in Catalonia and other provinces opposed their own interpretation of the events to the viewpoint of the state and church authorities.

Demonstrations and meetings against the regime and the church hierarchy itself have become a common occurrence. Witness the recent assembly of 70 priests in Madrid, or the expression of solidarity of the heads of all Catalan religious orders with the Sarria Capuchins whose monastery was occupied by the police. The police action was also condemned by 17 Catholic organizations in Barcelona. All the Catholic Action organizations in the province joined in a protest when the bishop of Lerida expelled from his diocese the Jesuit leader of those Catholics who had circulated a document devoted to these events.

The important processes developing in progressive Spanish Catholicism include the

ferment among the seminarians. Here we could mention the strike at the sociology faculty of the San Sebastian Seminary in solidarity with five expelled students, the strike in the Barcelona Seminary, the protest movement against the expulsion of Lugo Seminary students, and the crisis over the study plan in the Navarra Seminary, which brought the majority of the students into a clash with the archbishop.

The same solidarity was demonstrated during protests against police repressions.

Is not the movement among the seminarians a manifestation of the general "rebellion" of the youth reflecting its magnanimity and objective revolutionism? Is it not a reaction to the changes that have taken place in the world, and a sign of the influence of Marxist-Leninist ideology which sows doubts as regards traditional theology?

The participation in mass actions and the readiness to use methods of protest and struggle characteristic of the working class and the revolutionary forces are finding an equivalent in political positions and, as we shall see later, in all spheres of ideology. The difference in the attitudes of the progressive Catholic movement and the hierarchy towards the civil war and towards the recent referendum merits special attention.

Whereas the church authorities have not yet overcome the spirit of "crusade" which impelled them to come out against democracy, in defense of fascism, the progressive Catholic movement demanded, on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the ending of the civil war, an amnesty for political prisoners and emigres and abolition of liabilities connected with the war. As for the referendum, the hierarchy urged the Catholics to go to the polls, while the position of the Catholic progressives coincided, on the whole, with that of the Communist Party and the other opposition forces, which boycotted the referendum and demanded democratic conditions for the voting. Also, progressive Catholics refused to abide by the agreement concluded between the church and the authorities.

We have spoken about the participation of progressive Catholics in mass movements and in some political events because otherwise it would be hard to see the course of the dialogue between Christians and Marxists in Spain. Besides, struggle for the immediate demands of the working people and for political freedoms is the only means of raising the level of the

struggle for the social emancipation of man from any alienation, including religious alienation. Lenin pointed to the need to treat this problem in a concrete way, "on the basis of the class struggle which is going on *in practice* and is educating the masses more and better than anything else could." (*Collected Works*, Vol. 15, p. 376)

III.

As can be seen from the foregoing, serious disagreements and even open conflicts have erupted in recent years between the Spanish progressive Catholic movement and the hierarchy. Indeed, there is a gulf between the hierarchy and the Catholicism which strives for the more positive development and renovation initiated by John XXIII and manifested at the Second Vatican Council, and which supports the struggle of the masses.

Indicative in this respect is the Spanish bishops' statement on the church and the Ecumenical Council, in which they not only fully endorsed the conservative propositions contained in the Vatican documents (taking them in isolation from the rest of the text), not only "forgot" about such problems, so crucial for Spain, as the need for political rights and for development of agriculture, which found reflection in the decisions of the Council, but virtually vowed to block any movement for the realization of these decisions in our country.

The Spanish episcopacy did everything to support the integrism of the "ultras" in the government so that, for instance, the law on religious freedom which the regime was compelled to issue should not guarantee it in practice, that it should be "tapered," as progressive Catholics called it.

As for the *Populorum progressio* encyclical, the episcopacy saw to it that it had no influence in Spain. Whereas the Vatican is seeking to obscure the progressive character of some of the decisions of the Ecumenical Council, the Spanish hierarchy stresses the conservative and reactionary trends in them.

This attitude has a logical bearing on the problems of the dialogue between Christians and Marxists at the level of ideological discussion which has materialized in Spain in the form of Catholic-Communist dialogue. Contrary to the decisions of the Ecumenical Council and the practices recognized by the Vatican itself, the top clergy in Spain oppose this dialogue. Some of

them (Bishop Guerra Campos, for instance) have gone back on their own statements at the Council and regard the dialogue as a weapon of proselytism.

This attitude, however, cannot prevent the dialogue from proceeding in more favorable conditions in connection with the mass struggle, i.e., in the practical field, and, as we shall see, at a higher ideological level. On the other hand, it contributes to the deepening of disagreements between the hierarchy and the Catholic circles we have been speaking about. The presence of two churches is becoming ever more apparent, exemplified among other things by the deep crisis of Catholic Action.

IV.

What are the most characteristic ideological features of the progressive Catholic movement? Let us turn to some facts first.

On May 1, 1966, theologian Jose Maria Gonzales Ruiz delivered a sermon in Barcelona in which he not only criticized the former position of the Catholics and called for struggle for "a more just society," but also warned Catholics against the "grave danger" presented by "attempts to head the struggles for the workers' demands." *"The world of labor,"* he said, *"incontestably occupies the leading place in this fight for the freedom and progress of mankind."* Leadership of the struggle, Gonzales quite correctly thinks, belongs to the working class.

In September 1966 a large group of Catholic priests and laymen held a meeting to discuss a document entitled "Operation Moses." The meeting was prohibited by the Archbishop of Madrid and the police. Nevertheless the authors of "Operation Moses" had the document discussed by thousands of Catholics and secured the support of more than a thousand priests. In this document the hierarchy are criticized for aiding and abetting the Franco regime. The authors contend that the church should have no privileges, and that its leaders should give up whatever political posts they hold. They declare for the freedom of religion and separation of the church from the state, which should be secular, advance the idea of a pluralist society guaranteeing all rights, demand social justice and declare against nationalism, militarism and integrism.

While the "charter" of the progressive Catholic movement was being circulated in the country, about 300 Catholic Young Workers' Union councillors signed a letter

to the episcopacy expressing their desire to serve the poor and declaring for "a free church connected neither with the state nor with wealth."

Along with contending, in a document handed to the Archbishop of Catalonia, that *"only the workers themselves can be defenders of the interests of the working class,"* 25 Catalan clergymen criticize neo-capitalism and uphold socialism, "As distinct from the consumer society," they write, "which offers us maximum comfort or capital as the supreme blessing (forgetting about man), Communists offer us much more humane values."

The document of the Madrid congregation Nuestra Senora de la Montana, which was read in several churches in Madrid on the eve of the April 30 and May 1 events, *condemns capitalist exploitation and rejects the exploiters' "myth about God."*

In a colloquium on "The Gospel and Practice," priests from 16 dioceses come out against "alienation in a world divided into believers and non-believers, where a much deeper division exists *between the exploited and the exploiters,*" and call for dialogue and practical cooperation *with all those who will really strive to put an end to class discrimination.* "Our class faith," they add, "prepares us for the *struggle which is being waged by all the oppressed of the world.*"

Similar views are expressed by young Catholics. At a recent colloquium, "Ethical Appraisal of the Socio-Economic Situation in Spain," the Jesuit-headed Federation of Santa Maria University Congregations charged the official church with "consciously or unconsciously helping to preserve the dominant capitalist system and apparently strengthening . . . an unjust social system." For its part, the Catholic Student Youth raises the same problems and endeavors to work out a stand which would substantiate the need for radical social changes.

The recent 17th Social Week in Validolid, devoted this year to problems of youth, was turned by young people into a "collective protest week." Young Catholics declared for democratic freedoms and expressed their desire to work for genuine economic democracy. This is added confirmation of the depth of the currents which were discussed by Catholic Action's *Signo*. Responding to Comrade Carrillo's statements and directly addressing "our Communist brethren," this journal wrote: "We agree that nothing should prevent the par-

ticipation of Catholics in truly liberatory movements and even in a direct struggle for socialism."

Opposition to the dictatorship, criticism of the church hierarchy which supports it, exposure of neo-capitalism as a social system, pronouncements in favor of democracy and socialism, even revision of some fundamental theological foundation tenets of the Catholic church—this is what these facts testify to. The attitude of progressive Catholics towards socialism can be illustrated by other examples.

V.

Condemnation of capitalist ownership and a striving for socialism are clearly manifested by such Catholic workers' organizations as the Trade Union Association of Working People, which has declared that "man's harmonious development is incompatible with the concept of capitalist ownership."

The above-mentioned Father Gonzales Ruiz writes:

"Catholics already can go hand in hand with others and set about, without any prejudices, building a new society."

In an article entitled "Neo-Capitalism? Socialism? A Third Road?" he declares: "Today we cannot deny that many Christians have fully accepted the Marxist approach to problems, but this does not mean that they have denounced their ultimate aim—human dignity and freedom."

Enrique Miret Magdalena, a Catholic publicist, states: "We should understand . . . the profound meaning of revolution as not merely a forcible or peaceful change of rulers, but as cardinal transformation of the structures and institutions of Western society with a view to achieving, in the future, new social justice. In the course of 150 years the church has been particularly allergic to socialism. . . . If the Gospel agrees with anything, it is the general essence of socialism and not the egoism of capitalism."

Father Jose Maria Diaz Alegria points to the need to expose 'the sacrilegious syncretism of our time, the cult of God and the worship of capital which, instead of serving man, is an object of adoration. More than that: as in ancient Israel, human sacrifices are made to it.'

Many of the propositions advanced by Professor Joaquin Ruiz Gimenez, a man prominent in the Catholic world, and contained in the "Palamos Manifesto," coin-

cide with, or approximate to, our Party's concept of the socio-economic, political and cultural transformations which will lead to socialism in Spain. Gimenez declared at a recent conference: "In my speech at the Council I said that the church had been 200 years late in becoming liberal, and that we should see to it that it is not another 200 years late in becoming socialist." Which ties in with his statement that "our world is implacably advancing towards socialism." Can this socialism objectively be anything but Marxist?

In our opinion, the following conclusions can be drawn from these facts: increasingly evident cooperation of Communists and Catholics in the struggle for partial demands and for democratic freedoms, and also for social change, including the socialist reconstruction of society; there are two churches in Spain: "one compromised by association with official structures, and another which is not only outside these structures, but is opposed to them."*

VI.

The outside world exerts a definite influence on progressive Spanish Catholicism and the rise of this "new church." And in this outside world, notwithstanding the problems confronting the socialist world and the Communist movement, we see the growth and consolidation of the revolutionary forces and victorious advance of Marxist-Leninist ideology, whereas the imperialist system is in the throes of a general crisis. Its depth, of which American imperialism's defeat in Vietnam is a symptom, has been demonstrated anew by the recent social and political upheavals in France.

These new developments would have been inconceivable without the Second Vatican Council, which, after the *Pacem in terris* encyclical of John XXIII, provided, in a sense, a positive answer to the questions posed at the time of the Council.

And though certain Vatican spokesmen have sought to "freeze" the Council's progressive decisions and impede progressive trends in Catholicism, the facts show that the process is truly irreversible and has worldwide implications. The depth of this process depends on definite historical, political and social factors.

In the case of Spain, these can be reduced to the following:

First, the mass struggle, which though

*"Cuadernos para el Dialogo." April 1968.

it has not yet toppled the dictatorship, is assuming ever wider dimensions. Spain is caught in a tangle of social contradictions resulting from the decline of the present regime, and unless these are resolved there can be no changes offering even minimal satisfaction to the universal desire for democracy, freedom, well-being and social progress.

In Spain, neo-capitalism was doomed from the very start, both because of our specific conditions and because neo-capitalism is synonymous with American society—its gangsterism, exploitation of Third World peoples, race discrimination, political crimes, drug addiction and alienation. In short, a society of imperialist oppression and genocide, so glaringly manifested by the war in Vietnam.

These ideological and moral aspects are well known. But also well known are their antidotes—dissemination and penetration of the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist ideology, and not only among the workers, but also among students, intellectuals, etc.

There is a growing trend which Catholics define as “de-Christianization,” that is, retreat from religion, the drift to atheism. It is powered by scientific and technological progress, by the whole development of the world we live in. Both lend momentum to this objective retreat from religion, now one of the hallmarks of our age. But to a very large extent it is powered also by the integrism of the Spanish Catholic hierarchy.

These are the objective factors that go into the attitudes of Spain’s progressive Catholics. Their movement has its own intrinsic dialectics, its own dynamics. But there is also a subjective factor, the core of Catholic leaders, priests and laymen who provide its spiritual leadership, voice the sentiments of millions of religious working people and are inspired by traditions dating back to the democratic and revolutionary revolts of early Christianity. The position of the Communist Party is, also, bound to have its impact, although indirect, on their thinking.

Several years ago our Party declared that in the advance to communism it would welcome Catholics marching, under the sign of the Cross, side by side with Communists marching under the Red Flag and the Hammer and Sickle. Ever since, we have endeavored, while upholding and dialectically applying our materialist principles, to translate this into reality. The fact that our statement was not motivated

by tactical exigencies, by a desire to acquire a new campaign instrument, played its part too.

The Party was anxious to prove its sincerity to its allies and dialogue partners. At the same time, however, it worked to create better opportunities for joint action towards our main goal. It drew up a policy which, while founded on Marxism-Leninism, was adapted to Spanish conditions. In other words, it elaborated the strategy of the democratic revolution and its growing over into a socialist revolution in conformity with the conditions outlined above.

A feature of this revolutionary line is alliance of all the forces capable of advancing the fight for democratic freedoms, their extension and development and the institution of political and economic democracy as a transitional stage to socialism.

And when, arising from the changed structure of modern society, the forces of culture become one of the motive forces of revolution, their alliance with the forces of labor will become the dominant factor in the attainment of our goals. The progressive Catholic movement is a component of this alliance of the forces of labor and culture.

But it must be said that Catholic ideology continues to influence considerable sections of the Spanish people. However—and this too is a feature of the present stage—while its purpose is to befuddle the masses, it also helps to bring home to them the need to fight for social emancipation.

