

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW

**LENINISM
AND OUR TIME**
(CONTINUED)—PAGE 3



IMPERIALISM

and MONOPOLY

J. Geller
Page 71

ON THE ROADWAY

to SOCIALISM

Continued
Page 85

**PEASANTS AND
PROLETARIANS,**

and THE WORKING CLASS

Continued
Page 91

PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM

MARCH 1970

VOLUME 10 / NO. 3 / 35 CENTS

WORKERS OF ALL
COUNTRIES, UNITE!

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

Theoretical and
Information Journal
of Communist and
Workers' Parties

MARCH, 1970
VOLUME 13
NUMBER 2

Second class mail
registration number 2352.
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

3 Centenary of birth of V. I. Lenin

LENINISM AND OUR TIME (international
theoretical conference)
LENINISM AND QUESTION OF PARLIAMENT
IN MODERN REVOLUTION—H. Numata
LENIN'S IDEAS HELP WORKING CLASS AND
PEOPLE OF CHILE—J. Dickman
SOME RESULTS OF LENINIST POLICY
IN HUNGARY—D. Nemes
LENINISM AND EXPERIENCE OF BUILDING
SOCIALIST SOCIETY IN RUMANIA—I. Radulescu
LENINISM AND NATIONAL QUESTION—G. Batal
NON-CAPITALIST DEVELOPMENT OF BACKWARD
COUNTRIES TOWARDS SOCIALISM—T. Namsarai
LENINISM AND SOME ASPECTS OF THE
IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE—J. Diz
IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE FOR THE YOUTH—D. Ahrens
LENIN'S IMMORTAL IDEAS ARE OUR
GUIDING STAR—G. Colman
LENIN AND PROBLEMS OF SOCIAL REVOLUTION
IN IRAN—E. Tabari
INTERCONNECTION OF STRUGGLE FOR DEMOCRACY
AND STRUGGLE FOR SOCIALISM—E. Rautee
LENIN ON FIGHT FOR DEMOCRACY IN CAPITALIST
COUNTRIES (with particular reference to
Britain)—B. Matthews
LENIN'S COOPERATIVE PLAN IN BULGARIA—I. Prymov
LENINISM AND TOPICAL PROBLEMS OF REVOLUTION-
ARY STRUGGLE IN LATIN AMERICA—L. Becerra
TO FIGHT OPPORTUNISM—LENIN'S BEHEST—J. Foitik
LENIN'S THEORY OF REVOLUTION—M. Borques
LENIN AND LABOR MOVEMENT IN
SWEDEN—K. Beckstrom
LENINISM AND STRUGGLE AGAINST
CHAUVINISM AND FOR PROLETARIAN
INTERNATIONALISM—W. Ehrlich
LENIN'S TEACHING ON IMPERIALISM
AND OUR TIME—M. Jijon
LENINISM AND SOME PROBLEMS OF NATIONAL
LIBERATION MOVEMENT—A. Karim
SOURCES OF OPPORTUNISM TODAY—W. Garns
LENINISM—BANNER OF OUR MOVEMENT—K. Zarodov

J. GOLLAN **71 Lenin's analysis of imperialism and
some developments of monopoly**

**78 Meeting of European Communist
and Workers' Parties**

**79 Leninism and fight against
anti-communism**

83 In the communist and workers' parties

A. CUNHAL
J. METZGER
A YEAR OF HEADWAY
ENGINEERS AND TECHNICIANS, AND
THE WORKING CLASS
IN BRIEF

**99 25th anniversary of victory over
fascist Germany**

T. YEROFYEV
A. KISELYOV
O. RZHESHEVSKY
COLLAPSE OF IMPERIALISM'S STRIKE FORCE

105 Books and journals
GDR SCIENTISTS ON ECONOMIC LAWS OF SOCIALISM

107 Our mailbag

**Materials of the International Theoretical Conference
"Leninism and Our Time" (Conclusion)**

CONTRIBUTIONS BY:

HIDESATO NUMATA	Member Central Auditing Commission, Communist Party of Japan
JOSE DICKMAN	Communist Party of Chile
DEZSO NEMES	Member Political Bureau, Central Committee, Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party; Rector of the Higher Political School, CC HSWP
ILIE RADULESCU	Member Central Committee, Rumanian Communist Party
GEORGES BATAL	Member Central Committee, Lebanese Communist Party
TSOGTYN NAMSARAI	Alternate member Central Committee Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party; Editor-in-Chief, Namyn amdral
JUAN DIZ	Member Executive Committee, Communist Party of Spain
DIETMAR AHRENS	Member Secretariat, Socialist Unity Party of West Berlin
GUSTAVO COLMAN	Member Central Committee, Paraguayan Communist Party
EHSAN TABARI	Member Executive Bureau, Central Committee, People's Party of Iran
ERKKI RAUTEE	Vice-Rector Sirola School of Social Sciences (Finland)
BETTY MATTHEWS	Head Education Department, Central Committee, Communist Party of Great Britain
IVAN PRYMOV	Secretary Central Committee, Bulgarian Communist Party
LONGINO BECERRA	Communist Party of Honduras
JAN FOITIK	Secretary Central Committee, Communist Party of Czechoslovakia
MARTA BORQUES	Member Presidium, Central Committee, Mexican Communist Party
KNUT BECKSTROM	Labor historian, Sweden
WOLFF EHRLICH	Member Political Bureau, Central Committee, Communist Party of Israel
MILTON JIJON	Member Executive Committee, Central Committee, Communist Party of Ecuador; editor, El Pueblo
AHMED KARIM	Socialist Vanguard Party of Algeria
WILLI GARNES	Member Presidium, German Communist Party
KONSTANTIN ZARODOV	Alternate member Central Committee, Communist Party of the Soviet Union; Editor-in-Chief of Problems of Peace and Socialism

OTHER AUTHORS

JOHN GOLLAN	General Secretary, Communist Party of Great Britain
ALVARO CUNHAL	General Secretary, Portuguese Communist Party
JOE METZGER	Director of French journal ITC-Actualités
TROFIM YEROFYEV,	Soviet military historians
ANATOLY KISELYOV,	
OLEG RZHESHEVSKY	
JAN KNOP,	Czech economists
VLADIMIR WACKER	

Leninism and our time

This issue contains the second, and last, installment of contributions to the theoretical discussion "Leninism and Our Time" held in Prague on November 19-21, 1969 under the auspices of **Problems of Peace and Socialism**.

