

CC PLENUM IN
CZECHOSLOVAKIA

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW



PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM

1969

17 25 CENTS

To our readers on the New Year

The outgoing year has been one of persevering struggle by Communists and all men of labor against war and reaction, for peace and socialism. It has seen fresh victories for the socialist countries, the working class of the capitalist countries and the national liberation movement. The anti-imperialist forces are uniting; socialism continues to strengthen its positions throughout the world

The New Year will doubtless be one of further successes in the battle against imperialism and for the ideals of freedom, progress and socialism.

Published in 26 languages and read in more than 100 countries, Problems of Peace and Socialism provides for the Communist and Workers' parties a forum for exchange of views and experience. It has been our object to contribute to the dissemination and elaboration of Marxist-Leninist theory and to facilitate unity of the Communist and anti-imperialist movements. We are looking for new forms in this work, and you, readers, can help in this. We shall welcome your proposals and recommendations on how to make the magazine more informative and more responsive to the requirements of theory. What articles did you find more interesting? What particular subjects would you like to see in our columns? And, lastly, your overall opinion of the contents and make-up of Problems of Peace and Socialism.

Wishing you all the best in the New Year.

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

**JANUARY, 1969
VOLUME 12
NUMBER 1**

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

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

Copyright © 1968 by
Progress Books, Canada.
All Rights Reserved.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES:
\$3.50 a year. Single
copies 35 cents. Bundle
of five or more, 25 cents
per copy. Outside
Canada, add 15 cents
exchange.
**PROBLEMS OF PEACE
AND SOCIALISM** is also
published in French,
Russian, Bulgarian,
Czech, Dutch, German,
Greek, Hungarian,
Italian, Japanese,
Mongolian, Polish,
Rumanian, Spanish,
Swedish and Vietnamese.
Subscriptions to these
may be obtained through
Progress Books,
487 Adelaide St. West,
Toronto, or in the USA
from New Outlook
Publishers, 32 Union Sq.
East, Rm. 801, New York,
N.Y. 10003.

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



WMR

CONTENTS

- | | | |
|---|-----------|---|
| | 3 | Communique on meeting of preparatory committee of international conference of Communist and Workers' Parties |
| | 5 | Preparatory committee statements |
| | 7 | A fruitful meeting |
| | 10 | Communications and comment
VIETNAM: THE NEW PHASE
THE U.S. AFTER THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION
NATO BUILDING UP TENSION |
| W. ATIAS | 21 | Pages from history
FIFTY YEARS OF THE CP OF GERMANY
PROBLEMS OF COMMUNIST MOVEMENT IN GREECE
TEN YEARS OF THE CUBAN REVOLUTION |
| I. SHCHEDROV
V. DAGMAR
E. LIAN | 36 | Our round table
MODERN CAPITALISM, THE TECHNICAL REVOLUTION
AND THE WORKING CLASS |
| M. REIMANN
L. STRINGOS
M. CEPEDA | 46 | In the capitalist world
U.S. INVESTMENTS IN BRITAIN |
| J. R. CAMPBELL | 51 | Social problems in Africa
WAGE-LABOR IN AFRICA: HERITAGE OF
COLONIALISM AND PROSPECTS |
| O. LEV | 57 | Viewpoints
ECONOMIC SPECIFICITIES AND REVOLUTIONARY
PROCESS IN LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES |
| F. MIERES | 68 | In the communist and workers' parties
CONCENTRATION OF FORCES FOR CONTINUED
SOCIALIST ADVANCE
FRATERNAL JOURNALS IN THE NEW YEAR
FRENCH COMMUNIST PARTY GAINS MORE MEMBERS
FROM EXPERIENCE OF THE ARGENTINE COMMUNISTS: <i>Juan Luna</i> —How we distribute Marxist literature
<i>J. M. Lanao</i> —The working class and the people help the party financially |
| P. AUERSPERG | 83 | In defense of peace
TOWARDS UNITED ACTION (The World Peace Council session in Lahti) |
| P. H. | 85 | Readers' questions answered
CONCERNING THE MULTI-PARTY SYSTEM IN THE GDR |
| S. DOERNBERG | 88 | Against the persecution of democrats
PARAGUAYAN PATRIOTS IN DANGER OF DEATH
TERROR IN IRAN |
| G. COLMAN
A. FARHADYAN | 91 | Books and journals
MILITANT WEAPON OF SOUTH AFRICA'S COMMUNISTS (Review of <i>African Communist</i>)
SCHOLAR AND REVOLUTIONARY (New Contributions to Marxiana)— <i>A.D.</i> —G. Cogniot. K. Marx, Notre contemporain • <i>L. Sh.</i> — Marx as historian • <i>M.S.</i> — <i>Das Kapital</i> . |
| V. S. | | |

Communique

on the meeting of the preparatory committee of the International conference of Communist and Workers' Parties

The Preparatory Committee of the International Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties met in Budapest over November 18-21.

Representatives of the following 67 Parties took part in the meeting:

Socialist Vanguard Party of Algeria, Communist Party of the United States of America, Communist Party of Argentina, Communist Party of Australia, Communist Party of Austria, Communist Party of Belgium, Bulgarian Communist Party, Communist Party of Bolivia, Brazilian Communist Party, Communist Party of Ceylon, Communist Party of Chile, Progressive Party of the Working People of Cyprus, Peoples Vanguard Party of Costa Rica, Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, Communist Party of Denmark, South African Communist Party, Dominican Communist Party, Communist Party of Ecuador, Communist Party of Northern Ireland, Communist Party of Finland, French Communist Party, Communist Party of Greece, Communist Party of Guadeloupe, Guatemalan Party of Labor, Party of People's Unity of Haiti, Communist Party of Honduras, Communist Party of India, Irish Workers' Party, Iraqi Communist Party, People's Party of Iran, Communist Party of Israel, Communist Party of Jordan, Communist Party of Canada, Communist Party of Colombia, Polish United Workers' Party, Lebanese Communist Party, Communist Party of Luxemburg, Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, Party of Liberation and Socialism (Morocco), Martinique Communist Party, Mexican Communist Party, Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, Communist Party of Great Britain, Socialist Unity Party of Germany, Socialist Unity Party of Germany—West Berlin, Communist Party of Germany, Socialist Party of Nicaragua, Italian Communist Party, Communist Party of Paraguay, Peruvian Communist Party, Portuguese Communist Party, Réunion Communist Party, Rumanian Communist Party, Communist Party of El Salvador, Communist Party of San Marino, Communist Party of Spain, Swiss Party of Labor, Syrian Communist Party, Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Communist Party of Sudan, Communist Party of Turkey, Tunisian Communist Party, Communist Party of Uruguay, Communist Party of Venezuela, and one party not named since it is working underground. Representatives of the Communist Party of Norway and of the Left Party—Communists of Sweden were present as observers.

Letters were received from a number of parties informing the Preparatory Committee that they were unable to send representatives.

The Preparatory Committee, in accordance with the statement adopted at its September-October 1968 session, examined the question of convening and the method of preparing the International Conference. The Budapest meeting, after exhaustive discussion, decided to convene the International Conference in Moscow next May, with the agenda adopted at the Consultative Meeting: "The tasks of the struggle against imperialism at the present stage and the unity of action of Communist and Workers' Parties, and of all anti-imperialist forces."

They further agreed to convene the next session of the Preparatory Committee in Moscow on March 17, to consider the draft documents of the forthcoming Conference, to decide organizational matters concerning the Conference and to fix the date for it. The

Working Group was entrusted with drafting the documents in time for the next session of the Preparatory Committee.

The Preparatory Committee repeats its appeal to all fraternal Communist and Workers' Parties, including those which have not yet participated in preparing for the Conference, to join in this work.

The representatives of the Communist Party of Great Britain, the Swiss Party of Labor and the Reunion Communist Party, who in principle agree with convening the International Conference, will communicate the final view of their respective parties on these decisions at a later date, after consultations with their leading party committees. The other delegations unanimously adopted the Communiqué.

The work of the Preparatory Committee took place in an atmosphere of a frank exchange of views and in the spirit of comradely cooperation. It expressed the resolve of the Parties to reinforce, on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, the bonds of friendship and solidarity uniting them.

* * *

All the delegations warmly thanked the Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party for its hospitality and for the excellent organization of the work of the Preparatory Committee. On the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Communist Party of Hungary, they wished the members of the Party and the people of Hungary further success in building socialism.

Budapest, November 21, 1968.

Preparatory committee statements

IN DEFENSE OF THE LIVES OF COMMUNISTS AND OTHER PATRIOTS IN INDONESIA

We, the representatives of the 67 Communist and Workers' Parties gathered in Budapest, condemn with anger and indignation the brutal war of extermination waged by Indonesian reaction against Communists and other democrats, brave fighters against imperialism for the freedom and independence of their country.

Monstrous terror has been raging for the past three years. Tens of thousands have been killed and tortured, hundreds of thousands are suffering and perishing in prisons and concentration camps. Comrade Aidit, Chairman of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Indonesia, and other leaders of the Party have been summarily executed. Only recently the reactionaries committed yet another crime when they executed Comrades Njono and Sudisman.

The rulers of Indonesia, despite the pro-Budapest, November 20, 1968.

AGAINST UNJUST SENTENCE

The Preparatory Committee of the International Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties meeting in Budapest, vigorously protests against the death sentence passed by the Athens court on Alexandros Panagoulis, anti-fascist, fighter for freedom and peace, for Greek democracy and independence; demands that the unjust sentence, inspired by the fascist dictatorial regime, shall not be carried out, and annuled in line with the request of the In-

Budapest, November 20, 1968.

ternational Association of Democratic Lawyers; expresses on behalf of all the parties present at the Meeting its support and encouragement to the worldwide solidarity movement, and addresses its fervent appeal to all anti-fascist and anti-imperialist forces, to all true democrats, to all freedom-loving peoples to join their efforts in a broad united movement to save the life of Panagoulis and to put an end to the reactionary repression in Greece.

tests of world public opinion, are intensifying the terror, continuing the physical extermination of Communists and other democratic people in their country.

We again condemn these evil deeds. No more blood must be spilt! No more victims! We declare our unshakable solidarity with the Communists and other democrats in Indonesia. Expressing the will of the peoples of our countries, we demand an end to the terror and the release of all political prisoners.

The crimes of the Indonesian reactionaries will not go unpunished. They will never succeed in crushing the freedom-loving people of Indonesia and their will to fight against imperialism.

Let the voice of protest ring out throughout the world against the evil deeds of these reactionaries.

GREETINGS TO PEOPLE OF VIETNAM

The representatives of the 67 fraternal Parties gathered in Budapest for the November session of the Preparatory Committee of the International Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties warmly hail the recent successes of the Vietnamese people.

The fact that U.S. imperialism has had to end wholly and unconditionally the bombing and other military operations against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, and to agree to hold talks in Paris with the participation of the delegates of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and of the National Liberation Front of South

Vietnam, is a big gain for the people of Vietnam and for all the forces of peace and progress throughout the world.

The Communist and Workers' Parties reaffirm their solidarity with the people of Vietnam battling against the aggression of United States imperialism and will continue to maintain their vigilance in the face of imperialist machinations, to extend their actions jointly with all peace forces with the aim of achieving the total withdrawal of the troops of the United States and its allies from Vietnam and ensuring for the people of Vietnam the right to determine their own fate in peace and independence.

Budapest, November 21, 1968.

SOLIDARITY WITH THE PATRIOTS OF GUATEMALA, PARAGUAY AND HAITI

The representatives of the 67 fraternal Parties gathered for the session of the Preparatory Committee of the International Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties, express their deep indignation at the cruel and bloody reprisals of the American imperialists and their local henchmen against the revolutionaries fighting for freedom and independence in Guatemala, Paraguay and Haiti.

In Guatemala worker and peasant leaders have been cruelly murdered, among them Victor Manuel Gutierrez, Rafael Tischler and Leonardo Castillo Flores, to say nothing of many guerrilla fighters. In the last three years thousands of people in Guatemala have been arrested, tortured and murdered by the terror gangs maintained by the Guatemalan government and by U.S. imperialism. In Haiti several hundred

patriots were kidnapped and tortured to death; many more have been summarily executed during the past eight months.

The representatives of the Parties condemn this campaign of ruthless wholesale reprisals and violation of elementary human rights. They speak out in defense of the Communists and other patriots fighting courageously in Guatemala, Paraguay, Haiti and in other Latin American countries, and demand an immediate halt to the terror. They assure the revolutionary forces of their solidarity in the fight against U.S. imperialism and the reactionary regimes supported by it. They call upon world opinion to denounce the evil crimes committed against the Communists and other patriots and in this way help the struggle against imperialist oppression in Latin America.

Budapest, November 21, 1968.

A fruitful meeting

WALDO ATIAS

The Preparatory Committee of the International Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties, which met in Budapest over November 18-21, completed the tasks set by the previous session and has thus brought the Conference nearer.

Direct contacts between parties and fraternal cooperation in the intervals between meetings make it easier to continue the dialogue, compare notes, consider practical steps and look at the differences in an atmosphere of mutual respect characterized by independence, equality and internationalism. This approach helps to consolidate the progress made and to prevent divergences over a particular problem becoming an obstacle to specific decisions.

Another favorable development was that after the Consultative Meeting numerous bilateral and multilateral meetings took place at which constructive discussions on controversial matters were held.

The Communist movement, locked in battle with imperialism and reaction, needs greater unity of action if it is to be more effective. This is why the Conference and the preparations for it are an important step towards Communist unity and the unity of all the anti-imperialist forces.

The November session was attended by a larger number of parties, a sign that the Conference may well bring together more participants than anticipated at first. The communique, noting that some parties had informed the Committee that this time they would be unable to send delegates, repeated the call to those parties that so far have not taken part in the Conference preparations to join in.

The positive outcome of the Budapest meeting is also evident from the reaction of the bourgeois press, which makes no

secret of its disappointment. The results of the meeting were, plainly, a blow to those who had gloated over "insurmountable" difficulties. In Chile, for instance, the reactionary press commented on an alleged change in attitude by the Communist Party of that country, insinuating that our Party would stay away from Budapest. This was written at a time when the Chilean delegation was attending the session in the Hungarian capital. The falsehood was also refuted by the fact that during the Preparatory Committee meeting the Communist parties of Chile and Mexico, whose leaders were in Santiago at the time, issued a joint communique which reads in part: "The Communist parties of Mexico and Chile declare for convening in the near future an international Conference of the Communist parties to further their unity, reach agreement on vital problems of the anti-imperialist struggle and usher in a phase of growing understanding among Communists."

Elsewhere the joint communique says both parties "hold that the unity of the world Communist movement is based on allegiance to Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism and on respect for equality between the parties. They consider it necessary to lay emphasis on anti-imperialist solidarity and on joint action for common aims while respecting the autonomy of each party."

Despite the Budapest decisions, the bourgeois press persists in its campaign. It now talks about "unknown" aspects, saying there was only a "semblance of unity," and commenting fancifully on which parties "won" at the meeting and which lost." Reactionary propaganda is obviously worried over the progress made in the Conference preparations.

Its attitude also reflects the difficulties besetting the imperialist camp. The international situation in recent months has not been static, as many speakers at the Budapest meeting pointed out. Of course, to analyze developments as they occur is much more difficult than to make a detailed appraisal of the past. Nevertheless, analysis of current events is needed if we wish to arrive at sound conclusions. In the present complex international situation, notwithstanding all the diverse views on this or that issue, despite setbacks, headway is being made in unity of the anti-imperialist forces, unity of the socialist countries, of the revolutionary forces in the developed capitalist countries and the peoples of Africa, Latin America and Asia.

In the opposite camp, the crisis of imperialism is going from bad to worse. After the abortive attempts to break the will of the courageous people of Vietnam, the Americans have been forced unconditionally to stop their bombing of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. More, the economic crisis of capitalism, a recent manifestation of which is the currency difficulties in Britain and France and which has hit virtually all the capitalist countries, is yet another sign that the foundations of the financial system of these countries are rocking.

Imperialism tends to become more aggressive in this critical situation. It endangers world peace and the social and political rights of the peoples. The November session of the NATO Council was designed to generate tension, particularly in Europe, to justify increased war preparations. The Middle East, where the Israeli aggressors refuse to pull out of occupied Arab territory, remains a danger spot. Recent coups in Panama, Peru and Mali were products of imperialist intrigue. In addition, the imperialists are stepping up their ideological offensive and their brutal persecution of Communists and other champions of democracy and socialism.

Crisis, militarism, exploitation, repression and other phenomena in the capitalist world make it imperative for us thoroughly to discuss the question on the Conference agenda: "The tasks of the struggle against imperialism at the present stage and the unity of action of Communist and Workers' parties, and of all anti-imperialist forces."

The Preparatory Committee decisions include specific measures, to guarantee the success of the Conference. Agreement was reached on holding the Conference in May 1969, in Moscow. In the meantime the

Working Group, which over the months has been concerned with drafting the documents envisaged by the Consultative Meeting, will be able to complete its work. On March 17, 1969, the Preparatory Committee will meet in Moscow, where it is to decide on the date for the Conference, discuss procedure and the drafts prepared by the Working Group.

At the Budapest meeting each party stated its viewpoint. And while views on some issues were divergent, this did not prove an insurmountable obstacle. There was unanimous agreement on the need to hold the Conference. The delegates of three parties — the British Communist Party, Swiss Party of Labor and Communist Party of Réunion — while agreeing in principle said they needed time in view of the restricted character of their powers, to consult with their parties before adopting a definite attitude.

Another noteworthy aspect of the Budapest meeting was the expression of revolutionary solidarity with those countries fighting for liberation. This is natural, for it would have been absurd to expect the meeting to ignore the numerous revolutionary battles shaking the world. Indeed, the preparations for the Conference are an important stage in the worldwide fight for democracy, peace and socialism.

Understandably, the unconditional cessation of the bombing of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam — a victory for the people of Vietnam — has been received with acclaim. This and the Paris peace talks are seen as a gain for the people of Vietnam and for the forces standing for peace and progress. Speakers urged still greater solidarity with the people of Vietnam. The relevant resolution, approved unanimously, says: "The Communist and Workers' parties reaffirm their solidarity with the people of Vietnam battling against aggression of United States imperialism and will continue to maintain their vigilance in the face of imperialist machinations, to extend their actions jointly with all peace forces with the aim of achieving the total withdrawal of the troops of the United States and its allies from Vietnam and ensuring for the people of Vietnam the right to determine their own fate in peace and independence."

Delegates condemned the war of extermination being waged against Communists and other patriots in Indonesia. The meeting expressed solidarity with the patriots of Guatemala, where thousands of people have been murdered in the past three years

as a result of terror of the government and the U.S. imperialists; with the people of Haiti, where Duvalier's butchers have tortured and killed hundreds of people; with the people of Paraguay, where active democrats are hounded and imprisoned. The Conference resolution calls for still greater resistance to imperialist repression in Latin America.

Lastly, the meeting approved an appeal for an immediate campaign to save the life of Panagoulis, the Greek patriot sentenced to death by the fascist regime in Athens.

These resolutions reaffirm the solidarity expressive of proletarian internationalism. Their practical value is enhanced by the backing of the 67 parties represented at the meeting.

We may add that the greater the scale of the action and struggle against imperialism, for revolutionary solidarity, for peace, democracy and socialism, in this preparatory period, the easier will be the way to the Conference and the more imperative the need for joint action by all Communists, by all the anti-imperialist forces.

It is therefore most important in popularizing the coming Conference to see it in connection with the struggle going on in every country and with our grand international goals. The aim should be not only to ensure growing support for the Conference but also to intensify the fight in the various countries and to impress the prin-

ciples of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism on the minds of the millions fighting against imperialism.

Evidently the months between now and May will see meetings and comradely discussions between the parties, which may make the Conference more effective.

The delegations present at the Budapest meeting expressed thanks to the Hungarian Party for its competent and fruitful work as a hospitable host and member of the Preparatory Committee.

The scene now shifts to Moscow, capital of the homeland of the great Lenin, the centenary of whose birth will shortly be commemorated by progressives everywhere. The decision to meet in Moscow is a blow to the imperialist anti-Soviet propaganda. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union, ever loyal to its internationalist traditions, will do all in its power to ensure the success of the Conference.

To sum up, our review of the November session of the Preparatory Committee leads us to the conclusion—and we are careful to eschew undue optimism and do not overlook the difficulties—that the preparations for the international gathering now entering the final phase are making good progress and that they will culminate in the Conference being held in May on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

Vietnam: the new phase

The new phase that opened in November 1968 in the fight against the U.S. aggression in Vietnam presents good opportunities for a peaceful settlement, and augurs a relaxation of tensions in Indochina and throughout Southeast Asia.

The United States had had to modify its policy in this eight-year-old war which, having spread from South Vietnam to North Vietnam and Laos, now threatens to engulf Cambodia.

The past year has probably been the most turbulent of the Vietnam war. Take just the principal events: by the beginning of the year the DRV had a sophisticated air defense system which the U.S. military admitted to be the most powerful ever put to the test. In February, and later in May and June, the South Vietnam liberation forces mounted the war's biggest frontal offensive, while risings erupted in U.S.-occupied rural areas and towns. The political struggle, too, entered upon a new stage. The prestige of the DRV and the South Vietnam Liberation Front rose at home and abroad. This compelled Washington in March to announce a bombing restriction, limiting the bombing to the southern DRV provinces. In May, after long delays, the United States made official contacts with the DRV and the Paris talks began. Then, on October 31 the White House announced a total bombing halt as of November 1 and consented to quadrilateral (DRV, NLF-South Vietnam, U.S. and the present Saigon administration) negotiations.

The socialist states and world democratic opinion see this as an important victory for Vietnam, for the forces of peace and progress, over imperialist aggression, for international détente and peace.

Imperialist propaganda and the hawks in the United States want things to look different. They contend that the forced U.S. moves were a projection of long-cherished

peace aspirations, an "act of grace" amidst military and political victories.

Yet it would pay to examine the real reasons behind this new phase in the Vietnam conflict.

The exact date when the armed U.S. intervention began in South Vietnam is hard to place. The Pentagon keeps its count of personnel losses as of January 1, 1961, though the armed intervention began somewhat earlier. However, assuming we accept that date, the Vietnam gamble has escalated since then into the longest war ever fought by the United States. Obviously minimized Pentagon figures up to November 1968 place the number of killed, wounded and missing U.S. servicemen at 213,000, the losses of all intervention troops totaling 250,000, and the toll of South Vietnamese lives reaching into the hundreds of thousands, with millions more wounded and crippled.

In the effort to crush the national liberation movement militarily and politically the Pentagon built up a massive expeditionary force. By November 1968 it totalled 550,000, and nearly 700,000 with the "allied troops," the Seventh Fleet and Air Force personnel quartered in neighboring countries.

Yet the Pentagon is as far as ever from its ultimate goal. South Vietnamese resistance, which increased to match the U.S. escalation and was supported throughout the country and internationally, above all by the socialist states, put the interventionists on the defensive. The liberation forces controlled one-third of South Vietnam in 1960-61, two-thirds by 1965 and nearly three-quarters by November last.

Since the battle situation is common knowledge, I shall confine myself to just one aspect: the making of the People's Armed Forces.

In 1960-61 they were poorly armed and comprised what were in effect guerrilla

units. But in 1965, during my first visit to the liberated areas, I saw regular regiments and the initial divisions, officer training schools, ammunition factories and arsenals. By then the structure of the armed forces was much the same as it is now, the regular Liberation Army comprising highly mobile regiments and divisions, complemented by provincial units of several battalions each, local volunteers (named "guerillas" in the war reports) from villages in liberated and "neutral" areas and, lastly, by armed groups operating in occupied areas, including Saigon and other towns.

The National Liberation Forces are still growing. Over the past few years, it is true, Pentagon figures put their strength at anything between 150 and 300 thousand. Such meagre strength, however, would never have stemmed, let alone driven back, the powerfully equipped one-million-strong U.S. and Saigon armies.

According to the information at my disposal, which I had the opportunity to verify in part during my travels in the liberated and occupied areas of South Vietnam, the Liberation Armed Forces number at least about a million men. The arms, especially those of the infantry, are much better than they were. The Liberation Army has, in addition to automatic firearms (which U.S. military admit to be superior to those of the interventionists), considerable artillery and anti-aircraft weapons. Its offensive infantry rockets performed splendidly against U.S. bases, and tanks, too, were used for the first time last year. The skill of its commanders was demonstrated in the large frontal operations in 1968, in which areas with a population of more than a million were liberated and some of the biggest U.S. bases threatened.

Liberation Front leaders acknowledge the effective aid they have been getting from the Soviet Union, the other socialist countries and the world's democratic forces.

The political program adopted in August 1967 has helped the NLF expand its mass base. Its broad anti-imperialist platform paved the way for cooperation in a single front of the working class, the peasants, the small urban bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie, the intellectuals and religious groups.

Ever since the nuclei of later liberated areas appeared in the autumn of 1959, the patriotic organizations have been carrying through socio-economic changes, including agrarian reform. Since most of the big landowners had sided with the interventionists, the problem of the big estates was automa-

tically solved: by last autumn more than 2,500,000 hectares had been turned over to the peasants; the middle peasant quickly came to the fore as the principal figure in liberated villages. Hundreds of thousands of peasants joined the volunteer mutual labor groups, which not only extended the mass base of the Liberation Front, but helped resolve the food problem. The role of the Peasants' Union and the youth, women's and other organizations greatly increased.

The democratic elections to communal, district and provincial administrations in the liberated and "neutral" areas held at different times since last spring, depending on the war situation, were a big political success. The people's councils and their executive committees are replacing the provisional revolutionary committees that functioned throughout the Resistance. In territories with an approximately 10-million population, between 90 and 100 per cent of the electors vote for NLF-nominated deputies.

Though the Saigon administration pretends not to notice the existence of the NLF and the liberated areas, the press in the United States and other Western countries shows a distinct interest in, and a certain discomfort over, the appearance in most of South Vietnam of elected democratic bodies. The *New York Times* of November 16, 1968, reported people's councils functioning in seventeen provinces, five towns and 38 departments. And on November 27 *France-Soir* reported that "in liberated areas the Front operates openly. In nearly half the country with one-third of the population, voting takes place in public." The same paper reported that "in contested areas, with nearly one-quarter of the population, people vote secretly, at home. That is how they vote in the hamlets, villages and town suburbs." It amplified: "Lastly, an interesting and possibly unique feature is that since the creation of the secret Vietnam bodies the electorate is offered a choice of nominees," inferring therefrom that "when the fighting is over and it will be seen who controls what, recognizing that the land belongs to those who control it, who collect the harvest and the taxes, who see to it that schools function and who mobilize the youth, then the elections now held by the Vietcong will acquire their full significance." A momentous though somewhat overdue admission in this, the eighth year of the Resistance!

That the National Liberation Front attaches prime importance to consolidating

the democratic organs of government is indicated in a document issued by Liberation Agency: "The power which the August revolution gave the people 23 years ago is now returning to them after a long and bitter fight against invaders and traitors."

The political gains of the NLF in the shrinking enemy occupied areas are considerable. The Union of National, Democratic and Peace Forces, formed last spring in the midst of the popular uprising, is growing and cooperating closely with the NLF, despite having been outlawed by the U.S.-Saigon authorities who threaten death to all who dare to join it. The legal organizations in the occupied areas are also engaging in anti-government actions. The influential Association of Saigon Students, many Buddhist and Catholic leaders and prominent intellectuals, are calling for an end to the war and a peaceful solution of the many internal problems.

A score of coups d'etat, successful and unsuccessful, are on record in Saigon since the founding of the NLF. Today, too, the Saigon administration, propped up by U.S. bayonets, is in the throes of an acute conflict and a struggle for power.

That, in sum, is what Washington has succeeded in achieving in the eight years of its armed intervention; the United States has had to recognize — *de facto* — the National Liberation Front and consent to its participation in negotiations.

The opening blasts of the U.S. bombing of the DRV date to August 5, 1964, when U.S. aircraft made their first massive strike. Regular bombing was resumed on February 7, 1965, and continued with rare intervals until November 1, 1968. The purpose, U.S. strategists initially explained, was to destroy the war-economic potential of the DRV, and to demoralize the population, which was expected to demand of its government that it should cease helping the people in the south of the country. The main air strikes were against the anti-aircraft defenses, transport arteries, industrial centers, chiefly towns and power complexes, and also the key agricultural areas.

Washington hoped that the differences between the socialist countries, coupled with Vietnam's remoteness from the Soviet Union and the other members of the socialist community, would hamper timely and effective aid to the DRV.

Those were the assumptions; today, the Pentagon is totting up the score.

What have the U.S. strategists achieved? Dozens of towns and hundreds of villages

have been reduced to ruins. The net result: gutted factory buildings, hospitals, schools and thousands upon thousands of dead.

The Americans did their worst, but the Republic emerged from the test more united than before. It went on a wartime footing, reinforced its defenses and frustrated the designs of the U.S. strategists. The Soviet Union, the other socialist countries and progressive international and national organizations in all five continents stood by the people of Vietnam. Their aid was timely and effective, and its flow increased. On April 3, 1965, a month after the air war was escalated to uninterrupted bombing of the DRV, Soviet-made MIG's appeared over Vietnam, winning their first victory over the latest U.S. fighter-bombers, and shortly after rockets and coastal batteries saw action as well. A powerful anti-aircraft rocket shield has been built up around Hanoi and Haiphong. And DRV leaders emphasize that it was the Soviet Union that helped most in creating the modern air defense system and training Vietnamese in the use of sophisticated weapons.

Evacuation of towns and target areas, and the efficient civilian defense system kept losses to the minimum and preserved much industrial equipment and material.

An essentially new system of production emerged on the basis of the evacuated enterprises, with home-produced equipment and machinery sent as part of the aid program from the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. In 1966 and 1967 alone, according to official DRV figures, 420 new enterprises were started up and 150 operating enterprises were expanded. State farms, too, were reorganized.

Part of the growing need in manufactured goods was covered by aid from the socialist countries.

The U.S. strategists were also wide of the mark concerning agriculture. Despite all the difficulties, the Republic was adequately supplied with staples. Apart from intensified labor, this was assured by better guidance: farm cooperatives were reorganized to suit the situation, new techniques were effectively employed, and medium and small-scale irrigation was improved. As a result, rice and other food crops increased. In addition, the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries helped out with food.

Transport was the hardest hit. Most bridges were destroyed, while roads and transport facilities were methodically bombed. However, makeshift ferries and floating bridges were used to meet the

emergency and road battalions were stationed along the vital arteries to repair the damage.

The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries provided essential vehicles, transport and bridge-building equipment, and other materials. The flow of traffic along the main roads was maintained.

The Pentagon had planned "anti-Communist guerrilla areas" in DRV territory. But the plan went awry.

After almost five years of bombing, DRV aid to the South in repulsing the intervention continued unabated. By November last the United States was as far away from its aims as at the beginning of the undeclared war. The Republic maintained and consolidated its socialist gains.

DRV and NLF leaders see the forced U.S. moves — the bombing halt and the consent to negotiate with the DRV and NLF — as a victory for the embattled people of Vietnam in North and South stressing that the socialist countries and the worldwide solidarity movement had contributed greatly.

This political effort, they note, should be analyzed and conclusions drawn not only concerning further solidarity with Vietnam, but on a broader plane and with a long-term perspective.

A highly representative anti-imperialist front of democratic, peace-loving forces has emerged over the years as a counterweight to the aggressive imperialist policy. And the military elements in the capitalist world have to reckon with its strength and influence.

Among the first to initiate the international solidarity movement were the peoples of the socialist countries and the Communist and Workers' parties. In recent years the movement has grown into a millions-strong anti-imperialist front embracing Communists and Social-Democrats, peoples fighting for their independence, progressive organizations in the capitalist countries and all who cherish justice and peace. They have joined hands to fight for a common aim: to bridle the U.S. aggressors in Vietnam. Never before has there been such a broadly-based international solidarity movement as this. This is an auspicious fact, one that will no doubt contribute much to a peaceful settlement honoring the legitimate demands of the people of Vietnam. What is more, it will act effectively in other battles for democracy and progress, in defense of peoples exposed to imperialist aggression, against the threat of a new world war, for lasting peace.

The diplomatic front is most important at present. Though they acknowledge the futility of pressing on for a military solution by further escalation, the U.S. imperialists are in no hurry to get down to the negotiations in earnest. They delay them by raising procedural questions in order to win time for armed pressure on South Vietnam and for provocative acts against the DRV. Much hard effort lies ahead before the numerous difficult problems can be solved.

U.S. planes have continued their provocative reconnaissance flights over the DRV since November 1. And the Pentagon has made it clear that it has no intention of halting them in the foreseeable future. In mid-November U.S. forces resumed the shelling of the demilitarized zone, including communities north of Benhai in DRV territory. What is more, U.S. planes raid points in the southern DRV provinces. Seventh Fleet ships still patrol the coast off the DRV between the 17th and 20th parallels, and some U.S. generals and politicians declare in so many words that it is still too early to say that the bombing halt will last.

Alert and ready to repulse all aggressive moves, the DRV is working on important economic problems and improving its defenses. At a special Council of Ministers sitting in November the new 1969 tasks were outlined. "The people of North Vietnam," the decision says, "must actively develop the victories achieved, strengthen the North in every way, fulfil their duty to the compatriots in the South, and maintain a high degree of vigilance and preparedness to thwart all possible intrigues against North Vietnam, bringing the fight against the United States for national salvation to full victory."

Rehabilitation is underway everywhere. Transport workers are repairing roads, railways and bridges. Since November, the coal, power, lumber, and wood-working industries, and engineering, are being restored and expanded.

Agriculture faces the job of growing more food crops.

Though its main effort is centered on economic growth, the DRV is also strengthening its defenses. Bomb shelters are being repaired and new ones built. Anti-aircraft units and coast guards are on continuous alert. The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are extending effective aid. In Moscow, free of charge economic and military aid agreements, long-term credits, a trade and a number of other agreements,

were signed by the Soviet Union and the DRV at the end of November.

In the meantime, delaying a peaceful settlement, the United States has stepped up its military intervention in South Vietnam. The U.S.-Saigon armed forces are in the midst of an "accelerated pacification program."

Details of this secret Pentagon plan were leaked to the press. Liberation Agency, the information office of the NLF, reported that the Pentagon intended to carry through the following strategic aims:

1. Continue with the "clear and hold" strategy while defending and looking for ways of beating the enemy.

2. Retain the cities and towns, the communication lines and all important points at all cost; also to try to hold other areas.

3. Reorganize and rearm the Saigon army to prevent disintegration, make it battle-worthy and able to face up to an enemy offensive. Secure favorable positions for the Saigon army and Saigon government.

4. Reduce the losses and participation of the U.S. army by "de-Americanizing" the war, shifting the main burden gradually on the Saigon army.

Politically, the agency reported, three main tasks were set:

1. Reinforce the Saigon army.

2. Restrict North Vietnam aid to the South and isolate South Vietnam militarily and politically.

3. Consolidate the role of the Saigon government and administration.

According to U.S. press reports the Pentagon has extended the powers of the U.S. commander in Vietnam to prosecute the "accelerated pacification program." He is empowered to take any "retaliatory actions" he considers necessary in South Vietnam and in the demilitarized zone. Some reports have it that he has been given a free hand also with regard to southern areas of the DRV.

The large air force and naval units operating against the DRV until November 1968 are now helping on the South Vietnam front. Hopes are also pinned on Saigon "cannon fodder." The reorganization and re-equipment of the Saigon forces with latest U.S. arms is to be completed by summer. By the end of last year, the puppet regular army of 400,000 was equipped with sophisticated M-16 rifles, artillery, armored vehicles, machine-guns and communications equipment. The reorganization and rearming of the 350,000 strong so-called militia and paramilitary force of the Saigon regime will be completed by next June. The

Pentagon intends to use them to guard occupied areas and for punitive operations. This besides reinforcing the corps of mercenaries from "allied countries," particularly from South Korea and Thailand.

The U.S. launched out on this secret plan last November. Massed air strikes against liberated and guerrilla areas in South Vietnam attained the record high of 700-800 missions daily. B-52 bombers, which drop 400-700 tons of explosives daily, are sent on bombing missions. Punitive operations have been mounted in all the main South Vietnam provinces: south of the demilitarized zone, the Danang area, the Teinguen mountain plateau, north and northwest of Saigon and in the Mekong delta.