Our revolutionary Marxist-Leninist Party continues to study these phenomena and their implications. It is endeavoring to find, both in politics and other aspects of ideology, points of convergence with our position and perspective. The Party’s purpose is, first, jointly with the Catholics to promote the democratic and revolutionary struggle and, second, jointly to lay the foundations of a socialist society in which Marxism-Leninism would be applied in keeping with our national conditions.

In this context, Comrade Santiago Carrillo’s book, *New Approach to Present-Day Problems*, holds a very special place.

We believe it has done much to formulate a Marxist-Leninist theory firmly rooted in practical realities. The plurality of parties in a socialist society, the Communist Party’s leading, but not dominant, role in the alliance of labor and culture, etc.—these questions, we think, are of immense interest and their study will contribute to

strengthening the alliance of Communists and progressive Catholics and maintaining it throughout the historical period of the present struggle, right up to the building of a socialist society and its gradual development into a communist society.

Certain other problems merit attention. One of them concerns the class character of our position. To quote Santiago Carrillo: "Cooperation with the Catholic movement does not mean that we have abandoned our class positions; we adhere to them." And further: "It should be perfectly clear that we cannot cooperate with all Catholics, only with those of a democratic and progressive persuasion. Many—nearly all if not all—members of the financial and landed oligarchy consider themselves Catholics. But cooperation with this class is out of the question." That is basic to our position.

Our attitude to the reactionary hierarchy and to the Catholic democratic movement—the church which acts as a "vehicle of the religion of alienation, as opium for the people," and the church which "trenchantly denounces the existing order of things" and inspires the "Prophetic trend"—differs in every respect.

Is not this trend of the new church a continuation, in new conditions, of the early Christianity to which Marx, and particularly Engels, referred, and of which Lenin said that it had a "democratic revolutionary spirit"?

Another problem discussed in the *New Approach* relates to questions of ideology (and not philosophy) on which the views of Catholic critics of the existing system coincide with ours.

"No one doubts that there are deep differences between Marxism and religion in the realm of philosophy. . . . In some areas of ideology, however, there can be complete identity of appraisals. Political economy, for instance, is a component of ideology, and in this area a sizable group of Catholics have proclaimed support for the economic forms of socialism and accept Marx's criticism of capitalism. . . . Politics is likewise a part of ideology, and it is only natural that ideological rapprochement between the Catholics and us can be achieved on such questions as the political structure of democracy and socialism."

There is no need here to analyze on what issues, and to what extent, the views of progressive Catholics, based on the doctrines of early Christianity, coincide with

our materialist conception of social development. The important thing is that they do coincide.

VII.

There is no denying that development of the economic structure of state-monopoly increasingly discloses the conflict between the social character of production and the private character of appropriation. Obviously, this is more easily understood than other aspects of our ideology and helps to recruit support for the economic and political forms of socialism among people who do not fully accept Marxism-Leninism.

It is not surprising that progressive Catholics who incline towards socialism are not always clear about its nature. But it can be said that when these people speak of socialism they have in mind the kind of economic and social system that exists in the socialist countries — a society in which the basic means of production and distribution have been expropriated from the capitalists and turned over to the working people, after the working class and its allies achieved political power.

Consequently, there is a marked difference between this new concept of socialism and the Christian socialism criticized by Marx in the *Communist Manifesto*.

His criticism should be seen in historical context. The church, which in its day demended feudalism and negated capitalism, "fully condemned the new times."*

When feudalism had outlived its day, the church became a pillar of capitalism. And though as an institution, under "Schema XIII,"** the church is "not linked with any particular form of civilization, nor with any particular political, economic or social system," there is no doubt of its role as a moral and ideological support of capitalism. The main thing, however, is that worker and other democratic Catholic groups no longer turn to Christian or clerical socialism, so justly criticized by Marx, or to "ersatz-socialism" like the pretentious "revolution in conditions of liberty" preached by Chilean Christian-Democrats, but to scientific socialism, to Marxist socialism. And this despite the fact that Catholics do not subscribe to the Marxist-Leninist philosophy.

This holds good not only for Spain. We

*"Socialismo y Cristianismo." Editorial *Nova Terra*. Barcelona.

**Another title of the document "The Church in the Modern World" which was discussed at the Second Vatican Council—Ed.

have the same phenomenon in Latin America and other parts of the Third World, and even in developed countries. The authors of *Socialism and Christianity* convincingly show that socialism is a major phenomenon of history, a movement now at its zenith. That implies recognition that the objective trend towards socialism is irreversible.

Will not this lead to the rise and spread of the "poor man's church," so intimately associated with the longing for deep-going social transformations? That longing, evident in Spain and other countries, is a concomitant of the mounting class struggle. And will we, Communists, contribute to this movement, thereby furthering the prospect of joint struggle for socialism, which the movement itself proposes? In discussing the origins and significance of religion, Engels remarked that it would be folly to declare war on religion. He condemned Duehring's pseudo-revolutionary idea of "banning" religion in a socialist society.

Engels expressed that thought a hundred years ago, when there was nothing remotely resembling the present religious revolt. Lenin pointed out that in approaching this problem "a Marxist must be able to view the concrete situation as a whole, he must always be able to find the boundary between anarchism and opportunism. . . ." (*Collected Works*, Vol. 15, p. 408.)

What does the present situation show?

It shows that the protest against the humility prescribed by religion is mobilizing millions of Catholics to combat religion as the "opium of the people."

Within the "religious organizations" — which can be regarded as official institutions and, judging by the attitude of their leaders, as tools of the reactionary bourgeoisie—there is growing opposition, protest and struggle against their rigid traditionalism. Millions of Catholics who have abandoned the old doctrine of humility and meek submission accept and participate in the class struggle and are determined to see it through to victory—right up to the abolition of classes in a socialist society.

Not long ago Father Gonzalez Ruiz suggested elaborating a "theology of labor."

At the recent International Lay Apostolate Congress in Rome, there was talk of devising a "theology of revolution," an idea that has come from other theologians too.

This interest in the past, in the traditions and fundamentals of early Christianity, in the so-called "Prophetic church," although displayed at a different level, is apparently fostered by the fact that mankind is now passing through the transitional stage from capitalism to socialism. However, the most important thing is to understand how the new realities in Christianity can accelerate this process.

This requires that we overcome "instrumentalist" criteria, where these still exist, both in relation to Catholic and all other supporters of socialism. That will make for a fuller appreciation of the breadth and depth of the pro-socialist trend in modern Catholicism. But, of course, our Catholic allies and opponents should reciprocate by taking a frank and honest attitude towards us.

"Only the class struggle of the working masses could, by comprehensively drawing the widest strata of the proletariat into conscious and revolutionary social practice, really free the oppressed masses from the yoke of religion," Lenin wrote. (*Collected Works*, Vol. 15, p. 403.)

That has been wholly confirmed by reality. But freeing the masses from religion is a long socio-historical process, and the objective trend towards the withering away of religion—recognized today by outstanding theologians—will continue in a socialist society until relations between men are expressed in "visible and reasonable contacts between themselves and with nature," as Marx pointed out. These major factors have to be reckoned with both in our alliances and in our ideological struggle against Catholicism.

The truth of Marxism-Leninism has been conclusively confirmed by reality. However, the triumph of the social system for which we are fighting will to a large extent depend directly on our ability to gauge new phenomena and take them into account in our struggle for the revolutionary refashioning of society.

The Lenin centenary

In April 1970 the Communist Party and all the peoples of the Soviet Union and the working men of all countries will mark the centenary of the birth of Vladimir Lenin.

The Central Committee of the CPSU adopted a special resolution, "On Preparations for the Centenary of the Birth of Vladimir Lenin," which has met with a broad response among the Soviet people and progressives throughout the world. The resolution recalls the impact of Lenin's ideas on the course of world development.

Lenin has gone down in history as a brilliant theoretician of the proletarian revolution and the socialist transformation of society.

His profound knowledge of Marxist theory and analysis of the new historical experience enabled him to carry forward and enrich the teaching of Marx. Leninism is the Marxism of the new historical epoch, the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, of the transition from capitalism to socialism and the building of communist society. Leninism is an eternally living source of creative revolutionary thought and action.

Lenin's teaching about imperialism as the last stage of capitalism, about the party of a new type, about socialist revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat in its various forms, about socialist democracy, the alliance of the working class with the peasantry and all the working people, about the nationalities question and the ways of building a socialist society—all these treasures of Lenin's thinking constitute a reliable weapon of the Communist Party and of the world revolutionary movement.

While treating theory not as a dogma, but as a guide to action, Lenin consistently defended the purity of Marxism and tolerated no distortion of revolutionary theory.

In our time revolutionary theory is being constantly enriched by the theoretical activity of the CPSU and the fraternal parties, by the collective thought of the world Communist movement.

Lenin has gone down in history as the

greatest leader of the proletarian revolution, the founder and leader of the Bolshevik Party—the vanguard of the working class, a party of a new type, the party of socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, the party of the construction of socialism and communism, the highest form of socio-political organization.

Lenin's life and activities are inseparable from the struggle of the working class and the Communist Party. Life has confirmed Lenin's idea that a party can stand at the head of the fight only if it is guided by a progressive theory and can ensure correct political leadership.

The Great October Socialist Revolution and the history-making gains of socialism constitute the greatest victory of the strategy and tactics of Leninism. The leading role of the Communist Party, Lenin pointed out, is needed not only for the winning of power by the working people, but also for building socialism and communism.

Lenin attached decisive importance to the principles of democratic centralism, which ensure unity of ideas and actions of the Party, consolidation of conscious discipline and cohesion of its ranks, promotion of inner-Party democracy and constructive activity of its members. Leninist norms and principles of Party life were reflected in the documents of the Twenty-Third Congress of the CPSU.

Lenin has gone down in history as the founder and leader of the world's first socialist state, a state of workers and peasants. He further elaborated on the Marxist teaching on the state and made a profound analysis of the historical significance of the Republic of the Soviets as a state of a new type which is immeasurably more advanced and democratic than any bourgeois-parliamentary republic.

Lenin emphasized that a large-scale modern industry can be the only possible material foundation of socialism. The only kind of construction worthy to be called socialist is that which is conducted according to a comprehensive general plan with

the aim of making efficient use of economic and material resources. The half-century experience of socialism has confirmed the soundness of the Leninist policy of building a large-scale socialist industry and reorganizing agriculture along socialist lines.

Socialism, Lenin said, means active creative endeavor by the people, with the working people themselves building a new life and using all their experience to solve the extremely difficult problems of socialist organization. Socialism offers extensive opportunities for the participation of millions of workers and peasants in running society and provides material and political guarantees of the rights of the working people. In the process of communist construction there takes place improvement and further development of socialist statehood and democracy. The indispensable political condition for strengthening and extending socialist democracy is the leadership of the Communist Party as the spokesman of the working class and the entire people.

Freedom for working people means above all freedom from exploitation, from social, political and national oppression, from backwardness and ignorance. The question of freedom, Lenin said, should be considered in the concrete historical aspect: Freedom for whom, for what class? Freedom from what? Freedom in what?

The interests of socialism, the interests of the people demand protection of the gains of socialist democracy from the intrigues of capitalism, from anti-socialist elements.

Further development of socialist democracy presupposes cultivation in all members of society of an irreconcilable attitude towards all encroachments on the principles and standards of behavior in the socialist society.

Lenin made an inestimable contribution to the elaboration of problems of the cultural revolution, to the theoretical and practical solution of the nationalities problem.

Lenin substantiated the military program of the proletarian revolution, the teaching on the defense of the socialist motherland.

The Communist Party and the people of the Soviet Union, following Lenin's behests and overcoming enormous difficulties, turned the USSR in an historically short period into a mighty socialist power.

The victory of the Soviet people in the Great Patriotic War, the destruction of fascism was convincing confirmation of the

invincibility of the Soviet state and of the loyalty of the multinational Soviet people to the ideas of Marxism-Leninism.

The complete and final victory of socialism in the USSR and the transition to communist construction constitute an embodiment of Lenin's ideas in practice, a triumph of the policy of the Communist Party.

Lenin has gone down in history as the recognized leader of the world proletariat, of the international Communist movement. He contributed greatly to the elaboration of the strategy and tactics of the Communist movement, to the strengthening of the international unity of the proletariat. "Capital," Lenin explained, "is an international force. To vanquish it, an international workers' alliance, an international workers' brotherhood, is needed.

"We are opposed to national enmity and discord, to national exclusiveness. We are internationalists." The Communist International, founded on Lenin's initiative, played an outstanding role in rallying the revolutionary forces. Lenin combated opportunism, adventurism and nationalism in the international labor movement.

History has fully confirmed Lenin's analysis of world development.

The advance of the international working class, of the socialist world system to the central place in the modern epoch, the successes of the revolutions of national liberation constitute history-making victories for Marxism-Leninism. Lenin's prophecy that no matter how the imperialist bourgeoisie may rave in its fury, the victory of the new, socialist system is inevitable, is proving true. An acute struggle of two ideologies—socialist and bourgeois—is taking place in the world, and Lenin's call to "overcome resistance from the capitalists in all its forms, not only in the military and political spheres, but also ideological resistance, which is the most deep-seated and the strongest," is more topical today than ever. The imperialist bourgeoisie relies on nationalist, revisionist and leftist elements in its effort to blunt class consciousness, to undermine the ideological and political cohesion of the peoples of the socialist countries, to break up the unity of the working people. There can be no neutralism, no compromise in this struggle. To expose the reactionary nature of bourgeois ideology is a revolutionary duty of Marxist-Leninists. Without this the cause of peace, democracy and socialism cannot be upheld and carried forward.

Lenin was an ardent champion of the

freedom and happiness of the working people. The Soviet people fully agree with the idea expressed in the Central Committee's resolution that "there is nothing loftier and nobler than to follow Lenin, to fight selflessly for the cause to which he devoted his life."