The discussion of speeches of representatives of fraternal parties are given in abridged form and in the order they were delivered. Full texts will soon be available, in book form, in Russian, German, Spanish, French and English.

Contributions by representatives of the following 33 Communist and Workers' Parties appear in this and the previous issue of the journal: Socialist Vanguard of Algeria, Communist Party of Argentina, Socialist Unity Party of West Berlin, Bulgarian Communist Party, Communist Party of Canada, Communist Party of Chile, Communist Party of Colombia, Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, Communist Party of Denmark, Communist Party of Ecuador, Communist Party of Finland, French Communist Party, Communist Party of Germany, German Communist Party, Socialist Unity Party of Germany, Communist Party of Great Britain, Communist Party of Honduras, Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, Communist Party of India, People's Party of Iran, Communist Party of Israel, Italian Communist Party, Communist Party of Japan, Lebanese Communist Party, Mexican Communist Party, Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, Paraguayan Communist Party, Polish United Workers' Party, Rumanian Communist Party, Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Communist Party of Spain, Left Party—Communists of Sweden, Communist Party of the USA.

Participants said they were looking forward to similar international theoretical conferences in the near future. One such conference will mark the 150th anniversary of the birth of Frederick Engels.

Leninism and question of parliament in modern revolution

HIDESATO NUMATA

MARXIST-LENINIST THEORY ON REVOLUTION AND THE QUESTION OF PARLIAMENT

In his eventful revolutionary struggle extended over a long period, V. I. Lenin constantly gave heed to "the search after forms of the *transition* or the *approach* to the proletarian revolution" (Vol. 31, p. 92) and actually resolve it. One of the tasks of Communists in the highly developed

capitalist countries, basing themselves on the revolutionary and creative spirit of Lenin, is that of utilizing parliament in a revolution, and the question of peaceful or non-peaceful transition of revolution.

As is well known, while pointing out in their analysis of the situation in Europe in the latter half of the 19th century that a violent revolution was inevitable in "most countries on the Continent," Marx

and Engels considered that there was the possibility for the working class in Britain, in the USA and in some other countries to come to power through universal suffrage and by legal means.

Developing this thesis, Marx and Engels in a number of articles pointed out that in Britain the proletariat constituted the bulk of the population, that class differentiation in the rural districts was under way, and that hence there was a political and social basis which could enable the working class to gain a parliamentary majority through universal suffrage.

The second point was that there was a political system of bourgeois democracy in which Parliament had considerable legal powers and that the majority party in the parliament could form the government.

Thirdly, in Britain at that time compulsory military service was unknown, and the military and bureaucratic apparatus which was to become the major element of the reactionary forces for violent resistance to the will of the people's majority was not so advanced as in Germany, France and other countries on the Continent.

But it should be noted that Marx and Engels did not identify the question of whether or not the working class can assume political power by legal means with the question of whether the revolution will take a peaceful form or non-peaceful form.

"In fact, only so far as those who hold the power in their hands in the society do not place violent obstacles on the way, historical development can be 'peaceful'. . . The 'peaceful' way could, however, change into violence arising from a *rebellion* of those who benefit from the old system. If they are crushed by violence (as in the case of the Civil War in the United States or the French Revolution), they are done so as rebels against the 'legal' power" (K. Marx, "Outline of the Discussion on the 'Socialist Control Law'." Handwritten Manuscript 1878.)

The question of the democratic forces headed by the working class winning a majority in Parliament and that of the transitional form of the revolution—peaceful or non-peaceful—should be theoretically and politically distinguished from each other notwithstanding their deep interconnection. In the final analysis it is "the attitude of the enemy" that determines whether the transitional form of the revolution will be peaceful or non-peaceful.

Yet, according to Marx, given the pos-

sibility of the working class gaining political power by legal means, it would be a "foolish action" if it were to proceed towards the destruction of parliamentarism and armed struggle since there is always the possibility of the reactionary forces checking this by offering violent resistance. In this case, Engels makes the profound suggestion as to the attitude to be taken by the working class.

Is it not the bourgeois government that violates laws and regulations to crush us by violence? We will wait and see it. 'Please, pull the trigger first, Gentlemen Bourgeois'." (F. Engels, "Socialism in Germany," *Neue Zeit*, 1891, Vol. 10, No. 1, *Coll. Works*, Vol. 17).

As is well known, however, when capitalism entered the imperialist stage and plunged the peoples into the first imperialist world war, Lenin regarded the reservation made by Marx concerning Britain and the USA as having lost validity. It had become extremely difficult, he said, for the working class to win power by legal means and the establishment of the workers' state could be achieved, "as a general rule, only through a violent revolution" (Vol. 25, p. 400), Lenin stressed that together with "an unprecedented growth in its bureaucratic and military apparatus" (Vol. 25, p. 410) in monopoly capitalist countries, including Britain and the USA, it was difficult for the working class to win a majority of the unconscious non-proletarian working masses to its side before the assumption of power by the working class. In this context, while recognizing the revolutionary crisis in Europe at that time Lenin took into consideration the betrayal by the Second International which had influence among the petty bourgeoisie, and the smaller weight of the working class in the European and other continents.

At the same time, it is important that even in such a historical situation Lenin recognized that a case in which the "working class," after winning the "support of the majority of the population," proceeds to the conquest of power was possible was a "rare exception in history" (Vol. 30, p. 273). According to Lenin, whether to take the position of revolutionary utilization of Parliament or to deny it in principle was one of the important demarcation points which distinguish the revolutionary Marxist view from the anarchist view.