However, again the results of the "accelerated pacification" have not come up to expectations. The NLF is stemming the enemy assault, mounting a counter-offensive in the Mekong delta and Zone C, northwest of Saigon. U.S. and Saigon losses have soared in the past two months. Nor has the U.S. command succeeded in reducing the wholesale desertions from the puppet army, totalling, the Pentagon admits, 100,000 to 200,000 men annually.

The Central Committee of the NLF, which sent an official delegation to the peace talks in Paris in early November, called on the people in a statement of November 3, to show determination and fight on until complete victory. The statement called on all governments, all organizations, democrats and progressive leaders, to support the just stand of the NLF and aid the South Vietnamese people in fighting the U.S. aggression for the salvation of their country, for complete victory.

While engaging the enemy on all fronts, the patriotic organizations are strengthening the armed forces, going ahead with socio-economic reconstruction and building up democratic bodies of people's rule. Towards the end of last year, local councils and administrative committees were established in all the main rural areas where the overwhelming majority of the South Vietnam population lives.

Developing the successes in North and South, the DRV, NLF and the Union of National, Democratic and Peace Forces, are following their course in the search for a settlement that will honor the lawful and inalienable rights of their people. In connection with the Paris negotiations, they have renewed proposals based on the Four Points of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and Five Points of the National Liber-

ation Front and the Union of National, Democratic and Peace Forces of November 5, 1968.

These proposals require that the Vietnam problem be solved by the people of Vietnam without outside interference. The United States must end all provocative actions against the DRV, stop the armed intervention in South Vietnam, dismantle its bases, withdraw its armed forces and their "allies" from South Vietnam and leave the people of Vietnam to settle their

own future. The unification of Vietnam will be carried out gradually by the Vietnamese in both parts of the country by peaceful means through consultations and by common agreement of the two parts without foreign interference.

The socialist countries and the democratic peace-loving forces of the world support these just demands of the genuine spokesmen of the Vietnamese people.

Ivan SHCHEDROV

The U.S. after the presidential election

And so there is to be a new man in the White House. Meanwhile, in the transitional period, the press has been complaining about the outgoing Administration's inertia. But there certainly is no inertia on the part of the Republican Party, whose leaders and advisers are busy drawing up policy guidelines for the next four years. What will they be like? What is the new President likely to announce will be his first policy-making steps? What can the United States expect from the ideas enunciated during the Nixon campaign?

All this has been the subject of controversy and speculation. And that is understandable, for Americans were deeply disappointed with the Johnson Administration, with its helplessness in domestic affairs and its irresponsibility in international affairs.

However, it is already fairly plain that nothing Mr. Nixon is likely to say can dispel the disquiet of millions of Americans. The election campaign is over, but the problems of America's long and persistent policy crisis are still there. And the problems, Walter Lippmann remarked recently, "if they are soluble at all, are quite certainly not soluble in the next four years." Nor do they stem from the merits or demerits of this or the future Administration, or of either of the two parties. The difficulties now facing the United States are the logical sequel to a whole stage of

state-monopoly policy at home and imperialist expansion abroad.

The business boom (interrupted by a recessionary year) has engendered various theories about a new capitalism. There has been no end of eulogizing the practically inexhaustible market potential, the miraculous effects of government regulation of the economy and the ability of the "new industrial society" finally to resolve class antagonisms and social conflicts. Many learned studies have been produced to prove the coming of a "new economic era" of sustained and smooth development free of economic and social upheavals. There is, for instance, Professor Galbraith's *New Industrial State*, Heller's *New Dimensions of Political Economy*, and a collective effort by a group of economists edited by Professor Coleman, *The Changing American Economy*.

But none of these theories has stood even a limited test of time. For the sixties, with their "unparalleled prosperity," have proved to be a period of contradictions more acute and complex than any in American history. The proclaimed aim of state-monopoly policy both under Kennedy and Johnson was a high rate of economic growth and a stronger competitive position for American goods.

The boom years have clearly demonstrated the inadequacy of private capitalist methods of managing economic growth. In his 1967 message to Congress, President

Johnson admitted that far from solving the country's economic problems, the era of prosperity had but produced new ones.

Unemployment has been running at a high rate even in these "good" years. True, there have been more jobs, even a shortage of skilled labor in some industries and areas, but the problem of unskilled employment is still far from solved. The official annual unemployment figure for 1961-67 stood at 3.7 million, compared with 3.3 million in 1953-60.

The boom in industry has led to booming prices and living costs, to a spiralling inflation. Together with the growing budget deficit and currency difficulties, this has added to the tension in the sensitive credit and monetary sphere.

The position has been further aggravated by the escalation of the war in Vietnam, which is increasing the budget deficit, accelerating price rises and worsening the balance-of-payments position.

The balance of payments, decline of confidence in the dollar and the gold drain are bound to be the new Administration's biggest worries. Rising prices on export items have cut into the trade balance, in the past the main source of covering the payments deficit. In 1968, for the first time in recent years, imports were in excess of exports. In fact, the government had to inhibit export of capital, that distinguishing mark of imperialism. The so-called voluntary restriction of private foreign investments was by no means a voluntary move by the government. It is evidence of acute financial contradictions, of a situation in which the strategic aims of imperialism are sacrificed to expediency.

High growth rates have but added to America's economic contradictions without solving its major problem: the U.S. position in the sixties has grown weaker, not stronger.

The new President will also have to contend with an unprecedented sharpening of social contradictions. The Great Society failed to eliminate unemployment; in the "affluent society" 30 million Americans have family incomes below the \$3,000 level. What is more the gap between rich and poor has widened. The war on poverty turned out to be a war against the poor. Social conflicts exploded into numerous mass demonstrations against Washington's home and foreign policies.

The depth of the social antagonisms is measurable in the wave of election-day and subsequent student demonstrations against

the war in Vietnam and the American brand of "democracy." The periodic Negro protests are a constant reminder of social discontent. And there is another potent reminder: nearly a third of the voters did not bother to go to the polls. The *International Herald Tribune* described the 1968 presidential campaign as "sixty per cent democracy" — only 60 per cent of the electors voted, compared with 62 per cent in 1964 and 63.8 in 1960; about 30 million out of a total of 90 million registered voters, according to an Associated Press estimate, saw no point in casting their vote for any of the presidential candidates.

The war in Vietnam was a central issue of the election campaign. The Johnson Administration's aggressive policy aggravated all of the country's economic and political problems. And the President-elect, Richard Nixon, told *U.S. News and World Report*: "In foreign policy the first item we must deal with is Vietnam." The demand for a peace settlement has been long and vocal, both in the United States and other countries. But recently Washington has been faced with the dilemma—should the U.S. continue to act as the world's policeman in detriment to its economic and political positions in the world, or should it concentrate on its domestic problems, which are rapidly reaching menacing dimensions?

Nixon's idea of "de-Americanizing" the Vietnam war has little in common with the search for peace. It is prompted by expediency, by the desire to end the foreign-policy deadlock and find a way out of the internal-policy crisis. The idea of limiting America's commitments in Asia, and more specifically in Vietnam, has won wide support and is often considered the cure for the country's ills. The press, notably pro-government organs, is plugging the idea that an end to the war would automatically end the budget deficit and inflation, reduce taxes, bring the balance of payments out of the red, re-establish the prestige of the dollar and relax tension at home. All these have been capsuled into the magic formula of a "peace dividend"—an end to the war would solve all the economic and social problems and release vast amounts of money for the civilian economy, urban reconstruction, help to the poor, and so on.

The problems facing the new President are much more complicated than the oversimplified "peace dividend" formula suggests. Hopes of any substantial cut in military spending are not realistic. Nixon has announced his support for a costly anti-

missile system which, it is argued, will give the United States missile and nuclear superiority over the Soviet Union. But this can only mean that a large part of the money released by ending the fighting in Vietnam would be swallowed by military spending on other programs. At any rate, the Pentagon is not likely to give up its positions without a fight. And it is not surprising that most of the current Vietnam de-escalation plans do not envisage de-escalation of military spending. Even the most "optimistic" models are predicated on the assumption that there will be no reduction at all before 1970. In the opinion of a Harvard Professor, a former Presidential economic adviser, military spending will remain at a level of \$70-75 billion (the figure for the current fiscal year is \$71.9 billion).

In his campaign speeches, Mr. Nixon had much to say about the need to review the position in NATO, strengthen America's ties with its European allies and improve the quality of the U.S. forces in Europe. The idea, apparently, is to infuse new life into the Western European Union of the Common Market Six and Britain—it would discuss both political and economic affairs within the Kennedy Round framework and eventually enable Britain to enter the Common Market. The British business press suggests that the U.S. stands little chance of influencing Europe, particularly France, in this direction. It will be recalled that President Kennedy's attempt to exert pressure on France led to de Gaulle's veto on British membership in January 1963. Besides, America's balance-of-payments troubles will not give it a strong pressure position vis-à-vis Europe and NATO. In short, adjustment of affairs in Europe now depends much more on the European countries than on the United States.

Economic problems will rank high on the new President's program. In the opinion of Arthur Burns, formerly Eisenhower's chief economic adviser and now adviser to Nixon, the new government will begin by tackling the inflation and the balance of trade. It will probably try to slow down economic expansion, which inevitably means more unemployment. But the idea is that a low growth rate will discourage imports and encourage exports, and in this way improve the balance of payments.

Nixon promised the electorate he would hold back prices and repeal the 10 per cent tax surcharge introduced by the present Administration. The *Wall Street Journal* be-

lieves this is hardly feasible in view of the ever growing budget deficit.

Mr. Nixon's economic statements reveal a traditional Republican orientation. The accent is on maximum stimulation of private enterprise and restricting the role of government. There is also the hint that direct welfare subsidies to the states will give way to privately financed welfare programs. *Business Week* suggests that the new government will not concentrate on social programs of the Great Society type, though existing ones will not be fully dismantled.

The traditional Republican line is discernible also in the new President's position on foreign policy. His government is likely to support appeals to cut imports, reduce foreign aid and repeal private foreign investment restrictions. However, these protectionist proclivities are apparently prompted not only by the traditions of his party. The balance-of-payments crisis has led to bipartisan protectionism; even Hubert Humphrey supports higher tariffs though the Democratic Party traditionally stands for free trade. Consequently, it is not a matter of the new President's political philosophy, but of the stark economic realities of America's foreign trade difficulties.

In dealing with these and other problems the new Administration will have to face some hard alternatives. Attempts to restrict inflation by reducing growth rates are bound to increase unemployment. Attempts to cut taxes will immediately raise the danger of a bigger budget deficit. Continuation of deficit financing is fraught with the danger of greater inflation, a bigger budget deficit and fresh monetary difficulties. Retention of America's international commitments is bound to militate against "law and order" in America itself. Finally, concentrating on internal rather than foreign matters—racial groups, youth, urban renewal, the economy, etc.—is fraught with the danger of diminishing America's leading role in the capitalist world.

The campaign mounted by the three candidates was not without reason described as "sloganless." The problems that have accumulated over the past years are too big to be sloganized for election platforms. And it can be anticipated that so long as the present system continues, their solution will be beyond the powers of any Administration.

V. DAGMAR

NATO building up tension

The decisions adopted by the NATO Council in Brussels last November envisage an increase in military expenditure (in 1968 it was expected to reach \$100,000 million) and the numerical strength of the troops, whose quality, fighting ability and allocation are to be improved. The session issued a rather sensational statement to the effect that neutral countries and also some socialist countries fall within the NATO sphere of interests.

The North Atlantic bloc had its genesis in the myth of "Communist aggression" and the "danger from the East." Now, too, a "growing Soviet threat" is invoked to justify the Brussels decisions. However, in the almost twenty years of the bloc's existence the world has had ample opportunity to discern its real purpose. NATO has always been, and is now, an aggressive military-political bloc of imperialist powers designed to counter socialism and to further United States' global strategy, and this latest outcry about danger from the East merely signifies another attempt to prolong the existence of the pact.

NATO unites highly diverse countries, from bourgeois-democratic Denmark and Norway to fascist Greece and Portugal—a circumstance which some NATO members find shocking. But when the Danish Foreign Minister let fall a hint in Brussels that the Greek regime compromised the pact, he was brusquely called to order and told that that kind of talk played into the hands of NATO's adversaries.

The North Atlantic bloc is a vast military-political mechanism incorporating the armies and institutions of fifteen countries. It has at its disposal millions of soldiers equipped with the latest in military technique, including nuclear weapons. The NATO countries' allocations for military purposes in 1949-65 exceeded \$1,000,000 million—more than all the belligerents spent during World War Two.

The decisive role in the alliance is played

by the United States, which, according to *Wall Street Journal*, accounts for about 70 per cent of its total combat potential. The United States, which has 225,000 troops in West Germany, controls the bulk of NATO's stocks of nuclear weapons, including more than 7,000 nuclear warheads in Europe. U.S. generals and officers hold the key posts in the NATO administration. This enables the U.S. imperialists to utilize the alliance in the interests of their global strategy. The economy and policy of the member-countries are subordinated to NATO aims.

During the first phase of its existence NATO relied on the doctrine of "global" and "total" war, then on "massive retaliation," i.e., an atomic blow at the life centers of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. The United States pursued its policy of brinksmanship and cold war in an effort to retard the development of the socialist countries.

The growth of Soviet military and economic might and the evening up of the Soviet and U.S. nuclear potentials rendered the "massive retaliation" strategy dangerous to the United States itself. As a result of the economic and cultural progress of the socialist community and the growth of the international working class and national liberation movements, the correlation of world forces changed and the positions of the United States and its allies weakened. This necessitated a revision of the NATO military doctrine, its adaptation to the new conditions. And so there came into being the concept of "flexible response," according to which nuclear weapons would be used at a later stage in the war. The new concept enhances the importance of conventional weapons and, consequently, the role of the "non-nuclear" members of the bloc. This was one of the reasons for the change in the correlation of forces in NATO, for the growing ambitions of West Germany, whose attitude to the bloc is determined, as

the Czechoslovak writer O. Mahler pointed out in his book *The Balance of Forces and the Strategy of the West*, by the desire "to become the center of the NATO military system in Europe, to have the decisive say in NATO organs, a direct say on strategy, and thus the possibility to use the NATO military potential for its own political purposes."

In keeping with the new strategy, greater emphasis is laid on the economic, political and ideological preparations for war. Imperialism aims at utilizing the peaceful competition imposed on it with a view to undermining the positions of socialism, for an extensive ideological offensive camouflaged by the theory of "ideological co-existence." In recent years NATO spokesmen have been boosting "convergence," "European community," "bridge building" and similar concepts. Anxious to "soften up" the socialist system, the imperialists frequently pose as champions of socialist and communist ideas, painting them in "democratic" and "national" colors.

NATO strategy is closely interwoven with direct pressure and war by members of this and other imperialist groupings in their struggle against world socialism and the revolutionary movements. Proof of this is furnished by the U.S. war in Vietnam. While proclaiming their readiness to end this war, U.S. leaders do not visualize any change in the huge military budget necessitated by the Vietnam aggression. The methods of the North Atlantic bloc are also exemplified by the fascist military coup in Greece, accomplished in 1967 in accordance with a previously drafted plan. Similar plans are said to have been drawn up for other NATO countries.

The weakness of the alliance is evidenced by the new NATO strategy.

The uneven development of capitalism has led in the postwar years to an accumulation of contradictions between Western countries and within their groupings. NATO is the scene of constant wrangling, the acuteness of which was vividly demonstrated by France's withdrawal from NATO in 1966.

The new strategy has weakened somewhat the U.S. "presence" in Western Europe, which is not to the liking of the rulers of Federal Germany who need Washington's support until such time as they can definitively affirm themselves in that part of the continent. But the plans of the West German politicians are meeting with resistance in NATO, above all on the part of de Gaulle's France, which claims the

leading role in Europe for itself.

This explains by Bonn, sensing the collapse of the "new eastern policy" designed to realize NATO's present-day strategy, was particularly active in the autumn of 1968 in trying to scare its allies with the old bogey of the "Communist danger." It was Kiesinger, the London *Financial Times* wrote, who "has been the most critical of NATO's inactivity and who argues most persistently that the balance of power within Europe has changed." In this Bonn is vigorously supported by Britain who in return wants Bonn's help in its efforts to get into the Common Market. These actions by leading NATO countries are indicative of an old tactic of the imperialists: when their policies flop, they raise a hullabaloo to distract public attention from the real aims of their policy, to prepare for a new strategy and tactics, and to justify a new round in the arms race.

Having decided that the time has come to try again to influence the policy of the socialist countries from positions of strength, the Atlantic leaders have proclaimed patronage over some of the neutral and socialist countries which, of course, have no relation to NATO. The "grey zone" theory is regarded by them as the logical continuation of the policy of "selective coexistence," "softening up," etc. As they see it, the ideological wedges which they have been trying to drive between the socialist countries have produced cracks wide enough for political and military wedges as well. At the same time attempts are being made to undermine the trust of the neutral states in the foreign policy of the socialist countries, to get them to change their status and thus strengthen the positions of the Atlantic alliance.

A striving to intervene openly in the relations between the socialist countries is seen also in the fact that Atlantic politicians call in question the lawfulness of the cooperation and mutual aid within the socialist camp. They dislike the very concept of the socialist community. But the provocative attempts to justify interference in the affairs of the socialist camp do not appear convincing even to some NATO leaders. At the Brussels session France's Foreign Minister Debré declared that the socialist countries' right to defense is by no means a new doctrine, that it has been exercised by them since their emergence.

Exploiting the atmosphere of anti-Communist hysteria whipped up by them, the NATO apologists have succeeded in

somewhat weakening the centrifugal trends and muffling the voices of those who wanted to part ways with the bloc in 1969. "Recalcitrant" France, for example, has been more pliant this time, while its deteriorating financial position is restricting de Gaulle's freedom of action.

Such is the essence of the decisions reached at the recent session of the NATO Council. Their purpose is to strengthen the aggressive bloc, to halt the centrifugal trends and overcome the contradictions, to adapt it to the present correlation of forces, which is changing in favor of socialism, and to work out more effective forms of struggle against socialism and the entire revolutionary movement.

The new line of the Atlantic bloc is a threat to universal peace. It endangers both the economic and political gains of the working people of the capitalist countries

and burdens them with heavier military expenditure. It leads to a growth of reactionary trends in internal policy and facilitates activation of anti-democratic, neo-fascist trends.

This is a serious warning to all the forces of peace and democracy. The latest NATO intrigues testify to the need for unity of the Communist parties, for intensification of their struggle for a genuine European security system. The program of this struggle is set forth in the proposals of the Bucharest session of the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty, in the decisions of the Karlovy Vary conference of European Communist and Workers' parties. To carry this program into reality is the imperative task of the progressive, peace-loving forces.

E. LIAN

Fifty years of the Communist Party of Germany

Interview with Max Reimann, First Secretary, CC CPG

Question: We recently celebrated the 50th anniversary of the German workers' and soldiers' revolt against the Empire and its militarist government. The Communist Party emerged from the 1918 revolution and was formally constituted somewhat later by Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg. What was the significance of the founding of the Party?

Max Reimann: You have already pointed to the link between the revolution and the emergence of the CPG. In fighting to end the imperialist holocaust, overthrow the Kaiser and establish a system based on justice and humanism, the German working-class movement enriched its experience, which it had been accumulating ever since the early days of imperialism. Far from giving the people the promised "place in the sun," Germany's aggressive and chauvinistic policy, the arms build-up and the world war doomed them to hardship and misery. Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, the recognized leaders of the Left and later of the Spartacus League, fought to reverse that, but most Social-Democrat leaders made peace with imperialism. In 1914, despite Liebknecht's vigorous opposition, they voted for the war credits. They joined the jingo camp, enabling the Kaiser's Commander-in Chief to declare: "For me there are no longer political parties, only Germans."

In 1918 German imperialism was plunged into a military, economic, political and moral crisis. And again the Right-wing Social-Democrat and Center leaders co-

operated with the power-structure. When it became clear that there was no saving the monarchy, they helped convert the country into a bourgeois republic. The Social-Democrat and Independent Social-Democrat leaders called a halt to the November revolution even before it could attain its basic bourgeois-democratic aims.

The German Left was thus faced with the alternative which Lenin had foreseen and prepared for when he founded the Bolshevik Party. The split in the labor movement, brought about by the SD leaders, now accomplices of the imperialists, had to be countered by an independent revolutionary party. That was the only way the workers and all who cherished peace, democracy, progress and socialism could continue the fight for these aims. Furthermore, national and international necessity coincided—betrayal of the anti-imperialist struggle had to be answered by fidelity to the immortal slogan of Marx and Engels: "Workers of All Countries, Unite!" And this slogan became the guiding principle of the program adopted at the Party's inaugural congress. Rosa Luxemburg had every justification in saying: "Again we are with Marx, again under his banner." And "being with Marx" meant that, 70 years after the Communist Manifesto, the birth certificate of scientific socialism, the German working class had again acquired a militant party dedicated to liberating the proletariat and the nation from imperialist oppression and guiding them towards socialism. This was a party of resolute strug-

gle against opportunist and revisionist subordination of the workers' interests to those of Big Business. But there was also this aspect: the international labor movement had acquired in Germany a new ally, a party that proclaimed its solidarity with its Russian comrades in the fight against the common enemy and accepted the October Revolution as a guide to action. It regarded the founding of the Communist International as a logical and necessary development. It wanted to march shoulder to shoulder with its class brothers in every country "to extirpate capitalism, make socialism a reality, ensure peace and strengthen it by relying on the international brotherhood and revolutionary upsurge of the world proletariat."

The inaugural congress, understandably, could not solve all the problems of winning mass support. Nor was it able, in the difficult conditions of the time, fully to apply Lenin's strategy and tactics, and it was now too late to alter the unfavorable course of the revolution. The working class and its vanguard sustained a heavy defeat in the January 1919 battles. Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg were murdered along with hundreds of our leading Communists. But subsequent developments fully confirmed Liebknecht's prediction, written two weeks after the founding of the Party and only a few hours before his death: "The Spartacus League epitomizes the will and the cause of proletarian revolution. The German working class is not at the end of its road to Calvary, but the day of emancipation is near. The present events are like waves reaching to the skies, but we know how to weather the storm; we know that our ship is firmly and proudly sailing towards our chosen goal." Liebknecht could say this because there was the Communist Party, a revolutionary party whose program was permeated with the ideas of Marxism-Leninism. That is why we can confidently say that the founding of the Communist Party was a turning point in German history and a major event in the international workers' movement.

Question: As Liebknecht had foreseen, the movement experienced eventful and difficult times. Bourgeois and Social-Democrat historians have blamed the Communist Party for the collapse of the Weimar Republic and for Hitler's advent to power. Could you, in the light of your own experience, review the events leading up to 1933? How do you explain the rise of fascism in Germany? What conclusions did the German Communists draw from

the defeat of the working class in 1933?

Max Reimann: These questions are of interest to many people in the Federal Republic besides the Communists, and particularly the younger people. This is evident from talks with young trade unionists and Socialists, students and other groups of the extra-parliamentary opposition. The rise of neo-fascism and the persistence of elements of the Nazi past impel young people to seek the answers to the problems by establishing the historical truth.

The rise of fascism can be understood only in terms of its class substance. Consequently, the events of 1930, usually referred to by historians, provide some explanation, but do not reveal the much deeper causes of the collapse of the Weimar Republic. The true reasons date from the very birth of the Weimar Republic. The fatal seeds were sown when Ebert and Scheidemann, in alliance with employer federations and the General Staff, engineered their plot against the soldiers and workers, when Noske agreed to act as the "bloodhound of reaction" and used the reactionary *Freikorps* to crush the revolution. Furthermore, nothing was done to abolish property relationships, the big concerns, notably Krupp and Siemens, the big banks and landed interests, the military terror organizations, the biased courts, the virus of anti-Communism and anti-Sovietism—all were later to lead to political assassination, the rise of the Hitler party, in short, to the mechanism that brought the fascists to power.

Even the legal foundations of Hitler's terror regime were laid in those years. The emergency clauses incorporated into the Weimar Constitution contained the rudiments of dictatorship, and were widely used during the crisis of the thirties to abolish parliamentary government and democratic rights. This, you will appreciate, has a topical ring today, with the enactment of Bonn's emergency legislation. And, I might add, it applies also to the controversy over the electoral law. The advocates of constituency elections in the Bonn coalition maintain that the Weimar Republic was killed by proportional representation: it produced a "power vacuum," whereas constituency elections would have guaranteed a "stable democratic Center majority" and all would have gone well. The argument, a fallacious one, is refuted by the election statistics, which show that in those crucial thirties the Nazis would have been the only party to benefit from a

system of constituency elections. Even formally they would not have prevented a fascist takeover; if anything, they would have accelerated it.

I say "formally" deliberately, for the decisions were not made in Parliament, but in other quarters where there was no "power disintegration" or "power vacuum." Quite the contrary, the ruling elements were working to concentrate power. In fact, they were prepared gradually to abolish the Republic to maintain themselves in power. In 1930 they forced the resignation of the last Social-Democrat Chancellor, Mueller. They had already decided to discard republican and parliamentary procedures at certain intermediate levels in favor of dictatorship.

It is to the credit of the CPG that it drew correct conclusions, in its resolution of June 4, 1930, from the overthrow of the Mueller government. The Nazi movement, the resolution said, was a reaction to the mounting upheavals of the capitalist stabilization; the Nazi leaders were agents of finance capital, of its top crust. And we emphasized the need for unity of the workers and the millions of unemployed as the basis for a common front against fascism and capitalist exploitation, a front that would attract the farm laborers and small peasants, the urban poor and lower civil servants.

In the summer of 1930 the CPG opposed to Hitler's nationalist and social demagoguery its own Program of National and Social Liberation of the German People. This was an important theoretical and political document. It disclosed the role of finance capital as the vehicle of fascism and the No. 1 enemy of the working class and the people. Mass struggle in a united anti-imperialist front was the only way to prevent fascism.

The Social-Democrat leaders thought otherwise. In their view, the Nazi Party was a more or less inevitable product of petty-bourgeois revolt, an isolated phenomenon totally unconnected with the class forces behind the existing system. Accordingly, the Social-Democrats maintained, there was no point in focusing attention on the Nazis. And up to the very last minute they argued: Let the Nazis take power and show that they cannot cope with the responsibilities it entails. Another much-used argument was that the Left were exaggerating the danger from the right, that the fight must be against "totalitarianism from right and left." The same spurious arguments are used today and, let it be said,

bring grist to the mill of the National Democratic Party.

In the early thirties the Social-Democrat leaders were dealing blow after blow against the Left, and were either passive in relation to the Right, or were virtually helping it. For years this was lauded as the "lesser evil," a policy that played into the hands of the Right, which the SD leaders helped in their onslaught against the workers. When their last Chancellor was forced to resign, the Social-Democrat leaders accepted one "lesser evil" after another—Bruening, with his emergency decrees, von Papen, with his putsch against the Prussian government, and lastly Schleicher, who held the door open for Hitler. The "lesser evil" had grown and, in the end, the Social-Democrats found themselves face to face with the evil of evils—the Hitler terror.

Was there any justification for their political blindness? They knew the facts — from the statements of the Imperial Alliance of German Industry, with its demand to allow Big Business to contribute millions to the Nazis (under a Constitutional clause!) to outright collaboration with them in the October 1931 Harzburg front. But they ignored the facts; they shunned every policy that implied struggle and were dead set against "alliance with the Communists," for that, they argued, was the supreme evil. They supported Hindenburg's election to the presidency, whereas the Communists warned: "A vote for Hindenburg is a vote for Hitler! A vote for Hitler is a vote for war!" The Social-Democrat leaders resigned themselves to Papen's putsch, whereas the Communists called on the working class to combat this attempt to repeal the Weimar Constitution. Even after January 30, 1933, at the height of the terror against the working class, they rejected all the Communist proposals for a united front. In doing so they paralyzed the only force capable of utilizing every available means, right up to a political general strike, to prevent the imposition of a Nazi regime, with its imperialist program of war, genocide and national disaster.

The Communist policy of combating fascism and its supporting forces differed fundamentally from the attitude of the Social-Democrat leadership. In recording this, we Communists are not oblivious to the errors and shortcomings which prevented effective implementation of our correct anti-fascist unity policy. And we paid a heavy price for the defeat of the working

class in 1933, but we later analyzed its causes and drew the necessary conclusions. In this, too, we differed from the Right-wing Social-Democrat leaders, who to this day persist in their old mistakes. After 1945 they tried to save German imperialism; now, as partners in the Bonn coalition, they support the expansionist and aggressive policy of the German monopolies.

The attitude of its leaders prior to 1933 explains why, at one time, we regarded the Social-Democrat Party as the chief support of the bourgeoisie in its drive towards fascism. But we made a special effort to cooperate with Social-Democrat members and organizations to avert fascism.

But it has to be said that at that time we had not yet overcome our incorrect attitude towards the reformist-led trade unions, claiming that they, too, were undergoing a process of fascization, and this included even local trade union branches. Naturally, this made it difficult for us to win over Social-Democrats and trade union workers for a common struggle.

The Party leadership—and this was a sign of its growing political maturity—tried to reverse that policy even before 1933, and the Brussels Party Conference fully clarified the situation by calling for united action with Social-Democrat members and organizations in the fight for peace and democracy.

We had, moreover, to elaborate policy on still another point, the link between democracy and socialism. For, as Lenin wrote: "The proletariat cannot prepare itself for its victory over the bourgeoisie without an all-round, consistent and revolutionary struggle for democracy" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p.144). This should have impelled us, in the years preceding the fascist takeover, fully to appreciate monopoly capital's determination to discard parliamentary forms in favor of fascist dictatorship. Consequently, we should have called on the Social-Democratic Party and the trade unions to join in a united effort to defend democratic rights and the Weimar Republic. But at that time we did not fully appreciate this, though we resolutely campaigned for the rights of the people.

The Brussels Conference and subsequent developments enabled the Party to develop the Leninist strategy of revolution in German conditions. This is the conclusion the Party drew: the attack must be directed at the foundations of imperialist rule and for

anti-fascist and democratic reforms. Genuine democracy required dislodging monopoly capital, the big landed interests and the militarists from their positions, the ultimate aim being to reconstruct society along socialist lines.

Our policy was tested by the march of events after 1945. These events plainly showed which party had drawn the correct conclusions from the collapse of the Weimar Republic and the Hitler dictatorship. The Marxist-Leninist analysis contained in the Communist Party's call of June 11, 1945, indicated the road to an anti-fascist and democratic Germany that would be a bulwark of peace in Europe and of human progress. This was achieved in East Germany; working-class unity was established, the Communist and Social-Democrat parties merged to form the Socialist Unity Party, an alliance was formed of the working class and all anti-fascist and democratic forces. This made it possible to extirpate fascism, imperialism and militarism. The issue of power was solved in favor of the working class and its allies, and there came into being the first German state of workers and peasants. Closely associated with the Soviet Union and other fraternal socialist countries, the GDR became a permanent barrier to a new German *Drang nach Osten*. The GDR is a firm and reliable guarantee of peace in the heart of Europe, the bulwark of Germany's democratic and socialist future.

Events took a different course in West Germany. Yet there, too, the Nazi defeat opened the way to rebuilding society and the state on new principles. This time, too, as in 1918, the Social-Democrat leaders spoke of "socialism as the immediate goal." But this time, too, they supported the imperialists in exonerating the perpetrators of the two world wars. Exploiting the split in the working class, anti-Communist and anti-Soviet hysteria, they enabled the big concerns, the banks and the landlords to continue in business. In this way anti-fascist and democratic reforms were blocked, Germany was partitioned to maintain the imperialists in power and, subsequently, the Federal Republic was made the European center of imperialist global strategy, a center for aggression against the GDR and the socialist camp.

Fully in line with this policy, the Communist Party of Germany was banned in 1956. Yet it was the only West German party which from the very outset had vigorously opposed restoration of imperialism and militarism and the rearmament and

revenge policy of the militarists and their party—the Christian-Democratic Union and Christian-Social Union. Time and again we warned the Social Democrats against disregarding the lessons of history and supporting monopoly capital. Prohibition of the Communist Party helped them to follow that policy. The old lies about the “eastern menace” and the slander against the GDR were used to justify remilitarization and participation in America’s global strategy. And when the frontal attack on the GDR failed and brought the Adenauer era to an end, the Social Democrats again offered their services in extricating imperialist policy from this new crisis by sanctioning Bonn’s emergency measures and its “new Eastern policy.” Now, after two years of the Grand Coalition, the results are plain for all to see. Exploiting the general turn to the right and encouraged by Bonn’s chauvinism and revanchism, the National Democratic Party has gained election successes that have brought it to the point reached by Hitler in 1930, three years before he came to power. But the danger is greater than these figures suggest, for Nazism and neo-Nazism exist not only in the National Democratic Party; they are deeply rooted in the Bonn government and its parties. The President of the Republic, for example, had been a designer of Hitler’s concentration camps; the Federal Chancellor had worked under Goebbels and Ribbentrop; Hitler’s war-industry directors again hold commanding positions in the economy, and his generals top positions in the army; the courts are staffed by men guilty of heinous crimes; there are Gestapo and SS-men in the police and in the Office for Protection of the Constitution; old and new ideologists of Nazism are entrenched in positions which enable them to manipulate public opinion.

We do not fear the judgment of history: we can with all confidence face the question of which German party consistently combated imperialism and militarism, war and fascism and learned from the successes and setbacks to the labor movement in order to lead the workers to victory and ensure the triumph of peace and socialism in Germany.

Question: Comrade Reimann, you have pointed to some of the essential features of Communist policy in the present situation and have shown how the Party is drawing on the traditions of the German labor movement in solving the new problems. What, in your view, is now the key

issue of the class struggle in the Federal Republic and what would you say is the link between the old traditions and the problems of today?

Max Reimann: With the re-establishment of war-industry capital and militarism the working class must prevent our country again becoming the starting point of another war. This has both national and international implications.

Will the working class and the people generally follow the lead of monopoly capital, with its armaments drive, spirit of revenge and war-like gambles, or, after the disasters of two world wars, will they choose another road, one that will restrict monopoly power, eliminate militarism, chauvinism and neo-fascism and ensure the country and its people, peace, democracy and progress? That is the crucial question in our fight for mass support. The fundamental issues of the November revolution and the pertinent clauses of the 1918 Communist Party program, therefore, have a much greater validity for West Germany than ever before. True, West German imperialism’s domination and potential have been restricted by the changed balance of forces in favor of socialism, but it has reacted with more aggressive policies. Monopoly capital, that “economic giant,” to use Strauss’ description, refuses to accept the results of World War II. Kiesinger rejects the territorial status quo in Europe as “capitulation.” His government and the men who stand behind him want a “new” continental pattern. That, in fact, is the point and purpose of Strauss’ *Project for Europe*, and Strauss, the “strong man” of Bonn, adheres to the view that as far as West German imperialism is concerned, World War II is still unfinished business. Having recovered from its defeat in 1945, it wants to carry on from where Hitler left off. The idea is to link up with the other imperialist powers, and primarily the U.S., in throwing back socialism and re-establishing Germany’s imperialist supremacy in Europe.

How do they envisage this in the changed conditions? Under Adenauer, West German imperialism aligned itself with the Washington policy of “rolling back” socialism by frontal attack. The idea was first to crush the GDR, which the imperialists regard as the weak link in the socialist chain. The plan failed when, in 1961, the GDR took measures to safeguard its frontiers. Bonn’s German and Eastern policy was plunged into crisis. But this did not

lead to a more realistic concept based on recognition of the facts. On the contrary, the "new" policy vis-à-vis Germany and Eastern Europe is designed to achieve the same aims but using more subtle methods and with the help of the Social-Democrat ministers. But this new variant, like all the preceding ones, is subordinated to American global strategy. It provides for a combination of "softening up" and the threat of force, that is, ideological sabotage and military pressure. If the Bonn revanchists had learned anything, they would have signed the nuclear non-proliferation treaty, accepted the European territorial status quo, normalized relations with the GDR and concluded a binding non-aggression treaty with it and the other socialist states. But there is no hint of any such intentions from Kiesinger, Strauss, Brandt or Wehner, though all their public utterances are larded with references to a "European peace structure," "lessening of rigidity," and "bridge-building."