To mark the Lenin centenary in a fitting manner is a matter of honor for the Party and the entire Soviet people. Concrete plans of preparation for the Lenin jubilee are being drafted and implemented in the republics, territories and regions, in towns and villages, at industrial and agricultural enterprises, in army and navy units.

Soviet workers, peasants and intellectuals are responding with deeds to the Communist Party's appeal to greet the Lenin jubilee with new achievements in communist construction. They agree with the Party that the best way to mark the anniversary is to concentrate on the program of economic and cultural development. The year 1970 is the concluding year of the current five-year plan in the course of which the transition to the new system of planning and economic stimulation is being effected. The workers of Moscow, Leningrad and other cities have pledged to complete the five-year plan assignments before November 7 and, wherever possible, before April 22, 1970, Lenin's birthday. The emulation is already producing results, with thousands of tons of metal and machine tools turned out in excess of plan and many new houses, schools, etc., completed ahead of schedule.

A highly important task, the resolution points out, is to carry forward Marxist-Leninist theory, the powerful ideological weapon of the Communist Party in the fight for the triumph of communism. Scholars have concentrated on elaborating topical problems of Marxist-Leninist theory pertaining to the economic aspects of communist construction, development and consolidation of socialist democracy, communist education, theoretical generalization of the processes of the revolutionary liberation movement and the entire world development.

New editions of Lenin's writings, new works on Lenin and reminiscences of his contemporaries, and art productions devoted to Lenin are being prepared.

Demonstrating the struggle of the Party and the entire Soviet people for the implementation of Lenin's behests, the importance of Marxism-Leninism for revolutionary reconstruction and the historical role of Lenin as a great thinker and revolutionary, the leader of the international Communist and working-class movement, and explaining the significance of the Marxist-Leninist teaching for the construction of socialism and communism, for the development and consolidation of the socialist world system and the international revolutionary movement—such is the main content of the political work launched among all sections of the population of the Soviet Union before the glorious Lenin jubilee.

O.G.

German Communist Party: alive and fighting

Outlawed 12 years ago, the Communist Party of Germany, vanguard of the workers of the Federal Republic, is carrying on its work.

In four European countries Communist parties are banned—Spain, Portugal and Greece, which are three fascist states, and in West Germany, which bears the fig leaf of bourgeois democracy.

Bonn outlawed the Communist Party to

make the climate more advantageous for entry into Nato, for speeding up the arming of the Bundeswehr and clearing the way for a reactionary home and aggressive foreign policy.

Yet the neo-nazi National-Democratic Party (NDP) backed by West German monopoly capital is allowed to function; whitewashing Hitlerism, contaminating people with the venom of chauvinism and

racism, advocating nuclear weapons for the Bundeswehr, this Party is openly peddling revanchist ideas. That, precisely, is the reason why the top men in the Federal Republic bent on changing the status quo in Europe under cover of the so-called new eastern policy, treat it so benignly. The neo-nazis are anxious to win Bundestag seats in the next elections, and that seems to be within the realm of possibility because many electors, turning their backs on the Social-Democrats with their "policy of community" and "grand coalition" with the CDU-CSU are likely to vote for other parties, including the NDP.

Like Hitler, Bonn has failed to destroy the Communist Party, alive and fighting despite the persecution and winning influence because it is the only party offering an alternative which can be supported by other democratic forces. Its prestige has risen, as Comrade Max Reimann, First Secretary of the CC CPG, pointed out, after the appearance of the draft Party Program in February, which analyzes current West German problems, surveys the experience of class struggle and points the way to the country's democratic and socialist reconstruction.

The search for an alternative to the policy of the monopolies has aroused interest in Marxism, especially among the youth, and interest in the way it is embodied in the German Democratic Republic, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. This interest is impelled by the achievements of the socialist states in all spheres and by the popularization of Marxism by various societies and circles.

The Communist Party of Germany plays an important part in disseminating the ideas of scientific communism. So much so that the FRG Interior Minister admitted in a recent government report that "the Communists have made substantial headway."

The Communist Party combats anti-Communist falsifications, militarism, revanchism and neo-nazism; it stands for democracy, freedom for the people, and for the unity of the working class. It exposes the hypocrisy of the Kiesinger-Brandt "new

eastern policy" and advocates a detente, normalization with the GDR and improvement of relations with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

West Germany needs a legal Communist Party as an effective opposition to parties representing the interests of monopoly capital, for no other party has a program that envisages a cardinal change of power relations in the state and society. "The CPG alone," says a CPG statement issued on the 12th anniversary of the unlawful ban, "has thoroughly considered and outlined the way to a democratic change of the situation."

More workers and progressives in West Germany are raising their voices in behalf of the Communist Party. A demonstration against the ban was held in Mannheim. In Duesseldorf Communists held a discussion on communist ideas and the local Workers' Circle for the Legalization of the CPG distributed posters calling for the reinstatement of the Party. In Hamburg, too, handbills to that effect were issued on the 12th anniversary of the ban. Examples of this kind are many. A Committee for the Legalization of the CPG is working actively in the country, campaigning under the slogan, "Freedom for the Communist Party!"

The public in the German Democratic Republic, too, demands lifting the ban. M. Kapluk, a member of the Committee for the Legalization of the CPG, and E. Mueckenberger, member of the Political Bureau, SUPG, addressed a mass rally in Berlin. Noting that Bonn had failed to oust the Communist Party from the West German political scene, Kapuk said, "We Communists will work on with all the other democratic forces in West Germany for a policy of detente and lasting peace." Mueckenberger pointed to the Party's heroic struggle for the people's interests and demanded lifting the ban.

The international campaign for the legalization of the CPG is gaining momentum, joined by people of different political convictions, by all who cherish peace and social progress. The unlawful, undemocratic ban must be lifted.

R.S.

On modern bourgeois political economy

LEV ALTER

Expanding productive forces, scientific and technological progress and an ever-deepening division of social labor—these explain the vastly increased role of economic science in the life of bourgeois society. The emergence of state-monopoly capitalism, which reflects these objective processes, has further enhanced the role of economic science which, increasingly, becomes a direct instrument of management and rule.

The functions of bourgeois economic science, now much more complex, serve not only the private interests of capitalist firms and their associations, not only the job of defending and vindicating capitalism, but also the ever-increasing practice of state regulation and programming of the capitalist economy. Nowadays the economic experts are summoned to defend capitalism in conditions of its general crisis and in the economic competition with the socialist world, with the result that economic science finds itself closely connected with ideological struggle, economic policy and practice.

This broadening of the functions of bourgeois political economy under state-monopoly capitalism confronts its Marxist critics with a number of challenging problems. A dogmatic, indiscriminate approach to these problems will hardly make the struggle against bourgeois ideology more effective. On the other hand, we should resolutely reject the revisionist view which, based on the growing economic regulation and programming, claims that bourgeois political economy is undergoing "de-apologetization."

It is indisputable that regulation and programming have gained wide currency under state-monopoly capitalism, but they are used in the interests of the monopolies. On the other hand, they serve as added proof of the pressing need for planned socialist development of social production as a whole. Far from changing the nature of capitalism, the new phenomena testify merely to the maturity of all material, social and many organizational prerequisites for the transition to socialism.

Recent years have witnessed a marked growth in Marxist economic thinking. The scientific conferences on economic theory and policy (Rome, 1965), on state-monopoly capitalism (Choisy-le-Roi, France, 1966) and the 50th anniversary of Lenin's work on imperialism (Moscow, 1967) yielded a profound analysis of the new processes and phenomena in the modern capitalist economy and enriched Marxist science with new and fruitful ideas. A useful contribution to the elaboration of the new problems was made also by the conference of Marxist economists (in Berlin, 1960; in Sofia, 1964; in Bratislava, 1966).

The rise of state-monopoly capitalism has led to the withdrawal from the theoretical arena of the older schools in bourgeois political economy. Differentiation of trends expressing the interests of the monopoly and non-monopoly bourgeoisie and also the small bourgeoisie is deepening; this is at once the result and the ideological reflection of changes in the line-up of social and political forces in the present-day capitalist world between

labor and capital and between the monopoly bourgeoisie and all the anti-monopoly strata of society. This differentiation in bourgeois political economy is a highly complex process, for the ideologists of the different strata of the big, middle and small bourgeoisie can belong to the same or to different trends—for instance, supporters and opponents of the marginal utility theory, supporters and opponents of economic regulation by the state, etc., with the result that each trend is often marked by a certain social heterogeneity.

The differentiation in the trends of economic thought is acknowledged also by the bourgeois economists. Monsen, for instance, singles out "five ideologies of American capitalism": classical (free competition), managerial, "people's capitalism," "the force of equilibrium," and "entrepreneurial democracy." These "five ideologies" reflect differences in the attitude and tactics of different groups of ideologists of the monopoly bourgeoisie. But in capitalist economic thought as a whole there is a more profound differentiation between these "five ideologies" and the ideology of the radical intelligentsia, the petty-bourgeois critics of monopoly and Left leaders in the labor and democratic movement who are often close to Marxism.

Full credit goes to those Marxist critics who in recent times have rejected, in the main, the widespread sweeping approach of the past to the various trends in bourgeois economic science. That approach, dogmatic in essence, helped neither an objective scientific evaluation of these trends nor the consolidation of the anti-monopoly front. It would be wrong to put all non-Marxist economists in the brackets of bourgeois political economy and to lump together bourgeois economics and the various radical trends in the all-inclusive generic concept of "non-Marxist political economy" devoid of class characteristics. The theoretical and programmatic divergencies in economic science, just as the new alignment of socio-political forces in the conditions of the general crisis of capitalism and the economic competition between the two world systems, call for a more comprehensive and more differentiated approach.

* * *

The present diversity of trends in bourgeois political economy had its origins in the aftermath of the world economic

crisis of 1929-33, when *Keynesianism* came to the fore, followed by the formation, from earlier trends, of *anti-Keynesian* schools. Keynesian theory can be said to have provided the theoretical basis for the emergence and initial development of state-monopoly capitalism. Later, as state-monopoly capitalism developed and the problem of economic competition between the two social systems became more acute, these two basic trends crystallized in the main into neo-Keynesian and neo-classical theories of growth.

J. M. Keynes rejected the traditional concepts of an automatic self-regulating capitalist economy, pointed to some of its discrepancies and contradictions, above all the lack of effective demand. He opposed the "optimism" of the traditional economic theory one defect of which he saw in underestimating the obstacle to prosperity caused by lack of effective demand. Thus, while rejecting the older forms of bourgeois apologia, Keynesianism, in effect, is a new, more refined form of it.

Proceeding from the assumption that the contradictions of the capitalist economy can be removed by methods of state regulation, the Keynes school has elaborated a theoretical basis for a "planned capitalism," "full employment," "crisis-free capitalism" and "transformation of capitalism" as a whole. At the same time Keynesianism is yet another form of vulgar economics, for its analysis, far from penetrating into the essence of economic laws, merely scratches the surface of the economic phenomena.

The Keynesian model distorts objective cause-and-effect inter-relations in the sphere of production. It takes as points of departure for research, categories of social psychology (inclinations, preferences) which are in fact the end result and not the cause of profound socio-economic processes. This is clearly shown by the multiplier model which describes the profit-investment ratio as a function of propensity to consume and, moreover, considers it to have no relation to the class structure of society and to the social nature of production.

Reducing the analysis to external functional links predominantly in the sphere of circulation, without elucidating the cause-and-effect independences and the social nature of economic relationships, detracts much from the cognitive value of the Keynesian model which, far from revealing, obscures the real causes of the low "propensity to consume" and of the lack of effec-

tive demand inherent in the antagonistic class structure of bourgeois society.

These features make the Keynesian model a highly suitable theoretical basis for a system of economic regulation favorable to monopoly capital. On the one hand, disregard for the real cause-and-effect interconnections makes it possible to create an illusion of capitalism becoming a progressive neo-capitalism; on the other, the assertion that the marginal productivity of capital is an independent variable of the economic process puts maintenance of high capitalist profits in the center of the entire system of economic regulation. The class essence of Keynes's economic regulation is seen in that it proceeds from the inverse dependence of the level of employment on that of real wages, implying that full employment can be achieved by reducing wages to the level of the so-called marginal labor product. According to Keynes, growth of employment in conditions of economic equilibrium is impossible unless real wages are reduced. Hence the policy of "wage regulation" in capitalist countries to prevent "inflation of wages," i.e., to freeze or even to reduce them. Thus the Keynesian approach combines the bourgeois-reformist vision of a crisis-free economy of full employment with programs for reducing the standard of living of the working people.

While pointing to the class, bourgeois-apologetic essence of Keynesianism, Marxist critique does not ignore the practical possibilities offered by its program and those progressive trends of economic thought endeavoring to use the Keynesian model on behalf of the democratic sections of society. Regulation of the rate of interest on loans and of tax rates, the system of state purchases and orders, budgetary measures to encourage investment—all these attributes of the Keynesian program can, given certain conditions, mitigate the impact of economic crises and provide jobs. But these measures do not eliminate the real sources of the contradictions in the capitalist economy. They drive them deeper, as is the case, for instance, with the widely practised deficit financing, raising the ceiling of the state debt, and maintaining a "moderate" inflation. Nevertheless, they do produce temporary practical results, and have a more lasting effect when methods of so-called automatic compensation are applied, i.e., when deficit financing during a recession is made good by a favorable budgetary balance during the boom and a cyclical budgetary equilibrium is thereby

achieved. A certain positive role is also played by the so-called built-in stabilizers, such as income-tax rates, social insurance payments and agricultural procurement prices, which automatically regulate changes in budgetary revenue and personal income during booms and slumps.

Obviously, the regulation operates mostly in the sphere of finance, credit and money circulation, since capitalist ownership rules out direct planning of the production process. But to the extent that the finance and credit sphere influences the process of social production, the Keynesian programs can influence, although indirectly, capitalist business conditions. For instance, the growth of the annual index of U.S. industrial production in 1962-66 was in large measure due to state regulation. We should not, of course, overlook the military character of this regulation — the growth of military expenditure, especially in connection with the Vietnam escalation. But an important role was played also by the 1964 tax reform, the use of accelerated depreciation, the reduction of interest on long-term credits and the growth of government purchases and orders. As the draft program of the Communist Party of the United States points out, "the federal government is now a \$100 billion-a-year business. . . Government has been fashioned into a funnel through which billions of dollars extracted as taxes from the entire nation are poured into the coffers of giant corporations."