The tactic of revolutionary parliamentarism, further developed by Lenin in the subsequent changes in the situation, and

by the prospect of establishing a government of the working class based on Parliament derived from Lenin's own program. At the Fourth Congress of the Communist International (1922), the last one led by Lenin, the program of the workers' government was taken up together with the proposal of the united front tactic and this tactic was further elaborated at the Seventh Congress of the Communist International in 1935 as the tactic of the united front government based on the anti-fascist popular front.

In 1936, a year after the Congress the Popular Front in France and Spain won a majority in elections and succeeded in forming united front governments. This electoral victory in Spain developed into a civil war due to the rebellion of the reactionary forces. In this struggle the popular front government advanced toward democratic revolutionary power. The historical experience of the international Communist movement teaches us that under certain conditions the struggle for a united front government which utilizes parliament takes the "form of the *transition* or the *approach* to the proletarian revolution," that thereby conditions for the revolution can be made favorable, and that in this case too, whether the entire course of the revolution is peaceful or non-peaceful depends on the "attitude of the enemy."

At present, however, regarding this question there has arisen in the international Communist movement a Right-wing opportunist trend, which sees only the "peaceful revolution," and an ultra-Left opportunist trend which sees only the "violent revolution" and for which a "people's war" is an absolute.

Clearly this deviation of both wings is linked with unilateralization of the question of how to use parliament in our time.

PROSPECT OF REVOLUTION IN JAPAN AND ROLE OF THE DIET

Having learned from Marx, Engels and Lenin and from the historical experience of the international Communist movement, our Party attaches importance to the role of the Diet in the course of the revolution in Japan and, simultaneously, takes the position of clarifying the connection and distinction between winning a majority in Parliament and the transitional form.

Based on a detailed analysis of the present situation in Japan, our Party Program clarifies the prospect of the coming revolu-

tion continuously developing from an anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly democratic revolution of the people to the socialist revolution. It states that in the course of this revolution, should the national democratic united front forces "succeed in obtaining a stable majority in the Diet, then they would be able to convert the Diet from an instrument for reactionary rule into an instrument serving the people and thus make the conditions for the revolution still more favorable." Our Party's view on the important role of the Diet is based on the result of a profound analysis of the overall political and economic conditions in our country, and guided by the above-mentioned view of Marxism-Leninism.

Firstly, there is a possibility in our country of rallying the great majority of the people to the united front headed by the working class even before coming to power. In our country the proportion of the working class in the population is steadily increasing. (According to the 1967 census the percentage of the employees in the working population exceeds 60 per cent—data published by the Statistics Bureau of the Prime Minister's Office).

Secondly, as for the status and power of the Diet in Japan's machinery of state, the Constitution specifies that the Diet is the "sole legislature in Japan." There is, therefore, the possibility for the National Democratic United Front legally to form a government through elections and with the development of the mass struggle outside the Diet and further to advance this government to revolutionary power.

Yet, notwithstanding the above-mentioned conditions and possibilities, our Party does not assume the attitude of tying its hands by seeing the realization of the revolution by peaceful means as the sole way. The winning of a majority in the Diet and the formation of a united front government are but a "course towards power," they do not signify that revolutionary power has been finally set up. The correct attitude for a revolutionary party is to emphasize the effort to expand the possibility of this peaceful transition by the strength of unity and struggle and at the same time to be alert so as to be able to cope with the "attitude of the enemy."

Moreover, even the very premise of the legal establishment of a united front government is in itself not seen as absolute. It can be anticipated that faced with their own political crisis the reactionary forces will essay to prevent the establishment of

a united front government by such unlawful means as revision of the electoral laws, destruction of the electoral system, Right-wing terror, armed uprisings, etc. And the possibility of intervention by U.S. armed forces in Japan on the pretext of the Security Treaty should not be overlooked.

Our Party Program firstly takes into consideration the possibility that the way to the peaceful development of the revolution may be blocked, thus making another way necessary. Secondly, it defines what is meant by "converting the Diet from an instrument of reactionary rule into an instrument serving the people," "to make the conditions for the revolution more favorable," thus making it clear that it does not mean seizure of power by the people. Thirdly, it clearly indicates that in order to establish people's power it should dismantle the old machinery of state, the military-bureaucratic apparatus and transform these into a new democratic state apparatus.

At present, from the standpoint of the "theory of inevitability of violent revolution," the international ultra-Left trend and those who follow it blindly deny Parliament, electoral struggle and parliamentary activity in principle, ridicule the entire electoral fight, in which tens of millions of people in our country and other capitalist countries take part, as a "farce" and pour out slander and abuse. This is the "anti-parliamentarism" which Lenin in his time criticized. Actually this is in line with the political ambitions of the reactionary forces. The "anti-parliamentarism" pursued by this ultra-Left opportunist trend is akin to the ultra-Left, adventurist line of the Trotskyites and anarchists who aim at destroying the Communist movement on

the pretext of "anti-imperialism," and "anti-Stalinism."

Although they have not as yet gained a nationwide character in our country, the democratic forces have already won the Governorship and Chief Executive through election struggles in metropolitan Tokyo, a city with the world's largest population (ten million), in the Kyoto Prefecture, former capital before the Meiji Restoration, and in the Okinawa Prefecture presently under the direct rule of U.S. imperialism. These gains derive from the joint struggle of the united front in accordance with a definite policy agreement. Besides, in a considerable number of cities, towns and villages democratic heads have been returned through joint struggles by the democratic forces.