Who will believe them in face of the facts: Bonn wants to increase the already huge 1969 military budget; it is insistently pressing for nuclear weapons; is squandering millions in supporting America's war in Vietnam, thereby assuring Washington's support for its claims to domination of Western Europe and expansion of the Bundeswehr into the biggest NATO force on the continent. These are not bogies invented by the Communists. They are verified facts, intentions and aims publicly confirmed by leading Bonn politicians. And the facts show that West-German imperialism is the chief obstacle to peaceful coexistence in Europe, the chief menace to European security.

In pursuance of their national and international obligation, the West German Communists have made peace and a new alignment in the Federal Republic the focal point of their program, aimed at converting the country into a progressive, democratic and welfare state. In contrast to the design to turn the Federal Republic into an armed, war-preparing society oriented on imperialist aggression, straight-jacketed by emergency laws and saturated with neo-Nazism, we call on all the democratic and socialist forces to unite with the working class in the fight for a peaceful and democratic future. And the opportunities for such a broad popular movement will be all the greater the sooner people realize that the GDR, with its consistent peace policy and close ties with the USSR and the socialist community, with its record of achievement in

the political, economic, scientific, cultural, social and moral fields, is of the utmost assistance to progress in the Federal Republic. We West German Communists know that the advance of socialism throughout the world, and above all in Germany, would be a gain for our people. Defeat for imperialism, more particularly for Bonn revanchism, in the international class struggle would be a gain for us. That is why the Communist Party of Germany did not for a moment doubt the wisdom of the GDR in reinforcing its frontiers in August 1961.

Our enemies are furious at the failure of their hopes of a "national communism" and a "democratic socialism" gaining ground in the socialist countries. This, incidentally, is the same "democratic socialism" which, in 1918 and in 1945, was used to cover the monopoly comeback. This "model" will not help the working class of our country or of any other country to make a single step forward. And "national communism"? That is exactly what Strauss is banking on: he wants to tear the socialist countries away from the Soviet Union, put them at loggerheads and then swallow them up piecemeal. Nationalism and anti-Sovietism have always been reactionary weapons in the fight against social progress, and today are being used in imperialism's global strategy. That is why we West German Communists remain true to Ernst Thaelmann, who said: "The cardinal question of the international workers' movement is its attitude towards proletarian dictatorship in the Soviet Union. That is the dividing line between political outlooks."

Yes, on this issue political outlooks differ. Anyone in the Federal Republic who wants an alternative to the present policy and change in the alignment of forces will be forced to the conclusion that anti-Sovietism, the lie about a "menace from the east," the claim to speak for the whole of Germany, and slander of the GDR are the chief weapons of imperialist psychological warfare, a necessary initial stage of global strategy, according to the theorists of escalation. Those who allow themselves to be misled on this issue become captives of enemy ideology and politics.

But that should not be taken to mean that we consider acceptance of our class viewpoint a prior condition for joint action with trade unionists, members of the Social-Democrat opposition, the student Left, and other extra-parliamentary opposition groups. We hope that, in the course of comradely

discussion on these issues, above all joint action in defense of common interests, these people will see the true purposes of anti-Communist propaganda, whether primitive and bellicose or flexible and subtle. And we are confirmed in this hope by the numerous resolutions of local and national trade union conferences, conferences of young trade unionists, Social-Democrat branches, student groups, youth leagues, and statements by Social-Democrat members and functionaries and intellectuals. All of them urge a change in Bonn's policy, denounce anti-communism as a threat to all democrats, demand repeal of the ban on the Communist Party, free discussion with Communists and legal rights for the Communist Party.

The West German working class needs a legal Communist Party to carry forward its historical mission. The Federal Republic needs a legal Communist Party to become a factor of European security, a state of progressive democracy, and cease to be a menace to peace and freedom. That is why I welcome the formation, in Frankfurt-on-Main on September 25, of the Federal Committee for Re-establishment of the Communist Party, of which I was informed by its initiators. This accords with the interests of all German democrats.

And so, the half-century from the November revolution and the founding of the Communist Party has seen the ebb and flow of events. These have been momentous

years, and much has been achieved. There is the socialist GDR, the first state of workers and peasants on German soil. Closely associated with the Soviet Union, it is the guarantee that West German imperialism, neither alone nor jointly with its American ally, will ever again encroach on the East. What has to be done from outside to localize this highly dangerous center of war in Europe, is being done. But it is for us in the Federal Republic to say the decisive word. We must prevent this enemy, the main enemy in our midst, from continuing his peace-threatening policy and carrying it to the point of war. The task is, therefore, to lay the groundwork for a genuinely new policy free of revanchism and of any claim to represent all the people of Germany, a policy not tied to the United States and not based on atomic weapons.

What we need now is adjustment of relations with the GDR on the basis of international law, good relations with the USSR and equal relations with all states. And working in the Federal Republic, we must halt the trend towards fascism and eliminate the danger of dictatorship. For this we must rally the workers and the people for democratic progress, participation in management—from factory to university—combat monopoly omnipotence, work for broader rights and justice for the people. Our Party has always been in the forefront in the class struggle. That is our duty today and in the years ahead.

Problems of the Communist movement in Greece

LEONIDAS STRINGOS

The Communist Party of Greece recently celebrated its 50th anniversary — a half-century of struggle and sacrifice in the cause of the working class and the people. Founded under the direct influence of the October Revolution, it brought Marxism-Leninism into our young workers' movement.

In these 50 years of political and social upheaval, the Party has fought courageously for the interests of the working people, staunchly defending democracy, championing peace and national independence and resolutely opposing military coups and the dictatorial regimes set up by the Greek and foreign plutocracy. In the years of Nazi occupation, ours was the first party to rouse the people against the invader, giving inspiration and leadership to the Resistance. It was this dedication that made it the guiding force of the nation.

The Party has had to work in extremely complex conditions: three wars, four dictatorships, two periods of armed struggle in these 50 years. But throughout all these vicissitudes the Party remained true to Marxism-Leninism, proletarian internationalism and friendship with the Soviet Union. Subjected to continuous terror—during half of its history it was illegal, and semi-legal in the other half—it continued to uphold Marxism-Leninism against anti-Party and anti-Leninist deviations, gradually becoming a new type of party and exerting powerful political influence on the working class and the people.

In marking the 50th anniversary of its inception, the Party reviews its experience, especially that of recent years.

1. THE MILITARY-FASCIST COUP

The military-fascist coup posed before the revolutionary movement in Greece and Europe problems of the utmost importance.

For one thing, it demonstrated, forcefully and cogently, that there can be no underestimating the menace of imperialism. True, the balance of world forces is tilting to the detriment of imperialism, which is steadily losing its positions, but it is equally true that it is still able, in one or another area, to mount counter attacks which the working class and its allies must be prepared to repel. The coup in Greece and the methods by which it was carried out reaffirmed Lenin's words that "in order to accomplish its task, the revolutionary class must be able to master *all* forms or aspects of social activity without exception. . . ." Hence, the Party must shape its organization and work accordingly.

This is of particular importance in Greece, located as it is on the border of the two mutually-opposed social systems, at the juncture of three continents whose millions have risen against imperialism to win national independence and break out of imperialist tutelage.

There are also these facts: Greece was the first victim of imperialist invasion; an experimental field for the cold-war policy proclaimed by Churchill and Truman; was subjected to three imperialist interventions in the 25 years since the liberation—by the British in 1944-45, the U.S. in 1946-49 and NATO in 1967. The progressive forces were pushed back; the discredited reactionary forces took over. This explains the difficulties and complexities of our struggle and also the crisis of the ruling classes,

which have had to rely on foreign armed force to maintain themselves in power.

In analyzing these developments, the Eighth Party Congress (August 1961) and the Party Program it adopted stressed the reactionary role of imperialism and the plutocratic oligarchy collaborating with it. The conflict between these and the anti-imperialist, democratic forces, the Program said, was the central antagonism of Greek life. Things came to a head in 1963-64, when the Rights, after ten years in power, were defeated and Greece could look forward to democratic development. The beginning was thus laid for a process of differentiation and regrouping of social forces, for an upsurge of the democratic movement that would increase the influence of the Left and produce far-reaching changes in the Center Union and other bourgeois parties.

To halt that process, in July 1965, King Constantine, acting on the advice of the U.S. imperialists, carried out a palace coup. Our Party regarded this as the beginning of a deep political crisis which faced the country with the agonizing dilemma: fascism or democracy? And though the Party systematically exposed preparations by the Greek army, NATO and U.S. imperialism for an open military-fascist dictatorship, it proved inadequately prepared for effective struggle against the military-fascist coup.

What were the reasons for this, considering the existence of a mass democratic movement? Why were we unable effectively to resist the coup?

The chief reason why we could not prevent the coup, or even preserve the core of the democratic forces after the coup to continue the fight in better conditions, was, in my view, the lack of united action by the democratic parties and the democratic movement as a whole.

Even making allowance for Greece's dependence on imperialism, the harsh emergency laws and repressive measures—and these were continued by the Center Union government—we would have stood a much better chance of resisting fascism and repelling it if the democratic forces had acted long before the coup to consolidate their positions and had worked jointly for consistent democratic development. The Center Union's negative stand on united action, its anti-communism, its policy of concessions to and compromise with the Right and imperialist forces, its fear of a popular movement did not, of course, help to unite the progressive forces in the fight for de-

mocracy. This enabled the reactionaries to launch a counter-offensive after their 1963-64 defeat, to recapture positions won by the people at the cost of much sacrifice, and impose a military-fascist dictatorship.

However, that is not the whole picture. Ours is a revolutionary party, the vanguard of the working class, the most dynamic and consistent class of modern society. It was therefore our duty, in this crucial period, first to examine how during the years preceding the coup the Party had trained its forces, ideologically, politically and organizationally, to prepare them and the working class to combat the fascist danger, how it worked to bring the democratic forces together to repel the reactionary offensive.

Our inadequate preparation for these dramatic events, the shortcomings and errors in our work, hampered the preparedness of the entire working class and adversely affected the unity of the popular forces capable of preventing, or at least resisting, fascist dictatorship. In examining the reasons for the inadequate preparedness of the democratic forces, we must first of all examine the work of our own Party.

2. THE PARTY

One of the problems of the theory and practice of the revolutionary movement is that of the Party. For the fight for democracy and socialism is inconceivable without a strong party equipped with Marxist-Leninist theory, closely associated with the masses, and prepared ideologically, politically and organizationally to conduct its work in the most complex conditions, peaceful and non-peaceful. And in this context we must ask: how did we approach the problem of the Party?

Following an extended meeting of our Central Committee in 1956 which removed the dogmatist leadership and elected a new one, the Party saw its immediate strategic aim as the carrying out of a national-democratic revolution, and its immediate tactical aim in uniting the democratic forces to overthrow the reactionary government and replace it by a democratic one. We made a careful study of the problem of the Party, how best to organize its forces, which acquired particular importance at the end of the 1946-49 civil war.

A correct, and indeed the only possible, solution was worked out by a Central Committee in 1958. All Communists, it declared, should join the EDA, a political

coalition of Communists, Socialists and consistent democrats. This would help assure a correct and firm EDA policy, help to establish close ties with Communist supporters and other Lefts and would give us an active part in parliament, in the trade unions, in the cooperatives and in the other mass organizations. It was also decided that part of our cadres would continue to work in illegal Party groups—Party bases—to assure fulfilment of Party policy and proper party training. In the conditions then prevailing, with the Party continuing as an independent organization, this was the best way to apply the Leninist principle of combining illegal with legal forms of work. We did this despite brutal police terror following the defeat suffered by the democratic forces in the civil war, the repeated attacks on the Party and its penetration by enemy elements.

Looking back on this decision, we believe it should be assessed as positive. For it enabled us to break out of sectarian isolation and establish contact with the masses. This facilitated the growth of EDA organizations, both in the towns and in the countryside. It also encouraged greater activity in the trade unions and cooperatives, stimulated the mass struggle and enabled us to have a vote in parliament. Work among the masses, in line with the CC decision, increased our political influence, and the mass movement led by the Party culminated in the overthrow of the reactionary government and prepared the ground for democratic change. These developments were largely the result of Communist efforts, particularly of our illegal organizations, the Party bases. And though these were still few in number, they made it possible to guide our mass political activity.

But it also has to be noted that at one time members tended to devote all their efforts to legal work, underestimating illegal work and the illegal Party bases. The Eighth Party Congress (August 1961) drew attention to this.

This shortcoming had its repercussions. Some of our functionaries, engaged chiefly in legal work and not directly connected with the masses and mass organizations, displayed a tendency to shy away from illegal work which, they alleged, was only discrediting the movement. This has its explanation: our branches were destroyed during and immediately after the civil war and virtually ceased to exist. Besides, even after the 1958 C.C. decision, inner-Party life was necessarily restricted. To this should be added the difficulties created by

the emergency laws and the carefully organized anti-Communist campaign.

This gave rise to legalistic illusions. Some maintained that the position in Greece would remain normal since the international situation did not allow the United States to interfere in European, and consequently Greek, affairs. This, it was argued, enabled the Party to carry out by peaceful means the National Democratic Program drawn up at the Eighth Congress. The difficulties in ideological work and the inhibition of inner-Party life resulting from the police regime, tended to blur Party principles, weaken discipline and blunt criticism and self-criticism.

Politico-organizational work among industrial workers, the most revolutionary and consistent section of the working class, requiring secrecy to avoid penetration by government agents, was somewhat impaired by the weakness of our Party bases. We realized this in July 1965, when the factory workers should have taken part in a political strike against the "palace coup." It was very hard to conduct our work in the armed forces, too, by reason of the emergency measures, for even the legal party (and the EDA was then legal) was much harassed by the secret police. Difficulties cropped up in enlisting new members, in renewing the cadres and the Central Committee.

We could have coped with these difficulties if the Eighth Congress decisions to improve underground work and develop Party bases had been properly carried out. After the defeat of the Rights (1963-64) as a result of our correct political line, the conditions were favorable. Moreover, we knew that our underground groups needed reinforcing. Our Party had to be strengthened, because the Rightist government could not cope with the situation and the upswing of the mass movement offered good opportunities for consistent democratization. Our Central Committee set its sights on an alliance with the other democratic forces for the minimum program, a program designed to restore democracy and to press for economic and social progress (February 28, 1964), paving the way for a democratic revolution. The Communists and the people had to be prepared for this ideologically and politically.

It was therefore essential to organize the Party forces accordingly, improve guidance and train our cadres in order to assure consistent implementation of our policy. In other words, we had to enhance the role of the Party as an independent, or-

ganized force operating at a higher standard than that set by the Central Committee meeting in order to frustrate the reactionary efforts to turn back the clock and effect a fascist military coup.

Our Central Committee rejected the idea of converting EDA into a Communist Party. Far from achieving the desired aims, that would have split or at least narrowed the EDA, an extremely valuable coalition of Left forces. It was decided instead to extend the Party bases and campaign for their legalization, the legalization of the Party as a whole.

Though approved and adopted by the overwhelming majority of the CC, this resolution was opposed by some members of the Political Bureau and Central Committee. They maintained that the EDA was strong enough, that it could become a working-class party and that, consequently, a Communist Party was non-essential. As they saw it, the Party groups should not operate as the main levers of our movement and should act as mere appendages to the EDA. They went so far as to contend that the Communist Party and EDA had failed, and that a new Party formation, a formation of a different type, was needed. Their charges were made even before the junta took over and were redoubled after the coup.

The roots and the social basis of this erroneous conception can be traced to the difficulties of the class struggle in Greece and the gradual appearance of a legalist trend in the Party. We combated this idea, but we did so a bit too late and on too small a scale. What made things worse was that the trend had the backing of some members of the Central Committee and the Political Bureau. Legalist sentiment prevailed chiefly among those involved in parliamentary work. The bulk of the Party cadre, however, steered by its work in the mass organizations, rejected this trend, firmly supporting the resolution of the CC (February 1968), which took ideological issue with the legalist line.

Our Central Committee was slow in grasping the proportions of the problem and promoting the work of the underground groups. Even after examining the matter in detail in 1963-64, it was not quick enough nor firm enough in repudiating the Right-wing views which, in effect, denied the need for a working-class party.

The damage that could have been avoided by better organization, or at least reduced, surfaced during the fascist coup. For the above-mentioned reasons the Party,

ideologically, politically and organizationally unprepared during the putsch failed to rally the patriotic forces. This is the reason why conditions for more active and successful resistance, resistance that could perhaps have blocked the military coup, were almost totally lacking. Nor was the Party able to repel the coup, to parry the blow struck at a part of its main forces, which could have assured continued resistance in more favorable circumstances.

3. THE PROBLEM OF PEACEFUL TRANSITION

The problem of how to carry out the democratic and, subsequently, the socialist revolution, has occupied our Party time and again in recent years.

The point of departure was that "a radical change of the relation of forces in favor of socialism" was evident and that opportunities had appeared for a peaceful national-democratic revolution (CPG Program, August 1961). Besides, we took into account that revolutionary developments were becoming worldwide, that the fight of the two opposed camps had entered upon a new phase, requiring skilful use of all forms of struggle by each Party. In particular, this applied to Greece, which occupied a special strategic place in the imperialist system and had distinct anti-parliamentary traditions, making a peaceful transition extremely difficult. Taking these factors into account, the Program stressed that the Party would do everything to effect a peaceful change, but that "the people should be prepared for the other, non-peaceful way, ready to counteract any attempt by the plutocracy to throttle the will of the people by violence."

Subsequent events showed that the Congress had been right on this score. Soon after, the Rights carried out the "election coup" (1961), doctoring the results to suit the ruling ERE party according to a plan drawn up beforehand by the CIA, NATO and the Greek armed forces. After the 1961 coup, reaction was able to hit back at the working class and democratic forces. Alarmed by the growing democratic movement, the King and the Army intervened and overthrew the legal government in July 1965. Our Party and the entire democratic movement responded with 70 days of street demonstrations, demanding the reinstatement of the legal government and reversion to the democratic course. But to resist effectively, to reinstate the legal government and secure further growth of

the democratic movement, we first had to combat the legalist illusions in our own ranks and rally a united front.

After the "palace coup" of July 15, 1965, which was followed by the powerful street demonstrations, our Central Committee did not awaken to the fact that the reactionaries had mounted a broad counter-offensive. At that critical hour, reorganization of our ranks and growth of our underground groups was hampered by dangerous illusions. Although we could not help seeing that the reactionaries were turning to violence, that the danger of a coup loomed large, there were those among us who thought the Party should relinquish underground work. Shortly before the fascist putsch, following the warning issued on this score by our Political Bureau over the radio, "Voice of Truth," the legal Leftist press published a distinctly legalist article pooh-poohing the danger on the somewhat flimsy grounds that "we are living in 1967 and not in 1963."

What made matters worse was that this sentiment prevailed among some of our Political Bureau members. They embroidered the possibilities of peaceful democratic growth, although the situation indicated on the whole that parliamentary illusions were harmful and the Party should reorganize and resist the departure from the constitutional order. As we know, the the possibility of peaceful transition is predicated on the use of all forms of struggle and the Party's skill in combining underground and legal struggle.

Two important conclusions can be drawn: firstly, that regardless of the specific conditions, each Party must observe the general Leninist principles concerning the party of the new type. No other kind of party can fulfil its mission in the complex and ruthless struggle against imperialism, and, second, that the problems of peaceful coexistence and the possibilities of peaceful transition require further theoretical elaboration.

4. THE PROBLEM OF ALLIANCES

In recent years our Party has discussed the matter of alliances in fighting imperialism and reaction at home, for a national-democratic revolution. Our Eighth Congress stressed that due to Greece's peculiar position and dependence on imperialism, national-democratic transformations could not be the affair of just one class or one party. All social classes, strata and parties with a stake in democracy were in-

involved. The Congress also noted that in addition to the working class, the most revolutionary in our society, and in addition to the peasants and middle strata, craftsmen and small merchants, the patriotic anti-imperialist front could enlist a section of the bourgeoisie exposed to strong economic pressures by the country's dependence on foreign imperialists.

Acting on this, our Party worked for broad unity. That was our line during the demonstrations protesting against the assassination of Lambrakis in May 1963, culminating in the overthrow of the Rightist government; and we adhered to this line in the fight for the democratization program in 1964 and 1965. We also followed this policy in our fight to avert a fascist dictatorship (1965-66), the Party supporting the "five EDA points," that is, joint action against the danger of a military dictatorship. The Party worked for cooperation with the bourgeois parties at lower and, sometimes, at higher levels, particularly the Center Union or a part of it. And frequently our efforts were successful. Yet we never departed from our fixed principles, such, for example, as the principle of equality, unanimity in decision making, and the independence of the Party. That was the basis on which our Party worked, and in which it still works for cooperation no matter how limited wherever common views and points of contact with other parties are at hand.

In following this line we came up against a theory which, in effect, subordinated the working class to the liberal bourgeoisie; the entirely correct thesis that the national bourgeoisie played a definite radical and progressive role in some economically backward countries was applied to Greece, a country of medium development with a big bourgeoisie that for years had worked hand in glove with foreign imperialists. Besides, the Center Union was wrongly described as a party of the national bourgeoisie. In our view the Center Union is not a Rightist party, a party of plutocrats associated with imperialism. Though Greek monopoly capital is represented in it, it includes a section of the bourgeoisie which seeks to protect the home market from monopoly capital. But it is true that the leading part in the Center Union is played by men of the monopolies.

5. CPG ATTITUDE TO PROLETARIAN INTERNATIONALISM

Throughout its fifty years the Commun-

ist Party has firmly adhered to proletarian internationalism. When world imperialism launched its armed intervention against the newly-constituted Soviet Republic, in which Greece was also involved, the Party, newly founded, protested vigorously, "condemning the aggression of the Great Powers against Russian democracy with the obvious aim of throttling the social revolution." Later, our Party campaigned for recognition of the Soviet Union. And during the Second World War we organized powerful street demonstrations, strikes and even armed resistance to prevent Greek troops from being sent to the East. Throughout the history of the CPG the struggle for national, patriotic aims combined harmoniously with proletarian internationalism.

Looked at from the other angle, the fight of our people for independence and democracy cannot be separated from the October Revolution, from the gains of the socialist community. Never will our people forget what the Soviet Army did to liberate Greece from the fascist yoke. Never will they forget the aid of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries to our people fighting for deliverance from the fascist regime.

During the Hungarian counter-revolution in 1956 our Party, then deep underground, supported the Hungarian People's Republic and welcomed the internationalist action of the Soviet Union in rendering armed aid to the Hungarian revolutionaries to crush the counter-revolution. Our Party fought on the ideological front against the anti-Soviet propaganda in connection with the Hungarian events.

Now, too, our Party has to fight certain anti-socialist and openly anti-Soviet sentiments in its ranks, against charges that the CPSU is interfering in the internal affairs of the CPG and other fraternal parties. These charges attack the principle of proletarian internationalism which, in the final count, is the testing stone of a Marxist party.

Our internationalist position can be traced to the nature of our Party, a Marxist party of the new type; it can be traced to

the fact that for years our Party and people have been up against the imperialists, that in these 50 years our Party has seen in Greece four dictatorships, and that all of us know all too well the class nature of bourgeois democracy; it can be traced to the fact that in 50 years of struggle the Party and people have always had the Soviet Union as an ally in their fight for national liberation, in the fight against imperialism; it can be traced to the fact that throughout these 50 years our Party has fought staunchly against nationalism and has always been faithful to proletarian internationalism, cultivating the spirit of solidarity among the workers and the people.

The Twelfth Plenum of our Central Committee denounced opportunism, which could cause much harm to our Party and to the democratic movement. The Plenum's decisions are bearing fruit. Underground Communist organizations, which play a decisive role in rallying Party forces, forming and mobilizing resistance groups, are appearing in working class areas and in the provinces. Nationwide resistance, passive at first, is now more active in nature and form.

The anti-fascist demonstrations in Athens and Piraeus during the funeral of George Papandreou were a large-scale public action against the dictatorial regime. Hundreds of thousands came out into the streets of the capital to declare their opposition to the fascists. The working class and youth were in the van of this campaign, in which our Party organizations played a leading role.

We have confined ourselves here to some of the basic problems facing the Party and the progressive democratic movement of Greece. We hope, however, that we have shed some light on the problems facing the world Communist movement and that we have contributed to international experience. We hope this experience will further the unity of the international Communist movement, the essential element in our fight against imperialism, our common enemy, in the interests of peace, democracy and socialism.

Ten years of the Cuban revolution

MANUEL CEPEDA

Ten years have passed since the Revolution triumphed in Cuba. Throughout these years the gloomy prophets of reaction have daily foretold the "downfall" of the Cuban Republic. But the star of the Caribbean is shining brightly and elsewhere on the American continent social struggles have been gaining in intensity.

Before January 1, 1959, Washington felt sure that, as in the past, it would be able with impunity to quell any social unrest in Latin America, so that socialism would never appear on the continent. Alas for the wishful thinking. The Cuban Revolution was an event of historic proportions. The agrarian reform, expropriation of the U.S. monopolies and the reconstruction of the Army, previously the defender of reaction, into a truly people's Army highlighted the transition from the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal to the socialist revolution. This was palpable proof that America is no exception as far as the laws of historical development are concerned and that the era of the transition from capitalism to socialism has arrived in this continent too. The Cuban Revolution undermined the traditional pattern of Latin America; it pinpointed the deep-going contradictions on the continent and imparted impetus to the revolutionary storms raging there.

The imperialists, having recovered from the shock, are now trying to adjust their global strategy to the new situation, stepping up military measures against Cuba and at the same time striving to calm the revolutionary storms in Latin America by promises of "reforms" designed to bolster the sagging socio-economic structures. And so we get bourgeois "agrarian reforms" and lame attempts to solve economic problems—external financing, the Alliance for Progress, the Latin American Free Trade Association and proposals for economic integration and regional common markets.

Simultaneously, the imperialists have been revising their military concepts by

turning the local armed forces into their main weapon against the freedom fighters. Plans for psychological and sociological warfare are being implemented; military and civilian operations are conducted to "establish contacts" between the armed forces and the people, and a frontal ideological offensive has been launched. They are thinking in terms of an inter-American variant of NATO, envisaging a permanent inter-American force, and adapting the OAS to the new conditions.

Washington's strategic plans dressed up as reforms, also envisage strong-man governments in various countries of the continent. But all the plans notwithstanding, the crisis has worsened. The imperialist menace to Cuba has become a menace to all Latin American nations.

The tenth anniversary of the Cuban Revolution is an occasion for us to survey the sixties. These ten years have unmasked U.S. imperialism by showing that not for a single moment has it abandoned the use of force against the peoples of Latin America. Instances of this are the coup in Brazil, instalment of a military junta in Bolivia; the fall of Arosemena in Ecuador, where a military junta took over; President Illia's defeat and seizure of power by Army generals in Argentina; the "constitutional" and "legal" violence in Colombia; assassinations in Guatemala under the "democratic" rule of Méndez Montenegro, in Venezuela under the "republican government of Betancourt and Leoni, in Peru under the "progressive" government of ex-President Belaunde; the barbarous invasion of the Dominican Republic, repressions in Uruguay, bitter conflicts in Chile; the mummified regimes of Stroessner in Paraguay and of Duvalier in Haiti; the "associated" state of Puerto Rico; the recent upsurge of "gorillism" in Peru and Panama. In short, counter-revolution has been institutionalized.

The Cuban Revolution, proudly marching on, is overcoming incredible difficul-

ties. Having scaled the heights of the anti-imperialist revolution, Cuba is now advancing towards the aims of the socialist revolution.

In the past ten years the people in Latin America have come to accept the existence and proximity of the socialist camp as a natural state of affairs. The revolutionary leadership in Cuba broke out of the imperialist encirclement by establishing relations with the socialist community, first of all with the Soviet Union. This alliance acquired greater force at the height of the struggle, when, at the time of Playa Giron, Fidel Castro spoke of the socialist character of the Cuban Revolution. It evoked a lively response throughout Latin America, manifested in widespread feelings of solidarity and proletarian internationalism.

Latin America was an issue in the recent U.S. presidential election. The new President, Nixon, knows from personal experience how the continent is seething. His Latin American program has always been geared to anti-communism. Nor is this surprising. Our peoples recall that when Nixon was Vice-President he felt at home in the company of dictators like Batista, Trujillo, Rojas Pinilla, the Somoza brothers, Pérez Jiménez and Castillo Armas. Nor can we forget either his direct participation in the infamous Bay of Pigs affair, or his recent threat against Cuba.

The 1970s will undoubtedly be a decade of stormy class struggles. Imperialist exploitation has undermined the base and the economic structure of Latin America. Concealed social processes are underway and they give the lie to those chroniclers of imperialism who boast that "all is quiet" in Latin America. To be sure, the revolutionary forces on the continent have suffered reverses, and the trend of the struggle in some regions has not yet crystallized.

A broad popular struggle is now developing. The proletariat is engaged in hard-

fought battles. The workers, peasants and students are producing new freedom fighters, to whom the Cuban revolution has indicated the path to power. Among them are such men as Father Camilo Torres, Argimiro Gabaldon, writer, and Turcios Lima, a soldier. Above all there is the outstanding example of Che Guevara, that passionate hero with a pure heart who fell fighting for freedom in Latin America. Also, among the freedom fighters is Major Manuel Marulanda Vélez, the Colombian Communist guerrilla of legendary fame, a symbol of our people, who is pressing forward his gallant fight.

The decade ahead confronts us with the task of finding new ways that we can travel as we reinforce and extend the united anti-imperialist front and the unity of action of all the Communist parties of the continent.

The Cuban Revolution has revealed to us immense potentialities. We have seen that imperialist rule can be ended; that in some countries armed struggle can, if it takes into account the actual conditions and uses the right tactics, sweep away the forces of reaction; that popular unity behind the working class makes it possible to go over from the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal to the socialist revolution; that the socialist community, primarily the Soviet Union, supports in every way the peoples fighting for liberation.

For all the differences that may divide revolutionaries, there is a historical fact comparable to the Andes in greatness: a revolution blazing the trail to socialism has taken place in Cuba, for the first time in Latin American history. It has earned Cuba our firm solidarity.

The past decade has been by way of a rehearsal of the battles ahead on the continent. In the coming decade our people will raise the struggle to a higher plane.

Modern capitalism, the technological revolution and the working class

The role of the working class in the developed capitalist countries in the conditions of the technological revolution was the subject of an international round-table discussion held in Berlin over October 9-11, under the auspices of our journal (as reported in our October-November issue). Participants included members of the **World Marxist Review** editorial board and fraternal representatives on the journal: E. Zucker-Schilling (Austria), A. Silva (Brazil), P. Auersperg (Czechoslovakia), I. Norlund (Denmark), H. Berg (GDR), A. Gedo (Hungary), A. Avanesyan (Iran), Ts. Davagsuren (Mongolia), J. Kowalczyk (Poland), B. Zaharescu (Rumania), F. Anton (Spain), G. Oehman (Sweden), K. Zarodov (USSR), and the following researchers and theorists: L. Georgiev, Z. Tsanev (Bulgaria), M. Hirs (Czechoslovakia), G. Asplund, T. Koste (Finland), J. Fabre (France), F. Rische, K. Mehnert (FRG), M. Anders, L. Mayer, K. Zeischang, H. Schaul (GDR), P. Mavromatis (Greece), G. Bognar, G. Szanto (Hungary), A. Minucci, L. Pallagrosi (Italy), G. Apostol, C. Petre (Rumania), H. Putz (USA), A. Galkin, G. Dilighensky, V. Kulish and A. Weber (USSR). The first part of the review of papers and interventions ("The Structure of Society and the Structure of the Working Class" and "Conditions of the Working Class Today") is given below. The second part, devoted to the class struggle and class alliances, the strategy and tactics of the anti-capitalist offensive and related problems, appears in the next issue.

Over the past decades far-reaching changes have occurred in the working class of the developed capitalist countries and throughout the world. The technological revolution has affected the composition, conditions and role of the workers.

K. Zarodov, Editor-in-Chief of this journal, underscored in his opening address that for Marxists the role of the working class is not just an abstract theoretical issue. In substance, it concerns the revolution, its objective and subjective preconditions, its possibilities, the ways of winning power and the composition of the political army of socialist revolution.

Other speakers agreed that in the modern quickly changing world the workers' revolutionary mission has gained considerably in scope. The Editor-in-Chief called attention to problems that could be fruitfully discussed:

a) Changes in the structure of the working class and its class consciousness; the correlation of the demand for skilled and unskilled labor; the role of the intelligentsia, the "middle strata" and students in the social movement;

b) growth of consumption and the greater imbalance in incomes, the so-called incomes revolution, intensified exploitation and the gap between increasing requirements and the growth of purchasing power;

c) forms and methods of fighting for political and economic demands; the new possibilities for workers' organizations to intervene in management and government and to expedite social gains;

d) the biased complexion of the bourgeois concept of the technological revolution, the talk about "deproletarianization," the "embourgeoisement" of the working class and its psychological "integration" in capitalist society.

Zarodov pointed out that factors apart from the intrinsic laws of capitalism are at work in shaping the conditions and the struggles of the workers in the capitalist countries: we should take into account also the influence exerted by world socialism and the competition between the socialist and capitalist systems.

In the ten years since the establishment of this journal, Zarodov went on, the mem-

bers of its editorial board and representatives of many Marxist-Leninist parties have frequently discussed the conditions and struggles of the working class in the modern capitalist environment. This time, he said, the board would like to discuss how the technological revolution influences the workers' role in production, in public life and in the anti-monopoly struggle.

* * *

When the industrial revolution replaced manual labor with machines and the old manufacturing techniques with factory production in the early 19th century, capitalist output grew rapidly, new industries sprang up and the flow of commodities increased. This was a process of growth and structural change in the capitalist economy. While for the workers the machines were accompanied by the spectre of unemployment, for the capitalist owners of the means of production they brought opportunities to intensify the rate of exploitation.

At present, too, automation is creating economic and social problems, though, of course, in other conditions and at a different level of capitalist development. The first speaker, Z. Chrupek, who drew this comparison, observed that automation as the dominant trend in the technological advance is significant today because it in-

creases manyfold the machine-to-worker ratio of living labor. The technical and often organic composition of capital is going up, and most visibly so in industries where living labor was most extensively used and in the more labor-consuming fields.

The rapid technological revolution and revolution and growth of knowledge were affecting all areas of economic, social and political life. This, G. Apostol said, bears out the Marxist postulate that the productive forces play the decisive role in social growth, that the role of science and its links with production are growing continuously and that production is ultimately materially creative science, whereas science, as Marx put it, is "an immediate productive force."

Conversely, the technological revolution is greatly influenced by the highly complex social growth. In this time of transition from capitalism to socialism, the immense scientific advance, the technological progress, automation, cybernetics and nuclear energy are pushing up the productivity of social labor to unprecedentedly high levels. The socialist revolution and the technological revolution are, in effect, two aspects of the same process of advance to communism.

I. THE STRUCTURE OF SOCIETY AND THE STRUCTURE OF THE WORKING CLASS

THE GROWING PROPORTION OF WAGE LABOR

The technological revolution has imposed itself imperiously on modern capitalism, the effects impairing the latter's social stability, forging profound changes in the social structure and thereby in the socio-psychological mould and the relation of political forces. The most general trend is towards the process indicated by Marxist-Leninist science, namely, that the technological revolution adds rapidly to the proportion of wage labor.

No longer are wage-earners merely the majority—they are now the overwhelming majority of those gainfully employed, A. Galkin noted. In 1964, wage-earners comprised nearly 86 per cent of the United States active population and over 90 per cent of that of Britain. According to F. Rische, almost 80 per cent of those gainfully employed in the Federal Republic of Germany earn their living by working for employers. M. Hirsl listed figures for New

Zealand, Canada, Switzerland, Australia and the Netherlands, where at the beginning of the 1960s wage-earners comprised 80 or more per cent of the active population. The 1962 figure was 73 per cent for France and approximately two-thirds for Italy and Finland. In Japan, where capitalism developed later than in most of the other advanced countries, wage-earners aggregated 60 per cent of the active population in 1965. M. Daramvanchig, complementing the percentages with figures, pointed out that there were nearly 200,000,000 wage-earners in the developed capitalist countries and more than 150,000,000 in the Asian, African and Latin American states.