The specific role of Keynesianism is that it offers practical measures to regulate economic processes, measures more effective than those offered by all previous schools of bourgeois political economy. Hence some of the Keynesian methods are used not only in the interests of the monopolies, they are recognized also by leaders of the middle and petty bourgeoisie, the radical intelligentsia, trade unions and farmers. Thus a peculiar situation arises: although Keynesian theory demands, by its nature, pressure on the standard of living of the working class, some of its formulas, such as "full employment," "increased consumer propensity," "lower interest rates," etc., are used by many democratic organizations. As a result, there have emerged in Keynesianism radical and left trends opposed to its reactionary wing, and these constitute a significant school of modern economic thought. Economists adhering to the Marxist standpoint sup-

port the above-mentioned practical demands, and at the same time criticize the reformist illusions of left Keynesianism. However, the main point in their analysis is their refutation of the anti-popular nature of the economic regulation based on Keynesian programs.

Although these programs do exert indirect influence on the state of the capitalist economy, the influence, it should be said, is limited. They cannot eliminate the cyclical character of capitalist production and free capitalism from recessions and crises in the sphere of production, circulation and the currency and finance system. Ample evidence of this is furnished by the results of 1967, when the rate of economic growth slowed down sharply in the United States; industrial production dropped in Britain and in Federal Germany; sterling was devalued and the dollar lost stability. Was this due to inadequate use of the fashionable economic recipes? No, behind all this lies the immanent defect of the capitalist system.

* * *

The clash of interests among the diverse groups of the bourgeoisie, including the monopoly bourgeoisie, provides fertile soil for other trends in bourgeois political economy, which persist in giving preference to the traditional forces of the capitalist economy over state regulation. Such pillars of orthodox "classical" views as L. Mises, F. Knight, H. Haslitt, the so-called Chicago school, the "neo-liberal" school in Federal Germany, and others, have come out vigorously against the Keynesian "religion of state control," counterposing to it the traditional thesis that "the free market is much better equipped to effect these readjustments."

The argument between the advocates of state regulation and the "free market," or "free enterprise," reflects the contradictions between different groups of the monopoly bourgeoisie. But opponents of state regulation are found also among the spokesmen of the non-monopoly bourgeoisie, since its practical realization benefits monopoly and harms small business.

The progressive forces in the capitalist world insist on state regulation of the economy to restrict monopoly domination and raise the standard of living of the working people. A positive contribution to the struggle for this democratic alternative can be made by those radical trends in economics calling for replacement of

pro-monopoly regulation by anti-monopoly regulation, and also by some of the petty-bourgeois champions of the free market.

However, the difference between the Marxist understanding of the democratic alternative to pro-monopoly regulation and its petty-bourgeois understanding lies in the recognition of its necessity and exceptional importance as a stage in the future transition to a socialist alternative, i.e., planning of the entire economy on the basis of state power of the working people and public ownership of the principal means of production.

All schools of bourgeois political economy are preoccupied today with problems of the rate, scale and structure of long-term economic growth. "To make the sixties a decade of rapid economic growth" is an objective of both the latest theoretical investigations and government policy.

The emphasis on these problems is due to the new stage in the economic competition between the two social systems, the aggravation of the contradictions and difficulties in the capitalist countries, and the emergence of new and acute problems pertaining to the prospects of development of the newly-free countries. In these conditions both the Keynesian model, with its reliance on utilization of available resources and not on the dynamics of growth and efficiency, and the formula of automatic self-regulation within the framework of the current economic situation, which ignores factors of protracted growth, have proved inadequate, and the need has arisen to dynamize, so to speak, both models, to turn macro-economics into dynamic macro-economics. But the basic contradiction remains, as is evident from the different principles of building neo-Keynesian models of economic growth — open models, which demand active state influence on the factors of economic growth, and neo-classical closed models containing a mechanism of self-regulated sustained growth.

* * *

The *neo-Keynesian* models of economic growth proceed from an analysis of the dependence of growth rates on the share of accumulation in the national income and the effectiveness (productivity) of accumulation. The formulas of this dependence, though couched in specifically Keynesian terms, are the basis for the models of R. Harrod (rate of growth equals maximum saving divided by the capital inten-

sity factor) and E. Domar (rate of growth equals maximum share of accumulation and investment multiplied by their productivity, or investment-profit ratio). These dependencies actually exist in the process of reproduction, and they were long ago scientifically elucidated in Marx's and Lenin's theory and patterns of reproduction. But the neo-Keynesian theories see these dependencies in a distorted form. They ignore the specifically capitalist contradictions of economic growth, the dependence of rate of accumulation on rate of surplus value (i.e., the degree of exploitation of the working class), the inevitability of slumps in the process of growth, the impediments raised by the capitalist monopolies, and so on. This basic defect of the neo-Keynesian theories renders impossible the attainment, under capitalism, of the so-called natural rate of growth, which presupposes full utilization of all the resources of accumulation and an optimal level of its effectiveness in keeping with the possibilities of modern technology. Achievement of this optimum is prevented by the parasitic consumption of the exploiter classes, the anarchy of production, contradictory private interests, crises, under-capacity operation, and unemployment.

Some neo-Keynesian models — those of A. Hansen, G. Hicks, H. Scherman and others — incorporate a mechanism of cyclical fluctuations and make it possible to construct a "model of cyclical growth," which is more realistic than the models suggested by Harrod and Domar. They are designed to smooth out or even eliminate cycles through long-term state regulation. Aware that the cyclical character of the capitalist economy and the losses caused by crises slow down growth of production, their authors are searching for ways of eliminating the cycles. Here we get the reproduction, on a new basis, of both Keynes's "pessimistic" thesis concerning the inevitability of recessions in the course of the spontaneous development of the capitalist economy, and the apologetic "optimism" concerning the ability of state regulation to abolish cycles and secure rapid and stable growth rates.

* * *

The so-called *neo-classical* theory of economic growth (N. Kaldor, T. Haavelmo, R. Solow, J. Meade), which is also closely connected with the cardinal problems of

economic policy and political struggle, does not regard accumulation as the sole source of growth; it attaches great importance to technological progress, workers' skills, the economic infrastructure and other factors. It constructs economic models with a feedback mechanism based on competition and presupposing the possibility of stabilizing a crisis-free balanced economic growth by means of automatic self-regulation of the capitalist economy. Thus the neo-classical theory sees capitalism's salvation, not in state regulation and programming of the economy, but mainly in its automatic self-regulation. Although Say's old concept cannot be restored in its entirety today, its present-day followers believe it necessary sharply to limit those forms of state intervention likely to prejudice the interests of the big monopolies and, at the same time, to exploit the "free enterprise" atmosphere for bolstering their rule.

Whereas Keynesianism concentrates on those new phenomena in the modern capitalist economy which favor the regulating role of the state, the neo-classical school attaches primary importance to processes associated with the latest technological and structural changes. M. Abramovich, R. Solow, E. Denison, T. Schultz and others expound the theory of "ameliorating capital," meaning its technical renovation without further physical build-up, through capital-saving investments and raising the share of depreciation in investments.

Some of these processes actually take place. For instance, there is the trend to reduce capital to output ratio of the product and increase the share of depreciation in overall investments. We are also witnessing such phenomena, marked by the neo-classical conceptions, as greater spending on the infra-structure, the non-productive sphere and on raising the educational and professional skills of workers ("human investments"). But these phenomena are interpreted in an apologetic way: "improvement of capital" is regarded as discontinuation of the growth of its organic composition and, consequently, of its inherent contradictions (B. Higgins); the increased importance of technology and education is used to emphasize the role of such factors as national income growth, capital, labor, technology, education and skills (M. Abramovich, E. Denison); "human investments" are treated as the basis for defining wages as interest on capital

invested in a "human being" (T. Schultz, A. Becker), and so on.

The insolvency of the neo-classical theory stems from the outdated concept of "pure competition," non-existent under monopoly capitalism, which is vested with the mystical task of equalizing payment for production factors with their so-called marginal products. The very idea of automatic self-regulation of the expanding system of the modern capitalist economy is unrealistic. Self-regulation has taken place under non-monopoly capitalism, but it has led not to balanced growth but to grave disproportions and crises. Under monopoly and state-monopoly capitalism, when the complexity of production contacts vastly increases and all contradictions of the capitalist economy are aggravated, automatic self-regulation is fraught with disproportions and still graver crisis upheavals. In this respect, but only in this, Keynesianism and neo-Keynesianism evince a greater degree of understanding of the new conditions of economic development compared with anti-Keynesianism, including the neo-classical theories of economic growth.

The neo-classical programs, too, contain elements, dictated by the development of the productive forces, which can be utilized, not for the enrichment of the monopolies, but, given a democratic anti-monopoly policy, for raising the living standard of the population. They are opposed to deficit financing, growth of the state debt and inflation, and aim at maintaining general economic conditions for balanced economic growth, stable prices and currency circulation, balancing the budget, developing the infrastructure, promoting research, stimulating technological progress and encouraging "human investments." At the same time, the neo-classical theory narrows down the functions of anti-cyclical regulation and the policy of employment, considering that these problems should be resolved by automatic development of the economy and that moderate recessions and unemployment are indispensable for maintaining the flexibility of the system. And, of course, it ignores the genuine interests of the working people affected by the crises and unemployment.

The democratic alternative to Keynesian regulation programs is at the same time a democratic alternative to the neo-classical economic programs. Opposed to both concepts, it not only conforms to the vital interests of the masses but constitutes an

essential link on the way to realization of the tasks of social progress.

* * *

With the onset of the economic competition between the two systems, with capitalism suffering ever heavier defeats, bourgeois political economy had to occupy itself with problems of the political economy of socialism. And Marxists have had to study the three methods of ideological struggle employed by bourgeois political economy against socialism:

First, traditional bourgeois criticism by such advocates of anti-communism as L. Mises, F. Hayeck and A. Wheber, the Sovietologists who declare socialism, public ownership and planning to be an enforced, artificial system, a "command" economy in which economic laws do not operate normally and which is incapable of functioning rationally, and so on. Second, a novel method — "juxtaposition of economic systems" (W. Loucks, K. Wilcox and others), which more often than not obscures the fundamental differences between socialism and capitalism, the advantages of socialism and the prospect of its victory in the economic competition. Third, also a new phenomenon, attempts to devise a capitalist version of the political economy of socialism (J. Schumpeter, A. Lerner, P. Wiles, R. Daniels, to mention but a few). This concept of so-called non-Marxist socialism takes the principle of subjective marginal utility as the basis of the socialist economy, thus turning the latter into a variety of market economy subject to conversion into capitalist forms.

Engels' criticism of the Jevons-Menger theory of use-value and marginal utility as a superficial theory of vulgar socialism is applicable to Schumpeter's insistence on the need to replace the labor theory of value and reproduction in the socialist economy, in its price-formation system and methodology of optimal planning by the theory of subjective marginal utility. Equally untenable is the claim that the Marxist theory of value cannot ensure optimal correlation of expenditures and requirements. On the contrary, it is this theory that determines the socially necessary expenditure of working time depending on the technical conditions of production, making these expenditures conform to the volume and structure of social requirements. Therefore, a scientific basis for economic optimum is provided only by Marx's labor theory of value, and not by the theory

of marginal utility which has nothing to do with the objective content of economic processes. Hence the importance of the labor theory of value and of the further criticism of the bourgeois theory of marginal utility not only for a correct understanding of present-day capitalism, but also for the political economy of socialism and for the criticism of its distortion by the ideologues of anti-communism. Here we encounter yet another aspect of the tremendous importance of Marx's *Capital*, enabling us to refute all three bourgeois conceptions of socialism. The first, insisting on the artificial nature of socialism, is wholly disproved by the objective laws of economic development discovered by Marx and which call for bringing the relations of production into harmony with the new productive forces and thus make replacement of capitalist by socialist ownership and the transition to socialism inevitable. Likewise, from the standpoint of Marx's strictly scientific theory of socio-economic formations and their replacement through social revolutions the theory of convergence underlying the other two bourgeois conceptions of socialism and devoid of any real criterion of the mode of production does not hold water.

The convergence theory as represented by Galbraith's and Tinbergen's views regarding evolution towards an "optimal society," Rostow's and Perroux's image of a "single industrial society," Buckingham's idea of "hybridization of the two systems," etc., rests on two arguments: a) the similarity of the material and technical structures of the industrially developed capitalist and socialist countries, and b) the similarity of certain economic categories and forms — commodity-money categories under socialism, programming and other new phenomena in the capitalist economy.

It goes without saying that while criticizing the theory of convergence we should not overlook the new phenomena to which it refers, our job is to explain them in a scientific way. The relative similarity of the material and technical structures shows that the material prerequisites for the transition to socialism have fully ripened in the capitalist world, and it is absurd to interpret this as proof of the need for the socialist economy to go back to the capitalist forms. Not socialism's conversion, but the necessity of abolishing capitalism — that is what follows from an analysis of

the material and technical structures of modern society.

Nor does the existence and development of market relations in the socialist economy lead to its conversion, for, being based on the socialist mode of production, they are used to strengthen and develop it, as demonstrated by the economic reforms being effected in socialist countries. The absence of a scientific criterion of the mode of production is a fundamental defect of the current convergence theory.