Our Party attaches importance to the question of establishing a united front government in the direction of defeating the rule of U.S. imperialism and Japanese monopoly capital and within a framework in which the democratic forces can for the present agree. Our Party and the advanced democratic forces are at present striving for the establishment of a democratic coalition government based on the united front which agrees on tasks against the Security Treaty, for the return of Okinawa, and other immediate tasks. In the event of such a government being established, then when the term of the U.S.-Japan Security Treaty expires on June 22, 1970 this government would give its "notice to quit" to the U.S. government in accordance with Article 10 of the Treaty and put an end to the U.S.-Japan military alliance. This, undoubtedly, would be a milestone for the Japanese people's advance toward an anti-imperialist, anti-monopoly democratic revolution of the people.

Lenin's ideas help working class and people of Chile

JOSE DICKMAN

For the revolutionary working-class movement of our country Lenin's ideas and the Great October Socialist Revolution opened up new horizons, because they were, and are, of a profoundly international proletarian character. Lenin was the leader of the international revolutionary movement of the working class. He fought for international peace, for the liberation of oppressed and dependent peoples, for imperialism's defeat on a world scale, for the worldwide victory of socialism and communism.

Our Party came into being as a consequence of the influence of the October Revolution and Lenin's ideas. Lenin wrote: "Repudiation of the Party principle and of Party discipline . . . is tantamount to completely disarming the proletariat in the interests of the bourgeoisie. It all adds up to that petty-bourgeois diffuseness and instability, that incapacity for sustained effort, unity and organized action, which, if encouraged, must inevitably destroy any proletarian revolutionary movement" (Vol. 31, pp. 43-44).

Our Party came out of a working-class environment and its first organizations were formed in the main proletarian centers of Chile. It developed in uncompromising struggle against bourgeois reformist and extremist ideology. And in this struggle, Lenin's ideology was for us the guiding star. Recabarren, the founder of our Party, was always guided by proletarian internationalism. Together with Comrades Codovilla and Rodolfo Ghioldi, he founded the International Socialist Party of Argentina, the first general secretary of which he became. Subsequently, that party was reor-

ganized as the Communist Party of Argentina. Recabarren was a close friend, too, of Francisco R. Pintos, the founder of the Communist Party of Uruguay. They took part in the work of the Communist International, where they became acquainted with Lenin.

It was by no means simple and easy to form a party in our country on the basis of the Leninist principles of the party of the new type. Along our arduous path we committed mistakes, many of which were overcome thanks to acquired experience. But much effort is still needed to justify in full the name of a Marxist-Leninist party that organizationally and in revolutionary activity relies on a genuinely scientific, creative method and Lenin's ideas. The Communist Party of Chile has close links with the masses. Living up to the Leninist policy of unity, carrying it forward firmly and consistently, we have been able to organize the working class into a powerful united trade union center and to establish an action alliance with the Socialist Party, persevering in the work of uniting all anti-imperialist forces on the basis of a common program. That program outlines the ways of taking over power and forming a people's democratic anti-imperialist government, a government paving the way to socialism. This policy has helped us in extending our influence among the peasant masses and in wresting them away from the influence of the Christian Democrats. The Communist Party is the leading force among the workers and the student youth. In other words, our Party controls the majority among the Left forces. I have

enumerated these facts to stress again that we owe our successes to Marxism-Leninism. We have endeavored, to the extent of our ability, to master the valuable Marxist-Leninist ideas and to translate them into practice.

In the thirties, we expended considerable efforts in changing the organizational structure of the Party to conform with Leninist principles. But a fairly long time passed before we understood that the idea of democratic centralism is one of the basic principles of Lenin's theory of the party. Democracy and centralism have made our Party the most dramatic and, at the same time, the best organized party in Chile, acting on a single program, with firm discipline. It has passed all trials heaped on it by the bourgeoisie, from brutal repression to political flirtations. None of our leaders are irreplaceable. We have rooted out the cult of the individual once and for all. For years, for example, the general secretary has been elected not by the Party congress, but by the Central Committee. This rules out a situation in which any one, apart from the Party Congress, could supersede the Central Committee, the supreme authority between congresses. The collective spirit, criticism and self-criticism, respect for the opinion of all Party members and outspoken discussion, coupled with obligatory fulfilment of adopted decisions—all those are Lenin's principles which we have accepted and which we apply in our practice.

Many bourgeois theories rejected as much as half a century ago, have been revamped and put back into circulation in order to lead the masses astray and to split the anti-imperialist movement. They are aimed against the existence and development of the Communist parties, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. The present, however, is highlighted by the spread of Marxist-Leninist science. With the direct attacks of our enemies missing their mark, they now assault Marxism-Leninism from quasi-Left positions under the signboard of "genuine" Marxism-Leninism. Shop-worn methods of struggle are renewed to attract the youth to their side. Again, individual and group terror are being employed and banks are robbed under the slogan of "expropriating the expropriators." The Communist parties are violently attacked and Communists are called conservatives. New idols, worshipped as in primordial times, sling mud at the working class, which they allege to have ceased being revolutionary.

And it is no accident that modern mass information media controlled by reaction are made available to these groups to spread their propaganda in order to split and destroy the Communist parties. They say that class struggle has given way to the struggle of the generations, in which the son represents the revolution and the father the bourgeois order, that revolution must be carried out at once, without delay, by genuine revolutionaries. Alliance and unity with other anti-imperialist forces is ruled out. Breadth, they maintain, reduces the depth of the revolutionary movement; hence, revolutionary parties must not be mass parties and should consist only of professional revolutionaries.

But these unrealistic schemes collapsed when tested in practice. Objectively, the activity of these groups is anti-Communist and they merge in essence with the ultra-Right forces. Naturally, with the tide of revolution running low, there are many disappointed people who could be won over by persuasion to the side of the revolutionary working-class movement. There have been, and still are, considerable difficulties in our relations with the allies. Difficulties of this kind were once referred to with amazing foresight by Lenin: "Revolutionary phrase-making, more often than not, is 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 zigzags. By revolutionary phrase-making we mean the repetition of revolutionary slogans irrespective of objective circumstances at a given turn in events, in the given state of affairs obtaining at the time. The slogans are superb, alluring, intoxicating, but there are no grounds for them; such is the nature of the revolutionary phrase" (Vol. 27, p. 19).

