

**TAKING COUNSEL
WITH LENIN**
TIM BUCK
Page 3



**RUMANIA
&
EUROPEAN
SECURITY**

N. CEAUSESCU

Page 27

•

**SOME ROOTS
OF
OPPORTUNISM**

L. BECERRA

Page 65

•

**WORLD SURVEY
OF
CAPITALIST
ECONOMY**

Page 97

JUNE 1969

VOLUME 12 / NO. 6 / 35 CENTS



WORKERS OF ALL
COUNTRIES, UNITE!

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

Theoretical and
Information Journal
of Communist and
Workers' Parties

JUNE 1969
VOLUME 12
NUMBER 6

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 133, Ont.,
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 133, Ontario,
Canada.



WMR

CONTENTS

- | | | |
|---|----|--|
| T. BUCK | 3 | Taking counsel with Lenin on the problems of our time |
| J. WODDIS | 12 | Lenin and the international Communist movement |
| E. ROZENTAL | 22 | Lenin in Switzerland |
| N. CEAUSESCU | 27 | Rumania and European security |
| S. G. SARDESAI | 33 | Communications and comment
MINI-GENERAL ELECTION IN INDIA |
| | 40 | Our round table
SOCIALISM AND THE PEASANTRY
(Bulgarian Cooperative Farmers Speak) |
| K. KNIESTEDT | 57 | In the Communist and Workers' parties
WEST BERLIN: ANTI-IMPERIALIST STRUGGLE |
| C. UNNI RAJA
Ts. D. | 61 | Towards the Lenin Centenary
INDIA
THE MONGOLIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC |
| L. BECERRA | 65 | Viewpoints
SOME ROOTS OF OPPORTUNISM |
| J. E. PEREZ | 73 | Communists and the youth
STUDENTS AND DEMOCRACY IN MEXICO |
| P. G. ALBERDI | 77 | Pages from history
40th ANNIVERSARY OF FIRST CONFERENCE OF
LATIN-AMERICAN COMMUNISTS |
| A. KATSONIS | 83 | Against the persecution of democrats
MILLIONS OF HEARTS ECHO HIS HEARTBEAT
Documentary Report |
| F.K., S.G., F.A.
O. LEV
S. KHAMIS | 86 | Books and journals
VALUABLE CONTRIBUTION TO MARXIST-LENINIST
PHILOSOPHY
PATH OF GLORY
A BRAND OF ANTI-COMMUNISM |
| | 94 | In memoriam
PEOPLE'S GENERAL JUAN MODESTO |
| | 97 | Supplement
CAPITALIST ECONOMY: BUOYANCY BUT
MORE CONTRADICTIONS
Survey by Institute of World Economy and International
Relations, Academy of Sciences, U.S.S.R. |

Taking counsel with Lenin on the problems of our time

TIM BUCK

A striking phenomenon which confronts the Communist and Workers' parties, particularly in the capitalist countries, as we celebrate the centennial of Lenin's birth is that of the radical changes taking place in the forms of the opportunities for working class advance. Flowing out of the basic revolutionary change in the relation of world forces, started by the Great October Revolution and gathering momentum daily with the growing influence of socialism upon the course of world development, it seems in appearance that virtually every aspect of the struggle against imperialism has changed.

One of the important tokens of these changes is the growing scale of the class battles fought by workers in the capitalist countries for their rights, in which political demands and problems occupy an increasingly prominent place. The growth of state-monopoly capitalism in the leading capitalist states has sharpened the main contradictions of capitalism, adding a number of new ones related to the technological revolution. As a consequence, the social basis for battling the rule of the monopolies, for democratic transformations in the socio-economic structure of society, has broadened, offering new perspectives for the Communist parties and posing new tasks and problems.

The militancy and massive scale of the student and youth movements in the capitalist countries, objectively directed against the state-monopoly capitalist system, are another important token of change.

*All quotations are from the **Collected Works**, English translation, Progress Publishers, Moscow.

It is now up to the politically conscious vanguard of the working class to probe the causes behind the student actions and work for united action with them. Not until they act jointly with the working class will the students play an important role in the fight for revolutionary reconstruction.

The national liberation movement is an inseparable part of the world revolutionary process. The struggle of the peoples in the developing and the still colonial countries against imperialism and its attempts to retain its hold on them in one form or another, is exercising a substantial influence on the course of history. The U.S. aggression in Vietnam shows that imperialism will go to all lengths to preserve its positions in the world and that the success of the struggle against it hinges on the unity of all the anti-imperialist forces.

The fact that these changes are reaching their peak in the year of the centennial of Lenin's birth is pure coincidence, of course. But, what is certainly no coincidence is the fact that study of Lenin's work provides the infallible key to their solution in the process of the continuing enrichment of Marxism-Leninism by its correct application to the ever developing dialectics of life. In the immeasurable treasury of Lenin's writings there are direct answers to many of the new problems that confront us today. Even more important, however, is the fact that Lenin's work provides guidance in arriving at correct solutions to new and complicated problems, including those which are different from those that he himself faced,

because Lenin's life's work in every detail is the perfect example of a profound grasp of the fact that Marxism-Leninism is not a dogma but a guide to action.

One of the joys of systematic reference to Lenin and consistent return to him in connection with new questions which arise in the course of the class struggle, is that which comes with the unfailing reminder, whatever the question about which one takes counsel with him, of Lenin's tireless use of the tested truths of Marxism to discover that which was new in current problems. He was the uncompromising enemy of dogmatism. As early as 1899, in his article entitled "Our Program", Lenin emphasized the necessity for continued development and enrichment of Marxism on consistent use of it in the struggles of the working class. He wrote:

"We do not regard Marx's theory as something completed and inviolable; on the contrary, we are convinced that it has only laid the foundation stone of the science which socialists *must* develop in all directions if they wish to keep pace with life. We think that an *independent* elaboration of Marx's theory is especially essential for Russian socialists; for this theory provides only general *guiding* principles, which, *in particular*, are applied in England differently than in France, in France differently than in Germany, and in Germany differently than in Russia" (Vol. 4, pp. 211-212).

His star was the ideal of the abolition of the exploitation of man by man and of the oppression of nation by nation. He fought for the achievement of that lofty ideal with all the power of his mighty intellect and with energy and enthusiasm which knew no bounds. The completeness of his dedication to his ideal is expressed in the profound sense of personal responsibility which characterized Lenin. It made it mandatory for him to search out the scientifically correct answer for every problem, no matter how great or small it might be. It was expressed in his consistent emphasis upon the importance of settling even "seemingly minor" theoretical differences. It was expressed in his warning in "What Is To Be Done" in 1902 that: "The fate of Russian Social-Democracy for many years to come may depend on the strengthening of one or other 'shade'" (Vol. 5, p. 370).

This characteristic gave Lenin's life and all his work a purposefulness which was matched only by his genius. The amazing

creativity of his work flowed directly out of the combination of his recognition of the unique historical role of Marxism and his use of its revolutionary dialectic to reveal, always, that which was new in the continually changing situation. For example, consider his emphasis upon the sharp changes which took place in Russia after the defeat of the revolution of 1905, and note his insistence upon the search for Marxist answers to the new problems which had emerged.

"It is precisely because Marxism is not a lifeless dogma, not a completed, ready-made, immutable doctrine, but a living guide to action, that it was bound to reflect the astonishingly abrupt change in the conditions of social life. That change was reflected in profound disintegration and disunity, in every manner of vacillation, in short, in a very serious *internal* crisis of Marxism. Resolute resistance to this disintegration, a resolute and persistent struggle to uphold the *fundamentals* of Marxism, was again placed on the order of the day (Vol. 17, p. 42).

It was by his tireless and undeviating quest for the correct Marxist answers "*which do not permit of a double interpretation*" (Lenin's emphasis) that the victory of the Great October Revolution was prepared and achieved.

* * *

A striking example of the importance to the working class of Lenin's emphasis upon the indestructible relationship between correct theory and correct practice, is provided by his struggle for theoretical clarity concerning the aims of the Revolution, and the role of the working class and its party in 1905. The lesson of that struggle against the Right wing deviation and petty-bourgeois anarchist confusion is particularly dramatic because, carried through by Lenin to ideological victory, it played a major part in preparing the Great October Revolution. Without the correct political line and understanding for which Lenin's long struggle had won authority, the revolution would have been diverted and the fruits of its victories would have been dissipated, as was done with the German revolution in 1918.

The above facts make Lenin's booklet "*Two Tactics of Social Democracy in the Democratic Revolution*," required reading today. By drawing a hard-and-fast line between a truly revolutionary political course and the ideological and tactical

propositions of the Right-wing opportunists, Lenin made an important contribution to the preparation of the October Revolution. Those who look upon it as literature of the past which has no direct bearing upon the problems of our time, are missing a great experience and a penetrating light upon much of what is new in our current tasks.

"Two Tactics" is a classical example of Lenin's unlimited dedication to the struggle for clear understanding of the Party's position and of its tactical proposals as well as of its ultimate objective, and of the differences between the Party's principles and proposals and those advocated by others. Lenin placed special emphasis upon the necessity to clarify particularly the differences between the Party and those who pretended to be dedicated to "the same general goal in a somewhat different way". To reread that masterpiece of revolutionary polemics today, in the light of the Great October Revolution and the world revolutionary changes that have flowed out of that watershed of history, is like revisiting a little known scene and discovering new and richer rewards with every visit that we make.

Another example of how Lenin influenced the course of history by his recognition of the danger that was incipient in what at the time appeared to be only a difference of method to reach the same goal, is that of his fight against the anarchists. This is particularly interesting today because his arguments in that struggle, addressed to trade union meetings, party activists, the 10th Congress of the Communist Party, and to the people at large, are quite topical. He answered the very same doubts and the very same questions and challenged the same sort of proposals that are confusing a great many workers today.

This is not the place for a detailed description of that battle. The most important task that we could accomplish here would be to persuade more revolutionaries to read the record of it themselves. It should be noted incidentally that the record is relatively brief. Lenin "nipped in the bud" a potentially very dangerous trend. He aroused the core of the Communist Party by placing before its members, quite frankly, the real meaning of what until then had appeared to be only attempts to speed up the victory of socialism.

The circumstances, however, in which Lenin entered into that struggle and carried it through to victory must be noted.

It is a classical example of the compelling nature of his sense of personal responsibility. When he addressed a joint meeting of Communist delegates to the 8th Congress of Soviets, Communists members of the All-Russia Central Council of Trade Unions and Communist members of the Moscow City Council of Trade Unions, on December 30, 1920, he got up from a sick bed to speak to them. Note his modest apology to the meeting.

"Comrades, I must first of all apologize for departing from the rules of procedure, for anyone wishing to take part in the debate should have heard the report, the second report and the speeches. I am so unwell, unfortunately, that I have been unable to do this" (Vol. 32, p. 19).

The manner and method in which he carried through that struggle was a perfect example of his mastery of what may be called political in-fighting, as well as of public debate. It illustrates the unique combination of unequivocal and uncompromising struggle for the correct application of Marxism, with the supremely good-humored personal attitude and earnest effort to expose and defeat the error while saving the comrades who are making it. These were the personal characteristics which, along with the complete mastery of the science of Marxism, made Lenin the supreme party leader of our age.

Lenin explained carefully that what he was fighting against was, as yet, only a deviation, not yet fully formed and not yet expressed uniformly everywhere. It was finding expression in differing forms in seemingly unrelated and unconnected incidents in widely separated parts of the country. But he emphasized, its essence was that of a deviation towards petty-bourgeois anarchism. It was related directly to the situation in the Soviet Republic at that time, and the penetration of the Party by petty-bourgeois influence. Good humoredly he pointed out that one of its main public products so far had been "an abundance of platforms". And he added:

". . . We must take a hard look at this petty-bourgeois counter-revolution with its calls for freedom to trade . . . Behind a facade of workers' slogans it is trying to incite the petty-bourgeois anarchist elements against the workers. This, if successful, will lead directly to the overthrow of the dictatorship of the proletariat and, consequently, to the restoration of capital-

ism and of the old landowner and capitalist regime . . . A number of revolutions have clearly gone that way; we have always been mindful of that possibility and have warned against it. This undoubtedly demands of the ruling party of Communists, and of the leading revolutionary elements of the proletariat a different attitude to the one we have time and again displayed over the past year" (Vol. 32, pp. 185-86).

Lenin pinpointed the self-styled Workers' Opposition as the political spearhead of the petty-bourgeois counter-revolution and he so characterized it in public statements. But he recognized also that, because of the acute crisis in the country at that time, the demagogic propaganda of the Workers' Opposition appealed to a section of workers who supported the Party and Soviet power and even to some members of the Communist Party itself. Lenin point out: "This is the petty-bourgeois, anarchist element not only among the masses of the workers, but also in our own Party; and that is something we cannot tolerate in any circumstances" (*ibid.*, p. 204).

In that situation, for the Party to lose the active support of the organized workers or for a split to take place in the trade union movement might be fatal. Trotsky was advocating a radical change in the Party's approach to the trade unions which threatened to bring on one or both of those disasters. Lenin set himself the task of defeating Trotsky in the trade union conferences that were taking place prior to the 10th Congress of the Party and thereby liquidating the developing crisis in the trade unions before the 10th Congress of the Party took place.

In brief speeches to the Second All-Russia Congress of Miners, the Conference of Moscow Metal Workers, and in a pamphlet entitled "Once Again On the Trade Unions," Lenin transformed the character of the acrimonious controversy which was rocking the Soviet trade unions at that time and opening up the danger of a split. From the issue that had been created by Trotsky's proposal to initiate administratively a "shake-up" of their leadership and apparatus, Lenin raised the level of the discussion to that of the historically new place and role of the trade unions in the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In the course of that relatively brief ideological struggle Lenin formulated for the first time the Marxist definition of the vitally important place and role of the trade unions as basic organizations of the

ruling class, *but not state organs*, in the dictatorship of the proletariat. For example:

"In the transition to socialism the dictatorship of the proletariat is inevitable, but it is not exercised by an organization which takes in all industrial workers . . . What happens is that the Party, shall we say, absorbs the vanguard of the proletariat and this vanguard exercises the dictatorship of the proletariat" (Vol. 32, p. 20).

It is thrilling as well as educational to read those speeches and the pamphlet today. In addition to the simplicity of his language and the directness of his style, they illustrate the fact that so much of Lenin's ideological power derived from the manner in which he went directly, right to the heart of every question.

Having defeated Trotsky's erroneous project for a change in the Party's approach to the trade unions, and averted the threat of a split or disruption in the trade union movement, Lenin met the anarchist trend head on in the 10th Congress of the Communist Party. A pamphlet entitled *The Workers' Opposition* published by Comrade Kollontai was being distributed in the Congress. Reporting to the delegates on "The Political Work of the Central Committee", he said:

"I shall have to deal chiefly with this pamphlet to explain why the counter-revolution, to which I have referred, is assuming an anarchistic, petty-bourgeois form, why it is so vast and dangerous, and why the speakers from the Workers' Opposition have failed entirely to realize the danger" (Vol. 32, p. 194).

In direct and simple terms Lenin then showed the political ideological interrelation between the petty-bourgeois anarchistic demands and the policies indicated in the pamphlet entitled "The Workers' Opposition". Emphasizing the responsibility of the delegates to the Congress for the collective judgment passed on it, Lenin pointed out: "Comrade Kollontai writes on page 25 of her pamphlet, and this is one of the main points of the Workers' Opposition theses, the following:

" 'The organization of the management of the national economy is the function of an All-Russia Congress of Producers organized in trade and industrial unions, which shall elect a central body to run the whole of the national economy of the Republic' " (Vol. 32, p. 198).

He then repeated his lucid irrefutable explanation of why "a Congress of Produc-

ers" would in effect be a denial of and a challenge to the dictatorship of the proletariat and the reason why the dictatorship could be exercised only by the political vanguard "that has absorbed the revolutionary energy of the class."

The two resolutions adopted by the 10th Congress of the Russian Communist Party, on the Anarcho-Syndicalist Deviation and On Party Unity, are models of restraint. They express exactly Lenin's desire to correct ideological errors but to save the comrades who were making them. What they do not refer to, however, is, historically, even more important. By nipping in the bud the anarchist deviation, Lenin had influenced directly the course of history in the world as a whole.

* * *

Some readers may react to the foregoing with the thought that it is all true and no doubt very important as history, but it does not apply to the immediately pressing problems that confront us in the task of advancing the active struggle for socialism in the capitalist countries. Discussion of that point must be postponed now. To engage in it would divert us from a part of Lenin's work in which he deals with exactly that problem; namely, the problem of integrating Marxism in the mass struggles of the working class.

A central feature of that part of his work is his masterpiece *Left-Wing Communism—an Infantile Disorder*. It is true that, as Lenin himself pointed out in September 1917, history "has forged so far ahead that old formulas have acquired a new meaning" (Vol. 25, p. 279). But the lessons of *Left-Wing Communism* are as vivid today as they were when it was written.

In the arguments used and the people and parties referred to, *Left-Wing Communism* reflects the period in which it was written. In the struggle against Right opportunism and Leftist sectarianism at that time, Lenin dealt concretely with the actual phenomena as they appeared in various countries and parties — so concretely in fact that his arguments could be neither evaded nor denied. But, if the names of parties and individuals are ignored, his arguments are contemporaneous. For example, consider his arguments on the question of compromises:

"A political leader who desires to be useful to the revolutionary proletariat must be

able to distinguish *concrete* cases of compromises that are inexcusable and are an expression of opportunism and *treachery*; he must direct all the force of criticism, the full intensity of merciless exposure and relentless war, against these *concrete* compromises, and not allow the past masters of 'practical' socialism and the parliamentary Jesuits to dodge and wriggle out of responsibility by means of disquisitions on 'compromises in general' " (Vol. 31, p. 37).

When *Left-wing Communism* was first published its effect upon Communist parties, and all serious radicals everywhere, was revolutionary. Lenin's treatment of the key tasks of the Communist and Workers' parties in the struggle for socialism came as a revelation. It changed the thinking of millions of workers. Opposition to that booklet or disagreement with sections of it came to mean opposition to serious struggle for socialism. In Canada, and undoubtedly in most other countries, a number of men who had enjoyed great authority among radical workers until then, refused or were unable, to change themselves and undertake a systematic struggle to make the principles set forth in *Left-Wing Communism* the living expression of the activity of the revolutionary working class movement. They were left by the wayside and became political deadwood, with no influence whatsoever in the working class movement.

The theme which runs like an unbroken thread through *Left-Wing Communism* is that of the fundamental necessity for Communist and Workers' parties to maintain unflinching loyalty to the principles of Marxism along with complete flexibility of tactics, and to carry their message patiently but unequivocally everywhere where the masses are. This is one of the characteristics of the booklet which makes it invaluable today. First of all, the booklet abounds with guiding precepts for the struggle to build the Communist and Workers' parties as well as to improve the quality of their work among all sections of the population. The development of youthful leaders, the relation of party, class and mass, the attitude of a party to its own mistakes, the role of the vanguard, the fundamental law of revolution, these are but examples of its wealth of guidance.

A change which makes *Left-Wing Communism* increasingly valuable is that in the alignment of class forces. In some capitalist countries political developments

have reached the stage that is indicated in Lenin's statement in his article "A Caricature of Marxism", that in certain circumstances "... peaceful surrender of power by the bourgeoisie is possible if it is convinced that resistance is hopeless and if it prefers to save its skin" (Vol. 23, p. 69).

The growing influence of the socialist world system upon world relations, the growing weight of the organized working class movement and of the great popular movements for peace, civil rights, and national independence, in that part of the world which, for the time being, is still dominated by imperialism, all those factors combine to open up possibilities for the bringing about of radical changes in the relation of class forces in some countries. Provided such a change in the relation of class forces is achieved, effective combination of electoral strength with great mass movements of the people will create the possibility of carrying through the transition from capitalism to socialism without civil war.

The immediate task is to bring about the change in the relation of class forces. This is not a problem of numbers; in the capitalist countries the numerical weight of the working class is ample. It is ideological, that is to say, it is the problem of advancing the conscious aims and demands of the trade unions and other democratic mass movements to those of the quality which strike at the foundations of state-monopoly capitalism; and hence to demands for the revolutionary socialist transformation of society. In short, the need is to extend throughout the working class the break from bourgeois ideology.

A break from bourgeois ideology by a substantial proportion of the presently purely reformist movements will be a qualitative advance of the working class struggle as a whole. And the actual distance to be travelled is not so great as appears at first glance. Objectively, the working class is the decisive force in this epoch. Subjectively, it is already in advanced conflict with the capitalist class. In every imperialist country, the trade unions are being impelled increasingly into action on political issues, some of them potentially of a basic character. The broad masses of democratic people who are fighting against the criminal United States aggression in Vietnam, for civil rights, for national independence, etc., all are raising the banner of anti-imperialism by their mass struggles. Victory in the struggle

against United States aggression in Vietnam will open the floodgates of a broad new democratic advance in a large part of the capitalist world. It is noteworthy that in the United States, a national commission appointed by President Johnson, concludes its interim report to President Nixon with the following gloomy conclusion: "The basis of the social order is threatened" by the spreading social disturbances in the U.S. (Progress Report of the National Commission on Violence. Washington, D.C., January 30, 1969).

More than at any previous period in history, scores of millions of workers are receptive to the idea of radical social change. More and more they are becoming aware of the fact that only by the defeat of imperialism will meaningful democratic change be achieved. To advance the demands and the understanding of the trade union and other mass movements and through them to extend understanding of the necessity for the revolutionary socialist transformation of society is a practical possibility in every capitalist country today. That is what *Left-Wing Communism* is all about.

It requires systematic application of the lessons and the ideas that Lenin set forth in his booklet. Such application today is at a much higher political level than that at which the majority of parties applied it in the past. The trade unions, even those which are still under ultra-reactionary leadership, are engaged in struggles of a much higher level than was the case until quite recently. Parliamentary activity hinges upon much more advanced issues than was the case even five years ago. The issue of war or peace, of the very survival of civilization is a vital issue today. To make the implications of this issue understood and to win support for proposals in connection with it is an immediate challenge to Communist and Workers' parties and to all revolutionary workers everywhere. In this struggle *Left-Wing Communism* is an invaluable guide.

* * *

A number of young militants who proclaim themselves to be Marxists question the importance of an integral world outlook. In the main they tend to take the position that the important thing is to "get where the action is!" As a rule this sentiment is very commendable. Unhesitating readiness to get into militant action is a quality which is indispensable to the true

revolutionary. Along with such qualities, however, it is necessary to have a clear perspective which includes the ultimate objective, and a coherent tactical line by which to achieve it. All too often young militants, and some who are not so young, tend to consider that "to get where the action is" is all that is necessary. Some of them go so far as to declare that they have "open minds" concerning various non-Leninist and even anti-Leninist currents of opinion. Those of such young militants who are earnest, and seriously interested in the ideal of communism, would reap a rich reward by taking counsel with Lenin today. His comments in the review of the magazine "The Youth International" are well known, but it is worthwhile to repeat them here:

"Organizations of youth . . . which openly declare that they are still learning, that their main task is to train party workers for the socialist parties, . . . must be given every assistance. We must be patient with their faults and strive to correct them gradually, mainly by *persuasion*, and not by fighting them" (Vol. 23, p. 164).

Lenin stood equally for frank discussion and where necessary criticism as between the youth and the adult organizations. As he said:

"A worker who wishes to participate independently in deciding the destiny of his party will not waive aside polemics, even if they are not quite intelligible at first sight, but will earnestly seek until he finds the truth" (Vol 19, p. 149).

For a serious young militant, acceptance of the general idea that Lenin was right is not enough. His or her interest must be developed into a direct personal desire to know *how* Lenin would have dealt with every problem. The desire for a more penetrating knowledge of Lenin is the mother of the joy of being able to relate creatively what Lenin described as "the old but eternally new truths of Marxism".

It is a failure to develop in that direction and the resulting passive acceptance of the general idea that Lenin was right, without cultivating an insatiable desire to understand *how right*, and why, which sometimes deteriorates into a subconscious acceptance of the qualifying words "in his time". That is the insidious beginning of the attitude which is expressed by reference to those who emphasize the fundamental significance of Lenin as "dogmatic old folks who never read anything fresh or new".

We are not discussing here the question as to whether such statements are conscious or subconscious rejection of Marxism, in favor of something "fresh or new." Objectively, it is so. What we want to emphasize here is the fact that such immature counterposing of "new" or "fresh" to the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism is all too often a reflection of the fact that the Communist Party concerned has not succeeded in interesting such young people in the struggle to defend, and to work to enrich, the teachings of Lenin, and their lessons for the revolutionary movement today. As a result, their objectives are confused and they easily become the victims of petty-bourgeois revolutionism or of confusion expressed in such statements as how do we expect the Communist Party to be elected to government office if it gives affront to the petty-bourgeois democratic illusions of the masses. Such young people could learn a lot from Lenin's letter on the tasks of the revolutionary youth published in the *Student* in September 1903. Congratulating the magazine for its frank recognition of the necessity for organizing the students around the ideal of socialism, he wrote:

"By recognizing that 'revolutionary sentiment *alone* cannot bring ideological unity among the students', that 'this requires a socialist ideal based upon one or another socialist world outlook' and, moreover, 'a definite and integral' outlook, the editors of *Student* have broken in principle with ideological indifference and theoretical opportunism and put the question of the way to revolutionize the students on a proper footing" (Vol. 7, p. 43).

Lenin polemized against those who talked grandiloquently about "revolutionizing" the student body in general, pretending to believe that organization of revolutionary students in their own political unit would prevent unity of the student body as a whole. He pointed out that the student body in every university tends to reflect the political differences which prevail among the population as a whole. To talk of uniting the student body as a whole politically, is in fact a camouflage for excluding serious revolutionary politics altogether, which call for an irrevocable choice of one of the trends. As he said:

"Whoever protests against such a choice on the plea of effecting ideological unity among the students, of revolutionizing them in general, and so forth, is obscuring socialist consciousness and is in actual fact

preaching absence of ideological principles" (Vol. 7, p. 55).

Yes, Lenin was frank. Young militants who are anxious to emphasize their belief that the socialist revolution in their country will be different from the October Revolution in Russia have an ally in Lenin. He would have agreed with them completely—in fact he was ahead of them. As early as October 1916 he wrote of the differences in the expressions of capitalism in their concrete aspects from country to country. And he added:

"All nations will arrive at socialism—this is inevitable, but all will do so in not exactly the same way, each will contribute something of its own to some form of democracy, to some variety of the dictatorship of the proletariat, to the varying rate of socialist transformation in the different aspects of social life" (Vol. 23, pp. 69-70).

In his review of "The Youth International" referred to above, Lenin emphasized that "... it is the organ of seething, turbulent, inquiring youth." However, he warned, our attitude towards lack of theoretical clarity on the part of organizations of youth which declare that they are still learning, must be one of patient help. It must be noted though, his point was, that patient help should be directed to bring the youth towards a consistent Marxist position.

Lenin was a tireless and consistent champion of the idea that the youth must learn in their own way. He was equally a champion of the idea that they should be encouraged and helped to study Marxism—not as a lifeless dogma but with all the richness of its revolutionary dialectic. His attitude was expressed clearly in the resolution "On the Attitude Towards the Student Youth" that he wrote for the Second Congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party, held in Brussels and London in July and August 1903. His resolution started with the words:

"The Second Congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party welcomes the growing revolutionary initiative among the student youth and calls upon all organizations of the Party to give them every possible assistance in their efforts to organize" (Vol. 6, p. 471).

The resolution included a recommendation that student groups should seek to imbue their members with an integral and consistent socialist world outlook, a thorough acquaintance with Marxism. It warned them against "false friends" of the

youth who divert them by recourse to empty revolutionary or idealistic phrasemongering, etc.

For young people who are endowed with a serious desire to know, Lenin is still the best guide and counsellor today.

* * *

A question concerning which there is an inexhaustible treasury of information and guidance in Lenin's writings is that of democracy and the role of democratic action. It is a striking commentary that this is, also, the very question concerning which misunderstanding, and cultivated confusion, about Lenin's position is most widespread. Rather wide circles of democratic people, including some who support the Communist Party, are under the misapprehension that, recognizing the possibility of a peaceful transition to socialism in certain circumstances and extending and intensifying electoral action with the aim of bringing about such circumstances, constitutes a departure from Leninism. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Lenin always emphasized the integral relationship, the interweaving of the struggle for democracy and for socialism. In 1905, combatting the anarchists' petty-bourgeois adventurist attitude to the gathering of democratic forces of the revolution, Lenin wrote:

"Whoever wants to reach socialism by any other path than that of political democracy, will inevitably arrive at conclusions that are absurd and reactionary both in the economic and the political sense" (Vol. 9, p. 29).

For a certain period in 1917, Lenin believed that, given the necessary conditions, a peaceful transfer of power was possible. But the Mensheviks and Socialists Revolutionaries who had a majority in the Soviets rejected the Bolshevik proposal. The possibility for a peaceful transfer of power passed, since the Provisional Government employed armed force. As Lenin pointed out "... in time of revolution it is not enough to ascertain 'the will of the majority'—you must *prove to be stronger* at the decisive moment and in the decisive place; you must *win*" (Vol. 25, p. 201).

While fighting consistently for democratic advance, Lenin pointed out that democracy too is domination by one part of the population over the other. There is no such phenomenon as pure or abstract democra-

cy. Bourgeois democracy, historically very much advanced from feudalism or the democracy of slave owners, is the form that has been developed systematically by the capitalist class, to serve and protect its interests, i.e., the interests of capitalism. The formal democratic point of view is precisely the point of view of bourgeois democracy, i.e., the capitalist class.

Victory in the Great October Revolution created the possibility of and the imperative necessity for the dictatorship of the proletariat. As Lenin explained to the delegates gathered in the Third World Congress of the Comintern:

"The dictatorship of the proletariat does not signify a cessation of the class struggle, but its continuation in a new form and with new weapons. This dictatorship is essential as long as classes exist, as long as the bourgeoisie, overthrown in one country, intensifies tenfold its attacks on socialism on an international scale" (Vol. 32, p. 460).

The dictatorship of the proletariat is the expression, in the character of the State, of the fact that the interest of socialism,

of the revolutionary class struggle of the proletariat, is supreme. Lenin's historic booklet, *The Proletarian Revolution and the Renegade Kautsky* will stand for all time as the definitive analysis of the historical relationship of bourgeois democracy to the socialist revolution. He showed clearly how, against the victory of socialism all the forces of reaction group themselves around fake slogans of "democracy" and "freedom." The petty-bourgeois democrats who unite with the forces of reaction in such efforts serve merely as a political screen for the forces of international capital and the aim of restoring capitalist rule. He showed incontrovertibly that, as long as imperialism and classes persist, socialist democracy can be developed only under the protection of the dictatorship of the proletariat. To accomplish that, the interests of socialism must be supreme.

The combination in Lenin of splendid passion and political wisdom is in itself good reason why we can all benefit today by taking counsel with Lenin on the problems of our time.

Lenin and the International Communist Movement

JACK WODDIS

The span of Lenin's life, from 1870 to 1924, covered an epoch of decisive change in human history. During his more than three decades of political activity Lenin, founder of the party of a new type, more clearly than anyone else, was able to discern the essence of the new phenomena, to foresee what changes this necessitated in the work and organization of the revolutionaries, to lead the Russian workers to the victory of October 1917. Under Lenin's leadership the advanced detachments of the working class in every country rallied under the banner of Marxism, purged of the opportunism which had killed the Second International, and in opposition to the ultra-leftism which had laid low the First International.

Lenin's contributions to the international Communist movement were so all-embracing that in one short article it is not possible to deal adequately with more than some of them. On every important question facing the movement—the character of imperialism, the fight against imperialist war, the roots of opportunism and social chauvinism, the building of revolutionary parties, the strategy and tactics of revolutionary struggle in the epoch of imperialism, the role of the working class and its alliance with the peasantry, the role of national liberation struggles, internationalism, the struggle against anarchists and ultra-leftism, the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the question of democracy, economic planning and socialist construction, the fight for peace and peaceful coexistence between states of different social systems, the use of varied forms of class struggle, attitude to bourgeois parliaments, the art of insurrection, knowing

when and how to retreat, and the role of the Communist Party—on all of these, and many other questions, Lenin provided exhaustive answers, left a legacy of thought, of writings, of practice which enriched the thinking and activity of the whole international working class movement, and played an indispensable role in bringing it clarity and direction at a decisive turning point in world history.

BETRAYAL BY THE LEADERS OF THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL AND LENIN'S STRATEGY

It was the special genius of Lenin that he was able to analyze the change taking place in capitalism and to see not only the strength of monopoly capital, but also the "forces which counteract imperialism generally and opportunism in particular." (V. I. Lenin, *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*.) Imperialism, he saw, would result in a great sharpening of all the contradictions of capitalism—that between the capitalists and the workers, between monopoly capitalism and the widest strata of the people defending their conditions and democratic rights against the growing concentration of economic and political power in the hands of the big trusts, between the imperialist countries and the oppressed nations in the colonies. The contradictions between the imperialist powers, too, he saw, would become sharper as a result of the uneven rate of development of capitalism, and, in their struggle to redivide the world, the powers would resort to war. This in itself, would further sharpen all these contradictions, leading the world crisis of capitalism to snap it at its weakest link.

On the basis of a thorough analysis Lenin, in his *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, drew the conclusion that imperialism was the eve of the proletarian revolution—and accordingly directed his efforts to preparing the Russian working class for this task, and to inspiring and winning the international working class movement for this same understanding, and to create of the need for revolutionary parties capable of leading the workers in these new complex and difficult conditions.

This was no easy task. The European working-class movement, the trade unions and Socialist parties which were the main base of the Second International, had grown immensely in numbers and organized strength prior to 1914. The Socialist International, on the eve of the war, had twelve million workers affiliated. It was a potentially powerful force, but its leaders who in words still remained faithful to Marxism, in practice had steadily succumbed to opportunism, concentrating on winning reforms within the system, on obtaining limited benefits for sections of the working class, and abandoning the struggle to overthrow capitalism. How deep the corruption had set in was not at first clear in the first decade of the twentieth century. It was the world war of 1914-1918 which at one blow shattered the illusions of the reformists of a gradual evolution to socialism, and revealed to millions of people the real character of imperialism. In this crisis the Second International completely failed the people, and its opportunist leaders passed over to the side of their own bourgeoisie.

It was at this decisive turning-point for mankind that Lenin displayed his great capacity for leadership and was able to show the working class the way out of the morass and degradation of imperialist war, in which millions were being slaughtered.

Already, in the years before 1914, the Socialist International had repeatedly discussed the danger of the oncoming war and had worked out its attitude to the war if it came. At its Stuttgart Congress in 1907 a resolution was passed pointing to the danger of a world war. This resolution was later endorsed by the International Socialist Congress in Copenhagen in 1910 and at Basle in 1912. The resolution declared:

"If war threatens to break out, it is the duty of the working class in the countries concerned, and of their parliamentary representatives, supported by the coordinating

activity of the International Socialist Bureau, to exert every effort to prevent the outbreak of war by all the means which seem to them most appropriate, having regard to the sharpness of the class war and of the general political situation.

"Should war none the less break out, their duty is to intervene to bring it promptly to an end, and with all their energies to strive to utilise the economic and political crisis created by the war in order to arouse the masses and thereby to hasten the overthrow of capitalist class rule."

Lenin characterized the original resolution moved at the 1907 Congress as being "dogmatic, one-sided and dead," and finding the alternative drafts of the French delegation entirely inadequate, Lenin proposed amendments which were carried in the main. These amendments, drafted by Lenin and Rosa Luxemburg, and moved by the latter on behalf of the Bolshevik Party, were the basis of the resolution and became the main guiding line for all revolutionary socialists during the war. Thus, combating the opportunism of the Second International leaders, Lenin was exercising his influence and giving leadership to the whole international socialist movement.

When the war broke out in 1914, Lenin immediately threw himself into the struggle for the line of the Basle Congress resolution. His thesis *The Task of Revolutionary Social-Democracy in the European War*, endorsed by Bolsheviks abroad and in Russia, was subsequently developed into the manifesto of the Central Committee of the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party, written by Lenin and published in November 1914. The thesis was discussed at the Lugano conference of the Italian and Swiss Socialist parties, September 27, 1914.

Throughout the war Lenin ceaselessly hammered away—in speeches, in articles, in lectures, pamphlets and books—explaining the nature of imperialism, and the character of the war, stressing the need for a class approach to questions of war and peace, exposing the betrayal by the opportunists who had become social-chauvinists, and showing the revolutionary way out of the crisis of the war. In this task, Lenin was not directing himself solely to the Russian working people. He directed the entire world movement towards internationalism, towards revolutionary struggle against the war.

Repeatedly he pointed out that the war was not in the interests of the working people of any country, but a war of plun-

der, for colonies, for profits; a war between capitalist giants who, continuing their politics by other means, were striving forcibly to redivide the world in the interests of their big trusts. For this reason, "the question as to which of these two robbers first drew the knife has no significance for us whatever."

But, stressed Lenin, it was not enough to be against the war, and against one's government, it was necessary to turn the imperialist war into a civil war. In an article, *Defeat of One's Own Government in the Imperialist War*, he wrote: "A revolutionary class in a reactionary war cannot but desire the defeat of its own government."

Nearly two years later, in a lecture delivered in Petrograd on May 27, 1917, he declared: "There is no easy way out of this terrible war. Fighting has been going on for three years. You will either go on fighting for ten years or agree to make a difficult and severe revolution. There is no other way out. We say: the war which was started by the capitalist governments can be brought to an end only by a workers' revolution. . . . War is not a game; war is a terrible thing, war entails millions of victims, and it cannot be brought to an end so easily. . . . The war was called forth by the ruling classes; it can be brought to an end only by a working class revolution. . . . When power passes to the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies the capitalists will oppose us . . . the governments of all countries will oppose us. The capitalists will oppose us; but the workers will support us. Then—the war which the capitalists started will come to an end. This is the reply to the question of how to end the war."

Under the leadership of the Bolshevik Party, the Russian workers and peasants turned their guns against their own government, turned the imperialist war into a civil war and carried through the working-class revolution for which Lenin had called. The imperialist war ended on the eastern front, and the ensuing revolutionary upheavals and mounting anti-war feeling in the countries still at war brought the imperialist conflict to an end. The attempt of the imperialist powers to strangle the young Soviet Republic at birth was defeated by the courage and determination of the Russian workers and peasants, aided by the solidarity of the international working-class movement. The internationalism, the spirit of unity between workers in all lands, which Lenin had done so much to foster

and which drew fresh inspiration from the October Revolution in Russia, was tested and found powerful expression in the British "Hands off Russia" movement, in the Black Sea Revolt of the French Navy, and the opposition throughout Europe and in other countries, to the war of intervention.

BREAKING WITH OPPORTUNISM—A PRECONDITION FOR RALLYING THE REVOLUTIONARY FORCES

Throughout the war Lenin had had to direct powerful ideological and political blows against opportunism and social-chauvinism, and to expose its roots. After the victory of the October Revolution, Lenin, despite the immense domestic tasks facing him, continued to devote attention to the question of the international Communist movement. Already with the collapse of the Second International, at the outset of the war, Lenin had seen the necessity to break completely with the opportunists and to gather together on an international scale, the genuine revolutionary forces.

The European war had, he wrote, been the greatest crisis of all, "the beginning of a new epoch." It had sharpened all the deeply hidden antagonisms, brought them to the surface, "tearing apart all the hypocritical cloaks, rejecting all conventionality, destroying all discredited or half-discredited authorities." The Second International, which Lenin recognized had accomplished "the extraordinarily important and useful work of spreading Socialism over large areas and of preparing the initial, more rudimentary organization of Socialist forces," had completed its historical work, and had died at the hands of opportunism. The task now was to rebuild the International on a principled basis, on the basis of those who were "capable of defending Socialist internationalism in practice." This, he stressed, would be no easy task. It would require "much preparation, great sacrifices, it will not fail to suffer defeats." But precisely because it was a difficult and essential task, it had to be done "in company with those only who wish to do it, who are not afraid of a complete break with the chauvinists and with the defenders of social-chauvinism."

Analyzing the main currents then existing in the international movement, Lenin concluded that there had to be "a decisive break and rupture" with the opportunists who supported their own governments in the war. Internationalism could be defend-

ed only by those who were "consistent enemies of opportunism." As for those who vacillated and were confused, a part of them could be "saved and restored to Socialism," but only by decisively breaking with opportunism. Lenin made it absolutely clear that not only was it necessary for the new International to break with the opportunists, but that neither could it embrace those wanting to continue flirting with the discredited Right-wing opportunists. "We must," wrote Lenin, "take the initiative in creating a revolutionary International directed against the *socialist-chauvinists* and against the Centre." (*The Tasks of the Proletariat in the Present Revolution*, April 20, 1917). "The thing," emphasized Lenin, "is not to 'proclaim' internationalism, but to be able to be internationalist in deed, even when times are most trying."