Equally spurious, therefore, are the discourses on the conversion of capitalism. The new material and technological basis calls imperatively for the transition to socialism, but, under capitalist ownership, the basis alone, without class struggle, cannot give rise to socialism. For this reason all the new phenomena in the capitalist economy associated with the scientific and technological revolution and state-monopoly programming and which accelerate the maturing of material, social and organizational prerequisites of socialism do not change the exploiter nature of capitalism. State-monopoly capitalism is the highest and last, stage of capitalism and, as Lenin pointed out, the prologue to socialist revolution and socialism. The convergence theory itself is an indication that capitalism has outlived itself, that it is in the grip of a profound crisis, and that is why its ideologues are trying to put a socialist gloss on it. This shows also that they reckon with the growing popularity of socialism among the masses.

The Marxist teaching on the modes of production and social formations also helps refute the view, expounded by some radical bourgeois intellectuals, that convergence is a requisite of peaceful coexistence of states with differing social systems. While actively supporting all advocates of peaceful coexistence, we explain to them that it cannot be confused with the non-scientific theory of convergence, which distorts the historical perspective of the progressive development of society.

Thus, the fundamental socio-economic problems of our time can be solved only on the basis of creative application of Marxism-Leninism. Only by skilfully utilizing the powerful weapon of this science of revolution can we win complete ideological and political victory over all opponents of the working class and social progress.

Cybernetics and ideology

IB NORLUND, ILYA NOVIK

No one doubts any longer that cybernetics, expressive of the main trends and features of modern scientific and technical advance, is one of the greatest developments of the mid-twentieth century, a milestone in the advance of civilization and the prime mover of the now determinative process of automation in industry, transport and the services. Once upon a time, the machine revolutionized the structure of manual labor. Today, we have every reason to speak of the cybernetic revolution transforming mental work.

The importance of cybernetics continues to increase, and how effectively it is being used by the two opposed social systems has an immediate bearing on the results of the economic competition between them.

SCIENCE OF CONTROL

Control of production and transmission of information have always held importance in man's affairs. Yet no mathematically accurate theory of control existed until the compulsive need for automating increasingly complex objects made precision control imperative. That was when cybernetics, the science of the various processes of control and regulation, arrived on the scene, its rudimentary ideas set out in Norbert Wiener's "Cybernetics."

What cybernetics contributed to cognition were objective methods of precise description in the area of the formerly subjective processes of control and communication, expanding knowledge and especially the sphere of precise methods of quantity analysis. Besides, it had an immense practical impact, adding vastly to the effectiveness of conscious and deliberate influence on social processes.

The objects of cybernetic study range from man and his biological organization to social processes, covering systems of machines at factories, the sets of material objects interacting with man in production and, last but not least, the electronic computing machine.

To sum up, cybernetics abstracted from the specific features of complex systems is, in effect, a general theory of control designed to improve the organization of systems. That is something Marxist thought had worked on for years, being aware of the need for a special science of control.

In fact, we may go so far as to say that Marxism was oriented on creating a special accurate science of control. And if this was not accomplished, it was because the essential mathematical equipment was still lacking and no dependable means for intricate quantity computation were available. Marx was acutely aware that once the sciences began to use mathematics, they would become more precise. And according to Anatoly Lunacharsky, Lenin once remarked, "how good if we could resolve our social problems as precisely as the chemist resolves his in the laboratory" (See *Kommunist*, Moscow, 1966, No. 4, p. 61).

The cybernetic approach to quantity analysis is a generalized one, based on a quality content analysis of various phenomena. And though their variety is large, cybernetic devices have a common feature: information moves along a closed loop, a feedback system, the universal scheme being: program chamber — control device — executive mechanism — control chamber, the latter receiving information from the executive mechanism and

transmitting it back to the control device. This general model is applicable to a wide range of objects.

CYBERNETICS AND MARXISM

Theories appeared endeavoring to prove that Marxism was incompatible with cybernetics. One, aired at the Fifth International Cybernetics Congress in Namur in September 1967, maintained that socialism should either abandon Marxism and invoke cybernetics in carrying through the technological revolution, or abandon cybernetics and radical scientific and technical progress and uphold Marxism. This nonsense was repudiated by many delegates from capitalist as well as socialist countries.

It is fashionable to say nowadays that cybernetics alone — that is, minus social revolution — could reconstruct capitalist society. Cybernetics and automation are said to have the capacity for delivering the people in the capitalist countries from the hardships of exploitation.

Many theorists hold that cybernetics obscures the humanistic principles of civilization and even replaces men by machines, creating an abundance of material goods. Though paving the way to universal abundance, cybernetics is expected to impoverish individuals spiritually and make ideology redundant.

Objectivist talk about technical progress spurring "de-ideologization" is used in the fight against Marxism. Some anti-communists maintain that because of Marxist ideology the socialist countries will never assimilate the achievements of cybernetics.

That is the view expounded, among others, by G. Paloszi-Horvath in a recent book on cybernetics and Marxism, "Insurrection of Facts." The main purpose of the author was to brand the organizational principle of democratic centralism as contradicting the discoveries of cybernetics, though, in effect, scientific discoveries confirm and emphasize its benefits in administering democratic society and its general problems. Experience has shown that democratic centralism assures the most effective functioning of the body politic as an integral organism.

Paloszi-Horvath's train of thought betrays his annoyance with the fact that the socialist countries use cybernetics in the interest of the people and have condemned

in no uncertain terms the spurious idea that cybernetics is unscientific.

Creative Marxism harmonizes with cybernetics, which it provides with a theoretical foundation. Indisputably, Marxists have come to the fore over the past decade in cybernetic methodological research.

The key to the organic connection between Marxism and cybernetics is contained in the fundamental Marxist idea that a definite level of the productive forces is essential to attain man's supreme ideals. Marx predicted that to establish communism prior to a radical reconstruction of the productive forces would inevitably cause distortions and incongruities because, as he put it, without a high-level economic basis "there is nothing but universal poverty; yet in extreme need the fight for the essential objects would begin all over again, meaning that all the old abominations are sure to revive."

Always, Marxists centered their attention on rationalizing the social process, determining the most fruitful forms of activity and finding their effective combination, because for the Marxist the revolutionary establishment of the most desirable social structure gets top priority. In substance, the socialist revolution is destructive only in one sense: it destroys the old relations of production which act as a brake on the productive forces, while its mainspring is constructive and, in essence, organizational.

Social processes, and this is a typical feature, contain many factors which cybernetics, its theory and its technical vehicle, the electronic computing machine, enable us to calculate with a fairly high degree of accuracy. Admittedly, the cybernetic approach to control should not be seen as an absolute. Not all of the current social phenomena, and least of all the social process as a whole, can yet be cybernetically modelled.

A decisive role in social growth is played by class interests carried forward under the guidance of political parties. Cybernetic means do not conflict with political and economic guidance of the social process. On the contrary, they provide the technical facilities for making guidance more effective. That the Marxist-Leninist theory of planned and harmonious regulation is now equipped with cybernetic techniques will only spur on social progress. The combination of Marxism with cybernetics is a factor of historical progress in the latter half of our century.

The fundamental lines along which Marxism combines with cybernetics were anticipated by Marx in his reflections on automation as an imperative for the communist transformation of labor. Speaking of the eventual advancement of the labor process, Marx pointed out that man would stand not over the machine but beside it, turning from an agent of production into its master. In this transformed production the main source of activity and wealth will be "man's mastery of his own universal productive force, his knowledge and mastery of nature, rather than any direct labor he performs or the time in which he works" ("From Unpublished Manuscripts of Karl Marx," *Bolshevik*, Moscow, No. 11-12, 1939, p. 62).

Given collective ownership, progressive cybernetics makes this reconstruction of production practicable. It will not be out of place therefore to say that for cybernetics Marxism is a scientific sociological base, while for Marxism cybernetics is a dependable technical instrument for a radical and benign reconstruction of the very foundations of human activity.

Alongside candidly anti-communist ideas about Marxism's incompatibility with cybernetics, bourgeois writers maintain that universal cybernetic growth is "outside the pale of ideology." Showing that nations, including the socialist nations, are straining to overtake the United States, the recognized leader in electronic technology, they infer therefrom that technology is detached from ideology.

It is quite true that electronic computer systems and the theory of cybernetics are developed in capitalist and socialist countries alike. But the socialist basis, its humane aims, provide far more fertile soil for cybernetics both nationally and internationally. This is doubly obvious at present, in the midst of the economic reforms underway in the socialist states, when problems of scientific guidance come to the fore.

Some think that the United States is the stage on which the drama, "Machine versus Man," will be enacted first. Many think, too, that the further development of cybernetics depends on how Americans "digest" it. Indubitably, automation has created many new problems for capitalist society. Norbert Wiener, for example, observed that cybernetics may precipitate an economic upheaval dwarfing the effects of the 1929 world crisis.

Capitalism endeavors to exploit or, more

precisely, to adapt itself to, the technological revolution. However, after the October Revolution and the emergence of the world socialist system it has ceased to be the determinative force in history. No longer is the capitalist way of exploiting technico-scientific means universal in pushing forward technology. The drama, "Machine versus Man," on which the curtain has been raised in the United States, is not essentially worldwide. In the broad context, capitalist America is not staging a premiere. What it is putting on is rather a last performance. Technological revolution in the imperialist environment is no longer the sole model of productive growth.

An increasingly bigger share of humanity's productive resources is now being used in the interests of socialism, which utilizes the most advanced technical achievements, cybernetics included. In fact, computer techniques are in a state of precipitous growth in the socialist countries. The Soviet breakthrough in space exploration bears witness to this, for it was inconceivable without cybernetic development.

Pedagogics, the art of teaching, may be listed as another area in which the cybernetic trend is in evidence. With historical progress now depending more on the creative activity of individuals, communication of knowledge and man's capacity to absorb and process information gain top importance. Growing numbers of people are enlisted in teaching. It is steadily becoming one of the most widespread types of human relations.

Yet what concerns us is not just the giant growth of the role and scale of teaching. No less significant is the truly unprecedented expansion of information, information which every modern man has to digest in order to act completely in the contemporary social milieu. Sociologists are hinting at a new "downturn" resulting from over-saturation in man's "communicability." And it is quite true that an increasingly large part of our life is devoted to absorbing available information, less time being left us to discover and supply new information. Against this setting, the problem of making teaching and learning radically more effective is most acute, and doubly important for a society building communism and moulding active, knowledgeable and enterprising people.

Pedagogics sees teaching as a process of control in which the instructor regulates

the absorption of information by the student. This view is based on cybernetic ideas, many aspects of teaching being conceived as a system of successive operations, some of which may be delegated to a cybernetic device. It stands to reason that cybernetics provides but the technical means of easing the process of study. In cultivating ethics and political convictions among the younger generation the decisive role belongs to the educator, not the machine.

Incontestably, cybernetics will in time gain wider application in socialist society. Automation will become more widespread in industry. Modelling of thought processes and computerization of economics have a big future. Electronic diagnosing is sure to gain currently in medicine. The program of the Soviet Communist Party says: "Cybernetics, electronic computers and control devices will be used broadly in industry, building and transport, scientific research, planning and designing, and in the sphere of accounting and management."

CYBERNETICS AND DIALECTICS

The problem of the interaction and fusion of cybernetics and Marxism is at once a problem of working out a truly scientific cybernetic methodology. To develop more fruitfully and effectively, cybernetics must be based on the Marxist philosophy.

To prove this, let us examine some of the fundamental principles of cybernetics in the light of dialectical and historical materialism, the Marxist-Leninist philosophy. As we know, cybernetics stems from a number of sciences previously far removed from each other. The emergence of the new science at the junction between radio electronics, the theory of probability, neuro-physiology and logics revealed the synthetic tendency of knowledge. The very emergence of cybernetics bears out the basic ideas of dialectical materialism, which postulates that interaction of sciences, their convergence and synthesis, constitute the main law of cognition. Seeing the fruitfulness of this tendency, Engels stressed in his "Dialectics of Nature"—and this in the 19th century—that the weightiest scientific results should be expected precisely at the junctions between sciences.

At present, cybernetics is seen as a vehicle of theoretical analysis and experiment in many areas of science. It has invaded the technical sciences and taken

deep root in biological investigations. Its worth in sociology is incontestable. This is not surprising, for it offers a broad method of research — the method of cybernetic modelling—though, of course, the abstract cybernetic methods of cognition are taken in a dialectical unity with the traditional methods.

Given this dialectical approach, the charge of mechanicality levelled against exponents of cybernetic models becomes entirely groundless. True, mechanistic conclusions have been drawn by some authors under the signboard of cybernetics. It should be clear, however, that no science is responsible for any extremist ideas proclaimed on its behalf. Rationally understood as a special method of investigation, cybernetic modelling does not tolerate mechanistic extremes. Cybernetic methods will be universal in due course, spreading to more areas of science and technology.

To see the progressive impact and the limitations of cybernetic modelling, we should view the latter from the standpoint of dialectical materialism. The trend to universalize cybernetic modelling in its rational context does not counterpose cybernetics to materialist dialectics. Cybernetics does not contain methods opposed to dialectics. On the contrary, the association of cybernetics and dialectics brings out the essence of cybernetic modelling, just as it does in the case of all other scientific methods of cognition.

Philosophers and natural scientists have worked fruitfully in recent years to expand on the methodology of cybernetics, producing a basis for further, deeper, growth.

Marxist philosophy is approaching the end of its first stage of work in this area, a stage in which the accent was on a general dialectico-materialist interpretation of cybernetics. It was important to show how the results of cybernetics harmonize with present-day materialism and refute idealism. Cybernetics accords fully with the principles of dialectical materialism because, in the final count, every science leans objectively on dialectical materialism. However, disclosing the specific forms in which dialectics and cybernetics are inter-related is a formidable proposition and calls for collective research.

We are now passing over to the second stage in philosophical research, with the accent shifting to more specific methodological problems involving a deeper knowledge of cybernetics *per se*. The logical aspects of cybernetics, those of the theory

of automats and the nature of the mathematical apparatus, are forging to the forefront. Many problems have now emerged from the stage of "final" solution, entering that of controversial examination. This applies, among others, to the problem of the man-to-automat relationships, widely discussed against the background of our greatly increased scientific knowledge. So it may be pertinent to note that journalistic sensations and philosophical extremes have injected much confusion into the issue.