Our Party considers itself a member of the fraternal family of Communist parties. As we see it, we must display mutual respect and help each other. In that sense, we are in accord with the idea that Communist parties must be equal and that no Party must interfere in the affairs of another Party. But if we treat equality as a general concept, a concept divorced from reality, we may depart from reality and end up in the bog of subjectivist, anarchist, bourgeois egalitarianism. We hold that the Marxist-Leninist interpretation of the concept of equality is based on revolutionary duty and

responsibility borne by each Party in the specific conditions of its country, and that equality is not to be separated from proletarian internationalism. There is one revolution—the Great October Socialist Revolution; one country—the Soviet Union, and one Party—the Party founded by Lenin, the CPSU, which stand out among all the others. The responsibility borne by them is immense. When we say that the Soviet Union is the beacon illuminating the way for mankind, it is not a simple apologetic phrase, but a recognition of the fact that the historical center of gravity of the international revolutionary movement lies in the Soviet Union.

As we see it, all attempts at interference by one Party in the affairs of another, aimed at splitting and changing the class character of the Party, must be rejected. That is the context in which we may view the activity of the leaders of the Communist Party of China and their followers in respect to ours and many other parties. At the same time, it should be stressed that the Communist parties and the socialist states cannot be indifferent to the consequences of a political and ideological course pursued by the leadership of a Party or country, if these consequences may jeopardize the socialist camp and the existence of other Communist parties. The facts behind the recent Czechoslovak events confirm the need for the action taken by the socialist countries to safeguard socialism in Czechoslovakia, to secure her independence and progress, and to preserve European and world peace.

The policy of a Party must not be treated as an absolute to a point where no one, after analyzing it, may express his opinion. On the contrary, the interests of Marxist-Leninist science and the international working class oblige us to show an interest in the facts, in the activities, the experience and orientation of the fraternal Communist parties. The unity of the world Communist

movement may be cemented through bilateral and multilateral negotiations, through international meetings such as took place in Moscow in June 1969. The Meeting adopted important decisions, designed to cement the unity and step up the struggle against imperialism, for peace, for greater solidarity with the struggle of the peoples and the working class for liberation. Such meetings should be used for reaching agreement through comparing political and ideological positions with the objective reality. Then the concept of non-interference will not imply that a Party cannot express its opinion to another party, the orientation of which is in need of correctives. Though favorable conditions for that sort of exchange have not yet appeared in some Communist parties, we assume all the same that strengthening the fraternal ties and achieving closer friendship and contacts among Communist parties would greatly promote mutual understanding, produce truly comradely relationships based on Marxist-Leninist principles and proletarian internationalism. And all the Marxist-Leninist Communist and Workers' parties will follow this way, because it is predicated by the course of historical development.

As we see it, the need to act in unity in order to withstand and smash imperialism is one of the most important of Lenin's behests, those of one of the greatest geniuses in the history of mankind, a man who led his people to victory in the fight against capitalism and to a new socialist and communist society, opening thereby the way for mankind towards a society without exploiters and exploited. It may be said that the most distinctive feature of all of Lenin's activity was his loyalty to the ideas of proletarian internationalism. Giving all his knowledge and energy to the cause of the working class and the peoples now comprising the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, he also worked tirelessly for the international working class, for all mankind.

Some results of Leninist policy in Hungary

DESZO NEMES

Consolidating people's rule, the dictatorship of the proletariat, and carrying forward the building of socialism after the defeat of the counter-revolution in 1956 proceeded in an atmosphere of sharp ideological and political struggles. It was a battle for Leninism which we had to carry on in Hungarian conditions on two fronts. We had to fight with determination against Rakosist dogmatism, which had deformed and denigrated communist ideas, against the revisionism of Imre Nagy, who had betrayed working-class power and paved the way for the counter-revolution, and against other counter-revolutionary trends.

During that struggle our Party reorganized and its new Central Committee under Comrade Janos Kadar developed a new policy and political tactics in keeping with the situation, having deeply analyzed previous experience, rectified errors and made up as much as possible for the damage caused. The results were better than we had expected. They revealed the validity of Leninist ideas once again and showed *what these ideas can achieve if combined with a Leninist policy, if Leninist theory is combined with Leninist policy.*

The Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party did not renounce the positive legacy of the previous period and was careful to preserve and carry forward all the positive results achieved in building socialism prior to 1956. But it dissociated itself from the dogmatic views which had gained ascendancy in the previous leadership and from bad sectarian mistakes.

One of the more important tasks in consolidating the workers' state was to set those misled by revisionists and national-

ists apart from deliberate counter-revolutionaries. It was a *general* task but one closely linked with the task of *reorganizing the Party*. Indeed, even those of the 900,000 former Party members who were more mature ideologically were stunned by what had happened and found themselves in a state of ideological confusion. The reassuring effect of the defeat of the counter-revolutionary revolt was accompanied by the fear that Rakosist policies might be resumed and that imperialist propaganda might prove correct.

It was necessary to explain to everyone that the suspension of the counter-revolution would not mean falling back on the policies of Rakosi. However, this could not be brought about through agitation alone and it was only the practical experience of the Party's new policy that could fully eliminate these apprehensions. The HWSP leadership took this into account and combined its resolve with due patience.

It was necessary to draw from the events yet another conclusion, namely, that we must not admit into the reorganized Party people who did not meet the demands put to members of the Communist Party and that, on the other hand, we must restore and foster also *their* confidence in the Party. It was necessary to distinguish between conscious traitors to Leninism and workers' power and well-intentioned people who had, however, got themselves into a tangle. We had to ensure that the majority of those of them who before 1956 had been Party members made up or would make up that *non-Party group closest to the Party.*

By May 1, 1957, as many as 283,000 former members of the Party had been re-

registered as members of the HSWP at their own request. After that ex-members could only join the Party as new applicants, their former membership being discounted. More and more people were applying for admission as new members and most applications were granted.