LENIN, FOUNDER AND LEADER OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

The Russian Communist Party took the initiative to establish the new International. Invitations to attend the Foundation Congress were sent out in January 1919 in the name of six Communist Parties (Russia, Poland, Hungary, Austria, Latvia and Finland), the Balkan Revolutionary Social-Democratic Federation and a representative of the Socialist Labor Party of the United States. The Congress was held in Moscow on March 4-7, 1919, and as a result the new Communist International was founded.

In an article on the new International (*Pravda*, March 6, 1919) Lenin wrote: "We have recorded what has already been won. We have written down what has already taken a firm grip on the people's minds. Everyone knew, and what is more, everyone saw, felt, sensed, each from his own country's experience, that a new proletarian movement was in full swing." In a speech to celebrate the founding of the Communist International, Lenin emphasized the international role being played by the Russian workers and their new socialist state: "You can see we are fighting not only to win socialism for ourselves, not only to ensure that our children shall only recollect capitalists and landowners as prehistoric monsters; we are fighting to ensure that the workers of the whole world triumph together with us."

Summing up the significance of the formation of the Communist International, Lenin wrote:

"The First International laid the founda-

tion of the proletarian international struggle for socialism.

"The Second International marked a period in which the soil was prepared for the broad, mass spread of the movement in a number of countries.

"The Third International has gathered the fruits of the work of the Second International, discarded its opportunist, social-chauvinist, bourgeois and petty-bourgeois dross, and *has begun to implement the dictatorship of the proletariat.*

"The international alliance of the parties which are leading the most revolutionary movement in the world, the movement of the proletariat for the overthrow of the yoke of capital, now rests on an unprecedentedly firm base, in the shape of several *Soviet Republics*, which are implementing the dictatorship of the proletariat and are the embodiment of victory over capitalism on an international scale.

"The epoch-making significance of the Third, Communist International lies in its having begun to give effect to Marx's cardinal slogan, the slogan which sums up the centuries-old development of socialism and the working class movement, the slogan which is expressed in the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat . . . A new era in world history has begun." (*The Third International and its Place in History: Communist International, No. 1, May 1919*).

In all the work of the Communist International, up until the Fourth Congress in 1922, Lenin played a decisive role, drafting many of the key documents, helping to work out the key questions of Communist strategy and tactics, maintaining close personal contact with the new Communist parties and their leaders, patiently discussing and arguing with them in order to win them over to clear Marxist positions, and to learn from them and from the experiences the movement in their countries was undergoing. The main documents and speeches are available to read; but the countless discussions that Lenin had with so many revolutionary leaders, the helpful advice, the searching questions, the practical suggestions—all this was never recorded, but it lives on in the work of the Parties which Lenin did so much to assist in their decisive formative years.

THE FIGHT AGAINST THE "HEROES" OF THE PSEUDO-REVOLUTIONARY PHRASE

One of Lenin's major contributions in this period was his exposure of the dangers of

leftism, of pseudo-revolutionary phraseology, of sectarianism and adventurism. During the first world war Lenin had had to devote most of his attention to the political fight against Right-wing opportunism, against the open betrayal of the Right-wing leaders of Social-Democracy who had rallied behind their own bourgeoisie, for it was this betrayal that was the main danger to be fought in the international working-class movement at that time. But in the period after October 1917, Lenin found it necessary to turn his fire as well against "Left" adventurism, against the "heroes" of the pseudo-revolutionary phrase.

In the course of this essential political battle Lenin defended the positions of Marxism, and enriched the understanding of the international movement of the strategy and tactics of revolutionary struggle. Throughout 1918 he poured out a constant stream of articles and speeches, denouncing the dangers of ultra-leftism which had raised its head in opposition to Lenin's proposals to establish peace with Germany and accept the harsh terms of a peace with annexations and the payment of an indemnity. Those opposed to Lenin argued in favor of waging a "revolutionary war" against Germany, and denounced the proposal to make a separate peace with Germany as "an imperialist deal" and a betrayal of "the fundamental principles of proletarian internationalism."

The young Soviet Republic faced a desperate position. The workers and peasants were exhausted by the war, "choked in blood" as one Russian soldier put it to Lenin. As Lenin himself wrote in explanation of the decision to sign "an annexationist and unbelievably harsh peace treaty with Germany," it had to be done because "we have no army and cannot defend ourselves." Trotsky's initial refusal to carry out Lenin's request and sign the Treaty at Brest-Litovsk, and the subsequent opposition of the "Left" Communists to signing, only resulted in the Germans attacking, thus placing the Soviet Government in an even worse position and compelling it to accept terms even more damaging than those previously presented.

In his intense political battle in the first months of 1918 to defeat the opponents of peace with Germany, Lenin found it necessary to deal with the particular arguments that were posed against his line. He did this in masterly fashion in his article *The Revolutionary Phrase* (published in *Pravda*, February 21, 1918) in which Lenin examined

each argument and demolished it with powerful logic and political analysis.

In doing this, he elaborated his general ideas on the dangers of ultra-leftism and leftist phraseology, and thus equipped the whole international movement with valuable weapons with which to fight this political disease.

The essence of the question facing the Russian workers, stressed Lenin, was how best to defend Soviet power and prepare it to play its essential role within the world revolutionary process. It was vital to gain time ("even a brief respite for organizational work") — and to gain time it was necessary to surrender space. The whole problem was one of tactics, of understanding the need to make a temporary retreat so as to be in a better position later to make an advance. It was a question of knowing when and how to fight, of choosing the most advantageous conditions for fighting and not those which were best for the enemy and worse for oneself.

In an article *Where is the Mistake?* written at the end of February 1918, Lenin pointed out: "Surrender, generally speaking, is a bad thing, but this praiseworthy truth does not decide every individual proposition, for refusal to fight under obviously unfavorable conditions can also be called surrender, but *such* surrender is obligatory for a serious revolutionary." Again, in a speech to the meeting of the All-Russia C.E.C., February 24, 1918, he said: "... it is best, of course, to answer oppression by a revolutionary war, by an uprising, but, unfortunately, history has shown that it is not always possible to answer oppression by an uprising. But to refrain from an uprising does not mean refraining from the revolution."

Denouncing "revolutionary phrasemaking," Lenin described it as "a disease from which revolutionary parties suffer at times when they constitute, directly, or indirectly, a combination, alliance or intermingling of proletarian and petty-bourgeois elements, and when the course of revolutionary events is marked by big, rapid, zig-zags. By revolutionary phrasemaking we mean the repetition of revolutionary slogans irrespective of objective circumstances at a given turn of events, in the given state of affairs obtaining at the time. The slogans are superb, alluring, intoxicating, but there are no grounds for them..." Lenin called this disease "the itch". He recognized that this habit of revolutionary phrasemaking often arises "from the best, the noblest and loft-

iest of impulses," but he warned that it "does not cease to be harmful on that account." (*Pravda*, February 22, 1918.)

AGAINST THE "LEFT" DEVIATION IN THE INTERNATIONAL MOVEMENT

Opposition to the signing of a peace with Germany was not the only form of leftism with which Lenin had to contend. The young Communist parties that came into being after 1917, and became part of the international Communist movement, manifested leftist tendencies in a number of ways, especially in opposition to working in bourgeois parliaments and against working in reactionary trade unions. Lenin, therefore, found it necessary to assist the international movement by discussing these questions and formulating clearly his ideas on them, drawing on the experience of the Bolshevik Party. This he did in particular in his book, *"Left-Wing" Communism, an Infantile Disorder*, April-May, 1920.

Lenin saw the need for Communists to master such a form of political action as parliamentary struggle the importance of which was underrated by many at the time. Parliamentary elections and parliamentary struggle, wrote Lenin, are "obligatory for the party of the revolutionary proletariat precisely for the purpose of educating the backward strata of *its own class*, precisely for the purpose of awakening and enlightening the undeveloped, down-trodden, ignorant peasant masses." In reply to the arguments of William Gallacher, at that time a member of the Scottish Workers' Committee, and an outspoken champion of anti-parliamentarianism, Lenin praised his noble, proletarian hatred of bourgeois politicians as the beginning of wisdom, but went on to explain that "if it wants to conquer the bourgeoisie the proletariat must train *its own* proletarian 'class politicians' who shall be as skilled as the bourgeois politicians."

Lenin was in no way suggesting that Communists approach the question of Parliament in the same way as reformists, who posed elections and Parliament against the mass struggles of the workers. Lenin, on the contrary, argued: "The Communists in West Europe and America must learn to create a new, unusual, non-opportunist, non-careerist parliamentarianism . . . (they) should everywhere set people thinking, draw the masses into activity, hold the bourgeoisie to their word and utilize the apparatus they have set up, the elections they have

appointed, the appeals they have made to the whole people, and tell the people what Bolshevism is in a way that has never been possible (under bourgeois rule) outside of elections . . . It is very difficult to do this in West Europe and America, very, very difficult; but it can and must be done."

Writing in the period after the Great October Revolution of 1917, in the midst of revolutionary upheavals in Europe and Asia, and faced with the necessity to struggle sharply against the opportunist trends that were still strong in the European working-class movement, Lenin wisely warned the international movement to be ready to change to other forms of struggle. At all times, whatever use could be made of parliamentary struggle by the revolutionary parties (and this possibility, of course, was not open at all to the movements in many countries), Lenin's main emphasis was always on the mass struggle of the working people. He never reduced the struggle solely to that in the parliamentary arena, but stressed the need to master all forms of struggle and the ability to apply them, depending on the concrete situation. "In order to accomplish its task," Lenin wrote, "the revolutionary class must be able to muster *all* forms and aspects of social activity without exception." And since, as the history of revolutions shows, the concrete situation and the alignments of forces are changing continually, "the revolutionary class must be prepared for the most rapid and brusque replacement of one form by another."

The most important task of the Communist parties, in Lenin's view, was to win the confidence of the masses, learn to lead the masses. Hence the importance he attached to Communists working in the trade unions. Lenin clearly saw the need of winning the masses away from their reformist illusions and from their support of the Right-wing leaders. This lay behind Lenin's approach to work in even the most reactionary-led trade unions.

He took sharp issue with the German "Left" Communists on this very question. "To forget this most elementary and self-evident truth would be stupid. But the German 'Left' Communists are guilty of just this stupidity when, *because* of the reactionary and counter-revolutionary character of the *heads* of the trade unions they jump to the conclusion that . . . it is necessary to leave the trade unions !! to refuse to work in them !! to create new, *artificial* forms of labor organization !! This is an unpardon-

able blunder equivalent to the greatest service the Communists could render the bourgeoisie . . . To refuse to work in the reactionary trade unions means leaving the insufficiently developed or backward masses of the workers under the influence of the reactionary leaders, agents of the bourgeoisie, the labor aristocracy, or the 'completely bourgeois workers'."

Again and again, throughout this remarkable work, Lenin polemicized against the childishness, the stupidity, the pseudo-revolutionary phrasemongering of the ultra-Lefts who fluctuated violently between pessimism and wild enthusiasm, and showed an inability to display perseverance, to organize, to maintain discipline and staunchness. Describing anarchism as "a sort of punishment for the opportunist sins of the working class movement," Lenin pointed out that "both monstrosities mutually supplemented each other," and he cited the very relevant example that anarchists, no less than Right-wing opportunists, are opposed to the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Answering all seekers after "pure revolutions" and all dogmatists who reject any thought of compromise, Lenin asserted: "To reject compromises 'on principle,' to reject the admissibility of compromises in general, no matter what kind, is childishness which is difficult even to take seriously . . . There are compromises and compromises. One must be able to analyze the situation and the concrete conditions of each compromise, or of each form of compromise." There is, he pointed out, a fundamental difference between a compromise which one is compelled to enter into because of objective circumstances (such as lack of strike funds, or exhaustion), and a compromise by those who surrender out of a desire to play up to the capitalists or out of cowardice.

To overthrow international capitalism, he stressed, was a most stubborn, complicated and prolonged task. "It is possible to conquer the more powerful enemy only by exerting the utmost effort, and by necessarily, thoroughly, carefully, attentively and skillfully taking advantage of every, even the smallest 'fissure' among the enemies, of every antagonism of interest among the bourgeoisie of the various countries, among the various groups or types of bourgeoisie in the various countries; by taking advantage of every, even the smallest opportunity of gaining a mass ally, even though this ally be temporary, vacillating, unstable, unreliable and conditional. Those who do not understand this fail to understand even a

grain of Marxism and of scientific, modern Socialism in general."

Thus, as Lenin saw it, it was essential to use every opportunity to strike at the main class enemy. However, Lenin warned against using compromises as an end in itself. Compromise should always be subordinate to the interests of the class struggle, should be a means of struggle.

"The point is through all the compromises which are sometimes necessarily imposed by force of circumstances upon even the most revolutionary party of even the most revolutionary class, to be able to preserve, strengthen, steel and develop the revolutionary tactics and organization, the revolutionary consciousness, determination and preparedness of the working class and its organized vanguard, the Communist Party." (Vol. 30, p. 492.)

Lenin's principled class approach enabled him to forewarn the Communist movement against a rigid sectarianism on the one hand, and against opportunist capitulation on the other.

INTERNATIONALISM AND NATIONAL FEATURES

In the concluding section of "*Left-Wing Communism—an Infantile Disorder*," Lenin turned his attention to the future development of the international Communist movement, and the struggle against both Right-wing opportunism and "Left-wing" Communism. This struggle could only be waged, he emphasized, by adhering to the general principles of Marxism while taking into account the "*definite peculiar features*" of the struggle in each country, which arise from the specific features of its economics, politics, culture, national composition, religious divisions, colonies, and so on. As long as national and state differences exist, he insisted, adding that they will continue for a very long time, ("even after the dictatorship of the proletariat has been established on a world scale"), for so long will the unity of international tactics of the Communist movement of all countries demand "not the elimination of variety, not the abolition of national differences (this is a foolish dream at the moment), but such an application of the *fundamental* principles of Communism (Soviet power and the dictatorship of the proletariat) as will *correctly* modify these principles in *certain particulars*, will properly adapt, apply them to the national and national-state differences. To investigate, study, seek out, divine, grasp

that which is peculiarly national, specifically national in the *concrete manner* in which each country *approaches* the fulfilment of the single international task, the victory over opportunism and "Left" doctrinarism in the working class movement, the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, the establishment of a Soviet Republic and a proletarian dictatorship—this is the main task of the historical period through which all the advanced (and not only the advanced) countries are now passing."

For Lenin there was never any question of posing the specific national tasks of the proletariat and the revolutionary party in any one country as against "the single international task." In taking this line he was basing himself on the position of Marx and Engels, who, in the *Communist Manifesto*, explained the national and international role of Communists in these words:

"In the national struggles of the proletarians of different countries they point out and bring to the front the common interests of the entire proletariat independent of nationality."

Lenin was stating essentially the same principle when he wrote: "There is one, and only one kind of internationalism indeed: working wholeheartedly for the development of the revolutionary movement and the revolutionary struggle in *one's own* country, and supporting (by propaganda, sympathy and material aid) *this struggle*, this, *and only this* line in every country without exception." (*Selected Works*, Vol. 2, p. 71.)

Lenin, in his practice as well as his theory, fully lived up to this principle. The establishment of Soviet power signified new responsibilities as regards aid to the revolutionary movements in other countries. Lenin did not limit this conception to aiding only movements struggling for socialism, but extended his understanding to giving aid, often under the most difficult conditions, to peoples struggling for national independence against imperialism, for, as he constantly stressed, in the imperialist epoch all anti-imperialist struggles are part of the general stream of the world revolution against capitalism.

The young Soviet State was itself beset with immense difficulties. Its economy was in ruins as a result of the first world war. It was facing hostility and every form of sabotage and resistance from the dispossessed classes. It was compelled to fight for more than two years against the armies of fourteen capitalist states which at one time

controlled a greater part of the Soviet Republic.

Yet despite this, and lacking resources as it did, the young socialist country held out its helping hand to its struggling neighbors. As early as January 1918, it adopted the Declaration of the Rights of the Working and Exploited People which announced a complete break with "the barbarous policy of bourgeois civilization, which has built the prosperity of the exploiters belonging to a few chosen nations on the enslavement of hundreds of millions of working people in Asia, in the colonies in general and in the small countries."

To the best of its ability, the Soviet State immediately began to put these principles into practice. Thus, it was the first to recognize the independence of Finland and Poland in 1918, Afghanistan in 1919, Turkey in 1920, and Mongolia in 1921. It concluded treaties based on equality and respect for mutual interests with Mongolia, Turkey, Iran and Afghanistan in 1921, and publicly renounced concessions which tsarist governments had exacted from other states, as in the case of China. It gave direct help to peoples engaged in military struggles against domestic and foreign reaction, sending military advisers to assist Dr. Sun Yat-sen in China and Kemal Ataturk in Turkey, as well as troops to assist the people of Mongolia. Its publication of the tsarist government's secret treaties, and especially the Sykes-Picot documents exposing the Anglo-French intrigues over Palestine and the Middle East, further undermined the prestige and positions of the colonial powers.

In all these actions the Soviet Communist Party was acting in the spirit of Lenin's teaching on internationalism.

UNITY OF THE INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL INTERESTS OF THE WORKING PEOPLE

While he always stressed the principle of the *Communist Manifesto* regarding the need for Communists to bring to the fore the common interests of the entire working class, Lenin never allowed this understanding to overcloud his appreciation of the immense importance of the national question and in particular of the right of each nation to self-determination. In fact, it was precisely on this question that he had to conduct a determined polemic with Rosa Luxemburg and others who underestimated the importance of this question, regarded na-

tions as "antiquated prejudices" and national independence as "utopian."

Lenin understood the question in true dialectical fashion. The proletariat, he stressed, recognizes equality and equal rights to a national state, but it "values above all and places foremost the alliance of the proletarians of all nations, and assesses any national demand, any national separation, from the angle of the workers' class struggle." (*The Right of Nations to Self-Determination*. Published April/June 1914.)

For that reason, argued Lenin, "Insofar as the bourgeoisie of the oppressed nation fights the oppressor, we are always in every case, and more strongly than anyone else, in favor, for we are the staunchest and the most consistent enemies of oppression. But insofar as the bourgeoisie of the oppressed nation stands for its own bourgeois nationalism, we stand against it." (*Ibid.*)

Can a nation be free if it oppresses other nations? asked Lenin. And he replied, no, it cannot. Therefore, the proletariat of an oppressing nation had the duty of fighting against the oppressive nationalism of its own bourgeoisie. "Repudiation of the right to self-determination or to secession inevitably means, in practice, support for the privileges of the dominant nation."

Lenin summed up the Marxist attitude to the question of self-determination in these words: "Complete equality of rights for all nations; the right of nations to self-determination; the unity of the workers of all nations—such is the national program that Marxism, the experience of the whole world, and the experience of Russia, teaches the workers." (*Ibid.*)

In explaining the principles on which the relations between the different nations of the Soviet republics were based, Lenin was equipping the whole international movement for its future task of working out the principles of relations between socialist states. "We want a voluntary union of nations," wrote Lenin, "a union which precludes any coercion of one nation by another—a union founded on complete confidence, on a clear recognition of brotherly unity, on absolutely voluntary consent." (*Letter to the Workers and Peasants of the Ukraine in Connection with the Victories over Denikin*. *Selected Works*, Vol. 3.)

Thus Lenin oriented the Communist movement on the fight against all manifestations of nationalism, both great-power and bourgeois nationalism of the oppressed nation.

Lenin's experience of dealing with the national question in the Soviet republic convinced him that "only the utmost attention to the interests of the various nations can obviate cause for conflict, remove mutual distrust and fear of intrigue, create confidence, especially on the part of the workers and peasants speaking different languages, without which neither peaceful relations between nations, nor anything resembling successful development of all that is valuable in modern civilization, is at all possible." (An interview with a correspondent of the *Observer* and *Manchester Guardian*, published in *Pravda*, November 10, 1922.)

UNION OF THE THREE REVOLUTIONARY STREAMS

Lenin deeply appreciated the connection between the national-liberation struggles of the underdeveloped regions of the world and the proletarian struggle for socialism. Marx himself, as early as 1853, had, with brilliant prevision, posed the question: "Can mankind fulfill its destiny without a fundamental revolution in the social state of Asia?" (*British Rule in India*). Lenin, in his work *What Is to be Done?* (1902) stressed that history had confronted the Russian working class with the task of destroying not only the main base of reaction in Europe, but of Asiatic reaction too.

The 1905 revolution in Russia had an immediate impact on the peoples of Asia, and Lenin was quick to see its significance for the whole course of development of the international struggle of the working class. Writing in *Pravda*, May 7, 1913, he explained that "world capitalism and the 1905 movement in Russia have finally awakened Asia. Hundreds of millions of the down-trodden and benighted have awakened from medieval stagnation to a new life and are rising to fight for elementary human rights and democracy . . . The awakening of Asia and the beginning of the struggle for power by the advanced proletariat of Europe are a symbol of the new phase in world history that began early this century."

Lenin returned to this idea again in the autumn of 1917, on the very eve of the October revolution, when he wrote: "We have always stood, we stand and will continue to stand for the closest drawing together and merging of the class conscious workers in the advanced countries with the workers, the peasants and the slaves in all the oppressed countries . . . We shall bend every effort to draw closer to and merge

with the Mongols, Persians, Indians and Egyptians; we consider it our duty and in our interests to do this, for otherwise socialism in Europe will not be strong."

After the establishment of Soviet power Lenin saw how the question of the alliance between the international working class and the national liberation movements had taken on a new dimension. It was now a question of the Soviet Republic being a decisive component of this alliance. Addressing the Second All-Russian Congress of Communist Organizations of the Peoples of the East (November 22, 1919) Lenin stressed:

"It is self-evident that this revolutionary movement of the peoples of the East can now develop effectively, can reach a successful issue only in direct association with the revolutionary struggle of our Soviet Republic against international imperialism . . . The socialist revolution will not be solely, or chiefly, a struggle of the revolutionary proletarians in each country against their bourgeoisie; no, it will be a struggle of all the imperialist-oppressed colonies and countries, of all dependent countries against international imperialism . . . It is self-evident that final victory can be won only by the proletariat of the advanced countries of the world, and we, the Russians, are beginning the work which the British, the French or the German proletariat will seal. But we see that they will not be victorious without the aid of the toiling masses of all the oppressed colonial peoples . . . The international proletariat is the only ally of all the hundreds of millions of toiling and exploited peoples of the East."

Lenin strove for this understanding in the international Communist movement, and played a major part in winning support for this line in the discussion at the Second Congress of the Communist International in 1920, which set up a special Commission to examine the experience of the national liberation struggle. Lenin's preliminary draft of the Theses on the National and Colonial Question stressed that "the whole policy of the Communist International on the national and colonial questions should rest on a closer union of the proletarians and working masses generally of all nations and countries for a joint revolutionary struggle to overthrow the landowners and the bourgeoisie." The special responsibility of the Communist Parties in the imperialist countries was underlined in Lenin's draft: ". . . the Communist Parties must assist the bourgeois-democratic liberation movement

in these (the colonial) countries . . . the duty of rendering the most active assistance rests primarily with the workers of the country upon which the backward nation is dependent colonially or financially."

In presenting his report to the Congress, Lenin elaborated a further point of major theoretical and practical significance for the international Communist movement. He asked whether the capitalist stage of development was inevitable for the countries winning national liberation, and replied that this was not so. With the aid of the proletariat of the advanced countries, with the Soviet government coming to their assistance "with all the means at their command," the countries winning their national liberation could, said Lenin, pass over to Socialism "without having to go through the capitalist stage."

At the end of 1920, on December 6th, in a speech to Communist Party members in Moscow, Lenin recalled that the whole world was divided into oppressed and oppressing nations—the former comprising 70 per cent of the world's population. "We are really acting now," he said, "not only as representatives of the proletarians of all countries, but also as representatives of the oppressed peoples." He then referred to the new journal of the Comintern, *The Peoples of the East*, and drew attention to its new slogan: "Workers of all countries and oppressed nations, unite!"

He revealed that one comrade had asked: "When did the Executive Committee decide on a change of slogans?" Lenin commented: "Indeed, I cannot remember any such decision. And, of course, from the standpoint of the *Communist Manifesto* this is wrong, but then the *Communist Manifesto* was written under totally different conditions. From this standpoint of present-day politics, this slogan is correct."

In this way Lenin formulated the grand strategy for the whole international Communist movement in our epoch—the alliance of the three great revolutionary streams of our day—the socialist states, the international working-class movement and the national liberation struggles.

It is with this revolutionary concept of Lenin's in mind that the Communist and Workers' parties are now actively preparing their international conference which will have the specific task of discussing how to put into effect the alliance of all anti-imperialist forces in the struggle for peace, democracy, national independence and socialism.

Lenin in Switzerland

E. ROZENTAL

Vladimir Ilyich Lenin spent, all told, about seven years in Switzerland. He first visited the country as a young man in the spring of 1895, when he went to Geneva to meet G. V. Plekhanov, the outstanding Russian Marxist. He left Switzerland for good in the spring of 1917, when he returned to Russia after the February revolution.

The period between these two springs was filled with stirring events, profound economic and socio-political changes which eventually led to that decisive turn in world history—the Great October Socialist Revolution. Much of the work in preparation for that event, which required of Lenin truly titanic effort and singleness of purpose, was done in Switzerland.

What attracted Lenin to Switzerland? Why did he prefer to live and work in this country during his forced exile from home?

The explanation is partly that at the turn of the century Switzerland was the political crossroads of Western Europe and Russia, so to speak. It became a second home for the partisans of the many different political trends then current in Europe, and not only in Europe. During the second half of the 19th century an increasing number of political refugees from Russia swelled the ranks of the Swiss emigration. In 1883 the first Russian Marxist group, the Emancipation of Labor, headed by Plekhanov, was formed in Geneva. Geneva also housed the Russian section of the First International. By the turn of the century Switzerland had become a veritable haven for many Russian political emigres.

In the libraries of Geneva, Zurich and Berne, Lenin studied the works of Marx and Engels, literature on philosophy, economics, the natural sciences and other branches of knowledge, reflected in prob-

lems the solution of which raised Marxism to a new level.

Lenin delighted in Switzerland's nature, in its snow-capped mountains and limpid blue lakes. Whatever spare time he had he spent roaming the villages nestling in the Alps, and in the picturesque environs of Geneva and Berne.

UNDER THE PLANE TREES OF GENEVA

The Russian political emigres were particularly attracted to Geneva by its atmosphere of friendliness and hospitality, its culture and amenities.

Lenin and Krupskaya moved to the city in April 1903, when it was decided to print the Russian Marxist paper *Iskra* there. They took up residence in the working-class suburb of Secheron. The small, scantily furnished house of the "Ilyiches", as they were known to their friends, soon became the center of the Russian emigre Socialist-Democrats.

In the city itself, the Russian Marxists used to meet at the Landolt cafe in the vicinity of the university. Here Lenin had his "own" table at which he often worked, or sat talking with his comrades. The table is still there.

It was during this sojourn in Switzerland that Lenin and Krupskaya went through one of the most difficult and trying periods in their lives—the period of conflict with the opportunists in the Party, who after the Second Party Congress became known as Mensheviks.

After their defeat at the congress the Mensheviks did everything to sabotage its decisions and to gain control of the leading Party bodies. When *Iskra* passed into their hands, Lenin maintained contact with the Party in Russia mainly through personal

correspondence. In letters, articles and reports he denounced the anti-Party line of the Mensheviks. His work *One Step Forward, Two Steps Back*, written in Geneva in 1904, played a big part in laying bare their opportunism. In his work Lenin substantiates the organizational principles of the party of the new type.

In the fight against Lenin the Mensheviks, who had quite a following in Geneva, were none too scrupulous on the means they employed. L. Fotieva, a veteran Bolshevik, who worked with Krupskaya and Lenin at the time, described the situation as tense and difficult. The Mensheviks, she writes, "accused Lenin of being dictatorial, of wanting to seize power in the Party, of Bonapartism, in a word, of all the deadly sins . . ." L. Fotieva. *Pages from Lenin's Life*.) She was struck by "Lenin's restraint and invariable cheerfulness, by his willpower. . . . He countered the unprincipled sallies of the Mensheviks with his high principles, his firm conviction in the justice of his views."

In this hard-fought struggle Lenin was fortified by the companionship and trust that existed between him and Krupskaya, and by the unfailing support of his comrades.

Lenin's efforts to unite the revolutionary Marxists were crowned with success. At a meeting of Bolsheviks held in Geneva in December 1904 it was decided to start the newspaper *Vperyod* (*Forward*), the first issue of which appeared in January, 1905. Lenin's program was supported by the majority of the Party committees in Russia. Shortly after, Lenin learned about the outbreak of the first Russian revolution.

During June and July 1905 he wrote his *Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution*. In this book, which has become a classic, Lenin shows the character of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in the new epoch and the specific features of its development into a socialist revolution, substantiates the strategy and tactics of a genuinely revolutionary Marxist party, shows the bankruptcy of opportunism and reformism. The work retains its validity to this day, for it draws a distinct line between the policy aimed at the revolutionary transformation of capitalist society, and passive accommodation to circumstances which eventually spells loss of the socialist perspective.

At the end of 1905 Lenin left Geneva for St. Petersburg.

RETURN TO SWITZERLAND

The revolution was defeated. The political police were on Lenin's tracks and he was compelled to emigrate once more. Lenin and Krupskaya returned to Geneva on a cold, windy day in January 1908. They rented a small room on Rue des Deux-Ponts, 17. They felt terribly depressed. Krupskaya recalls those days in the following words: "It was difficult for us, after the revolution, to get used to life in emigration again. Vladimir Ilyich spent all his days in the library, and in the evenings we did not know what to do with ourselves."

However, this mood soon passed. Lenin was confident that the defeat of the proletariat was temporary, that battles lay ahead which would bring the long-awaited victory. "At the moment of defeat he was thinking of the proletariat's sweeping victories. He talked about this during our evening walks along the shore of Lake Geneva," Krupskaya recalls.

And Lenin set to work with renewed vigor to prepare for these victories. Everything had to be begun anew. People had to be found for the new paper, *Proletary*, contact had to be re-established with the underground in Russia, guidance given to the organizing work to preserve and consolidate the Party. "Not for nothing," he wrote at this time, "do they say that we are as hard as rock. The Social-Democrats have built a proletarian party which will not be disheartened by the failure of the first armed onslaught, will not lose its head, not be carried away by adventures." (Vol. 13, p. 446.)

While waging a struggle to rid the working class and its political vanguard of the influence of an ideology alien to Marxism, Lenin now had to combat the bearers of erroneous views inside the Party, who presented these views as a development of Marxist theory.

Revision of a number of basic Marxist tenets on the pretext of their further development was nothing new in the international working-class movement. Lenin had been taking issue with this kind of "improving" Marxism ever since 1893. However, after the defeat of the 1905 revolution, the ideological-theoretical vacillations in the Party, the calls to fuse Marxism with empirio-criticism, imperilled the Party's ideological work.

In April 1908 Lenin sent to Russia his well-known article "Marxism and Revisionism," which he described as a "formal

declaration of war" against revisionism. In it he laid bare the class and gnosiological roots of revisionism, showed its international character, and stressed the importance of consistent, uncompromising struggle against it in all its manifestation.

Lenin was engaged at the time in writing a work in which he gave battle to the attempts to revise Marxism with the aid of the philosophy of Mach and Avenarius. He spent hours in the library of the Société de Lecture, studying numerous works on philosophy and the natural sciences in different languages, rereading Marx and Engels, Dietzgen and Mehring. In May he went to London where he worked for a month in the British Museum.

At the library of the Société de Lecture which Lenin joined in 1904 he was known simply as Ulyanov, an ordinary reader. Recalling that period N. K. Krupskaya wrote:

"The librarian was a witness of how a Russian revolutionary in cheap trousers with the bottoms turned up against the mud in Swiss style (he had forgotten to turn them down) would come early each morning, take the book on barricade fighting or the technique of attack left over from the day before, sit down with it at his customary place by the window, pat the sparse hair on his bald head with an habitual gesture, and become deeply absorbed in reading."

The result of Lenin's diligent research was his *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, which to this day is the working-class's most powerful ideological weapon.

In this gem of Marxist and world philosophical thought Lenin comprehensively and brilliantly argued the case against the attempts to replace Marxism with Machism, exposed the idealistic essence of the latter. He showed that any attempt to reconcile Marxism with idealism inevitably signified betrayal of Marxism. In this work Lenin creatively developed dialectical materialism, supplied the answer to a number of fundamental questions posed by the revolution in the natural sciences, proved that this revolution far from refuting the Marxist philosophy, could be correctly comprehended only from that standpoint.

HE SAW FURTHER AHEAD THAN ALL

Shortly after the outbreak of the First World War, in September 1914, Lenin and Krupskaya arrived in neutral Switzerland (from Austria-Hungary) and this time took

up residence in Berne, where he remained until February 1916.

Berne was a quiet place. Krupskaya describes Berne as being "chiefly an administrative and academic center. It has many excellent libraries, and plenty of scholars, but life is permeated with a kind of petty-bourgeois dullness."

These were crucial years for Social-Democracy. Succumbing to the war fever, the French Socialist leaders, and the Social-Democratic leaders in Germany, Austria and in other countries, swung over to national-patriotism.

In these conditions Lenin considered that the most important task was to preserve the revolutionary core, unite all genuine Social-Democrats in a new, Third International, and under the slogan of turning the imperialist war, into a civil war, to wrest the international proletariat from the influence of the chauvinist bourgeoisie.

At a conference of Italian and Swiss Socialists in Lugano, in September 1914, Lenin submitted for discussion his theses on the war, "Tasks of Revolutionary Social-Democracy in the European War", in which he characterized it as an imperialist war, and denounced the betrayal by the leaders of the Second International. Some of the theses formulations were incorporated into the conference decisions.

At a meeting in Lausanne Lenin gave battle to Plekhanov on the Social-Democrats' attitude to the war. In Geneva he lectured on "The European War and Socialism". On behalf of the Bolshevik Central Committee, he renewed publication of the Party organ *Sotsial-Demokrat*.

He established contact with the Bulgarian and Serbian revolutionary Social-Democrats, closely followed the development of the Left opposition among the German Social-Democrats, headed by Karl Liebknecht. He gave the International Socialist Youth Bureau every assistance, and contributed to its magazine *The Youth International*.

Realizing how important it was to give a theoretically correct substantiation of the social processes under way, Lenin again devoted himself to elaborating materialist dialectics. Again long hours spent in libraries, rereading Aristotle, Hegel and Feuerbach. Lenin's copious notes were subsequently published under the title *Philosophical Notebooks*.

The unflagging work to unite the Left internationalists yielded its first fruits. On September 5, 1915, the First International

Socialist Conference met in the Swiss village of Zimmerwald, near Berne. Lenin saw it as the first step towards an international movement against the war, which would spread and grow stronger.

A GREAT INTERNATIONALIST

Lenin was a great internationalist. While leading the working class movement in Russia and waging a struggle against revisionism and opportunism on the international arena, he at the same time took an active part in the Social-Democratic movement in Switzerland.

In the autumn of 1916 Lenin found the time to write the theses "The Tasks of the Left Zimmerwaldists in the Swiss Social-Democratic Party", which armed the Left in the party on the eve of its emergency congress. In 1918 Lenin's theses were printed in a pamphlet. In the Preface, the Geneva Social-Democrats wrote: "One can but marvel at the profound and precise knowledge of facts and conditions of our country displayed by this 'foreign' author. One can well understand that it is because of his perspicacity and his revolutionary spirit that the Russian proletariat have placed him at the head of their great revolution."

In February 1916 Lenin and Krupskaya moved to Zurich, the industrial and financial center of Switzerland, so utterly different in its hustle and bustle from staid Berne. In 1916-17 Zurich was a veritable melting pot of people of the most diverse views, professions and nationalities from all over war-torn Europe. Here Lenin could feel the pulse of the times more strongly.

He and Krupskaya rented a room at 12 Spiegelgasse, in a flat that belonged to a shoemaker named Kammerer. Immediately after their arrival Lenin began preparations for the second International Socialist Conference. It met in the village of Kienthal in April 1916. This conference helped to reinforce the ranks of the internationalists.

The Zurich period was one of unceasing activity for Lenin, what with participating in innumerable discussions and conferences, writing articles for the press, personal meetings and engaging in a vast correspondence with the Party organizations in Russia and with the internationalists in other countries.

Titus Kammerer, the shoemaker's son, remembers most of all the vast number of letters Lenin received from different countries. Krupskaya would sort them out, becoming so engrossed in the job that she would forget about the dinner cooking on the stove.

This seemingly insignificant detail remembered by a boy recreates one of the important aspects of Lenin's life in Switzerland. He did not lead the life of a recluse. He remained in the center of events, even in Switzerland, guiding the struggle of the Russian proletariat, the revolutionary vanguard of the working class of Europe.

The Zurich period was also one of intensive theoretical work. The First World War, the collapse of the Second International, the sharpening of contradictions in the new epoch—all these gave Lenin much food for thought, served as a powerful impulse for further elaborating Marxism, the strategy and tactics of the revolutionary party of the proletariat in the new conditions. During 1915 and 1916 Lenin wrote a series of works which in their aggregate constituted a new phase in the development of Marxism, became the theoretical foundation of the policy of the Leninist party and of the revolutionary Marxists in other countries.

These included the articles *The Collapse of the Second International*, *Socialism and War*, *The Defeat of One's Own Government in the Imperialist War*, *On the Slogan for a United States of Europe*, his major work *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, *The Military Program of the Proletarian Revolution*, *The Junius Pamphlet*, *The Discussion on Self-Determination Summed Up*. In all these writings he lays bare the essence and social roots of opportunism, develops the Marxist theory on war and peace, gives the first Marxist analysis of imperialism as the highest and final stage of capitalism, at the eve of socialist revolution. Lenin raises the theory of the socialist revolution to a new level, formulates the Marxist solution of the nationalities question in the new conditions.

During the stay in Zurich Lenin began research on the Marxist theory of the state. He re-read the works of Marx and Engels on this question, adding important comments to their basic ideas. The material collected went into the notebook *Marxism on the State* (the so-called "Blue Notebook") which subsequently provided the basis for his *The State and Revolution*.

* * *

Throughout the long years in emigration Lenin's thoughts and his heart were in Russia.

The February revolution finally made it possible for him to return. On April 9, 1917 Lenin left Switzerland. At the station in

Zurich, one of the Swiss comrades who was seeing him off said: "We hope we shall see you among us again soon."

"That would be a bad political sign," replied Lenin with a smile.

He did not return to Switzerland again. But to the end of his life he retained the

fondest memories of that country. The seven years spent there were years of uncompromising struggle and intensive creative work, years that left their imprint on the development of world history.

Geneva

Rumania and European security

NICOLAE CEAUSESCU

In the present conditions, when the desire of the peoples everywhere to resolve the problems accumulated in international relations becomes ever more articulate, progress towards peace and detente in any part of the world accords with the vital interests of all. And accommodation of the controversial issues in Europe, creating security, tranquility and fruitful cooperation among the peoples of the continent would contribute greatly to peace and improve the world climate.

Some European countries possess a considerable economic, human, scientific and technological potential, and play an important part in international affairs. Epoch-making events in history are associated with the European continent, marking deep-going changes in society and the life of the peoples. In our times, too, the inexhaustible creative powers of the European nations are a potent source of spiritual and material progress. Yet more than once, Europe has been the theatre of acute conflicts which, involving the big powers, drew the countries of the continent and of the entire world into the vortex of war. That is why European security has for years been an object of concern for various political groups and the public generally. At their 1966 conference in Bucharest, the socialist countries broadly and objectively discussed this issue, and the Declaration adopted as a result, based on a profound analysis of the international situation, set out measures designed to create a climate of mutual understanding and all-round cooperation on our continent, expressive of the peoples' determination to safeguard peace and of their lawful desire for tranquility and security. That, too, was the subject of the Appeal issued recently to all European countries by the Budapest conference of the Warsaw Treaty countries.

Resolving the European problems and setting up a collective security system on our continent would have an impact on the world at large, serving as a compelling example to all peoples in the fight for peace and detente. Normalization and closer relations between the European countries would benefit the anti-imperialist forces in all countries, the peoples fighting for freedom and national independence and the efforts for world peace and security. Any step forward to European security gives added impetus to the forces of peace and progress, opening up more broadly the perspective of peaceful growth and fruitful international cooperation in the interest of the well-being and the progress of all mankind.

1.

No objective analysis of the situation in Europe can overlook the overall relation of forces in the world arena; it requires an all-round study, based on our Marxist-Leninist outlook, of the entire range of trends and phenomena marking present-day social growth.