The main trend in capitalist society, G. Szanto remarked, is for the number of owners of means of production to decrease, with proletarianization in full swing.

While the percentage of wage-earners is going up, that of independent producers, merchants, proprietors of workshops and

service stations is on the decline. This, Z. Chrupek observed, is due to the advantages of modern techniques and large-scale monopoly operations in industry, trade and services, strongly affecting the social macro-structure and bearing out the Marxist view that the division of bourgeois society into a relatively small class owning the means of production, on the one hand, and the massive class of propertyless proletarians, on the other, is a law of capitalism.

G. Szanto noted that in the United States the so-called independent capitalists (owners of means of production) comprised 27 per cent of the population in 1910, and 13.3 per cent in 1954, whereas in Britain the percentage dropped from 7.8 per cent in 1911 to 6.5 per cent in 1965. In Germany, independent owners and members of their families comprised 33.8 per cent in 1907 and 22.9 per cent (in the FRG) in 1960. This decline has been accelerated in recent years. Among the European countries, Italy alone still has a large number of independent owners, though the tendency there, too, is downward (the rate of monopoly concentration, too, is lower in Italy than in, say, France), the percentage dropping from 48 in 1936 to 37 in 1959-1960.

Nor is agriculture unaffected by the technological revolution. On the one hand, we see a general decrease of the farming population—by virtue of the accompaniment of rising productivity of labor—while, on the other, competition is ousting the independent small and middle farmers, with production concentrating on specialized, purely capitalist farms. Gone are the times when farmers comprised the greater, or at least considerable, portion of those gainfully employed.

Throughout the postwar, Z. Chrupek said, manpower has been moving from the farms (where mechanization began back in the prewar) to industry and the services. In Sweden, for example, G. Oehman amplified, a mere eight per cent are employed in farming and fishing, this percentage being expected to drop to five in the next ten years. Even in Spain, trailing far behind most of the other West European countries economically, F. Anton noted, the drop is so considerable that peasants, formerly the overwhelming majority, now comprise barely one-third of those gainfully employed, with the percentage employed in the services rising rapidly.

Z. Chrupek stressed that the greater employment in the services is due to the

changes in the material and technical basis of modern capitalism, while the increasing rate of growth is a consequence of the technological growth promoted by the monopolies and the structural modifications in consumption.

THE TECHNOLOGICAL REVOLUTION, THE INTELLIGENTSIA AND THE WHITE-COLLAR WORKERS

The technological revolution, A. Galkin said, has triggered a rapid growth of the intelligentsia. No longer is it a narrow substratum of educated people in an intermediate position between the main classes. Seen as a category with a sufficiently high standard of education and engaged in predominantly mental labor, the intelligentsia now accounts for a fairly large section of the people, of which the scientific and technical intelligentsia — scientists, auxiliary research personnel, engineers and technicians — comprises an influential and rapidly growing contingent. The need for skilled labor and, hence, for a higher standard of general education, he noted, has spurred on the growth of another numerous group: people engaged in education. Another large group is engaged in the medical services, and the continuing division of labor and growth of state-monopoly capitalism have enlarged the numerous category employed in administrative work.

The rapid growth of the intelligentsia and service personnel, coupled with the decline of the small producer, C. Petre said, has increased the percentage and modified the structure of the middle strata.

Speakers attested to the growing numbers of government employees in all the developed capitalist countries.

F. Rische cited figures to illustrate the employment pattern in capitalist production: according to data furnished by the German Institute of Economic Research—West Berlin, from 1961 to 1966 employment in 26 West German industries dropped by 371,810, the number of workers declining by 407,385, while white-collar workers increased by 35,575. In four industries where overall employment increased by 8,141, the number of manual workers shrank by 10,224, but new jobs opened for 18,365 white-collar workers.

In 12 industries, Rische went on, the number of manual workers grew by 190,868, that of other employees by 231,848, with total employment going up by 422,716.

Between 1961 and 1966 overall employ-

ment in industry increased by 69,255, with an overall increase of 290,862 for white-collar workers and a drop of 221,607 for factory workers.

The growth of the white-collar percentage in the working class, Rische said, is explained by the technological revolution and soon the number of white-collar workers will exceed that of manual workers.

True, the situation is somewhat different in some of the less developed countries such as Greece, where, *P. Mavromatis* said, growth of the white-collar employees trails behind that of manual workers.

G. Szanto cited data illustrating changes in the percentages of technicians, engineers and office employees in industry (per cent of total wage-earners):

	USA	Britain	Germany	France
1901-1910	12.0	8.6	7.6	10.4
1931-1940	17.7	15.0	14.0	14.6
1957-1963	28.0	22.0	23.0*	—

*Federal Republic of Germany.

In the United States engineers in industry totalled some 1,000,000 in 1963, or triple the 1940 figure.

G. Oehman pointed to similar trends in Sweden. The number of white-collar workers, he said, grows with technical progress, rate of growth surpassing that for the working class as a whole. Sweden has some 2,500,000 wage-earners, of whom about 1,000,000 are in the category of technicians and white-collar workers. Socially, he said, employees are a heterogeneous group, though many of them are recruited from the workers. Like the workers they are well organized and they too use the same working-class methods—strikes.

Since the number of wage-earners engaged predominantly in mental labor is growing and has attained a fairly high level, their class status requires to be analyzed, the more so because capitalist propaganda, understandably, extols capitalism. It gives a false coloring to processes underway in the developed capitalist states and infers the disappearance of the main classes and of their antagonisms, fusion of bourgeoisie and proletariat in a "middle class" and the advent of a new era of harmony and social peace.

C. Petre recalled that the labor theorist Crossman claimed some twenty years ago that in the capitalist countries "there is no longer a bourgeoisie in the sense that Marx described it—or rather there is only a vestigial group to remind us of its former dominance. There is no more a proletariat

in the Marxist sense — or rather there is only a remnant to remind us of past miseries."

Similar ideas were recalled by *F. Rische*. *Georg Leber*, ex-Chairman of the Building Workers' Union of the FRG, for example, now Communications Minister in the Kiesinger cabinet, declared at the Sixth Congress of his Union that the proletarians of Marx's time no longer existed. Falsifying Marx, he defined as a proletarian the worker who did not surpass "a definite level of consumption."

Herbert Marcuse, too, claims that for Marx the proletarian is, above all, a worker engaged in manual work, expending and exhausting his physical energy. And Nordhoff, Director-General of the Volkswagen Works, contends that the principles advanced so convincingly and, as it appeared, so irrevocably by Marx, are no longer valid, for the proletarian has vanished without a trace from our vocabulary and generally as a concept.

The "middle class" construed by capitalist theorists, *P. Auersperg* said, includes members of various social classes and groups, covering a large section of the bourgeoisie and proletariat. Some sociologists, he added, calculate it at 60, 70 or 80 per cent and even more of the gainfully employed population; *H. Schelsky*, a West German sociologist, has described West Germany as a completely "middle class society."

The purpose of these theories, *F. Rische* maintained, is to blot out the proletarianization underway in state-monopoly capitalism, to dull the workers' social and political awareness and to befog their class consciousness.

CONVERGENCE WITH THE WORKING CLASS

The socio-structural changes precipitated by the technological revolution, *A. Gal-kin* said, have extended the boundaries of the working class. Together with the conventional working class (industrial workers, shop assistants, etc.) we see a crystallization of new groupings who, by virtue of their place in production and their way of life, tend in many cases to fuse with the working class.

F. Rische referred to the concept "aggregate worker" used by *C. Vernay* at a *World Marxist Review* symposium in Prague in October 1967 to infer that most engineers and technicians are part of the

aggregate worker consisting of the working class and employees in spheres where the production process is either prepared or completed. Rische agreed with Vernay that the bulk of the technical personnel had a stake in ending monopoly power and were in the van of the anti-monopoly struggle alongside the workers. This trend will be accelerated, Rische maintained, once the Communist Party and the trade unions realize their new tasks in relation to these strata.

Attention was drawn, too, to the more intensive social differentiation among the intelligentsia, which was gaining a clearcut class-based complexion. An upper stratum materialized at one pole, A. Galkin noted, becoming a composite element of the ruling elite. Intellectuals—experts, professors, etc.—are in growing numbers now found in top political and government jobs and in managerial jobs. Obviously, he added, their interest is the opposite of that of the majority of intellectuals. At the other pole we witness the fusion of a large section of the intelligentsia with the working class.

While agreeing with Galkin on this score, T. Koste pointed to the need for a clearer definition of the working class. This, he said, was essential for the fight against capitalist ideology and for our own work and research. Capitalist statistics did not show the class relationship, revealing at best the breakdown by trades and professions, spheres of endeavor and incomes, which shed practically no light on the class structure and often even obscured the class criteria.

The working class still did not own means of production. We are of one mind on this, the speaker said, but the second criterion—that the working class creates value and surplus value—is challenged by many. The worker creates value and surplus value in the so-called production sphere, this, seemingly, being a sufficiently valid condition for worker and employee to be graded as working class. But are workers and other employees engaged in transport, trade and banking, who take no part in production, to be excluded from the working class? As Koste sees it, the process of capitalist production and commodity circulation is a single process, and by the token that capitalists in the non-productive spheres remain capitalists, the people exploited by them should be regarded as part of the working class.

As to the third criterion, that of the worker having to sell his labor, it appears

to be obligatory, for failing it no working class would exist. This did not mean, however, the speaker went on, that the working class should be automatically identified with all earners of wages or, to use the modern Finnish term, all those who “live on wages.” Otherwise, the highly-paid bureaucrat, too, could be regarded as working class. Salaried employees who help maintain the capitalist system and who protect the class interests of the capitalists are certainly no part of the working class.

That section to which neither the criteria of the working class nor those of the bourgeoisie applied in full or to which the criteria of either applied in varying measure, Koste added, should, evidently, be classed as the middle strata. In Finland this applied above all to the farmers and small producers, as well as to part of the salaried. Comrade Kaiku Vuori cited basic statistics of the country's class structure for the economic policy sector of the Finnish Communist Party, showing that more than half the white-collar workers belonged to the working class, which, in turn, comprised some 60 per cent of the total population.

According to estimates by M. Hirsl, between 80 and 90 per cent of the wage-earners in the developed West European capitalist countries belonged to the working class in the broad sense. He based this, he said, on a study of the economic situation or, more precisely, of the incomes of office employees. According to the U.N. Economic Commission for Europe, at the beginning of the sixties between seven and 12 per cent of the salaried employees in France, Holland and Denmark belonged to the highly privileged with incomes well over double, even triple, the average, and nearly 15 to 25 per cent with incomes exceeding the average by 50 to 100 per cent, who, the speaker held, had many features in common with the middle strata. All other employees are in material terms distinctly part of the working class.

To be sure, he added, income is just one, though substantial, status-making factor; other aspects have to be taken into account when determining the class status of the white-collar employees. Differences in outlook between manual and mental workers is quite considerable, Hirsl averred, though there is no reason to refer white-collar workers to any other class or to deny their convergence with the working class.

In defining the working class, G. Szanto recalled, Marx did not say it was homogeneous. On the contrary, he stressed that it consisted of different strata, setting the following criteria: workers did not own means of production, they are compelled to sell their labor power.

Szanto classed factory workers in three categories: 1) skilled workers of the old type; 2) ancillary workers engaged in manual labor and, 3) a stratum of new type workers—the so-called specialized workers. The first two categories, he said, were shrinking, while the stratum of specialized workers with high technical skill, in evidence chiefly at modern plants, is growing (wherever the technical structure has been modified by automation and the use of modern sources of power).

G. Apostol took a somewhat different view. Automation, he said, tended to increase the number of skilled workers; new trades were appearing, requiring a special technical education. In the circumstances, the demand for specialized technical skills and the general cultural standard was higher. Yet meeting this continuously rising demand was in many ways beyond the powers of capitalism.

Though automation was accelerating organic growth of capital, the working class, too, was increasing in numbers and its percentage in relation to the employed population was going up. This, the speaker went on, was due to many factors and not least to the fact that the technological revolution and the high degree of capital concentration and centralization was tied in with the expanding division of social labor and the increasing diversity of production. This, he said, tended to create new categories of workers.

The growth of science into an important productive force, Apostol went on, coupled with the invasion of cybernetics, impels a

considerable increase in the contribution to production by scientists and researchers. Today, he added, their place in the production process was much nearer to that of the workers, and though the distinctions between scientific and factory workers were self-evident, we should not ignore the fact that both produced (or helped to produce) surplus-value and that their basic interests were more alike than before. In that context, the sphere of working-class interest is linked closely with the interests of other categories of wage-earners in the fight against exploitation, for socio-political rights and for democracy.

G. Szanto expressed the view that the similarity between worker and technician was becoming more pronounced as science turned into a productive force. He warned, however, that this should be viewed as a long-term process. Ultimately, he added, technicians, engineers and factory administrators, as well as some employees in the sphere of trade, would gradually become part of a new, structurally-changed working class.

A considerable part of the intelligentsia now had much in common with the working class, which was winning many new allies in its midst.

The realities of the class struggle bear out the Marxist view that the working class was that force in society most profoundly interested in establishing socialist relations. This interest, P. Auersperg said, was no mere wish of theorists; it was conditioned by the economic and social situation of the workers. Objectively, the working class had the biggest stake in eliminating capitalism, and its role would grow in step with the increasing convergence of the workers' labor with scientific work in the course of the technological revolution.

II. CONDITIONS OF THE WORKING CLASS

It was not the purpose of the discussion to analyze in detail working-class conditions in the developed capitalist countries. However, some aspects of the problem were examined in discussing the impact on the class struggle of automation and technological advance generally. The results of technological advance under capitalism were described by Lenin: "Improvement in technology, signifying increased labor productivity and greater social wealth, be-

comes in bourgeois society the cause of greater social inequality, of widening gaps between the rich and the poor, of greater insecurity, unemployment and various hardships of the mass of the working people."*

AUTOMATION AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Unemployment was one of the major topics of discussion. Speakers stressed

*Collected Works, Eng. ed., Vol. 24, p. 467.

that automation leads to lay-offs and unemployment. *M. Daramvanchig* remarked that automation and rationalization, coupled with recessionary trends, have made unemployment a really acute problem in the United States and in Western Europe.

G. Szanto said that technological unemployment and inadequate occupational training were the chief adverse results of the technological revolution. Partial and comprehensive automation, "chemicalization," the use of new fuels (oil, atomic energy, etc.) have led to more unemployment, though they are not the only factors.

Automation affects the skilled workers. Many lose their jobs at the age of 40, or even 30, and form a specific but fairly permanent contingent of unemployed.

A still bigger cause of unemployment is the drastic reduction in manual labor. And since the capitalists and their governments cannot—or do not want to—provide facilities for retraining and re-employment, these jobless are the worst off and are often exploited by reactionary politicians. They make up the bulk of the unemployed in Western Europe and in the United States, where Negroes predominate.

Unemployment, *G. Apostol* emphasized, is the most dramatic consequence of capitalist automation. Technological advancement makes for a higher organic structure of capital, and automation has accelerated the process. In capitalist society automation ousts large numbers of workers from the production process. There are, for instance, these revealing figures relating to Canada: two million jobs will have disappeared by 1974 and there will be 1.5 million new entrants into the labor force, mostly young people, which means an unemployment figure of 3,500,000 unless, of course, new jobs are created.

Our ideological opponents, while they cannot deny that automation breeds unemployment, are reluctant to admit its real causes, for that would lay bare the incurable evils of capitalism. And we find bourgeois writers discussing unemployment "ratios," or "natural," "normal" unemployment, and so on. And it is being emphasized that in an industrial society "... progress, by its very nature, entails such factors as insecurity and hardship for a certain number of citizens."

Z. Chrupek remarked that way back in the fifties we already had a forewarning of what monopoly capitalism was bringing the working class. It has brought not only technological unemployment, but also unemployment resulting from structural

changes in the economy, though these, too, are the outcome of technological progress. Production has declined in industries that cannot find a market for their products or services. In the United States this includes rail transport, coal mining and branches such as cotton textiles and leather goods, that is, industries using traditional raw materials.

However there has been in recent times a shortage of skilled labor in some capitalist countries (Federal Germany, for instance) and in some of the new and rapidly expanding industries (e.g., electronics).

This is due to a number of causes. One is the high, though uneven, rate of economic expansion in the leading capitalist countries (Britain being the exception). Their economies have thus been able to absorb some of the labor power released by technological innovation.

Towards the close of 1967 and in early 1968 there was a heightened demand for labor in the U.S., but now the outlook is gloomier. The government's measures to ward off the danger to the dollar might well dampen business activity and, consequently, the employment growth rate. This could affect chiefly government employment and the services, complicating things not only for new labor-force entrants, but also for the technologically unemployed. The anticipated slowdown in America's economic expansion rate contains a very real menace to workers' living standards.

Automation does more than oust workers from industry—it tends to cut down potential employment. This is how Joseph Beirne, President of the U.S. transport workers' union, describes the position: "Automation does result in the displacement of workers directly, and to an even greater extent indirectly, through the reduction of job opportunities. From the first half of 1953 to the same period of 1960—a time when the country's output of goods and services was rising—factory production and maintenance jobs dropped by 1.5 million; farm employment declined by one million; railroad jobs were down 400,000; mining employment declined 200,000." Much less manpower is used in the new, technically-advanced industries, with their labor-saving equipment, than is released by industries forced to curtail or suspend production. As a rule new technology does not lead to more employment.

To this should be added, *Chrupek* remarked, that the continuing and accelerating process of capitalist concentration and monopolization tends to extend this to

all areas of the economy. Monopoly industry can use only a restricted and constantly contracting amount of labor. It holds out no prospect for young job seekers, migrants from farming communities and the unemployed. But the investment policy of the big corporations has substantially increased employment in other branches, notably in the services.

That is characteristic not only of the United States but also of the other advanced capitalist countries, though neither West Germany, France or Italy have achieved a changed employment structure comparable to that of the United States. In that country four-fifths of new jobs in 1967-68 were in government employment and in the service industries. This has helped to absorb some of the technological unemployment, and it is precisely in this area that attempts are made to achieve "full employment," a favorite catchword with bourgeois governments.

A direct consequence of automation and concentration, T. Koste said, was the ever-present menace of losing one's job, with all the anguish and hardship this entails. And the menace squarely faces millions of people still in jobs.

U.S. unemployment at the end of 1967, he said, stood at about three million; in Argentina it was 1,500,000, in Italy 1,000,000, in Britain 600,000, in West Germany 526,000 and in France 450,000.

H. Putz cited examples of how technical change has affected the occupational composition of the American working class. Technical progress and takeovers can erase thousands of skilled jobs. For instance, closure of a big New York newspaper (which only shortly before had merged with two other papers) signified unemployment for some 3,000 highly-skilled and highly-paid print-workers, with no prospect of finding work in New York.

Dockers at Atlantic and Mexican Gulf ports are feeling the "technological pinch" too. One of their union leaders says that with the new container techniques from 60 to 70 percent of dockers will find themselves without work—goods are containerized in, say, Chicago, delivered to the ports, lifted by cranes and lowered into the hold.

J. Fabre, speaking about unemployment in France, estimated it at nearly 600,000, not counting partial and quiet unemployment. Z. Chrupek said the five per cent annual growth rate envisaged in the current French five-year plan is below the country's potential, does not assure an

adequate number of new jobs, and pegs the unemployment figure to more than half a million.

F. Ritscre, discussing the position in Federal Germany, pointed to another aspect of the problem: the absence of employment plans for the economy as a whole and in most enterprises. This means that no arrangements are made for prior re-training and re-employment of the large number of workers likely to be automated out of industry. The trade union paper *Welt der Arbeit* cited a recent study showing that 69 per cent of enterprises employing more than 1,000 workers have long-range investment plans, 59 per cent have financial plans and 52 per cent production plans, but only 18 per cent have employment plans. And the paper added: "Machines are better treated than human beings. In slack seasons it is easy to get rid of redundant workers, but not of idle machinery."

EXPLOITATION, WEALTH AND POVERTY

In addition to a detailed discussion of the link between unemployment and automation, there was an examination of other aspects of working-class conditions and the general status of the worker in present-day capitalism in the context of the technological revolution.

The monopolies, G. Apostol said, are intent on squeezing the most out of automation in terms of higher production and productivity. The capitalist's share is growing at an unprecedented pace and exploitation of the workers intensified.

The interests of the French monopoly bourgeoisie, by which the government is guided, J. Fabre said, tend to depress living standards, viz., decelerate growth of wages and curtail labor's basic gains, while the gap grows between the increasing social needs and the limited allocations for housing, medical care and education. France, he added, has Europe's longest working week (46-47 hours).

Referring to Italy, A. Minucci noted the deterioration in the workers' conditions due to greater physical and mental strain.

P. Mavromatis drew attention to the need for a comprehensive approach in assessing working-class living standards. They cannot be measured, he said, simply by the amount of bread and meat consumed—Marx did not use that criterion. In Greece, for example, meat and butter consumption is nearly double the prewar fig-

ure. But there are also these statistics: in the past ten years the accident rate in industry has trebled, and today one worker in ten is a potential accident casualty. The cause, very largely, is speed-up, one aspect of technical innovation.

E. Zucker-Schilling posed the question: Have the economic and political conditions of the working-class worsened since the end of World War II? Let us take this example. Austria has one of Europe's best social insurance schemes, particularly in regard to sick benefits. The interesting thing is that the system was founded under the First Republic, that is, at a time when Austria was experiencing a recession. Some improvements were made after 1945, again at a time of economic ebb. In the past ten years, however, with business activity running high, there has been a gradual deterioration in social insurance and specifically in sick benefits. That is why today the fight in defense of the social insurance system is a focal point of labor's struggle.

Zucker-Schilling noted that there had been no improvement in the Austrian workers' conditions in terms of access to higher education (which is still greatly restricted) or in terms of being able to influence the mass media, which nowadays play such an important part.

The working class and other sections of the working people G. Dilighensky said, have, by dint of hard struggle, improved somewhat their purchasing capacity. The rise in labor productivity resulting from the technological revolution has enabled the monopoly bourgeoisie to make certain concessions without in any way lessening its volume of profits. Moreover, standardized production, another result of the technological revolution, has brought within the reach of the population many goods which were formerly considered luxuries.

Still, it should not be difficult to see that despite the rise in productivity a very large section of the working class continues to live in conditions of poverty. This applies chiefly to unskilled and semi-skilled workers, to workers in "crisis" industries and areas, and obviously to the unemployed.

C. Petre spoke about intensified exploitation of the working class. Mechanization, automation and computer techniques add greatly to the strain on the worker.

More and more Western authors admit that technical progress under capitalism is accompanied by intensification of labor, that is, by a heavier work load, and by techniques that deprive work of any crea-

tive element. Man becomes dehumanized the process of his alienation continues apace. "In our modern society," writes Jean Fourastié, "work is merely a function of the machine, not a function of life. Man is looked upon as a machine of a special kind, with two hands, two feet, two eyes, and endowed with traits that enable him to perform simple specified operations. The only thing that really counts is his ability to produce for the market, that is, to make profit for his employer." Volume 12 of the French *Encyclopedia of Modern Industry* tells us that modern Western society, with its stress on efficiency and speed, has produced a way of life based on coercion, tension and brutality. But efficient factory operation requires some solicitude for the worker, and it criticizes the concept of man as merely "a tool," an appendage of the machine. This, it says, has an adverse psychological effect on the wage-worker, who wants to use his human abilities, the ability to understand, think, analyze, decide and participate.

M. HirsI described some of the changes revealed in a statistical survey of working-class conditions. The share of wage-earners in the gainfully employed population has risen, but the share of wages and salaries in the gross national product has only slightly increased in some countries and has remained stable or has even declined in most. This, the speaker said, was a development that merited special attention. For in most capitalist countries the fifties and sixties have been boom years. And during booms the share of wages usually declines (and increases during crises, though in absolute figures the total national payroll declines). This wage stability suggests that we are witnessing the beginning of a change in the capitalist economic mechanism stemming from the growing role of consumption, both personal and social, in realizing the national product.

This stable share of wages in the national product refutes the Social-Democratic and bourgeois talk about an "incomes revolution." Even in conditions that favor higher wages, in most cases their share shows no upward trend. In most countries, the relative position of the worker is not better, if not worse. With the steady growth in the national product the gap between the incomes of exploiters and workers, in absolute figures, has widened (despite relatively identical rates of growth). This creates new conditions for the working-class struggle.

Many figures could be cited to show that

the gap is very much wider. If we take the bigger incomes, averaging, say 2.5 times the national average (counting gross personal income before taxes, but excluding undistributed profit), then the figures for the early sixties in the developed capitalist countries were from 3.5 to 9.5 times above the national average. The sharpest differentiation in this respect is observed in West Germany where top-crust exploiters, comprising a mere 3.1 per cent of all incomes, account for 29 per cent of all personal earnings. Average income in this group is 9.5 times the national average.

In the developed capitalist countries there is a small group, from three to six per cent of all income earners, whose incomes deviate from the national average. But here, too, the income is derived from exploitation. The group is made up mostly of so-called independent incomes, that is, owners of means of production, but also of top government officials, managers, etc. Their incomes are four or five times above average. On the other hand, there is a considerable group—25 to 30 per cent of the population, of wage and salary earners, pensioners, etc., or people with no regular income—whose incomes are about 30-50 per cent of the average. These are people in the "lower income brackets," whose earnings range from 10 to 30 times less than the top group. And yet we see the general level of consumption rising in all developed capitalist countries.

C. Petre noted the tendency in these countries towards reducing the share of necessary labor time in total labor time, that is, a tendency towards more surplus labor and, consequently, higher exploitation of the worker.

Though worktime has been reduced since the war, it still remains very long and in some countries, especially the United States and France, is even longer.

Wage levels are much lower than the economic potentialities resulting from rising productivity and technological advance. One French worker in five lives in poverty. Even in the United States, the richest capitalist country, according to Johnson's economic advisor, 32,700,000 live in poverty, with annual incomes below \$3,200, or little more than one-third of the officially designated "moderate" family budget. And many more live on the border of poverty, including the working class minority whose incomes more or less approximate to the official cost of living "average."

Furthermore, working-class purchasing power is gradually and steadily being undermined by higher instalment-buying charges, taxes, rents, etc.

Z. Chrupek emphasized that the profound contradictions of a highly developed capitalist economy are felt most painfully by the wage-earners. Every adjustment of economic policy is invariably to the detriment of the working people, never to the detriment of the monopolies. Inflation, the companion piece of the boom, acts as an effective brake on real wages (and provokes counteraction by the working class and its organizations). But this should not be taken to mean that deflationary measures can be equated with satisfaction of the workers' demands, or with their fight to prevent the monopolies from appropriating a still bigger share of the national cake. On the contrary, deflationary measures—as the French and British income policies clearly show—are directed not against wage demands to bring them into conformity with higher productivity. Deflationary measures tend to impede economic growth, inhibit investment, produce more unemployment, limit government welfare spending and in this way further worsen the workers position.

Most speakers agreed that the basic mass of white-collar workers could be classed as part of the working class, or as standing very close to it. M. Hirsł noted that a study of the basic mass of white-collar workers revealed no essential differences in terms of material position from industrial workers, in fact, some sections were worse off than the industrial workers.

To this might be added, G. Szanto said, that the changes in trade and the administrative services (self-service, mechanized bookkeeping, computer techniques, etc.) are likely to have a more adverse effect on the white-collar man than on the manual worker.

The reality, therefore, Szanto said, summing up, is not the "welfare state," the "industrial society," or a "democratic socialism," as Social-Democratic and bourgeois theorists would have us believe. *The stark reality is a deepening of the crisis of capitalism and its adverse effects on the workers, the technical intelligentsia, office employees, students, civil servants, and the diminishing, but still very large, mass of farmers. And no amount of economic, political or sociological manipulation can obscure the sharpening of the class struggle.*

U.S. investments in Britain

J. R. CAMPBELL

There are approximately 1,600 branches of American firms in Britain, with a capital value of approximately £2,500 million, and the number is steadily increasing every year. In 1950 the total value of U.S. investments in Britain was £300 million. Now with investments amounting to £2,500 million it comprises one-fifth of all the American investment outside the United States itself.

All of the great U.S. "international companies," which control their foreign branches directly from a center in the USA are represented in Britain. In the past the Americans have allowed considerable autonomy to the management of their British branches, for example, the managements of the Ford and General Motors factories in Britain were predominantly British. Of late years however the American centers have replaced British managements with American managements and have endeavored, not without difficulty, to fully introduce into their British plants the methods of labor management in existence in America.

The American international firm fully believes that one of the reasons for its success is its vast technological knowledge due to its immense expenditure on research and development, most of which is provided by the U.S. Government as part of the gigantic war effort. Expenditure on research and development can be judged from the fact that in 1930 its total cost over all American industry was 166 million dollars, 3,400 million in 1953 and no less than 12,000 million in 1960. In 1930 only 16 per cent of research and development was financed by the state which today finances over 60 per cent. Naturally the bulk of this is on aerospace problems and on electrical equipment, and communications, but quite considerable sums are spent on other industries as follows —

chemicals 196 million dollars, machinery 265 million, motor vehicles 174 million, and scientific instruments 172 million.

Some research is done in American factories in Britain, especially when more of them are directly controlled by American managements, but the main research is done in America, which also receives the results of the research of all its European subsidiaries. American managements in Britain have been known to boast that it would be of little use to nationalize some American firms as British managements would not have the full technological knowledge to work the plants. The best known U.S. international firms with branches in Britain tend to be located in industries of the scientific and technological revolution.

Automobiles. Three of the largest firms in the capitalist world, General Motors Corporation, Ford Motor Corporation and the Chrysler Corporation, have large plants, fully under American managerial control. The tire firms, Goodyear Tire and Rubber Company, Firestone Tire and Rubber Co., have a large share in the British tire market.

The motor industry is regarded as one of Britain's most successful industries. It employs 750,000 workers and it is the main export industry in the country. This would be exceedingly praiseworthy but unfortunately some sixty per cent of the industry is U.S. owned. Its exports help Britain's balance of payments, but on the other hand they will involve a greater transmission of dividends across the Atlantic in future years, and this will have the opposite effect.

When the vast possibilities of expansion of the automobile industry became apparent in the 1920's, the U.S. firms with General Motors at their head, began to

acquire factories in Europe. These firms were faced with the fact that most European countries were seeking to protect their infant automobile industries, by raising tariff barriers. Ford had established factories in Britain even before the outbreak of the First World War, and in the early 1920's General Motors sought to buy the two most efficient British producers of the light automobile, Austins of Birmingham, and Morris of Oxford. This attempt failed, but later General Motors acquired a non-automobile firm, Vauxhall, and converted it for the production of cars and trucks after much initial difficulty. Both American firms moved cautiously. The local managements were British, and in Fords quite a number of shareholders were also British. As neither of the firms recognized trade unions they had ample opportunities up to the late 1920's of introducing mass production techniques. Even in the British sector of the industry, except in the departments calling for the utmost skill, trade union organization was weak. Just before the second war, trade unionism secured a foothold in Fords and after the war the American firms had to make considerable concessions to trade unionism.

During the 1960's the number of British motor firms gradually declined until by the mid-1960's only three effective firms were manufacturing the small compact type of car for which the British automobile industry was famous—British Motor Corporation, Rootes, and Leyland Motors. Rootes, however, got into difficulties, could get no assistance from the Government or from other sections of British industry, and so the third biggest U.S. firm, Chrysler's, bought part control of Rootes. It was argued at the time, that this was by no means a take-over, that the Rootes productive organization was being joined to the worldwide marketing organization of Chrysler to the benefit of both. This was during the period of the Tory Government, and the Labor Party, then in opposition, accused the Government of shamelessly betraying British interests by allowing the Americans to penetrate into the management of British companies. The position of Rootes continued to deteriorate, the Government and the other sections of the British motor industry refused to help, and the alternative was, either let the company be taken over completely by Chrysler, or close down. And the Labor Government which succeeded the Tories

after 1964 tamely allowed the all Chrysler takeover.

In 1966 the firm British Motor Holdings found itself in difficulties and it became clear that it had a long and difficult struggle before full recovery would be possible. Again the British Government had to intervene, and this time forced the firm into amalgamation with Leyland Motors in a new firm British Leyland Motors Corporation. Government money was necessary to make this deal possible.

Thus while at the beginning of the 1960's there were, as far as popular cars and mass produced trucks are concerned, three large British firms to two American, there are now in 1968 three American firms, claimed by the Americans to be the first, the second and the sixth manufacturing firms in the capitalist world against one British firm, aided by the British Government.

U.S. Oil Firms in Britain. The big American companies, Standard Oil, Socony Mobiloil, Texaco Incorporated, Gulf Oil Corporation, Continental Oil Corporation, Union Oil Corporation have more than half the oil-refining capacity of Britain in their grip. The Esso (Standard Oil) refinery at Fawley in Southern England is reputed to be the most up-to-date in equipment and, from the capitalist point of view the most artful in the manipulation of its labor force. Naturally these firms are in the forefront of the campaign (approved by many of the managements of the large scale energy-using plants in Britain) for the quickest possible replacement of coal by oil, in the production of electrical power for industry, and for domestic consumption. There is at the moment only a minute economic advantage of oil over coal for this purpose, from the point of view of the British economy, for British coal produced by the latest mechanical methods is comparatively cheap. In fact to throw tens of thousands of British miners out of work, is no advantage to the British economy taken as a whole, but it does benefit the American and also British oil firms.

Recently when extensive deposits of natural gas were discovered beneath the North Sea, off the East Coast of Britain, this new and rich source of energy could have been developed by the British Government as a state monopoly. The Government pleaded, however, that its economic difficulties made this impossible and invited large oil firms from all over the world to

help explore and exploit the gas. Now some 60 per cent of them are great American oil companies.

The Battle of the Computers. The computer is an example of a discovery first developed (as far as the capitalist world is concerned) in Britain, but taken over, improved, and produced on a mass scale in the United States. The dominant firm in the computer business is International Business Machines, rated by the Americans as the eleventh largest manufacturing firm in the capitalist world.

The USA is bent on establishing a virtual monopoly of computer production and servicing in Western Europe including Britain. In the USA there has been a tremendous development in the use of computers. In 1960 the U.S. Government expressed the view that within five years there would be 15,000 computers in American industry. This turned out to be a modest estimate, for in fact 25,000 were being used in 1965, and today the number is in the region of 40,000. The British computer industry, though second in the capitalist world to the American, is still a long, long way behind. The British economist, Christopher Layton, made the following estimate of the share of companies in the computer market of continental Europe in 1965—International Business Machines 62 per cent, ICT (International Computers and Tabulators) (British) nine per cent, Bull (French) seven per cent, Olivetti (Italian) two per cent, others (mostly British) 20 per cent. The computer branches of Bull and Olivetti were subsequently taken over by the General Electric Company of U.S. Thus America has over 70 per cent of the European computer market.

In 1965 when the British Labor Government conducted a technological survey it became clear that without Government assistance the British computer industry would disappear under the blows of its American rivals. The Government extended support to the industry, and this year persuaded a number of computer firms to merge.

U.S. Chemicals and Drugs in Britain. Much of the chemical machinery installed in Britain, is made in the United States so it is no wonder that after the Second World War some of the best known American firms began to instal themselves in Britain also. There is the Du Pont Company a branch of the world famous Du Pont de Nemours and Company), Procter and Gamble, Dow Chemicals, Allied Chem-

icals, Monsanto Chemicals, Johnson and Johnson. Some of those firms are quite well known to the British public because like Procter and Gamble they are in open competition for the vast and growing detergent market with well-known British firms like Unilever and Imperial Chemical Industries. The Monopolies Commission in Britain estimated that the prices on both sides were much too high, largely due to excessive advertising costs and called on the firms to reduce them. A half-hearted effort was made to do so.

Every American knows of the alleged failure of "socialized medicine"—the American name for the British National Health Service and similar services in other countries. Until recently the British health service supplied drugs free to all citizens on prescription from a doctor. It still supplies them at less than cost. It thus forms one of the most stable markets for medicinal drugs in Europe, and American pharmaceutical firms have rushed to commend their products to the "socialized medicine" institutions of Britain. Before the National Health Service of Britain the main established U.S. firm in Britain was Merck, Sharp and Johnson. Since then many other well known pharmaceutical enterprises such as Bayer, Pfizer, Abbot Laboratories, Parke-Davies, and Eli Lilly have flocked in. Today more than one half of national health prescriptions are for American drugs.