By the end of 1959 the Party was not even half as strong *numerically* as prior to 1956, but then it was stronger by far with regard to its *general ideological level*. The unity, cohesion and efficiency of the Party were also increasing due to confidence in the Party's policies, the consolidation of workers' power, deep satisfaction at the successful continuation of socialist development, a better knowledge of Lenin's teaching and better theoretical and political training.

The evolution of the *agrarian policy* of the HSWP is most instructive. First of all we had to regain the peasants' shaken confidence and revive their interest in production, which had been considerably discouraged by the former system of compulsory deliveries and by excessive taxation of the individual peasants, who at the time were in a majority. It is appropriate to recall at this point what Lenin said in the spring of 1921, speaking of the introduction of the tax in kind. He asked what was "the principal economic determinant" of the new policy under which "we must not base our relations with the peasants on surplus-grain appropriation but on a tax." And he answered: "It is that under the surplus-grain appropriation system the small peasant farms have no proper economic basis and are doomed to remain dead for many years" (Vol. 32, pp. 410-11). They could not develop because the small peasant had no incentive to increase output, a development whose harmful effects Lenin stressed.

The agrarian policy based on compulsory deliveries had strongly discouraged the peasants from increasing production and brought our agriculture to a standstill. Continuing it was out of the question, and relations with the peasants had to be built on a different basis stimulating greater output. The Hungarian Communists tackled this task and accomplished it *on a new basis, by organizing the purchase of farm produce*. A contract system was introduced under which produce was purchased at economically based prices. This system, the crop yields of the state farms, a moderate grain tax and grinding fee enabled the Party and the government to adopt a

more effective purchase system than the former which had been attended by great difficulties and troubles. The peasants became more confident of the HSWP and the government. They were grateful because, with the counter-revolution put down, they had been delivered from the danger of the landowners coming back and because the purchase system met their interests. The new system was an important political and economic success of the Party's agrarian policy.

The *development of the production co-operatives* was one of the principal problems of the agrarian policy at the time. The former leadership had tried through economic and administrative pressure to bring the peasants into the cooperatives. Yet the peasants did not see the advantages of cooperation. They were still too strongly attached to individual farming. We remember that during the counter-revolution even cooperatives set up in that way did not disintegrate because they guaranteed organized defense against the former landowners and various elements serving them. The cooperatives also guaranteed organized defense against action by the kulaks. But when the peasants saw that the defense of people's power was guaranteed, the cooperatives, which had been set up forcibly, began to fall apart. The HSWP enabled the members of cooperatives to revert unhampered to individual farming and to take back the land they had contributed to the cooperatives. The issue of organizing agriculture along socialist lines was shelved. This was also one of the prerequisites of the disrupted worker-peasant alliance regaining strength and of *creating the necessary political climate* in which the countryside could be switched to co-operative farming. It was a Leninist policy due to which the political conditions for socialist reorganization matured at a fast rate.

Prior to the counter-revolution the co-operative sector owned about 22 per cent of the country's arable area. By the spring of 1957 this area had shrunk to nine per cent. The HSWP, which encouraged the production activity of the individual peasants while curbing profiteering, did much to consolidate the surviving cooperatives. A very instructive competition began between the cooperatives and the individual peasants in 1957 and 1958. In plant cultivation, the cooperatives had already proved their superiority. Some of the peasants who had withdrawn from the co-

operatives rejoined them and by the end of 1958 the cooperatives accounted for 14 per cent of the country's arable. In December 1958, the Central Committee stated that the situation was ripe for reorganizing the countryside along cooperatives lines. It decided to carry out this reorganization in such a way as to ensure that agricultural production did not decrease but increased, if only to a small degree. This was necessary from the standpoint of both the overall interests of the country and the political success of the reorganization. The *socialist reorganization of Hungarian agriculture was accomplished* between early 1959 and early 1962 by carefully planned stages, the process being slowed down rather than rushed in some regions. In the reorganization period — 1959-1962 — average gross output in agriculture per year was eight to 10 per cent higher than the average in the previous three years. This, of course, necessitated state assistance, especially investment, on a considerable scale.

This success of the socialist reorganization of agriculture, which exceeded the most optimistic expectations, was a big gain of the Party's Leninist policy. Leninism won another victory over revisionism. This victory was a new source of strength for socialist Hungary and for Leninism. *Laying the foundations of socialism was completed and a higher stage of socialist development set in.*

Improving the *management system* has become the most important problem of our entire economic development. Under the former system of management the country made considerable headway but subsequent progress called for change. Numerous economists and managers — both Communists and non-Communists — took part in the preparation of the reform. The reform is designed to *promote socialist planned economy*, to bring out and use economic resources more fully and to raise the efficiency of production and trade.

Improving economic management is a very important problem facing Marxist economic policy. It is not only an economic and administrative problem but a very important political problem of principle that will have its effect on the subsequent progress of society as a whole. The necessity for change is due to great economic achievements in the socialist countries, including the tremendous expansion of the socialist world market, and to

the scientific and technological revolution now going on.

I wish to mention some aspects of the changes introduced into our system of economic management. In terms of both principle and practice, it is an important aspect of these changes that the *interplay of plan and market* is being made *more effective*. This is a general task whose importance to Hungary is growing also because one-quarter of the social product is exported and this proportion will probably tend to grow. As the reform is being implemented, it is essential to raise the efficiency of central leadership while the managements of industries and enterprises should be entrusted with decision-making on matters on which they can take the right decisions in time and with a full sense of responsibility. The enterprises should draw up their detailed annual plans, taking account of the orders placed with them and the market conditions. Greater financial responsibility should be put on the enterprises as regards the distribution and utilization of government investments. Unprofitable investments (with the exception of those necessitated by special state interests) should be put off and profitable ones allowed greater scope. We should increase the influence of trade agencies on production, primarily on consumer goods production. On the other hand, our reform relaxes trade monopoly, enabling industrial enterprises manufacturing consumer goods to open their own shops and directly to study the demand for new products.