Current studies show that growth of the forces of progress and peace is now the *main* feature of the international scene. True, socio-political processes are not all arrow-straight; they are complex and contradictory. What is important, however, is that *the forces of progress and peace are on the upgrade, exerting an increasing influence on socio-political development. And by virtue of their immense power and capacity, they are fully able to solve the current problems in the interest of the peoples, of international stability and security.*

Everything the imperialists have been doing in recent years shows that reaction is

firmly bent on maintaining or regaining its privileges to shore up its position of dominance. With this purpose, aggressive imperialist groups violate the sovereignty and independence of other peoples, plot to overthrow progressive governments in Africa, Asia and Latin America, and suppress revolutionary and democratic movements. Their purpose is to poison international relations, provoking conflict and tension in different regions of the world. On our continent, too, reactionary forces are active. Blind to the lessons of history, aggressive imperialist circles, especially the revenge-seeking and neo-Nazi groups in Federal Germany, want to continue the old militarist policy. Analyzing events in the world of today, we arrive at the incontestable conclusion that imperialism has not changed its aggressive nature, that it still possesses a considerable economic and military potential. And so long as it exists the danger of war will be with us, requiring constant vigilance by the peoples.

However, it is increasingly obvious that imperialist policy is solidly resisted by the peoples determined to safeguard their right to independence and freedom. The Vietnam war is a striking example. Despite the immense concentration of its military power in South Vietnam and the bombing of the DRV, the United States has failed to crush the heroic resistance of the Vietnamese people, who rose firmly and courageously to defend the sacred right of deciding their own destiny. Public opposition to this policy is expressed specifically in the refusal of some capitalist countries to participate in the Vietnam war and in their disavowal of some aspects of the great power politics pursued by the United States.

The democratic movement for peace and the mass actions against the war, spreading even to the United States, are gaining in scale. And contradictions among the capitalist countries grow sharper, too, as they scramble for positions in international economic and political life. Efforts by some states to withdraw from NATO, coupled with the powerful movement in some Western countries against renewing commitments relating to that military pact, also need emphasizing.

And it is most gratifying that the efforts to revive power politics, to reanimate and reinforce NATO and step up the arms drive have failed of late to evoke any substantial response among the public in Western Europe. Often, attempts to renew the cold war spark an outcry of protest, revealing the

deeply-felt desire of the peoples to work on for detente in international affairs.

A study of the current situation reveals that the intensified activity of the aggressive circles is no sign of imperialism growing stronger, no sign that humanity is faced with an imminent danger of war. The strength of imperialism and reaction, the correlation of forces in the world, must be correctly assessed. Underestimating these forces would obviously harm the anti-imperialist struggle, but just as incontestably overestimating them would have a similarly negative result, robbing the people of perspective in the effort for peace and progress and possibly leading to actions inconsistent with the actual relations of strength and the interests of world peace. *A close study of the struggle between the anti-imperialist forces and international reaction shows clearly that there is a real chance of averting another world war and of securing the triumph of the policy of cooperation among the peoples, and of safeguarding world peace.*

The overall picture of the vital world factors operating against the policy of domination and aggression in favor of peace and détente is a rousing and optimistic one. *The decisive role in the effort for peace and progress is now played by the socialist countries, the socialist world system — the main support of the peoples and the main economic, political and military force opposing reaction and imperialism.* The steady growth of the material and political strength of each socialist country adds to the socialist system's capacity of influencing world events and securing victory for peace and social progress.

Headed by its vanguard detachments, the Communist and Workers' parties, the working class in the capitalist countries is a powerful force in the revolutionary anti-imperialist movement. The Communist and Workers' parties are well to the fore in political life in some of the capitalist countries and exert an increasingly stronger influence on political life at home. In many Western countries the Communist parties have succeeded in starting a dialogue with all social forces working for progress and renovation, which is an essential requirement in the revolutionary struggle for the aims of all working people. The trend towards convergence and united action by Left parties, by the Communist and Social-Democratic parties, adds continuously to the influence of the working class in the modern world, and to its strength and capacity for action.

The peasant masses, too, possess considerable weight in the movement for progressive development, playing a particular political role in countries with a less developed economy. The middle strata, artisans and traders are also involved in all countries in this anti-imperialist movement. Faced with monopoly competition, they have an objective stake in a policy protecting national interests and promoting peaceful international cooperation.

The intelligentsia is an outstanding force, too. Both by reason of its numerical growth and the extremely important role it plays in the material and spiritual life of modern society, it is gaining prominence in social and political affairs, exerting a powerful influence on the big democratic and progressive movements and on the action for peace and international detente.

The numerous actions of the younger generation, expressing protest against the economic and social state of the society in which they live, against submission to world imperialism, evoke a strong response in the capitalist world. The movements of recent years in some West-European countries have shown that in the revolutionary struggle the young people with mounting determination are lining up with the workers, peasants and progressive intellectuals, striving for a better and more just world, for peace and international security. Even though here and there youth movements embrace a variety of trends, opinions and convictions, their overall role is considerable and positive, striking out for social progress and assisting the anti-imperialist struggle.

There is considerable potential in the women's international movement, the national women's organizations and mass actions, deeply committed to peace and the safety of their homes and striving to banish bloodshed for all time.

Peoples fighting for national liberation, the newly-independent African, Asian and Latin American states, are an impressive sector of the world anti-imperialist front. Their fight against neo-colonialism and foreign interference, for a world climate favoring their efforts to gain and consolidate economic independence, economic and social progress, contributes objectively to the anti-imperialist cause, to world peace and security.

Note should also be made of the influence in the modern world of national democratic forces working actively in all countries for independence and sovereignty, civil rights, and opposing power politics, intimi-

dation and tension, for international detente and cooperation, for peace and security. Mass organizations, and particularly the World Peace Movement, are also active against the aggressive imperialist policy.

What stands out in the present-day international life is that realism and common sense are gaining ground in the approach to current problems. This is advocated by large sections of the public, by people of different political, philosophical and religious beliefs and trends, including some from the ruling circles in different capitalist countries. And it is a highly important positive factor that the smaller states are taking a more determined stand, striving to establish equal relations among the nations and respect for the aspirations of each country. Numerically, these countries comprise a considerable part of the world, and could play an important part on the international scene, influencing the course of events and helping to safeguard peace and international security.

It is an essential feature that the matter of preserving peace and averting war is now a vital object of concern, a cause espoused by hundreds of millions of people, all nations, all continents, including Europe. Mankind must now choose the way to final deliverance from the nightmare of destructive war. The imposing growth of political consciousness, the steadfast, unshakable determination to champion peace and security, are the guarantee of ultimate success, the earnest of the ultimate triumph of progress and peace. And taking these far-reaching socio-political changes in Europe and the world into account, accounting for the positive trends burgeoning in international life, encouraging and stimulating them, and multiplying the ranks of the champions of a policy imbued with responsibility for the future of the world, socialism, democracy and progress can give the peoples a clear and rousing perspective for peace and détente, a concrete program aimed at excluding war from the life of states and producing a climate of security, trust and cooperation, a program in which European security holds a key place.

2.

Three years ago the Warsaw Treaty nations met in Bucharest for a detailed survey of Europe's security problems. The Declaration that issued from their meeting had a wide response in Europe and throughout the world. For the first time, the West did not reject out of hand proposals emanating

from the socialist countries. Indeed, Western political circles showed a pronounced interest in the Declaration, which was based on a comprehensive and objective study of the European situation. Its underlying ideas and proposals, reaffirmed anew in the recent Budapest Appeal of the socialist countries, correspond to the interests of all peoples and to the pressing and objective need for lasting peace.

In the years since the Bucharest Meeting, the Rumanian government has had talks with leaders of practically every European country, and we have found that there is a clearly expressed desire for negotiations and discussion of realistic ways and means of eliminating the sources of the accumulated misunderstanding and placing European relations on a new and healthier foundation.

The situation today favors successful action for European security. Of course, there are still many obstacles; we have no illusions on that score. Nor do we believe that European security can be achieved through general declarations and pious wishes. But we feel that through persevering joint effort by all countries, through active contacts, persistent and patient exploration of every opportunity for peaceful adjustment of outstanding issues, a desire for a European detente can take root and the ground will thus be prepared for effective steps towards European security.

The wide response in Western Europe to the Budapest Appeal of the Warsaw Treaty nations is further evidence of public interest in active cooperation to reduce international strain and assure durable peace. The Appeal met with a favorable response from diverse social strata—workers, intellectuals, prominent personalities, political leaders and representatives of public opinion in many countries. To this should be added the positive reaction of certain heads of state and party and political leaders who welcomed the Appeal and its proposals for easing tensions and promoting a climate of confidence and peaceful cooperation on our continent. This positive attitude—and it is not confined to Europe—to the ideas set out in the Appeal shows that any proposal, any step, towards European detente can count on public support and will stimulate the forces working to preserve and strengthen peace.

A European conference would provide a welcome opportunity for collective discussion of the continent's security problems. Furthermore, it would indicate the ways and means of surmounting the difficulties

towards detente and would make for a better atmosphere in Europe. But for such a conference to be successful there must be active political and diplomatic moves to clear the way for better understanding. We do not maintain that the ideas and proposals outlined in the Budapest Appeal cover every possibility of achieving European security. It would be especially valuable if each country were to make its own distinct contribution to evolving the most suitable methods of achieving this goal. What we need are constructive proposals. In approving the Budapest Appeal, the Rumanian Council of State and the Rumanian Government announced their readiness carefully to examine the proposals of other European states concerning a European conference. We are prepared to examine all the obstacles that might arise and closely study every proposal for European security and cooperation. The important thing is for each country to take a constructive attitude on this issue and endeavour to meet other countries halfway, treating with maximum attention all proposals and viewpoints, regardless of their source. At the same time, new steps should be taken to unite all the forces that want comprehensive cooperation in Europe, irrespective of social systems.

Such cooperation between states regardless of their social system is an important element of European security. European relations have too long been bedevilled by mistrust and suspicion. The time has come to shed prejudice and hesitation and gradually to build European relations on a new and healthier foundation. In the view of our Party and Government this presupposes unqualified recognition of, and full respect for, the right of each country to shape its destiny and follow the path which it believes best accords with its will and interests. This also implies that international relations be based on full equality, independence, sovereignty and mutual benefit. Strict adherence to these principles, emphasized in the Budapest Appeal, is a basic requisite of peaceful coexistence and fruitful cooperation for enduring peace.

Developments have shown that direct contacts between European leaders are of especial importance for a better understanding of each other's views and standpoints, close analysis of bilateral and general problems and broader and more fruitful cooperation between the nations of our continent.

But any effective examination of European security and peace must be predicated on *recognition of the realities stemming*

from World War II. This presupposes recognition of the inviolability of existing boundaries, including the Oder-Neisse line and the border between the GDR and FRG. We should work towards a situation in which each nation will have full assurance of its security, inviolability of its boundaries and territorial integrity—in short, it must be free of any menace of aggression.

Recognition of the existence of the two German states, the socialist German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic, and normal relations with them, with each sharing in the settlement of all European problems, is a vital factor in improving Europe's political climate and promoting wider cooperation.

Dismantling the military blocs would be a long step towards eliminating tension and promoting European peace and security. The Communist Parties and the Governments of the socialist countries have repeatedly emphasized that the division of the world into mutually-opposed military blocs runs counter to the healthy trend of international life and is an anachronistic barrier to international cooperation. The socialist countries have repeatedly stated their readiness simultaneously to cancel the North Atlantic Alliance and the Warsaw Treaty. The idea, as we know, has met with wide support in Europe and other parts of the world, and today, with the public demand not to prolong the North Atlantic Treaty, the socialist position reaffirmed anew in the Budapest Appeal, has evoked even stronger approval and support.

The socialist countries have consistently advocated—and this was emphasized in the Budapest Declaration—*dismantling of foreign military bases and withdrawal of all troops to national territory*. This, too, should be seen as part of the effort for European security. There is a growing public protest against all warlike actions designed to intimidate nations and against all demonstrations of force, which poison the international atmosphere.

We believe that in present-day conditions all countries, all the progressive anti-imperialist forces, must pay more attention to disarmament. Mankind is vitally interested in removing the menace of thermonuclear war, and the only radical way of doing that is nuclear disarmament, liquidation of all nuclear weapon stockpiles and prohibition of their manufacture and use. The nuclear non-proliferation treaty is the first step in that direction, but, if we want further to reduce the nuclear danger, it must be followed by more concrete measures towards

complete nuclear disarmament. The creation of atom-free zones is of exceptional importance for international peace and security.

Rumania and the other Balkan socialist countries have all along urged closer cooperation in this area, for the interests of its peoples require normalization of relations and a better political atmosphere. History has shown that Balkan conflicts are ruinous to all the nations involved. Making the Balkans a zone of peace and good-neighbor cooperation would benefit all our peoples and would serve the cause of peace and progress. Peaceful cooperation in the Balkans is an inseparable component of European and world security.

It is therefore the duty of all Balkan countries to work for a healthier climate and promote relations based on mutual respect and trust.

Unremitting effort and practical action by the socialist countries and the other forces of peace and progress can prevent the reactionary imperialists from escalating the tension and set the continent on a positive course of peace and security. To sabre-rattling policies, which have done so much harm to mankind and, in the end, have proved insolvent, we should oppose an intelligent, constructive policy designed to sustain and further the process of detente.

3

The effort for peace, security and detente is a sacred mission of socialism and of all Communists. Upon them devolves the duty to assure that a policy prevails of easing tension, eliminating the war danger and promoting security. By fulfilling that duty they will enhance their prestige and increase the influence of socialist ideas in the world.

The people of Rumania have experienced the horrors of two world wars. For them European security is a vital necessity, a problem in the correct solution of which they see a basic safeguard of their peaceful labors in completing the building of socialism and creating the requisites for the building of communism. That is why European security is a priority and permanent concern of the Rumanian Communist Party and the Government of the Rumanian Socialist Republic. And we are fully determined to work side by side with the other socialist countries and with all progressive forces to achieve the great goal of peace and progress.

We in Rumania feel that we are fulfilling

one of our great international missions as a socialist country, as a European state by consistently contributing to continental peace and security, by expanding contacts with other European countries, taking new initiatives and a constructive attitude in promoting international cooperation in the interests of peace and socialism.

Friendship, alliance and cooperation with all socialist countries is central to the international activities of our Party and Government. Continued development of economic, scientific and cultural cooperation with all the socialist countries, broader exchange of experience with them, closer mutual aid and fraternal solidarity are cardinal elements of our foreign policy.

Now more than ever before world developments and the movement for European and world peace and security require re-establishment and consolidation of unity of the socialist countries. For only through unity can the socialist world system bring to bear its material, political and moral strength and superiority and shape developments in a way that will conform with the interests and aspirations of the people everywhere. The Rumanian Communist Party, conscious of its great responsibility as part of the international Communist and workers' movement is determined to continue actively to contribute to the unity and solidarity of the socialist countries and the entire international Communist movement.

Acting in a spirit of peaceful cooperation, Rumania is at the same time actively promoting economic, political, cultural and technological cooperation with all countries, irrespective of their social and political systems. This is being done through numerous exchange visits, political and diplomatic contacts, negotiations with many European and other countries. These meetings and contacts enable us to examine questions of bilateral interest and also international problems. This makes for a useful exchange of opinions, closer acquaintance with the views of each other, and cooperation in a spirit of mutual respect and trust, which helps towards peace and security. In recent times Rumania has concluded economic,

commercial and cultural agreements with many European and other countries, also agreements on scientific and technological exchanges, tourism and sport. This offers favorable conditions for mutually advantageous contacts. The scope of Rumania's international relations is a clear expression of our people's constructive effort and its desire to promote mutual understanding, friendship and cooperation with all nations.

Rumania is active in many international organizations. It has advocated increasing their role in observing international law and the norms of international relations and in promoting closer cooperation and consolidating peace. In 1965 the United Nations adopted a Rumanian-sponsored resolution on regional measures to improve relations between European states with differing social structures. Rumania has consistently upheld the universal character of the United Nations and has urged that it make a bigger contribution to the observance of international law and to international cooperation.

Our people are firmly convinced that now, more than ever before, the situation is ripe for concerted effort by the democratic and progressive forces to set international life on a course towards detente and security.

In discharging its duty to the people, to the international Communist and workers' movement and the cause of socialism and peace, the Rumanian Communist Party and the Government of the Rumanian Socialist Republic will exert every effort in their unflinching resolve to work for victory over imperialism, for a climate of confidence and cooperation in Europe and throughout the world, for international detente and peaceful coexistence. As a signatory to the 1966 Bucharest Declaration and to Budapest Appeal, Rumania will continue to work for an atmosphere of peace and security in Europe and throughout the world and will do everything in its power to develop international cooperation in the interests of world civilization and progress for all nations, for all mankind.

Mini-general election in India

SHRINIVAS G. SARDESAI

Four major States in India—West Bengal, Bihar, Uttar Pradesh and Punjab—went to the polls in February to elect their State legislatures. One more, Nagaland, in the far east of the country, also had its election at the same time. It had an importance of its own, Nagaland being a much disturbed tribal State bordering on Burma and not far from Tibet. But it is a small State and besides not in the main stream of Indian politics.

Elections in the other four States, however, were of very great national significance. Taken together, they accounted for a hundred and two million voters, constituting a little over a third of the total electorate of the country. Moreover, West Bengal is one of the two States in India where the Left and democratic forces are strong (the other one being Kerala). West Bengal is also one of the States in which India's heavy industries are located and foreign and Indian monopoly capital is concentrated. In contrast, Uttar Pradesh is one of the States in which reactionary, agrarian and communal* forces are very powerful. There are Hindu and Sikh, as also Muslim communal parties. They incite religious and caste prejudices and passions which often leads to very sanguinary riots. Naturally, the policies of these parties cut right through the democratic unity of the people and the class solidarity of the urban and rural toiling masses. That is why elections in West Bengal and Uttar Pradesh, on the one hand, and in Bihar and Punjab, on the other, differ in character.

*The term communal forces and parties is used in India to mean the social forces and political parties which exploit religious and caste loyalties for disruptive, separatist and generally reactionary politics.

The elections in these four States were spoken of in India as a mini-general election. Unquestionably, they mirrored the shifts in the economic and political situation in India since February 1967, when the entire country held its fourth, quinquennial, general election to elect its Parliament and State legislatures.

WHY MID-TERM ELECTIONS?

Why did these four States have to have a general election within two years considering that the legislatures elected in 1967 should have lasted for five years according to our Constitution? That needs an explanation.

The Indian National Congress, the main party of the Indian bourgeoisie, held the monopoly of power both at the Center and in the States until the fourth general election in 1967. It brought about a certain economic advance during twenty years of its unbroken rule; developed positive, friendly relations with the socialist countries; and worked out the now well-known foreign policy of non-alignment associated, in India, with the ideas and leadership of Nehru.

However, the economic development, with all the Congress hullabaloo about socialism, was and continues to be undeniably capitalist. What is worse, it has been based on heavy compromises with foreign private capital and internal landlord elements. It has also led to the development of internal monopoly capital. The two biggest Indian monopoly concerns, the Tatas and the Birlas, now control capital assets worth 10,500 million rupees (a little less than 1.5 billion dollars), which is more than

a third of the entire capital assets of the private, corporate sector of Indian industry and finance.

Inevitably this development led to unbridled inflation; a mountainous burden of foreign debt owed mainly to the USA; spiralling prices; shortage of consumer goods including food; rampant black-marketing and profiteering; growing unemployment; shocking corruption and demoralization of public life; growing mass discontent and popular struggles; increasing resort to repressive legislation and police terror by the ruling party—and as happens in all such cases, to a decay and incipient disintegration of the Indian National Congress itself.

Roughly since 1964, the middle of India's Third Five Year Plan, the country has landed itself into a deep economic crisis, most graphically highlighted by the thirty-seven per cent devaluation of the rupee in the middle of 1966, on the dictates of the World Bank. The Third Plan ended in failure in 1966. Since then, national-economic planning in India has become a farce and an abortion.

CONGRESS LOSES MONOPOLY POWER

It was the entirety of these developments that led to the first major breach in the Congress monopoly of power in the general election of 1967. The Congress was reduced to a minority in nine out of the seventeen States in the country, comprising over half of its total population. And though it managed to secure a majority in the Indian Parliament (which we call the Lok Sabha), its lead over the opposition parties was reduced to a bare forty in a house of 509. This weakened position of the Congress was made still more precarious by internal factions and quarrels, some of a purely opportunist character, while some surely have a progressive significance in Indian politics.

The severe set-back suffered by the Congress in 1967 was not all garnered by the Left and democratic forces. In States, regions and pockets where the Left had become powerful as a result of decades of activity, the electorate definitely voted for a Left alternative to the Congress. At the same time over substantial States and regions, where the Left forces were weak, reactionary, Rightist political parties also succeeded in cashing in on the anti-Congress discontent. By and large, however, the Left definitely made a notable advance in the 1967 general election.

The plethora of political parties in our

country, both Right and Left, and many of them limited only to one State or another, can confound any foreign student of Indian politics. Therefore, a word is necessary about those which have nationwide importance.

OUR MAIN POLITICAL PARTIES

To the right of the Indian National Congress stand the Jana Sangh and the Swatantra party. The Jana Sangh is a party of Hindu communal reaction, intensely anti-Muslim and anti-Communist. Its main support comes from Hindu trading and landed interests, but it has made a big headway in Central and Northern India, both in urban and rural areas, by whipping the Hindu revivalist sentiments. It is undoubtedly the most dangerous reactionary political force in India.

The Swatantra party is the party of the former princes and Indian big business, though it has to be borne in mind that big business is powerfully represented in the Indian National Congress also. The bourgeoisie never puts all its eggs in one basket. The Swatantra Party is thoroughly pro-American, bitterly anti-Communist, anti-democratic, anti-planning, anti-progress, etc. But it has not succeeded, and very likely will not, in securing a mass base, comparable with the Jana Sangh, since its slogans and policies are too obviously anti-people, and has no demagogic cover like the Jana Sangh.

Among the Left parties, the Communist Party of India, and the parallel party which designates itself as the Communist Party of India (Marxist) are the most important and influential.

The CPI (M) broke away from the parent party in 1964. It is more influential than the CPI in West Bengal and Kerala, though the latter has made a big headway in these two States also since the split. But the CPI (M) is very weak in other States while the CPI has a considerable influence in a number of other States as well. In Andhra, the united Party was very strong till 1964. After the split we have had an edge over the CPI (M) though both, naturally, have been weakened because of the division.

Our Party has grown steadily after the split, a growth that has been reflected in the trade union movement, the peasant movement, the Central and State legislatures, and so on. In particular, we have more members in Parliament than the CPI (M).

During the last year and a half, extreme Left-wing and adventurist elements in the

CPI (M) have broken away from it and have formed a third, all-India Communist Party by coordinating their activities in various States. It would be wrong to estimate that the departure of the extreme Lefts has seriously weakened the CPI (M) though it has surely been affected by the exit.

The two other main Left parties on the all-India plane are the Samyukta Socialist Party and the Praja Socialist Party. Their real outlook and policies are essentially Left nationalist, with all the contradictions and internal conflicts arising from such an outlook. The S.S.P. is militant, which cannot be said of the P.S.P., and in addition the leadership of the latter is clearly pro-American and anti-Soviet.

CONGRESS DISBANDS STATE MINISTRIES

In the general election of 1967, Left and democratic fronts composed of the CPI, the CPI (M), the SSP and other democratic parties and elements emerged victorious in West Bengal and Kerala and formed the State ministries.

In Bihar, the CPI and the SSP emerged as a substantially influential force. Together with certain other non-Congress parties they constituted the majority bloc in the State legislature and formed a ministry.

In Uttar Pradesh and Punjab also our Party was represented in non-Congress coalitions which formed the ministries in the two States.

Thus, the Communist Party was represented in five State ministries and the CPI (M) in two, with the position of the latter much stronger than ours in West Bengal and Kerala.

We are not dealing here with States in which Congress or Rightist ministries were formed after the 1967 general election.

From the very beginning, the Central Congress Government (the Government of the Indian Union) took a very non-cooperative and, in fact, a hostile attitude towards all non-Congress, progressive State ministries, and most of all, the ministries in which Communists were represented. For twenty years, the Congress leadership was accustomed to look upon political power as its exclusive patrimony. It could not tolerate the idea of power slipping out of its hands, least of all to Communist and other Left forces in the country.

Thus, no sooner than the ministries were installed into office, the Congress Government at the Center, in league with big business, the monopoly press and the bu-

reaucracy (the notorious steel frame of India inherited from British rule) started creating all kinds of impediments and obstructions in the functioning of the popular, democratic ministries.

Indian public finance is highly centralized. Taxes yielding the highest revenue are with the Center. The power of issuing currency which has been freely used for years for deficit financing, lies with the Center. On the other hand the responsibility for education, health, agricultural development, etc., rests on the shoulders of the State Governments. Hence, according to our Constitution, innumerable State activities have to be financed from the Center.

The first thing the Central Government started doing after the formation of the new ministries was to curtail central financial subsidies to which the new State Governments were entitled, on various pretexts. The allocation of food supplies, again vested in the Center, was utilized to deny the popular ministries requisite food supplies. Even famine relief in Bihar suffered because of stinginess on the part of the Central Government.

Even more serious encroachments into the constitutional rights of the popular ministries followed. In West Bengal, as was right and proper, a wave of mass actions followed in the wake of the formation of the popular ministry. Workers came out to surround (Gherao) their managers and employers for wage and bonus payments to which they were legally entitled for years but which had been withheld by the employers under the previous Congress regime. The movement was perfectly peaceful. In the countryside, the tenants, illegally ejected by the landlords for years, started reoccupying their land under the leadership of the peasant unions (Kisan Sabha). This movement, too, was peaceful. Anti-food-hoarding and anti-blackmarketing committees were formed in many urban and rural areas to compel the hoarders to disgorge their illegally secreted hoards.

The United Front ministry of West Bengal struggled to keep the police out of such actions wherever they were peaceful. It declared that labor, peasant and other socio-economic problems must be solved through negotiations. They were not a law-and-order problem to be settled by batons, tear gas and bullets.

The Central Government and the monopoly press of West Bengal, as also the defeated Congress in West Bengal, raised a gigantic hue and cry about the collapse of law-and-order in West Bengal. Reaction-

ary elements provoked violence in order to invite police intervention in popular struggles. Over the heads of the State ministry, the Home Minister of the Central Government pressurized the State police officers to go ahead with repressive measures.

In West Bengal, Bihar, Uttar Pradesh and Punjab the Congress poured in hundreds of thousands of rupees to bribe and purchase weaker members of the ruling alliance (no Communist could be bought over) to reduce the alliance to a minority.

By these and similar nefarious means, and often by riding roughshod over clear stipulations of the Indian Constitution in respect of the rights of the State ministries, the Central Government pulled down all the four ministries of West Bengal, Bihar, Uttar Pradesh and Punjab during the first three quarters of 1968. However, despite their being kept on tenterhooks from the day they were sworn in, the ministries of West Bengal, Bihar and Punjab did manage to put in some popular legislation and execute a number of ameliorative measures in the interest of the people during 1967 and 1968 until they were lawlessly thrown out.

In the autumn of 1968 the Central Government dissolved the four State legislatures and ordered a general election in all of them to be held in February 1969.

These elections are now over. What do the results show?

ELECTION RESULTS

Firstly, the hope of the Congress leadership to stage a comeback and win a majority in these four States has been shattered for a second time in two years. In fact, it is now recognized by the Congress leadership, though unofficially, that such expectations have been shattered for good.

But that is not all. The West Bengal election results have demonstrated that where a united Left and democratic front confronts the Congress, it rallies the masses on a vast scale and inflicts a defeat not only on the Congress but also on the parties of Right reaction. The united Left and democratic front candidates in West Bengal polled nearly 54 per cent of the actual votes cast, and won 214 seats out of the total of 280 of the State legislature. The Congress polled 41 per cent of the votes and secured 55 seats. The Jana Sangh and the Swatantra polled less than one per cent votes and did not win a single seat.

In the united front total of 214, the CPI (M) is the main party with eighty seats,

the Bangla Congress (the democratic party of dissident Congressmen in West Bengal) has thirty-three, the CPI has thirty, with other Left parties accounting for the rest.

Our Party has doubled its strength in the West Bengal legislature compared to our strength after the 1967 elections. It should be stated that in the allocation of candidates within the Left and democratic front, our Party always sacrifices more seats than others in the interest of the unity of the front. If all our due seats had been allocated to us, we would have surely secured a bigger representation in the legislature than thirty.

The political pattern in Bihar was different. In contrast with West Bengal, no united Left and democratic front confronted the Congress and the parties of Right reaction in Bihar. Our Party, which is the only true and full-throated champion of such a front in our country could not succeed in forging such an electoral front in the State despite all its efforts.

In the main the reasons for the failure were two. By itself our Party is not so powerful in Bihar as to be able to make other Left and wavering elements realize that such a front was the only alternative to the Congress and the parties of the Right. Secondly, the main Left party in Bihar, viz., the Samyukta Socialist Party adopted an extremely self-important and power hungry attitude towards electoral adjustments. It persisted in its traditional obsession of wanting to build an "all-in" electoral alliance of all non-Congress parties from the Jana Sangh at the extreme right to the Communists at the extreme left. We were categorically opposed to such an unprincipled and opportunist anti-Congress front. In result, for all practical purposes, the election in Bihar became a free-for-all fight, a fight of each against all the rest. We could not prevent the unfortunate development.

Even in such a situation the Congress failed to secure a majority in Bihar. In fact its performance was worse than in 1967. It secured thirty per cent of the votes polled and 118 out of 317 seats in the legislature.

Among the Left parties ours is the only party in Bihar which has improved its position in comparison with the 1967 elections. The percentage of votes polled by us increased from 6.9 in 1967 to 10.3 this year. In actual numbers our vote increased from less than one million to more than a million and a half. The seats won by us, however, increased only by one, from 24 to 25, due

to the great division of votes. In the constituencies in which we lost, we stood second in thirty-two, some of them being lost by very small margins. A very conspicuous feature of our advance in Bihar is that this time we won six predominantly working class constituencies as against one in 1967. The main reason for our progress in Bihar, as in West Bengal, is that during ministerial periods, our comrades effectively combined the conduct of mass struggles with legislative activity.

Though there was no overall Left front in Bihar, we had an adjustment of seats with CPI (M). However, it polled 0.9 per cent votes this time as against 1.3 in 1967, and won three seats as against four in the last election.

The Samyutka Socialist Party, the main Left Party in Bihar, slid down from 17.6 to 13.3 per cent of the votes polled, and from sixty-eight to fifty-two seats won, between the two elections.

A disturbing feature of the situation in Bihar is that the Jana Sangh has improved its position over the last election from 10.2 percent of votes to 15.2 per cent, and from 26 seats won to 34.

Thus, the positive experience of West Bengal has been demonstrated negatively in Bihar. Where a united Left and democratic front faces the Congress, the mass support lost to the Congress goes to the Left. Where such a front is not realized, the decline in Congress influence is garnered by parties of the extreme Right.

Another experience has been that only a united Left and democratic front creates confidence in the harassed Muslim minority in India (which is substantial in number though a minority) that its just rights would be protected by such an alliance. Or else, it sticks to the Congress as the "power that be," or comes under the influence of Muslim communal parties. In West Bengal, the Muslims voted dominantly for the united front. In the other three States they did not.

In Uttar Pradesh and Punjab, the Left forces as a whole are much weaker than the Congress and the parties of Right than in Bihar. In these States too, no united Left and democratic front could be formed, which made matters worse. Even the de facto adjustment of seats among non-Congress parties which took place in the 1967 election was absent on this occasion.

In both these States, again, as in West Bengal and Bihar, the Congress failed to get a majority. However, in Uttar Pradesh, it slightly improved its position over 1967,

while in Punjab it declined as in West Bengal and Bihar.

In Punjab, the main beneficiary from the loss to the Congress has been the Akali Dal, the party of the Sikh community. It has certain progressive elements and features (decades ago it was a militant, anti-imperialist peasant force and also stood for the democratization of the management of the Sikh shrines). But in recent years it is getting increasingly dominated by the Sikh landed gentry and is becoming communal. In this election it even allied itself with the Jana Sangh, something like a conservative alliance of Sikh and Hindu landed and trading interests.

In contrast with West Bengal, Bihar and Uttar Pradesh, not even a CPI and CPI (M) understanding could be forged in the Punjab. This was due to the fact that the CPI (M) in Punjab made an electoral pact with the Akali Dal.

So both of us suffered, the CPI successful seats being reduced from five to four, and the CPI (M) from three to two as between the two elections. Together we polled eight per cent of the votes.

In Uttar Pradesh, the election has produced a regular skein of political parties and groups.

The really redeeming feature of the election results in Uttar Pradesh is that the Jana Sangh declined from its 98 seats won in 1967 to 49. Its vote declined by four per cent.

A very peculiar feature of the situation in Uttar Pradesh is that during the last two years a new and powerful party has emerged in that State. This is the Bharatiya Kranti Dal and it mainly voices the kulak interests in the countryside, both as against the rural proletariat and semi-proletariat and against the industrial bourgeoisie in the cities. Non-existent in the 1967 general election, this time it captured ninety-nine seats, polling a little over 21 per cent of the votes. Its future role needs watching.

Such in bold outline is the post election situation in these four States. Reference to innumerable other parties of which we, in India, have to take cognizance in our day-to-day activity, is deliberately omitted.

KEY LESSONS

The key lesson our Party has drawn from the elections is that the strengthening, broadening and consolidation of a Left and democratic front is the one and only alternative in India for replacing Congress rule by a progressive, democratic, popular rule. In the absence of such a development,

Congress rule will be followed by a takeover by the forces of the Right, foreign and internal, big bourgeoisie and landlords.

Through the entirety of our parliamentary and extra-parliamentary activities, through mass struggles and propaganda, this is the key lesson our Party has been driving home to the Indian people for the last many years.

But there are more concrete and specific lessons besides. In 1967, the mass of the voters was in a mood to vote for any non-Congress Party and candidate that it thought capable of defeating the Congress. Where the Left was in such a position, the voters surely voted Left in preference to Rightist parties. But where such was not the position, they voted Right in preference to the Congress.

Such was not the voters' mood this time. Two years' experience of non-Congress rule in nine States has ended blind anti-Congressism in the voters. Now they listen more attentively and thoughtfully in public meetings to the speakers of various parties, want to understand their programs and policies, and to choose what they consider would really end or alleviate their misery, poverty, unemployment, landlessness and so on.

The four State elections brought out that only where the Party is deeply rooted in its basic masses—the workers, agricultural laborers, poor peasants and similar elements—only then can the Party be certain of success against the gusts and squalls of Indian politics. This was proved positively in West Bengal and Bihar, despite the open terrorism and intimidation as in the latter, and negatively in Uttar Pradesh and Punjab. We could hold out effectively only where our mass base was solid and strong.

Even the formation of a stable and strong, united Left and democratic front, the overcoming of the vacillations and the opportunism of our allies, depends on the independent strength of the Party and the mass organizations in the cities and rural areas. It depends on perseverance and hard work in organizing united mass struggles, choosing tactics and forms of struggle suited to the occasion, and in combining mass and parliamentary activity. This, too, comes out clearly from the experience of the four State elections.

LOOKING AHEAD

The elections are over. A powerful ministry of the Left and democratic front has assumed office in West Bengal. In Punjab,

the Akali-Jana Sangh combine has formed a ministry. In Bihar and Uttar Pradesh the Congress, though in a minority, has combined with various reactionary splinter groups to form rotten and rickety ministries.

What is now the future?

In West Bengal we will naturally combine mass struggles with legislative reforms however limited the scope of the latter may be considering the very restricted power of the States in the Indian Constitution.

The National Council of the Communist Party of India (our Central Committee) met in Delhi from April 5th to 12th. Reviewing the election experiences and results, the resolution of the National Council on the post-election tasks emphasizes two points.

"Mass struggles for the defense of people's rights, betterment of their condition, extension of democracy, resistance to the Center's interference against progressive moves of the United Front governments (the plural is used because it refers to Kerala besides Bengal, SGS) and the fight for the extension of State autonomy are the levers to build up a broader front and smash the remaining bases of the Congress and other reactionaries."

The National Council, in the same resolution, appealed to "all Left and democratic parties and elements to meet together with the Communist Party as early as possible for joint deliberations to devise ways and means to bring about a united front on an all-India scale."

WE AND THE CPI (M)

The National Council also reiterated in the same resolution a position which we have consistently held and attempted to implement in relation to the CPI (M). We have stated that "closer understanding, co-operation and unity of action between the two parties has a distinctive significance in building the unity of all national democratic forces by bridging the gulf between Communists and non-Communists belonging to the Left and democratic camp."

For this purpose, we will carry on, as in the past, open debates and discussions with CPI (M), in a fraternal manner on all major ideological and political differences while recognizing that there is much common ground for developing common understanding between us.

In addition, the National Council has offered to the CPI (M) the proposal to "form an all-India coordinating committee

since it has become necessary to take certain immediate steps to set up a common platform for the two parties." The National Council has also proposed "the formation of a bloc of the CPI and the CPI (M) in Parliament and the State legislatures where no united front as yet exists." The purpose is to facilitate the formation of a broader Left and democratic bloc in Parliament and in the State legislatures where it does not exist. Our Central Secretariat is now initiating talks with the CPI (M) on these proposals.

We will assiduously pursue this path in future as in the past. Brother parties abroad will surely realize that restoring the unity of the Communist movement in our country (as in countries comparable with ours) is not easy. Nor are there any short cuts to unity. Communist unity, as Lenin taught us, is also a struggle, however fraternal one may want it to be. We know by experience how obsessed the leadership of the CPI (M) is with its totally untrue notions regarding the so-called "revisionism" of the CPI. We know by experience what serious difficulties its outlook and policies create in practical, day-to-day mass activity in the trade unions, the peasant organizations, in student and youth organizations and in parliamentary work. The difficulties pertain not only to the relations between the CPI and the CPI (M), but also to the relations of the latter with the broad forces of Indian democracy and progress.

It should also be realized that the problem of the unity of the broad stream of the Indian Communist movement now also includes the extreme Left forces that have come out of the CPI (M).

But life and experience are the great teachers. And we (our Party) would be poor Marxist-Leninists if we claimed that we have nothing to learn from experience. We have no such pretensions and need have none, the more so since it is the Program and policies of our Party that are being essentially corroborated by life.

1972 LOOMS ON THE HORIZON

A major outcome of the recent elections has been that the Congress leadership now frankly recognizes that it cannot go into the quinquennial, 1972 general election without allies if it has to have any chance of winning, not only in most of the States, but what is vital, in Parliament.

So various elements of the Congress leadership have already started a search for "like-minded" elements and parties outside the Congress.

It goes without saying that the progressive elements in the leadership and ranks of the Congress are thinking of seeking allies in the Left forces outside the Congress, just as the reactionary, Rightist elements in its leadership have started making love to the Jana Sangh and the Swatantra Party.

This development has potentialities for the advance of the democratic and progressive forces in India. Of course, the fructification of the potentialities depends, first and foremost, upon Communists, and other Lefts and democrats playing their due role in the coming period. That role needs all the courage, wisdom, determination, and fidelity to principles and flexibility in their application, that all the Communists and democrats can muster. Our Party will spare no efforts and no sacrifice in discharging its obligations.

Nehru's death coincided with the end of the first post-independence period of India's contemporary history, a period of which he was the leading architect and symbol. He carried forward India, as much as he could, on the path of democracy, independence, secularism, non-alignment and a planned economy, under parliamentary rule dominated by a single party. This was a valuable historical achievement, and it should not be considered an uncharitable criticism of Nehru if the other half of the truth is also explicitly stated, viz., that what Nehru really worked for was a progressive, independent, capitalist development of our country.

That path could not but be fraught with the gravest internal contradictions and external compromises. It could not but lead to a profound economic and political crisis in the course of time.

This crisis stood out for the blindest to see with the devaluation of the rupee in 1966, the abandonment of Indian planning in subsequent years, and the loss of the Congress monopoly of power in the 1967 general election.

Since then, the question, "Whither India, left or right?" has assumed growing dimensions and a sharper edge with every passing day. India is in travail. We are passing through an extremely critical period of danger and opportunity, of rapid turns and twists, and, I must add, of unprecedented responsibility. The outcome will primarily affect us, the five hundred millions of our countrymen. But India's position in world politics being what it is, it will also affect the wide world outside.

Socialism and the peasantry

Bulgarian Cooperative Farmers Speak

The question of the peasantry as a social class, of its revolutionary potential and the ways of utilizing it in the socialist revolution, as well as the forms of enlisting the millions of peasants for the building of socialism is a central one in the theory of scientific socialism. The founders of Marxism-Leninism formulated principles which became the basis of the policy of the working class and its Communist vanguard in relation to the peasantry. Foremost among these is that of the toiling peasantry as the principal ally of the proletariat in the fight to overthrow capitalism and build a new society.

A brilliant example of creative application of this fundamental principle in shaping the strategy of revolution was given by Lenin. He showed, moreover, that this strategy is not specific to Russia alone, that many elements of it are valid for the socialist revolution generally.