The Consumer Market. Every night on Independent Television (the section of the British Television service maintained by advertisements) there appears a succession of American consumer goods that are especially popular with middle class people and with the better paid workers. In the first place there will be electrically-operated cleaning machines, the latter using special detergents manufactured by some of the big chemical plants, located in Britain but owned by U.S. chemical firms like Procter and Gamble.

A wide variety of packaged cereal foods for breakfast will be offered to the housewives, the product of American-owned firms such as Kellogg's Corn Flakes, Weetabix and Quaker Oats and drinks like Maxwell House Instant Coffee and Tetley's Tea bags.

Almost fifty per cent of the toilet materials for men are produced by U.S. firms located in Britain—Gillette razors and razor blades, Gillette Foamy Shaving Cream, and for those using Ronson elec-

tric razors there is Old Spice shaving lotion. The majority of the best known beauty preparations used by women will be from American owned factories—Elizabeth Arden, Max Factor, Helena Rubinstein, are the well-known names here.

Cameras from all over the world—from the GDR, the Soviet Union and Japan as well as from the USA find a ready sale in Britain but 77 per cent of the color film used is produced by the well known factory of Kodak Ltd. The Government Monopolies Commission examined the workings of this firm recently and found that it made excessive profits on capital employed. Under Government pressure it had to reduce its prices.

The British are reputed to be one of the principal dogowning nations of the world and, of course, in the past fed their pets on food left over from the family meal, or on cheap food that could be bought at the butchers. Now tinned foods which are supposed to work wonders for cats and dogs are widely sold. The U.S. firm Pet Foods Ltd., is particularly active in this sphere.

One of the favorite justifications for the acceptance of American firms in Britain is that they introduce the latest techniques which otherwise would not be known to British firms. This cannot apply to the latest American moves to take over some of the long established British tobacco firms. The largest tobacco firm in British ownership is the Imperial Tobacco Company, capital £286 million, and a labor force of 45,000. Imperial Tobacco held a large number of shares in Gallahers Ltd., the third largest tobacco firm in Britain which would have enabled it to control the day-to-day management of Gallahers. The Government Monopolies Commission advised the Imperial Tobacco Company to reduce the danger of monopoly by selling its Gallaher shares to other firms, and this was done. The American tobacco company Philip Morris then offered to buy the Gallaher firm for the sum of £92 million but the Gallaher directors rejected the offer. A still bigger U.S. firm, American Tobacco, then approached the merchant banks which had sold the Gallaher shares to buy them back on its behalf. When this had been done American Tobacco was in a position to exert considerable pressure on the Gallaher directors and was able to buy the company, by offering a larger price than its rival Philip Morris. Philip Morris was subsequently able to buy up a smaller British firm—Godfrey Philips—which manu-

factures luxury brands of cigarettes for the foreign market. It should be noted that both British firms mentioned were squeezing comparatively good profits from their workers and were in no particular need of outside assistance. But their directors and shareholders thought they could enrich themselves by selling their firm to the Americans and the interests of British state monopoly capitalism as a system were not taken into consideration at all.

The Take-Over of the British Cinema Industry. In common with other countries in the capitalist world the British state takes steps to protect the film industry. Cinemas are obliged to show 30 per cent of British films in a given period and there is a levy on all films exhibited, which goes to help the domestic film industry. The film industry, however, is not controlled by British companies. Any company, whatever its ownership, in which 75 per cent of the wage and salary bill is paid to British citizens, and which shoots its studio scenes in Britain, is regarded as a British firm. This signified that the big Hollywood companies could come to Britain and shoot films in which British actors and actresses star and thus qualify for the full protection from foreign competition enjoyed by the native British film company. Today the greater part of the levy, intended to help British firms, is collected by branches of the Hollywood corporations located in Britain. It is argued that this is "better than nothing" and no section of the British film industry is arguing against it at this moment.

What of the Future? It is contended by British admirers of the U.S. that the extent of U.S. penetration of the British capitalist economy is exaggerated—being only some eight to 10 per cent of the total capitalist investments. American investments however are not spread over the entire economy; they are concentrated chiefly in the industries associated with the scientific and technological revolution as shown by the American grip on the motor industry, the electronic industry, oil refining, chemical and petro-chemical industries.

The British chemical engineering industry has technological knowledge equal to the best American, yet it is the branches and subsidiaries of the American chemical firms that get the orders for new chemical plants both in Britain and abroad. The U.S. firms have the capital with which to expand their share of the science-based industries in Britain.

In addition the present Labor Government is only too anxious to have more American capital investment in Britain. The flow of American money into Britain to erect factories or to buy existing British firms, helps the balance of payments for a short period. At the moment the balance of payments is in heavy deficit, and the Government welcomes any inflow of foreign investment, even though the long-term result will put the British capitalist economy still heavier into the debt of the U.S.

The British economy, it is true, still draws an exceedingly heavy tribute from its investments in the countries of its former empire and in other overseas countries. In 1966 the tribute was in excess of £1,000 million. However in recent years it has had to pay out a growing tribute in the shape of profits and dividends to those foreign capitalists (many American) who have investments in Britain. The sum of tribute grows steadily year after year. £342 million, paid out in 1956 had grown to £569 million in 1967.

American Firms—British Workers. At the Trades Union Congress in September 1968 the following resolution was discussed—"Congress calls upon the Government to make it a condition that foreign firms recognize the British trade union movement and the rights of the organized workers before they are allowed to operate in this country."

The Brookings Institution (USA) report on "Britain's Economic Prospects" boasts that firms which are subsidiaries or branches of U.S. firms are much more efficient than similar British firms in the same industry. The Institution publishes the following figures of rate of profit, before tax, of British firms and U.S. firms in the same industry in 1961.

	U.S. firms	British firms
Chemicals, etc.	17.4	16.8
Metal Manufactures	18.3	17.0
Electrical Engineering	21.8	18.7
Vehicles	21.0	16.7
Food, Drink and Tobacco	31.6	18.2

It is also alleged that those American subsidiaries in Britain managed by American managers are always more profitable than the American subsidiaries run by British managers.

The tradition of American firms in Britain is that wherever possible they have been strongly against trade unions and,

on the basis of their higher profits, they paid slightly higher wages than many comparable British firms. The outstanding example of this was the Ford Motor Company, and their subsidiary Briggs Bodies. It was not until the 1930's when great struggles for the right to organize trade unions were being fought out in the United States, that British workers employed in American owned enterprises followed suit. There are still in the 1960's powerful American firms like Kodak Ltd., which still do not fully recognize trade unions. In most American-owned firms in which unions are now recognized hard struggles had to be waged to force the managements to give shop stewards the same rights to negotiate on behalf of the workers as they had in British owned factories.

All American companies with subsidiaries in Britain are out to break the power of the shop stewards and to introduce new methods of wage negotiations in the factories. They want to abolish the British method of incentive payments—generally known as payment by results—which is negotiated between shop stewards on behalf of the workers and foremen or rate-fixers on behalf of the management. All American managements firmly believe that the British system of negotiations on bans on payment by results gives the workers higher wages for the same output, than any current American system.

Everywhere they are seeking to introduce the American system known as the measured day work, which is based on time work measured against certain norms of output. This, as a rule, does not mean lower earnings for individual workers, but it could mean intensification of labor and redundancies. It may mean new agreements every third year, instead of at any time that a change in production methods renders it necessary. It curtails the powers of the shop stewards and gives the management much greater power in the factories. This or similar systems are in operation in most American-owned motor firms in Britain and fiercely resisted attempts are being made to introduce it in the British motor firms.

Another American practice which British workers are strenuously resisting is that of buying up established British firms, seeking to rationalize them to American methods and then when the workers resist, close the firm altogether and condemn the workers to unemployment.

This happened with a long established firm, CNV Engineering, in North West London, and with the firm, Roberts Arundel, in Stockport in North-West England.

Naturally in areas of Britain where unemployment is high and where there are few prospects of unemployed workers getting employment—such as in Scotland or

in Northern Ireland, there is sometimes acceptance of an American firm, but all available evidence shows that the growing penetration of Britain by American capital is a source of subjection of the British economy to American capital and of increased exploitation of the British working class.

SOCIAL PROBLEMS OF AFRICA

Wage-labor in Africa: heritage of colonialism and prospects

OTA LEV

Imperialism turned Africa, potentially one of the richest continents of the world, into its raw-materials appendage, and did everything to retard its economic development. With a population of some 300 million—approximately 10 per cent of the world's total—Africa produces a mere two per cent of world industrial output.

The number of wage workers in Africa is estimated at 20 million—less than seven per cent of the total population and less than 20 per cent of the able-bodied population. These data conceal substantial differences between the three main regions—North, Tropical and Southern Africa. In Tropical Africa, the largest and most backward part of the continent and inhabited by three-quarters of the entire African population, wage workers make up four per cent of the total and 10 per cent of the able-bodied population. Most Africans live in conditions of a natural or semi-natural economy.

The structure of the working class and other groups of wage workers differs from that in the industrially developed countries. The industrial enterprises are mostly small, and there is an acute shortage of technicians. Unjustifiably large numbers are

employed in the services, in the distributive system, in the primitive agriculture and in the administration which, in contrast to the developed countries, does little to promote industrial development. It follows, then, that workers employed in the large industrial enterprises—that is, those who form the core of the proletariat—are but an insignificant part of the African army of wage labor.

Another feature is fluctuation of labor, largely the result of migration. The reasons for this migration differ in many respects from those in other areas of the world. It is caused, among other things, by land expropriation, pressure of taxation, the contract system, use of forced labor, and, of course the natural increase in population.

People leave their villages and often their countries in search of work, but most return sooner or later, being unable to find permanent jobs in the towns and to maintain their families there. A role in this is played also by the links with particular tribes or communities, which help the migrants and their families in time of need. The attraction of urban life and the desire to save up as much as possible

tend to prolong the migrants' stay in the towns. As opportunities increase for permanent employment and for settlement in the towns, the tendency to break the links with the village grows, and a gradual proletarianization takes place. Be that as it may, Africa to this day resembles a huge ant-hill of migratory workers shuttling between town and countryside.

Migrant labor is not conducive to the forming of a regular proletariat, involves an unnecessary waste of energy by the able-bodied population. The constant changing of jobs makes it difficult for many workers to acquire a trade and, what is more, it militates against trade union organization and growth of class consciousness. Lastly, the system of migration enables the capitalists to maintain pressure on wages and living standards.

Still, the migration has its good side. It enables many rural residents to become familiar with urban life, with industry, with the conditions of the working class, with its ideology and with its trade unions and political organizations. They observe strikes and at times take part in them. Ultimately, some of the migrants settle down and lose touch with their villages and tribes. Contact with working people belonging to other tribes and nationalities helps overcome tribal prejudices. "Like the diversion of the population from agriculture to the towns, non-agricultural migration is a *progressive phenomenon*. It tears the population out of the neglected, backward, history-forgotten remote spots and draws them into the whirlpool of modern social life. It increases literacy among the population, heightens their understanding, and gives them civilized habits and requirements" (Lenin, *The Development of Capitalism in Russia*. Collected Works, Vol. 3, p. 575).

An exceedingly low literacy level is another feature of the African working class and all African wage workers.

In contrast to Europe and North America, where adult literacy is almost 100 per cent, the number of literates in the developing countries averages 135 per thousand. And most African countries have the lowest level of literacy in the Third World.

Not long ago the journal *Afrique Nouvelle* reported that out of 34 million children of junior school age in the Central African countries and Madagascar (total population: 210 million), only 15 million, or 44 per cent, were receiving any kind of

education in 1965. Secondary schools had an attendance of five per cent, and higher schools about 0.5 per cent, of the young people of the corresponding age.

Out of 5,350,000 six-year olds in 1960, 3,816,000 will still be illiterate by 1969. Out of six million six-year-olds in 1965-66 over 4,000,000, or more than two-thirds were doomed to illiteracy. This means that in the coming decades the greater part of the adult population of Central Africa and Madagascar will still be illiterate.

This affects the level of development of the working class. The African continent is in dire need of skilled manpower. Skilled workers in Africa are mostly Europeans, a state of affairs which leads to the preservation of privileges for persons of European descent. This has a negative effect on the native working class, inhibiting growth of class consciousness, organization and militancy.

Mention should also be made of the fact that in Africa, as distinct from the industrialized countries, the number of women employed does not exceed 10 per cent of the wage workers. Women are employed for the most part in the services and in agriculture, and only very few in industry.

The insignificant participation of African women in industry and in social life is explained by the need to look after the family, especially when the bread-winner leaves home in search of a job. The strong religious, tribal and other traditions, the low level of welfare (the almost total absence of child establishments, the inadequate health service), also constitute a serious obstacle to the participation of women in industry and in social life generally.

The smallness of the proletariat, the migration, dispersion of wage workers in small enterprises, the low level of literacy and skill, racial, national and tribal strife—these are some of the factors hindering the formation of an African proletariat and retarding the growth of class consciousness and trade unions.

However, despite these weaknesses the African working class does play a role in the national liberation struggle and in other political and economic processes. Industrialization in Africa is accompanied by changes in the structure of the working class and in wage labor generally, helping to overcome the aftermath of the colonial oppression.

II.

The economic and social status of the African proletariat corresponds to the general socio-economic conditions inherited from colonialism.

Of considerable interest are data relating to per capita national income in 123 countries (non-socialist) in 1960. For the United States the figure was \$1,541, for Great Britain \$798 and \$722 for France. Out of 39 African countries surveyed, 28 had a per capita national income lower than \$100, and in 13 of these it was lower than \$50. Only ten African countries registered between \$100 and \$200. The Republic of South Africa boasted \$749—less than Great Britain but greater than France. This was largely due to the exceptionally high incomes of the three million white minority benefiting from the apartheid system.

Out of the 51 countries in which the average national income per head of population in 1960 was below \$100, more than half (28) were African countries. The proportion of African states averaging less than \$50 was still greater.

Average per capita national income in the United States was from 10 to 50 times higher than in all countries of Africa with the exception of the Republic of South Africa. In France, it was five to 22 and in Britain, five to 17 times higher than in their former colonies. According to some estimates, the income gap is widening. In these figures we have testimony to the state in which Africa was left by its imperialist "patrons."

This economic backwardness determines the condition of the working class and other groups of working people in Africa. It depends on the cost of labor, which includes living conditions, the standard of medical service, social welfare, labor legislation, etc. The extremely low standard of living can be traced also to the insufficient development of the struggle of the working people for their economic and social demands.

Compared to the countries in higher latitudes, expenditure on housing, heating, clothing, etc., is not high in Africa. Taking advantage of this, the capitalist employers, in the course of whole generations have confined themselves to the minimum expenditure on the production of manpower and the maintenance of workers' families.

Data of the International Labor Organization published in 1967 testify to the

growth of both nominal wages in the non-agricultural sector and the prices of consumer goods and services.

Average Annual Increase in Wages and Prices of Consumer Goods and Services in Some African Countries (%%)

Country	Average annual increase in wages in non-agricultural sectors	Average annual increase in prices of consumer goods and services
Ghana	6.1	7.1
Kenya	5.8	2.2
Malawi		
non-Africans	2.0	2.2
Africans	6.8	—
Nigeria		
skilled workers	18.0	—
unskilled workers	9.8	2.3
Senegal	0.5	2.8
Rhodesia		
non-Africans	7.9	1.9
Africans	2.9	2.2
Tanzania	12.2	1.5
UAR	2.0	2.9
Zambia		
non-Africans	5.5	3.0
Africans	10.1	3.1

NOTES:

1. The data for the separate countries were calculated for periods of four to ten years.

2. Though the percentage of increase in wages is higher for Africans than non-Africans the actual increase is much lower due to large differentials in wage levels (e.g., in Malawi Africans are paid 12 times less than non-Africans, in Rhodesia, and in Zambia nearly eight times less).

In most African countries the index of nominal wages is rising somewhat faster than that of consumer prices. But in some countries growth of nominal wages is accompanied over the years by a faster rise in prices for consumer goods and services.

Detailed data for the structure of expenditure testify to an extremely low standard of living. In most African countries wages are spent chiefly on prime necessities, above all food. Only in one of 13 countries surveyed did expenditure on food come to less than 30 per cent of the family budget. In four countries it amounted to 40-50 per cent, in five to 50-60 per cent, and in three countries 60-70 per cent and more. Thus, in eight of 13 countries families spend more than half of their income on food.

Despite the considerable budgetary expenditure on food, the diet of the Afri-

cans is inferior in quantity, structure and calorie content to that of the majority of the population in the developed capitalist countries. According to the statistical bulletin of the International Labor Organization the daily wage of a Dahomey coalminer buys 500 grams of cheese and 750 grams of bread; that of a baker in Ethiopia, one litre of milk and 800 grams of bread; that of an unskilled worker in Lesotho, one kilogram of bread and 500 grams of mutton; that of an unskilled worker in the Kenyan textile industry, one kilo of rice, one litre of milk and two eggs. It should be borne in mind that in most cases these are family incomes. This means that the majority of the African population is not far removed from a starvation level.

Added to the malnutrition are the vile housing conditions. Some have no shelter at all. Most striking in the capitals of many African countries is the contrast between the modern residential sections where foreigners and the local bourgeoisie live, and the shacks of working people on the outskirts lacking all amenities. But even the shacks are beyond the reach of the unemployed migrants.

Speakers from Senegal addressing a seminar in Cairo in October 1966 said that most Senegalese workers live in shantytowns, usually with five to 10 people to a room. Sometimes the room may be shared by 20 people. Electricity, sewerage and piped water are absent.

These conditions lead to a high disease incidence. According to U.N. statistics infectious diseases are responsible for 20.9 per cent of deaths in Nigeria, 25.0 in Sierra Leone, 11.6 in Tunisia, and 12.2 in the Republic of South Africa (the percentage for whites there is 2.2) Respective figures for Great Britain and the United States are 1.1 to 1.2 per cent, for France, 2.6.

The African continent suffers from a grave shortage of doctors and hospitals. Public health legislation exists only in a few countries.

According to a report of the African section of the World Health Organization the number of doctors and other medical personnel is decreasing both relatively and absolutely. In 1962, the report tells us, twenty-six African countries had 4,700 doctors and three years later, 300 less. The average is one doctor per 20,000 residents. African doctors are few: one per 50,000 residents, and in some areas the proportion is one to several hundred thousand.

Medical charges are so high that most Africans cannot afford them. Hence the free health service in the socialist countries and the better health services gained by the working people in some of the industrially developed countries are attractive examples to the working people in Africa.

Colonialism, which ruthlessly exploited the material and human resources of the continent, did next to nothing to improve living conditions and health protection. The incidence of disease, coupled with the inadequate medical service, keeps the average life span at an extremely low level. Few Africans can expect to reach the age of 50.

Child mortality is shockingly high. In Nigeria, approximately 40 per cent of all children die in their first five years.

Needed for any improvement in the condition of the African working people are the proper material prerequisites and the enactment of adequate labor and social legislation.

III.

Before the Second World War basic social and labor laws had been enacted in only a few African colonies. The fight for these and for other economic and social demands was stepped up in the postwar. Purposefulness, organization and unity marked the movement of the working people in French Tropical Africa which in 1952 forced the adoption of a Labor Code. This was the first big victory which eased the lot of 350,000 workers or, counting their families, about a million people. Some gains were also registered in other countries.

With the advent of the sixties, a period marked by rapid and vigorous growth of the labor and national liberation movements, the fight for the complete elimination of colonialism on the African continent entered upon its decisive stage. A big role in this struggle was played by the political, economic and cultural aid of the countries of the socialist world system. This aid is rendered in many forms, from the erection of big enterprises—the rock bottom of a modern economy—to the training of specialists. Aid from the socialist countries is a constantly operating factor promoting numerical growth of the working class and the improvement of its socio-economic position. The existence of the socialist world with its economic and

political advantages, especially as regards social welfare, greatly influences the formation and orientation of the working-class movement.

Since gaining independence the working people of Africa have achieved definite progress in the sphere of labor and social legislation.

Most African states have enacted laws on maintenance in the event of disability resulting from individual accidents or occupational diseases. In some of the countries family allowances and pensions are paid and labor codes have been adopted. The latter differ in content, depending on the demands of the working people and the intensity of their struggle.

As a rule, the labor codes give the working people certain guarantees pertaining to collective bargaining. With few exceptions, they prohibit forced labor and set limits on the duration of the working week, which at present ranges from 40 to 48 hours with one day off. Paid holidays, usually of two weeks duration, are another gain.

The codes adopted in recent years pay special attention to working conditions for women and juveniles. Child labor is prohibited. Some of the codes contain provisions for working mothers and expectant mothers, such as transfer to easier jobs and maternity leaves.

With all its limitations, this labor and social legislation signifies progress. In some countries that have opted for the non-capitalist way this progress conforms in some measure to the general political orientation, which in many respects proceeds from the requirements of the working people. The situation is different in those countries with neo-colonialist regimes, where labor and social legislation is patently inadequate or purely formal. In a number of countries not even a minimum wage has been fixed, and there are laws restricting the right to strike and the right to assembly.

Labor and social legislation does not automatically ensure improvements for the working people. Where the laws of capitalism operate and exploitation is in the order of things, often violated is that part of the legislation restricting capitalist profits, and consolidating the gain won by the masses.

Clearly, the fight for a better life, for social and labor legislation is inseparable from the fight for democratic rights. The broader the rights enjoyed by the working

people the more effectively they can fight for their everyday demands and, conversely, vigorous struggle for economic and social improvements makes it easier to fight for political demands, to combine economic, social and political forms of struggle.

This is particularly important for the African labor movement. In those countries of Africa that have taken the non-capitalist way the working people already enjoy certain rights and democratic freedoms. But in many other countries they still have to fight and gain these rights. Typical in this respect are the surviving colonial and racist regimes, such as the Republic of South Africa, where terror is the chief instrument of power. In 1967 South Africa, with a comparatively small population, executed, in keeping with just the officially announced death sentences, almost as many people as did the rest of the world. This infamous priority in legalized murder is matched by vicious legal and extra-legal persecution of all progressives.

Democratic rights are also affected by the frequent military coups often inspired by the imperialist circles. In 1967 the number of African refugees seeking asylum abroad mostly for political reasons increased by 17 per cent.

The governments of some of the newly-free countries which have chosen the capitalist way grant fewer democratic rights and freedoms than the former colonial regimes. Misusing the victory won against colonialism, they try to utilize the unity gained in the course of the liberation struggle to buttress their rule.

Respect for democratic rights and freedoms, however, does not run counter to the need for the working people's discipline in building the new states. The working class demands democratic rights and freedoms not because it wants to weaken the young state and retard its development, but because it wants to take its rightful place in the new society.

The fight of the working people imperils the domination of bourgeois and bureaucratic forces and they are making desperate attempts to stifle the voice of the progressive forces in the working-class movement. Most Marxist-Leninist parties, the vanguard of the working class and of all working people, are persecuted and compelled to work underground. In some countries contact between the mass organ-

izations and the revolutionary forces is restricted or banned altogether. For instance, laws have been passed prohibiting organizational links between national organizations, including trade unions, and progressive international organizations.

These facts testify to the direct interdependence of the socio-economic and political position of the working people,

point to the need to combine economic and social action with action for political demands, to organize mass action for economic, social and political progress on the continent. The leading role is played in this struggle by the progressive forces, specifically the Marxist-Leninist and revolutionary democratic parties and the trade unions, which unite millions of workers.

MEETING IN LENINGRAD

On November 26-27 a number of comrades from the Editorial Board had a meeting with Leningrad factory workers and discussed with them the political, social and economic achievements of the Soviet working class, its role in socialist society and work and social activities in Leningrad factories. Workers from 20 enterprises were present, among them A. V. Chuyev, lathe operator in the Baltic Plant; A. M. Larionova, assembly worker in the Krasnaya Zarya Plant; K. V. Govorushin, mechanic in the Kirov Plant; A. A. Gritskevich of the Sevkabel Plant; V. I. Kukin, crane operator; S. S. Vitchenko, mechanic in the Elektrosila Plant; N. S. Selyavin, machine setter in the Leningrad Engineering Works, and L. A. Dubina of the Vera Slutskaya Factory.

The Editorial Board was represented by Helene Berg (Socialist Unity Party of Germany), P. Naumov (Communist Party of the Soviet Union), P. Hentges (French Communist Party), C. Unni Raja (Communist Party of India), E. Zucker-Schilling (Communist Party of Austria).

A detailed report of the meeting will appear in a forthcoming issue.

Economic specificities and revolutionary process in Latin American countries

FRANCISCO MIERES

The need for a scientific investigation of the problem of the unity and diversity of the continent is, we think, quite obvious. There is hardly a work on Latin America that does not refer to this subject—either directly or hypothetically, or simply by mentioning the influence it exerts on other issues.

We have only to abstract ourselves from theory and turn to the practical activities of imperialism and the oligarchies on the continent to see that our adversaries have for long been trying to settle this problem in their own interests. What better evidence of this than the organizations through which they are working — the Organization of American States, Pan-American Union, Alliance for Progress, Inter-American Development Bank, Inter-American Defense Council, Latin American Free Trade Association, Central American Common Market, Pact of the Andes Countries. These organizations are, if anything, *indicative* of the fact that the matter is not only a theoretical but also a practical one.

Nor, for that matter, is it a new one, something that has cropped up overnight. It has agitated socio-political thought in Latin America over the past 150 years, and never more so than today. The Latin American Communist parties have drawn attention to it time and again, ever since their first continental conference in 1929. That revolutionaries have taken up the question over the years bespeaks a justified apprehension concerning the intensified activity of our class enemies. It could not be otherwise. The exploited and oppressed classes of our countries could hardly remain in-

different to these activities and allow our enemies to retain the initiative indefinitely. Furthermore, the vanguard role of the Communists in the Latin American revolutionary movement requires that they give the masses clear-cut, lucid answers to this question.

Clearly this can be done only through joint effort, through exchanges of views and information, gradually arriving in this way at the right conclusions. Proceeding from this premise, it would be useful to examine this problem from different angles and analyze the partial or tentative results of the different investigations.

Current economic and socio-political literature sees all the Latin American countries as a vast politico-economic community: as underdeveloped countries in the aggregate, as a tricontinental group, a zone of the colonial, semi-colonial and dependent countries, a zone of the national-liberation movement, the so-called Third World.

This generalization, although essentially correct, and although widely accepted, needs a more precise definition, as we shall see later.

Having said this, we arrive at two conclusions. First, that it is methodologically possible to group into "social zones" countries sharing certain common features, despite any differences in type that may exist between them. Second, that the inclusion of the Latin American countries in the above-mentioned broad community makes them an *object of generalization* and, consequently, they are considered as *components of an entity* (along with countries of other continents).

But are the Latin American countries united only by a similarity that approximates them to the backward and dependent countries of Africa and Asia? Are there not elements within this global similarity that are applicable specifically to the Latin American countries? Do they not represent a *species* within the *genus* of the underdeveloped countries? Does not Latin America therefore possess specific features which make it possible to classify it as a region differing socially and economically from the rest of the Third World?

A more profound study of the Third World shows that the concept of its definition, that is, the concept of economic underdevelopment, does not make it possible to advance beyond the first, very general approximation which cannot serve as a starting point for examining the problems of the different zones. As a result, when attempts are made to explain the character and structure of development in the aggregate, the description reflects chiefly the problems of the colonial and semi-colonial or newly-independent Afro-Asian countries whose socio-economic backwardness is even greater. The picture that emerges is one in which Latin America often does not figure at all, or if it does, then just perfunctorily. This underscores the need to examine the aggregate in its parts with the object of making a deeper study of the problems of each without upsetting the logical generalizations pertinent to the Third World as a whole.

LENIN ON LATIN AMERICA

It will be useful to examine the interesting conclusions drawn by Lenin with respect to Latin American reality, conclusions which until now have not been given the attention they merit, despite their relevance to the present subject.*

In his *Notebooks on Imperialism*, Lenin included the 20 countries of South and Central America and also those of Eastern Europe among the financially dependent, but politically independent countries, drawing a distinction between them and the colonies and semi-colonies. Lenin noted in this respect that the era of national and democratic movements, which began in the colonies and semi-colonies after the 1905 revolution in Russia, had already begun in Latin America at the time of the wars of independence in 1810-1826, covering the 19th and 20th centuries.

Lenin returns to these conclusions in the

outline for his work *Statistics and Sociology*, and in his *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* he excludes the 20 Latin American states from imperialism's colonial system, stressing the difference between Argentina—a country financially and diplomatically dependent while retaining its political independence—and the semi-colonial countries at the time (Iran, China, Turkey).

These Leninist ideas are extremely pertinent when making an objective analysis of Latin America today. Let us examine them more closely.

To begin with, it is obvious that Lenin considers the Latin American and other countries on a multinational, regional and continental scale.

Secondly, he includes the financially and politically independent countries (England, Germany, France, the United States) in the first group; Eastern Europe (Russia, Austria, Turkey), the smaller West European countries, Japan and the non-colonial countries of South and Central America in the second group; semi-colonies—in the third group; colonies in the fourth (*Collected Works*, Vol. 39, p. 718).

In another variant in his *Notebooks on Imperialism* Lenin classifies the countries of the world into three major groups and subgroups:

Group I is divided into three sub-groups: (a) Western Europe (12 countries); (b) the United States; (c) Japan;

Group II includes two sub-groups: (a) Eastern Europe and part of Asia (nine countries); (b) South and Central America (20 countries);

Group III is divided into two parts: (a) the semi-colonies (ten countries); (b) colonies (about 60 countries) (*ibid.*, p. 715).

It is noteworthy that in both variants Lenin regarded Latin America as a specific group of countries. A study of his *Notebooks* shows that he arrived at this view not *a priori*, but as the result of profound study.

Nor did Lenin include Latin America in the colonial world of imperialism, and he distinguished between the Latin American countries and the semi-colonies. We shall return to this later.

To digress somewhat, we should like to

*The exception, in our view, is S. Semenov's article "Marxist-Leninist Approach to the Problems of the Anti-Imperialist Struggle in Latin America," published in the collection "El Gran Octubre y el proceso revolucionario universal" (*The Great October Socialist Revolution and the World Revolutionary Process*) (Moscow, 1967, p. 326 et seq.).

draw attention to the little-known fact that in both classifications Lenin places the Latin American countries next to those of Eastern Europe (in one variant even next to Tsarist Russia), although he lists them as a separate sub-group. Lenin's tables show the similarities and differences between these countries. For example, both the one and the other while politically independent, were financially dependent countries; at the same time some of the European countries (Russia and Austria, for example) had colonial possessions and capital investments in third countries, whereas the Latin American countries did not have the one or the other.

Another common feature, indicated by Lenin, was the coincidence of the eras of national and bourgeois-democratic movements (1848, 1905 and 1909 for Eastern Europe, 1823-1911 for Latin America). It is obvious that Lenin saw here not a casual "coincidence," but the expression of a historical social-economy analogy, the roots of which should be sought in the economic and political levels of development.

We can therefore say that Lenin viewed the Latin American countries not as semi-colonies, but as underdeveloped countries at an average level of capitalist development. This assessment enables us better to understand the table in his *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, illustrating the division of the world between the Great Powers. There is no special mention of the Latin American countries, but since they are not included in the group of the colonial powers, or in the group of the colonies and semi-colonies, they come under the "remaining countries," along with the countries of Eastern Europe.*

As regards Russia, in this table it is included in the group of great colonial powers with the remark that it is "a country most backward economically, where modern capitalist imperialism is enmeshed, so to speak, in a particularly close network of pre-capitalist relations" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 259).

Tsarist Russia as a major colonial power which, furthermore, had its own "modern capitalist imperialism," quite obviously differed from the Latin American countries. And yet, there are elements of similarity between them in the multiplicity of their economic structures, in the existence of a "close network of pre-capitalist relations" and big foreign investments, which determine financial dependence on the imperialist powers of the West.

Commenting on this table, Lenin analyzes the forms of dependence typical for Latin America. For the capitalist world in the epoch of imperialism, he writes, "the two main groups of countries, those owning colonies and the colonies themselves, but also the diverse forms of dependent countries which, politically, are formally independent, but in fact, are enmeshed in the net of financial and diplomatic dependence, are typical of this epoch. We have already referred to one form of dependence—the semi-colony. An example of another is provided by Argentina." (Vol. 22, p. 263.) Lenin quotes Schulze-Gaevernitz in this connection: "South America, and especially Argentina, is so dependent financially on London that it ought to be described as almost a British commercial colony." As an example of this, Lenin gives the figure of British investments in Argentina and writes: "It is not difficult to imagine what strong connections British finance capital (and its faithful 'friend,' diplomacy) thereby acquires with the Argentine bourgeoisie, with the circles that control the whole of the country's economic and political life." (Vol. 22, p. 263.)

In these works Lenin charted the course of scientific investigation of socio-economic backwardness in relation to economic and political dependence. The task was to define, deepen and further evolve these ideas through an analysis of the fundamental changes that had come to pass in the world—the triumph of the October Revolution, the general crisis of capitalism, the emergence of the socialist world system, the sweeping growth of the world Communist and working-class movement, the upsurge of the national liberation movement, the collapse of the colonial system of imperialism, and so on. Take, for example, the different forms of dependence of countries that are not colonies or semi-colonies (such countries are typical of our time). Regrettably, disregard of Lenin's ideas led to a tendency in socio-economic literature to lump the different concepts into one empirical generalization — the colonial world of imperialism, classifying all the dependent and backward countries in one and the same category.

The theses of the Sixth Congress of the Communist International, "The Revolutionary Movement in the Colonies and

*The similarity in the socio-economic formation, evident in the similarity in the level of development and social problems, explains why Lenin in all his classifications places Latin America next to Eastern Europe, which he does not do with respect to other regions and countries.

Semi-Colonies," contained the same generalization, including the Latin American countries in the category of colonies and semi-colonies.

As a consequence, even the dependent countries were included under the term "colony." This necessitated dividing the "colonies" into backward and developed, and defining their revolutionary perspective accordingly. Thus, the non-capitalist path of development was defined for the backward "colonies," and the transformation of the bourgeois-democratic revolution into a proletarian one for the developed colonies. But even this distinction, essential to charting the strategic revolutionary perspective in Latin America, was subsequently forgotten.

LATIN AMERICA AND THE THIRD WORLD

Although we do not maintain that all of Lenin's above-mentioned propositions are wholly applicable today, especially considering that the composition of the so-called Third World has changed considerably, it is our contention that they retain their methodological validity in examining this question.

To begin with, it is obvious that the colonies, semi-colonies and dependent countries are united at least by two features in common: social and economic backwardness and intensive financial-economic exploitation by the developed capitalist countries. It is this that approximates Latin America to other countries of the Third World. But whereas the colonies and semi-colonies are, politically, directly dependent (completely or partly) on a colonial power, that is, have to put up with foreign state intervention in their political affairs—either in the central organs or in some sphere of influence—in the dependent countries we observe indirect political subordination, propped by foreign investments. Besides, the metropolitan countries exert political and diplomatic pressure on the dependent countries, use close military, police and other ties that are an expression of the forced alliance between their finance capital and the circles governing the economic and political life of the country where this capital is invested. In this case the terms "annexation," "colony" or "semi-colony," in their economic connotations, might sometimes be used not so much in the direct political sense, as the figurative. Failure to remember this extremely impor-

tant difference caused the confusion earlier mentioned. The same happened with the concept "national liberation," which should be understood as a purely political category, since its object is to achieve political independence. However, it is sometimes erroneously interpreted as meaning the revolutionary movements in the politically independent countries where state power has for years now been in the hands of the local ruling classes. Latin America is a case in point.

Furthermore, it is no longer enough simply to separate the financially-dependent countries from those classified as colonies and semi-colonies. What is more important is to analyze the different forms and degrees of dependence, and also the different structures and stages of internal social development of the countries of the first group, that is, those politically independent. The number of these countries has increased considerably and today they represent a much more variegated and complex picture. Superficially, the impression is that the differences between Latin America and the other underdeveloped regions have decreased over the past fifty years. "Neo-colonialism," the term used after World War II to describe the situation in the Asian and African countries that had won freedom from the imperialist empire, began to be applied to our continent. But besides the generally known features characteristic of all three continents — socio-economic backwardness, one-sided economies, economic exploitation and political dependence on imperialism — there are obvious differences which should be noted.