The reform of economic management involves a number of problems into which we cannot go here. Its preparation was a result of research over a long period during which ample account was taken of the plans and experience of fraternal countries and, naturally, of the peculiarities and requirements of the Hungarian economy. January 1968 was the decisive period of introducing the reform. Its drafting and introduction are an important achievement of the Party and the government.

Throughout the 50 years of its struggle our Party has drawn on the revolutionary experience and the rich treasury of 70 years' activity by the CPSU, on its lessons in terms of principle and practice. One of the main sources of strength for the revolutionary Party of the Hungarian working class throughout the five decades of its struggle has been its confidence in Lenin's Party, a confidence which now is stronger than ever.

The struggle to carry forward the socialist world system and to destroy imperialism, and every victory of our peoples are inseparable from Lenin's name. So is the struggle going on in Hungary for the full

building of socialist society. Lenin's teachings are put into effect in our everyday activity and embodied in every big victory achieved or to be achieved by the Hungarian people in building socialism.

Leninism and experience of building socialist society in Rumania

ILIE RADULESCU

The Rumanian Communist Party, our working class and all our people revere the memory of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, faithful disciple of Marx and Engels and brilliant continuator of their revolutionary theory and practice, staunch fighter for the emancipation of the working people from exploitation and oppression, for social and national freedom, for the triumph of socialism and communism.

Lenin's ideas are embodied in the triumph of socialism in the Soviet Union, in the Soviet people's important achievements in building communism, and in the gains of the socialist countries, the Communist movement and the anti-imperialist forces.

In connection with the Tenth Party Congress and the celebration of the 25th anniversary of the country's liberation, our Party and the whole Rumanian people had an opportunity to make a careful analysis of the progress made in a quarter of a century and to draw appropriate conclusions from the experience gained in carrying out the socialist revolution and in building socialism.

We would like to deal briefly with some aspects of the experience of the Rumanian Communist Party in leading socialist society in accordance with Lenin's theory of building socialism.

The experience of building socialism, like

the world revolutionary process as a whole, bears out again and again Lenin's statement that the strength of the Communist Party and the success of its general line depend in decisive measure on the application of the general laws of the socialist revolution and of building socialism in the specific conditions of the country concerned and the given historical stage. This thesis is of exceptional importance now that the Communist parties have to operate in increasingly diverse conditions due to historical progress and the growth of the revolutionary forces.

Rumania's progress in building the new social system demonstrates through facts the ability of our Party creatively to apply Marxist-Leninist theory according to the situation in our country. In evolving the strategy and tactics required by each stage of the country's progress, the Party studies objective general laws and draws on its own experience and on that of other Communist parties and fraternal socialist countries and works out solutions in keeping with our social conditions.

As we know, intensive development of material production on a modern scientific and technological basis is, according to Lenin's concept, the only solid foundation on which the new society can be built and the standard of living raised. The pivot of

the growth of the productive forces as conceived by our Party is the *policy of industrialization*, which plays a notable part in extending the material and technical basis of socialism, bringing the economic level of the country nearer that of the foremost countries and paving the way for the gradual transition to communism. Maintaining a continued high growth rate of industrial production, along with improving its pattern, increasing the key role of industry in the economy and vigorously developing modern branches closely linked with progress in science and technology, will be the main feature of industrial development in the next decade.

Lenin, it will be recalled, saw the *socialist transformation of the countryside* as one of the most challenging problems of the transition from capitalism to socialism. Our Party has accomplished this revolutionary task. The results of the Party's Leninist agrarian policy are seen in the fact that our agriculture fully meets the consumers' needs and the requirements of the economy.

Rumania's experience in building socialism shows that in our conditions agricultural production cooperatives have been the quickest and surest means of doing away with backwardness in agriculture and with the poverty and insecurity of peasant life. The cooperatives will retain their significance throughout the period of socialist development and the transition to communism.

Economic progress at this stage is characterized by the increasing utilization of *scientific and technological achievements*. We plan to increase the contribution of science to social progress and harmoniously to combine theoretical and applied research, with emphasis on a closer connection between research and economic needs.

Lenin gave much attention, as we know, to the problem of *continuously improving the forms and methods of directing socialist society*. An important aspect of the policy of our Party and state is that we apply the principle of *democratic centralism*, always taking account of changes in the structure of society, the new exigencies of all-round progress and the growth of the productive forces. We consider that in economic management we must achieve a more correct combination of centralized management, which should under no circumstances result in excessive centralism stifling local initiative, with encouragement of the economic initiative of the working people and increas-

ing autonomy of the enterprises, as well as to ensure greater flexibility in decision-making at all levels. While preserving the levers enabling the center to decide on cardinal economic problems, we extend the range of problems on which decisions are made by the production units concerned.

Lenin pointed out that *planned development* is a constant, consciously maintained proportionality. A concentrated expression of Party policy, the plan has been, and is, the principal instrument of specifying our tasks at each stage and of achieving unity of the goals and actions of the whole people. In the twenty-odd years of planned economic management, Rumania has gained ample experience, and shortcomings telling on economic efficiency were removed after the Ninth Party Congress or are being removed at present.

Our socialist system has become stronger in recent years. The working class has grown in numbers and is becoming more and more active as the leading social force. The growing socio-political unity of the working class, the peasants, intellectuals and the working people in general — Rumanians and members of other nationalities — will continue to be a tremendous motive power speeding the progress of our socialist system.