Lenin's program for the socialist reconstruction of the countryside is pivoted on cooperative farming, which he regarded as the most effective means of involving the non-proletarian masses of working people in the building of socialism, of cementing the worker-peasant alliance while preserving the leading role of the working class. "Given social ownership of the means of production," Lenin wrote, "given the class victory of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie, the system of civilized cooperators, is the system of socialism" (*Collected Works*, Eng. Ed., Vol. 33, p. 471).

The basic propositions of the Marxist-Leninist theory on the peasant question are borne out by experience of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. This experience shows convincingly that given political and economic support from the working class, given public ownership of the

means of production and the abolition of exploitation, cooperative farming brings socio-economic emancipation to the peasantry and turns it into a socialist class.

Socialist agricultural cooperation has passed through several stages of development and has assumed different forms depending on the national conditions. But its essence as a method of socialist collectivization of agricultural production and as a form of socialist education of the peasantry remains unchanged. Hence the international significance of the relevant experience of the different socialist countries.

Taking this into account, *World Marxist Review* arranged, with the cooperation of our Bulgarian comrades, a meeting with peasant cooperators in Bulgaria. This was done in keeping with one of the traditions of the journal: to familiarize itself—and hence its readers—with the life, work, problems and prospects of a definite social stratum of society.

The gathering in the village of Pervenets (Plovdiv District), was attended by representatives from fourteen cooperatives and by Party functionaries, local officials, and scientists: I. Airanova from the Strupets Cooperative, Silen District; T. Alexandrov from the Pervenets Cooperative, Plovdiv District; T. Angelov, agronomist and vice-chairman of the Exarkh Antimovo Cooperative, Burgas District; Z. Atanasov from the Preselentsi Cooperative, Tolbukhin District; K. Berkov, Chairman of the Slivo Pole Cooperative, Ruse District; T. Berkovski, head of the hog-raising sector, Knezha Cooperative Vratsa District; S. Drumev, chairman of Nova Cherna Cooperative, Silistra District; M. Georgiyev of the agricultural department of the Party Central Committee; A. Ivanov, vice-chairman, Plovdiv branch of the National Farmers' Union; B. Iliyev,

veteran Bulgarian cooperator; *S. Kavaldzhiyev*, mechanic from the Bolgarovo Cooperative, Burgas District; *P. Kordovski*, chairman of the Pervenets Cooperative in Plovdiv District; *S. Kinev*, a Deputy Minister of Agriculture and the Food Industry; *A. Lyakhov*, secretary of the Krichim Party committee, Plovdiv District; *N. Malinchev*, chairman of the Perushtitsa People's Council, Plovdiv District; *G. Nalbantov*, secretary, Tseretelevo branch of the Communist Youth League, Plovdiv District; *P. Nenov*, chairman of the Beglezh Cooperative, Pleven District; *R. Petrova*, chairman, Yagodovo Cooperative, Plovdiv District; *L. Rashev*, secretary of the Plovdiv district committee of the Party; *Professor Ranchev*, Kolarov Agricultural Institute, Plovdiv; *S. Syulemezov*, chairman of the Central Cooperative Union; *P. Sheiretova*, chairman, Novo Selo Cooperative, Lovech District, *Z. Topalov* from the Nikolovo Cooperative, Ruse District; *A. Vasilev* from the Dolen Chiflik Cooperative, Varna District; *Prof. V. Velkov*, director of the Plovdiv Institute of Horticulture; *E. Videnova*, milkmaid from the Obelya Cooperative near Sofia.

The journal was represented by *M. Grigorov* (Bulgarian Communist Party), *T. Davagsuren* (Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party), *P. Hentgès* (French Communist Party), *S. Khamis* (Communist Party of Israel), and *G. Colman* (Paraguayan Communist Party).

These comrades visited several districts of the country where they familiarized themselves with the work of agricultural cooperatives and cooperators.

Below is a summary of the talk in Pervenets and of talks with farmers, economic executives, Party and public leaders and scientists which the WMR team had during the trip through the country.

* * *

The Pervenets meeting was opened by *M. Grigorov* who noted that the experience of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries had confirmed the correctness of the following basic tenets of Marxism-Leninist theory: first, the peasants can achieve social emancipation and put an end to capitalist exploitation only on the condition of their active participation in the revolutionary struggle against capitalism in alliance with and under the leadership of the working class and its political vanguard, the Communist Party; second, they can, in an historically short-space of time, do away with backwardness and poverty, increase

production and raise their material and cultural standards only by pooling their efforts in large collective enterprises making possible large-scale use of modern machinery, scientific organization of labor and the latest achievements of science. This, again, they can attain in firm alliance with the working class, under the guidance of the Communist Party.

The Bulgarian experience of socialist reconstruction in agriculture is instructive. History has dispelled the illusions about the independent liberation of the rural toiling masses from capitalist exploitation and oppression, about some kind of independent peasant power. Reaction has always striven to utilize divisions between the peasantry and the working class in order to suppress the revolutionary struggle of both classes, to strengthen its rule and intensify the exploitation of the working people.

After the victory of the revolution the Communist Party based the socialist reconstruction of agriculture on Lenin's cooperative plan, adapting it to Bulgarian conditions. The successful development of agricultural cooperatives and the achievements of our agriculture testify to the fruitfulness of this policy. Thanks to the efforts of all our people, led by the Communist Party, agriculture is rapidly becoming a highly intensive and profitable branch of the national economy. The changed appearance of the village, the improved conditions of labor and the entire mode of living of our peasantry are indicative of the progress in overcoming the distinctions between town and countryside. Our agriculture is on the upgrade, *M. Grigorov* said in conclusion. More and more effectively the peasant co-operators are contributing to the building of a developed socialist society in our country.

I. A PAGE FROM HISTORY

The Village in Pre-Revolutionary Bulgaria

The state of agriculture and the condition of the peasants in pre-revolutionary Bulgaria were described by *S. Kinev*. Let me remind you, he said, that Bulgaria was an agrarian country in which small-scale farming predominated. While landlordism was practically non-existent, we did have many rich farmers. The 1946 census showed that out of 1.1 million private holdings more than 67 per cent were not bigger than 5 hectares. An intensive process of fragmentation and pauperization was under way. Most holdings consisted of tiny plots often dispersed over considerable distances. One

holding averaged 11 such plots. The cultivated area consisted of some 12 million plots averaging 0.37 hectares each. The use of machines, fertilizers and modern farming methods was, therefore, out of the question. In this respect the Bulgarian agriculture was among the most backward in Europe. Many peasants used wooden implements, and domestic animals provided most of the traction. Our agriculture was often referred to as "cow-driven," for three-fourths of all the cows were used as draught animals. Productivity, naturally, was low. In 1934-39 wheat yielded an average of 1.25 tons and maize, 1.17 tons per hectare. Milk yield per cow in 1939 was a mere 450 litres.

In characterizing the condition of the peasantry in tsarist Russia, Lenin wrote about a sea of tiny holdings, about misery and ignorance, chronic improverishment and hunger. That fully applied also to the Bulgarian peasantry. Capitalism in peasant countries like Russia and Bulgaria generated the same insoluble contradictions and led to the degradation of the peasantry as a class.

Peasant poverty in our Sliven District, I. Airanova said, had become proverbial. The exhausted soil barely kept people from starving to death. Grain lasted only till the end of the winter. Then strings of carts would move off to exchange a carload of firewood or straw for a few pounds of grain in a luckier village. Many were reduced to begging, haunting the doors of flour mills in the hope of getting a handful of flour for their hunger-swollen children.

During the crisis of 1929-32, B. Iliyev said, even the fascist government had to go through the motions of helping the peasants hit by the catastrophic fall in prices for their products. But what measures did it take? The then Prime-Minister, N. Mushanov, said with cynical frankness that perhaps they would put on their feet those still able to stand, but could not revive the dead.

Most of Z. Atanasov's fellow-villagers were in want. Usury and sharecropping prevailed in the village. Some earned a meager livelihood working as laborers for the big farmers. Their homes were mud-huts with straw or corn-stalk roofs. Clay 'couches,' covered with straw mats, were the only pieces of "furniture". Icon-lamps or, at best, kerosene lamps provided the lighting. Maize porridge and bread made from maize flour were the staple diet. A health service was a thing unknown. The village school was housed in a dilapidated

hut. All four classes were taught by the same teacher.

The Cooperative Movement in Bulgaria Prior to the Revolution. The cooperative movement in our country came into being seventy years ago, said S. Syulemezov. In pooling their efforts the more enlightened peasants saw a way out of their plight.

At first they used the simplest forms of cooperation in the purchase and marketing of farm products, in trade with industry, in crediting, etc. After the First World War cooperatives for joint land tilling began to be set up. The movement for the establishment of such cooperatives was particularly active in 1920-23 and 1937-40.

S. Syulemezov recalled the time when he headed a cooperative in the village of Vesselinovo in Yambol District. That was in 1938. The cooperative farmed 530 hectares of land and had some machinery. Their incomes grew considerably. Joint labor greatly influenced the growth of the peasants' consciousness. This was seen particularly during the war when many cooperative farmers joined the guerrillas and actively supported the Communist Party in the fight against fascism.

In 1939, B. Iliyev said, despite resistance on the part of the authorities, a small delegation of cooperative-farming enthusiasts visited the Soviet Union. Iliyev was among the delegates. They visited three collective farms and made a detailed study of their work, organization of labor and distribution of income. The Soviet collective farmers received their Bulgarian friends not as tourists but as brothers in class and in struggle and readily shared their experience. The visit proved very useful. In autumn of the same year the delegates began to organize a cooperative in Plevna District. In the first year the cooperative was joined by the peasants of three villages and in the second, by those of another five.

QUESTION: What was the authorities' attitude?

B. Iliyev: The authorities reacted negatively right from the beginning. Persecution came during the fascist dictatorship and after Hitler's attack on the Soviet Union. For example, at the end of June 1941, Prime Minister Filov complained that cooperatives were springing up in the villages "like poisonous mushrooms", and that they should be "stamped out". The law on state security was amended to read that the advocacy of cooperative farming would be persecuted as communist propaganda. Many

cooperatives were dissolved at this time, a mere 29 managing to survive until the socialist revolution in 1944.

QUESTION: *What attitude did the Communist Party take?*

Iliyev: Communists were present at the birth of the cooperative movement in Bulgaria. Dimitr Blagoyev, founder of the Party, ably combined propaganda for socialism with that for cooperative farming and was among the first organizers of cooperatives in Bulgaria. The Party held that cooperative farming would help the peasants towards a better life. But Communists never deluded themselves regarding the possibilities of cooperatives under capitalism. They realized that a cardinal solution of the problems of the countryside would come only after the socialist revolution.

Socialist Reconstruction in the Bulgarian Village. Twenty-five years ago our people turned to socialism. Georgi Dimitrov, addressing the 5th Congress of Bulgarian Communists said: "Within 15 or 20 years we shall catch up with what it took other countries a whole century to reach."

The revolution of September 9, 1944 and the establishment of people's democratic rule as a form of the dictatorship of the proletariat paved the way to the building of socialism, said S. Syulemezov. Our peasants now had the opportunity really to unite for large-scale cooperative farming. Adapting Lenin's cooperative plan to Bulgarian conditions, the Communist Party worked out a form of cooperation which ensured the least painful transition to farming on socialist principles. In 1945 a law on agricultural cooperatives was adopted and the establishment of machine and tractor depots launched. The adoption in the following year of the law on land ownership, based on the principle "the land belongs to the tiller", ushered in agrarian reform in Bulgaria. The maximum cultivated land in private possession was limited to 20 hectares. About a quarter of a million of hectares were confiscated from the big landowners. The reform facilitated a rapid growth of cooperatives. Some 480 were formed in the course of 1945-46. Thus the Bulgarian countryside made the first but resolute steps along the highway of producer cooperatives.

I. Airanova said that the peasants in her village of Strupets decided to have done with the past as early as September, 1945. They ploughed the boundaries between their plots and proclaimed the establish-

ment of a cooperative. From now on, they thought, things would go smoothly. But difficulties lay ahead. Starting from scratch, having neither machines nor experience, the cooperative could not immediately provide all its members with everything they needed—even bread. What will-power and persistence the local Communists and the pioneer cooperators had to display to prove their case! And how hard they had to work! But the hardships were overcome and Strupets soon advanced to a leading place among the cooperatives of the district.

The Dimitrov Cooperative in the village of Bolgarovo was formed on October 27, 1945. Recalling this, S. Kavaldzhiyev said that the initial membership was 353. It was tough going at first.

"I recall the sleepless nights that we Party activists had; the problems were countless, but even then the cooperative demonstrated its superiority over individual digging and scraping on the small strips."

QUESTION: *How, concretely, did you apply Lenin's cooperative idea in Bulgaria?*

I. Ranchev: Lenin saw in cooperative farming the beginning, the first beginning of the transition of the small producer to socialism; the transition, Lenin held, should be accomplished gradually, on strictly voluntary lines, on the basis of democratic centralism and socialized means of production. It was these Leninist principles that we applied in Bulgaria.

A feature of our experience was that while implements were socialized the land remained in the possession of the cooperative members. In other words, private landownership was preserved. So that at first there existed, in addition to distribution according to the work put in, also payment for the land turned over to the cooperative. This was a kind of land rent, but in conditions of people's rule it did not grow into capital. Gradually the share of land rent in remuneration diminished.* Ultimately, with the assent of membership meetings, it was abolished. The socialist principle of payment according to labor is now the sole principle of remuneration in our cooperatives.

QUESTION: *What is the position with land ownership now?*

*Under the 1945 law on agricultural cooperatives 60 per cent of all income designed for distribution was payment for labor and 40 per cent for use of the land. The Rules of Agricultural Cooperatives adopted in 1950 changed the proportion to 70 and 30 per cent respectively. In 1953 the ratio was 75-25. In 1957 only 4.92 per cent of distributed income was paid in land rent. In 1958 land rent was abolished by the first 1,319 cooperatives.

S. Syulemezov: The land belongs to the tiller, that is, to the cooperative farmers. But the member cannot sell the plot with which he joined the cooperative. Actually the land is now collectively owned, and is administered by the collective which tills it.

QUESTION: *In the event of a peasant deciding to opt out, would his plot be returned to him?*

B. Iliyev: Yes, it would, but not necessarily the same one, but always the equivalent in size and quality. Actually, however, we have not had a single case of a peasant quitting the cooperative in the past fifteen years.

E. Videnova added that nowadays not even the one-time big farmers want to hear about returning to private farming. For them, too, the advantages of the new system are too obvious.

QUESTION: *Did you make mistakes in the initial phase of cooperation?*

M. Georgiyev: Oh yes. Our biggest mistake in some places was in relying too much on administrative methods; one result was that cooperatives were joined by peasants who were not yet sure in their minds that they would be better off by doing so. And so in 1951 a decree was issued enabling anyone who so desired to leave the cooperative. And about 50,000 families (approximately 3 per cent of the total) did quit at that time. This act created a healthier atmosphere for the further development of the cooperative movement. In the course of 1952 the number of cooperatives grew to 2,747. At that time they accounted for more than 48 per cent of the cultivated area.

Mention should also be made of our inattention to the value of incentives, added **S. Syulemezov**. For instance, in 1951-52 the purchasing prices of agricultural products were considerably reduced, while the prices of the materials needed by the cooperatives were raised. As a result, the interest in collective farming diminished, some cooperatives began to lose members, and individual peasants refrained from joining.

A turning point came in April 1956, when the Communist Party took steps to rectify the mistakes. Specifically, state aid to the cooperatives was increased and the role of incentives enhanced. By July 1956 the country had 3,056 agricultural cooperatives uniting 77 per cent of peasant families and 75 per cent of cultivated land. Three years later the number of cooperatives reached

3,452. They had approximately 95 per cent of the land that could be collectivized. This figure signified that reconstruction of the countryside had been virtually completed.

Now new tasks came to the fore, those of stepping up output of agriculture, which actually meant a turn to intensive farming. To facilitate this we took the course of amalgamating the cooperatives. The process started in 1959 with membership meetings to decide on the matter, and ended with the establishment of 972 large cooperatives each averaging 4,500 hectares. The amalgamation greatly facilitated the use of the land, machines and manpower resources.

QUESTION: *How effective was the state aid to the cooperatives?*

S. Kinev: I would say that the state aid and support have been decisive. A whole complex of vital political, economic and financial measures was put through. Some of these measures have been spoken about here but special mention should be made of nationalization of industry, carried out in 1947, and the policy of industrialization which of course greatly facilitated the reconstruction of the countryside.

State financing played a very big role. During our first five-year plan agriculture received 10 per cent of state appropriations for capital investment, and under the second and third plans, 11.7 per cent. Annual investments in agriculture averaged 56.5 million leva in the first plan, 114.5 million in the second and 299 million in the third.

L. Rashev: The state aid was in many respects based on Soviet experience in promoting the collective-farm system. It was always an inspiring example for us. And, of course, there was, and is, Soviet aid. Our people will never forget the severe draughts we experienced right after liberation. In those years the Soviet Union, although it was experiencing tremendous postwar hardships itself, sent us the necessary quantities of grain. In later years too, it has often helped with credits, machinery and seeds.

Georgi Dimitrov, **L. Rashev** said in conclusion, stressed that the working people of Bulgaria need friendship with the Soviet Union just as every living being needs sun and air. As years pass, this behest acquires ever deeper meaning. No force on earth can undermine this friendship.

II. THE STRUCTURE OF BULGARIAN AGRICULTURE

"At present Bulgaria has 854 cooperative farms, 152 state farms, 30 seed-growing farms, 27 state hill-farming centres and 21

experimental farms run by the Academy of Agricultural Sciences. These have at their disposal 4.8 million hectares of land. About two-thirds of the country's agricultural produce is supplied by the cooperatives, and nearly 10 per cent, by the state farms. Employment in agriculture totals 1,843,000. Of these, 1,160,000 are cooperative members. Servicing our fields are nearly 90,000 tractors (in terms of 15 hp units) and about 15,000 harvester combines, including upwards of 8,000 grain harvesters. Practically all ploughing is mechanized, and the same is true of planting and harvesting. In 1967 one hectare of cultivated land received an average of 500 kilograms of mineral fertilizers, which is 100 times more than in 1948. Since the end of the war the area of irrigated land has increased almost 30-fold, reaching 1,000,000 hectares.

"In 1967 average per hectare yields were 3.06 tons for wheat, 3.43 tons for maize, 1.73 tons for sunflower seeds, 34.22 tons for sugar-beet and 30.65 tons for tomatoes. Total agricultural output was 2.1 times greater than in 1939."

(From a talk with P. Krystev, head of the agricultural department of the CC BCP)

M. Georgiyev: Today agriculture is a prospering branch of our socialist economy. It has a solid material and technical base, and socialist relations of production fully dominate in it.

This is a guarantee of further rapid progress, all the more so since the entire economy has been comprehensively developed. During the years of people's rule industrial output has grown approximately 30-fold. National income has registered a 5-fold increase. A mere 25 years ago, economically Bulgaria was on the same level as Turkey and Greece. Today our per capita national income is 50 per cent higher than in Greece and three times higher than in Turkey. Bulgaria has become an industrial-agrarian country with a rapidly developing modern industry and a prospering socialist agriculture.

Production Growth in the Cooperatives. Speakers voiced pride over the success of their cooperatives. Z. Atanasov said that in the past two years his cooperative had been taking in high per-hectare yields of basic crops: 5.03 tons of wheat, 6.12 tons of maize, 2.88 tons of sunflower seeds.*

T. Berkovski said that his cooperative's

*Yields of most crops in cooperatives are higher than the national average. In 1967 they were 3.11 tons per hectare for wheat, 3.9 tons for maize, 1.8 tons for sunflower seeds, 34.42 tons to sugar beet and 32.11 tons for tomatoes.

wheat harvest was enough to feed the entire population of Bulgaria for two days. Average annual yield of milk per milch cow is 3,700 litres.* Each year our hog-raising farm delivers to the state more than a million kilograms of pork.

P. Petrova said that in 1966 her cooperative obtained 3.7 tons of wheat per hectare and in 1967, 4.5 tons.

Last year gross output of the Novo Selo Cooperative, where P. Sheiretova works, was four times that of 1959.

Between 1961 and 1965, said K. Berkov from the Slivo Pole Cooperative, we increased the wheat yield from 2.56 tons per hectare to 4.08 tons, maize from 2.97 tons to 6 tons. Per cow milk yields grew from 3.180 to 4,000 litres.

S. Drumev reported that in 1968, despite a severe drought, their cooperative averaged 4.71 tons of wheat. Average milk yields reached 4,000 litres and the clip of wool, 8 kilograms per sheep. In the last four years the gross output of the cooperative has doubled.

These are not isolated examples. The representatives of WMR visited Tolbukhin District, talked with local Party people and familiarized themselves with the work of a number of cooperatives. Here is what they were told by G. Krystev, secretary of the district committee of the Party. Tolbukhin District is one of the country's biggest grain growers. Between 1959 and 1967 grain harvest in the district grew from 440,000 to 970,000 tons. In 1961 the average yield of wheat was 4.03 tons per hectare (from an area of 120,000 hectares). In that year only the Netherlands and Denmark achieved higher yields. But the area sown to wheat in the Netherlands is smaller than in Tolbukhin District.

Animal husbandry achieved similar success. In 1954 milk yields averaged 709 litres and the clip of wool, 1.8 kg. In 1968 the figures were 3,300 litres and 6 kg respectively.

The team from Prague also visited one of the country's 152 state farms, Varnenskoye, and had a talk with its manager, B. Ledlov, with the secretary of the Communist Party organization, Y. Demirov, and the chairman of the trade union committee, I. Zhelev. This highly-mechanized farm of 14,200 hectares specializes in grain, grapes and livestock. Each year it delivers to the state 12,000 tons of grapes, 3 million litres of milk and 5 million eggs. Output is growing

*In 1967 average milk yield in cooperatives was 2,763 litres, 50 per cent higher than in 1960.

at an annual rate of 6 to 7 per cent. Annual profit to the state approximates one million leva.

Material and Technical Facilities. The degree of mechanization of farm jobs and the growth of productive assets were described by many speakers.*

P. Kordovski, chairman of the Pervenets Cooperation (3,200 hectares): We have 120 tractors, 36 lorries and machines which perform most operations in the vineyards and orchards. Each year we invest up to 1.2 million leva in production facilities. For instance, we have built a cold storage with a capacity of 5,000 tons and automated hot-houses covering an area of 6 hectares. The latter cost us 1,000,000 leva but they are already bringing us a profit of 220,000 leva a year.

QUESTION: What percentage of income is ploughed back?

S. Syulemezov: An average of 12 to 15 per cent.

I. Airanova's cooperative has 70 tractors, 30 lorries and many other machines. Its irrigation canals extend for tens of kilometres and it is now erecting four big pumping stations. More than 65 per cent of its land is irrigated.

T. Angelov: Our basic production assets exceed 6 million leva. Every year more than 700,000 leva are ploughed back to maintain production at a high technological level and thus ensure steady growth. At present our cooperative which farms 5,500 hectares has 102 tractors. By the end of the year their number will be brought to 120. And by the end of 1971 we plan to have 150 tractors.

The picture is about the same in the cooperative where S. Kavaldzhiyev works. For its 4,500 hectares it has 46 tractors, 22 lorries, 11 grain harvester combines, 3 cotton combines and excellent repair and service shops.

For Progress in Agriculture. "The new five-year plan makes special provisions for achieving progress in agriculture by gradually introducing industrial methods, intensifying agricultural production and bringing it nearer in character to industrial production." (Report to the 9th Party Congress by Todor Zhivkov, First Secretary of the Bulgarian Communist Party.)

M. Georgiyev: Qualitatively new processes are taking place in the Bulgarian countryside and new trends are emerging as agriculture switches onto industrial lines.

*In 1967 each cooperative had an average of 1,298,000 leva in indivisible funds, ten times the 1956 figure.

This changeover is being effected, first of all, by completing the all-round mechanization of grain-growing. We think this mechanization will be completed in a couple of years. Secondly, the change will be wrought by adopting industrial methods in poultry and pig breeding, and lastly, by developing the network of cooperative and inter-cooperative processing enterprises. The new system of planning and management, launched in 1964, is designed to secure far-reaching changes in the productive forces in the countryside.*

S. Kinev: Specialization and concentration are important means of industrializing agriculture. This is why all-round mechanization brigades have become widespread in the cooperatives. They are production units in charge of land and machinery. As many as 1,380 brigades and 580 teams fully equipped with mechanical facilities have been set up since 1968. They till about 1,500,000 hectares.

The principal index of labor productivity is the land area assigned to each machine operator. Until 1967, each machine operator working in a mechanized team had a lot of 16.4 hectares. In 1968 the lots were extended to 32 hectares per operator. We plan to increase them to 100 to 120 hectares, which modern technology makes possible.

P. Nenov added that in his cooperative a mechanized team of 23 operators and nine auxiliary workers grows grain on 2,400 hectares. This means that in 1968 each operator was in charge of 90 hectares or of 64 hectares if account is taken of the auxiliary workers. This year the team will be reduced and each operator allotted a stint of 140 hectares.

Z. Topalov said his team cultivates about 2,500 hectares and raises a total of seven crops. It uses various types of tractors and trailers and combine harvesters, and numbers 30 machine operators and 17 auxiliary workers. Before the revolution the same area was cultivated with the help of oxen, horses, wooden and occasionally steel ploughs by 806 peasant households totalling roughly 2,000 working members. Today each team member has 28 hp of mechanical traction at his disposal. If we consider only the machine operators and discount the auxiliary workers, each machine operator commands 43 hp. In other words, human labor is amply replaced by mechanical. The team now harvests 3.5 to 3.8 tons of wheat and 4.5 to 4.8 tons of maize per hectare of non-irrigated land.

*See the January 1968 issue of this journal for details.

We know that Americans expend one hour to produce 1,000 kilograms of wheat. Our team produces as much in two hours but this year we expect to close the one-hour gap.

In 1965 our team suggested sowing spring crops, maize and sunflower with seeding machines ranging over five metres instead of 4.2 metres, so as to increase the daily performance from 20 to 38 to 41 hectares. That year neither the United States nor other countries could boast such results. We widened the range of the cultivator from 4.2 to 5.6 metres and this enables us to handle 48 hectares instead of 18. No such result has been achieved in the United States or anywhere else while in our country this year almost half the farms will adopt the method we have suggested.

K. Berkov's cooperative has in recent years laid out hotbeds on an area of 12 hectares which yield 1,900 tons of vegetables a year. It has a juice and syrup plant with an annual capacity of 6,000 tons and a plant producing concentrates. Further processing capacities will go into operation in the next two years. The cooperative is planning a plant that will process an annual 2,000 tons of coarse fodder. It also envisages strawberry and flower hotbeds on an area of 12 hectares; it will expand its fruit-juice factory and build a factory for the production of dietetic and children's food.

QUESTION: *How do you acquire your plant and how modern is it?*

K. Berkov: We use both plant manufactured at home and purchased abroad — in socialist or capitalist countries. It is up to date and in keeping with world standards.

We are now building a highly effective irrigation network covering 1,500 hectares which will enable us to increase labor productivity tenfold.

Our cooperative has assumed the character of a big industrial enterprise.

P. Sheiretova spoke of the role of auxiliary enterprises and industries in ensuring the steady and effective development of the cooperatives lying in hill regions and enjoying less favorable natural and climatic conditions than their lowland counterparts. Their cooperative, she said, has processing plants which handle the entire crop of black currants and apples, 80 per cent of the plum crop, half the raspberry crop and all the milk. The cooperative makes juices, syrups, wines, and dairy produce. The auxiliary enterprises account for 64 per cent of the cooperative's total output. The coopera-

tive proposes to go on extending its industrial facilities.

S. Syulemezov spoke about Bulgarian experience in agricultural specialization and concentration on the basis of inter-cooperative agrarian-industrial complexes. In recent years we have been building inter-cooperative enterprises in a big way. Ten inter-cooperative broiler factories are in operation, turning out 2.5 to 5 million broilers each, and another 11 are under construction. These factories are equipped according to the latest technical standards. Ten inter-cooperative pig farms now under construction will fatten 10,000 to 30,000 pigs each. We expect that by 1972 all our poultry and pig farms will be operating on an industrial basis. We are building also many inter-cooperative canneries and refrigerating plants.

T. Berkovski said that in his district six cooperatives have combined to build a complex for fattening 32,000 pigs annually. Poultry farming is developing along much the same lines. The very nature of farm labor is changing — becoming more like industrial labor—as enterprises of this type spring up. Expenditure per item is decreasing, while labor productivity is rising.

Agriculture and Science. The representatives of the journal interviewed K. Daskalov, President of the Bulgarian Academy of Agricultural Sciences. He told them that the industrial methods and the intensive agriculture require a thoroughly scientific approach. Which explains why numerous research institutes and experimental stations have been brought into being to handle agricultural problems. The Academy alone is in charge of 56 research institutes staffed by 1,200 people.

The main field of the Academy's activity is scientific and technological forecasting and ideas concerning agricultural progress. With due regard to the country's achievements and to progress made elsewhere, the Academy's research institutes have evolved three tentative forecasts for developing 22 branches of agriculture up to about 1980. They are working on development plans for individual branches till 1975 and have already completed plans for the introduction of industrial methods in pig and poultry breeding.

These institutes are grappling also with problems of agricultural zoning and specialization in the 27 districts of the country. The work involves 700 scientists.

Scientists also help the countryside with day-by-day advice. They have achieved

noteworthy success in selection and have devised industrial methods for a number of branches.

Professor V. Velkov told about the manifold activities of the Plovdiv Institute of Horticulture, which include raising new varieties, competent advice and the training of personnel for the cooperatives. The Institute is also responsible for zoning the country's fruit plantations. It took part in drafting development programs for fruit-growing and has prepared fruit-growing forecasts up to 1990.

V. Velkov pointed out that the area under orchards has increased 3.5 times since 1948. Progress became particularly marked after 1960, when growers turned to intensive fruit-growing and improving the variety composition of the orchards. The results have been most heartening. The fruit crop in 1968 was 1,062,000 tons against 568,000 in 1960, while the area under fruit trees had increased by only 35 per cent.

The visitors from Prague inspected the Varna experimental station. S. Nenov, who heads the station, told them that it employs five researchers and has 170 hectares of land at its disposal. Research concentrates on testing grape, vegetable and fruit varieties. The people's university organized by the station helps vine-growers improve their skills and has graduated 740 team leaders and over 400 agronomists since 1962.

No cooperative, let alone agriculture as a whole, can progress any longer without the aid of science, said K. Berkov. We have a scientific and technological council. The council, made up of researchers and production experts, has made a complete analysis of the economic functioning of the cooperative and has drawn up a development plan on this basis reaching to 1970. In working on the plan we tried to solve the main problems, that is, to carry intensive cultivation further, raise labor productivity and increase profitability.

The state, said S. Kinev, spares no effort in training competent personnel for agriculture, and this helps to raise the standard of our production. Working in our agriculture by late 1968 were 18,000 specialists with a higher education, 52,000 who had received a secondary specialized education, and over 100,000 machine operators. Our country has five higher agricultural colleges, 156 technical and secondary agricultural schools and 85 schools for machine operators and tractor drivers. Each year they train from 18,000 to 20,000 young people.

The Five-Year Plan — P. Krystev told

the journal that the Ninth Congress of the Party had provided under the five-year plan (1966-70) for increasing agricultural output by an annual average of 30 per cent. So far the task has been fulfilled as follows:

1965	100 per cent
1966	116 " "
1967	118 " "
1968	107.9 " "

Owing to an unprecedented dry summer output of agriculture in 1968 was eight per cent below the 1967 figure, but exceeded the 1965 figure (which was average) by 7.9 per cent. Wheat last year averaged 2.39 tons per hectare. It is interesting that in 1947, another drought year, wheat yields averaged a scant 0.7 ton per hectare. These facts suggest that the Party's effort to promote agriculture and the peasant cooperator efforts are producing good results.

III. PUBLIC LIFE IN THE COUNTRYSIDE

The Party's Leading Role in Agriculture. It would seem, said L. Rashev, that what we have been talking about here is easy to carry out. In reality, however, it is to the Party's effort in the countryside that we owe the present healthy state of our agriculture, its complete reconstruction and amalgamation, the adoption of industrial methods.

A. Lyakhov described the work of the rural Party organizations. The communal Party committee of Krichim, a village of 11,500 inhabitants, has 10 branch organizations uniting 350 members.* Communists take an active part in running the cooperative and the associated enterprises in the villages and in guiding the public life of the villagers. One form of Communist participation in leadership is the discussion at Party meetings of current problems of production and public life.

Another form of this participation is that many Communists are elected to the leadership of various rural organizations, such as the cooperative or the communal council, in which they implement the policy of the Party according to decisions of the Central Committee, district committees and the branch organizations.

QUESTION: *What is the main line of activity of the Party organization as you see it?*

*There are 3,997 cooperative Party organizations in Bulgaria totalling 116,000 members, of whom more than 93,000 are engaged in work in the fields and in various production departments of the cooperatives concerned.

We think it is ideological, propaganda and educational work, said A. Lyakhov. We try to carry it on in such a way as to help fulfil the economic tasks. The Party leadership takes care not to interfere in the actual economic functioning of the cooperatives or enterprises but helps them with Party work to reach production targets.

QUESTION: *How do you carry on ideological work in your organization?*

A. Lyakhov: It follows two main lines. First, we popularize the Party's ideas through talks, discussions, and in other ways. Secondly, we support every progressive economic activity of the cooperative, enterprise or other unit. Party meetings discuss both internal and international matters.

In the village of Ovcharovo the WMR representatives interviewed N. Angelov, secretary of the local Party committee. The Party organization has 246 members in seven branches. General meetings are called three or four times a year to discuss various matters and measures aimed at carrying out Party Congress decisions. The latest general meetings concerned themselves with such matters as the efficiency and initiative of the branches, scientific and technological progress in the economic field and the Communists' work. The meetings are mostly open to non-Communists.

K. Gyaurov, secretary of the Plovdiv District Committee of the Party, said that the Plovdiv Party organization has 47,250 members, 14,000 of whom work in agriculture. There are 380 rural Party branches, including 210 cooperative branches with a total of more than 11,000 members. Some 5,000 rural Communists are engaged in crop raising, 939 in animal husbandry, and 1,584 operate machinery. Leading posts in co-operatives and on state farms are held by 810 Communists. The rural Party branch averages 35 to 40 members.

Speaking of the basic tasks of the rural Communists, Gyaurov described it as carrying out the Party's policy for intensive agriculture.

The keynote of our ideological work among the people is to educate them in the spirit of socialist patriotism, proletarian internationalism and fraternal friendship with the Soviet Union. The Party lays special emphasis on educating the younger generation. It is the duty of every Communist to impress the finest revolutionary traditions of our people on the minds of the youth, traditions which today take the form

of effort to carry forward the building of a developed socialist society.

The Agricultural Union. The People's Agricultural Union,* said A. Ivanov, has always been a loyal ally of the Communist Party against capitalism and fascism, for a strong Patriotic Front government, socialist progress, industrialization, and agriculture based on cooperative farming. It takes an active part in every single initiative of the district, especially in agriculture. Joint Party and Union meetings have become traditional and discuss developments at home and abroad. Occasionally the two organizations take joint measures for the solution of urgent political, social and economic problems of our countryside, especially of our cooperative farms.

QUESTION: *Are there any political contradictions between the Agricultural Union and the Communist Party?*

A. Ivanov: The Union was a corporative organization until 1948 when it relinquished that principle to become a class political organization of working peasants who had chosen socialism. It follows that there are no political contradictions between the Union and the Party nor can there be, since both are keen to build a developed socialist society.

A. Vasilev added that as one who joined the Agricultural Union in 1944 he knows from experience of the fruitful cooperation between Communists and Union members. In the village of Dolen Chifli, the Union has 48 members all of whom are engaged in production and cooperate with the Communists in accomplishing common tasks.

The Youth League. The young people, especially the more advanced of them, are united in the Communist Youth League and vigorously contribute to the execution of Party decisions aimed at raising the efficiency of agriculture. G. Nalbantov told about the life and work of the League members in the countryside.**

The League organization in our commune, said G. Nalbantov, has 250 members. We live on the cooperative farm and are part of its personnel, and this means that most young men and women contribute to the effort of the farm. Eighty League members are employed in field work, 15 in animal husbandry, 30 are machine operators and another 15 are truck drivers.

Our young people have ample opportunities to become skilled machine operators.

*The Union has 120,000 members.

**The 818 communal organizations of the Communist Youth League have a total of 132,000 members.

We have assigned League members to tractor teams and to the machinery workshops. Each year the board allocates the League branch funds for organizing socialist emulation between youth teams. When deciding to take on or dismiss young men or women, the board consults the League. This has greatly heightened the prestige and influence of the League in our commune.

Much of the League's effort is devoted to organizing recreation and sports. But whatever the task tackled by the League its primary concern is to educate young people in the spirit of socialist patriotism and train them for labor and defense. At the same time we inspire them with proletarian internationalism, a friendly attitude to the people throughout the world.

QUESTION: *Are there any conflicts between the generations?*

G. Nalbantov: Bourgeois propaganda alleges that such conflicts do exist in our country. That is not true. Young people are increasingly entrusted with difficult tasks and appointed to key economic or administrative posts.

Democracy in the Countryside. The people's council in the village is the nucleus of state power in rural Bulgaria, said N. Malinchev. Among the tasks of the people's council is to modernize living conditions in the countryside, provide shops and other facilities, solve health and educational problems and carry on cultural work.

I would like, N. Malinchev went on, to tell first of all about the working people's participation in the people's council. This is made possible primarily through elections. In our commune,* 65 council members are elected by popular vote. Elections are strictly democratic. Candidates are nominated at communal meetings and from time to time council members report back to the electorate about their work, familiarize them with council decisions and consult them on the items the council proposes to discuss. The subcommittees are another form of working people's participation in the local council. Our council has four of them and they freely enlist the assistance of the rural population. The local council is obliged to guarantee public order in the countryside, uphold civil rights and protect socialist property. We fulfil these tasks with the help of working people's volunteer groups, which in our village number a hundred members.

*There are 1,164 communal peoples councils in Bulgaria totalling 55,194 elected deputies.

QUESTION: *What about rural taxes? What is their share in the budget of the local council?*

N. Malinchev: Each rural family pays five to six leva a year for modernization, water supply, removal of refuse, and so on. However, this tax is a negligible fraction of the council's budget, whose main source of revenue is the income tax and the deductions paid by the enterprises within the jurisdiction of the council. The council's revenue is roughly two million leva while taxes paid by the population make up a mere 25,000 leva.

The supreme body of the cooperative is the general meeting of the membership, said B. Iliyev, speaking of the steady progress of intra-cooperative democracy and the membership's extensive participation in management. As a rule the general meetings are held three times a year. However, a general meeting may be called at any time to discuss an extraordinary matter. Ever since the cooperatives were amalgamated (1959) they have comprised five or six villages each. It is difficult, and sometimes impossible, to have the entire membership attend a general meeting. So, before calling a general meeting, we hold village meetings which elect delegates to the general meeting and give them their mandate. It is becoming an increasingly frequent and popular practice to broadcast over the local hookup the course of the general meeting of delegates.

Production conferences by work teams or departments have also proved their worth as forms of exercising intra-cooperative democracy. They are generally held once a month to discuss production assignments and propose improvements.

Another tested form of collective management used on numerous farms is production or work-team councils. They are made up of 10 to 12 team leaders and leading workers. As a rule, the team leader confers with his fellow members at the end of the week to sum up the week's work and decide on the tasks for the coming week. The participants then acquaint other members of the team with the tasks and with matters discussed by the leadership.

The board of the cooperative confers at regular intervals with members on vital production and organizational matters and the tasks of the cooperative. Normally the board meets twice monthly.

QUESTION: *What qualifications are required by people standing for election to managerial posts in the cooperative?*

B. Iliyev: The requirements are first organizational ability, specialized knowledge of the job, political awareness and ability to work with people and gain their confidence. But should a man fall down on the job he can be recalled before his term is up. That is provided for by the cooperative rules, and there have been such cases.

I. Airanova described the functioning of the production conference of her team which consists of 85 people subdivided into 5 smaller units. The conference meets weekly to allocate work assignments to the teams, to indicate priority undertakings and to examine complaints by members.

Farmers with a New Outlook. M. Georgiyev pointed to the changes that have taken place in the outlook of farming people since the socialist reorganization of agriculture. The present-day cooperative farmer is an active builder of the new, socialist life. His whole attitude to work has changed. Cooperative members actively participate in management in the local government bodies, and in Party committees. Socialism has become an integral part of the farmer's life.

Our cooperative farmers, R. Petrova said, are conscious that they are responsible for the entire cooperative. In other words, what we have is a new collective sense instead of the old private property mentality.