It would be safe to say that the noise over the achievements of cybernetics in the capitalist countries is not disconnected from the class struggle. Speculation about man's likely displacement by the machine and the likely collapse of civilization can but breed passivity and a sense of hopelessness.

Though science nowadays sees no limits to the cybernetic modelling of psychic phenomena, man is in no way threatened by a "society of machines." Nor is there any valid ground for other pessimistic fantasies. No matter how effective electronic machines become, no matter how they revolutionize mental work, they will always be no more than the aides of man. Whatever capacity it may have, the machine will never fully reproduce the human mind. At best, it will perform "thought-like" operations. This makes the man-to-machine relationship predominantly a social problem. From the angle of natural science, too, certain limitations exist, for it is assumed, among other things, that no machine will ever process more information per second per gram of its own weight than a certain, albeit large, finite quantity.

The growing possibilities and limitations of cybernetically modelling the human mind are interwoven with materialist dialectics. While studies of factual material on the correlation of man and machine substantiate the infinite possibilities of advance in cybernetics, they furnish no proof of any ultimate predominance of the machine over man.

CYBERNETICS AND HUMAN LABOR

Cybernetic theory and engineering are related to the fundamental Marxist idea of the historical mission of the working class and the abolition of the exploitation of man by man. In the present ideological struggle bourgeois scientists proceed from a distorted view of the cybernetic revolution, maintaining without valid grounds

that ultimately, under the impact of technological progress, human labor will become superfluous. Some even contend that in the future civilization a numerically small elite will operate the highly-productive automats.

Scientific discoveries, it is said, reveal no new spheres for applying creative human labor; all they yield is more scope for electronic automats. Mary Hilton, a U.S. researcher, holds, for example, that "it is also not true that 'the advancing frontiers of science open new fields', or rather, they open up new fields for the application of computing machines, but not for the employment of human beings."

Speaking of the outlook for a complete displacement of human labor, Mary Hilton contends that Marx, allegedly, wished to free people from labor. That, as we see it, is a misrepresentation. Marxism sees labor as a manifestation of the very essence of man. Not liberation of man from labor, but liberation of labor from exploitation, a humanizing transformation of labor, replacement of its primitive forms by highly qualified ones, by profoundly creative types of labor, changing labor from a means of subsistence into a prime and vital requirement in the advance to communism—that is the Marxist view.

The idea that living labor might be completely displaced by the electronic machine is at odds with production practices and with cybernetic theory. It should be borne in mind that the theoretical possibilities of cybernetic engineering coexist today with a relatively modest use of fully automated production systems. Comprehensive automation advances far more slowly than was anticipated only a few years ago.

The cybernetic revolution is on a zig-zag path, and in its rational context is certainly not aimed at totally displacing human labor.

This, by the way, is reflected in the forecasting models developed in the United States. A forecast of the Board of the National Industrial Conference for 1964-1975 estimates that the labor force will increase 1.8 per cent annually until 1975, outstripping the estimated average 1.66 per cent annual population growth of the 1970's.

The effects of cybernetic technology on human labor are closely related to the structural changes of the working class. The consequences of technological progress, auguring more unemployment under

capitalism, cannot but alert the workers. Hence the demand that wage-earners should participate in charting the course of scientific and technical growth. The important thing is soberly to weigh the two objective trends in the changing structure of hired labor.

That the ratio of people employed in the non-productive sphere keeps rising is an established fact. In 1965, for example, 57 per cent of all labor (outside of farming) in the United States was employed in the non-productive sphere. All in all, the percentage of white-collar workers in the total labor force has risen in the United States from 49 in 1950 to 62 in 1965; moreover, we see the same tendency in the other capitalist countries with a high productivity of labor.

The entry into the working class of increasing numbers of service employees as labor productivity mounts (and hence also the growing product per producer) was foreseen by Karl Marx in *Capital*. Stressing that professional factors do not determine a person's identification with the proletariat, Marx wrote:

"By 'proletarian' in the economic sense we should mean exclusively the hired worker who produces and increases 'capital' and is flung into the street as soon as he is no longer needed to increase the value of the 'master capital'."

The other tendency in the present-day working class stems from the steady growth of the intellectual factor in workers' activity. Forecasts indicate that by 1975 the United States will have 50 per cent more highly skilled than medium skilled jobs. By that time the number of trained workers will increase by more than one-third, while those of medium skill by less than one-sixth, and unskilled by just one-fifth (against 1964 figures).

The growth of the intellectual factor in mass production, coupled with the entry of technical workers and engineers into the ranks of the working class, poses the question: will immediate technological changes in production alone be sufficient, with capitalist relations still prevailing, to eradicate the distinction between mental and manual labor?

The only answer to that is in the negative. The contradiction between mental and manual labor (though its abolition is, indeed, objectively connected with a sufficiently high level of labor productivity and is thus technologically conditioned) is social, not technological. What is decisive

is not the spectrum of differently tinted collars, not their dynamics, but the social essence of the labor process.

No matter how much the worker's professional skill improves, it will cause no fundamental change in the two really basic factors so long as capitalist relations prevail. The embodiment through labor of an ideal design in a material object and, consequently, the correlation between the intellectual program and the physical action used to materialize it, is dictated by capital, mediated and determined by capital. The thesis formulated by the young Marx is still valid: "The external character of labor manifests itself for the worker in the fact that this labor belongs not to him, but to another, and that in the process of labor he belongs not to himself, but to another."

The extent of a worker's education and training, and hence the possibility of performing highly skilled work depends on capital and its specific class interests. Thus, technical change cannot *per se* surmount what Marx describes as the "human essence materialized in an inhuman way in contradiction to itself."

It follows, too, that the higher educational level and proficiency emerging among workers against the setting of capitalist technological advance is likely to facilitate and expedite a revolutionary break-up of private enterprise, whose dilatory role in relation to the progress of civilization is entirely intolerable in the era of the technological revolution. Scientific and technical flux does not repeal social revolution. Quite the reverse: it makes social revolution more urgent and inevitable.

The displacement of ordinary by complex labor is accompanied by a process in which complex labor becomes mass labor, while ordinary labor becomes rare and, so to speak, elite. This destroys the illusion of "work becoming play" calling for no effort on man's part. As we see it, complex labor is more difficult to mechanize; it is more difficult labor. No matter what progress the machine makes, none will deny the role of inspiration, vision and creative pain. But pain of creation is still pain, though no one ever pleads to be relieved of it. The higher forms of mental labor are also difficult because they represent what is termed non-active activity. Little or no muscle is involved, but nervous strain has its wear and tear. This premature wear and tear (with more time spent on learning and

absorbing the increasing mass of available information before pursuing creative activity) is, in its own right, a highly complex social problem.

Yet the aforementioned Mary Hilton assumes that cybernetic progress will eliminate creative thought, and observes:

"The maintenance required by cybernated equipment is less complicated than replacing light bulbs." (See *Political Affairs*, 1965, No. 5, p. 59).

That is hardly the case. In fact, the displacement of unskilled labor always, in the social process, stimulates a demand for more skilled and creative forms of labor. Seen against the setting of labor of different degrees of skill and the growth of its creative aspect, society is subject to the operation of what may be described as the *law of the preservation of labor activity*. In step with technological progress, the shrinking demand for unskilled labor is compensated by a growing demand for the more complex and more productive labor of designing, controlling and maintaining cybernated systems. We should reckon with the fact, too, that society is never immobile. It is in constant motion and constantly more complex. The material and spiritual needs of its members grow continuously, and more leisure is needed.

Unemployment, that perverse phenomenon of capitalism, stems not from cybernated technology or cybernated productive forces, but from the nature of the capitalist production relations that withhold opportunities for workers to improve their skills, acting as a brake on the growth of the material needs of society.

* * *

Creative Marxism shatters all illusions, whatever they may be. That is its source of strength. And today, while appreciating the capacity of cybernetics to expedite social progress, it opposes that "pan-cybernetic" illusion that automats advancing to infinity will in some way iron out all the snags in human society, eventually transforming the inhuman capitalist order into a sort of bodiless political entity, a "welfare society."

Marxism also refutes the tragic view that the demon of automation will add to the confusion of present-day existence. The substance of that view is set out in William Ashby's pessimistic thesis that we have built a civilization we do not understand and now see slipping out of our control.

Marxism opposes the simplistic petty-bourgeois theories underrating the role of the technical and, for that matter, all other culture, suggesting progress minus any thoroughly grounded technico-economic concept based on the experience of the current scientific revolution.

For creative Marxism, robots are not mechanical demons but an essential material element of our civilization. It depends on ourselves whether they are used, as Wiener put it, for good or evil.

Having anticipated the development of automats, Marxism pointed to the ways of using them for man. Socialism in its developed stage was cast by history to bring out all the advantages of the collective principle in developing and using the cybernetic revolution.

Scientist and fighter

(10th anniversary of the death of Frederic Joliot Curie)

JOHN BERNAL

The life of Frederic Joliot Curie will go down in history, and not that of France alone, as an example and an inspiration for an entire epoch, the one in which we live and that appears to us tragic and menacing, an epoch of transition, the most important that man has ever lived. It is transitional in two respects: firstly in science that now, for the first time, gives us the power to conquer what were once unconquerable evils, hunger and poverty, and, secondly, in society which now, throughout the world, must find new forms of utilizing all the new forces for the good of all and not devote so much effort to maintaining a precarious existence on this planet in face of conflicts and injustices.

Joliot Curie ranks among the great men place in the history of this transition. He knew it well, and knew what to do to assist the painful but glorious birth of the new times. True, we have not come to them yet and still live with the peril of terrible destruction. But he has shown by word and deed that the peril is not fatally inevitable, and that it is up to us to remove it.

Joliot Curie ranks among the great men of the century for two reasons—for having contributed as a scientist to the fundamental discoveries that showed us how to liberate the giant forces locked in the atom, and for his public activity against the use of the new forces to destroy mankind rather than secure man's well-being delivering him from his many woes.

I can speak only briefly here of the scientific exploits of Frederic Joliot and Irene Curie, who always helped each other in their research. They carved a niche for

themselves in the history of conquering the atom, for they made possible the second great stage in the study of radioactivity. The researchers that followed the initial discoveries by Becquerel and Curie, principally those by Rutherford, established in basic outline the structure of the atom with its electrons and its nucleus, and also described the spontaneous transformations of certain elements, the natural radioactive bodies. A new epoch began after the thirties, the doors to which were flung wide open by Joliot—the first door to deliberate action on nuclei by means of neutrons, the existence of which was first indicated in his experiments, and the second to the discovery of artificial radioactivity which instantly multiplied the number of radioactive elements. The third stage was the discovery of nuclear fission, to which Joliot contributed greatly by his experiments, being the first to point to the possibility of a chain reaction, crucial for the atomic pile and, unfortunately, also for the atom bomb.

This discovery dialectically completed the science of radioactivity. From a profound conception of the nature of matter it became an instrument usable for both good and evil. Long before he completed his investigation, Joliot realized that from then on it was no longer a question of just understanding the world, but also of changing it.

In face of the perils represented by Hitler and the rise of fascism in France, he realized that science cannot be defended in laboratories alone. Inspired by his teacher, Paul Langevin, he recognized the scientists' duty with regard to the use to which governments may turn their dis-

coveries. I remember clearly what Langevin said on this score at the time: "My scientific work may, if necessary, be continued by others. For me, the most important thing is to defeat fascism and war in order that science may continue."

In those critical prewar years, Joliot, who was younger and stronger, made his greatest discoveries, and at the same time joined the progressive movement. He prepared thus for his great mission as French patriot and Resistance fighter.

What he accomplished as scientist and patriot up to the end of the war was ample to establish his reputation, but it was after the war that his qualities of mind and courage reached their zenith. The events necessitated this, and the man was ready.

Although I had the good fortune of knowing Frederic Joliot for nearly thirty years, it was not until the war that I had occasion to participate in the great tasks to which he devoted himself.

He was among the first to realize that owing to scientific progress war had become a thousand times more deadly and cruel, and that it was never more vital to steer science from that destructive path, making it perform its true mission of providing knowledge and helping build a just and happy world.

It was after the war that Joliot, still a scientist and a French patriot, became one of the first citizens of the new world—not without sacrifices and inner conflicts, the depth of which none but he will ever know. After liberation his reputation was incontestable throughout the world and certainly in France. For the first time in his life he also seemed to have the financial means to fulfil all his scientific dreams.

But to make complete use of this he had to go along with the interests of those who, he knew, yearned for the restoration of the old regime and prepared for a third world war. Yet he did his best to break the road for France into the new atomic world, building the first nuclear pile in Châtillon and trying to develop research on a broader scientific base. Always, he set conditions, of which the principal one, "the atom is for peace and never for war," cost him his post of High Commissioner for Atomic Energy, and though this act rests on the conscience of the government, and by no means on his own, he took it very hard. He could no longer employ his eminent gift of organizing research on a broad scale, whereas in more favorable circum-

stances he could have achieved immense progress. Why was it that only shortly before his death, and that with a thousand difficulties, could he complete and establish the huge nuclear center of Orsay begun by Irene some time before she died?

Yet he was loyal to the main idea which he had weighed well: use of science is for man not only good but also necessary. He believed that none but free and united peoples could secure the flowering of science. He entered the new postwar world emerging thanks to the heroic effort of the Soviet people and, later, to the movement embracing the peoples of the so-called underdeveloped or, more precisely, exploited countries.

Most of his energy Joliot devoted to serving peace. In 1949 the imposing function in the Pleyel Hall inaugurated the international peace movement, of which Joliot was elected the first President with an unanimity expressive of the respect felt everywhere for his incontestable and unique merits.

For years, he had contributed more than anyone else to the expansion of that movement of hundreds of millions, forging it into an intelligent and powerful force.