Paulino Gonzales Alberdi and Volodia Teitelboim, two leading figures in the Latin American Communist movement, drew attention to these differences (1959), especially with respect to the post-independence periods.

The countries of Latin America, which gained independence a century and a half ago, never were imperialist colonies. From then on their economic development followed the line of a dependent capitalism. Light industry grew rapidly between the two world wars as capital from the imperialist countries flowed in to give the latter key positions in the continent's economy. Hence, the peculiarities of economic structure, socio-political organization, level of economic development, socio-cultural level, place in the world system of imperialism, not to mention many other factors, gave the Latin American countries a *qualitative-*

ly different status from that of the newly-independent countries on other continents. Any comparison, even the most superficial, shows that the continent is confronted with problems that differ from those of countries which only recently broke away from imperialism, but which are either still tied to it or are only in the process of breaking the link, countries whose birth was assisted by other imperialist powers acting as midwife.

It is impossible on the basis of existing statistical data to show these differences directly since, as far as we know, there are no complete figures for all types of production. However, bearing in mind the indirect and approximate character of the figures used and taking them therefore simply as *indices*, it is possible to get an idea of some of the differences.

Table No. 1 shows average per capita income in various regions of the world.

TABLE No. 1

**Gross Product per Capita in 1963
(in dollars)**

Region	1963
Africa (excluding South Africa)	103
South and Southeast Asia (excluding Japan)	92
Latin America	345
USA	2,764
Western Europe	1,062

While there is an obvious similarity between Southeast Asia and Africa, there is a no less obvious difference between these regions and Latin America where the average figure is three and a half times higher. The ratio between Latin America and Western Europe according to this index is one to three, and between Latin America and North America, one to eight. It is difficult to show in more condensed form the *average position* Latin America occupies — in the non-socialist world — from the viewpoint of the development of capitalist relations of production compared with the advanced capitalist countries and the economically backward countries.

A similar conclusion can be drawn on the basis of data relating to the per capita capital accumulation in different regions of the world (table 2).

TABLE No. 2

**Capital Accumulation per Capita in 1964
(in dollars)**

Region	1964
Tropical Africa	10
North Africa	33.5
Southeast Asia	18
Latin America	63
Western Europe	270
USA	666

Tables 1 and 2 are based on data from "A Survey of Economic Conditions in Africa 1960-1964," of the UN Economic and Social Council.

In Latin America the index is 2, 3 and 6 times higher than in North Africa, Southeast Asia and Tropical Africa, and 4.5 and 11 times lower than in Western Europe and North America, respectively.

These figures show that the problems of Latin America cannot be equated with those of the underdeveloped countries of Africa and Asia, or with those of the developed capitalist countries, the two basic questions determining the continent's socio-economic place in the world today.

We are of the opinion, therefore, that Latin America occupies a special place in the Third World. In other words, its level of social, economic and political development places it in an intermediary position between the developing countries of Asia and Africa and the advanced capitalist countries.

II.

In the first part of the article we tried to show through the prism of its specific features, Latin America's similarity to the rest of the Third World, on the one hand, and the developed capitalist countries, on the other.

In the second part we shall dwell on the *internal* aspects of the continent's similarity (or on its unity in diversity).

Apropos the method of political economy, Marx wrote: "The right thing to do, it would seem, would be to start with the real and the concrete, with the actual prerequisites and, consequently, in political economy, for example, with the population, the basis and subject of the entire social process of production. However, a closer study shows this to be a false premise." In Marx's view the correct scientific method is the method of ascent from the abstract to

the concrete. In this way, abstract definitions lead to reproduction of the concrete through thinking, "but this time not to a chaotic concept of the whole, but to a rich totality with many definitions and relations."

Through the process of abstraction and generalization science extends its horizons, goes beyond merely investigating the peculiarities of certain phenomena to disclose what is common to them, what links them in one way or another. The reverse process reveals the specific features of the individual. It would be incorrect to view Latin America as a single whole, unless the components of this entity are taken into account, and not sacrificed to the whole. Such a concept would be insubstantial and sterile. It is a matter of elaborating a scientific concept of Latin America as a *dialectical entity*, in other words, of evolving a dual process: abstraction and concretization which would reflect the reality in all its diversity.

And so, if we are to perceive the concrete entity (in this case Latin America), which "is the synthesis of many definitions, and consequently, unity in diversity" (Marx and Engels), we must begin with certain abstract categories which have already been comprehensively elaborated by Marxism. In this case we propose proceeding from the following factors: (a) the economic structure; (b) the level of capitalist development; (c) degree and type of economic dependence; (d) the social and class structure.

Applying these criteria, the data relevant to the respective countries can be systematized and then, through comparisons, the general laws for the whole established.

ECONOMIC STRUCTURE

The basic internal element that unites the Latin American countries is their economic structure. In this structure there co-exist, on the one hand, features typical of a certain level of capitalist development (a more or less developed light industry, extensive capitalist development in the countryside, which is intertwined with semi-feudal production relations and based on large-scale land ownership, small-scale trade and industry), and, on the other, features of latifundist one-crop agriculture geared mainly to export, with an admixture of peasant farming. Still another element is foreign imperialist capital, mainly U.S., which holds key positions in the eco-

nomy, particularly in the production of raw materials, foreign trade, the few branches of heavy and medium industry (assembly and finishing plants especially). The state sector, ensuring the infrastructure of production (roads, communication, electric power, etc.), has been considerably promoted. The state sector, it might be noted, is making an increasing impact on the production sphere.

Although the components of this heterogeneous structure are of varying relative importance in the different countries, they have the following features in common: growth of U.S. monopoly capital, growing importance of internal capitalist relations of production, particularly in agriculture, export of one type of raw materials to imperialist markets and the still extensive, although declining, importance of pre-capitalist forms in agriculture as a source of employment and the production of export items.

It is interesting to note that the pluralism of this structure notwithstanding, there is a tendency towards its integration. Even though in agriculture capitalism developed chiefly the "Prussian way," land was acquired by the urban bourgeoisie and the foreign monopolies which, incidentally, explains their present links with the traditional latifundism. In the towns industrial capitalism emerged mainly after monopoly capital had penetrated into the basic branches of the economy, or in close association with this penetration; it developed partly on the basis of investments out of ground rent. As the Latin American countries became industrialized and a home market made its appearance, foreign investments shifted to industry. This was made all the easier by a protectionist customs policy which encouraged the companies of the imperialist countries to ship to the continent the semi-finished product instead of the ready-made item. Today the state sector is developing, by and large, not in open collision with private national and foreign capital but rather as a complement to this capital, taking the responsibility for the more risky and less profitable branches. Hence the prevalence of "mixed companies" in which three principal investors participate — foreign capital, private national capital and state capital — and which pursue a common aim — "Latin American economic development" on the basis of "free enterprise" and under the aegis of U.S. imperialism.

LEVEL OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The continent's economic structure took shape in the course of more than a hundred years of capitalist development which, in turn, proceeded in conditions of foreign economic dependence on markets and inflow of capital from the big capitalist countries. This dependence, alongside latifundism, accounted for the slow rate of development of capitalist relations. However, capitalism's slow development, coupled with the changes that took place during the two world wars and in the postwar resulted in the fact that Latin America has already passed the initial stage of capitalist development and is now at the stage of *average development of a dependent capitalism*. Tables 1 and 2 show this.

From the viewpoint of capitalist devel-

opment, this stage can be compared with that of Russia on the eve of World War I, and with most countries of Eastern Europe prior to World War II. At present the continent's economic development can be likened to that of such countries as Greece, Portugal and Turkey. The difference being that foreign capital is more firmly entrenched in Latin America and the latter is, consequently, more dependent on the leading imperialist countries. In other words, although capitalist relations prevail, the Latin American countries come under the category of underdeveloped countries whose progress is conditioned and deformed by the domination of imperialist capital and by an unequal competitive war with it.

Let us turn to such an index of the level of economic development as national income per capita.

TABLE No. 3

National Income per Capita in the Latin-American Countries in 1966 (in dollars)

Latin America	370	Colombia	285	Costa Rica	362
Argentina	705	Peru (1965)	222	Nicaragua	311
Uruguay (1965)	537	Ecuador	188	Dominican Rep.	220
Chile	474	Paraguay	189	El Salvador	240
Mexico	446	Bolivia	160	Guatemala	265
Venezuela	744	Panama	451	Honduras	199
Brazil	252	Trinidad-Tobago	541	Jamaica	427
Guiana	273				

Source: "Yearbook of Labour Statistics, 1965."

From the above data we can *approximately* gauge the disparity in level of development between the different countries. The UN Economic Commission for Latin America proceeded from this in the classification of the countries into three groups: the more developed countries, countries with an insufficiently developed market, and countries of relatively low economic development. This classification was, quite obviously, not prompted by subjective or academic considerations. It is needed by the Latin American ruling classes to establish with the maximum precision a differentiated economic policy towards each group. Here it will not be out of place to note that this classification is based on the assumption of future economic *integration* of the entire area. It is with this end in view that the aforementioned differentiation is made within the Latin American Free Trade Association.

And so, recognition of the differences between the different parts of the continent

does not preclude considering the question of their common features. The important thing is to determine the extent of the disparity. In this respect it should be noted that *level of production per capita in the less developed Latin American countries is higher than average level in the countries of Asia and Africa*, while the corresponding level of the more developed countries of our continent is lower than the average in Western Europe and North America. To gauge the similarity in development levels it is not enough to compare production data per capita. Any comparison based on such data should be done with the utmost caution, since neither the sources of information, methods of calculation, the real picture behind these figures, nor the periods covered, are identical. But the main, almost insuperable, difficulty is that it is well-nigh impossible to express adequately the cost of the national product in terms of dollars. Hence, some features of similarity and difference between individual countries can

sometimes be the result of faulty calculation. Additional data should therefore be invoked, for only an analysis of all the available information on the subject can help us more or less correctly to assess the actual scale of the differences. Take Bolivia, for example. In level of gross product per capita we see that it is last but one among the Latin American countries, but if we take the figures on structure of production (see table No. 4), and composition of the labor force (see Table No. 5), we might conclude that Bolivia should occupy a higher place. In the same way we might question the validity of Venezuela occupying first place in Table No. 3. This, evidently, goes to show that the disparities between Latin American countries are less than follows from the table.

Two parallel processes indicate the accelerated economic development of each country individually, and of the continent as a whole. These processes are the development of light industry and of capitalist

farming, both geared for the home market.

In this respect the difference between individual countries is that some are still at the initial stage of a dependent capitalism, some have advanced further, while still others have reached the stage leading to self-reliant development, based on industrialization. In view of the aforesaid, the disparities between individual countries and areas of Latin America should be seen, in our opinion, as reflecting different levels within similar economic structures and at one and the same stage of development. (This probably does not apply for a few of the smaller countries, the Caribbean area and Paraguay, in particular).

The tables printed below give the reader a fuller picture of the stage of average capitalist development which we consider to be typical of Latin America. Thus, Table No. 4 shows that agriculture in most Latin American countries is no longer the main producer of the gross national product.

TABLE No. 4

**Structure of the Gross National Product in the
Latin-American Economy (1966)**
in % %

Country	Agriculture	Industry, including mining	Trade and the services
Argentina	15	41	44
Bolivia	23	32	45 (1965)
Brazil	30	27	43 (1965)
Chile	11	45	44
Colombia	32	26	42 (1965)
Ecuador	35	26	39
Guiana	25	34	42 (1965)
Mexico	17	36	47
Paraguay	35	19	46
Peru	20	31	49 (1964)
Uruguay	16	30	54 (1964)
Venezuela	7	44	49 (1964)
Trinidad-Tobago	10	51	39 (1963)
Jamaica	12	37	51 (1965)
Puerto Rico	6	35	59
Dominican Republic	24	23	53
Costa Rica	31	19	50 (1964)
El Salvador	32	19	49 (1964)
Guatemala	29	17	54
Honduras	41	22	37
Nicaragua	35	19	46 (1965)
Panama	23	20	57
Latin-American countries as a whole ¹⁾	18	34	48

¹⁾ Author's estimates.

Sources: UN Statistical Yearbook, 1967. "Latin-American Economy in Figures." Moscow, 1965.

TABLE No. 5

**Composition of the Gainfully Employed Population
According to Branches of the Economy (1960)**

(in %%)

Countries and Regions	Agriculture	Industry, includ- ing mining	Trade and the services
Argentina	19.2	32.5	48.3
Uruguay	17.9	27.5	54.6
Chile	27.7	28.3	44.0
Mexico	54.2	18.9	26.9
Venezuela	32.1	20.6	47.3
Brazil	51.6	24.8	23.6
Colombia	47.2	19.0	33.8
Peru	49.7	19.0	31.3
Ecuador	55.6	18.5	25.0
Paraguay	52.2	18.5	29.3
Bolivia ¹⁾	56.9	24.4	18.7 (1950)
Panama	46.2	12.5	41.3
Costa Rica	49.1	18.8	32.1
Nicaragua	59.7	16.1	24.2
Dominican Republic	61.4	11.4	27.2
El Salvador	60.3	17.2	22.5
Guatemala	65.2	14.2	20.4
Honduras	66.8	10.2	23.0
Latin America	40.0	27.0	29.0

1) Author's estimates.

Source: "Yearbook of Labour Statistics, 1967."

The data in the above two tables show also that the Latin American countries have ceased to be *purely agrarian and have become either agrarian-industrial, or industrial-agrarian*. True, they also indicate obvious differences in this respect between Central and South America. In the southern part the gross value of industrial production already exceeds that of agriculture, whereas in Central America the situation is still the same. However, this state of affairs is bound to change, since Central America's industry is developing rapidly, unlike agriculture which is in a state of stagnation. Furthermore, if we take into account capitalist development in the countryside we see that latifundism now plays a still smaller role, and that its share in the total of production relations is, consequently, less than may seem from agriculture's overall share. This means, in particular, that pre-capitalist production relations no longer predominate in Latin America, that they have been replaced by capitalist relations in their various manifestations — foreign monopoly capitalism, private national capitalism, and state capitalism.*

U.S. IMPERIALISM—THE COMMON ENEMY

We tend to forget that U.S. imperialism's exclusive positions on our continent (see Table No. 6), are the result of a relatively short process which gained momentum during World War I when from a debtor nation the United States became a creditor nation, especially in the subsequent decade when from an exporter of minerals it became an importer. A decisive factor in this change was the expansion of U.S. capital in Latin America, and the edging out of British capital. At the beginning of the century, American capital accounted for a little over eight per cent of foreign investments on the continent, as against the 58 per cent controlled by Britain. By 1913-1914 the United States' share had shot up to 20 per cent, whereas British capital, although still

*The fact that despite this, latifundist agriculture ranks first as a source of income from exports (the mining industry, which is controlled by foreign capital, ranks second), is a paradox hampering the development of the continent's economy, since the most backward and less productive sector of the economy has to supply the means for acquiring the needed items, specifically industrial plants, in conditions of a steady deterioration in international trade.

in the lead, controlled less than half of the total foreign investments. Since then, the situation has changed radically: the U.S.

monopolies account for four-fifths of the total sum of foreign investments, British capital for less than 13 per cent.

TABLE No. 6

Some Aspects of Latin America's Economic Dependence on the United States

Country	U.S. share in direct foreign capital investments		U.S. share in foreign trade	
	Place	% %	Place	% %
Argentina	1	38	1	18
Uruguay	1	*)	1	14
Chile	1	66	1	35
Mexico	1	69	1	65
Venezuela	1	60	1	54
Brazil	1	33	1	35
Colombia	1	70	1	55
Peru	1	80	1	36
Ecuador	1	60	1	53
Paraguay	1	*)	1	26
Bolivia	1	50	1	37
Panama	1	90**)	1	54
Costa Rica	1	*)	1	53
Nicaragua	1	*)	1	44
Dominican Republic	1	*)	1	73
El Salvador	1	*)	1	*)
Guatemala	1	90**)	1	69
Honduras	1	90**)	1	69

Source: "Economic Problems of the Latin-American Countries," Moscow 1963; "The Latin-American Economy in Figures"; "The Economy and Foreign Trade of the Latin-American Countries," Moscow 1966.

*) More than 50 per cent.

**Estimate based on incomplete figure.

The U.S. entrenched itself on our continent not only with the aid of brute force, but also by using economic and political levers. Probably that is why the penetration of U.S. capital into our economy took place so "naturally": the average Latin American is influenced by the machinery of control and propaganda channeling the continent's riches to the North American metropolis much more strongly than might appear at first glance. No other area of the world is so directly and utterly dependent on the United States (add to this also political subordination) as is Latin America.* This dependence is determined not only by the activity of U.S. companies in production but also by the existence of banks, insurance and shipping companies, publishing houses, control over communications and international—and partly nation-

al—transport, over the press, radio, television, the cinema; increasing penetration into the remaining spheres of culture, especially into the universities and, lastly, invasion into all spheres of everyday life.**

Thus, the subordination of Latin America as a whole, and of each of its countries individually, to U.S. imperialism is yet another feature common to them.

The inroads into the continent's industry are being made more and more in the guise of "mixed companies," with U.S. monopoly capital acting as a partner of private national, or state capital. The foreign monopolies are thus able to don a national mask, to use state accumulation, enjoy the protection of the state, control the local bourgeoisie, etc. They are also able, owing to their technological superiority, to retain a firm grip on the companies and pocket handsome profits. These "mix-

*Concerning the political aspects of Latin America's dependence on the USA see L. Becerra's article "US Imperialism in Latin America," in *World Marxist Review*, No. 5, 1968.

**See M. Cepeda's article "U.S. Imperialism Penetrates Latin American Universities," in *World Marxist Review*, No. 8, 1968.

ed companies" are also used to cut into the state sector and subordinate it to U.S. interests.

This process of subordination has been stepped up in recent years in connection with the Alliance for Progress program. One of the objectives of this program, designed to finance so-called development projects by U.S. state capital, is "modernization" of the traditional land-owning and commercial oligarchy by bringing them into the orbit of capitalist development. The Alliance also aims at reinforcing the local industrial bourgeoisie's ties with foreign monopoly capital. Hence the Inter-American Development Bank, an offspring of the Alliance for Progress.

As a result of these processes, the Latin American bourgeoisie, especially its upper crust, is becoming U.S. imperialism's principal ally, is gradually squeezing out the land-owning class. Always short of the means needed to acquire equipment (mainly foreign), the continent's bourgeoisie is concerned primarily with securing foreign investments to "harmoniously" complement national capital. This explains the emphasis on ensuring a "favorable climate," indispensable for attracting foreign investors, a "civilized" political atmosphere that would preclude disorders and revolt, guarantees against "nationalization" and other similar measures, on having an "energetic" and "effective" government, which would not only ensure "law and order," and the material infra-structure for capitalist development, but would not interfere in the functioning of "free enterprise" and avoid becoming a "state employer."

And so, in its economy, policy and other spheres of social life, Latin America is caught in the fetters of integration with U.S. imperialism. The last link in these fetters was the project to establish the Latin American Common Market, signed in April 1967 by the presidents of the respective countries and also by President Johnson in the role of the rich uncle. This agreement, considered the pivot of the continent's economic development in the immediate decades, shows that "Latin American capitalism" has taken the only possible road open to it, that of developing under the aegis of U.S. imperialism. It is also pretty clear that the big bourgeoisie of the continent has had a hand in the project.

* * *

In summary, I should like to set forth some propositions emerging from this ar-

ticle, which, in my view, are vital and merit further examination.

1. From the economic and social viewpoint, the Latin American countries can be regarded as a *unity in diversity* in the sense that they have similar economic structures, are economically equally dependent on the same imperialist power—the United States—and in their majority have reached the *average level of dependent capitalist development*; at the same time they are at different levels within this stage, the degree of their dependence differs, and each has its own specific national image.

2. Latin American problems are not entirely identical with those of the colonial and semi-colonial countries, or those of the newly independent countries of Asia and Africa; the Latin American revolutionary movement is not entirely identical with the national-liberation movement.

3. In many respects, Latin American problems seem similar to those of Eastern Europe in the period between the two world wars, and those of pre-revolutionary Russia. However, its heavy dependence on U.S. imperialism, economic underdevelopment and the real threat of U.S. intervention give Latin America certain features in common with the remainder of the Third World. Latin American problems include, as it were, both the features of Eastern Europe during the inter-war years, and those of the present-day Third World.

It is obvious, moreover, that the problems of the continent do not coincide with those of the developed capitalist countries, and it would therefore be wrong to apply the same criteria.

4. The economic task facing Latin America today is to create its own modern industry, the bedrock of its independent development. This cannot be accomplished in an alliance with imperialism. It cannot be done in conditions of a dependent capitalism, in the conditions of a capitalism subordinate to U.S. imperialism as its appendage. Hence the need to make a qualitative leap, to sever completely the relations of dependence and rebuild the entire socio-economic structure. Essential to this is the unity of the Latin American peoples, their multiform cooperation in anti-imperialist actions on a basis of equality.

5. This necessitates adding to the revolutionary concept of the modern world at least one more dimension that would cover the Latin American scene. This is what the Colombian Communists have in mind when

they say: "In general, the struggle of the peoples of Latin America is part of the national and colonial problem, comes under the same category as the countries of Asia and Africa, which are fighting against imperialist rule. However, a 'deeper' theoretical analysis of the revolutionary struggle in Latin America will enable us to disclose features that apply specifically to it." (Resolution of the 1968 September Plenum of the Colombian Communist Party Central Committee. "Documentos Politicos," No. 77, Bogota, September-October 1968).

This theoretical analysis has its pre-history. For the key to understanding our realities is the methodology and general principles of Marxism-Leninism. However, it should be emphasized (for reasons mentioned earlier) that for the revolutionary movement in our countries Leninism has special significance as the basis for theoretical research. The Cuban revolution is also an invaluable source of experience. Of

considerable importance, too, are the works and documents, generalizing the practical and theoretical work of the international Communist movement. It might also be noted that the Communist parties and other revolutionary forces in the respective Latin American countries have accumulated valuable experience and now have a deeper understanding of the complex reality of their particular countries and of the general problems of the continent as a whole. Our parties are systematizing their experience and sharing views. This, needless to say, is yielding results.

The author appreciates that his analysis is not complete and that his theses are by no means final. He has merely staked out the area of research without going into details. His purpose has been to draw attention to problems he considers urgent and basic to a study of the ways and means for the revolutionary transformations of our continent.

WMR

in the communist and workers parties.

Concentration of forces for continued socialist advance

The Czechoslovak CP Central Committee Plenum

The recent plenary session of the Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee (November 14-17, 1968) analyzed developments since the beginning of the year in the light of the present situation and charted the Party's political course for the coming period.

A serious approach to all the problems was a distinguishing feature of the meeting. Its deliberations were followed with close attention here and by friends and

enemies of socialist Czechoslovakia in other countries. Prior to the meeting there was much speculation about dramatic personnel changes and a departure, even full retreat, from the policy the Central Committee initiated at its plenary session in January. None of the speculations proved true—the discussion was businesslike, with all Central Committee members concentrating on formulating a policy based on the positive post-January values, which

will be carried forward in the present situation.

The Central Committee was guided by the conviction that the Party and people appreciate the urgent need for a purposive, clear and resolute policy. After the August events that is the only way to overcome the feeling of uncertainty, indecision, individual extremist attitudes and the influence of anti-socialist forces, and set about devising effective solutions for the problems of socialist construction. The chief pre-condition for shaping future policy is an understanding and practical application of the objective need for unity of national and international tasks, which follows from the international character of Marxism-Leninism and the Communist movement. And the Central Committee made this its starting point in framing the resolution, which maps out the Party's tasks and aims and, at the same time, gives a political appraisal of the positive and negative aspects of Czechoslovakia's past year.

The point of departure for any such appraisal must be an analysis of the twenty-year period begun in February 1948. During this time the foundations of socialism were laid and vitally important aims of the working class and working people achieved. Basic class and socio-economic reforms were carried out, including the transition from small-commodity to large-scale agriculture. In combination, this made for closer mutual understanding between classes and gradual harmonization of their interests, thus altering the very nature of our classes. The working class became the leading force of society and held power in alliance with other sections of the working people.

A new socialist class of cooperative farmers emerged and the worker-farmer alliance was strengthened. There also emerged a numerous intelligentsia devoted to socialism, the working class and the Party. Industrial output increased substantially. Living standards improved, especially for some sections of the population. Education, professional training and culture were made accessible to all.

The Central Committee gave a high appreciation of the dedicated labor effort of Communists and non-Communists and categorically rejected a one-sided, nihilistic judgment of our twenty-year development as contrary to the facts.

In making this overall estimation, however, the Central Committee was not oblivious to certain defects, attributable to sub-

jective and objective factors. The plenum resolution says: "Socialist progress was impeded by failure to follow the principle of comprehensive development, and this led to a number of serious upheavals." This was most clearly demonstrated in the economy. By the end of the fifties it had become obvious that the potential for extensive development under the existing management system had been exhausted. Politically, the Party proved incapable of consistently developing socialist democracy in keeping with the socio-economic changes. The unity of society was thus gravely disturbed, and contradictions arose between various classes and groups, between the Party and society, between the older and younger generation, and between nationalities. The resolution further states: "The Party's authority and confidence in its policy were weakened. This was manifested in the general growth of public dissatisfaction and tension, attended by a marked decline in the people's activity."

On many central issues there was a widening gap between Party policy and methods and the objective requirements of socialism. The roots of this prolonged crisis should be sought in the post-1956 period, when the Party, and in particular its leaders, failed to draw the necessary conclusions from the mistakes disclosed at the Twentieth CPSU Congress and creatively apply Marxism-Leninism and the experience of the international Communist movement to the objective conditions of socialist construction in Czechoslovakia. It was only at the Twelfth Congress (1962) that the Party responded more actively to the requirements of the situation and called for policy changes. But inconsistency and indecision following the Thirteenth Congress (1966) hampered elimination of these distortions and shortcomings. Underestimation and procrastination in resolving pressing problems led to a conflict-charged political situation. The year 1967 was marked by a series of socio-political crisis developments, the result of a conflict between Party policy and the methods of its implementation, between policy concepts and the actual requirements of society.

The root cause was bureaucracy, the substitution of bureaucratic centralism for democratic centralism, expressed in an inordinate concentration of power in the hands of Antonin Novotny. The political crisis that had been maturing for years came to a head. To continue with the Novotny policy would have meant suppressing, from positions of force, the just demands

and interests of the Party and society. This would have gravely damaged socialism, the leading role of the Communist Party and, consequently, the socialist system and the international Communist movement.

The fact that even partial elimination of shortcomings had been delayed for such a long time added to the tension between Party leadership and membership, notably in the local branches and district committees. There was resentment over the inconsistent and superficial approach to rehabilitating Communists and non-Communists wrongly condemned in the early fifties, during the violations of socialist legality. Still another source of tension was inadequate information to the Party membership and inability to react to its complaints that statements by some Party leaders were at odds with their actions, with the policy they urged Party members to carry out.

The January 1968 Central Committee plenum was, therefore, the objective sequel to these developments. It signified a determined attempt to rectify mistakes that were obstructing and restricting active development of society and its members and imposing subjectivist and autocratic fetters on socialism. That is why the January plenum met with such popular response throughout the country, among all sections of the population. It indicated the only possible way out, and its decisions were eagerly supported by the people.

But behind this unanimous support were divergent socio-political interests. Not all social groups were properly prepared for the new development and, consequently, their contribution to its success differed. In characterizing the situation, the November plenum took as its basic idea the following: it became increasingly obvious that the Party could not continue using the old methods, but the prerequisites and forces necessary for operating the new policy had not yet emerged.

That there were shortcomings in the pre-January policy no one doubted. But criticism alone could not produce the new methods required by the new policy. For the situation had changed radically, with no parallel in Czechoslovakia's postwar history. The new policy could be carried out only by concerted and constructive effort by the Communist Party and the socialist forces generally. The situation was contradictory; the revelations of shortcomings that had been ignored for so long heightened the tension. There was a

vocal demand for all the problems to be solved immediately, at one go. Justified criticism of those responsible for the mistakes of the past gave way to indiscriminate criticism of the whole Party, its apparatus, its active members, etc. The wide discussion of political issues, plus exposure of the causes of past shortcomings, encouraged elements pursuing other, non-socialist aims. Anti-socialist and anti-Soviet forces, while outwardly supporting the Party's positive policy, took advantage of its criticism and self-criticism to further their own ends, and they were helped by Right-wing and opportunist tendencies within the Party.

The January plenum and its results were, consequently, the logical and inevitable sequel to crisis phenomena and contradictions in the Party and in our socialist society. The Central Committee's job was to change the situation and provide the basic conditions for coping with long-unresolved problems. This the plenum accomplished. But it could not fully analyze past sectarian and dogmatic mistakes and organize the Party leadership and forces in a way that would enable them to rectify the mistakes and formulate, if only in its fundamentals, a new policy, and mobilize the membership to uphold it against the very real pressure from the Right. This was a task the Central Committee could accomplish only gradually and with the active support of the entire Party.

The conclusions drawn by the January plenum were, despite their undoubtedly positive significance, an objective compromise that produced new problems and complications, and these were to make themselves felt throughout the post-January period.

POST-JANUARY POLICY: CONCEPTS AND PROBLEMS

The basic features of the post-January policy, both positive and negative, began to emerge shortly after the plenum. Alexander Dubcek told the November plenum: "We wanted to premise our policy on the principles formulated by Marx, Engels and Lenin and on the general laws of socialist development, with due account to Czechoslovakia's national peculiarities and her new development stage. . . . There was no question of creating a model of socialism not based on the common laws of socialist development and presenting it as an example for all other Communist Parties."

The new policy was to be realized

through the Action Program, conceived as a means of uniting the country politically and organizationally and setting it on a new course. The Central Committee decided in favor of extending all the positive aspects of Party policy, notably since the Thirteenth Congress and creatively applying its conclusions. In some cases the post-January policy was unjustly contrasted to all the Thirteenth Congress decisions.

From the very start, realization of the political aims set out in the Action Program came up against unexpected obstacles and phenomena. Some measures were carried out in compliance with demands in line with the new policy, but there was also strong and growing pressure from the Right.

Inadequate information to the Party membership, the result of the January plenum compromise and of the former composition of the Presidium, was likewise exerting a negative influence. Some lower-level functionaries also underestimated the importance of keeping the Party informed.

The CC Presidium and the government did not display the necessary firmness in coping with these personnel problems and in working out concrete aspects of the new policy. There were widely differing views on what tactics to adopt, and this, too, seriously disturbed Party unity in this complex situation.

All this injected a strong element of spontaneity which in many places persisted throughout the period.

Certain forces began to exploit the situation to discredit the Communist Party, weaken and undermine its leading role, weaken and paralyze key elements of the socialist state, particularly through unjustified and indiscriminate charges against all the security and judicial authorities, whereas responsibility for the distortions of the fifties lay with definite persons. Lastly, the aim was to weaken Czechoslovakia's Party and State links within the socialist community. Right-wing and anti-socialist elements were able to penetrate some of the mass communications media and use the vast influence of the press, radio and television for their own purposes. They were thus able to minimize the constructive and responsible work of a considerable part of the mass media personnel who supported the positive aspects of the post-January policy. Prior censorship was abolished, but the appropriate state and government bodies did not have an effective system of directing the mass media, nor were they told what was right in their

activity and what was only complicating things, exerting a harmful and negative influence. Often there was no critical approach to the mass media, with the result that gradually they became an uncontrolled force.

More and more problems were being raised, regardless of whether or not they could be solved. In February, March and April this, together with other negative tendencies, led to more pressure and to considerable ideological confusion in the Party and among the public. Things were further complicated by the strong opposition, especially in the early days of the post-January period, from the dogmatic and conservative forces. It was only natural that development before and after the January plenum was uneven, as was the influence of the anti-socialist forces.

What were the basic trends during this complex period? And what needed to be done to unite the Party on Marxist-Leninist principles and strengthen its bond with the working people for the continued building of socialism?

Most of the Party activists and members fully supported the Central Committee and its policy, and shared in framing and in operating the new line. The membership insisted on a speedy elimination, both in public life and in relations between citizens, of all the distortions and deformations of the pre-January period. And it was this part of the Party that set the tone of the post-January process, correctly expressing the workers' interests and attitudes. It was, in fact, the guarantee of the Party's continued link with the people—the guarantee that it would regain their full confidence, and would strengthen and extend its relations with other members of the world socialist community.

The results of the initial steps taken to implement the decisions of the January, April and May plenary sessions can be summed up as follows:

—a clear trend towards overcoming conservative thinking in the Party and in society, towards strengthening the links between the Party and the scientific community and giving it a greater share in formulating Party policy and devising solutions for the country's problems, notably more effective economic development and fuller satisfaction of the demands and interests of the people;

—a marked heightening of activity by the working class, the young people and

other social groups in charting new paths for our socialist society;

—the beginnings of a steady and firm process of overcoming the deformations and assuring full rehabilitation of the victims of the unjustified repressions against Communists and other citizens;

—opportunities for more effective activity by Party and government bodies after the election of the new President of the Republic and the appointment of a number of capable functionaries to top posts. These personnel changes went a long way towards strengthening public confidence in the January policy, though some serious errors were made in personnel selection;

—far-reaching steps to eliminate distortion of the Leninist principles of Party life, particularly in inner-Party democracy, the development of which, however, was not accompanied by tighter discipline and closer adherence to democratic centralism;

—more democratic relations between the nationalities inhabiting the Republic resulting from the proper appreciation and application of the Marxist-Leninist national policy and preparations for a federal structure;

—a steady rise in the Party's prestige and confidence in its policy, accompanied by a process of uniting the sound forces in society behind the Party; development of socialist democracy.

In the aggregate, these positive features are the proof that the post-January period was one of the most important in the life of the Party and the country after May 1945 and February 1948.

SITUATION IN THE PARTY AND THE COUNTRY

The overwhelming majority of Party members consistently support proletarian internationalism and have a deep feeling of responsibility for the destiny of our socialist country and its normalization along socialist lines.

However, the inner-Party situation was highly complex and contradictory. Differences had come to the surface long before January 1968, and the situation was exacerbated by extremist views.

These merit closer examination. First, there was a definite trend to give way to the spontaneity emanating from the liberal forces which, in the Party and outside it called for a process of "renewal" and democratization, in total disregard of its socialist content, and idealized formal bourgeois democracy. These people underesti-

mated the leading role of the Party and the working class. The Action Program's accent on socialist democracy led to talk of a democratic socialism. This was a misinterpretation of the democratization process. The term "democratic socialism," let it be said, has never figured in any document of the Central Committee or of its Presidium.

In the spring these non-Marxist and opportunist views were sloganized: "Political partnership and free play of political forces." There was also the contention that it would be wrong to use the instruments of power at the present stage. Behind all this was the false slogan of absolute democracy, an underestimation of the class aspects of socialist democracy, tolerance and, indeed, encouragement of the atomization of our mass organizations and political system—the emphasis was always on the independence of its various elements, that is, independence of the Communist Party and its policy. Those who held these views underrated the danger of the anti-socialist forces and shunned ideological struggle against them. Their position on foreign policy aspects of our development (the influence of the international class struggle and imperialist attempts to exploit the process which had begun in Czechoslovakia, the interests of the socialist world community, of which Czechoslovakia is a component part) was subjectivist and contemptuous.

These views were given extensive and unnecessary publicity, creating the impression that they represented official Party policy. This, of course, played into the hands of the anti-socialist forces and tended to confuse some of the Party membership and also public opinion. What is more, the mass media were now devoting less attention to the positive features of the post-January policy.

But there was also a sectarian, dogmatic trend, men who did not understand the new requirements of socialist development and the new forms in which the interests of the working class and the working people generally now found expression. They clung to obsolete judgments and to political positions which, though correct in a different situation, were no longer applicable. Their policy had no appeal whatever for the majority of the Party and the working class. However, it should be said that the indiscriminate charges of sectarianism were, in a number of cases, meant to discredit or silence sincere Communists courageously combating Right-wing tendencies.