Z. Topalov spoke about this new attitude and about the comradely relations developing in the cooperatives. Of the 30 members of his team of machine-operators, 22 are in the Youth League and 8 are Party members. His team was the first, in 1959, to win the title of Youth League shock team, and in 1962 Communist work team. It runs a voluntary fund to which each member makes a monthly contribution. The money is used to buy cinema and theatre tickets, to help the aged and the sick. Team members on sick leave get 2 leva a day over and above the regular sick benefit. A committee of five looks after members attending the mechanization school and awards monthly bonuses to good students. All members of the team have been able to spend holidays abroad.

Four of our 30 members have had a secondary education and one is a college graduate, the remainder have had a 7-year schooling, and all 30 have attended or are attending two-year mechanization school. In fact, each has three or four skills and can handle all the latest farm machines.

Moreover, all take an active part in pub-

lic life. Speaking for myself, Topalov said, I am secretary of the Party branch, one of our tractor drivers is secretary of the Youth organization, three are bureau members of the Youth League, two are members of the Party bureau, three serve on the local Party committee and one is president of the local sports society.

QUESTION: Comrade Topalov, I notice that you are a Hero of Socialist Labor. How did you qualify for the title?

Z. Topalov: There are proficiency standards relating to job performance, crop yields, efficient use of machinery, and so on. The man who meets these standards is nominated by local organizations and the title is conferred by the Presidium of the National Assembly. I have spent 20 of my 42 years on the farm. Before gaining this title, I had been awarded the Dimitrov Order and the Order of the Red Banner of Labor, also gold, silver and bronze Labor Medals. The government appreciates the work of the farmers and we all try to do our best.

Women on the Cooperative Farm. The status of woman, her role in production and in public life, which is one of the more striking results of socialism, was described by R. Petrova.

As you have heard the bulk of the farm work is mechanized, but some jobs, notably in vegetable and fruit growing, do not lend themselves to mechanization. Vegetable and fruit raising is almost wholly a woman's job. There are 572 women in our cooperative, or 60 per cent of the total membership. We have a female agronomist and 15 female team leaders, 8 are employed in the bookkeeping department, 3 are members of the board of management (one of whom is chairman of the Board) — 17 work in the various auxiliary services and the remainder in the fields, in the orchards and in the dairy.

Equal pay for equal work is the rule throughout the country. On the farms women, like their menfolk, usually exceed their work quotas. For instance, we have a minimum quota of 195 work-day units, but our women chalk up 250 and more. And for this they are suitably rewarded by cash bonuses, tourist trips at home in Bulgaria or abroad. Twenty of our women have been awarded government decorations. They work with a will because the new system has brought them benefits of which they could only dream in the not so distant past. We have a cooperative bakery, a canteen, which serves cheap and appetizing

meals, our own health center and many families have washing machines, refrigerators, and electric ranges, all of which have done much to eliminate household drudgery.

Speaking on the same subject, I. Airanova said there was full equality in every respect, and our aim is to give the woman more free time for education and public life.

But we have the problem of finding work for all the women on the farms—in some cooperatives this is quite a serious matter. We are tackling the matter in a variety of ways. T. Angelov said that in his cooperative large scale strawberry cultivation had provided many more jobs for women. T. Berkovski said that on their farm the new canning plant had provided jobs for many more women.

M. Georgiyev mentioned that 6,400 women cooperators have government decorations and 11 hold the title of Hero of Socialist Labor.

Employment Problems. The mechanization, S. Syulemezov said, while it has considerably increased productivity, has posed new problems, among them that of employment. Generally speaking, field work consumes 130-140 days, leaving the farmer idle, if nothing is done, for the remainder of the year. The problem is being tackled on a national scale. One way of solving it is transferring the available labor to those branches (tobacco cultivation, for instance, or orchards) where manual labor still plays a big part. Another way is starting more industry in the rural areas, and still another is a planned transfer of labor to industry. All three are being used.

A study of the problem S. Kinev said, has shown that in 1967 between 80,000 and 100,000 persons migrated to industry from rural areas, and the estimate for the next few years is 60,000-70,000 annually. The need, therefore, is for a nation-wide program of industrial expansion to take up this labor.

K. Berkov spoke about another aspect of the problem: our cooperative cultivates 2.2 hectares per member, and since we have 2,511 members, the area obviously is much too small to assure full employment. Besides, technological progress has released many workers, and so the problem is an urgent one. There is also this consideration: the young people want conditions approximating to those in the cities. We are solving the problem by starting industries (plants making fruit juice and fodder concentrate, hot-houses, etc.) In this way

we have created more than 400 jobs, including 205 for young people. And so, parallel with the mechanization of agriculture we are steadily solving the problem of rural employment.

G. Krystev said that the employment problem in his district was very serious indeed. Mechanization will release at least 20,000 workers, and half that number will be re-employed in tobacco cultivation, now being started in the Tolbukhin area. The remainder will gradually be absorbed in newly-established industries.

Overall, the problem is being tackled in a planned way and on a national scale, so that every able-bodied worker will be assured employment commensurate with his ability.

Abolishing the Distinctions Between Town and Countryside. I. Ranchev, who spoke on this subject, said that rural mechanization was one of the basic methods of gradually eliminating the differences between town and countryside. The Party's policy of introducing industrial methods in farming is steadily removing the differences in the level of the productive forces. This also tends to eliminate the difference between the two forms of property, cooperative and state-owned, for the cooperatives are acquiring more facilities, being supplied with more machines and equipment for auxiliary enterprises and are pooling resources to start new industries. All this makes it possible to link more closely and more directly state and cooperative property. We are also overcoming inequalities in living standards and in education; in fact, many villages now compare favorably with the towns in cultural and service amenities. And this process will be accelerated.

IV. HOW SOCIALISM BENEFITS THE FARMER

Farm Incomes. The facts cited here, B. Iliyev said, should make it clear that socialism has not only rescued the Bulgarian peasant from exploitation, but has given his life a new meaning and purpose. Our farmers are active fighters for the communist ideals. This, of course, is only to be welcomed, but it should be borne in mind that the farmer can be won over only if he is convinced that these ideals are worth fighting for. And personal experience has convinced him of that: his life is improving with every step in socialist construction. Prosperity standards are rising, the farmer has an assurance of his future. This is the best propaganda for socialism.

Increased production means bigger incomes for cooperative members: from an average of 284 leva in 1953, they rose to 886 in 1967, and this year are estimated to reach 1,025 leva. If to this we add incomes from the personal plots, we can say that the cooperative farmer earns about as much as the city industrial or office workers (the average nominal wage in 1967 was 1,284 leva).

P. Kordovski said that last year members of his cooperative averaged 1,483 leva, an increase of 120 per cent over 1959, or about the same as the increase in output.

QUESTION: Are members paid only in cash?

P. Kordovski: The bulk of the payments are in cash, though members receive part payment in kind.

Z. Atanasov said that in his cooperative members have averaged 1,400 leva in recent years. All of the cooperative's 450 families have radios, 70 per cent have television sets, over 200 have motorcycles, 12 have cars and many more families are on the waiting list for cars.

Question: What about personal savings?

Z. Atanasov: Most cooperatives have their savings. According to 1967 data, average savings of urban workers were 247 and of cooperative farmers 327 leva.

E. Videnova said in her cooperative, which specializes in livestock farming, earnings average 1,944 leva. Best workers are rewarded with free trips to other countries, and 130 have already visited the USSR, the GDR and Czechoslovakia.

In 1948, T. Alexandrov said, each of the 230 members of his team earned 1,620 leva. In addition, 52,000 leva worth of produce was distributed among members.

The personal plot is an additional source of income, said S. Drumev. The rules of the cooperatives allow each family up to half a hectare, the actual amount being decided by the board of management; in my cooperative, the figure is 0.4 hectares. The plots are sown mostly to kitchen and fodder crops. Each family is entitled to have one cow and calf, 2 hogs, 5 suckling pigs and 5 sheep. In hill farming areas, a member can keep 15 sheep, one mule and one donkey. There is no limit on poultry and bees.

The family plots are ploughed by cooperative tractors and the cooperative supplies members with seed, fertilizer, irrigation and transport to carry produce to the market. Thus income from the personal

plot depends in large measure on the aid provided by the cooperative.

Question: What income does the family plot yield?

S. Drumev: The farmer earns an average of 300 leva by selling part of his product to the state.

Question: Are the farmers obliged to sell family plot produce to the state?

S. Drumev: No, there is no such obligation. The farmer can dispose of his product himself or through a procurement agency. The latter method is preferred because if, say, he sells a pig to the procurement agency, he gets fodder as an extra bonus.

The Cultural Revolution. In our village, P. Nenov said, the first thing the new system did for us was to open a secondary school. We Bulgarians are not only an industrious people, we are also eager to learn. And I can say that the school has wrought a cultural revolution in the village. In the 24 years since it was built the number of persons with secondary education has increased 5-fold and those with college education 24-fold. In fact, our village has produced 329 college-trained specialists and 256 specialists with specialized secondary-school training. I suppose there is not a single family in which one or more members have not had secondary and higher education.

The new school in my village, A. Lyakhov said, has 1,700 pupils and 70 teachers—there were only 16 before the revolution. Residing in the village are some 350 specialists with secondary and higher education. We are proud of our new concert hall, where companies from Sofia, Plovdiv and other cities perform, and we also have a new cinema seating 400.

Twenty-five years ago, G. Nalbantov said, there was not a single person with a higher education in the whole of my district, whereas today there are 30. Secondary education is practically universal. These two facts, he said, are a measure of our cultural progress.

Cooperative farms grant scholarships to students from their villages. M. Kraichev, chairman of the Ovcharovi Cooperative, said their 36 students receive grants of 70 leva a month, paid by the cooperative. Many graduates, among them 10 agronomists, who received cooperative grants, are now working in Ovcharovo. The graduates, however, are not obliged to return to their cooperatives, they are free to choose their place of work.

The New Village. The changes taking place in the Bulgarian countryside were mentioned by many speakers. P. Nenov cited the example of his own village: in the years of people's rule they have built offices for the cooperative, several schools, recreational and cultural centers, a sports stadium, hospital, bakery, public baths; all the streets are asphalted and all houses have electricity and running water. All the houses in the village are new — the old houses have all been demolished.

Z. Atanasov said that in his village a secondary school, a cultural center with a concert hall seating 350, a health center with a maternity ward, administrative buildings, shops, kindergarten, and bakery had all been built in recent years.

In the 25 years of peoples' rule, N. Malinchev said, his district has changed beyond recognition. There are cultural centers in three of the villages and a sports stadium seating 10,000 in the central village. The latter, incidentally, is famed for its wrestlers, and the cooperative has erected a training hall for them. And let me add, he said, that Perushtitsa is perhaps the only village in the world with a basketball team classed in the top division.

K. Berkov described his cooperative's development programme for 1969-70. It envisages, among other things, three more kindergartens to accommodate 250 children, two cultural centers, shops and a sports complex costing 3,000,000 leva. My village, he said, is known for its swimmers, some of whom are on the national team.

During their visit to Pervenets the comrades from WMR looked in at its excellent kindergarten and nursery. Their meeting with cooperative members was held in the House of Culture, a two-storey building with a 400-seat concert hall, large library, reading room and facilities for amateur art.

In Ovcharovo, they visited S. Popov, a one-time farm laborer. His family of three occupy half of a two-storey house (total floor space 108 sq.m.).

The house was built by the cooperative at a cost of 8,000 leva, of which Popov paid 2,000—he received another 2,000 as a grant from the cooperative, and 4,000 in the shape of a 20-year interest-free loan. The cooperative has built nine such 2-family houses, and a tenth is under construction. The cooperative intends to build 20 such houses a year. The Popovs have modern furniture, a radio and a television set. Total earnings (all three work) run to 3,500 leva a year, with another 300 leva from their household plot.

The scale of the housing and cultural amenities was described by S. Kinev. He cited these figures: prior to the revolution, kindergartens and playgrounds were unknown in Bulgarian villages, now there are 6,390; in 1967 there were 2,614 village cinemas, compared with only 32 in 1939; the number of village libraries increased over the same period from 2,453 to 4,141, most of them housed in new buildings; maternity wards increased from a mere 4 in 1939 to 859 in 1967. More than half of our villages have laid-on water, more than 90 per cent have electricity. Also these figures: 644,000 houses, or 56 per cent of all housing, have been built since the advent of people's rule.

Public Welfare. The growth of cooperative farming, M. Georgiyev said, has made it possible to introduce welfare facilities for all cooperative farmers. This is done through the national pension fund made up of contributions from farm income. The scale of the pension does not depend on the financial resources of the cooperative.*

In addition to payments from the national fund, Georgiyev continued, many cooperatives supplement the pension from their own funds. They also finance summer camps for children, holiday homes and other amenities.

Sick benefits and maternity grants, introduced in 1967, are the same as for city residents.

In our cooperative, Z. Atanasov said, pensioners receive an average of 30-40 leva a month, plus 20 leva from cooperative funds.

T. Berkovski remarked that in his cooperative pensioners can earn an extra 10 leva a month doing part-time work. All pensioners receive bread free of charge from the cooperative.**

P. Nenov said this is also the practice in his cooperative. Cooperative members enjoy paid holidays and the cooperative runs its own seaside rest home and rents a sanatorium. All brigades and work-teams are supplied with meals at reduced prices.

Many speakers drew attention to the special facilities for children. Citing his own cooperative, P. Kordovski said that it covers all expenses on children between 18 months and 7 years. Meals in the six kindergartens are free, and so is accommodation at the cooperative's summer camp

*Last year, 841,800 cooperative farmers were receiving pensions averaging 25 leva a month. The pension age for women is 55 and 60 for men.

**Many cooperatives provide pensioners with bread and other items of food. This is the rule in 48 per cent of all cooperatives, and 50 per cent pay additional pensions.

for children between the ages of 7 and 14.

R. Petrova remarked that care of the child actually begins before birth, for every village has a health center where expectant mothers can receive expert advice. In her own village there is a baby-food kitchen, a kindergarten for 100 children and a day nursery for 30. School meals are free. All children go to summer camps, one of which is run by the cooperative itself. Cooperative members enjoy 15 days paid holiday which they can spend at one of the country's health resorts. All members are entitled to sick benefit; 465 members receive pensions.

K. Nikolov, chairman of the Ovcharovo District Council, said it has become a tradition to present newly-weds with a cheque for 100 leva; young men called up for military service get 50 leva, the mother of each newborn baby is given a savings book with an initial deposit of 40 leva.

M. Kraichev, chairman of the Ovcharovo Cooperative, added that they had 498 pensioners, to each of whom the cooperative pays an extra 20 leva a month. The cooperative has its Black Sea holiday home for 80; the cost is 12 leva for 15 days. Each year about 900 cooperative farmers spend their holidays in holiday centers.

What Is Your Definition of Happiness? This question was put to Leningrad workers during a meeting with them (see WMR No. 4, 1969). It was interesting to put the same question to Bulgarian cooperative farmers. How do they understand happiness? Does their conception coincide with that of the Leningrad worker?

The answers show that, in the main, it does. Nor is this accidental, for in both cases happiness is associated above all with the new life ushered in by socialism.

Here are some of the answers:

I. Airanova: Happiness can mean many different things, but in my view it means, first and foremost, life and work in a society free from exploitation, a society that holds out a future for one's children and educates them to be devoted builders of the new socialist society.

E. Videnova: Each understands happiness in his own way. This is how I, a milkmaid, understand it. I am happy that I have two fine children. My son is studying engineering and my daughter is in a technical school. And I am happy when we come together in the evenings to talk and argue—they are young, yes; but you'd be surprised how much they know. And I know, too, that I owe my happiness to socialism,

that I could find happiness only in a socialist Bulgarian.

R. Petrova: Bulgarian women are happy also because their work is so highly regarded, because they can work in an atmosphere of peace, and because the government displays such solicitude for their children.

Z. Topalov said he derives moral satisfaction from his work in the cooperative: it is gratifying to know that my effort has gone into the growing prosperity of our cooperative. And it is good to feel that you are master of the cooperative, of the whole country, in fact. Work for the common weal, confidence in the future—that is what makes a man happy. We cooperative farmers realize only too well that our achievements, the remarkable changes in our daily lives have been possible thanks solely to the policy of our Communist Party and the aid of the Soviet Union. That is why we farmers have boundless faith in the Communist Party and are convinced that under its leadership our people will march from progress to progress in building socialism and communism.

* * *

Before leaving Bulgaria, the representatives of fraternal parties working in the journal met with Stanko Todorov, Political Bureau Member and Central Committee secretary of the Communist Party. He described the Party's main tasks in the economic, political and ideological fields.

Bulgaria, he said, has now entered the stage of building a developed socialist society. This has been made possible by our previous progress under the leadership of the Party, which enjoys the undivided support of our workers, farmers and intellectuals.

The Central Committee, Stanko Todorov said, acting on the initiative and under the leadership of Todor Zhivkov, has drawn up a number of decisions, based on the resolutions of the 9th Party Congress; these set out our main goals in building a developed socialist society.

Bulgaria is rapidly expanding her economy, Todorov emphasized, but under present conditions economic development must be intensive, based on the technological revolution and international integration of production. The Party wants to raise the technological level of our economy and is making a special effort to introduce industrial techniques in agriculture. Comprehen-

sive mechanization and better organization of farming, Todorov emphasized, will enable us to match world standards in basic economic indicators. More efficient farming is not a purely technical or economic problem — it is an important political and social matter.

Replying to questions, Todorov said that in a socialist society development of democracy can proceed only under the leadership of the Communist Party. Any diminution of the Party's leading role can but un-

dermine the foundations of socialism. And, in this context, he pointed to the importance of the Party's ideological work in moulding a Communist outlook and consciousness of one's patriotic and internationalist duty.

In conclusion, the WMR team asked Comrade Todorov to convey to the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party their gratitude for the opportunity to acquaint themselves with the life of the country's cooperative farmers.

West Berlin: Anti-imperialist struggle

The special congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (West Berlin), held in February, approved the report of Party Chairman Gerhard Danelius as the Party's political line. It also adopted a statement of principles and aims and amended the Party Rules. The name of the Party was changed to Socialist Unity Party of West Berlin.

The Congress ushered in a new stage in our effort to make West Berlin, situated on the boundary between socialism and imperialism, play a positive role in the struggle for peace, the nation's future and social progress.

This is our answer to Bonn's attempts unlawfully to present West Berlin as a composite part of the Federal Republic and use it for provocation against the German Democratic Republic, with all the dangers implicit in that policy.

The mounting political and economic influence of the GDR is a fact with which the West-German and West-Berlin monopoly bourgeoisie must reckon. Indeed, it finds itself compelled to camouflage the system of capitalist exploitation, even make certain concessions in order to avoid sharper political and social conflicts. These and other developments show that the GDR is a reliable support base for West-Berlin workers in all their class conflicts and, needless to say, this objectively favors our anti-imperialist fight.

The Party Congress was able to record a rise in the West-Berlin movement for a change of policy that would benefit the working population and free the city from dangerous subjection to Bonn and NATO. The movement involves both blue-collar and white-collar workers, Communists and Social-Democrats, university students and lecturers, trade-unionists, Catholics and Protestants.

The Congress, and particularly the policy debate, received much attention — there were 83 reporters from West Berlin, the GDR, West Germany and European capitalist and socialist countries. The press showed a marked interest in the growth of the Party, the influx of young members, and, especially, the Party's policy at the present juncture, when contradictions between imperialism and socialism are becoming more tense and, in West Berlin itself, the dividing line between the interests of its peaceful population and the policy of the Bonn and West-Berlin rulers is more sharply drawn.

More specifically, the Congress was important in view of the following developments.

Last December the then Bundestag president, Gerstenmaier, (since forced to resign on charges of corruption) announced that the March presidential election would be held in West Berlin, though the city is not part of the Federal Republic. Like previous violations of international law, this move by the Bonn and West-Berlin authorities was conceived as an arrogant demonstration in support of Bonn's claim to be the sole representative of all Germans. This was an outright challenge to the GDR.

The West-Berlin Senate and the Right-wing Social Democrat Mayor, Klaus Schutz, fully backed this provocation, wholly ignoring the fact that the entire West Berlin population, mindful of previous expansionist experiments that jeopardized peace, and fully aware that such imperialist moves could only breed more tension, wanted a policy of peace, detente and security.

Indicative in this respect is the resolution of the West-Berlin Free University council on the FRG presidential election: "The avowed purpose of holding the election in West Berlin is to support the contention

that the city is part of the Federal Republic. This is a continuation of the policy of non-recognition of existing European boundaries and of the German Democratic Republic."

In this situation, the alternative suggested by our Party to prevent continuation of cold-war policies was in the interests of the West Berlin population.

Staging the presidential election in West Berlin, we said, was a clear menace to peace and security. A genuine German peace policy, we emphasized, ought to begin with recognition of the German Democratic Republic, renunciation of all claims to "exclusive representation of the German people and conclusion of a treaty renouncing the use of force.

This would be the beginning of peaceful coexistence and a peaceful life for the Germans in the Federal Republic, the Democratic Republic and West Berlin. It would be the beginning of a detente that would assure peace to us Germans and the whole of Europe.

This view was shared by Dr. Sarkander, who attended the congress as a representative of the West-Berlin Committee for Peace and National and International Understanding.

From its inception, our Party has pursued a policy of peace, detente and normal relations with the GDR on a basis of equality and mutual advantage. And our Party facilitated the agreements that enabled West-Berliners to visit their relatives in the GDR capital in 1963, 1964 and 1965. Subsequently negotiations between the GDR Government and the West-Berlin Senate broke down owing to the latter's intransigence: contrary to common sense it replied to the GDR proposal by declaring its support for Bonn's "exclusive representation" claim. As late as February 23, 1969, Comrade Danelius said there was still a chance to arrange Easter visits if Bonn would agree not to hold the election in West Berlin. But the Federal Chancellor declared: "The prospect of a better climate cannot, of course, induce us to shift the presidential election to another venue." The Springer press called for "a firm stand"; the Senate issued a statement implying that it would do nothing to prevent this new Bonn provocation and advanced demands patently unacceptable to the GDR. Bonn and the Senate hardened their position after President Nixon's visit to the city on February 27.

Our Party called for a protest demonstration on March 4. On March 3 the Senate

banned the demonstration—it had to use 1,700 words to explain its illegal decision—but on the evening of March 4 thousands of West Berliners defied the police and marched in protest against the Bonn provocation.

Another important event shortly before the Party congress was the militant demonstration in the Tiergarten area of workers from the AEG-Turbine plant. Their demand was for job security and defense of their social gains: the AEG management, with the tacit consent of the West Berlin Senate, had decided to transfer production of 300 mgw turbines to West Germany. This would have been a telling blow to West-Berlin workers and the West-Berlin economy in general, for electrical engineering accounts for two-thirds of total production. On January 24, 2,000 skilled AEG workers downed tools and demonstrated against the management's "run-away" decision.

Though Senate officials have solemnly promised to stop the "run-aways," many big concerns, especially in engineering, are transferring to West Germany. If this continues West Berlin will be reduced, economically, to auxiliary and dependent status.

The events at the AEG and other plants fully confirmed what our Party had been saying all along, namely, that the Senate policy of subjecting West Berlin to Bonn was aimed first and foremost against the working people. They also confirmed the imperative need for worker participation in the management of the major industries and in the West-Berlin economy as a whole.

We have repeatedly insisted on this. And we understand worker participation to mean the effective right of the workers, their production councils and trade unions, to have a say on all questions pertaining to personnel, social, economic, financial and investment policies, the right to protest and control management decisions. In May 1968 our Party drew up a draft law to that effect, emphasizing that it could be realized only through active support by all workers. Actions at factory level, the Party said, should be closely tied to wage demands, full employment and more social amenities, and also to the fight to restrict monopoly power.

Demonstrations for a democratic educational reform, recognition of the GDR, free speech on political issues and against the Senate's proposed "disciplinary rules" were held in the two West Berlin universities and the Teachers College. Students and lecturers were supported by the young

workers' movement against the profit-swollen monopolies and the Senate's anti-democratic policy.

In this situation, the Party Congress decided on a more active campaign for united working class action as the basis for cooperation of all West-Berlin democratic and socialist forces for peace, democracy and social progress. Comrade Danelius told the Congress: "We are faced with a sharp antagonism between blue-collar and white-collar workers on the one hand, and the system and mechanism of latter-day capitalist power on the other.

"Our opportunities for emancipation, both ideological and in more practical terms, of workers now influenced by the Right-wing Socialist-Democratic leadership will be all the greater the more we are able to win over young workers, trade-unionists, Social-Democrats, young Socialists, students and university lecturers for joint struggle in defense of interests which they accept as their own."

The SUP policy is entirely in the interests of the West Berlin working people. And ever since our first congress, in May 1966, this policy has been subjected to a severe test in the difficult conditions created by our situation at the cross-roads of socialism and imperialism. These years have seen a sharpening of contradictions between the growing forces of socialism and imperialism, which is seeking a way out in provocation and warlike gambles. These years have seen a sharpening antagonism between labor and capital, between the forces of aggression and reaction, on the one hand, and the forces of social progress, on the other.

The Party demands that the West-Berlin Senate follow an independent policy of peace and oppose all attempts to use the city for provocations against the GDR and other socialist countries. We demand agreements with the GDR, an end to West Berlin's subjection to Bonn, and to the latter's claim to "exclusive representation" and its drive for boundary revision. These are all pressing issues and, whether the Senate likes it or not, our demands have the support of increasing numbers of the West-Berlin population.

The policy of tying West Berlin to Bonn was stepped up after November 1966, when Social-Democrats Brandt, Schiller and Wehner joined Kiesinger and Strauss in the Grand Coalition.

Last year brought increasing support for our demand to normalize relations with the GDR. This was clearly shown by the mass

anti-imperialist May Day demonstration.

The policy of shunning reality and refusing to recognize the sovereignty of the GDR, which the Senate and Mayor Schutz have pursued with such consistency, is widening the gap separating them and Bonn from the West-Berlin working people. Indicative in this respect is that both the Senate and the Bonn government intensified their arrogant propaganda about West Berlin being part of West Germany as the hope grew among Bonn and West-Berlin revanchists of severing Czechoslovakia from the socialist camp and eventually changing the territorial status quo in Germany and the alignment of forces in Europe in favor of imperialism.

But the situation changed after the presidential-election provocation of March 5. More and more West-Berliners are coming to see things in a more realistic light. They feel that the Bonn gentry are anything but friends, that our demand for an end to the provocations and for normal relations with the GDR is the only possible alternative to the cold-war policy and its destructive consequences.

Our Party urges all opponents of capitalism, all supporters of democracy and social progress, to join forces and rescue West Berlin from the adventurist policies of Bonn and put an end to the city's subordination to NATO.

The sharpening labor-capital confrontation has confirmed the validity and vital need of our policy of united working-class action, restriction and abolition of monopoly power, and broad and effective worker participation in economic management.

The big concerns are pursuing a "brink-of-unemployment" policy to prevent worker action in support of wage and participation in management demands.

By mid-1967 many factories had gone over to part-time work. The West-Berlin Senate, submissive as always to Bonn policy, blandly stated that this was being done "against its wishes," and some Social-Democrat Senate members even argued that this "streamlining" would benefit the entire community. But even the trade union *Welt der Arbeit* reported that "while net wages have gone up by about 1 per cent, net profits are up by about 33 per cent".

The Right-wing Social-Democrats try to channel the demand for worker participation into "worker cooperation" with management. In contrast, our Party insists that the working class have a more important position and a more effective function in society. This is becoming a key issue in

promoting democracy, an instrument for effective struggle against the monopoly bourgeoisie and its policy of transferring major industries to West Germany. The fight on this issue is an important factor in abolishing the reactionary social system of latter-day capitalism.

Our propaganda for concerted effort by all opponents of capitalism played no small part in promoting the 1967 and 1968 mass demonstrations against the U.S. aggression in Vietnam, neo-Nazism, the emergency laws, in defence of constitutional rights and freedoms, for broad and effective participation in management, against big-capital exploitation of the universities, and for a democratic educational and university reform. And our propaganda did much to expose the substance of, and energize the movement against, the policy of Bonn and the West-Berlin Senate.

In December 1968 thousands of West-Berlin workers demonstrated against the acquittal, by the West-Berlin court, of the Nazi judge Rhese, who had sent hundreds of anti-fascists to the gallows.

Our Party firmly adheres to Lenin's proposition that the masses learn best from their own experience in the struggle for social and political rights. It is not enough to oppose the Senate's policy by advancing another policy concept. If the interests of the West-Berlin population and the demands of the workers and students are to be satisfied, we must have organised united action against the policy of the West-German monopolies and their West-Berlin accomplices. The monopoly-serving press and the Left-radical petty-bourgeois windbags are using anti-communism and anti-Sovietism to sow discord and division among anti-imperialists. Our Party is countering that by an organized campaign for united action by the working class and all opponents of the imperialist system.

Our Congress reaffirmed anew the Party's unswerving stand for proletarian internationalism. In this it is guided by the experience of the German and international working class and by the proposition worked out by the fraternal parties that each

Communist Party, in the specific conditions prevailing in its country, is responsible to the working class of that country, but also to the international workers' movement. And the closer the unity and solidarity of the Communist and Workers' parties of Europe and the world, the more effective will our struggle be.

In conformity with these principles, mindful of our own experience in the fight against West-German imperialism, and with a clear understanding of its rapacious nature and expansionist proclivities, our Party believes that it is the prime duty of Communists to defend socialism and repel the internal and external forces of counter-revolution.

Our Congress declared that the struggle for the vital interests of the West Berlin people and the struggle for normal relations with the GDR are parts of an integral whole. We support the forthcoming Moscow Conference of Communist and Workers' parties.

Party members and functionaries are working to translate into reality the tasks set by the Congress. Thus, on March 3, workers of the AEG-Turbine plant staged a token strike against management and Senate procrastination in meeting the demands advanced in January. Later in March there was a demonstration of apprentices demanding equal pay for equal work and better training facilities. Our Party calls for guaranteed equal pay for women and young workers and its proposals for worker participation in management include occupational training and general education for young workers.

On March 15 the Party and other anti-imperialist forces vigorously protested against neo-Nazi attempts to extend their activities to West Berlin.

The Socialist Unity Party of West Berlin consistently opposes the policy of Schutz and the Senate of tying the city to Bonn. We are vigorously working for a detente, normal relations with the GDR, for peace, democracy and social progress.

Karlheinz KNIESTEDT

Towards the Lenin Centenary

INDIA

The National Council of the Communist Party of India, held on April 5-12, 1969, adopted a resolution calling upon all Party units, members and sympathizers to celebrate on a truly nation-wide and mass scale the great event of the hundredth birth anniversary of Lenin, the greatest revolutionary and thinker.

The resolution pointed out that "the name of Lenin will forever be bound up with the revolutionary freedom struggle of our great peoples. As early as 1908, Lenin hailed the political action of the working class strike against the arrest of Tilak. Full forty years before we gained freedom, Lenin foretold the doom of British imperialist rule over India. Till the very last days Lenin closely followed the progress of our freedom movement, analyzing it and working out the path for its speedier advance...

"Whole generations of Indian freedom fighters were inspired by the name and ideas of Lenin. It was Lenin and his ideas that inspired ardent Indian patriots to turn to the working class, to organizing the toiling peasantry and advancing a militant anti-imperialist program of complete independence, ending of feudalism and opening the high road to socialism. It was Lenin and his ideas which led these patriots to found the Communist Party of India as an indispensable factor in the freedom struggle of our peoples."

The resolution goes on to say that "now, when our country stands poised once again on the brink of great happenings, when the bankruptcy of the capitalist path of development has burst in the shape of a grave and intensifying political crisis, when the forces of reaction and the forces of the Left and democracy are gathering for a decisive confrontation, the ideas of Lenin are needed as never before."

The resolution outlines a detailed program for the celebrations:

—From April 22 this year, plans are to be made to take the ideas of Lenin to the

toiling masses on the widest possible scale. Broadly-based Lenin Centenary Celebration Committees should be set up wherever possible.

—The sale of Lenin's works is to be organized. The three volume edition of his *Selected Works*, should be translated into as many major Indian languages as possible along with the short biography of Lenin.

—At Party Schools at all levels, special classes must be conducted on the life, work and teachings of Lenin.

—Arrangements must be made to organize lectures on Lenin for the workers of every factory and the toiling peasants of every village where there is a branch of the Communist Party.

—Special meetings on Lenin should be organized by the Communist Party in every state capital and district centre. Exhibitions and film shows must be held on the widest possible scale.

—Seminars and symposia must be held on a broad basis to discuss the teachings of Lenin and their relevance to the present crisis in India.

—Special posters, banners and badges will be produced, displayed and distributed on a big scale.

—A special Lenin Enrolment Week for recruiting new members in a planned manner should be observed from November 1 to 7 this year.

—The celebrations to be concluded with the observance of a Special Lenin Week from April 15 to 22, 1970.

The National Council worked out this program on the basis of the work already started by the State Councils of the Party in different parts of the country. For example, in the State of Kerala, a broadly-based and representative Lenin Centenary Celebration Committee has been set up. The Chief Minister of the United Front Government in Kerala (leader of the break-away Marxist Communist Party) is the Chairman of the Celebrations Committee.

Many progressive and prominent public figures are members of the Committee.

The Party publishing house in Kerala has started work on the translation and editing of the three-volume *Selected Works* of Lenin to be published in Malayalam on 22nd April, 1970. The publication will consist of about 3,600 printed pages in Malayalam. Nearly three dozen Communist and non-Communist writers, journalists and literary men have been mobilized to do the translation. The Party is organizing a mass campaign to enrol pre-publication subscribers at concessional rates for the *Selected Works* of Lenin in Malayalam.

An Institute of Marxist Studies, set up by the Kerala State Council of the Communist Party of India, was formally inaugurated on April 22nd this year. The Institute will organize and promote studies and research on social, economic, philosophical, historical and other problems from a Marxist standpoint by conducting debates, lectures, studies, seminars, symposia, etc., on various topics and problems, including the fundamentals of Marxism. It is planned to publish a quarterly journal under the auspices of the Institute.

The centenary celebrations were inaugurated on 22nd April under the joint auspices of the Lenin Centenary Celebrations Committee, the Kerala Institute of Marxist Studies and the Kerala State Council of the Indo-Soviet Cultural Society. There was a three-day seminar at Trivandrum, the capital of Kerala State, in which prominent Marxist and progressive scholars read papers on "Lenin and the National Liberation Movement with special reference to India," "Lenin and the Intelligentsia," "Lenin and the United Front," "Lenin and Left-Wing Communism," "Lenin — a Marxist Thinker," etc. Director of the Bureau of Economics, Kerala Government, Director of the Kerala Languages Institute, Head of the Politics Department of Kerala University, Minister of Agriculture, Kerala Government were some of the participants in the seminar.

There was also a gala public meeting on April 22nd evening at Trivandrum where

leaders of the Communist and other Left parties as well as progressive literary men spoke.

The Kerala University organized an exhibition of books on Lenin in the University Library. The Centenary Celebrations Committee presented to the exhibition 60 books by Lenin in English and Malayalam. The set of the 40-volume *Collected Works* of Lenin has also been presented, with which Kerala University Library has started a special Lenin Section.

In India the name of Lenin is widely known, honoured and respected ever since the October Revolution which was headed by the Bolsheviks of whom Lenin was inspirer, leader and organizer. Gandhi, the leader of the struggle of the Indian people the master-spirits of humanity. Jawaharlal against British rule, hailed Lenin as one of Nehru expressed his respect and admiration for Lenin on innumerable occasions. Bhagat Singh and his immortal colleagues celebrated Lenin Day literally on their way to the gallows. Innumerable biographies and translations of the works of Lenin have appeared in different Indian languages. In the state of Kerala, in many working class families the parents have given the name of Lenin to their sons.

As pointed out in the resolution of the National Council of the Communist Party of India, "the biggest tribute and the worthiest way to celebrate the Lenin centenary would be to struggle for the still greater ideological cohesion of the Party on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, to reinforce its organization, expand its links with the toiling people and make it a still finer weapon in the service of the revolutionary struggle of our peoples."

The Communist Party of India has declared its resolve and pledge to rededicate itself to the ideals of Lenin, to re-equip itself through further study of Lenin's ideas and to work to its utmost capacity for achieving the fusion of Leninism with the working class and toilers movement of the country during the Lenin Centenary year.

C. UNNI RAJA

THE MONGOLIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC

In 1970 the Mongolian people and their Party will, together with the Soviet peoples, the peoples of the other socialist countries, the fraternal Communist and Workers' parties and the working people all over the world, mark the centenary of Lenin's birth.

The Central Committee of the Party has in this connection adopted a decision "In Preparation for the 100th Anniversary of the Birth of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin", showing Lenin's role and teaching in the world revolutionary and Communist movement,

in the struggle of the Mongolian people for freedom and independence, for socialism.

The decision stresses that the great revolutionary changes of our age, which have completely changed the social face of the world, are associated with the name of Lenin, who was a thinker of genius, and an unsurpassed theoretician and exponent of communism.

Lenin exemplified irreconcilable struggle against deviations from the revolutionary essence of Marxism, and against attempts to turn theory into a collection of dogmas, divorced from life, from revolutionary practice. He consistently upheld the purity of Marxism, uncompromisingly combated revisionist and dogmatic distortions of it. Lenin's entire theoretical and practical activity is permeated with a profound understanding of Marxism as an ever living, developing doctrine, is an example of a creative approach to it.

The decision shows Lenin's role as leader of the proletarian revolution, as the founder and leader of the CPSU and the world's first socialist state.

"V. I. Lenin was the recognized leader of the international Communist movement, an ardent internationalist and champion of international solidarity of the working people," states the Central Committee decision.

He constantly promoted unity of the world-wide proletarian army on the principles of scientific communism, made an invaluable contribution to the strategy and tactics of the Communist movement.

"The freedom and independence won by the Mongolian people, their success in building the new life are indissolubly associated with the name of Lenin, with his great teaching," we read in the decision. Lenin showed the peoples of the oppressed countries the way to national and social emancipation. He resolutely supported the liberation struggle of these peoples as an integral part of the world revolutionary process, comprehensively substantiating the need to combine the national liberation movement in the colonies and semi-colonies with the class struggle of the proletariat of the advanced countries.

A very important factor that made possible the success of the revolutionary struggle of our people was the close contact established by the Mongolian revolutionaries with the Leninist party, their meetings with the founder of the Soviet state. In his talks with them Lenin stressed that the only way for the working people of Mongolia was to fight for state and eco-

nomic independence, in alliance with the workers and peasants of Soviet Russia, and that the establishment of a revolutionary party of the Mongolian arats was essential to the success of this struggle.

Acting on Lenin's counsel, the outstanding revolutionary Sukhe-Bator and his associates formed the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party. The founding of this party in a country which had no working class and where the bulk of the population consisted of herdsmen, was a living embodiment of the Leninist teaching about the possibility of creatively applying Communist theory and tactics to conditions when the peasantry constitute the main mass.

A most important contribution to the theory and practice of the revolutionary movement was Lenin's elaboration of the new paths of development opened, as a result of the victory of the proletarian revolution, to the peoples of the backward countries who have won freedom. Proceeding in their general line from the Leninist precept that "with the aid of the proletariat of the advanced countries, backward countries can go over to the Soviet system and, through certain stages of development, to communism, without having to pass through the capitalist stage", the MPRP headed the struggle of our people for the fundamental revolutionary transformation of the country's political, economic and cultural life along non-capitalist lines.

As a result of these big changes of an anti-feudal and anti-capitalist character, an end was put to feudal relations and the class of feudal lords, the road was barred to capitalism and a national bourgeoisie, and economic independence was achieved. The general democratic changes went hand in hand with the birth and development, with the help of the world's first socialist country, of a new socialist economy, and the appearance and growth of new social forces—a national working class and people's intelligentsia.

The people's khurals, formed in the course of the revolutionary reconstruction of Mongolian society, were a variety of peasant Soviets which Lenin repeatedly stressed could and should be established in countries where pre-capitalist relations prevailed. As the people's revolution took root, the revolutionary-democratic power of the arats evolved into the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The experience of the Mongolian People's Republic which made the historic transition from feudalism to socialism, confirmed that

only the path indicated by Lenin, the socialist path, leads to genuine national emancipation and social progress.

The decision particularly stresses how the comprehensive fraternal aid rendered by the Soviet Union helped the Mongolian people to win and consolidate their freedom and independence, to overcome the centuries-old backwardness of the country and to build socialism.

The decision examines, in the light of Lenin's teaching on socialism and communism, the problems connected with the present stage in socialist construction in the country, and its further development.

"The more complex the tasks facing the Party and the people, the greater the implication of Lenin's ideas and principles regarding the building of the new society," the decision notes. The Party aims to turn the Mongolian People's Republic in the near future into an industrial-agrarian country with a modern industry. In its policy of industrialization the Party proceeds from the need to marshall all internal resources and possibilities, to avail itself of the advantages of economic cooperation with the fraternal socialist countries, concentrating on the development of those branches which have the most favorable natural and economic conditions.

As it tackles the important tasks of socialist construction the Party is at the same time promoting the unity and organization of its ranks, strengthening its tie with the masses and on this basis enhancing its ideological-political influence among them.