I remember clearly the early days when six people who then comprised the steering committee gathered under his chairmanship round an improvised table consisting of a plank and two benches in the small study in Rue de l'Elysée. The brilliant and prophetic idea of drafting the famous Stockholm Appeal came to Joliot the following year. For the first time the peoples of the world were alerted to the danger of an atomic war already in preparation. Even those who stood for war paid involuntary tribute to this act, which ever since qualified the atom bomb in the eyes of all as a monstrous and inadmissible weapon, even though they should have preferred to see it accepted as a conventional weapon of the great powers.

The battle over the bomb continues. The bomb has not been used in war since Nagasaki, though the opportunities for that were many. The force of public opinion, informed and mobilized by the peace movement, has stayed the hand of the militarists.

The significance for the peace movement of Joliot's knowledge and undisputed authority in matters atomic is beyond measure.

Yet he had another task, more difficult and less known: to rally the scientific

world against atomic war. That did not mean uniting people who could come to terms on general political lines, but rather to bring home to men of different backgrounds and interests that the problem of averting nuclear war was the most important of all.

Thanks to the World Federation of Scientific Workers which he founded and of which he was the first President, the idea that scientists were responsible for the good or evil results of their research became widespread. But there were many scientists, especially among the older and better known, who resisted the very idea of joining an organization. That was where Joliot's knowledge and universally acclaimed integrity tilted the scales. He took part in drawing up the first appeal issued by Einstein and Russell. And many more followed from eminent scientists holding Nobel prizes. We owe it largely to his efforts, too, that the first international meetings took place in which responsible scientists from the United States, the Soviet Union and other countries agreed to warn the world about the perils of an atomic war and issued insistent demands for a stop to the testing of nuclear weapons.

More than anyone else, Joliot reminded scientists by his example rather than words of the old Rabelesian dictum that "science without conscience merely ruins the soul." Today this conscience is alive, and it exists among scientists. The movement Joliot so courageously launched is going from strength to strength. True, we are now deprived of his advice, clever and firm in leading us forward, but his work has not been in vain, his inspiration remains and has even become more fruitful.

My recollections here of Joliot's scientific work and fight for peace are very incomplete. Unquestionably, they cover not all the important aspects of his activity;

neither do they produce the full image of him as a man, a man of fame, a man venerated by thousands and millions of people all over the world.

I had the great pleasure of knowing Joliot at times of leisure, with his family in Sceaux, boating together, and talking in Arcouest. He had the gift of happiness and shared it with all his friends. And weren't those who had known him all his friends? He took an interest in all men, he lived fully.

Naturally, his life was punctuated by tragedy. He suffered deeply the sickness and premature death of Irene. His own long and painful sickness he endured like a real scientist, studying it in minute detail and seeing himself as a guinea-pig.

But he suffered more than many others, because the conditions of his time and country hurt him deeply. He anticipated the new possibilities of science to improve the life of men. He felt he could help realize them and form teams of young people who would secure success. But he always had to fight stupidity, greed and barbarity. Evidently, his great talent was not able to materialize in full.

Joliot's tragedy was real, but it was noble. Precisely because he lived in troubled times, he displayed real greatness. By reason of his work and courage he will be always an example of how man can surmount the most arduous difficulties and conquer the most terrible evils.

The magnificent and happy world to which he aspired is sure to be built, and even earlier than we think. Though death snatched him from us at the zenith of his genius, we must not see it as a defeat of his spirit. He would not tolerate that. He lived consciously for the future. We shall honor his memory the better by following his inspiration and working for peace and freedom which alone can guarantee the full flower of the human spirit.

A life devoted to struggle

Manuel Rodrigues da Silva, a Portuguese Communist, was born in 1909, into a worker's family. At the age of 13 he got a job in a factory. There he was directly confronted with problems of the class struggle, there he entered upon the life of a fighter for the cause of the working class.

As a leader of the Portuguese affiliate of the Red Trade Union International, and of the Portuguese League Against War and Fascism, he devoted all his energies to the struggle for working-class unity, for a single trade-union front.

In March 1933 Manuel joined the Communist Party.

The first arrest came in 1936, when Manuel was a member of the Central Committee. In 1945 the struggle of the Portuguese people, the victory of the forces of progress and democracy over fascism helped Manuel to regain freedom, and he immediately resumed active work in the trade union movement, helping to implement the Party's line of combining legal and illegal activity and turning the corporative trade unions into a weapon for defending the workers' interests.

In 1946 the Second Congress of the Party, held clandestinely, elected Comrade da Silva to the Central Committee. The struggles of subsequent years, the strikes

of 1947 and the rise of the working-class movement were directly associated with his activity.

Manuel Rodrigues da Silva was again arrested in 1950. He served his eight-year term, but the doors of the Peniche Prison remained locked for him: the political police thought him to be too great a danger to the regime.

In 1961 Comrade da Silva suffered a haemorrhage of the brain, with the resultant paralysis of the left half of the body. But he was not allowed even to be transferred to the prison hospital—so great was the regime's fear of a half-paralyzed Communist.

It was only in January 1964, thanks to the efforts of his people and to a vigorous international campaign, that Manuel Rodrigues da Silva was wrested from the fascist secret police.

In the last years of his life, gravely ill, he lived in Moscow.

On July 22, 1968, the heart of this true son of the Portuguese people, outstanding Communist and patriot, Secretary of the CC of the Portuguese Communist Party, ceased to beat. But time is powerless against the memory of people like Comrade da Silva.

M. CAMPOS

True son of the Belgian working class

The death on August 6 of Comrade Ernest Burnelle, Chairman of the Communist Party of Belgium, ended a life wholly devoted to the struggle for socialism.

Ernest Burnelle was born on July 12, 1908, in the family of a factory worker. Progressives of his generation reached maturity when the inability of reformism or anarchism to pave the way for social change had been fully demonstrated. Rejecting opportunism, young Ernest turned to the experience of the October Revolu-

tion in Russia, to the ideas of communism. Working as a teacher, Ernest Burnelle became active in the trade union movement and joined the Socialist Teachers Union, where he displayed exceptional organizational talent. But the political line of the Belgian Labor Party, the patron of the Union, did not satisfy Burnelle. In 1938, impressed by the success of socialist construction in the USSR and under the impact of the rise of the labor movement in Western Europe in the years of the Popu-

lar Front, Ernest Burnelle joined the Communist Party.

During the occupation in World War II Comrade Burnelle worked underground, directing propaganda in various industrial regions of Belgium.

A Central Committee member since 1946, Ernest Burnelle worked for several years as secretary of the Liege federation of the CPB and in the central office of the Party. The Liege workers elected him to Parliament. In 1954 Ernest Burnelle became a member of the Political Bureau and National Secretary of the Party. In 1961 Comrade Burnelle was elected Chairman of the CPB, a post he held until his death.

A consistent internationalist, Comrade Burnelle fought for the unity of the world Communist movement, against revisionist,

dogmatist and Leftist distortions of Communist theory and practice.

Ernest Burnelle devoted considerable time to theoretical work. Many of his articles, generalizing the experience of the Belgian and West European working class movement, were printed in our journal.

"An optimist, he insisted that we were advancing to socialism perhaps faster than is generally believed," the Political Bureau of the CPB said in the statement in connection with his death. Optimism was not peculiar to Comrade Burnelle alone. It is a distinguishing trait of every genuine revolutionary. The life of Ernest Burnelle, an indomitable Communist, will remain an inspiring example and a call for struggle till final victory.

A. DUMONT

Dramatic page of Polish history

This book* by Zenon Kliszko, Political Bureau member and Central Committee secretary of the Polish United Workers' Party, has won wide readership in Poland and will doubtlessly be read with interest in other countries.

Its terse account of the events that led up to the 1944 rising against the Nazi invader makes for a closer understanding of this dramatic page of Polish history. The author traces the origin of the Polish Workers' Party (PWP) and its political and armed struggles in an exceptionally complex internal and international situation.

The position in occupied Poland, the threat of physical annihilation of the Polish people, their part in the war effort of the anti-Hitler coalition—they are all described against the historical background and the international alignment of forces. The author emphasizes the decisive role of the Soviet Union in the anti-Hitler coalition, its part in demolishing Hitler's Third Reich and in bringing liberation to peoples languishing in Nazi slavery. This is, in a way, one of the dominant themes of the book.

But its central theme, of course, is the tragedy of Warsaw, and it is by no means accidental that Warsaw's political and military importance is continually stressed in Zenon Kliszko's account.

He had a direct part in the rising, from the first day to the last, and was the first to provide a considered appraisal of it. He did so on October 5, 1944, in a radio broadcast from Lublin, at a time when all the valor and horror of the Warsaw fighting was still echoing throughout the country. Only a few days earlier, Kliszko, together with a group of Armia Ludowa fighters, had crossed to the liberated eastern bank of the Vistula.

Included in this volume are five public statements: the Lublin broadcast, two articles published in 1944, one in 1947, and

a speech delivered in 1964 on the 20th anniversary of the rising, on which Kliszko has written extensively. They show that his early appraisals have been fully corroborated by subsequent evidence and are fully valid today.

And they show that the political line of their author—and of the PWP—was not based on transitory factors or temporary expediences.

The speeches and articles are published in their original texts, without any change or editing: the judgments made by the Polish Workers' Party in 1944 and by its successor, the Polish United Workers' Party, twenty years later, do not require change. No other political party was able to give so realistic a judgment of the 1944 events in the Polish capital. And this, of course, is not due to clairvoyance on the part of the PWP, but to its close link with Polish reality, its commonsense approach, political realism, historical experience and, above all, its deep understanding of the vital interests of the working class and of the entire Polish people.

The Warsaw rising was organized by the so-called Armia Krajowa (Home Army) and political groups closely associated with the emigré government in London. Militarily the rising was directed against the Nazis, but politically—and of this its organizers made no great secret—against the Soviet Union and the popular government that had just been proclaimed in the liberated part of Poland. It was not the purpose of the men responsible for the rising to strengthen the anti-Hitler coalition. Quite the contrary, and no matter what documents might be uncovered in future, they cannot refute the facts adduced by Kliszko. They can only add to the embarrassment of politicians who precipitated the rising in furtherance of their own dubious aims.

The author's motivation in repeatedly reverting to the rising was to show the heroism of the Warsaw people who, true to their long tradition of freedom and revolutionary struggle, were eager to fight

*Zenon Kliszko: Powstanie warszawskie. Artykuły, przemówienia, wspomnienia, dokumenty. (The Warsaw Rising. Articles, Speeches, Reminiscences, Documents). Warszawa, KiW, 1967. 347 pp.

through to liberation. And in this contradiction between the unparalleled heroism of the masses and the political cynicism of the men who brought on the rising lies the tragedy of Warsaw in 1944. While paying tribute to the fortitude and daring of the hundreds of thousands who fought on the barricades, the author says it was not easy to convince them that a small band of politicians were motivated entirely by criminal designs which they sought to conceal.

"It is human nature," the author writes, "not to admit that you were deceived in what you considered a sacred cause. It is human nature not to want to face the fact that 200,000 people were killed and Poland's finest city destroyed as a result of criminal political designs" (p. 88). The truth has a bitter taste.

For all that, there is not a single word of reproach of the Home Army soldiers with whom the author fought side by side. Nor is there a tinge of reproach in describing the last—and most tragic—day of the fighting.

On that day he told Colonel "Zywiciel," the Home Army commander at Zoliborz, in north Warsaw, that they could still withdraw to the eastern liberated bank of the Vistula. At first the Colonel agreed, but on orders from his superiors turned down the suggestion, and only 27 men crossed the river. Yet this was a crucial moment, morally and politically: either surrender to the nazis or withdraw and join the Polish army. The Colonel chose surrender.

The episode is significant, so much so, that it can probably be described as the "Zoliborz experiment." An experiment, the author remarks, that played into the hands of the nazis. They benefited from "the refusal to withdraw the Home and Popular Army Zoliborz groups to the other bank of the Vistula, and the rejection of the idea of national unity which was forged in joint struggle against the invader and which subsequently helped to counter reactionary conspiracies and also find correct solutions to many agonizing problems of the Home Army" (p. 226).

That was the true position. But the author's purpose in reestablishing the truth is not to re-open old wounds. He sees the truth as a factor uniting the peo-

ple in building the new, socialist Poland. And it was the truth, and more especially the activity and action program of the Polish United Workers' Party, that made possible the political unity of the people. The idea of concerted effort within a national front was first advanced by the Polish Workers' Party in February 1943, in its appeal to all illegal groups.

"United in rebuilding our country," Kliszko writes, "were people who in the occupation years belonged to diverse political groups. Just as we never used Party labels to measure the blood shed for Poland's freedom, so we do not measure the contribution to the building of the new Poland from the standpoint of past political positions. And though it was not all easy and simple, though there was still among many a lingering feeling of bitterness, distrust and hurt, everyone who, moved by patriotism and a sense of national duty, was prepared to share in repairing the damages of the war, in developing the reunited western lands, building up our economy and culture, found a place among the builders of People's Poland, despite past views and affiliations.

"That is why we can now say with deep conviction that the old discords are a closed chapter. We who fought in Warsaw under different banners against Poland's sworn enemy, now stand firmly united" (pp. 116-17).

The book contains a large section, 120 pages, titled "Reminiscences and Reflections," the first published memoirs of a Party leader. They give us a deeper insight into the humanism of Kliszko's earlier articles, but they also have a distinct educational and literary value.

The early articles are summed up in the author's speech on the 25th anniversary of the Polish Workers' Party.

The book also contains documents, many of them little known, relating to the Warsaw uprising. That crucial point of Polish history is treated in a new light. Zenon Kliszko's analysis of the Polish people's bitter experience and the lessons the Party, now responsible for the nation's destinies, drew from it lends the book both historical and topical value.

Stanislaw WRONSKI

Brief notices

PAULINO GONZALEZ ALBERDI. *Los estudiantes en el movimiento revolucionario latinoamericano*. Buenos Aires, Ediciones Medio Siglo, 1968. 123 pp.

PAULINO GONZALEZ ALBERDI. *Studies in the Latin American Revolutionary Movement*. Buenos Aires, Ediciones Medio Siglo, 1968. 123 pp.