The May Central Committee plenum adopted a political and tactical line that left decision of all the fundamental political issues to the 14th emergency Party Congress. The plenum resolution drew attention to the danger of mounting Right-wing, anti-socialist tendencies and forces and the need for a resolute struggle against them. In his concluding remarks, Comrade Dubcek emphasized: "The most serious danger at this stage, one that could disturb the process, is the emergence of anti-Party and anti-socialist forces that might launch a struggle for power."

What were the social and economic roots of this danger? There are still people in our socialist society who suffered as a result of the revolution. Former officials of the Right-wing parties believed that, in the situation that had arisen, they could again enter the political scene and at the opportune moment capture the leadership of some of the political parties. Nor should we discount the influence of foreign propaganda, which fostered illusions about capitalism and its so-called democracy. These anti-socialist forces tried to build up their own organizational base, taking advantage of the correct provisions of the Action Program on democratization of political life, rehabilitation of the victims of the fifties, and participation of the broad non-Party masses in political life. Early on these people founded their own organizations, Club-231 and the Club of Committed Non-Party People. A special effort was made to revive the anti-Marxist Social-Democratic Party as a means of undermining working-class unity and weakening the Communist Party. Similarly, there were attempts to alter, even revise, policy towards the Church. To this should be added the extremist attacks on the People's Militia, the armed force formed by the working class to safeguard its socialist gains and positions.

Fulfilment of the May plenum decisions was not adequately organized, though there was growing resistance both in the Party and among the public to the anti-socialist and Right-wing trends. This was evidenced, in particular, by the Presidium's stand on the Two Thousand Words statement, which it denounced as, in effect, "directed against Party policy."

The Central Committee held that its chief weapon against the anti-socialist, Right-wing, liberalist danger was development of its own positive policy, ideological struggle, efforts to unite the Party, enhance its

capacity to wage a concerted campaign for its positive policy.

In short, the correct decisions of the May plenum were not backed by effective action and the necessary organizational and cadre measures.

The ideological fight was not conducted systematically, especially in the press, radio and television. Many Communists working in the mass media did not make it their duty to assure fulfilment of Party decisions; control of fulfilment of CC and CC Presidium decisions on broadcasting, television and the CTK News Agency was inadequate.

* * *

At its post-January plenary meetings the Central Committee assessed the positive and negative aspects of the Party's work which, despite all the complexities of the situation, had exerted a definite political influence. The overwhelming majority of our people favor socialism, support the sincere and conscientious efforts of the Communists not only to rectify the mistakes of the past, but also to find constructive solutions for the continued advance of socialism in Czechoslovakia. But the activity of the anti-socialist forces detracted from the effect of the Party's post-January policy, seriously complicated the entire political situation and also relations with our socialist allies.

The prime purpose of the November Plenum, which made a frank analysis of the post-January experience, was to give the Party a better understanding of the positive essence of the post-January process, and to discard everything that does not belong to, and militates against, Party policy. What policy should the Party follow now, after the events of August? The answer is contained in the Plenum resolution: "Sincere and consistent fulfilment of the Bratislava statement and the Moscow protocol of August 26, is of exceptional importance for Party work and the continued shaping of its policy and provides the only realistic starting point for normalization of the position in Czechoslovakia and of her relations with the five Warsaw Treaty countries.

"The temporary stationing of Soviet troops on Czechoslovak territory has now been adjusted by a treaty between the Czechoslovak and Soviet governments, ratified by the National Assembly on October 18.

"The Central Committee draws the attention of all regional and district Party com-

mittees, all Party branches in the Czech lands and Slovakia, all Party members working in administrative, economic and public bodies to the need consistently to carry out the decisions contained in these documents."

IMMEDIATE TASKS AND AIMS

The Party needs clear political guidelines for the immediate future. In his report to the November Plenum, Comrade Dubcek said: "Our future policy must be premised above all on a determined desire to strengthen socialism and our political system; this should include measures that would rule out anti-socialist activity, but also tendencies towards a return to the pre-January situation. The Party must clearly state on what principles it will endeavor to unite its ranks and the people. We cannot confine ourselves to declarations; we must prove by our practical work our adherence to socialism and internationalism as the basis of continued progress in building socialism."

The chief factor in this context is the plenum's interpretation of the Party's leading role, which assumes diverse forms:

- the Party charts the course of social development on the basis of a scientific analysis of trends and needs of the people;

- as the guiding political force, it unites and coordinates the work of administrative, economic and public organizations in conformity with its policy;

- it sets out the principles of cadre policy, paying systematic attention to selecting, training and allocating personnel;

- encourages initiative through its day-to-day political and organizational work;

- defines the orientation and forms of ideological work, assures Marxist-Leninist education, promotes socialist consciousness and combats influences alien or hostile to socialism;

- assures the fullest possible and truthful information to the public about Party plans and decisions.

These methods are used in their organic unity. The Central Committee stressed that Party organizations exercise their leading role primarily through Communists working in administrative, public and economic agencies. This does not imply that the Party replaces these agencies—there can be no return to that. What it does imply is a more consistent unity of political action and a more resolute opposition to all manifestations of sectarianism and factionalism,

and a radical improvement in control over fulfilment of Party decisions in order to avoid repetition of the mistakes of past months.

Extension of socialist democracy signifies a more active policy by the National Front, in which the Communist Party is the leading force. Party members will actively support democracy and unity in the mass organizations so that their members see in the Communists genuine champions of their interests, and through them, and the National Front, have a full and democratic share in formulating and operating national policy. The National Front, the political alliance of the parties, nationalities, social and interest groups, is based on the present social system and contributes to its further development.

The Central Committee regards elaboration of Party policy in relation to the trade unions and to the younger generation as a cardinal task. The idea is to support measures designed to satisfy reasonably differentiated interests and, at the same time, assure the necessary degree of unity of the organizations involved.

Another key measure that will influence socialist democracy in Czechoslovakia is the federal structure of the state and democratic adjustment of the legal status of the nationalities (besides the Czechs and Slovaks) by a special constitutional law. Federal adjustment of the entire political system must be accelerated, with guarantees that its operation will be rational and economical.

The plenum devoted special attention to the press, radio, television and their Communist personnel. It pointed out that they should orient the press on promoting ideological unity of the socialist forces, oppose all manifestations of bourgeois ideology, rebuff extremist, alien and hostile views, which can only impair Czechoslovakia's socialist advance. The mass media—and this is one of their urgent tasks—should explain the inter-connection of world issues, the struggle between socialism and imperialism, and Czechoslovakia's role as a component part of the socialist world system. The mass media should be seen as an instrument and vehicle of Party and government policy. The Party undertakes adequately to inform journalists of its plans, so that they will be fully equipped to conduct all their work in a clearly expressed socialist spirit.

The influence and activization of the anti-socialist forces should meet with pur-

positive and resolute opposition. If we accept that the latter are the chief obstacle to normalization, then we must carefully and responsibly analyze—and this too is emphasized in the resolution—their character and intentions. The Party will not countenance any irresponsible name calling. It will differentiate between temporary emotional reactions and premeditated actions, between revision of the fundamentals of Marxism and their development, ideological or political mistakes and concepts foreign to socialism.

The Central Committee and its organs will oppose every attempt to discredit comrades who sincerely abide by Party policy, and any attempt to vilify comrades for openly stating their internationalist attitude towards the USSR. In assessing the work of Party members, the resolution says, the decisive criterion will be a sincere, devoted and disciplined attitude in carrying out the tasks following from the Party's political line.

In the interests of maximum unity, the Party will insist that no member shall be punished for present or past views, provided these are not attended by activity of an anti-party or illegal nature.

The November resolution states that the central line in economic policy will be "continuation of the reforms in a way that will make for fuller and broader utilization of all the advantages and potentialities of the socialist system. Concretely this means:

"socialist planning and programming;

"socialist enterprise, use of the market mechanism and material incentives;

"democratic participation by the workers in the administration and control of the economy and of social processes."

The purpose of the reforms is to increase economic effectiveness and raise the standard of living.

The Party will support every initiative of research institutes and individual scientists in devising new methods of furthering socialism, based on creative application of Marxism-Leninism. This relates in particular to the key social problems posed by the technological revolution and the all-round development of the personality in a socialist society. Marxist scientists and publicists should more resolutely combat alien and hostile views. The Party Rules apply to all Party members, and, regardless of the nature of their work, they must bear equal responsibility for violation of the Party's political line.

In keeping with the Action Program, the

Central Committee regards "overcoming restrictive interpretations of the social and humane functions of science, culture and the arts in refashioning man and the world he lives in, freedom of scientific and artistic creation," as an inalienable part of the all-round development of socialism. The resolution states that "the Party does not relinquish its role of inspiring science and art to help shape the man of socialist society in the struggle to remake the world."

PROLETARIAN INTERNATIONALISM

The class struggle between socialism and capitalism is being waged on a world scale. Our Republic occupies a crucial sector of the front and, especially in recent months, has become the target of intensified imperialist pressure. Czechoslovak foreign policy must therefore pursue aims deriving from the fact that we firmly stand on the socialist side of this worldwide front. And this presupposes, first and foremost, firm alliance and all-round cooperation with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries and affiliation with the international Communist movement. It also implies vigorous opposition to all imperialist attempts directly or indirectly to influence our internal policy and the thinking and attitudes of our people.

In keeping with the Action Program, the starting point of our foreign policy is proletarian internationalism, the treaties with socialist countries, the documents of international conferences of Communist parties, the conclusions reached at the Cierna-nad-Tisou and Bratislava conferences, and the Moscow Protocol of August 26. For Czechoslovakia there is no other alternative—and there never has been—save close alliance with the Soviet Union, membership of the Warsaw Treaty Organization and active participation in the Council for Mutual Economic Aid. The resolution emphasizes:

"Together with the other socialist countries, we will follow a coordinated policy conforming to the common interests of the socialist countries; we will indefatigably and systematically oppose all aggressive imperialist actions, all attempts—and this applies primarily to the West German militarists and revanchists—to change the situation created in Europe by the result of World War II."

The Communist Party will help strengthen the international position of the German Democratic Republic, will support the just struggle of the Vietnamese people and facilitate early implementation of the Se-

curity Council resolution on the Middle East.

In line with the Action Program and the Bratislava Statement, Czechoslovakia follows an active foreign policy vis-à-vis countries with differing social systems, a policy stemming from the Leninist concept of peaceful coexistence and aimed at promoting mutually advantageous relations, mutual understanding and trust among the nations. Such a policy can be an effective weapon against imperialist attempts to revive the cold war and create a new vantage ground for attacks on socialism.

The Party will continue its policy of promoting and strengthening relations with all democratic, progressive and revolutionary forces in furtherance of our common fight against imperialism, for peace and social progress.

Our Party will continue its bilateral and multilateral contacts with Communist and Workers' parties in the socialist and other countries with a view to exchanging experience, comparing standpoints and opinions on various questions and removing possible unclarity. It will join in a concerted effort to resolve the cardinal political and ideological problems in the struggle against im-

perialism and for the advance of socialism.

In this spirit, the Czechoslovak Communist Party will actively work for the convening of an international conference of Communist and Workers' parties, which, it is persuaded, will go a long way towards removing the present difficulties in the international movement, strengthening its unity and heightening its combat ability.

* * *

The Central Committee meeting decided to postpone the 14th Party Congress. Other decisions provide for a Bureau to direct Party work in the Czech lands and a Bureau of the Central Control and Auditing Commission for the Czech lands. It also decided on certain personnel and organizational measures.

The Communist Party has the forces and the opportunities for the all-round development and manifestation of initiative, for application of all the creative abilities of our people, of every citizen prepared to work for continued socialist progress and for the well-being of his socialist country.

Pavel AUERSPERG

Fraternal journals in the new year

Editors-in-Chief share plans for 1968

NIKOLAI IRIBADZHAKOV, Editor-in-Chief of Novo Vreme:

Novo Vreme, theoretical journal of the Bulgarian Communist Party, was established seventy years ago by Dimitr Blagoyev, founder of our Party. The journal has played an exceptional role in the Party's fight against capitalism, and is now contributing to the building of socialism in our country.

In 1969 we shall concentrate on theoretical problems of our Party policy, the policy outlined by the 9th Congress, on problems of the fight against imperialism, against bourgeois ideology, against "Left" and Right opportunism, problems of the international Communist and national liberation movement, of socialist patriotism and internationalism and of further con-

solidation of unbreakable Bulgarian-Soviet friendship. At the same time the journal will continue creatively to elaborate questions of Marxist-Leninist theory, science and culture in the context of socialist experience.

For us, 1969 will be highlighted by the 25th anniversary of the socialist revolution in our country, and the Lenin centenary.

The Party and the people will sum up the results of 25 years of socialist construction. This poses before our journal highly responsible tasks: to show what the country has achieved under the leadership of the Party, indicate immediate and long-

term prospects, and theoretically elucidate the most important tasks of Party and state policy.

The 9th Congress of the Party set the aim of going over from extensive to intensive economic development, of sharply raising the effectiveness of production. In keeping with this, important measures, now in the process of realization, were outlined at sessions of the Central Committee and conferences organized by it. Special mention should be made of the decisions of the July (1968) session on improving the new system of economic management and the entire system of social guidance in the country.

The development of our socialist society is characterized by a deepening of the scientific approach to all aspects of the life of the country. As the Central Committee stated in its report to the 9th Congress, enhancing the scientific level of Party leadership is at present most important.

By elaborating and adopting, at the July session, a thoroughly substantiated program of further development of the system of guidance in our society the Party demonstrated its Marxist-Leninist maturity, its ability to adopt a scientific approach to social problems. The decisions of the session, just as the measures to promote science, specifically the social sciences as the basis for social guidance, will be in the centre of attention of the journal.

We strive to approach all problems of our development and international life from the standpoint of Marxism-Leninism, above all from the standpoint of Lenin's ideological heritage.

ANATOLY YEGOROV, Alternate Member of the CC CPSU, Editor-in-Chief of *Kommunist*:

The Lenin centenary will be the predominant theme in this theoretical and political organ of the CC CPSU, and in the Soviet press generally in 1969-70.

The guidelines of our activity were set forth in the CC resolution "On Preparations for the Centenary of the Birth of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin," which contains a comprehensive analysis of the historic importance of Leninism and its decisive influence on the entire course of world development, and a concrete program of ideological, political and organizing activity of the Party in the conditions of today.

The Lenin theme has always figured

In connection with the 100th anniversary of the birth of Lenin, *Novo Vreme* will print a series of articles to show the greatness of Lenin's ideas, their scientific and revolutionary importance, their vitality and international significance, especially in the present situation. Understandably, most of the articles will be devoted to the role played by Lenin's ideas in making our Party a genuinely revolutionary party, in bringing about the victory of socialist revolution and the success of our socialist construction, which is convincing proof of the profoundly scientific and international character of Leninism.

Just as in Lenin's time, an acute struggle is being waged today between bourgeois and socialist ideology, a struggle which reflects the irreconcilability of the class standpoints of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, of socialism and capitalism. Now as in the past, the imperialist bourgeoisie relies on nationalist, revisionist and Leftist elements in its effort to blunt the class consciousness of the proletariat, to weaken the ideological and political unity of the peoples of the socialist countries, to divide the working people. No one can be neutral in this struggle. To expose bourgeois ideology is a sacred behest of Lenin and an imperative necessity of our time. To wage uncompromising struggle against bourgeois ideology, against revisionism and dogmatism means to fight even more boldly and consistently for the triumph of the great ideas of Marxism-Leninism. That was how Lenin acted, and that is the ambition of the Bulgarian Communists and of their theoretical journal *Novo Vreme*.

prominently in our journal. Its very first issue, which appeared in April 1924 under the title of *Bolshevik*, had a section headlined "Lenin and Leninism" where Lenin's works and materials on his life and activities were printed. Since its appearance the journal has printed more than 80 little known or hitherto unpublished works by Lenin.

Today, as it prepares for the anniversary, *Kommunist* sees its task in demonstrating even more fully and vividly Lenin's role as the brilliant theorist of the proletarian revolution and socialist reconstruction of society, the founder and leader of the Bol-

shevik party, the party of a new type, the founder of the world's first socialist state, the recognized leader of the world proletariat and the international Communist movement.

Kommunist will concentrate on explaining the significance of the Lenin period in the development of Marxist philosophy, political economy and scientific communism. Articles on this subject will be printed in the section "Leninism and Scientific Knowledge of the World" and in other sections. We also plan to publish articles showing the creative character of Marxism-Leninism and the significance of Lenin's ideas for revolutionary action and for the analysis of major events, trends and contradictions of social development in our time, as well as articles devoted to the international essence of Leninism, to the cardinal problems of materialist dialectics in connection with the latest achievements of natural science, to the consolidation of the socialist state by way of promoting and perfecting socialist democracy, to the freedom and harmonious development of the individual in the Soviet society, to the national cultures in the USSR.

A prominent place will be given to Lenin as the theoretician and organizer of the building of the material and technical foundations of the socialist economy and elaborating the socialist forms of running the economy, founder of the political economy of socialism and his development of Marxist economic theory. We shall write about current problems of the economic competition of the two world systems in the light of Lenin's ideas, the Leninist teaching on economics and politics in socialist society, the role of scientific and technological progress in achieving higher labor productivity, the interconnection between the economic laws of socialism, the mechanism of their operations, commodity-money relations under socialism, the principles of scientific planning and management and the role of combining material and moral stimuli in production. Special attention will be paid to the study and generalization of the social and economic experience of the socialist countries and the specific features of their economic development depending on the concrete conditions.

The Lenin theme will be represented also in the permanent section "Theory and

Practice of Party Building," where we plan to print articles showing the essence of Lenin's teaching on the party of a new type, on its leading role in the socialist revolution and in the building of socialism and communism, and the Leninist principle of democratic centralism as the basic principle of Party organization.

In its international department, the journal will continue to elucidate theoretical and political problems of the world Communist movement, in the first place those pertaining to the forthcoming international conference of the Communist and Workers' parties. We shall discuss pressing tasks of the fight against imperialism and unity of Communists and all anti-imperialist forces. We shall continue to analyze topical questions of Lenin's theory of imperialism, the economic and political contradictions in the capitalist world, the struggle between labor and capital and the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the historical mission of the working class in the present-day world. Articles will be devoted to the national-liberation movement. The journal will regularly inform its readers about the activities of fraternal parties.

We also see our duty in explaining and popularizing the Leninist foreign policy of the Soviet Union, its struggle for world peace and security, against the aggressive plans of imperialism, and at the same time in exposing, as we have always done, bourgeois and reformist critics of Leninism. We intend to introduce a new section, "Leninist Principles of International Relations."

Our aim is to print materials which will fight, from scientific positions, for the triumph of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, against Right and "Left" opportunism and dogmatic distortions of revolutionary theory, uphold the purity of Marxism-Leninism and contribute to its further development.

As in the past, we shall have sections "On Socialist Economic Management," "Ideology, Science and Culture," "In the Socialist Countries," "The World Working-Class and National Liberation Movement," and others. Considerable space will be devoted to book reviews, bibliography and scientific discussions.

Our contributors will include leaders of the CPSU and other fraternal parties, Party functionaries, government and industrial executives, scientists and educational workers.

INKERI LEHTINEN, Communist Party of Finland, Editor-in-Chief of *Kommunisti*:

In 1969 our journal will devote chief attention to publications connected with the 15th Congress of our Party, due to be held in April. The congress will adopt a renovated program of the Party, the draft of which is now being discussed in the Party. Last November the Central Committee reviewed the course of the discussion and, taking into consideration the numerous proposals from Party organizations and individual Communists, prepared a new text of the draft which was returned for further discussion.

We shall contribute to this discussion by materials in which the processes of social development in Finland are analyzed from Marxist-Leninist positions. Moreover, we want to continue publication after the congress, too, of articles on programmatic issues.

The journal will continue the discussion of paths of the socialist revolution and the transition from capitalism to socialism.

Special attention will be paid to problems relating to the role and task of the Party in the present conditions, the anti-monopoly struggle, and the political and economic program of the CPF, the latter being a particularly important theme, for at present there is much unemployment in the country, and everybody expects our Party, which is represented in the government coalition, to contribute to the adoption of radical measures aimed at reducing it.

Our Party and its theoretical organ occupy themselves with matters concerning parliamentary and government activity. The government, which includes three representatives of the People's Democratic Union (among them two Communists), is working in exceptionally difficult conditions connected with the economic depression. The Party has succeeded in securing the adoption of a number of measures in the interests of the working people. We strive to show that only joint action by all workers and their organizations can lead

to restricting the privileges of the monopolies and, on this basis, to socioeconomic changes.

Struggle for good-neighbor relations with the Soviet Union in the political, economic and cultural fields will remain the central theme of our journal. Our Party has already done much in this respect, and is now fighting hard against the reactionary forces bent on changing the foreign-policy course of the country.

It goes without saying that *Kommunisti* will continue to discuss problems of the world Communist movement. We hope that in this we shall benefit from cooperation with *Problems of Peace and Socialism*, whose articles we reprint in a special section. We should like *Problems of Peace and Socialism* to give more space to problems of the highly developed capitalist countries.

In connection with the Lenin centenary we are preparing a number of articles devoted to theoretical and political problems, to Lenin's works as a Marxist theoretician and leader of the world working-class movement.

We also want to publish materials describing Lenin's stay in Finland, his contacts with the Finnish revolutionaries and our Party. In February we intend to print an article on the 50th anniversary of the Communist International and Lenin's role in founding it.

There is a pressing need for a profound study of the youth problems, of all the problems pertaining to the younger generation. This work should be conducted better, on a broader scale, and with the participation of the young people. First of all we should discuss ways and means of drawing younger people into the general political struggle on the side of the working class, for on the outcome of this struggle depend the future victories of the revolutionary movement in our country and the solution of the specific problems of the youth.

French Communist Party gains more members

At a recent meeting of secretaries of the Party's federal organizations, Georges Marchais, Secretary of the Central Committee, reported that 55,000 new members had joined the Party during 1968. The Party now has 19,200 branches, the largest number in the past 20 years.

Marchais noted that the biggest membership growth had taken place in the industrial areas and that the majority of the new members are young people.

In 1968 the Central Committee Secretariat issued 454,005 membership cards to the federations, that is, 26,955 more than in 1967.

This growth in membership is undoubtedly of political significance, Marchais said, especially in the light of the events experienced in the outgoing year.

"During this year," Marchais went on, "the reactionary big bourgeoisie did everything possible to hit at the Communist Party, the party of the working class. It launched a rabid anti-Communist campaign, hoping thereby to shake the prestige of the Party, weaken it organizationally and cause dissension in its ranks.

"But once again the anti-Communist maneuvers of reaction and of those Leftist forces who consciously, or unconsciously, became its accomplices, ended in fiasco. Polling four and a half million votes in the last elections, the Communist Party remains the strongest party of the Left, the party which embodies the hopes of France and is concerned with leading the country to democracy and socialism."

Reviewing the political situation, Marchais spoke of the tasks that need to be carried out if the economic and social demands of the working people are to be upheld, if freedom is to be preserved and extended, the de Gaulle regime replaced by a democratic regime, American imperialism combated, and an end put to its aggression against Vietnam. The Party is rallying all its forces to make possible the establishment of a broad anti-monopoly alliance; it is working to achieve agreement between the Left parties and, in the first place, between Communists and Socialists on the basis of a common program that would be supported by the majority of the people.

These tasks imperatively require that the Communists work unflaggingly to strengthen the Party organizationally and ideologically.

In this connection Marchais stressed the importance of democratic centralism, for it is this principle, he went on, that can ensure the Party's ideological and political unity, its unity of action.

"The existence of different trends and factions would undoubtedly suit those who refuse to submit to discipline, but this can only undermine the ideological unity of the Party . . . The Party would not be able, as a consequence, to lead, direct and organize the struggle of the working class and the people . . . We must therefore observe democratic centralism at all levels in our Party, as called for by the October meeting of the Central Committee . . ."

P.H.

From the experience of the Argentine Communists

I.

HOW WE DISTRIBUTE MARXIST LITERATURE

The Communist Party of Argentina has no little experience in legal and underground publication of Marxist-Leninist literature, putting out a weekly, *Nuestra Palabra*, a monthly journal, *Nueva Era*, a bi-monthly, *Cuadernos de Cultura*, the last-named catering largely for intellectuals, and an economic journal every four months — all of them underground. We have published the complete works of Lenin, two three-volume editions of *Capital*, numerous classical and current Marxist books, and a large number of papers and booklets by Argentinian writers.

Our Buenos Aires Committee publishes the newspaper, *Frente Unido*, and other publications, including bulletins issued in enterprises and by local branches. Mass organizations (with Communists in the leadership) put out their own publications. When still on a legal footing, the Party published a daily, *La Hora*. Often the Party signs contracts with commercial publishers to issue Marxist-Leninist books.

We have press and literature committees at all Party levels, including the Central Committee and the provincial committees, charged with disseminating *Nuestra Palabra*, our underground weekly, other Party journals, and our booklets and books. The committees work jointly with our propaganda committee, which they consult on political issues. The national press committee works with the *Nuestra Palabra* staff, and the national literature committee with the staff of the Party journals, for whose finances they are responsible.

The Party leadership insists that members (many of whom are new) be told of the role of the Party branches in the factories and neighborhoods, that it be impressed on them that the prestige of the individual Communist, whoever he may be, his prestige in the trade union or in the peasant organization or in the mass struggle, is really the prestige of his Party. Anarchist, syndicalist, Social-Democratic

and, especially, Peronist traditions often prevent new Party members, and sometimes even veterans, from understanding the close link between the everyday Party work and participation in the mass actions.

Unfortunately, some branches and members underestimate the role of the press and literature in enlightening the masses. For one thing, the branches often shuffle around members responsible for the press and literature.

Our national journal, *Nueva Era*, has twice held New Era Days and will hold a third to mark its 20th anniversary in April. The first two New Era Days took place in 1966, before the coup d'état, when the Party was still legal. The branches were supplied with leaflets and posters, and articles from other publications about *Nueva Era*. Large gatherings attended by Party leaders were held in the federal capital and the bigger provincial cities, and were addressed by the director of the journal or one of the editorial board members. Branch secretaries and activists took part in the subsequent discussions, giving their views about the journal's contents. Measures were suggested for improving the journal. To be sure, in 1967 the number of meetings on Press Day was quite modest because of our underground situation.

Meetings with the *Nueva Era* readership proved useful. Opinions were expressed as to how to awaken interest in some of the articles, etc., among workers, peasants, students, Peronists, radicals and Catholics.

Exchanges of views organized by *Nueva Era* are attended by Party members responsible for the art and literature sector. The problems discussed may concern a specific province or district or a particular branch of industry. The exchanges are then reported in the journal.

Commercial distribution is the term used for the sale of Marxist books and Party journals in bookshops and newsstalls. But with the Party underground the obstacles are many. It is impossible, for one thing, to get all bookstalls to sell all the books and journals we should like. It is important, therefore, to conduct work among owners and salesmen.

Bookshop salesmen often visit prospec-

tive buyers at home. This method, used by the bigger publishers and big bookshops, is also used with good results by our Party publishing houses and shops. Some comrades have made it a full-time job selling Party publications and non-Party books. In effect, they act as Party propagandists, because it is part of their sales technique to awaken interest in the content of the books, in the problems of the day and in national and international affairs. They establish contact with customers and invite them to visit their shops. Some customers gradually get into the habit of helping the Party in fund-raising campaigns and become sympathizers or members. Those who belong to other political parties learn of our views and are more readily won for our policy.

Juan LUNA

II.

THE WORKING CLASS AND THE PEOPLE HELP THE PARTY FINANCIALLY

Our Party recently ended another fund-raising campaign. This, the 22nd campaign, held in July, yielded more than 150 million pesos, or 20 million more than expected.

Five per cent of these funds are earmarked for the Vietnam Aid Fund.

The financial aid obtained by the Party in the towns and villages is extremely important in the present conditions. The political situation under the military fascist-type dictatorship which has almost totally suppressed democratic rights, is a very difficult one for the Communists. The economic situation is critical, the standard of living of workers, peasants and other wage-earners, and of the middle strata, has declined.

Yet the people responded well to the Party's fund-raising appeal. In the factories, in country villages and in working-class districts in the cities people willingly contributed to the Party treasury. Every contribution was an expression of trust in

the Communist's struggle against the dictatorship, for peace, national independence and socialism.

The twenty campaigns have provided us with considerable experience, borne out by the work of the Buenos Aires Party committee. It enlisted a large number of activists, each declaring the sum he expected to raise. Propaganda measures were planned, with the *Nuestra Palabra* devoting considerable space to the campaign. District and street committees and branches issued campaign bulletins and a *Letter to the Communists*, containing campaign instructions and hints, was widely distributed among the activists.

The campaign began in July. We paid special attention to its tempo, dividing the month into stages, with a concrete target for each. This helped collect the sum planned for each branch. Branches and district committees convened to discuss fulfilment at the end of each stage. We were pleased to note that the campaign had not interfered with the usual Party work.

As we see it, the campaign yielded more than just financial benefit. Our contacts with the masses expanded. The Executive Committee stressed in its report that the contributions made by factory and office workers were greater this year than in any previous campaign. Considerable sums were raised by Buenos Aires power workers, railwaymen, etc. Students in the capital exceeded their target, collecting more than one million pesos, while secondary-school students collected 500,000 pesos. The contributions made by middle class people were also quite considerable.

The funds raised enabled us to extend our propaganda and educational activities and, at the same time, to express our solidarity with heroic Vietnam in material terms. They testified to the close contact between Party and people, expressive of the defiance to the Ongania dictatorship which is desperately anxious to banish the Communists from the political life of the country.

Towards united action

The World Peace Council Session in Lahti

Frederic Joliot-Curie, founder of the world peace movement, said that no nation and no individual can prevent war, that this can be done only by the concerted effort of all nations. Peace supporters always remember this.

The peace movement has become a real factor because it accords with the aspirations of the people for peace and progress. Its guiding principles are prohibition of all weapons of wholesale annihilation, an end to the arms drive, abolition of all forms of colonialism and racial discrimination, respect for sovereignty and independence, mutually-advantageous trade and cultural relations, peaceful coexistence of states with differing political systems.

These principles were unanimously reaffirmed at the World Peace Council meeting held in Lahti, Finland, over November 11-13, 1968, shortly before the twentieth anniversary of the movement.

The movement plans to celebrate its 20th anniversary by holding a *World Peace Assembly*. Its purpose will be to alert and rally public opinion. This is all the more necessary in view of the continuing U.S. aggression in Vietnam, acts of aggression against the Arab peoples by Israel, the NATO threat to peace and security in Europe, military coups in a number of countries, repressive measures against the democratic and progressive forces. In all these acts we have the proof of intensified imperialist activity, which needs to be countered by intensified effort to safeguard world peace and security.

Needed for this is maximum unity. Of course, there are differences among peace supporters, and no one can lay claim to a monopoly in the fight for peace. But differences should not prevent coordinated action for common aims. Discussion leads

to better understanding, and common aims to united action.

The World Peace Council invites all organizations, groups and individuals to attend the World Assembly, which will meet in Berlin next June to discuss ways and means of furthering cooperation and united action.

Of late the bourgeois press has been spreading the story that the World Peace Council has lost its appeal and influence. This snide propaganda is designed to weaken the movement and prevent closer understanding and cooperation between the nations in the fight for world peace and security.

Over the past two decades the World Peace Council has built up a strong worldwide reputation. Representative of a wide range of opinion it has close relations with many regional and international organizations. In fact, it would be hard to name any corner of the earth where its influence is not felt. Its international congresses and conferences, its campaigns for a nuclear-weapons ban, its support for embattled Vietnam, have met with a worldwide response.

The scale of its activity can be judged by some of its principal initiatives in recent years.

1966—its Appeal to "all who cherish the future of mankind," its efforts to extend united action in support of Vietnam, its Memorandum on European Security, resolution on national independence, condemnation of America's aggression in Cuba.

1967—its call for an end to the U.S. aggression in Vietnam, statements on European security and on the Middle East, message to the Geneva Disarmament Conference, recommendations on other aspects

of the peace movement, conference in support of the Arab peoples.

1968—its appeal on the Paris talks between the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the United States.

At the Lahti meeting, the Council's Presidium expressed its admiration for the people of Vietnam who have forced the U.S. unconditionally to cease air, naval and ground actions against the Democratic Republic and to consent to peace talks with the DRV and the South Vietnam National Liberation Front. These initial successes were seen by the meeting as an achievement of Vietnam's patriots and of all peace supporters. The meeting expressed the confidence that the peoples will impose their will and that peace will triumph.

The Council's Presidium has called for:

- full support for a political settlement along the lines proposed by the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the South Vietnam National Liberation Front;

- condemnation of America's continued aggression in South Vietnam and the danger of renewed aggression against the DRV;

- greater moral, political and material support and aid to Vietnam by all organizations and individuals standing for peace and justice.

The Council also urged greater aid to the Arab liberation movement, fulfilment of the November 22, 1967 Security Council resolution, in particular withdrawal of Israeli forces from occupied Arab territory, and endorsement of the Second International Conference in Support of the Arab Peoples, scheduled to meet in Cairo on January 25-28, 1969.

With the North Atlantic Treaty expiring in April, the World Peace Council called on its national committees to campaign against its renewal. A conference of European committees and other peace organizations is scheduled to open in January. The Lahti meeting also registered a protest against the rearming of Federal Germany and its refusal, supported by the U.S. and other NATO powers, to accept existing European boundaries and recognize the German Democratic Republic. The Council called on all the peace forces to step up their fight against neo-Nazism, for

European collective security, and condemned the fascist terror in Greece.

It declared for a Central American Peace Forum in March, urged an energetic protest against the repressive measures of the Portuguese fascist regime, called for an immediate halt to the persecution of progressives and peace supporters in Indonesia, and took a stand against the U.S. occupation of South Korea and U.S. interference in the internal affairs of Laos and Cambodia. Lastly, it drew attention to the Japanese imperialist menace to peace in Asia.

The resolutions adopted at the Lahti meeting are an important contribution to the anti-imperialist fight.

Another aspect of the World Peace Council's work has won recognition throughout the world. One of the movement's most prominent leaders, Professor J. D. Bernal, said it was highly important, in the insane world that the nuclear strategists are creating, to foster realism. The World Peace Council is effectively applying measures designed to encourage works of literature and art expressing the humane ideas of peace and happiness and condemning militarism.

The World Peace Council upholds the rights of the progressive mass media and journalists working to prevent war and promote peace. It calls on all publications to contribute to universal security and peace.

Lastly, the World Peace Council called on the movement to observe the Lenin centenary in April 1970.

Communists have always opposed imperialist war and championed peace and international friendship. The policy of the Communist parties in the socialist countries, the resolutions of the international conference of Communist and Workers' parties, and the bilateral and multilateral statements of fraternal parties, pledge support to all organizations and movements working for lasting peace. Communists consider it their duty actively to participate in the work of these organizations and movements. Together with all men of goodwill, they are doing everything to make the decisions of the recent World Peace Council meeting an effective contribution to peace and progress. V.S.

F. Petrov, Cheboksary, USSR, wants to know about the plurality of political parties in the German Democratic Republic.

Specifically, F. Petrov would like to know about the political, ideological and organizational basis of the merger of the Communist and Social-Democratic parties into the Socialist Unity Party and how the latter coordinates its activity with that of the other parties.

These questions are answered by Stefan Doernberg, head of the GDR Institute of Modern History.

CONCERNING THE MULTI-PARTY SYSTEM IN THE GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

The Communist and Social-Democratic parties merged on April 21, 1946, after the Communists had declared for the merger at their 15th Congress and the Social Democrats, at their 40th Congress.

The merger, effected in the eastern part of Germany, marked the turning of a new leaf in the history of the German working class. It enabled the working class to extirpate imperialism and militarism and to start on its historical mission of building socialism in the German Democratic Republic.

The split in the labor movement in Germany and in other countries goes back to the beginnings of the century when the transition of capitalism to its imperialist phase provided conditions for opportunism and revisionism in the labor movement. Renunciation of the revolutionary traditions of German Social-Democracy and revision of the Marxist theory of scientific socialism by the opportunist leaders had a disastrous effect on the German working-class movement and on German history as a whole. Support for the imperialist war of 1914-19, attempts to save the monarchy in one way or another by warding off revolution, alliance with the Kaiser's generals against the revolutionary workers in 1918-19, coalition with the parties of the big bourgeoisie, and rejection of repeated Communist proposals for a united anti-fascist front were landmarks in the policy

of those who began by splitting the working-class movement and ended by paving the way to the Hitler dictatorship.