The Central Committee of the Party has directed all Party organizations to develop mass political and propaganda work among the population, explaining Lenin's historic role as theoretician, revolutionary, and founder of the CPSU and the Soviet state, as leader of the world revolutionary movement, as the teacher and great friend of the Mongolian people, the importance of the Marxist-Leninist teaching in building socialism in our country, in developing and promoting the socialist world system, the entire revolutionary movement of our time.

As part of the centenary preparations the country's industrial, agricultural and other enterprises have started a socialist emulation drive for pre-schedule fulfilment of targets. The central and local papers, radio

and TV carry and broadcast materials devoted to the forthcoming anniversary. Conferences and lectures are being organized on the subject. The Young Pioneers and school children have started a movement under the watchword "To be true to the behests of Lenin". In the higher educational institutions a competition has been announced for the best research in the social sciences.

Collections of Lenin's works are being prepared for production. These will include the pamphlets *Labor Productivity*, *Ideological Work*, *The Peoples of the East*, *The Organizational Work of the Party*, *Accounting and Control*. Also books by Mongolian authors will be put out: *Lenin, the Teacher and Friend of the Mongolian People*, *Lenin and Mongolia*, *The Mongolian People's Republic Advances Along the Lenin Road*, and others.

The country's writers, poets, composers and artists are creating works dedicated to the Lenin theme.

The Academy of Sciences of the MPR, the Institute of the History of the Party, and the country's higher educational institutions are studying contemporary aspects of Marxist-Leninist theory: the economic problems of socialist construction, perfecting social relations and the Communist education of the working people, showing the profound meaning of Lenin's teaching regarding the non-capitalist, socialist path of development for the Mongolian People's Republic.

One of the main aspects of the centenary preparations is the further strengthening of the bonds of Mongolian-Soviet friendship initiated by the great Lenin and the leader of the Mongolian revolution, Sukhe-Bator. The Party, the Revolutionary Youth League, the trade union organization, the Mongolian-Soviet Friendship Society, and the Mongolian Federation of Peace and Friendship Organizations are popularizing the success of the Soviet people in carrying out Lenin's behests in communist construction, the experience of the Soviet people in all spheres of endeavour. The number of Russian language classes is increasing and competitions have been announced for the best works on Lenin and on Soviet-Mongolian friendship.

Ts. D.

Some roots of opportunism

LONGINO BECERRA

The international Communist movement has grown. Marxism-Leninism, the scientific theory lighting the way to a revolutionary reconstruction of the world, is gaining more and more followers. Yet weeds of opportunism keep shooting up, diverting the workers from their historical mission of extirpating capitalism and building socialism in its stead. Investigating the nature and peculiarities of present-day opportunism is a complex scientific assignment. It cannot be done overnight, and entails a collective effort by Marxist researchers. The aims of this article are therefore far more modest: all it sets out to do is take stock of some of the sources of present-day opportunist vacillation.

Marxism has had to combat opportunist trends for more than a hundred years. Considerable victories are on record in exposing their substance, roots and character. But the battle is not over, for opportunist trends reappear clad in new garb and are deliberately encouraged by the capitalists, the class enemy.

The irreconcilable stand of the founders of Marxism against trends represented by Lassalle, Bernstein, Kautsky and others, against reformism and anarchism is a model of the truly ideological approach to the issue. All their works concerning opportunism are based on the following main idea: opportunist trends surfacing in the class struggle of the workers are expressive of bourgeois influence, emanating from bourgeois and petty-bourgeois survivals grafted onto the working class by members of other classes. This concept was completely in harmony with the facts in the period of developing capitalism, the lifetime of the founders of Marxism.

The *Communist Manifesto* says that "entire sections of the ruling classes are, by

the advance of industry, precipitated into the proletariat, or are at least threatened in their conditions of existence."*

The Circular sent by Marx and Engels to Bebel, Liebknecht and others, also contains an explicit warning on this score: "If members of other classes join the proletarian movement, what is primarily required of them is to leave behind the remnants of bourgeois, petty-bourgeois and similar prejudices and unconditionally accept the proletarian world outlook."**

We may also recall that in his *The Condition of the Working Class in England*, Engels referred to the "bourgeois respectability" displayed by the privileged minority of the workers created by the advantages of the industrial monopoly wielded by the British capitalism of that age.

In many of his works Lenin examines the sources of opportunism, corroborating the point of view expressed by Marx and Engels, namely, that opportunists "are alien to the proletariat as a class . . . are the servants, the agents of the bourgeoisie and the vehicles of its influence."*** The reason why their viewpoints coincide, as Lenin indicated, is that the seeds of opportunism reduce the workers' struggle either to forms acceptable to the bourgeoisie, or to a scrimmage for extremist aims, aims, in other words, in no way related to the process of accumulating strength. Both these Right and "Left" trends act as a brake on the class struggle, for which reason, despite their disparity, they are objectively an expression of bourgeois influence.

In treating the problem, Lenin proceeded from general Marxist principles, which he applied to the conditions of his time, and,

*Marx, Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party*.

**Marx and Engels, *Completed Works* (in Russian), Vol. 19, p. 174.

***Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 111.

being essentially dialectical, his method enabled him to make a profound analysis of the economic, political and ideological aspects of opportunism. That is why he goes far beyond the critical though shallow view that, ostensibly, opportunism is a fortuitous phenomenon, the result of confusion in the minds of some or the product of some national peculiarity. As Lenin sees it, it sprang from "deep-rooted causes in the economic system and in the character of the development of all capitalist countries which constantly give rise to these (opportunist—L.B.) departures."*

Lenin, judging by his works, defined the sources of opportunism at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th century as follows: a) the general growth of the working class by virtue of the steady development of the productive forces and the inflow into its ranks of other, chiefly petty-bourgeois, social strata; b) the variety of methods employed by the capitalists who sought to reduce to nought the fighting capacity of the proletariat in the battle for its supreme aims by inducing it to sacrifice the basic interests for the sake of receiving forthwith real or imaginary material benefits and c) the economic and political crumbs which capitalists drop to some sections of the working class.**

DANGER OF SCHEMATISM

Lenin's approach is doubtlessly valid still. The wealth of his deductions is for us an effective guide in the ideological battle of today. What we should bear in mind, however, is that this valuable ideological weapon must be used creatively, not dogmatically, in our study of the origins and the new forms of opportunism. Should we ever forego this dialectical rule, sterile schematism is sure to be the result.

As we see it, two mistakes are committed in approaching the problem without sufficient substantive evidence: firstly, the viewpoint of the Marxist-Leninist classics is over-simplified, with anything but dialectical conclusions being ascribed to them, usually confined to just one or two elements: bribery of some sections of the working class or precipitation of some groups of the petty-bourgeoisie into the labor movement, and, secondly, the structural changes of the many factors pertain-

ing to the problem are overlooked, such as the trends of capitalist accumulation, the employment structure, wage dynamics, the economic and political methods of capitalism, etc. Yet, obviously, the schematic approach will hardly succeed in combating present-day opportunism in the labor movement.

This is true, we hold, with respect to the "workers' aristocracy" concept, usually posited as the fundamental factor in analyses of opportunism. True, that "aristocracy" is still extant. Yet, taken singly as the theoretical point of departure it cannot explain the far more complex development that in our time the imperialist bourgeoisie also employs other means, means much broader and much more effective than handing out sops from its profit to definite elements in the working class. If that were all, the implications of opportunism would be less grave, and combating it would be incomparably easier. The facts show, however, that things are not quite so simple. In fact, the exponents of opportunist views are not necessarily those who get the highest salaries or occupy prominent posts in the bureaucratic machinery manipulating the labor movement. It should be borne in mind, however, that relatively highly-paid technical and other jobs are proliferating these days.

THE NEW LEFT

The theory of the so-called New Left is no more valid than the "labor aristocracy" concept, which, schematically employed, is of little use in grappling with a highly complex problem. The exponents of various "theories" ascribe schematism not merely to those guilty of it but to Marxism-Leninism, and proceed to proclaim on these grounds that Marxist-Leninist postulates related to this and other fundamental issues are "out-dated." As they see it, opportunism is rife not among a lesser section of the working class. The bulk of the workers hold an opportunist view of the capitalist system. Herbert Marcuse, a proponent of this "concept," maintains that the "labor aristocracy" theory is no longer valid, and endeavors to prove that the workers are "integrating" in capitalist society and that this integration is "by no means confined to the small minority of a labor bureaucracy but extends to the rank and file."*

*Collected Works, Vol. 16 p. 347.

**See Lenin's works: *Marxism and Reformism* (1908), *Differences in the European Labor Movement* (1911), and *Imperialism and the Split in Socialism* (1916), and others.

*From *The Obsolescence of Marxism*, quoted by Hyman Lumer in *Political Affairs*, November 1968.

What makes Marcuse think so? He avers that the objective process under way in the so-called technological society is changing the working class by virtue of technology into a force gravitating to the status quo, implying thereby that its role of revolutionary vanguard can be written off. As a result, the workers become "integrated" and lose interest in overthrowing the capitalist system; on the contrary, they acquire a stake in protecting it. And, Marcuse contends, the material and other comforts of the "consumer society" stimulate the workers' assimilation in capitalist society.

To begin with, no such objective process as the workers "integration" exists. In definite circumstances (as, say, in the United States) large sections of the working class still face strong opportunist ideological pressures. But so long as the main contradiction of the capitalist system (the contradiction between the social nature of production and the private form of appropriating the fruits of labor) is not abolished, no new technological developments could conceivably wipe out the class antagonism. On the contrary—and Bruno Trenton demonstrated this during a recent discussion of the trends in European capitalism at the Gramsci Institute—current changes in working conditions modify the situation of the proletariat and, at once, create new grounds for class collisions. The job now, Trenton holds, is to define the forms these collisions take at present, for workers' struggles these days centre on a variety of issues, not just wage demands.

The facts show, indeed, that the deepening of the contradictions of capitalism and primarily that between the state-monopoly element and the workers, not the workers' integration in imperialist society, not a reconciliation with capitalist conditions, is the dominant objective process of our time. A close look at modern capitalist society shows that it does not fit the concept of a "one-dimensional world" in which the working class follows the lead of the bourgeoisie, as claimed by the New Left. The strike movement, among many other facts, demonstrates the deep-rooted opposition of the workers who are profoundly critical of the capitalist system. In the past four years the strike curve in the capitalist world has gone up steeply, with 37 million strikers in 1965, 45 million in 1966; 47 million in 1967 and nearly 57 million in 1968.* Most convincing in this respect were last year's powerful movements of the French and

Italian workers the scale of which invites comparison with some of the most heroic chapters in the history of the class struggle of those two countries.

It should be noted, too, that neo-Bernsteinism, on which the liberal critics of developed capitalism build their arguments, is a distortion of facts. Advanced capitalist society, they say, is "irrational" because it suppresses individual freedoms, yet it is "rational" because it dispenses the material blessings of mass production. Exploitation, as it were, vanishes into thin air and, understandably, the ideologues of the New Left avoid concrete references to the ravages of poverty, unemployment, insecurity and discrimination, in capitalist society. Though capitalism as a system does, indeed, satisfy some of the requirements of some of the people, it is equally true that the wants of the vast majority are never met. Even in the most advanced capitalist society the blessings of what is ostentatiously described as "the consumer society" do not come the way of a large section of the people. An official figure estimates 32 million poor in the United States with an annual family budget of \$3,200 against the \$9,191 estimated to assure a "modest" living.* Add to this the acute housing shortage, the dearth of educational opportunities, the cost of medical treatment, etc., that harass these and other sections with incomes below the above "modest" subsistence figure.

THE ROOTS OF PRESENT-DAY OPPORTUNISM

The fact that the forms of opportunism are conditioned by social growth obliges us to look for its roots—as Lenin did—in the economic, political and ideological specifics of the particular period, this being doubly proper now, because the imperialist bourgeoisie employs sophisticated technical appliances in pursuing its strategic line aimed at subverting the working class and its militant organizations from inside. For clearly, the bourgeoisie would much rather that the workers abandoned the class struggle by their own choice than impose the choice on them by coercive means. With the balance of social forces tilting steadily in favor of the world revolutionary movement, the policy of penetration, deceit, peaceful control and ideological erosion ranks high in the reactionary program of the bourgeoisie. Though, obviously, it will

*From an article by T. Timofeyev, *Pravda*, December 24, 1968.

*Victor Perlo, "Labor Conditions in the United States", *World Marxist Review*, No. 3, 1968.

not hesitate to use force if and when the circumstances arise.

What the above shows is that though no *objective* process of the workers' integration in the capitalist system exists, there is an increasingly acute *subjective* need for the ruling bourgeoisie to undermine the positions won by the working class and block its advance to the supreme goal. Hence the ideological and political efforts in that direction, designed to pervert the advances and possibilities of the working class. And for this the bourgeoisie employs two opportunist trends: (1) subordination of part of the working class to reformism, which, in effect, reconciles itself with the conditions of the capitalist system, and (2) devaluation of intermediate, including direct economic, demands in the struggle for socialism. In the former case, we deal with Right-wing reformism, in the latter with tactical adventurism. Both play into the hands of the capitalists, though they concentrate on the former by reason of the possibilities afforded to the bourgeoisie by its control of the fruits of present-day scientific and technological progress.

The ultra-Right and ultra-Left opportunism that surfaced in the 1968 class battles in France were an example of the two trends. Here is how the French Communist Party defined them:

"The Right opportunists deny the necessity for a socialist revolution. They are content, in effect, with just touching up current policies and shuffling the Cabinet, and are reluctant to attack the positions of Big Business . . . The 'Left' opportunists preach conquest of 'power in the factories' and 'power on the university campuses', but avoid raising the issue of political power. Or else they maintain that fighting for democratic objectives is a waste of time and that a workers' party should work for immediate and direct socialist revolution."*

The bourgeoisie endeavors to contain the interests of the proletariat as a whole by reactionary policies, obstructing its immediate and more long-range aims all along the line. The capitalist strategists know that in the prevailing situation any step forward by the working class is a step back in their own fight for the survival of capitalism. That is what prompts them every time to divert the workers' struggle onto the wrong road.

Reformism, liberalism, nationalism and other opportunist trends animated by

*French Communist Party Manifesto, adopted by the Central Committee at its meeting in Champigny-sur-Marne, December 5-6, 1968.

the bourgeoisie from outside are objectively intended to subvert the essence of the class struggle, to divert the workers from their basic mission. In specific terms, these trends distort or deny the various aspects of the class struggle in the various periods of its growth: fight for democratic rights, winning power and establishing the class dictatorship of the proletariat, carrying forward the line of proletarian internationalism. Yet obviously, the bourgeoisie cannot realize its reactionary aims to the desired degree in all areas, because alongside groups liable to fall under the influence of its subversive policy there are workers' forces bent on the genuinely revolutionary goals.

As Lenin pointed out, the sources of opportunism may be rooted in different social spheres—the economy, politics or ideology.

a) *Economic roots.* Technological progress has led to substantial changes in the productive basis of modern capitalist society. In this article I shall confine myself to what I hold to be three fundamental aspects of the problem: 1) internationalization of state-monopoly capitalism; 2) structural changes in employment; 3) changes in the wages pattern.

The bourgeoisie is seeking to utilize the economic effects of the structural changes to provide the material basis for opportunist deviations in the modern proletariat.

Let us examine the problem in its more general features. No one is likely to deny the development of a process of supra-national integration of capitalist production and trade, attended by increasing state interference. The process was thoroughly analyzed at the International Conference on State-Monopoly Capitalism arranged by French Communist researchers in May 1966. Objectively, the process is powered by the growth of the productive forces, the rapid rise in productivity, and by the efforts to save the capitalist system. What we have, in other words, is a system of anti-cyclical and anti-crisis measures designed to moderate economic upheavals, which now represent a greater danger than ever.

The fact that the supra-national organizations have managed to resolve some minor problems (but not to the extent the apologists would like us to believe), is being exploited to create a semblance of capitalist stability and thus influence certain groups of the proletariat.

Technological progress has also re-patterned the structure of employment: new skills, trades and professions are emerging, with the result that the working class is be-

ing joined by new categories. We can speak of the emergence of a technological working class. Its place in the production process is similar to that of the classical proletariat and, like it, it is subjected to exploitation.

Changes in employment have meant changes in the wages pattern. Wider use of modern technology results in the absolute growth of the proportion of skilled labor and a larger share of workers with relatively high earnings. This, too, is used by the bourgeoisie to stimulate opportunist tendencies. Indeed, by working on egoistic propensities that are part of the petty-bourgeois mentality, employers are seeking to suppress resistance to exploitation and cultivate among some groups a taste for their privileged position. The more or less wide occurrence of this tendency in a number of countries is indicative of the extent to which the bourgeoisie has been able to do this.

Of course, all objective changes in the production base of modern capitalism are dialectical and, dialectically, have contradictory consequences. For parallel with the capitalists' new opportunities of influencing the workers, there are powerful objective opportunities for developing and extending the revolutionary workers' movement. For example, the growth of the technological working class not only presents the ruling bourgeoisie with additional means of disseminating opportunist views and attitudes, but, objectively, irrespective of the wishes of the ruling class, brings new sections of the technological and managerial personnel into closer contact with the working class and its struggle, from which in the past they tended to hold aloof.

High productivity and more state control in some branches of the economy enable the bourgeoisie to make up for concessions made to the working class. Take this example: a wage rise resulting from strike action or negotiation can be compensated for by more speedup, higher prices on goods and services, and increased taxation. And possibilities for utilizing this compensation mechanism to offset enforced reforms increase with the expansion of the productive forces. This, in fact, enables the bourgeoisie to indulge in disquisitions about its readiness to satisfy workers' demands. Some groups of the working class see only the concessions the bourgeoisie is forced to make, and are oblivious to the means it uses to reduce the scale of concessions or annul them altogether. This hoodwinking

technique is one of the many sources of present-day opportunism.

Systematic use of structural changes to foster an opportunist outlook is clearly seen in the policy of neo-paternalism. For the facts show that the super-profits accruing from technical advance and internationalization of capital, provide a very concrete source of material means to win the working class over to more "amenable" positions—in other words, to induce it to abandon its fundamental aims. And neo-paternalism is proving more effective than the classical method of sops to the labor aristocracy, for non-skilled workers are more likely to succumb to these illusory benefits. Reformist trade union leaders in some countries are employing concrete forms of this policy for closer ties with Big Business.

b) *Political roots.* The character of our times is determined by the socialism-capitalism confrontation. It assumes different forms depending on conditions, time and place. The October Revolution and the subsequent defeat of attempts to restore the old order through foreign intervention, led to peaceful coexistence of states with opposite social systems as a specific form of the world-wide class struggle. Peaceful coexistence is not an artificial policy, but an objective reality stemming from the fact that the revolutionary process has not been carried to completion. But peaceful coexistence is conditioned by another objective reality—the power of modern armaments, which makes military conflicts fraught with the danger of wholesale annihilation, a menace that is arousing millions to oppose war, thereby restricting imperialism in unleashing a world war.

The antagonism between the two mutually-opposed systems, socialism and imperialism, remains substantially unchanged. And the final, and inevitable, outcome of the conflict is the complete abolition of capitalism and the emergence everywhere of a society that will know neither oppressors nor oppressed.

The imperialist bourgeoisie is deliberately distorting the significance of the present forms of struggle between the two systems. Theorists in the service of Big Business are at pains to prove that the rapid development of military technology precludes any change in the present two-system status quo. That idea is being driven home—and accepted by some groups of the working class—by Right and "Left" opportunists. The former maintain that the class struggle is bound to abate since there is no chance of altering the present political

structure of the world. The latter allege that coexistence is an arbitrary and artificial policy whose architects must be combated on a national and international scale.

Unable to suppress the workers' struggle, the bourgeoisie is following a policy of "digesting" the reforms the people insist on. It is employing more subtle methods to maintain itself in power in the face of the mounting resistance of the working class and its allies to the anti-democratic policies and actions of the bourgeois state and attacks on its commanding positions.

Its tactic, both in the economic and political spheres, is to inculcate a false idea about the class nature of the bourgeois state. Public opinion polls, elections, parliamentary institutions, etc., are presented as elements of genuine democracy. And this finds ideological generalization in the contention that the bourgeois state stands above society and operates independently of class interests. Behind this mystique is a ramified system of manipulation, manoeuvre, deceit and corruption; but above all there is the gaping social inequality, the result of private ownership of the means of production.

The people, including some of the working class, do not immediately see the realities behind this subterfuge and tend to regard bourgeois democracy as an absolute, not as an opportunity to advance the revolutionary political struggle. Opportunists and reformists have seized on this uncritical acceptance of the capitalist political structure to justify their refusal to utilize the parliament for revolutionary aims. Marxism-Leninism has dubbed this "parliamentary cretinism", the hallmark of opportunism in every period.

Then there is a new element: opportunist distortion of a major aspect of modern capitalism. The rapid development of the productive forces, with resultant complication of all facets of social life, make it objectively necessary to run the economy in the interests of society as a whole. The bourgeoisie, always pursuing its selfish aims, is incapable of championing the public interest, let alone the interests of the working people. But it has to adapt somehow to the new conditions and does so through state interference in the economy and in social relations. This enhanced role of the capitalist state is held up by the opportunists as proof of their claim that the state is no longer a class institution, no longer associated with the egoistic aims of capital, and so on. A dialectical examination of the problem, however, shows that

the exploitive nature of the capitalist state remains unchanged and, furthermore, that another contradiction has been added, between the top monopolies' use of the state in furtherance of their aims, and the need for public regulation in the interests of the people, which can be accomplished only by the revolutionary working class.

The bourgeoisie plays on ingrained illusions not only to maintain the present system, but also to support every action aimed at re-establishing the old order in countries where the working class is in power. Supporters of liberalism in the new society argue that the specific forms of proletarian dictatorship are "inconsistent," "not humanistic," etc., and propose their own pseudo-democratic models. The spread of such typically Right-wing tendencies always carries a clear danger to working-class power.

Besides being a weapon of suppression, the bourgeois political system is a means of moderating maturing class conflicts. Capitalist society today is so organized that explosive issues can be subjected to arbitration, and what is more, by bodies in which the bourgeoisie has the final say. And every effort is made to prevent the opposition forces from going beyond the framework of bourgeois legality and to keep their demands within "negotiable bounds". The Right-wing Social-Democrats and labor organizations directly influenced by the bourgeoisie are vehicles of the policy of reconciling the working class to capitalism. Similarly, the "Left" opportunists, by denying the role of the revolutionary party of the new type, by attacking it and claiming to replace it, hamper the workers' struggle against exploitation.

c) *Ideological roots.* Bourgeois ideologists deliberately distort the real significance of the changes in modern capitalism in order to prevent consistent development of class consciousness. Bourgeois ideology still rests on anti-communism, i.e., the fight against the working-class movement. But anti-communism is being clothed in pseudo-scientific objectivity, for the rabid anti-communism of earlier years has proved utterly insolvent. In our day world development is no longer determined by capitalism, and the bourgeoisie finds itself constrained to re-adapt its ideological concepts.

More emphasis is being laid on indirect forms of struggle against the working class. But that is not to say that direct forms are being discarded. In the opinion of this author, the imperialist bourgeoisie feels that maximum sharpening of the contradictions

harbors the danger of a third world war, the outcome of which no one can predict. It therefore tries to keep class conflicts within "acceptable" bounds and achieve its reactionary aims without major crises. Of the many theories designed to help it in this mention might be made of the "second industrial revolution," "vanishing classes," the "affluent society," "convergence of capitalism and socialism," etc. The purpose here is ideologically to disorient the working class and destroy its chief weapon—class dictatorship and proletarian internationalism.

In fact, according to some of these new-fangled concepts, technological progress will eliminate all the antagonisms. We are, for instance, asked to believe that the world is being transformed into a technological society free of all ideology, a one-dimensional society which, furthermore, will be "dehumanized" by the universal application of technology. And the prototype of the future society, we are told, is the present "similarity" between the USSR and the USA, the two most highly developed countries of the modern world. From this the conclusion is drawn that present-day struggles, though historically necessitated, are not antagonistic class struggles, but part of the fight for a "humanized" society, a fight waged both in the imperialist and socialist camps. This "humanization" does not pursue class aims and, therefore, is not represented by any social force. Nevertheless, we are told, a "humanized" society can be achieved only by the "free" intelligentsia, that is, a group that has not been absorbed by the "technological society" mechanism.

A Marxist analysis will reveal the purpose of these concepts. The bourgeoisie is vigorously encouraging them through such institutions as the Social Science Research Council and the Rockefeller Foundation. The theory of the universal application of technological progress under socialism, and of a working-class created "humanized" society, which, like capitalism, would renounce individual freedom, are part of a much broader reactionary concept. Classless humanism is a catchword for obscuring the real prospect of social progress and the firm leading role of the only class which, by freeing itself, wins freedom for society as a whole.

Nor does it require much acumen to realize that when the "industrial society" ideologists write about an "uncontaminated intelligentsia" capable of "humanizing" socialist society, they are actually appealing to petty-bourgeois consciousness,

hangovers of which persist among the working class even in socialist countries. This is a receptive soil for bourgeois propaganda, a point that is fully appreciated by the anti-Communist strategists, who seize every opportunity to infiltrate and undermine the working class in the socialist and non-socialist world.

SOME CONCLUSIONS

From what has been said we can infer that the ideological front assumes primary importance for proletarian class struggle on a national and international scale. The imperialist bourgeoisie knows only too well that sharper class conflicts, whether economic or political, can reach dangerous dimensions. That is why it is so anxious to disarm the working class ideologically. Indeed, one of its priority tasks is to influence mass thinking through every available means: mass propaganda, economic sops, diverse techniques of indirect control. All classes, all sections of the population—workers, students, intellectuals, farmers, white-collar workers—are the object of constant attention from organizations whose express function is to carry through this policy of monopoly capital.

Of course, this meets with resistance from the working class and encounters obstacles. Of these the most important is the victorious advance, despite all difficulties, of the socialist system. The progress made by socialism vitiates all the efforts to undermine its foundations. Another formidable obstacle is the objective reality of capitalism which, hampered by all its antagonisms, is fertile soil for social crises.

The Communist parties' systematic activity in fostering a clear, deep-rooted and unshakeable class consciousness converts these objective factors into an effective force determining mass political behaviour. And this work is bearing fruit; far from achieving its reactionary aims, the imperialist bourgeoisie finds itself increasingly encircled by the forces of peace, democracy and socialism.

Regardless of the specific nature of one or another species of opportunism, the struggle against it retains all its importance and validity. Lenin pointed out that "unless a determined and relentless struggle is waged all along the line" against opportunism, "there can be no question of a struggle against imperialism, or of Marxism, or of a socialist labor movement."*

*Collected Works, Vol. 23, p. 118.

That view is fully confirmed by experience, for opportunist trends, those concrete manifestations of bourgeois infiltration, hamper the revolutionary processes at every stage. The force that will wage the energetic struggle to which Lenin referred is the devoted section of the pro-

letariat that exists in all working-class organizations. Recognition of this fact will help us not only to avoid sectarian errors, but also more convincingly to expose opportunists of every hue and promote class consciousness among ever wider sections of the workers.

Students and Democracy in Mexico

J. ENCARNACIO PEREZ

Mexico City showed no sign of social explosion until July 26, 1968, when a column of students marched to the City Hall to protest against the police beating students and teachers at the National Polytechnical Institute. Just before they reached the Hall hundreds of police charged with truncheons. The students fought back and the ensuing clashes in the city center lasted several hours. Before the clashes were over security agents raided the Communist Party headquarters, broke into the printshop of *La Voz de Mexico* and seized the workers. Similar steps were taken against the National Democratic Student Center.

Subsequent days saw more clashes but the authorities proved powerless to quell student resistance. Some Communist leaders were jailed, including Gerardo Unzueta, member of the CC Presidium, leaders of the mass organizations and some members of the leadership of the Communist Youth League.

The President of the Republic ordered drastic measures against the students. On July 30, at daybreak, troops blasted the main entrance to the preparatory faculty of the National Autonomous University with a bazooka.

The students refused to surrender, however, and held meetings in the streets, with the result that hundreds of them were in clashes, several were killed and dozens arrested. This assault on democratic rights and the violation of university autonomy angered students and teachers and was resented by the public. The students called a general strike and held demonstrations demanding the release of the political prisoners and the repeal of the law on so-called violations of public order.

Five large-scale demonstrations took

place between early August and mid-September, some involving half a million people. The students set up the National Strike Council on which each of the seventy faculties and departments involved in the strike had three representatives. An association of secondary and higher school teachers for democratic liberties came into being. Hundreds of student groups were formed to organize meetings in factories, streets, squares and market places with the aim of explaining the objectives of the movement, collecting funds and drawing the people into a common fight for democracy.

Students and teachers were joined by scientists and artists, who made statements and issued manifestos, held conferences and forums and took part in demonstrations and public meetings of railwaymen, power and oil-industry workers and workers in other industries along with schoolteachers, peasants, office employees and housewives.

The period of mobilization of the masses (August and September) was succeeded by a period of brutal repression. On September 18 troops occupied the National University and mass arrests were resumed. On October 2 there was a calculated massacre—hundreds of students, workers, women and children were shot dead in cold blood during the night, many more were injured and over a thousand people found themselves in prison. The order for this ruthless action came from the presidential palace in a frantically desperate effort to smash the student movement. President Diaz Ordaz said on September 1 that the authorities would not shrink from extreme measures, a threat which materialized a month later.

The Mexican people will never forget this infamous crime.

Early in December the National Strike Council adopted a manifesto addressed to the people. The manifesto analyzed the student movement and offered a plan for future action. It analyzed the causes of the movement and pointed out that "the task is to organize on a higher level protests and opposition to a regime which is becoming more and more incapable of meeting the lawful demands of the people. To become an effective force, this movement will need support not only from the students, and not so much from them as from that section of our society engaged in productive labor."

The Diaz Ordaz government is persisting in its policy of repression. Over a dozen student leaders were arrested in January. Scores of political prisoners are still held. The political forces became polarized in this tense situation. The government put the blame for the student actions primarily on the National Democratic Student Center and the Communist Party. Right-wing trade union leaders followed suit by assailing the movement. One of them, Fidel Velazquez, went so far as to call for the formation of vigilante groups to combat the students. The leadership of the ruling Institutional Revolutionary Party adopted a similar stance.

To the traditional Right the student movement, understandably, is anathema. Ex-President Aleman called on manufacturers to form punitive squads against the students. Bankers, too, opposed the movement.

As to the "reasonable Left," the "legal" opposition (they denounced the use of armed force against the people and protested against the anti-Communist campaign), they tried to whitewash the President. The blame, they said, should be put on the American CIA and on the ultra reactionaries. Defending the government, they maintained that the President's policy is designed to "further the democratic aspirations of the government," citing as proof such facts as the President's interview with Communist leaders in May 1968, his intention to grant civil rights from the age of 18 irrespective of sex or civil status, a government official's criticism of some private capitalists, statements against America's unfair treatment of Latin American countries, the President's statements in favor of world peace during an interview with the Ambassador of the

Democratic Republic of Vietnam to Cuba, the maintenance of diplomatic relations with Cuba, and a certain extension of cultural relations with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. These facts, some of which are not new, must certainly be described as positive. But no one should overestimate them unless he wishes to justify support for a government whose policy is essentially reactionary and conciliatory towards U.S. imperialism.

The Socialist People's Party heading the "moderate Left" believes that the government's policy caused concern to imperialism and reaction, who considered it impermissible. This party sees the student movement primarily as a result of acts of provocation by the CIA and fascist-minded groups whose agents shaped developments in such a way as to bring about a decisive clash between various sections of the people and the government and so to antagonize government and people as far as possible.

The press readily picked up this allegation to launch a campaign. The rumor was put about that the "primary cause" of the events was imperialist and reactionary provocations coupled with actions by small Left groups. The student movement was also accused of being an instrument of Communist conspiracy.

Yet the student movement, which encompassed other groups of the population, was not a bolt from the blue. In February 1968 the National Democratic Student Center organized a Freedom Road March. The march started from Dolores Hidalgo, the cradle of national independence, and reached Morelia under the watchword of securing the release of Aguilar Talaman-tes and other political prisoners. It developed into a large-scale action despite government provocation. "The direct cause of developments since July 26," we read in a statement by the Presidium of the Communist Party dated August 2, "is the methods of government introduced in this country years ago. These methods are characterized by recourse to the police and force in reply to popular demands, as well as by abuses of the so-called principle of obedience to the authorities," under which every popular protest is seen as a threat to the regime." These were the immediate reasons for the actions which took the form of protests against arbitrary practices and the abuse of power and which the government seized on to crush the student movement. However, it was not long

before the students decided on the means of realizing their objectives and joined in the big actions of the people; their movement will go down in the nation's history as the most important movement in defense of democratic liberties in the past three decades.

There are also deeper social and economic reasons for these developments, and it is in their light that we should examine the methods of government mentioned above and the rise in the political consciousness of the people, among whom the students stand out as the most active and sensitive group. Some thirty years ago the big bourgeoisie in Mexico began to force the small and middle bourgeoisie out of government agencies and seized the key posts; this bourgeoisie, firmly in the saddle for a long time now has developed tactics drawing on its own and foreign experience. The main features of these tactics are occasional concessions to the masses (the distribution of land among the peasants, wage increases once in two years, better social welfare, granting of certain rights to the workers), bourgeois paternalism under the catchword of "revolution under government leadership," control over the trade unions, peasants', students', cultural and other mass organizations, and guaranteed continuity of the role of the party which forty years ago proclaimed itself the "revolutionary family." In applying these tactics, the bourgeoisie abides by the rules of the "political game." According to these rules, the President of the Republic may not be re-elected, outgoing members of government must undertake to keep out of politics, and each President-elect must be vested with powers virtually making him an uncrowned monarch.

These tactics, used in elections for decades, have made it possible to keep up a pretence of democracy while guaranteeing the election of official candidates. Election campaigns are conducted at government expense. The government selects the candidates in advance for the posts of deputies, senators, chairmen of municipal councils, governors and the President of the Republic. Thereupon they are formally nominated by the Institutional Revolutionary Party. The candidates are then voted into office, while the opposition cannot secure the election of a single candidate. The fact that a few candidates of the Right-wing National Action party were elected recently as chairmen of municipal

councils is due to political wheeling and dealing. Candidates of this party, the Socialist People's Party or the Genuine Party of the Mexican Revolution cannot be put on the lists just because their parties wish it. Government consent is needed for their nomination.

Federal electoral legislation and the actual conduct of elections ignore the political rights of hundreds of thousands and even millions of people, who cannot vote because the candidates they would like to support cannot be registered. The Communist Party, which all political groups regard as a force of national magnitude, is not entered on the electoral lists and so cannot put forward any candidates.

Now it is becoming difficult to appease the people by making minor concessions and using "revolutionary" demagoguery. "It is precisely the problem of democracy," the 15th National Congress of the Communist Party pointed out in June 1967, "that explains the crisis in our country and constitutes the basis on which we can develop the movement for immediate change, a movement reaching out to large sections of the population and arousing them to struggle."

The Communist Party supported the student movement without any reservation. The Communists saw from the first that in both program and composition it was a democratic movement evoking a response among large sections of the population. The program of defense of democratic liberties called for the release of all political prisoners, the abolition of Article 145 of the Federal Criminal Code, dealing with so-called violations of public order, the abolition of the police Grenadier Corps, the dismissal of police chiefs directly responsible for repressive measures against the people, and the payment of indemnities to the victims of the terror. This program reflected the pressing aspirations of our people. Though limited, it allowed room for the demands of the students, teachers, office workers, peasants, homeowners, a section of the Catholic clergy, and traders.

We feel certain that imperialist agents and police provocateurs were planted in this mass movement, but this was not typical, nor did it determine the character of the movement. For example, the CIA and Mexican police agents circulated a manifesto entitled "Power to Youth" and "signed" by the Communist Youth League of Mexico and the National Democratic Student Center. The mass action involved

some small "Left" groups, but their participation was not a factor determining the Communists' share in or support of the movement. We Communists must be where the masses are, must bring our policy home to them and strive to win them over. We do not pivot our activity on attacks against the ultra-Left groups. We realize that the enemy of democracy is on the Right, and we spearhead our fight against the government and other reactionary forces. We combat adventurists attitudes, put our Party's case and invite the people to make their choice. We Communists champion the unity of all who fight for democracy, and if diverse groups and forces adhere to a common program and fight in common we have no reason to attack them. To be sure, we always rebut calumnies against our Party, and when the ultra-Left ventured to state their views the masses refused to support them.

The mass movement was not led by ultra-Left or neo-Trotskyist groups. But the Communist Party does not claim an exclusive role in this. We Communists are one of the political forces taking part in the fight. We compare our tactics with those of the masses, who see them largely as their own. Numerous non-Communists, intellectuals and students did much to explain the objectives and character of the student movement.

A new social force—the students and progressive intellectuals—is joining in the people's fight for democracy. This force should become a component of a broad alliance of the whole people which is so badly needed for the defence of democracy. We Communists do not view the fight for democracy as bourgeois democrats but as revolutionaries. We hold that the motive

forces of the people's democratic and anti-imperialist revolution in our country must concentrate, organize and unite in the course of the struggle for democracy, which implies not only defense of democratic liberties but the democratization of political and economic life through electoral reform, democratic reform of higher education and a radical agrarian reform, and by meeting the economic demands of the people.

We declare for unity to bring about by revolutionary means the far-reaching anti-imperialist and democratic changes Mexico needs.

The vital economic and political problems of the Mexican people have yet to be solved. The government persists in its policy of repression, rejects minimum demands, saying that "nothing can be achieved by unlawful means", and degrades the "principle of obedience to the authorities" to the level of the principles of any reactionary dictatorship in Latin American or elsewhere.

The Presidium of the Communist Party noted that the Mexican bourgeoisie can no longer ensure political and social development according to democratic principles. Bourgeois democracy in our country is experiencing an acute crisis. Today the masses, aspiring to a democratic system, are striving to change the present system by fighting for socialism.

Presidential elections will be held in Mexico before long. There is a growing determination among the people to fight. This entitles us to look forward to widespread action in support of democracy in which the Communist Party will play its rightful role and fulfil its duty towards the working class and the people of Mexico.

40th Anniversary of First Conference of Latin-American Communists

P. GONZALEZ ALBERDI

When the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the Communist International was commemorated last April, it was noted that one of its merits was that it had helped to found and develop the Communist parties of Latin America. The First Conference of Latin-American Communists was a concrete instance of such help.

The conference, held 40 years ago in Buenos Aires (June 1 to 12, 1929), discussed the international situation, the danger of war, the anti-imperialist struggle, the tactics of the Communist parties of Latin America, the racial problem, the activities of the anti-imperialist leagues, the trade union movement, the peasantry and other questions. Representatives of Communist parties and groups from 14 countries participated. The Chilean Communist Party delegation was prevented from attending by the reactionary forces of the country. Present also were fraternal delegations from the Communist parties of the United States and France, the Communist International and Communist Youth International, and representatives of the South American secretariats of these organizations.

The conference stated that "although the parties of Argentina, Uruguay and Brazil have for several years been waging the struggle and have somewhat matured ideologically and organizationally, their contact with the workers in the big enterprises is still weak. The Communist parties of Chile, Cuba and Mexico had been struck heavy blows by the reaction. Some of the parties represented at the conference could not yet call themselves Communist in view

of their organizational structure and ideological standpoint. In some cases it was a question of small groups engaged in Communist propaganda, who at times confined themselves to trade union activity."

The present-day Communist movement in Latin America presents *an* entirely different picture. Battle-tempered parties exist in all the countries of the continent. Undaunted by the persecution of the reaction and the many difficulties they have to grapple with in their activity, the Communist parties organize and guide the struggle of the workers and the masses for their economic and political demands, against imperialism and the military dictatorships in its service, for world peace, for solidarity with the peoples battling for their independence, and with the people of Vietnam in the first place.

Socialism came to America as a result of the glorious Cuban revolution. This revolution initiated a new stage in the anti-imperialist struggle of the Latin-American peoples. It inspired them and reinforced their militant spirit, proved that considering the present balance of world forces, the might of the USSR and the other socialist countries and the solidarity of the working-class and national-liberation movements, a people determined to fight to the end can defeat North American imperialism in Latin America, accomplish the tasks of the democratic, agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution and then pass on to building socialism.

The author attended the conference as a member of the delegation from the Communist Party of Argentina.

CHARACTER OF THE LATIN-AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Various internal and external factors contributed, in their aggregate, to the development of the Communist movement on the continent. The strengthening of the Communist parties in Latin America is closely connected with the changes in the balance of world forces, with the fact that the achievements of the Soviet Union and the socialist system as a whole have evoked enthusiasm among the workers and the masses. Another contributing factor was the failure of the attempts by the imperialists and local oligarchies to solve the growing crisis in the economic and social structures of their countries. Added to this, capitalist development on the continent in the past decade has aggravated the contradictions between the requirements of development, on the one hand, and the latifundists and imperialist monopolies on the other. Monopoly domination retarded and deformed the continent's capitalist development. It resulted in the ruin of thousands of peasants, artisans, small manufacturers and craftsmen. At the same time, capitalist development led to an increase in the number of workers and their concentration. This created more favorable conditions for Communist work among the masses, especially among the working class.