This book, by a member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Argentina, contains several works by the author devoted to problems of the student movement in Latin America. The span of time covered in it (1928-67) makes it possible to trace the social roots and the stages of this movement. The author points out that the October Revolution in Russia was one of the main causes of the radicalization of the Latin American students.

The university reform of 1918 in Argentina, he writes, established university autonomy, modernized curricula and allowed students and professors to read lectures for workers, but it did not solve the fundamental problems of higher education. On the contrary, it led to an intensification of the students' struggle and to a broadening of its objectives. Today students comprise a major component of the forces fighting for a democratic, agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution in Argentina and throughout Latin America. The road to a genuinely democratic educational reform, to a genuinely free higher school, the author argues, lies through liberation from imperialist domination and abolition of the old social system. This is one of the points of objective convergence of the interests of the students and workers, of all working people.

The 1918 university reform and the subsequent development of the student movement did much to radicalize the petty bourgeoisie and enhance its political influence in many Latin American countries. Its leaders, often leaning for support on the students, began to lay claims to leadership of the entire revolutionary anti-imperialist movement. But, as the author shows in his book, the leading role of the working class and its vanguard, the Communist parties, is indispensable if the revolution is to succeed in Latin America.

The author stresses the need to win the students for this revolution, to secure their participation in a broad anti-imperialist and democratic front. This calls for patient work, for vigorous struggle against the reformist and leftist views actively propagated among them.

M. P.

A KODACHENKO. *Ekonomicheskoye sotrudnichestvo razvivayushchikhsya stran*. Moskva, Mysl, 1968. 325 pp.

A. KODACHENKO. *Economic Cooperation Between Developing Countries*. Moscow, Mysl Publishers, 1968. 325 pp.

Economic independence and social progress are foremost among the problems confronting the developing countries, and many of them regard economic cooperation among themselves as one of the means of solving these problems. The first steps have been undertaken, and the need arises for a scientific, Marxist-Leninist analysis of this phenomenon and of its significance both for the countries concerned and for the anti-imperialist struggle throughout the world.

The book under review, written by a Soviet economist, deals with the theoretical and practical aspects of the process of economic *rapprochement* between Third World countries. Not limiting himself to an economic analysis, although it is central in the monograph, the author reviews a complex of political and social conditions which have a bearing on the process. In his opinion, the problems of economic cooperation of the young states cannot be correctly posed, let alone solved, if taken in isolation from such social factors as the anti-imperialist struggle and the break-up of the colonial system, the emergence of the socialist world and its impact on the world revolutionary process, and the scientific and technological revolution.

The book, rich in factual material, consists of three parts. The first is devoted to the specific conditions in which economic contacts between Third World countries are being established, the international, national and economic prerequisites for such contacts, the forms and methods of the

economic cooperation of these countries among themselves and with the world capitalist economic system within the orbit of which most of them are still enclosed.

The second part contains an analysis of the experience of regional and sub-regional economic cooperation in Latin America, Africa, the Arab world, Asia and the Far East.

In the third part the author deals with economic integration as a factor of the socio-economic progress of the developing countries, and the importance of this trend for the prospect of non-capitalist develop-

ment. He also describes the difficulties and contradictions attending the pursuit of this policy.

Although the forms and methods of economic cooperation between many developing countries have capitalist features, it is basically progressive. The author is of the opinion that this cooperation alone will not bring about economic independence. Achievement of this goal calls for deep-going progressive socio-economic reforms and support from the socialist world in their realization.

Y. S.

Books listed here are in the language of the country of publication

MARX, K., ENGELS, F. *Pisma o "Kapitale"* (Letters about Capital). Moscow, Politizdat, 1968. 744 pp.

MARX, K., ENGELS, F., LENIN V. I. *O dialekticheskom materializme* (On Dialectical Materialism), an anthology. Moscow, Politizdat, 1968. 431 pp.

MARX, K., ENGELS, F. *Opere* (Works). Vol. 29, Bucharest, Editura politica, 1968. 756 pp.

LENIN, V. I. *Mi a teendo?* (What Is To Be Done?). Budapest, Kossuth Konyvkiado, 1968. 327 pp.

AMENDOLA, G. *La classe operaria italiana* (The Italian Working Class). Rome, Editori Riuniti. 1968.

BOGNAR, G. *Az osztalyharc idoszeru kerdesei* (Current Problems of the Class Struggle). Budapest, Kossuth Konyvkiado, 1968. 128 pp.

CORNFORTH, M. *The Open Philosophy and the Open Society*. A Reply to Dr. Karl Popper's Refutations of Marxism. London, Lawrence and Wishart, 1968. 396 pp.

Die westdeutschen Gewerkschaften und das staatsmonopolistische Herrschaftssystem 1945-1966 (The West German Trade Unions and the State-Monopoly System of

Domination. 1945-1966). Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1968. 685 pp.

DROZDOWSKI, M. *Klasa robotnicza Warszawy. 1918-1939. Sklad i struktura spoleczna* (The Working Class of Warsaw. 1918-1939. Composition and Social Structure). Warsaw, KiW, 1968. 461 pp.

Istoria kommunisticheskoi partii Sovetskogo Soyuza (The History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union). In 6 volumes. Vol. 3. The Communist Party — Organizer of the Victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution and of the Defense of the Soviet Republic. March 1917-1920. Book 2: March 1918-1920. Moscow, Politizdat, 1968. 607 pp.

KOROLYOV, N. E. *Lenin i mezhdunarodnoye rabocheye dvizheniye. 1914-1918*. (Lenin and the International Working-Class Movement. 1914-1918). Moscow, Politizdat, 1968. 296 pp.

Problemi na ikonomicheskita efektivnost (Problems of Economic Effectiveness). Collection. Sofia, BAN, 1968. 190 pp.

STIEMERLING, K. *Wachstumsprobleme des Nationaleinkommens in der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik*. (Problems of National Income Growth in the German Democratic Republic), Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1968. 187 pp.

Interested in politics or world affairs?

Keep pace with fast-moving events and background analysis of today's headlines by subscribing to one or more of the following:

1. **WORLD MARXIST REVIEW: Problems of Peace and Socialism (English, French)** Each month a rich selection relating to political science, economics, culture and international affairs. Free supplement **Information Bulletin**. **\$3.50 a year (12 issues)**
2. **POLITICAL AFFAIRS.** Theoretical journal of Communist Party of the United States. **\$7.50 a year (12 issues).**
3. **HORIZONS.** La Revue Trimestrielle Marxiste **HORIZONS** The Marxist Quarterly, featuring original studies of Canadian and world problems. Each issue carries articles in French language. **\$3.00 a year (4 issues) \$5.00 for 2 years.**
4. **LABOUR MONTHLY.** Published in England and edited by R. Palme Dutt. Articles on the labor movement and world events. **\$6.50 a year (12 issues).**
5. **CANADIAN TRIBUNE.** Labor and political weekly with Communist viewpoint. **\$5.00 a year; \$9.00 2 years; \$12 for 3 yrs. Other countries \$6.00 a year.**
6. **DAILY WORLD.** Only daily Marxist newspaper in the U.S.A. **\$15 (U.S.) a year, week-end issue only \$5.00 (U.S.)**
7. **MORNING STAR.** Formerly the British Daily Worker. Surface **\$25.00 a year. Airmail \$60.00.**
8. **COMBAT.** French language labor and Communist paper in Quebec. Published twice a month **\$3.00 a year.**
9. **INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS (English, French)** Monthly journal of economic and political

analysis of world developments by leading Soviet experts. **\$3.50 a year (12 issues); \$5.25 for 2 years.**

10. **NEW TIMES (English, French, Spanish, German)** Authoritative Soviet weekly with analysis of the week's developments in world affairs. Carries important government documents or statements. **\$3.50 a year (52 issues); \$5.25 for 2 years. Airmailed.**
11. **GRANMA. (English).** Weekly review of daily editions of official organ of Communist Party of Cuba. **Airmail: \$5.40 a year.**
12. **THE AFRICAN COMMUNIST.** Published in England by the illegal South African Communist Party in the interests of African solidarity. A forum for Marxist-Leninist thought throughout the African continent. **(4 issues); airmail \$3.00. (2 years \$5.00)**
13. **PEKING REVIEW (English, French)** Weekly on China's political, economic and cultural trends and views on international affairs. **\$4.00 a**

year (52 issues). Airmailed direct. \$6.00 for 2 years.

14. **MARXISM TODAY.** Theoretical organ of the Communist Party of Great Britain. **\$6.50 a year (12 issues).**
15. **DEMOCRATIC GERMAN REPORT.** Newsletter with factual material about controversial Berlin and the two Germanys from on-the-spot, veteran British journalist John Peet. **\$1.25 a year (26 issues).**
16. **GERMAN FOREIGN POLICY (English)** G.D.R. viewpoint on international questions. Written by experts in international law, political science, history and economics. **\$5.00 a year (6 issues).**
17. **SECHABA.** Official organ of African National Congress of South Africa, leading national liberation struggle. **Monthly \$6.50 a year.**
18. **MOSCOW NEWS* (English, French, Spanish or German).** Weekly tabloid on Soviet events. Free supplements. Airmailed direct. **\$2. a year. \$3.00 for 2 years.**

*Effective Jan. 1, 1969, rates increase to \$5 a year.

Circle item required and send to:

progress subscription service

487 adelaide st. west, toronto 2b, canada

Send for _____ year(s) to:

NAME

ADDRESS

CITY Enc. \$.....

My choice: 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18

(Unless otherwise stated all subscriptions sent surface mail. Airmail extra if requested. Subscriptions sent c/o Progress Subscription Service will be forwarded. All prices subject to change. Add 15 cents for out-of-town cheques.)

VOL. 39 OF LENIN'S COLLECTED WORKS

NOTEBOOKS ON IMPERIALISM

by V. I. Lenin

Long-awaited 842-page Volume 39 of *Lenin's Collected Works*, containing the original materials Lenin gathered to write his classic work *Imperialism—the Highest Stage of Capitalism*. The *Notebooks* are of immense scientific value and represent an important contribution to Marxist political economy. Their current significance is that they form an invaluable background for current analysis of monopoly-capital both with regard to data and methodology.

SUBSCRIBE TO COMPLETE SET

Now is the time to subscribe to the complete expected 45-volume set of *Lenin's Collected Works*. Available now, Vols. 1-39 incl. at \$1.00 per volume if entire set is ordered. Single copies ordered individually \$1.75 each.

Prices net plus shipping charges.

ORDER FROM:

progress books

487 adelaide st. w. / toronto 2b / 368-5336

new outlook publishers

32 union sq. east, rm. 801, new york, n.y. 10003, u.s.a.



Editions of the journal

"PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM"



EDITIONS IN ENGLISH
(World Marxist Review):
Central Books Ltd.,
37 Grays Inn Road,
London, W.C. 1, England

Progress Books,
487 Adelaide St. West,
Toronto 2B, Ontario,
Canada

FRENCH EDITIONS
(La Nouvelle Revue Internationale)
Société d'Édition et
d'Information 9, Boulevard des Italiens
Paris (2e) France

Librairie Du Monde Entier,
5, Place St-Jean,
Bruxelles

Librairie Rousseau,
36, rue J.-J. Rousseau,
Geneve

RUSSIAN EDITION
Stredisko pro rozšírování tisku,
Praha 6, Thakurova 3
Czechoslovakia

BRAZILIAN EDITION
(in Portuguese)
Rua da Assembléia, 34
3.º andar, sala 304,
Rio de Janeiro, Estado da Guanabara
Brazil

BULGARIAN EDITION
Raznoiznos,
1, Rue Tzar Assen
Sofia

CEYLON EDITION
(In Sinhalese)
91 Cotta Road
Colombo, Ceylon

CYPRUS EDITION
(in Greek)
Laikon Praktorion,
Tricoupi Street, 53 T. Nicosia

CZECH EDITION
Artia, Praha 2,
Nove Mesto, Ve smeckach 30

DUTCH EDITION:
Progressief Algemeen Vertaalbureau,
Chr. Snouck Hurgronjehof 22",
Amsterdam W

GERMAN EDITIONS
Deutscher Buch-Export und Import
GmbH,
Leipzig C I, Leninstrasse 16

"Globus" Vertrieb ausländischer
Zeitschriften, Wien XX,
Höchstädtplatz 3,
Austria

Genossenschaft Literaturvertrieb
Zürich, Zürich 4, Feldstrasse 46,
Switzerland

HUNGARIAN EDITION
Kossuth Kiado, Budapest, V,
Arpad-U6

ITALIAN EDITION
Libreria Rinascita, Via delle Botteghe
Oscure 2, Roma

JAPANESE EDITION
Nauka Ltd.,
2, Kanda-Zinbocho
2-chome, Chiyoda-Ku, Tokyo

MONGOLIAN EDITION
Mongolgosknigotorg,
ul. Lenina 41, Ulan-Bator

POLISH EDITION:
P. K. W. Z. "RUCH", Warszawa,
Wilcza 46

RUMANIAN EDITION
Directia Difuzarii Presei,
Palatul administrativ C.F.R.,
Bd. Dinicu Golescu, Intrarea G.
Bucuresti

EDITIONS IN SPANISH
Agencia de Distribucion de Prensa
Praha 6, Thakurova 3

Ediciones Paz y Socialismo,
Apt. Nacional 1253,
Bogota, Colombia
Ediciones Pueblos Unidos,
Casilla Correo 589, Montevideo.
Uruguay

Fondo de Cultura Popular
Apdo. postal 2352
Mexico I, D.F.

Empresa Editora Austral
San Francisco 36,
Casilla 13201
Santiago, Chile

Editorial "Anteo,"
Entre Rios 1033,
Buenos Aires,
Argentina

SWEDISH EDITION
Arbetarkultur, Kungsgt 84,
Stockholm K, Sweden

VIETNAMESE EDITION
So'o xuất nhập khẩu sách báo 32,
Hai Ba trung, Hà-noi