In 1945, the task was to draw lessons from this bitter experience. Tens of thousands of Social Democrats had come to realize the need to end the mistakes of the former policy and establish unity with the Communists. The Central Board of the Social-Democratic Party, formed in Berlin on June 15, 1945, under Otto Grotewohl, declared for working-class unity, "We see our moral duty," it stated, "in rectifying the political errors of the past and in giving the younger generation a united, militant political organization." The appeal issued by the Central Committee of the Communist Party on June 11, 1945, won unqualified approval. In it Wilhelm Pieck, Walter Ulbricht and other Party leaders insisted on anti-fascist unity as the only way to destroy the foundations of imperialism and militarism. The appeal reaffirmed the concept of working-class unity and of rallying the anti-fascist forces evolved at the Party conferences in Brussels (1935) and Berne (1939).

On June 19, 1945, the Communist and Social-Democratic leaders agreed on unity of action to contribute to the new, anti-fascist course of development, to clear up ideological matters and jointly uphold the interests of the working people of town and country. Elucidation of ideological

issues and the launching of joint political actions to destroy the political and economic basis of imperialism were vital to working-class unity based on revolutionary Marxism. What the working class needed was not just any kind of unity. Some Social-Democratic leaders, who advocated unity at the time, expected the labor movement to be "freed" from Marxism and subordinated to bourgeois ideology and an anti-Communist policy wrapped in nationalism. They wanted a Social-Democratic type of united party.

The Communist Party took a stand against these anti-working-class views. It warned of the disastrous implications of the policy of a "third road" and of anti-Sovietism pursued at the time of the Weimar Republic, a policy which some Social-Democratic leaders grouped around Schumacher were making their own. Nor did the Social-Democratic Left allow itself to be misled on the issue of revolutionary unity.

As a result there arose fundamental questions which had to be fully clarified before the Communist and Social-Democratic parties could merge. The membership of both parties was growing fast, and by 1946 stood at 600,000 in eastern Germany alone. Most of the new members, however, had no great experience of political struggle, which made it all the more imperative to combine anti-fascist and democratic activity with discussion of problems of theory.

Important in this respect were the joint meetings held in November 1945 to examine and compare the events and lessons of the October Revolution in Russia and the November Revolution in Germany. Relevant historical problems and their close connection with the current tasks of the political struggle were discussed at other meetings too.

More important still was the discussion of the program of the proposed united workers' party. It began at a joint conference of the Central Committee of the Communist Party and the Central Board of the Social-Democratic Party in December 1945 and went on at membership meetings of both parties, in the party press, and in *Einheit*, the theoretical journal published by the two parties. In December 1945 the two parties agreed that the immediate objective of the united party should be to establish an anti-fascist democratic republic guaranteeing adequate political, economic and social rights to the working class and other working people, and that

the ultimate goal should be to build socialism through the working class exercising its political power in keeping with Marxism. This fundamental postulate was prompted by the desire to found a party of the working class and other working people on the principles of democratic centralism and proletarian internationalism. Emphasis was laid on the need to combat every manifestation of chauvinism, racism and national persecution and anti-Sovietism.

Consensus on the ideological aspects of the program played a decisive part in forming, through the merger of the two parties, a revolutionary, militant Marxist party of the working class. The idea was supported by most members of both parties, who called for a merger and who actually effected it, from top to bottom, in eastern Germany in the early months of 1946.

In the three western zones, too, there was a growing desire to establish political and organizational unity on the basis of the decisions adopted in Berlin. The opponents of revolutionary unity, compelled to revise their tactics, did their utmost to check the unity movement or at least to gain time. They prevailed on the Social-Democratic organization in the western zones to break away from the Central Board in Berlin. Their aim was to prevent the formation of committees for a united socialist party or to dissolve them where they had been set up, and they used subtle demagoguery, anti-Communist calumny, the Party apparatus under their influence and, last but not least, outright bans by the imperialist occupation authorities. As for eastern Germany, there was nothing they could do there.

And so early in 1946 two lines emerged which were destined to produce opposite results. In a radio interview on January 11, 1946, Walter Ulbricht described them as follows: "There are two ways. One is the way of working-class unity, of uniting the two working-class parties. That is the only way to create the power center that will serve peace and democratic progress . . . The other way, the one preferred by the Social-Democratic leaders in the West, is the old way, which in the Weimar Republic led to the gradual whittling away of the democratic gains. This way would again lead to the Social-Democrats forming a coalition with the bourgeois parties and tailing in their wake."

Subsequent developments—the successful building of socialism and the peace policy of the German Democratic Republic

lic, on the one hand, and the reactionary, aggressive policy of the "grand coalition" in the Federal Republic, accompanied by the growth of neo-Nazism, on the other — proved the warning right.

The offensive of the Right Social-Democratic leaders against working-class unity, the extensive financial and administrative support accorded them by the occupying imperialist powers and the revival of reaction in the three western zones made the merger of the Communist and Social-Democratic parties in eastern Germany an urgent necessity. That is why some of the political, ideological and organizational questions could not be fully cleared up before the formation of the Socialist Unity Party (April 1946). However, the decisive prerequisite for developing the united party into a new, Marxist-Leninist type of party were there. Within a few years, during which ideological issues were cleared up and an effort made to tackle the pressing political issues, the long-standing differences between members of the two parties were overcome. In January 1949 it became possible to abolish the parity distribution of Party functions between former members of the Communist and Social-Democratic parties, a principle which proved useful during the initial process of ideological and political consolidation of the Socialist Unity Party (at that time, each Party organization had two chairmen or secretaries enjoying equal rights). Marxism-Leninism became the ideology of each member.

The emergence of the Socialist Unity Party made for the consolidation of the bloc of anti-fascist democratic parties which in July 1945 comprised the Communist and Social-Democratic parties and two bourgeois-democratic parties, the Christian Democratic Union and the Liberal Democratic Party. The bloc was an expression of the alliance of the working class and other, primarily petty-bourgeois, sections of the population. It should be borne in mind that the urban middle classes held important positions and numerically were even superior to the peasants. That is why it was of decisive importance to enlist these strata in effecting anti-fascist democratic changes and, subsequently, in carrying out the socialist revolution.

From the outset, the anti-fascist democratic bloc was based on independence, equal rights and unanimity in decision-making. Its meetings, chaired by representatives of the various parties, discussed

such fundamental problems as land reform, expropriation of war criminals and active Nazis, establishment of a public sector in industry, a democratic school reform, establishment of anti-fascist democratic government bodies and, later on, of provincial governments and the central government.

In 1948 two more parties — the Democratic Peasant and the National Democratic — were founded. They, too, joined the democratic bloc. In the same year the bloc was extended by admitting the trade unions and, somewhat later, the Free German Youth League and the Democratic Women's League.

The Socialist Unity Party supported the progressive forces in the friendly parties and helped them counter the reactionary politicians who were against the policy of the bloc, being intent on reversing the anti-fascist democratic way of development and who, in the long run, found themselves isolated from the rank and file of their own parties.

Thus a multi-party system was formed and was successfully tested in both the anti-fascist democratic and the socialist revolutions. All the bloc parties took part in the complex process of building up the republic against West German imperialist intrigue, in far-reaching ideological changes, in bringing the diverse groups of the population into the building of socialism and in gradually establishing a socialist society. In the process, the parties friendly to the Socialist Unity Party developed into parties having socialist programs and recognizing the leading role of the working class and its Marxist-Leninist vanguard. Today they cooperate in strengthening the socialist state and the community of socialist countries.

The forms of the cooperation between the Socialist Unity Party and the other parties, of the coordination of their policies and activities, have become more varied. Now as in the past, spokesmen of all the members of the democratic bloc meet regularly to discuss questions of cooperation on the tried and tested principles of complete equality and unanimity in decision-making. Besides, cooperation expresses itself in participation in party congresses, theoretical conferences and other activities organized by the individual parties.

There is also coordination and cooperation on the State Council and in the Council of Ministers, where the bloc parties are represented by vice-chairmen. The

chairmen of the committees of the People's Chamber, too, represent all the parties. The various parties have their own groups: the Christian Democratic Union, Democratic Peasant Party, Liberal Democratic Party and National Democratic Party have 52 deputies and the Socialist Unity Party group 127. The trade unions have 68 deputies, the Free German Youth League 40, the Democratic Women's League 35 and the German Cultural League 22 deputies. The bloc parties have their republic and district newspapers, their printing plants, publishing houses and party schools. Besides, they cooperate on radio and television.

The parties naturally cooperate in the National Front and its local committees.

Experience shows that the socialist revolution can win, and a socialist society

be built, only if the working class and its Marxist-Leninist party exercise the leading role. It shows also that the working class can accomplish its historical mission only by a close and solid alliance with other working people in town and countryside. Strict adherence to these common principles is a requisite of the steadfast socialist advance in the German Democratic Republic. Our republic owes its experience, in particular the merger of the Communist and Social-Democratic parties and the setting up of a multi-party system, to its social structure. However, this experience should be considered only within the framework of consistent application of the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism and the general laws determining the content of the present period.

WMR

against the persecution of democrats

Paraguayan patriots in danger of death

In February last year the notorious General Stroessner was "re-elected" President of Paraguay for a third term as a result of yet another election farce. The jails of the country are filled with political prisoners. But neither torture nor the long years of incarceration have been able to break these dauntless patriots who never lose hope of regaining freedom. What infuses them with indomitable courage is their conviction that united action by the patriotic and democratic forces outside, by the political organizations of the country, will wrest them from the clutches of the dictatorship. For them every step towards unity of action is a ray of hope.

The lives of many men and women dear to our people have been saved due in large measure to the solidarity and support of the people of Argentina, Uruguay, Chile and other Latin American countries and of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

Thanks to a vigorous campaign by our people and by world opinion, Dr. Ignacio Fernandez was released after a hunger strike. After almost five years in prison he came out in a state of physical exhaustion.

Recently the 62-year-old Gilberta Verdun de Talavera, too, regained freedom after nine years' imprisonment. Her husband was murdered before her eyes. She was forced to look on as her son, wounded and bleeding, was taken away. For the next nine years she never knew whether he was dead or alive.

Also murdered was the husband of another prisoner—Kandelaria Ramirez. After brutal torture she lost her child. Released after four years in jail, she is now seriously ill. Political prisoners, men and women alike, are detained in the police stations without right to counsel or to habeas corpus. She said, "There is no legal procedure as far as we are concerned. The Sup-

reme Court never examines political cases."

Some time ago Carmen Soler, the writer, Mauro Saguier and Sandino Gil Oporto gained their freedom after a prolonged hunger strike.

On the other hand, the teachers Antonio Maidana and Julio Rojas, and the economist Alfredo Alcorta have been detained in a special cell of the 3rd Police Station in Asuncion for over ten years now contrary to the law and to court decisions ordering their release. The physical and moral torture to which they have been subjected defies description.

The dictatorship vents its fury on men and women fighting for democracy and bread for their people, for national sovereignty. Even the families of the political prisoners are subjected to brutal persecution. Isabel Ortiz de Casal, mother of six and chairman of a mothers' club, has spent four years in prison, and now, after a hunger strike, is in the police hospital gravely ill. Another woman in prison is Marciana Balbuena de Alcorta who fought for the release of a group of prisoners including her husband, jailed over ten years ago. Idalina Gaona, Maria Elina Rodas de Ramirez, Maria de Rondelli (whose husband was tortured to death by the dictatorship), Oilda Rivarola, Livia Rodas, Saturnina Almada are among other women detained in police stations in the capital after torture by investigation officers.

A powerful solidarity movement is developing in our country to secure the release of the political prisoners.

Of great importance is the work of the College of Barristers, particularly the steps taken by it in the case of Dr. Ignacio Fernandez. Its efforts are supported by the International Association of Democra-

tic Lawyers, the Law Student Center, the university federations and barristers' colleges in Argentina, Chile and Uruguay, and hundreds of members of the judicial profession and cultural workers in the United States, Argentina, Canada, Italy and France.

Also active on behalf of the political prisoners is the National Committee for Human Rights. The Women's International Democratic Federation, the World Federation of Trade Unions, the International Teachers' Organization and other associations have demanded freedom for the political prisoners in Paraguay. In the socialist countries, above all in the Soviet Union, Bulgaria, Hungary, Cuba and Vietnam, protest meetings have been held. Many organizations have written to the Stroessner government insisting on the release of the prisoners.

There is a growing solidarity movement among Paraguayan citizens in Argentina, Uruguay and Chile. In Argentina, a meeting of Paraguayans set up a Committee of Solidarity with the political prisoners. A statement issued by the Committee says:

"Many Paraguayans have paid with their lives or with long years in prison for having fought for freedom for our people. Today the prisons are filled with men and women convicted for political and trade union activity. Our Solidarity Committee is coming into existence in Human Rights Year, announced by the United Nations. Our action program is to fight for the *actual exercise* of the rights in Paraguay, and so we fully support the campaign of active solidarity with prisoners which the Paraguay Committee for Human Rights and other organizations with headquarters in Asuncion are carrying on."

Gustavo COLMAN

Terror in Iran

The progressive press in Iran has reported the arrests and execution of more democrats. In recent months large numbers of Kurd patriots have been put to death.

The public in Iran and in the outside world heard of these latest crimes of the Iranian rulers only after the death sentences had been carried out. The official report deliberately withheld the dates of arrest and execution. The ruling clique in

Iran tries hard to conceal its evil deeds because it fears world opinion and is conscious of the people's wrath and its own weakness.

Although the Shah makes a pretence of championing human rights at home and abroad, he rules by terror. Democratic organizations, in particular the People's Party (Tudeh), are persecuted and trials by court martial are regular occurrences.

In Kurdistan three of ten victims were murdered in their homes, while seven others were hanged publicly in Mehabad and Sakiz.

Usual charges are "possession of arms" and "resisting the authorities." Yet carrying arms, as everyone knows, is an ancient custom of Iranian tribesmen, and no one has ever been prosecuted for doing so.

The real reason for the summary trial and execution of the Kurd patriots is that they fight for democracy and the interests of their people.

There is much unrest also among the students. After a wave of strikes and demonstrations over a hundred students were detained and some were sent for military service. A group of 17 is to be tried by a military tribunal and the prosecutor is demanding the death sentence for eight of them.

Wholesale arrests are reported from towns in Iranian Kurdistan, Iranian Azerbaijan and in Teheran. Teachers, students, clergy and peasants are among those arrested.

The terror and repression have caused indignation in many countries. Iranian students studying in London demonstrated outside the Iranian Embassy. Bertrand Russell sent a protest telegram and the French Committee for Iranian Political Prisoners issued a statement in defense of the victims of terror.

While people throughout the world are protesting against the terror in Iran, the authorities in some countries, notably West Germany and France, have taken extradition proceedings against Iranian progressives.

An appeal launched by the People's Party in Iran calls on world opinion to protest against the ruthless persecution of patriots, including Kurds, whose lives are in danger. The Party urges an active effort for the release of all political prisoners. It expresses the confidence that, now, as in the past, a solidarity campaign will be launched by progressives everywhere and in this way bring succor to those languishing in Iranian prisons.

A. FERHADYAN

BOOKS AND JOURNALS

Militant weapon of South Africa's Communists

(Review of **African Communist**)

Seen against the dynamism characteristic of world development today, the African continent stands out for rapidity of change, for contrasts and paradoxes in its social life. To pick out the deep-going currents in this rush of events, to size up the alignment of class forces, to give a scientific forecast of Africa's future—such are but some of the new and challenging problems that have confronted Marxist thought in the last ten or fifteen years.

A useful contribution to the solution of these problems in being made by *African*

Communist, theoretical journal of the South African Communist Party. The range of subjects examined, its high theoretical and journalistic level make this small journal, published by an illegal Communist Party, one of the most interesting of African periodicals.

During 1968, for example, the journal kept its readers informed about events in Kenya, Malawi, Algeria, Liberia, the United Arab Republic, the two Congos, Dahomey, Zambia, Swaziland, Sierra Leone, Senegal and Morocco, interpreting these

events from a principled Marxist standpoint.

Special mention should be made of its study of the political situation in Kenya ("Uhuru's Bitter Fruits," No. 32) and the civil war in Nigeria ("Nigeria in Turmoil," No. 35). In the Kenya article, Muhoi wa Kirinyaga writes about the differences between the ruling Kenya African National Union and Oginga Odinga's Kenya People's Union. In the article on Nigeria, Sol Dubula cites facts concerning the sources of the crisis that had led to civil war, and stresses the complexity of the nationality problem in this, the biggest country of Tropical Africa, where ethnic strife is interwoven with social and political contradictions between the toilers, the national bourgeoisie and the feudal upper crust, contradictions aggravated by the neo-colonialist policy of imperialism.

Problems of the national-liberation movement in the South of the continent are a prime concern of the journal. In the last months of 1967 the struggle in Southern Africa entered upon a new stage: having set up bases in Rhodesia, the combined guerrilla units of the Zimbabwe African People's Union and the African National Congress engaged in armed struggle against the Smith regime. In March and April 1968 they mounted an offensive in the central regions of the country, including the environs of Salisbury, the capital.

Hailing the successes of the freedom fighters, the *African Communist* stressed editorially (No. 32): "These were preliminary skirmishes. The relatively small advance units . . . were obviously not intended to engage the major forces of the enemy in pitched battles. When they were intercepted they fought back with tremendous courage and skill. They out-generalled their opponents and inflicted a heavy toll of casualties, before melting back into the bush, merged with the people. . . . Yet these first clashes have had a tremendous impact, far beyond their immediate military or strategic importance."

No. 34 for July-September carried the text of the Executive Committee's report, "The Developing Armed Liberation Struggle in Southern Africa," which contained an appraisal of the fighting in Rhodesia.

"The South African Communist Party declares its unreserved support for an identification with the freedom fighters of the alliance of the ANC/ZAPU in their armed struggle," the document reads. "They have opened a new phase in the long and bitter

struggle for the liberation of Southern Africa.

"For the first time south of the Zambesi River there exists a trained and dedicated army of African liberation armed with modern weapons and a high level of political consciousness. . . .

"The first few months of guerrilla struggle, though restricted in scale, have already done more to shake the Smith regime than two years of United Nations' 'Sanctions' . . ."

The successful beginning of guerrilla warfare testifies to the maturity of the national-liberation movement, which has adapted the forms of the struggle to the changed conditions. In the fifties, when it was still legal, the African National Congress refrained from violent action. Avoiding a head-on clash with the racist state, the ANC succeeded in awakening and organizing hundreds of thousands of working people.

Things changed in 1961. The government banned progressive organizations and resorted to armed suppression of any opposition. Thousands of ANC activists and supporters were jailed, deported or forced into exile. Conscious that the old methods no longer applied and that armed struggle was inevitable, the Southern African national liberation organizations and the Communist Party, began to prepare themselves accordingly. Subsequent events proved them right, while the first guerrilla engagements in Rhodesia, fought in alliance with the ZAPU, are proof of the African National Congress' ability to continue the struggle in the difficult conditions of the terror.

The report pointed out that "neither the Communist Party nor any other section of the national-liberation movement has ever adopted any 'theory' of violent struggle or guerrilla war as the only possible road to national or social liberation in South Africa or in other countries, irrespective of conditions and circumstances."

Moreover, in the specific conditions of the South African Republic, especially in its initial stage, guerrilla war cannot be the predominant form of struggle. South African colonialism is colonialism of a special type. The oppressor nation is right there, not thousands of miles away. This racist state possesses a powerful machinery of suppression, and an industrial base capable of manufacturing planes, missiles, napalm, and a wide variety of other arms; it has the support of most of the three mil-

lion white residents, who enjoy the economic, social and political privileges accruing from apartheid. Therefore, whereas in other countries the national liberation movement could count on compromises and concessions on the part of the metropolitan countries, in Southern Africa the political emancipation of the non-white population can result only from the break-up of the colonialist state and far-reaching socio-economic changes. This confronts the South African liberation movement with very complex tasks.

A weakness of South African colonialism is that its entire economy depends on non-white labor. It can be predicted, therefore, that the South African regime will prove more vulnerable at the stage of a large-scale guerrilla war than any other imperialist state. But today, with the guerrilla movement making its first steps, "the task of the armed units is basically a political one. Their operations must be designed to help organize and rally the masses, and arouse them to action around their practical problems and grievances."

Attention is paid to the relationships between the Communist Party, the national liberation movement and other progressive organizations. Stressing that the Party remains an independent transmitter of proletarian ideology, the vanguard of the working class with a program of its own, the Executive Committee of the South African Communist Party points to the inadmissibility of sectarian trends. "We have never considered that the way to play a 'vanguard' role is by 'proclaiming' it or by contesting for positions. In the fight against white supremacy we have no aims separate from those of our non-communist comrades and colleagues in the liberation and working class movement . . . We maintain that our ideology of Marxism-Leninism enables our members to be better Congressites, better trade unionists and better fighters for the freedom of our country."

Not limiting itself to purely African problems, *African Communist* responds to events in other countries and comments on the general theoretical and political problems of the international Communist movement. Recent issues contained the Executive Committee's statements on Czechoslovakia, the April meeting of the preparatory committee for the international conference of the Communist and Workers' parties (including the communique and the speeches of SACP representatives), an article on the 150th anniversary of the birth

of Karl Marx, editorial notes and comments on Vietnam, the United States, France and Latin America.

A feature of the article on general problems is that these are examined from the standpoint of the revolutionary processes on the African continent. The peculiar feature of South Africa as a developed capitalist society and a colony provides an objective basis for the international contacts of the South African liberation movement. South African Communists study with equal interest the experience of both the developed capitalist countries and the countries of the Third World. On the other hand, the Party's experience of decades of struggle under this "special type colonialism" is of equal interest both to Africans and to the other contingents of the world Communist, working class and national liberation movement.

An interesting parallel between the liberation movement of the Africans in South Africa and the U.S. Negroes' civil rights movement is drawn in the article by A. Lerumo headed "Our People in the USA. Some Thoughts on the Africans in America" (No. 33). Referring to the experience of South Africa, the author points to the complex nature of the Black Power movement as the ideological front for an alliance of the differing social and political trends. Just as in South Africa, where the slogans "Amandla Ngawethu!" ("We are the Strength!") and "Maatla ke Arona!" ("Power to the People!") were followed by elaborating a program of action (the 1955 Freedom Charter), so in the United States the Black Power slogan is likely to develop into a program of national liberation as a result of polarization of the progressive and the reactionary trends in the Negro movement.

In the conditions of today the attention of the South African Communist Party is drawn to the theory and practice of armed struggle for national and social emancipation. Joe Slovo's article "Latin America and the Ideas of Regis Debray" (No. 33) poses questions pertaining to guerrilla warfare. The author argues that despite the changed conditions and the new experience, Lenin's theory of revolution remains the correct guide to action, and warns against mechanically transplanting the revolutionary experience of one country to other countries.

Slovo analyzes the correlation of objective and subjective factors in the emergence of a revolutionary situation, pointing out

that the greater role of revolutionary parties and of their policy in preparing objective elements of the revolutionary crisis does not refute the fundamental laws of Leninism. Specifically, he disproves the idea that in agrarian countries, by virtue of the antagonism between state power and the peasantry, the setting up of flashpoints of a guerrilla movement by intellectuals (chiefly students) is enough for a popular war to spread "like an oil patch." These views, of which Debray is an exponent, are characterized by the author as neo-Blanquist.

The article examines in detail the role of the Marxist-Leninist party in the armed struggle. Slovo criticizes the anti-Leninist contention that guerrilla forces and the party are one and the same thing, that revolutionary practice engenders revolutionary ideology, that it is not for revolutionary parties to build guerrilla forces, but that, on the contrary, the guerrilla forces should serve as the nucleus for a revolutionary party. These views, he argues, stem from a denial of the revolutionary spirit of the proletariat, from lack of faith in its strength.

"If Leninism has taught us anything," he writes, "it is surely this: the existence of such a vanguard group equipped with knowledge and understanding of the science of struggle not only speeds up the process but makes more certain that the **fruits of victory** are not snatched away. How many 'people's' armed struggles have we seen in recent decades in which most of the participants were 'honest and sincere' and ready to die and yet the 'natural' process of the struggle generated either a militarist dictatorship or gave birth to Right-wing regimes . . .

"This sort of military economism has nothing in common with Leninism—a name under which it parades. It is presumptuous because it seeks to give a flood of over-generalized advice to almost a whole continent. It is harmful because it gives birth to, and nurtures the subjective illusion that revolutions can be 'made' rather than led. Above all, in its emphasis on the primacy of revolutionary practice over revolutionary theory it is anti-scientific because it destroys the harmony which should be aimed for between the two and replace it with a crude sort of determinism which has very little in common with Leninism."

Slovo's article is especially interesting in that it reflects the principled attitude of one of the oldest Marxist-Leninist parties waging a difficult underground struggle and which has set its course on armed struggle against the racist government.

A. Langa's article "Socialism and Rural Revolution" continues the discussion of theoretical problems examined at the Cairo seminar in 1966.* As Langa sees it, the problem of Africa's socio-economic development cannot be solved without a deep-going agrarian reform. The capitalist development of agriculture, encouraged in most of the independent African states, leads to the emergence of a class of small farmers. The political result of this process—the rise of a new conservative force interested in preserving capitalism—suits the former colonial metropolitan countries very well.

But the contradictions and ineffectiveness of the capitalist way are already evident. Much of the land has found its way into the hands of the bureaucratic elite, "absentee landlords" who, for the most part, lease plots to the small cultivators. This system of land tenure perpetuates the perennial backwardness of farming, hinders use of machines and fertilizers and leads to parasitism. As a rule the small cultivator, lacking the capital needed for raising productivity, suffers from the declining world prices for agricultural products.

Polemizing at the Cairo seminar with Abdel Ghoneim (UAR) Langa points to the restricted character of measures for reorganizing African agriculture "from the top." "We are all learning how cooperatives can become tools for the advancement of capitalism," he writes, "how democratic land redistribution can create new strata of reactionaries, how party branches are transformed into feudalist cabals, how misinformation and ignorance can weaken progress and turn large groups of peasants into counter-revolutionaries, how feudalism and capitalism advance everywhere in new guises and subtleties."

The road to the solution of the agrarian problem in Africa lies through a profound social revolution, and the task of the Marxist-Leninist and other progressive parties is to define the ways of accomplishing this revolution.

V.S.

*See *World Marxist Review*, Nos. 1 and 2, 1967.

Scholar and revolutionary

New contributions to Marxiana

GEORGES COGNIOT. *Karl Marx, Notre Contemporain* (Karl Marx, Our Contemporary). Paris, Editions sociales, 1966. 222 pp.

The title of this book fully fits its contents, for the author, a leading French Marxist and director of the Maurice Thorez Institute, relates Marxism to present-day problems (a point emphasized in Waldeck Rochet's preface).

The central idea of Cogniot's study is the unchanging relevance of Marx's teaching, which has found its continuation in Leninism.

The first part of the book is biographical—the story of a life dedicated to the emancipation of the workingman. Cogniot describes Marx's close ties with France, its labor movement, militant traditions and spiritual heritage. But he also emphasizes the scope of Marx's interests, his ability to interpret and generalize the vast amount of material at his command, his scientific investigation of reality in all its diversity.

Revolutionary internationalism was characteristic of Marx's work in directing the world labor movement of his day, founding the First International and assisting the growth of working-class parties. The author points to Marx's criticism of Social-Democrat errors and his fight against opportunist trends.

The second part of the book outlines the main features of Marx's doctrine in sharp polemic with bourgeois ideology, deviations from Marxism and its latter-day "critics."

In characterizing Marx as a scholar and revolutionary, the author shows the connection between his research and his political activity. Marx became the recognized leader of the international working class, and his theory the expression of the proletariat's historical mission, because his every step in practical politics was based on a searching and creative analysis of social reality. His discoveries in the social sciences were based on dialectical materialism

and the dialectical method.

A salient manifestation of the dialectics of social development is the class struggle, culminating in social revolution. Marx created—and it fell to Lenin to enrich and develop—a scientific theory of revolution, the theory of the historical mission of the working class.

At a time when capitalism was in the ascendancy and becoming the dominant system in the world, Marx had no hesitation, the author writes, in predicting its inevitable downfall. This prevision was based on knowledge of the objective laws of social development and on a clear understanding of the role of the revolutionary forces in capitalist society. "The strength and speed of social progress depend on the actions of the vanguard class aimed at resolving problems which history has brought to maturity." (pp. 147-48.)

Cogniot uses concrete analysis to show the projection of Marx's ideas into the future, their importance, for instance, for an understanding of some of the problems of state-monopoly capitalism. In this context he quotes the following passage from the *Theories of Surplus Value* (Vol. IV of *Capital*), refuting the contention that capitalist profit is no more than payment for managerial functions: "If it were to be put into practice tomorrow and capitalist profits were confined to payment for managerial functions, then the day after tomorrow we would see the end of capitalist production . . ." The ruling class, the monopolists, are desperately anxious to retain capitalism. That is why they cling to their privilege of ownership of the means of production and the privilege of directing production (and social life generally), using anti-democratic methods to deny other classes—the working class in the first place—any part in directing the affairs of society. That is why in our day the class struggle organically combines socialist and consistently democratic demands.

Cogniot recalls Marx's thoughts on the

revolutionary transformation of capitalism into socialism and the subsequent development of socialist society, notably socialist economic management.

The concluding chapters examine Marx's work as leader of the international working class, emphasizing the importance of his fight for a scientific theory, and the need for its constant development in the spirit of that great continuer of Marx's work, Lenin.

A.D.

Marx as Historian. Nauka Publishers, Moscow, 1968. 711 pp. Edited by E. A. Zhelubovskaya, L. I. Golman, V. M. Dalin and B. F. Porshnev.

"His brain was like a ship, ready to sail: he was always ready to explore new fields of thought." That is how Paul Lafargue describes one of the most remarkable traits of Marx's character. Many were amazed by Marx's capacity to see the inner meaning of events long before their implications became apparent. This applied to many historical turning points—the Paris Commune, the Second Empire in France, Russia after the emancipation of the serfs—are but a few out of a much longer list.

Marx as a historian is the subject of this symposium put out by one of the leading publishing houses in the Soviet Union. The joint work of a group of Soviet historians, philosophers and economists, it was published to commemorate the 150th anniversary of Marx's birth.

Marx converted socialism from an utopia into a science. This was preceded by years of painstaking research, by a critical processing of the ideas and propositions enunciated by thinkers of different times and peoples. And this book traces the process, taking the reader into the laboratory of Marx's research and showing the origins and evolution of his theory.

The opening chapter discusses pre-Marxian sociology and historiography in France, Britain and Germany. Marx's discoveries, his materialist conception of history, stood out in contrast to the subjectivism which then pervaded the social sciences.

Marx's concept of history, G. A. Bagaturia says in his contribution, encompasses the general laws governing the development of society and history, for Marx found the key to how society functions at any given time and how it develops in the process of history.

In studying social phenomena, Marx

employed both the logical and historical method. Their combination to form a single unity is especially apparent in *Capital*. In later years, in drawing up his chronology of world history, Marx sought to produce an integrated picture of a multi-society world in which each society exerted an economic, political and ideological influence on the others. In drawing this conclusion, B. F. Porshnev, author of the chapter on the *Chronological Notes*, says Marx thus disclosed the interconnection and unity of the destinies of nations. That approach which might be described as synchronic, is essential to a correct appraisal of historical and contemporary events, which never develop in isolation from the clash of ideas, classes and interests.

The proletarian class struggle is central to all Marx's work, and the contributors to this symposium have brought together a wealth of material on the subject from Marx's early pronouncements to his generalization of the experience of the Paris Commune and his conclusions concerning proletarian dictatorship and the advance towards a classless society.

Marx attached importance to the economic factors, but he was not a primitive or rigid determinist. His approach to the study of history and politics is indicative of his attitude to the role of subjective factors, including the role of the individual in "accelerating or decelerating" the march of events. Cited in this volume, for instance, is a passage from a letter by Marx to Kugelmann, dated April 17, 1871, in which he emphasizes that the chances of the Paris Communards depend to a very great degree on "fortuitous factors," "... among them the character of the men who head the movement."

Discussed in this book is also Marx's journalism, and facts are cited to show that into every article he invested his talent and knowledge. Franz Mehring wrote: "True to himself, Marx ennobled the journalist's craft. He attached permanent value to his articles and saw that each had a scientific grounding."

The chapters on Marx's manuscripts on history, his numerous notes, etc., many of which still await publication, are of considerable interest.

The volume concludes with a chapter (by E. Chernyak) "Marx and New Trends in Bourgeois Historiology." In this and the last century there have been numerous attempts to refute the fundamentals of historical materialism. All of them have failed;

no one has been able to contrast to Marxism anything resembling a comprehensive theory of social development.

L. SH.

Das Kapital. Centenary Volume. A Symposium. Edited by Mohit Sen and N. B. Rao. People's Publishing House, New Delhi, 1968. 229 pp.

The appearance of this symposium, with 14 contributions by Marxist and university scholars, is a significant event in the development of Marxian thought in India. Put out as a tribute to Marx on the 100th anniversary of *Capital*, it goes beyond its original purpose of explaining the basic ideas of Marx's famous work and gives a Marxist analysis of socio-economic, philosophical and other problems confronting India and the underdeveloped part of the world.

The focus is on the present stage of India's economic and political development.

This is discussed by one of the editors, Mohit Sen, in his article "Indian Capitalism and Its Crisis," which dissects the country's development problems. Mohit Sen formulates his main idea in these words: "One would find (in India) so many specific features as to make it not a very special case of a capitalist crisis but rather a crisis of the capitalist path, of a structure of production relations and of policies flowing therefrom which are yet transitional." (p. 206)

Since independence India has enjoyed a relatively high growth rate and "has moved quite a distance from the period of colonialism" (p. 213). But this movement along the capitalist path has produced a number of negative phenomena. One of them, the author says, is growing economic dependence on the imperialist powers, participation in the capitalist international division of labor, which entails "neo-colonialism adapted to the specific conditions of India," the existence of a special type of capitalism, collaborationist or dependent capitalism. A higher growth rate in the public sector, which includes the bulk of heavy industry—created largely with the aid of the USSR and other socialist countries—leads the author to conclude that the public sector "provides a base for independent development and non-capitalist transition" (p. 207).

Summing up, Mohit Sen emphasizes that what we have in India is not a typical crisis of mature capitalism with all its inherent contradictions, but a crisis of the capitalist path of the development of collaborationist capitalism. "Its grave-diggers will be not only the workers but all the democratic classes of the nation" (p. 224).

Gyan Chand's article traces world population trends with special reference to India, where the percentage increase has risen from 0.7 in 1901-10 to 21.5 in 1961-67.

In Dr. Chand's opinion, study of the influence of the "demographic explosion" on all aspects of social life and on the possibility of planning population growth is hampered by the fact that there is no satisfactory population theory, either for capitalism or socialism. The starting point for any such theory, he believes, should be Marx's ideas on the decisive role of social factors. Dr. Chand rejects the bourgeois contention that family planning is the "alternative to communism." "It should be clearly realized," he writes, "that it is no alternative at all and revolution will take its own course, family planning or no family planning" (p. 27).

Another article of undoubted interest is "Das Kapital: Its Universals and Particulars," by Asok Sen. The author criticizes the Keynesian concept of capitalism and the views of bourgeois economists on the present state of the Indian economy, in which, the author says, "industrial capitalism never arrived at a predominating role." Even after two decades of political independence, India has still to go through its industrialization process. Full industrialization, he believes, can be achieved only by a national-democratic state. And he explains the economic and political preconditions for the emergence of such a state, showing that the national-democratic revolution in India can be completed only under the leadership of the working class, through non-capitalist development, by national-democratic transformations.

D. Chattopadhyaya contributes an article on "Indian Materialism." In his view, ancient Indian materialism is "the most significant trend of Indian philosophy" (p. 141). It is necessary, he says, to re-examine the well-known system of Indian philosophy, according to which materialism is restricted to the *Lokayata*. M.S.

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 1, 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 1, 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