But all these factors would not have been enough in themselves to enhance the parties' influence in the working class and other sections of the people, had it not been for the militant and selfless work of the Communists. However, this too is still not enough to win the confidence of the working class and the people unless it is accompanied by a correct political line. The Communist parties were able to elaborate such a line as a result of tenacious effort, aimed at assimilating the scientific principles of Marxism-Leninism and applying them creatively, at studying the lessons of the world's first proletarian revolution, the Great October. The parties were able to chart such a line thanks also to a Marxist-Leninist analysis of the situation in their respective countries.

The First Conference of Latin-American Communists did much to make this possible, and also the assistance rendered by the Communist International after the conference. A particularly big role was played by the Seventh Congress of the Comintern, and also by the 1960 Moscow Meeting of the 81 Communist and Workers' parties, and the 20th and other congresses of the

CPSU, whose decisions oriented the Communist Parties of Latin America in charting their policy.

Comrade Victorio Codovilla who took a prominent part in the preparations for the First Latin-American Conference and in its deliberations, said that it "played a tremendous role in the ideological and organizational consolidation of the Latin-American Communist movement." He noted, furthermore, that at the conference a serious study was made for the first time, on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, of the characteristics of the revolutionary process in the different countries of Latin America. "After analyzing the situation in the different countries," wrote Comrade Codovilla, "the conference arrived at the conclusion that not a socialist revolution was maturing there as some extremists who advocated skipping stages averred, but a bourgeois-democratic, agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution that would abolish the domination of the landed oligarchies, imperialist exploitation, mainly Anglo-American, and open the way to socialism. The conference pointed out, in keeping with the Marxist-Leninist doctrine, that the working class, in alliance with the peasant masses, was the principal motive force in the revolution and that, consequently, one of the main tasks of the Communists was to establish a firm worker-peasant alliance led by the proletariat."

By assessing the character of the revolution in their countries and determining the strategy of its realization the Communist parties suggested the solution of those old problems which no other political force was capable of analyzing deeply enough, leave alone resolving. It should be noted that the Communist parties on the continent use different terminology in assessing the democratic, agrarian and anti-imperialist character of the revolution in their countries which opens the way to a socialist revolution.

The Spanish and Portuguese colonialization in America differed from that of Britain. Unlike the latter, which gave land to immigrants, Spain and Portugal brought the latifundist form of agriculture and feudal relations to their overseas colonies. This is the source of the backwardness of the Latin-American countries compared with the United States and Canada, whose development rested on private capitalist farming. Adam Smith in his day noted the difference in the colonization of North and South America. Marx too made a study

of the type of colonization carried out in the new lands by the free immigrants.

Far from doing away with the latifundist form of agriculture, the Latin-American governments promoted it. The latifundist oligarchy, lacking a home market for their agricultural products established contact with foreign buyers. When capitalism entered upon its imperialist phase the local oligarchy gave the imperialists a free hand in the continent's economy, which they exploited and deformed. Thus as we know from Lenin's theory of imperialism, the continent's economic and financial dependence on imperialist monopolies and concerns turned its political independence into a mere formality.

Meanwhile, however, progressive European thought was making its impact on the continent. In their fight against the monopolies of the metropolitan countries and for immediate political independence, the men heading this struggle based themselves on the views of the English economists and the French Encyclopedists. Later, many Latin-American thinkers spoke of the backwardness of their countries, the evil of latifundism and the unprotectedness of the national industry from foreign competition. But this was not accompanied by mass action, the masses were not organized at the time, which made it impossible to put an end to the entrenched latifundia system and foreign economic domination. It was the historical mission of the Communist parties to organize the masses and give leadership to their struggle.

The parties of the national bourgeoisie which eventually came to power proved incapable of resolving the fundamental problems of their countries. This was the case with the Mexican agrarian revolution of 1910-1917, headed by the bourgeoisie, with the bourgeois government of Hipolito Irigoyen in Argentina. Battle y Ordonez, the initiator of progressive social laws in Uruguay, likewise failed to cope with the country's basic problems. As for the bourgeois-landlord government of Peron, which enjoyed fairly wide mass support, it did not even attempt to introduce an agrarian reform and expropriate the imperialist-owned enterprises.

At the time of the First Conference neither the Socialist parties, nor the anarchists or syndicalists were concerned with the basic problems of their country. They confined themselves to fighting for reforms which left the social structure intact, and

engaged in abstract propaganda against capitalism.

The merit of the Marxist groups, for example in the Socialist Party of Argentina, is that they popularized the basic ideas of Marx, helped promote the struggle of the workers, peasants and the masses generally, showed the need for socialist revolution and exposed the character of the First World War as a struggle between two imperialist groups. They came out against the Socialist leaders who supported the war. When the revolution took place in Russia they sided wholly with Lenin and the Bolsheviks.

It was Lenin, the Russian Bolsheviks and the Communist International who helped the Latin-American Communists to understand the character of revolution and the ways to socialism in their countries. It is to the credit of the Communists that they were the first of the political groups and parties to pose the question of imperialism in Latin America.

At the time of the conference the Latin-American Communists waged a stubborn struggle against the American People's Revolutionary Alliance (APRA), headed by Haya de la Torre, who denied the leading role of the proletariat in the revolution. APRA favored a policy of supporting one imperialist country against another. Today Haya de la Torre serves U.S. imperialist interest in Peru. The First Latin-American Conference denounced reformism, anarchism and Apraism, thereby equipping the Communist parties in their ideological struggle.

The conference declared against "revolutionary" adventurism which was supported by some of the delegates. It charted a firm policy of going to the masses, of winning them over by organizing them to fight for their demands. At the same time, the conference combated the tendency to "conceal" the activity of Communists by having them join non-proletarian "broader parties" of a non-Marxist-Leninist type.

The conference discussed ways of establishing a front of struggle against imperialism and the landed oligarchy—a front that would include different social classes—by rendering support to the various anti-imperialist leagues and promoting their development, or by forming worker-peasant blocs. It also attached importance to developing the trade unions, the peasant, women's, youth and other organizations. Here it is pertinent to mention the support given by the Communist parties to the student

movement for university reform, which started in Cordoba (Argentina) in June 1918 and subsequently spread throughout the continent.

The conference also spoke of the possibility of army units siding with the revolution, especially in conditions of armed struggle.

Another of the conference's merits is that it impressed upon the parties the need to concentrate their activities in the big enterprises and to form strong Party branches there. This was done by the Communist parties of Argentina, Uruguay and other countries. The conference, however, failed to rebuff those of the participants who incorrectly maintained that the Latin-American towns bear a parasitic character, going so far as to say that "the urban workers, in view of their more privileged position, their 'European' orientation, are more easily susceptible to the influence of the petty-bourgeois ideology..." These comrades ignored the self-evident fact that the industrial proletariat is by its class nature the most revolutionary class in modern society.

PROLETARIAN INTERNATIONALISM

The First Conference was held under the watchword of proletarian internationalism. This was reflected in Victorio Codovilla's report "The International Situation of Latin America and the War Danger," and in the discussion that followed.

In connection with the war between Bolivia and Paraguay, provoked by the rivalry between U.S. and British oil magnates (who also used the oligarchies of Argentina and Brazil for their purpose), the Communists advanced the slogan of fraternization between the soldiers of the two belligerent countries as part of the struggle against imperialism and their own governments. As the movement against this war gained momentum the Communist parties gained increasing mass support. The conference stressed the importance of the Latin-American Communists' solidarity movement with the armed struggle of the people of Nicaragua, headed by the legendary Sandino, against the U.S. invasion of their country.

The conference adopted the following call in the event of an imperialist war against the Soviet Union or against countries battling for their liberation from imperialism: "No fuel, no food for the imperialist armies battling against the world's

first Socialist Republic or against the revolutionary movements in the colonies. Render direct and all-out support to the USSR and smash the imperialist front. Sabotage by every possible means all measures to supply the imperialist armies."

Defense of the Soviet Union, admiration and love for the world's first socialist country and its leading party, the CPSU, have become a tradition of the Latin-American Communists. *La Internacional*, organ of the Marxist opposition in the Socialist Party of Argentina which subsequently formed the Communist Party, wrote in September 1917: "We are with Lenin and not with Kerensky." In his book, *The Scientific Humanism of the Communists*, Orlando Millas, one of the leaders of the Chilean Communist Party, referring to Luis Emilio Recaberren, founder of the Party, writes: "When the Soviet Revolution of 1917 took place he enthusiastically supported it." Millas goes on to say that "for us there is no such thing as nationalist communism or anti-Soviet communism." Gallegos Mancera, a leading Venezuelan Communist, shows how this sentiment of the Communists spread among broad sections of non-Party working people: "It was in the oil fields that the first clandestine meetings were held in 1924 at which they spoke, at first timidly and then more boldly, about the role of the proletariat, about socialism, and even about *bolshevism*." Many more such examples could be cited.

UNITY OF THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

The conference analyzed the big actions then taking place on the continent, among them the strike on the banana plantations in Colombia. These actions showed the need to accelerate the establishment of Communist parties which would be able to direct the mass struggle and link the immediate economic demands of the working people with common revolutionary objectives. The existence of Communist parties was essential to victory. Replying to one of the delegates, Comrade Victorio Codovilla said: "The comrade does not appreciate the importance of the Party, he does not understand that the temporary defeat of the Chinese revolution was largely due to the absence of a Communist Party possessing revolutionary experience and a clear ideology."

By helping to secure the unity of the

Communist movement in Latin America the First Conference contributed to the unity of the international Communist movement. The importance of world Communist unity for the continent's anti-imperialist forces was underlined many years later at another conference of Latin-American Communists, held in Havana at the end of 1964. It affirmed that unity of the international Communist movement "is the guarantee of the success of our struggle against imperialism, and for the national and social liberation of all peoples, for world peace and the building of socialism and of communism."

The First Conference of Latin-American Communists marks its 40th anniversary at a time when U.S. imperialism is intensifying its aggression against the continent, arrogating to itself the right to invade our countries. It supports military coups and reactionary dictatorships and takes part in the actions against the guerrillas in some of the countries. It has not renounced its blockade of Cuba and its plans to invade it, it is working to form the so-called Inter-American Peace Force which will, in effect, be its military police force. While U.S. imperialism is making ever deeper economic, military, political, ideological and cultural inroads into Latin America, other imperialist powers, notably West Germany, are likewise buttressing their positions on the continent.

The continent is presently the scene of big actions by workers and other sections of the people in defense of their demands, against the policy of the imperialist monopolies, and for an agrarian reform; against the ruling dictatorships and for a democratic regime. The movement of solidarity with Vietnam and other peoples resisting imperialist aggression is spreading. The Latin American peoples are on their guard against the machinations of imperialism which is preparing a new aggression against Cuba. The Communist parties head the struggle.

The Communist parties are steadfastly advancing despite the obstacles put in their way by the reactionary governments, reformist leaders and some bourgeois nationalists. Imperialism, especially U.S. imperialism, the landed oligarchy, the Latin-American capitalists and their puppet-governments are doing everything they can to discredit the parties with a view to eventually crushing the resistance of the masses. They are using the propaganda and divisive methods of certain "ultra-Left" elements.

Acting in the same way as it does on the international scene, imperialism is trying to undermine the confidence of the masses in the Communist parties, in the world Communist movement, in the Soviet Union and in the socialist camp generally. But the bonds of unity between the Latin-American Communist parties are growing stronger, as evidenced by the increasing number of bilateral and multi-lateral meetings between parties and by their identical positions on important Latin-American and international issues.

The Communist parties of the continent have shown that they firmly support unity of the international Communist movement on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, that they are fully aware that such unity is essential to the ultimate victory of the anti-imperialist struggle. Hence the hopes they place on the International Conference of Communist and Workers' parties scheduled for June.

Far from removing the contradictions hampering the continent's economic progress capitalism has but added to them. The increasing investments in agriculture in some of the countries are leading to the impoverishment of hundreds of thousands of poor and middle peasants and unemployment of agricultural laborers, while preserving intact the latifundia belonging to imperialist capital or the local oligarchies. Industry and trade are being brought under the control of imperialist monopolies. Many small and medium-sized national enterprises are disappearing and state enterprises are being denationalized.

Unemployment and the cost of living are spiralling, inflation is spreading, real wages are dropping. The illusions fostered by imperialism in connection with the so-called Alliance for Progress, with economic integration, are fading for these prescriptions to resolve the continent's problems are proving useless. The home market is narrowing, particularly in relation to production capacities. The continent's foreign markets, too, are becoming restricted and the terms of trade worse. Therefore, despite imperialist pressure, especially North American, Latin American governments are anxious to establish economic, diplomatic and cultural relations with the countries of the socialist camp and with the Soviet Union in the first place. They are impelled towards this also by the pressure of the masses headed by the Communist parties which for many years now have called for the establishment of such relations with

the socialist camp. This has enhanced the prestige of the Communist parties in the eyes of the masses.

Despite some mistakes, the First Conference of Latin-American Communists decisively contributed to the formation, orientation and development of the Communist movement on the continent. The trail it blazed has become a wide road leading to socialism via a democratic, ag-

rarian and anti-imperialist revolution which the bourgeoisie is incapable of accomplishing. The Latin-American proletariat is performing the historical mission of leading the people's struggle to throw off the century-old yoke of backwardness and exploitation, and to win a socialist and communist future. And it will be able to accomplish this for it is led by battle-tempered Communist parties.

Millions of hearts echo his heartbeat

A documentary report

The warden gave the prisoner a vicious push and the steel door closed.

The cell was a cement tomb in which the inmate could either crouch or lie down with bent knees. Not a ray of light, nor the slightest sound ever reached it. The close air all but choked the prisoner, who could only wonder how long he had been kept in the utter darkness of the cell, a week or a month.

However, this was but the threshold of the hell devised by the secret-police experts in "psychological" tortures. The prisoner found himself in the real "inferno" when he was taken to the interrogator's chamber. There they made him stand perfectly motionless for hours on end, with a shaft of strong light focussed on his eyes, and beat him. The light caused unbearable pain and the prisoner often lost consciousness. Some prisoners were known to have lost their eyesight or gone mad with beating and other tortures. Only the strong and the indomitable retained their self-control during those inhuman interrogations.

Among the unbending is Grigoris Farakos, leading member of the Greek Communist Party and of the Patriotic Front Against the Dictatorship, who was seized by the secret police in Athens on the night of November 29, 1968.

An energetic man with expressive eyes and a high forehead, unassuming and sympathetic, Farakos was esteemed by both fellow-Communists and non-Communists.

Farakos was born and spent his early years in a small town in southern Greece lying amid mountains. It was a town of white cottages with tiled roofs, with olive

trees growing in the tiny courtyards. His was an inquisitive mind and he began to wonder when still a schoolboy why the people of his beautiful country had to live in poverty. The answer came to him in the Athens Polytechnical Institute, where as a member of the illegal student society he first became acquainted with Marxist-Leninist literature.

When the Second World War engulfed Greece and Hitler's tanks rolled over the fields, patriots went into action under Communist Party leadership. Farakos, in the frontline of the Resistance, was one of the leaders of EPON, the youth organization whose members constantly harassed the invaders. When student patriots formed the **Byron Battalion**, Farakos became one of its commanders.

Death stalked him everywhere. In one of the actions he was severely wounded in the head. His friends were sure he had been killed, and mourned his death. The Provisional Democratic Government awarded him posthumously the title of Hero of the Liberation War. Afterwards when the guerrillas regained the area they were joyfully amazed to find Farakos—fearfully emaciated but alive—in a hospital.

The end of the anti-fascist war did not, however, bring freedom to the Greek people. The British and American imperialists who overran Greece installed a reactionary government which set out to hound the Resistance fighters. People who had survived the battles against the German invader lost their lives at the hands of those who only recently had collaborated with the fascist enemy. In those crucial days

Farakos was in the thick of the fight. He carried out important assignments for EPON, edited the journal *Eponites*, wrote articles exposing the imperialist intervention and the treachery of the home reactionaries.

Farakos gave much time to the study of Marx's and Lenin's writings, to research and political writing. His works, including a book on the centenary of Volume I of *Capital*, evoked considerable interests. His *The Power Economy of Greece* is concerned with the future of his country. It shows by means of Marxist-Leninist analysis that a feeble national economy cannot overcome its difficulties so long as it is shackled by foreign capital. Farakos' writings stress that only through a socialist reconstruction, such as that effected in the Soviet Union and elsewhere, will Greece be able to make rapid industrial and agricultural progress and raise the standard of living.

Farakos, ever loyal to Lenin's teaching, often told his fellow-Communists how proud and happy he was to carry the light of this on Greek soil. What he puts above everything else is revolutionary firmness of principle and uncompromising attitude to the class enemy.

One of the founders and leaders of the Patriotic Front, Farakos made an appreciable contribution to ideological work by foiling the anti-socialist and anti-Soviet intrigues of the Right opportunists. In the May 1968 issue of the Party journal *Neos Kosmos* he scathingly criticized the contention that the Greek Communist Party should adopt an "autonomous attitude" in the international Communist movement.

"No one can," he wrote, "divert the Communist Party of Greece from its internationalist course onto an isolationist and anti-Soviet track . . . To the Greek Communists, the principles of independent elaboration of the problems of our Communist movement, the principles of fraternal cooperation on an equal footing with all brother parties, of close friendship with the great Soviet Union and Lenin's glorious party, the principles of proletarian internationalism are sacred and unshakable. Let us uphold and safeguard them as our most valuable weapon."

The colonels' coup of 1967, which enabled the military-fascist junta, with United States and NATO support, to usurp power, greatly complicated the activity of the Communists and all Greek patriots. Ruthless repressions became the order of the day. Communists, trade unionists, intellectuals, and even bourgeois party leaders not

to the liking of the "colonels' " regime were crowded into foul island prisons. The staunchest fighters for a Greece free from the tyranny of imperialism's stooges were subjected to frightful brutality, especially men like Farakos.

When first arrested, Farakos was taken to the secret police headquarters in Bubulinas Street, in the heart of Athens. This building achieved notoriety during the Hitler occupation when it housed the Gestapo.

The interrogators, who tried to wrest Party secrets from Farakos, were infuriated by his firmness.

"Men like you should be killed and not questioned!" screamed one of the interrogators.

Yoanidis and Manusakakis, two of the guards who, according to their superiors, can make a dead man speak, proved powerless against the young woman Kallerghi, a student. The details of how she was tortured leaked out. Her body was burned with glowing cigarettes and red-hot rods. Three times they stood her on the brink of a grave and made a show of shooting her. "Shoot, you scoundrels!" she shouted. But they did not, and continued the torture.

Some foreign journalists who seem to have exclusive access to information in Athens have reported that the junta headed by Papadopoulos—promoted from lieutenant-colonel to Prime Minister—are worried because the news of the torture in Greek prisons has found its way to the press. Angry protests have poured into Athens from every corner of the earth. The colonels, fearful of compromising themselves still more, have had to retreat. Farakos and his comrades were transferred from the torture-chamber in Bubulinas Street to the Averof prison.

Early in April *The Voice of Truth*—Greek underground radio—broadcast an appeal from the Averof inmates to the public opinion of Greece and the world. The appeal was signed by Farakos and others on behalf of the prisoners. Thanking those who had raised their voices on behalf of the imprisoned democrats and helped them out of their cement tombs, it went on:

"We are deeply convinced that our people's struggle and the international solidarity movement will in the end lead to the overthrow of the dictatorship and the establishment of a genuine and regenerated democracy in Greece."

The military tribunal which tried these Greek patriots last May sentenced Farakos to life imprisonment and most of his co-

defendants to terms ranging from 15 to 20 years.

But world opinion is a mighty moral force today. The sinister designs can be thwarted by furthering the campaign in defense of the Greek political prisoners, of

those who are tortured, and all whose lives are at stake. Millions of hearts echo the heartbeat of Grigoris Farakos, a true Leninist, Communist leader and a forceful writer.

A. KATSONIS.

Valuable contribution to Marxist-Leninist philosophy

The new nine-volume edition of Academician Todor Pavlov's *Selected Works* provides a comprehensive picture of the scientific and political activity of this prominent Bulgarian Communist and Marxist researcher. Pavlov's writings, which span more than half a century, include books, articles and other items on many topical problems of philosophy, sociology, history, aesthetics, the arts and education. All his work is closely associated with the political and ideological struggle of the Bulgarian Communist Party, both before September 9, 1944 and since then, in the building of socialism. His consistent defense of Marxism-Leninism is based on a searching analysis of facts and events.

Pavlov's philosophical studies cover dialectical and historical materialism, philosophical aspects of the natural sciences, history of philosophy, logic and in all these subjects his examination is "in depth."

But he is probably best known for his research on the theory of cognition. His fundamental "Theory of Reflection," the first edition of which appeared in the USSR in 1936 and has since been translated into other languages, has had a favorable reception. Using a rich fund of data drawn from the concrete sciences, it comprehensively examines the principal problems of Marxist-Leninist gnosiology: the relation of matter and consciousness, subject and object, unity of object and image, of theory and practice, the nature of truth. Many of the propositions he advances have found conclusive corroboration in the development of the natural and social sciences.

In examining the history of gnosiology as part of Marxist philosophy, Pavlov traces the development of the ideas of Marx, Engels and Lenin, their contribution to the theory of knowledge, and effectively

refutes all attempts to contrast Marx to Lenin.

He treats the theory of reflection as part of philosophy, devoting special attention to the role of matter and the dialectical interconnection of object and subject as an element of the cognitive process. And here he draws a line between philosophy and the concrete sciences, for the theory of reflection is the subject of study also of the natural sciences. Philosophy, on the other hand, regards reflection as a universal property of matter and as the dialectical interconnection of object and subject in the process of forming subjective mind-images of the external, objective world.

Some critics of the theory of reflection maintain that it leads to a mechanistic understanding of the relationship of object to subject, of matter to consciousness. But taking Lenin's propositions as his starting point, Pavlov proves that the theory of reflection can and should be developed from positions of dialectical materialism. The argument that the theory of reflection is a product of mechanistic materialism comes from those who use criticism of the latter's shortcomings and limitations as a pretext to reject the theory of reflection and dialectical materialism generally.

We know, of course, that modern science makes wide and increasing use of symbols and models. Pavlov shows that the philosophical problems posed by this do not represent anything new to Marxist philosophy. Some of them, in fact, are discussed by Marx in his "Mathematical Manuscripts."

Besides, modern science (cybernetics, for example) has injected qualitatively new elements into the problem and they are a further source for development of Marxist philosophy, notably its theory of knowledge. The findings of Pavlov and of other

Marxist philosophers are evidence that the theory of reflection furnishes a scientific explanation of the role of symbols in the process of cognition, with due account to the new data accumulated over the past thirty years in semiotics, mathematical linguistics and other sciences studying the role of symbols as elements of communication and cognition.

There is the contention that the theory of reflection does not fully appreciate the creative nature of the human mind and its specific role. Here, too, however, Pavlov has shown, notably in his "Information and Creation", that the theory of reflection helps one to understand how material objects are reflected in the human mind as ideal images and how, through practical activity, this helps to change material reality.

The theory of reflection explains both the origin of social consciousness, which, in the main, produces a correct picture of reality, and of the illusory, false consciousness which gives a distorted picture. An understanding of that is important in combating certain forms of modern agnosticism, whose adherents affirm that human experience is limited to realities restricted by the micro and macro world, and all forms of mental activity are therefore conditioned by that experience. That line of reasoning, however, is oblivious to the dialectical connection between the empirical and theoretical level of cognition which, moreover, is treated out of historical context. Little surprise, then, that this logically leads to accepting the theory of insuperable boundaries to our knowledge.

In his criticism of these concepts, Pavlov draws on data from the concrete sciences and builds his arguments on their latest achievements. He took a significant step forward in this respect in the fifties and sixties, when progress in cybernetics, physiology, psychology, linguistics and in other areas made it possible to concretize and expand certain concepts and propositions of the theory of reflection and, more important, furnish added proof of the validity of its underlying principles.

In later editions of his "Theory of Reflection", Pavlov compares his views with those of other Marxist scholars. It is therefore proper to say that certain amendments and addenda in these new editions are, to a degree, the result of collective Marxist research.

Bourgeois philosophy has endeavored to exploit recent scientific data for an attack on the theory of reflection, which it rejects

as "obsolete." On the other hand, a one-sided, metaphysical approach to recent achievements in the natural sciences has led some philosophers to fall back on refurbished mechanistic concepts and theories. Here too, Pavlov critically analyzes both idealistic and mechanistic views, to which he opposes an interpretative generalization of scientific data based on dialectical materialism.

Some of Pavlov's recent works examine the chief gnosiological categories in the light of new scientific achievements, particularly in such fields as cybernetics, the theory of information, physiology, psychology and psychiatry. And in this context it should be observed that Pavlov has always devoted special attention to the relationship of philosophy to the social and natural sciences. In articles on the philosophical aspects of biology, cybernetics and other fields of research, he makes out a convincing case against scholastic divorcement of philosophy from, and its positivist submergence in, the natural sciences.

Dialectical unity of philosophy and the concrete sciences, he has repeatedly emphasized, is an indispensable condition for progress in both. This unity is achieved by the concrete sciences accepting Marxism-Leninism as their philosophical and methodological foundation. But this also presupposes that philosophy develops in constant association with these sciences and social practice, in all its multiformity.

And in investigating the interrelation between philosophy and the concrete sciences, in his treatment of individual problems of history, the arts, culture and politics, Pavlov has been able to prove that the dialectical-materialist theory of cognition and materialist dialectics in general are the methodological instruments of concrete sciences dealing with diverse facets of nature and society.

Pavlov has made a significant contribution to the methodology of the social sciences, using as his research material the history of the Bulgarian revolutionary movement, literature and art. His work in this field is an example of how the fundamental propositions of historical materialism can be applied to concrete historical research and further enriched in the process.

He has given us a searching analysis of such cardinal methodological problems of historical research as the relation of the content and form of the historical process, the scientific nature of historical knowl-

edge, the objective and subjective aspects of the historical process, etc.

His historical writings cover a wide range of problems pertaining both to the Bulgarian Renaissance and modern times.

Special mention should be made of his study of the character and motive forces of Bulgaria's bourgeois-democratic revolution, the ideology of the Bulgarian revolutionary democrats, the socialist movement after liberation from Turkish yoke, periodization of modern Bulgarian history, and the character of the September 9, 1944 popular uprising. At the same time, Pavlov has made a fruitful study of specific problems, notably the role and significance of such prominent personalities in the Bulgarian and international working-class movement as Dimitr Blagoyev, Georgi Dimitrov, Vasil Kolarov, and also Marin Drinov and Gotse Delchev, to mention a few out of a much longer list.

In articles discussing the ideological views and revolutionary activity of Vasil Levsky and Khristo Botev, Pavlov refutes attempts by bourgeois historians to distort and belittle their revolutionary heritage. Pavlov's bold exposure, at the time of the fascist monarchy, of how bourgeois historians deliberately falsified the role of these national leaders is one of the services he has rendered Marxist historiography in Bulgaria.

Much of Pavlov's historical research after the establishment of people's rule deals with the Bulgarian Renaissance, and he has made an important contribution to a Marxist-Leninist analysis of this significant stage of the Bulgarian revolutionary movement.

He has also written extensively on conceptual problems of modern Bulgarian history and his studies, including several recent ones, are a most valuable aid to young historians. His "For a Marxist History of Bulgaria" (1954) casts a new light on basic methodological and concrete problems of Bulgarian history, in particular the September 1944 uprising, showing that while people's democratic in form it was socialist in content.

Academician Pavlov's studies are a valuable contribution to our knowledge of Bulgarian history and to Marxist-Leninist historical methodology.

He has been equally active in propagating Marxist ideas in education and exposing anti-scientific theories, to which much of his early writing is devoted. Two of his works, "Labor As an Element in Education" and "Pedagogical Anarchism", and also a

number of articles reveal a creative approach to education and lucidly explain Marxist views. Taking historical materialism as his premise, Pavlov shows that in a class society education can only be of a class nature, and that the dominant system of education is designed to serve the needs of the ruling class. However, it would be outright vulgarization of Marxism, he emphasizes, to believe that the classical theories of education, inasmuch as they are of class origin, do not contain permanent and progressive ideas. The ideas of Aristotle, Komensky, Rousseau and Pestalozzi will doubtlessly play their part, though in a reconstructed form, in communist education.

Pavlov deals also with the problems of polytechnical education. The training of the new man, he writes, cannot be confined to acquiring the rudiments of polytechnical knowledge. Marxism, the result and synthesis of human practice and culture, has its own pedagogical, moral and socio-historical ideal, namely, all-round and harmonious development of the personality. That is why socialist and communist education, Pavlov stresses, must be both polytechnical and general in order to give the young generation knowledge of all the achievements of science, the arts and culture and thereby stimulate creative endeavor in all these fields. And Pavlov is fully justified in stressing that this is not as simple a matter as it might seem, for here we are dealing with people.

Another field in which Pavlov had worked is the history, theory and criticism of literature and the arts.

This aspect of his work should be seen in context with the struggle in pre-revolutionary Bulgaria between adherents of bourgeois formalist theories and Marxists. And Pavlov had an active part in this battle against the reactionary views of various bourgeois schools of literature, particularly the group around the *Zlatorog* magazine in the twenties and thirties.

Pavlov treats Bulgaria's cultural traditions in their social implications. As a Marxist, he approaches cultural traditions from a class standpoint: he studies the relations between the social milieu and active personalities as part of the historical process and assesses specific situations as a result of that process. He is guided by the Leninist idea that the real spiritual values of the past must be broadly used by the masses in their battle against decadent and reactionary bourgeois culture, but

also in building the qualitatively new, socialist culture.

In his critical works on Shakespeare, Ibsen, Tolstoy, Gorky, Mayakovsky and other writers he analyzes, with characteristic profundity, the ideological and artistic significance of their work. He has made a meaningful contribution also to an understanding of Aleko Konstantinov, Ivan Vazov, Pencho Slaveikov, Elin Pelin, Khristo Smirnensky, Geo Milev, Khristo Yasevov, Nikola Vaptsarov and other Bulgarian writers and poets.

Still another facet of his wide range of interests is the interaction of the general and specific laws of the economic base and superstructure, the role of the personality, historicism in literary theory and criticism. The latter, he says, should be based on the principle of dialectical unity of form and content, method and correct, progressive world outlook, high artistic standards and

multiformity of genres and styles, partisanship and kinship with people, but at the same time, should bear a creative individual character.

Pavlov's career in these fields of research, social and political activity is an example for all researchers, all Communists. His work is imbued with militant partisanship, intolerance of views hostile to dialectical and historical materialism and Marxism generally. He has made a truly significant, creative contribution to Marxism-Leninism.

The nine-volume *Selected Works* cover a wide range of problems, all of which are treated scientifically and with the utmost clarity. His work will be drawn upon by everyone working in Marxist-Leninist theory.

F. KONSTANTINOV
S. GANOVSKY
F. ARKHIPTSEV

Path of glory

A new, third edition of President Svoboda's book, "From Buzuluk to Prague",* appeared in the Soviet Union recently. A veteran of the Second World War, and decorated with many Soviet and Czechoslovak distinctions, Ludvik Svoboda, President of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, is a legendary figure in his country.

He tells in his memoirs how during the Second World War the Czech Corps, the nucleus of the People's Army of Czechoslovakia, was formed on Soviet territory, how it fought from the trans-Volga town of Buzuluk all the way to Prague.

After the Munich betrayal thousands of Czechs and Slovaks left the country, hoping to rally support abroad for resistance to German fascism.

Lt.-Col. Svoboda left Czechoslovakia illegally in June 1939, and was active in organizing the anti-fascist movement among his emigre countrymen first in Poland and later, the Soviet Union. However, with "the emigre government in London fearing, not without cause, that joint

action by Czechoslovak and Soviet soldiers against the common enemy would cement the friendship of the Czechoslovak and Soviet peoples," Svoboda encountered considerable obstacles. But he persisted in his efforts for contacts between the Soviet Government and the Czechoslovak emigre government in London, seeking to coordinate anti-fascist action. Negotiations between an emissary of the emigre government and representatives of the Soviet government opened in January 1941, and Svoboda's participation in preparing these talks contributed greatly to their success.

Shortly after Hitler's perfidious attack on the Soviet Union, the USSR and the Czechoslovak emigre government concluded their first agreement (July 18, 1941), which read in part:

"The two Governments undertake to render each other every aid and support in the present war against Hitler Germany.

"The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics consents to the forming in the territory of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of national Czechoslovak military units under a commander ap-

*Ludvik Svoboda, *From Buzuluk to Prague*, in Ukrainian, Kiev, Politizdat of Ukraine, 1968.

pointed by the Czechoslovak Government with the approval of the Soviet Government. The Czechoslovak fighting force in the territory of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics shall operate under the guidance of the Supreme Command of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

The newly-formed Czechoslovak units consisted of Czechs and Slovaks residing in the Soviet Union and volunteering to fight alongside the Soviet people against the fascist invader. Several thousand Czechoslovaks were resident in the USSR at that time, with about 45-50 thousand more who were citizens of the USSR. The Corps was joined also by many officers and men of the Czechoslovak Army, and by Czechs and Slovaks who had fought in the International Brigades in Spain. Although at first the number of Communist Party members was small, the officers and men not associated with the revolutionary movement at the time of the bourgeois republic were strongly conscious of the traditional bonds between the Slav peoples and had a warm fraternal affection for the people of Russia.

Our bonds with Slav Russia are deep-rooted, going back to the time of our national revival when the Czech "revivalists" referred to the Russian people as the powerful oak that could be counted on for support in the fight against the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. After the October Revolution the fraternal bonds between the Czechoslovak and Russian peoples took on a new complexion: the friendship became closer, and in many respects due to nearly 20 years' activity of the Czechoslovak Communist Party and other progressive organizations. Besides, the Munich betrayal of Czechoslovak interests by the Western powers strengthened our conviction that the USSR, the first socialist state and the historically fraternal and powerful Slav power, was the only truly dependable support in the fight against fascism.

The Czechoslovak fighting force was formed in the town of Buzuluk some 180 kilometers east of Kuibyshev. Ludvik Svoboda was put at its head. When the crucial battle for Stalingrad began, the Czechoslovaks requested that the Soviet Government send them to the front to fight alongside the Soviet Army. Later, after the baptism of fire at Sokolovo, when Svoboda, then colonel, was decorated with the Order of Lenin in the Kremlin, Mikhail Kalinin, Chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, recalled that the Czechoslovak force had asked to be sent into battle at the most difficult hour of the war. "It did not

matter at all how many you were," Kalinin said to Svoboda. "The important thing was that you, Czechs and Slovaks, stood by us in that dark hour. Hitler's troops were near Stalingrad, on the Volga, and the capitalist world did not believe we would survive. They expected the Soviet Union to go down in defeat, they were certain we would surrender. Yet you had confidence in the ultimate victory of our common cause and, even without the consent of your government, against its will, asked persistently to be sent into action. And in battle you did everything that could be done." The Soviet Government set a high merit on the bravery of the Czechoslovak fighting force in the battle at Sokolovo. On April 17, 1943, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet decorated 86 men and officers of the First Czechoslovak Battalion with Orders and medals of the Soviet Union, and the commander of First Company, Otakar Jaros, who fell in the battle, was posthumously awarded the title of Hero of the Soviet Union, the first foreign soldier to receive this high tribute.

In the autumn of 1943 Svoboda's First Czechoslovak Brigade took part in the fighting for Kiev. At Sokolovo, in the battle of Kiev, and later at Belaya Tserkov and Zhashkov, in the Dukla operation and in the liberation of Slovakia, the Czechoslovak fighting force proved its mettle alongside the Soviet units.

More volunteers joined — Czechs and Slovaks residing in the Soviet Union, Slovak soldiers forcibly inducted into Hitler's armed forces and crossing the lines en masse, Volyn Czechs from the Ukraine and Czechoslovak refugees from the Transcarpathians. The small Buzuluk force grew gradually into the First Czechoslovak Army Corps of some 60,000 men, a regular fighting force equipped with Soviet tommy-guns, artillery, tanks and planes. And this thanks to the generous, fraternal moral and material support of the Soviet people and their government.

That a Czechoslovak unit became part of the armed forces of the world's first socialist state had a strong bearing on the nature of the resistance movement in Czechoslovakia. As the Soviet Army came closer to the Czechoslovak border, resistance in the occupied country stiffened, culminating first in the Slovak and, later, the Prague uprising.

In 1945, when the Czechoslovak people welcomed on their soil the Soviet army that had smashed Hitler's war machine, they accorded an affectionate reception to their own soldiers who had fought in the

armies of the anti-Hitler coalition, and doubly affectionate to the men and officers of the First Czechoslovak Corps under Ludvik Svoboda, the personification of Czechoslovak resistance, bearing unmistakable signs of socialist orientation in post-war and epitomizing future security based on an alliance with the Soviet Union.

General Svoboda, a national hero, not as yet a member of the Communist Party, was appointed Minister of Defense of the Provisional Czechoslovak Government at the Party's suggestion. He was for us a symbol of the unbreakable friendship of Czechoslovakia and the Soviet Union sealed with the blood shed in the war. The Czechoslovak Corps became the nucleus of the People's Army and many of its officers were given posts of command, stressing its progressive essence. These comrades still hold top posts and guarantee dependable defense and close alliance with the armies of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. Throughout the postwar, the Czechoslovak Army has been, and is, an important link in the line of defense not only of the Czechoslovak border, but also of part of the Western frontier of the socialist camp.

One might say it is symbolic that General Svoboda's memoirs were first published in 1960, when the National Conference of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia proclaimed the victory of socialism in our country. That reminded us of our closeness with the people of the Soviet Union, of blood shed jointly in the fight for freedom, independence, progress and socialism. Our people will never forget those who fell in battle for us. Some 360,000 Czechs and Slovaks were killed or mutilated in Hitler's prisons and concentration camps. In March 1942, Svoboda's 17-year-old son, Mirek Svoboda, too, was brutally murdered in Mauthausen after being terribly tortured.

A third Soviet edition of Svoboda's book was being prepared shortly before the 25th anniversary of the battle for Kiev, in which the Czechoslovaks took part. And

it came off the presses when, after the January Central Committee meeting in 1968, the Party nominated Svoboda for President, the highest office in Czechoslovakia, and he was made a member of the CC CPC and elected to its Presidium.

In his foreword, Svoboda stressed that his book is but a chronicle of the first unit of our armed forces. It had been an arduous time: 26 months of heavy fighting against the Nazis. Many did not live to see the day of victory. More than 4,000 fell in battle for their country. It was a glorious path, a path of thousands of kilometers from Buzuluk to Prague across the steppes of Russia and the Ukraine, the Carpathians, all Slovakia, southern Poland and, at last, on Czech soil.

President Ludvik Svoboda, as he notes in his foreword to the Soviet 1968 edition, wrote his book chiefly for the young people of his country, to tell them of the heroism of those Czech and Slovak soldiers who fought against fascism alongside the Soviet soldiers. But, as Svoboda notes, that was not the only reason for writing the book. Telling of the staunchness of Czech and Slovak soldiers fighting shoulder to shoulder with Soviet men, the writer "wanted to put on record for all time everything that had brought our peoples together, to show where and how the friendship of the peoples of the USSR and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic was steered, a friendship that has deep roots in the history of our two fraternal countries."

Svoboda speaks of the political work and selflessness of the Communists. The Communist Party of Czechoslovakia was the heart and soul of the anti-fascist resistance both at the front and behind the lines. It impressed on all patriots the need to fight against German fascism. It inspired the policy of the National Front in which broad anti-fascist forces rallied round the working class. Subsequently, this policy of the Party paved the way to socialist construction in our country.

Ota LEV

A brand of Anti-Communism

Israeli aggression against the Arab states, the events taking place in the Middle East and in other areas of the world urgently dictate the need to expose the theory and practice of Zionism, which, as Meir Vilner, General Secretary of the CPI, expressed it, is "alas, a 'forgotten' but topical problem . . ." The 16th Congress of the Communist Party of Israel, therefore, subjected to critical analysis Israel's official state ideology—Zionism. And there was nothing accidental in this. For more and more frequently world public opinion encounters this somewhat "unusual" phenomenon.

Added to the complexity and difficulty of the struggle of the progressive forces against Zionism is the fact that for many reasons the subject has not been studied for many years. Most helpful in filling the vacuum is the book *Attention: Zionism!* which appeared recently in the Soviet Union.

Present-day Zionism, the author stresses, is "an ideology, a ramified system of organizations and political practice of the Jewish big bourgeoisie integrated with the monopoly circles of the USA and other imperialist powers. The main content of Zionism is militant chauvinism and anti-Communism" (p. 4).

Zionism originated at the turn of the 20th century, when capitalism had entered upon its final phase of imperialism.

In substance, the Zionists were indifferent to the connection of a "national home" and "the land of their ancestors." They were ready to create a "Jewish home" in Latin America, Eastern Europe, Kenya or Uganda, so long as it would serve imperialist interests.

The constitution of the State of Israel personifies the idea of gathering the Jews "around Zion" in, as it were, its optimum measure. The program of the 26th Zionist Congress (1965) defined the supreme aim of the Zionist movement to maintain and

consolidate the "Jewish world nation" with Israel as the center of orientation, a kind of octopus whose tentacles are to stretch to all the countries of the world.

The author notes that one of the main reasons for the emergence of Zionism was the sharpening of the class struggle which at the threshold of the 20th century compelled "imperialism to consolidate and support ALL FORCES (emphasis ours—S.K.), which in one way or other opposed the international working class movement, the class solidarity and struggle of all working people . . . The rulers of all major European states without exception were objectively interested in such a phenomenon as Zionism" (p. 37).

At the same time "the process of class differentiation and decay in the Jewish communities and the striving of the Jewish working people to rid themselves of the control of the community rulers in each country where a Jewish community existed, led to the formation, among those belonging to the upper strata of the community, of groups of like-minded people with the aim of re-establishing and strengthening in every way the former hegemony, of ensuring control over the masses of Jewish working people" (p. 37).

The book comprehensively and critically examines the "pillars" of the Zionist concept of the so-called worldwide Jewish nation, of the alleged eternal longing of the Jews to return to Palestine, of the "eternity of anti-semitism," etc.

Proceeding from Leninist concepts, the author shatters one by one the pseudo-scientific arguments of the leaders of Zionism, criticizes the "theories" of Moses Hess, Leo Pinsker, Theodore Herzl, Achad Haam, Leon Simon and many others about the "exclusiveness" of Jewry and other features characteristic of it alone as "the chosen of God."

"The main organizational and ideological center of Zionism possessing financial funds equal to the funds of large monopoly

Yuri Ivanov, *Attention: Zionism!* Moscow, Politizdat, 1968. 175 pp.

unions," the author writes, "is the World Zionist Federation set up in 1897, based on the racial principle and operating from the United States. It controls and directs Zionist organizations in more than 60 countries; its directives determine the character of the work in sixty-seven countries of the World Jewish Congress, which is actually a branch of the WZF. Associated with these two main Zionist organizations are numerous societies, clubs, provisional and permanent committees, unions and alliances" (p. 125).

The facts cited in the book speak of the influence exerted by the WZF on all aspects of the life and policy of Israel: 86 per cent of the arable land leased in the country belongs to the WZF; the WZF is the "guardian" of more than 480 rural settlements in Israel; by 1963, 60 Israeli enterprises belonged to the WZF; one of the biggest construction companies in Israel "Rassco" (of mixed capital, mainly American) belongs to the WZF; the WZF is a shareholder in "Mecorot", a leading Israeli irrigation company, a shareholder in the EL-AL international aviation company and the "Zim" shipping company, etc. (p. 126).

"... The true masters of the international Zionist Agency," says the author, "advance at present three cardinal tasks, called upon to determine the role of Israel in the system of international Zionism:

"The turning of the state into a militant plunderer capable of controlling or effectively influencing through violence the direction and course of events in the Middle East (the vital importance of which for imperialism can hardly be overestimated);

"Further consolidation of Israel as the center of ideological and political influence and, as far as possible, of control over millions of Jews—citizens of various countries of the world;

"Strengthening the positions of Israel as an instrument in the economic and political penetration of imperialism (under the banner of Israel) into the developing countries of Africa and Asia (as well as some other countries . . .)" (pp. 128-129).

Based on original documents, statements and contributions of ideologists and official leaders of Zionism the book helps expose the subversive character of the anti-Communist orientation of the ideology of this reactionary trend.

The reader learns about the crimes committed by Zionists against the international revolutionary and national-liberation movement.

Zionists adopted an extremely hostile attitude to Soviet power after the October Revolution. The documentary proof in the archives shows that Zionists collaborated with the counter-reactionary "governments" of Denikin, Petlyura and Skoropadsky.

One recalls, for example, the monstrous deal transacted by Zionists with the rulers of Nazi Germany, a deal which staggers the mind by its cynicism. In the book we read that: "In May 1944, Eichmann received orders to supply through the Zionists 10,000 lorries for the Eastern front in compensation for a promise to release Jewish people in German concentration camps and transfer them to Palestine.

"In Hungary Eichmann met the Zionist leader Joel Brandt who immediately conveyed the German offer to the Jewish Agency. The latter delegated him to Constantinople to discuss the offer with representatives of the agency." (Judgments M.D. Israel, 1965, p.65.)

The present pro-Bonn policy of the Israeli rulers, too, is cynical in the extreme, for in return for so-called reparations received from the FRG, Israel hushes up the past of the Nazi killers, as the Eichmann trial showed all too clearly, whipping up an anti-Communist campaign.

The facts on the activities of Zionism on a world scale cited in the book enable the reader to see more clearly the difficult conditions in which genuine internationalists, the courageous members of the Communist Party of Israel—true defender of the interests of the broad working masses of Israel, champion of peace, independence and understanding with the Arab neighbor states and consistent fighter for the unity of the world Communist movement—live, work and fight.

The Israeli version of apartheid, elaborated and applied by the Zionist leaders of the state, the brutal racial discrimination to which the native Arab population is subjected, the refined methods of prosecuting progressive Israeli citizens and other features of life in Israel, expounded in this book, bring out the gloomy and sinister background against which one sees ever more vividly the infinite selflessness of the progressive forces of Israel waging a struggle against the reactionary course of the Zionist leaders of the country.

The author cites as a vivid example of the intrigues of international Zionism in the Communist and working-class movement the recent attempt to undermine the internationalist positions of the Communist

Party of Israel, to replace its Marxist-Leninist genuinely patriotic policy by a policy of actual alliance with Zionism, solidarity with the criminal adventures of the advocates of formation of "a Greater Israel." The international Jewish-Arab unity of the members of the CPI, forged in the difficult conditions of an artificially incited national strife, the brotherhood based on a class foundation, the cooperation of Jews and Arabs united in a party of which the Israeli Communists can be proud, which is a living example of the community and indivisibility of the interests of all working people in the Middle East—all were subjected to the fire of social-chauvinism by the splinter group headed by the former secretary of the Party, Mikunis.

The Communist Party of Israel, the author emphasizes, has undergone most severe trials. "The Israeli authorities which failed to explode the Party from within, subjected the Communists to a wave of repressions. All methods designed to paralyze the activities of the CPI were used: beginning with the harassing of the children of Communists in schools and in the streets, and ending with the arrest of members and leaders, brutal beatings at police stations, attempts at physical extermination of leaders" (p. 160).

In the last part of the book the author shows that "the fundamental aim of the international Zionist concern has been and remains enrichment by all possible means which guarantees them, within the frame-

work of the imperialist system, power and parasitic wellbeing;

"The establishment of ideological and political control over the population of Jewish origin, which is promised in an unforeseeable future the role of pastors of mankind, has been and remains in the Zionist projects of realization of this aim one of the main weapons;

"The state of Israel, created as a result of the humane act of representatives of many peoples of the world, (by decision of U.N.O. 1947 based on the right of self-determination of peoples.—S.K. has been, due to the anti-national treacherous policy of the ruling Zionist circles and in their person, turned into an instrument of the 'holy alliance' of world Zionism and imperialism" (p. 153).

The main target of the aims and subversive activities of the international Zionist concern (within and beyond the framework of its day-to-day financial-political machinations, which run counter to the genuine interests of the peoples of all countries without exception), has been and remains the Soviet Union, all socialist countries, the world Communist, working-class and national liberation movement.

The book, naturally, does not examine all the problems connected with this complicated and broad subject. It draws, however, a clear picture of Zionism in all its ramifications.

Saliba KHAMIS

People's General Juan Modesto

It was with a feeling of deep pain that the news of the death of Comrade Juan Modesto Guilloto, member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Spain, was received in many countries of the world, especially by anti-fascists and progressives who have not forgotten the 32 months' heroic resistance (1936-39) of the Spanish people to the Franco mutiny and fascist intervention. The Spanish people were the first to rise in arms against fascism.

With the death of Juan Modesto we have lost one of the great heroes of the national revolutionary war of the Spanish people. Modesto was of that special mold which the international working class always has in its ranks.

Born into a worker's family, and himself a worker, Juan Modesto who joined the Communist Party of Spain as a young man, received his military tempering in the crucible of battle, rising to the rank of general by his bravery and his talent as a strategist and organizer. He became the Republican Army's first People's General.

He was one of the organizers and commanders of the glorious Fifth Regiment formed by the Communist Party of Spain. His name is closely associated with the major battles of the Spanish war (the defense of Madrid, Jarama, Brunete, Belchite, Teruel, Aragon, Catalonia, and Ebro), in which he played a leading role, particularly in the glorious battle of the Ebro, the major action of the war. It was during this battle that his outstanding qualities as a commander came to the fore.

Juan Modesto was a true internationalist. Already during the first days of the Franco

mutiny he organized a battalion which was named after Thaelmann, the leader of the German Communists then in prison and later murdered by the Nazis. This battalion became the backbone of the regular Republican Army. Juan Modesto displayed his internationalist spirit in the unceasing concern he showed for the men of the International Brigade which fought under his direct command.

Modesto was a symbol of the heroic struggle of the Spanish people, a symbol of its fighting brotherhood with the anti-fascists from 54 countries of the world who came to its aid. This common struggle left its imprint on the lives of people and nations.

On April 29, delegates from 20 countries, among them former members of the International Brigade and representatives of a number of parties and governments, came to Prague to pay a last tribute to the comrade and commander under whom they had fought in so many battles. The Spanish delegation included Dolores Ibarruri, Chairman of the Communist Party of Spain, Santiago Carillo, General Secretary, and other leaders of the Party. There were also delegations of Spanish comrades from different parts of the world, and from Spain.

The death of General Juan Modesto, firm and selfless leader of the Spanish Communists, is a heavy loss for the Spanish people and its Communist Party. With his death the movement for peace, democracy and socialism has lost one of its best sons.

Eternal glory to the memory of Juan Modesto!

Books listed here are in the language of the country of publication

LENIN, V. I. *Aprelskiye tezisy* (The April Theses). The Tasks of the Proletariat in the Present Revolution. Moscow, Politizdat, 1969. 16 pp.

LENIN, V. I. *Glavnaya zadacha nashikh dnei* (The Chief Task of Our Day). ("Left-Wing" Childishness and the Petty-bourgeois Mentality). Moscow, Politizdat, 1969. 40 pp.

LENIN, Karl Marx. Edited by P. Togliatti. Rome, Editori Riuniti, 1969. 112 pp.

LENIN, V. I. *Imperialismen som kapitalismens hoyste stadium* (Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism). Oslo, Forlaget Ny Dag, 1969. 141 pp.

LENIN, V. I. *Spisy* (Works). Vol. 41. Prague, nakladatelstvi Svoboda, 1968. 420 pp.

Ryadom s Leninym (By Lenin's Side). Recollections about N. K. Krupskaya. Moscow, Politizdat, 1969. 430 pp.

ULYANOVA-YELIZAROVA, A. I. *Vospominaniya ob Ilyiche* (Recollections about Lenin). Moscow, Politizdat, 1969. 127 pp.

AGOSTI, H. *La milicia literaria* (Militants of Literature). Buenos Aires, Ediciones Silaba, 1969. 218 pp.

GOMULKA WL. *O naszej partii* (Our Party). Warsaw, KiW, 1968. 705 pp.; *Z kart minionej historii* (Pages from History). Warsaw, KiW, 1968. 485 pp.; *O problemie niemieckim* (The German Problem). Warsaw, KiW, 1968. 511 pp.

DUCLOS, J. *Mémoires. 1935-1939. Aux jours ensoleillés du Front populaire* (The Sunny Period of the Popular Front). Paris, Fayard, 1969. 462 pp.

KAMBAR, U. *BNMAU-d sotsializmyн material tekhnikiyn baaz baiguulzh duusgakh yavdal tus ulsyn khogzhliyn shine ue shat mon* (Completion of the Building of the Material and Technical Base of Socialism in the MPR—a New Stage in Mongolia's Development). Ulan-Bator, Ulsyn khevlel, 1968. 317 pp.

KOHEN, A. *Clases sociales y programas agrarios* (Social Classes and Agrarian Programs). Buenos Aires, Editorial Quipo, 1968. 298 pp.

LIEBKNECHT, K. *Gesammelte Reden und Schriften* (Collected Speeches and Articles). Vol. IX. May 1916-January 15, 1919. Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1968. 734 pp.

Das Menschenbild der marxistisch-leninistischen Philosophie (Man's Image in Marxist-Leninist Philosophy). Collection. Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1969. 323 pp.

MINIS, A. *MAHN-aas feodal angiiyn uls tor, ediiyn zasgiyn noerkhlyg ustgakhyn toloo yavuulsan temtsel (1921-1940)* (Struggle of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party for the Liquidation of the Political and Economic Domination of the Feudal Class (1921-40)). Ulan-Bator, Ulsyn khevlel, 1968. 196 pp.

THAELMANN, E. *Pisma iz turmy rodnym i blizkim* (Letters from Prison to Relatives and Friends). 1933-37. Moscow, Politizdat, 1969. 160 pp.

Wissenschaft im Klassenkampf (Science in the Class Struggle). Scientific-Technological Research in the System of State-Monopoly Domination in West Germany. Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1968. 304 pp.

DENISOV, V. V. *Strakh pered narodom* (Fear of the People). Criticism of Modern Bourgeois Conceptions of the Role of the Masses in History. Moscow, Mysl, 1968. 222 pp.

SUPPLEMENT

Capitalist economy: buoyancy but more contradictions

Survey prepared by the
Institute of World Economy and International Relations,
Academy of Sciences of the USSR.

The livelier business in the capitalist world that succeeded the stagnation and difficulties of 1966 and 1967 is highly contradictory in character. In 1968, the aggregate national product of the industrial capitalist countries averaged a 5 per cent growth against 2.6 per cent in 1967, while industrial production increased 5.5 per cent and international trade 12 per cent.

Yet the capitalist economy was shaken by currency crises, prices and the cost of living were affected by inflationary trends, and the budget deficit problem was as acute as ever. Though business improved, economic and political growth was more uneven, antagonisms sharpened, the rift between the monopoly elite and the working people deepened, social conflicts were bitter, and the class struggle became more tense.

Growth of production was sparked by factors surfacing in varying degrees of intensity from country to country, such as increased spending on modernizing production plant (though, admittedly, the rate of this process declined somewhat in some countries); greater military allocations, especially due to the continuing escalation in Vietnam, the growing demand for durable goods spurred on largely by the inflationary processes and the continued devaluation of money, and, last but not least, intensified exports by the monopolies chiefly of the FRG, Italy, Japan and Britain.

Modernization of Plant and Rising Prices

Bigger investments, however sporadic, tended to stimulate industrial production and increase the national product.

Dynamics of Investment in the Main Capitalist Countries

(percentages of preceding year)

Country	1958	1961	1962	1965	1966	1967	1968
USA	-10.6	- 2.5	+ 7.1	+ 8.7	+ 8.7	- 8.2	+ 4.3
FRG	+ 5.9	+ 9.3	+ 5.8	+ 6.6	+ 0.2	- 7.4	+ 7.8
Japan	- 0.8	+28.3	+ 7.7	+ 5.1	+10.7	+29.3	+25.0
Britain	+ 1.0	+ 9.5	- 0.6	+ 4.0	+ 1.5	+ 5.4	+ 2.3
France	+ 2.3	+10.5	+ 7.9	+ 5.3	+ 6.0	+ 5.9	+ 3.5
Italy	+ 1.2	+11.4	+10.2	- 8.2	+ 3.7	+ 9.9	+ 4.1
Canada	- 3.8	- 1.9	+ 6.0	+18.5	+17.9	- 3.3	+ 0.5

High rates of investment were observed in the power industry and housing, whereas investments in industry generally were relatively low, even declining somewhat in some countries. This applies particularly to manufacturing industry in the United States, Britain, France and Sweden.

Below-capacity operation of plant, quite widespread and still spreading, was, in a way, a "stimulant" for modernizing factories. At the end of 1968, for example, the U.S. manufacturing industry was working to about 83 per cent of capacity and the engineering industry only 80 per cent. Losses thus incurred, compelled industrialists to seek salvation in raising the efficiency of plant and reducing the cost of labor by automation. In the United States, for example, expenditure on automation comprised 25 per cent of the total investments, and as much as 45, 35 and 35 per cent respectively in the case of iron-and-steel, electrical and general engineering. This is large-

ly true of all the developed capitalist countries.

Inflation and also the certainty of further price increases evidently affected investment policy. In 1968 private U.S. investments rose 9.6 per cent in current prices, but what with the cost of building and installation rising 7-7.2 per cent over the 12 months and the price of plant and equipment an average of 3 per cent, actual growth amounted to no more than 4.5 per cent. 1969 is also expected to see a considerable increase in investments, although some quarters in the business world think the rate of growth will drop.

Expansion of output in Britain, Switzerland and the Netherlands was also largely due to spiralling consumption prompted by the inflationary processes. In Britain, for one, wholesale prices of manufactured goods went up 9.7 per cent, with the cost of building and assembly rising by nearly as much. In the Netherlands, raw materials and

equipment went up 5 per cent, the fear of further devaluation putting consumers and industrialists in the mood for shopping durable goods and plant before the next price increase.

A fast-rising cost of living was a feature of the economic situation.

Rise in Cost of Living (percentages)

	Average annual rise in 1957-67	Rise in 1968
USA	1.7	4.7
FRG	2.5	2.1
Japan	6.5	4.5
Britain	2.8	6.0
France	4.8	4.2
Italy	3.5	4.0
Netherlands	3.4	4.9
Switzerland	2.7	6.0

Higher prices for consumer goods, for medical treatment, various services and house-rents were accompanied by higher taxes. Growth of private consumption surpassed the growth of individual net incomes, with purchases made partly on savings (the norm of which began to drop in 1968) and on instalments.

Monetary Contradictions and the Relationship of Forces

What affected the capitalist economy most was the succession of monetary crises, which rattled the capitalist financial system in 1968.

The current financial difficulties, rooted in the interlacement of the political, economic and social contradictions of U.S. imperialism, stem from deep-seated causes, the main one unquestionably related to the changing relationship of forces in the imperialist camp in recent years as a result of the law of uneven development of capitalist countries and the impact made by the increasing power of the socialist camp and

Share of Individual Countries in Capitalist World's Industrial Output (percentages)

	1948	1958	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968
Capitalist world including:	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
USA	55.8	46.6	44.1	44.9	46.0	45.2	44.6
FRG	4.2	9.5	9.5	9.4	8.9	8.7	8.9
Japan	1.3	3.5	5.8	5.7	6.0	7.0	7.8
Britain	11.3	9.8	8.4	8.1	7.7	7.5	7.4
France	3.9	5.0	4.6	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.4
Italy	2.6	3.1	3.5	3.5	3.6	3.8	3.8
Canada	3.2	3.3	3.2	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.2
Netherlands	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1
Sweden	1.3	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1
West-European countries	30.4	35.7	34.6	34.0	30.7	31.0	32.8

the disintegration of the colonial system of capitalism.

West-European countries and Japan have gained a firmer grip on the capitalist world market. Asian, African and Latin American countries, having shaken off colonial and semi-colonial dependence, are also playing a more substantial part while the U.S. monopolies are no longer the monopoly financiers that they were at the end of the Second World War, which permitted them to impose their methods of financial regulation on the whole capitalist world.

A paradoxical situation has arisen of late in international settlements. The purchasing

power of the dollar at home has decreased 61 per cent in the past 20 years, while it has risen in other countries due to devaluation of local currencies while the dollar rate remains pegged to the price of gold. As result, U.S. dollar investments in Western Europe secure nearly double the profit of the European competitors, enabling U.S. monopolies to make up for high production costs at home and, what is more, exploit the economy of other developed capitalist states by controlling local industries, especially those crucial for technological progress. At present, USA controls more than half the manufacture of semi-conductors, 80 per cent

of computers and 96 per cent of integral schemes in Western Europe.

More than 2,000 U.S.-owned firms are located in Federal Germany, **Stern** reports. U.S. monopolies control 85-90 per cent of the West-German computer-manufacturing and operating industry, 40 per cent of the automobile and oil industry and 65 per cent of razor-blade manufacture. Von Oppel, the West German industrialist could not have put it more lucidly when he said to F. Donner, Vice-President of General Motors:

"Even in colonial days no power on earth made more profit out of its colonies than U.S. companies make from their enterprises in West Germany."

More than 90 per cent of investments in new U.S. enterprises in Western Europe are actually re-invested profits derived from European sources, with less than 10 per cent brought from the United States.

Wages lower than at home enable U.S. monopolies to compete to greater advantage in world markets. Products of overseas branches are shipped increasingly to the home market, a profitable thing for the monopolies, though the effect on the U.S. balance of payments is negative, because the imports exceed exports.

By virtue of its economic power, coupled with the advantages accruing from the status of the dollar, the U.S. Government has assumed the role of international gendarme. Its reckless policies involve vast spending abroad, though by now the pillar of these policies, that is, U.S. economic supremacy in the capitalist world, has visibly eroded.

The West-European countries and Japan have augmented their economic potential, turning from debtors of the United States into its rivals. By virtue of the lower cost of labor in these countries as compared with the USA they are now elbowing their over-

seas patron out of many markets. In 1947, for example, the U.S. share in world exports was 33 per cent, amounting to more than double the exports of its main competitors—Britain, West Germany, France, Italy and Japan combined, whereas in 1968 the U.S. share shrank to 15 per cent while that of West Germany, France, Italy, Japan and Britain increased to 36 per cent against 16 per cent in 1947, with West Germany covering most ground, her share rising from 0.5 per cent in 1947 to 12 in 1968.

The colossal spending incurred through its expansionist ambitions has turned the United States from creditor to debtor. The U.S. balance of payments deficit is now chronic. Confidence in the dollar has waned in the past three or four years, and to avert devaluation and the consequent loss of financial supremacy, the United States has had to sell large amounts of gold, its gold reserve decreasing to a point where the government had to abolish gold coverage of the dollar at home.

In July 1968 the U.S. gold reserve was \$10,400 million, or 25.7 per cent of the world's gold against 75 per cent in 1946. True, towards the end of the year it rose to \$10,892 million, and the general gold and monetary reserve to \$15,600 million, but debts claimable abroad rose in the same period from \$31,000 million to \$34,000 million. This presents a grave danger to the U.S. balance of payments because according to U.S. law, foreign central banks may claim gold for dollars from the U.S. Treasury at any moment. The consequences of anything like that would be nothing short of disastrous in view of the fact that U.S. gold and monetary reserves cover less than half the country's commitments abroad.

It would be proper to add that the artificially low price of gold has caused gold-mining to decline. In the postwar, gold re-

Distribution of the Gold Reserve
(end of year figures)

Country	\$000 million				Percentages			
	1948	1965	1967	1968	1948	1965	1967	1968
Capitalist world including:	32.8	43.4	41.6	40.7	100	100	100	100
USA	24.4	13.8	12.1	10.9	74.4	31.8	30.4	26.7
FRG	—	4.4	4.2	4.5	—	10.1	10.1	11.6
France	0.5	4.7	5.2	3.9	1.6	10.8	12.6	9.6
Italy	0.1	2.4	2.4	2.9	0.3	5.5	5.8	7.1
Britain	1.6	2.3	1.3	1.5	4.9	5.2	3.1	3.6
Canada	0.4	1.2	1.0	0.9	1.2	2.7	2.4	2.2
Japan	—	0.3	0.3	0.4	—	0.8	0.8	0.9

erves grew much more slowly than the international commercial transactions required, and in 1965 even began to decline on reaching a peak of \$43,230 million. The gold reserve of the capitalist world totalled a mere \$40,700 million in 1968, whereas trade totalled \$226,000 million, exceeding the available gold by as much as 450 per cent (it will be recalled that in 1945 world trade surpassed the gold reserve by only 80 per cent).

The West-European allies of U.S. imperialism naturally clamour for a revision of the international monetary system and demand a normal gold price, coupled with a sounder U.S. balance of payments, the chronic deficit of which upsets international settlements.

Concentration of Capital and the Competitive Struggle

Sharper currency contradictions between the principal capitalist countries indicative of their continuing economic instability, are a side-effect of the uneven development of capitalism. Efforts of the individual imperialist countries to tighten their grip on the world market is hotting up the competition between the big national and international monopoly groups.

That the competitive struggle between the principal capitalist countries has gained in intensity is evidenced by the emergence of super-monopolies, whose rivalries are stoking tension in the capitalist world. Their investments abroad, no more than \$15,000 million before the war, have passed the \$100,000 million mark. Many U.S. companies get far bigger receipts from their daughter companies abroad than from transactions at home. Standard Oil, Singer and Anaconda Copper, for example, secure over 60 per cent of their net profit from their overseas branches, and Ford Motor Corporation and Massey-Ferguson more than 90 per cent.

The magnitude of the monopoly transactions (amounting in the case of the USA, for example, to as much as 20 per cent of the country's foreign trade) is causing anxiety in countries where the international monopolies operate. In recent years, the authorities have encouraged mergers of national companies, liberalized anti-trust laws and stimulated concentration in industry and banking. In Japan thousands of companies annually were taken over or merged in the past five years, and the West-European press reports almost daily take-overs of weaker rivals or agreements of joint operation by giant corporations. U.S.-type inter-

national supermonopolies for Europe, like Ford, Esso and General Electric, are widely discussed, with national interests bowing before the aims of "global concentration".

Mergers and take-overs of small, medium-sized and large companies, were still numerous last year.

In France, where the number of iron-and-steel concerns shrank from 106 to 83 in the past 10 years while steel production doubled, 70 per cent of the steel output is accounted for by Usinor and De Wendel-Sidlor, this being the result of mergers and take-overs.

Four syndicates comprising 30 steel companies have evolved in the Federal Republic of Germany, with the August Thyssen-Hutte which produces more than 10 million tons annually, the strongest. Only two U.S. monopolies, United States Steel and Bethlehem, are ahead of it in the steel market.

Italy's Fiat has come to terms with France's Citroen concerning joint production, the new alliance ranking first in Europe and fourth in the world behind the U.S. big three.

In Japan, Kawasaki Dockyard, Kawasaki Aircraft and Kawasaki Rolling, three huge firms, have been merged as Kawasaki Heavy Industries.

In Britain, the process is particularly intensive in the engineering industry, but spreading also to other branches.

When Ling-Temco-Vought purchased 63 per cent of Jones and Laughlin Steel Corporation shares in the United States, they accomplished the year's biggest merger, with concentration of production and construction of giant concerns wielding colossal economic and political power, dominating the scene in the country. According to Senator Hart, Chairman of the Senate Anti-Trust Sub-Committee, fewer than 200 corporations now control 60 per cent of U.S. industrial production, ranging from tooth-paste to spacecraft.

* * *

The conflicting nature of the economic processes under way against the backdrop of uneven development, unrelenting competition and subjugation of the weak by the strong, is a good clue to the state of affairs behind the official statistics.

Economic Situation Country by Country

For the **United States** economy* 1968 was less difficult than the year before. The long upgrade phase of 1962-66 spawned illusions

*See Victor Perlo, *World Marxist Review*, No. 4, 1969 for detailed study of U.S. economic problems.

of untroubled growth through active state regulation. But they were dashed. The war in Vietnam and the consequent rapid inflation had an unnerving effect, and doubly so with the wholesale technological modernization largely completed by mid-1966. Investments first declined, then shrank drastically in 1967. The 4.3 per cent growth of investments in 1968 is accounted for chiefly by the power industry, non-durable goods and laying in of stocks. Investments in manufacturing dropped 0.8 per cent, iron and steel 3 per cent, chemicals 3.5 per cent, automobiles 3.6 per cent, building materials 5.5 per cent, general engineering 7.2 per cent, transport (excluding automobiles) 9.4 per cent, textiles 11 per cent and, closing the list, extractive industries 4.7 per cent.

This decline had a negative effect on the economy as a whole.

Industrial output increased 3.9-4 per cent, chiefly due to the expansion of the power industry (which registered an increase of 7.4 per cent) and the somewhat bigger output of the consumer industries (4.3 per cent). Production of producer goods went up a mere 1.1 per cent, with industries more sensitive to the general state of the economy (instruments, general engineering and, particularly, metal-processing equipment) cutting back 2-3 per cent against 1967. The signs of stagnation were thus quite distinct on the heels of what in the business vernacular was described as the mini-crisis of 1967.

Economic and political observers saw the

INDUSTRIAL INDICATOR FOR CAPITALIST COUNTRIES (1963=100)

	1961	1962	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968
Capitalist world	89	95	108	115	123	126	133
Industrial countries	89	95	107	114	122	125	133
Developing countries	90	95	109	117	125	130	138
West-European countries	92	96	107	112	116	117	126
Common Market countries	91	95	106	110	115	116	123
Austria	94	96	108	112	117	117	124
Britain	96	97	108	111	112	112	116
Belgium	88	93	107	109	111	113	120
Spain	81	91	113	127	140	144	150
Italy	84	92	102	107	119	128	135
Canada	86	94	109	119	128	130	135
Luxembourg	103	99	110	110	106	106	111
Netherlands	90	95	110	116	123	129	139
Norway	92	95	109	115	122	127	133
USA	88	95	106	115	126	127	133
Finland	91	96	107	115	121	124	129
France	90	95	107	109	116	120	122
FRG	93	97	108	114	116	114	127
Switzerland	91	95	105	109	113	116	120
Sweden	89	94	110	119	123	126	134
Japan	83	90	116	120	136	162	190

war in Vietnam at the root of most of the economic and political difficulties at home and internationally. Though the colossal war spending built up demand in many branches of industry, it was a heavy burden on the economy and nation.

The steadily growing military expenditures are causing inflation, debasing the dollar and pushing up the cost of living. In the past three years, house-rents have risen by 19 and mortgage payments 36 per cent. The normal annual cost of living for a family of four was officially estimated at \$4,485 in

1946, with an income of \$5,000 sufficing to cover the \$515 payable in taxes. The same standards required an income of \$9,390 in 1968, out of which \$3,476 to cover price increases and \$1,429 taxes. Yet—and this also according to official estimates—the annual income of 24 out of every hundred U.S. families was less than \$5,000, and particularly low in the case of the non-white population. In this bracket, 41 per cent have an annual income of as little as \$3,300.

Intensive price increases create a demand for the cheaper imported goods,

damaging national exports and affecting the balance of payments. The trade balance deteriorated visibly, with even a deficit showing in some months of 1968, which is unprecedented. The year's exports exceeded imports by only \$700 million against \$4,800 million in 1967. The crash measures taken earlier in the year to depress the balance of payments deficit, including restrictions on investment abroad, failed to yield the desired result. Direct U.S. investments in other countries increased nearly 10 per cent against 9 per cent in 1967, the monopolies ignoring government recommendations because profit on overseas investments is considerably higher than at home.

The aggregate national product of the **Federal Republic of Germany**, dropping 0.2 per cent in near-crisis 1967, increased 6.3 per cent the following year. Investments went up 7.3 per cent after dropping 9.5 per cent the year before, industrial production climbed 10 per cent, and the balance of payments was \$2,700 million to the good.

The upturn was largely due to increased foreign trade. Suffice it to say that the credit side of the West German trade balance passed \$4,000 million in 1968 thanks to the relatively low exchange rate of the West German mark and inflationary trends in the United States, Britain, France and a number of other countries creating a strong demand for the cheaper West-German commodities. As a result, West German exports to the United States, for example, increased 43 per cent in a matter of 12 months.

The artificially low exchange rate of the mark is creating difficulties for West Germany's paying partners. This surfaced most distinctly in the November 1968 monetary crisis, when the mark "breached the peace" in international finance and was an object of speculation.

The meeting of central bank directors in Basle on November 17 and a conference of the big ten finance ministers in Bonn on November 20-22 insisted on the Federal Republic revaluating the mark. Bonn refused, confining itself to a temporary 4-per cent tax on West German exports and a 4-per cent rebate on the import tax. This altered little or nothing, and the mark remains a potential source of new monetary upheavals.

For West German concerns 1968 was the most profitable year since the war, though the situation of the people continued to deteriorate. The Bonn Government went out of its way to create favorable conditions for the monopolies, on the one hand, and devised ingenious ways of pumping money

out of the working people, on the other. With tax revenue up 3.2 per cent, income tax revenue went up 10 per cent. The cost of living is climbing, house rents increasing 7 per cent, meat prices 10 per cent and services 5.4 per cent.

Japan's national product went up 11.2 per cent in 1968. Investments and industrial output expanded 25 and 17 per cent respectively, with the balance of payments \$1,000 million ahead.

To all intents and purposes, Japan has caught up with West Germany (having outstripped Britain back in 1967) in volume of production, with some industries ahead of the FRG and even the United States. More than half the merchant vessels built in the capitalist world, originate in Japan. The country ranks first in the world for cine- and photo-cameras, radio receivers and looms. It is second only to the United States in steel, power, electronic equipment, automobiles, cement, aluminum, synthetic rubber, plastics, woolen and synthetic textiles, sulphuric acid and many other items, with Japanese goods a match in quality to the best produced by U.S., German and British firms.

Though behind the USA and FRG in industrial output, Japan has the incontestable advantage of lower production costs. This is due largely to low wages, which are no more than 25 per cent of the average U.S. wage and some 20-25 per cent lower than in Western Europe, while labor productivity is higher than in Britain and West Germany and only 15-20 per cent lower than in the United States. In sum, Japan's economic headway rests on ruthless exploitation.

By and large, the Japanese economy is doing well, though observers hold that unchecked industrial growth might entail painful consequences. The difficulties of 1965-1966 were overcome chiefly by virtue of billion-dollar U.S. war orders for Vietnam. And many in Japan are wondering today what will happen when the war ends or the U.S. Government restricts Japanese-American trade in attempting to straighten out its balance of payments.

The economy of **Britain** is still in the doldrums. After three stagnant years, industrial output went up 3.7 per cent. But this rise rested on such undependable factors as the devaluation of the pound and the spiralling inflation. The devaluation made British exports—automobiles, chemicals and the products of engineering—more competitive, with an increase of production, but output in other industries dipped. As for the rapidly

rising prices, fear of further price increases prompted consumers to buy up durables.

Outlays for renovation and expansion are still low, rising a mere 2.3 per cent in comparable prices in 1968, and this chiefly thanks to a 5.7 per cent increase in housing development. Investments in industry have been on the downgrade for three consecutive years, dropping 5.5 per cent in the manufacturing industry.

Attempts to maintain the pound and resolve the balance of payments problem have proved futile. According to experts of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development the potential advantages of the 1967 devaluation had not worked. The devaluation secured bigger exports, but despite the restrictive measures of the Labor Government the increase in imports was greater, creating a \$2,000 million trade deficit and a \$1,600 million payments deficit. By July 1968 Britain had used up her reserve credit of \$1,400 million and was again compelled to borrow money from the International Monetary Fund. The \$2,000 million credit granted her under the Basle Agreement kept the pound steady for a while, but no consolidation followed. In November the pound wobbled again, though less than the French franc. By the end of that month Britain's gold and currency reserve shrank to \$2,510 million against \$2,695 million in December 1967, with the debt to the International Monetary Fund aggregating \$2,700 million.

The dip in investments, inflationary trends, limitation of consumer credits and the Labor Government's wage-freeze policy are holding back economic growth, with the scene clouded by prospects of a drop in British exports to the United States.

For the **French** economy 1968 was a bad year. The festering labor-capital contradictions bred by the fact that the fruits of economic progress are reaped exclusively by the big bourgeoisie, came to a head in the mammoth May-June strike of nearly nine million workers. The strikers won considerable concessions: family allowances were increased, social insurance considerably improved and trade-union rights extended. Wages went up 14 per cent.

The May-June shake-up, precipitated by the reluctance of the monopolies to meet the wage-earner's legitimate demands, retarded economic growth, reduced the foreign exchange reserve and the hoard of gold and money. The balance of payments was upset. In November, speculation with the West-German mark made the French franc the

epicenter of a new monetary crisis, France's gold and currency reserves shrinking to \$3,986 million in December 1968 against \$6,994 million earlier in the year. To avoid devaluation, France introduced rigid currency controls and borrowed \$2,000 million from the central banks of the other capitalist powers.

The consequences of the monetary crisis were painful: the national product increased 3 per cent instead of the expected 5.5, consumption and capital investments 3-3.5 per cent against 6 per cent in 1967, and the balance of payments was \$200 million in the red. Industrial output went up less than 3 per cent, and this against the setting of higher indirect taxation, higher charges for gas and electricity, increased railway fares, a rising cost of living and greater unemployment.

In **Italy**, too, economic growth slowed down in 1968. The national product and industrial production increased 5 per cent against 6 and 8 per cent respectively in 1967, while general investments rose 4.1 per cent against 9.9 per cent in the preceding year, and consumer spending only 4.2 per cent. But foreign trade flourished: the turnover expanded 12 per cent, enabling Italy to come out \$2,400 million ahead in the balance of payments and increase her gold reserve to \$2,800 million.

Livelier business in the capitalist world tended to increase international trade. On the whole, the turnover between the industrially-developed countries went up 12 per cent, with the traffic reduction by the Kennedy Round countries in January 1968 and the repeal of the remaining tariffs on industrial goods by the Common Market countries on July 1, contributing to this rise. Against this background, it is true, monopoly groups in countries that lowered tariffs exerted pressure on the respective governments to institute protectionist measures against foreign competition at home.

* * *

Stock exchange convulsions rapidly succeeding each other in the United States, Britain, France and other countries, highlighted the beginning of 1969. Industrial shares dropped 15 points on the New York exchange at the beginning of January, registering a new drop of 21 points at the end of February. Gold speculation is running high. After President Nixon's announcement that a reform of the international monetary system was desirable, the price of gold in the U.S. and British free

market rose to over \$43 per ounce, and to as much as \$46.5 on the Paris exchange.

A scrimmage for "hot money" is under way by the United States and the West-European countries. In January the First National City Bank of New York raised its interest rate to 7 per cent and 7.5 per cent in March, with the Bank of England following suit and raising interest to 8 per cent and the rate also going up in other countries. Production cut-backs are registered in a number of U.S. industries.

The instability of the economic and financial situation fraught with new monetary crises and economic recessions, coupled with the policy of economic restraints, gives reason to expect a decline of growth in the capitalist world economy in 1969. A drop is expected in the United States, Britain, Canada, Sweden, the FRG and Japan, and concern exists over the monetary situation and the prospects of adjusting the finances of the capitalist world. The barometer shows overcast.

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 Praktoron,
Tricoupi Street, 53 T. Nicosia

CZECH EDITION
Artia, Praha 2,
Nove Mesto, Ve smekach 30

DUTCH EDITION:
Progressief Algemeen Vertaalbureau,
Chr. Snouck Hurgronjehof 22",
Amsterdam W

GERMAN EDITIONS
Deutscher Buch-Export und Import
GmbH,
Leipzig C I, Leninstrasse 16

"Globus" Vertrieb ausländischer
Zeitschriften, Wien XX,
Höchstädtplatz 3,
Austria

Genossenschaft Literaturvertrieb
Zürich, Zürich 4, Feldstrasse 46,
Switzerland

HUNGARIAN EDITION
Kossuth Kiado, Budapest, V,
Arpad-U6

ITALIAN EDITION
Libreria Rinascita, Via delle Botteghe
Oscure 2, Roma

JAPANESE EDITION
Nauka Ltd.,
2, Kanda-Zinbocho
2-chome, Chiyoda-Ku, Tokyo

MONGOLIAN EDITION
Mongolgosknigotorg,
ul. Lenina 41, Ulan-Bator

POLISH EDITION:
P. K. W. Z. "RUCH", Warszawa,
Wilcza 46

RUMANIAN EDITION
Directia Difuzarii Presei,
Palatul administrativ C.F.R.,
Bd. Dinicu Golescu, Intrarea G.
Bucuresti

EDITIONS IN SPANISH
Agencia de Distribucion de Prensa
Praha 6, Thakurova 3

Ediciones Paz y Socialismo,
Apt. Nacional 1253,
Bogota, Colombia

Ediciones Pueblos Unidos,
Casilla Correo 589, Montevideo,
Uruguay

Fondo de Cultura Popular
Apdo. postal 2352
Mexico I, D.F.

Empresa Editora Austral
San Francisco 36,
Casilla 13201
Santiago, Chile

Editorial "Anteo,"
Entre Rios 1033,
Buenos Aires,
Argentina

SWEDISH EDITION
Arbetarkultur, Kungsgt 84,
Stockholm K, Sweden

VIETNAMESE EDITION
So'o xuất nhập khẩu sách báo 32,
Hai Ba trung, Hà-noi