The national question is a key problem in building socialism and Lenin paid special attention to it. Economic, social and cultural progress and the steady promotion of socialist democracy afford all the citizens of our country—Rumanians, Hungarians, Germans, Serbs and others—every opportunity to develop their abilities and prove their worth in any public sphere. The constitution of councils of nationalities living together is evidence of the Party's effort to encourage the working people of different nationalities to participate more and more in all public activities.

It is common knowledge that Lenin devoted unflagging attention to the *problem of the nation*, to the relationship between the national and the international in the socialist revolution and in socialist development.

Historical experience shows that the nation, far from ceasing to perform its function and mission after the proletarian revolution, rises to a qualitatively higher plane during the transition from capitalism to socialism.

Two objective trends condition each other and intertwine as the socialist world system develops: first, the comprehensive

advancement of each socialist country and the flourishing of its national life due to socialist development, and second, growing fraternal friendship among the socialist countries and increasing cooperation and coordination in every social sphere. This makes it particularly important to perfect mutual economic relations, the international socialist division of labor, and specialization and coordination in production, science and technology. It is a question of the policy of every socialist country judiciously combining the requirements of planned growth of the productive forces with the need to use the opportunities provided by cooperation between socialist countries, primarily between members of the CMEA.

The socialist state establishes its foreign relations on the principle of complete equality. Its foreign policy acts are prompted both by the national interest and the common interests of the socialist world system, of peace and international cooperation. It follows that socialist internationalism cannot be opposed to national sovereignty. National sovereignty is an organic, inseparable component and attribute of the state. It is inconceivable that sovereignty can be divided, that the state can exercise only a part of its sovereign rights while the rest is exercised by external, supranational forces.

Our Party does much to foster socialist democracy. A notable aspect of socialist democracy is that the people, having become the force wielding political power and the owner of the means of production, participate directly in the management of social and economic affairs and in the elaboration and implementation of the program of building socialism. Social practice proves that increasing democracy, which is a continuous process, cannot affect the class character of the Party's policies and activities and, far from reducing the leading role of the Party in society, extends it and helps to strengthen the socialist system as a whole.

One of Lenin's most important teachings is his theory of the Communist Party and its role in the revolution and in the building of socialism. The experience of our country and social practice show that with socialist progress the objective basis for the *leading role of the Party* is strengthened and this role becomes even more important.

The Party's leadership of the entire life of society is a universally valid law of building socialism and communism.

A noteworthy aspect of the Party's leading role is to mould and foster the socialist consciousness of the masses. "A state," Lenin wrote, "is strong when the people are politically conscious. It is strong when the people know everything, can form an opinion of everything and do everything consciously" (Vol. 26, p. 256).

There is a dialectical relationship between Party and society. It was aptly described by Comrade Nicolae Ceausescu at the 10th Congress. The Party, he said, "is the central nucleus of the whole of society which radiates energy and light setting the whole mechanism of the socialist system in motion and ensuring its functioning. The Party, in its turn, constantly gains new strength from the energy and light continuously radiated towards it by the mass of our socialist nation."

One of the principles of our Party is to promote internationalist relations and solidarity with other fraternal parties and the anti-imperialist forces. Our Party consistently champions Communist unity on the principles of proletarian internationalism, solidarity, and mutual support, respect for independence and equality, and non-interference in each other's internal affairs, principles recorded in the Document of the 1969 Meeting.

In line with the foreign policy consistently pursued by our Party, the Rumanian people identify themselves with the heroic people of Vietnam fighting against the U.S. aggressors, with all peoples fighting against imperialism, for social and national freedom.

In the present period Marxist-Leninist thought is confronted with new phenomena and problems requiring scientifically valid solutions that are impossible without a thorough study of reality and a creative approach to it. Hence the extraordinary relevance of the example set us by Lenin. His activity was a vivid illustration of the innovating character of the revolutionary theory of the proletariat, a splendid model of critical assimilation of all that was progressive in his day. Our theory is strong because it is not a closed system set once and for all but a dynamic science growing richer as it probes into a continuously changing reality.

The Lenin centenary sees the triumph of the great ideas of Marxism-Leninism. The best tribute to the memory of Lenin is to work in a creative spirit on building the new society in our countries, consolidate the socialist world system and the unity of

the world Communist and working-class movement, of the anti-imperialist front of

struggle for the triumph of socialism and communism throughout the world.

Leninism and the national question

GEORGES BATAL

Works on the national question hold a special place in Lenin's vast ideological legacy. They provide a scientific explanation of the Communist Party's theory and practice on the national question. Their keynote idea is that of the need to distinguish between the nationalism of the oppressing nation and the nationalism of the oppressed nation. The essence of the policy on the national question formulated by Lenin is support for the national liberation movements of all oppressed peoples, uncompromising struggle against imperialism, granting every nation the right to self-determination and national independence, and struggle against every form of national inequality and national oppression. Life has borne out Lenin's theory on the national question and the national liberation movement.

Lenin's role is not restricted to what he wrote on the national question. Credit is also due to him for putting his theoretical principles into practice. As leader of the Russian Bolshevik Party, Lenin directed the Great October Socialist Revolution and led it to victory, to the establishment of a new, socialist social system, which paved the way for the abolition of exploitation and oppression in any form, for the emancipation of nations, for their prosperity and cultural progress.

We can say that the October Revolution had a particularly strong impact on the peoples of the East because the ideas and principles of equal rights for the peoples, the ideas of principles of social progress

proclaimed by it fully met the requirements of the social, political and economic development of that area.

The October Revolution was the first revolution to indict imperialism and colonial rule. It swept the Russian colonial empire out of existence and freed the numerous peoples oppressed by the tsarist regime. Today, when progressive mankind is preparing to celebrate the Lenin centenary and when almost five decades have passed since Lenin wrote on the national question, his teachings on this question are still valid and meet present-day conditions.

Lenin's slogan—"Workers of all countries and oppressed peoples, unite!"—put forward by the Communist International at its inception is still the slogan of the world revolutionary movement. The Document of the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties says: "It is of paramount importance for the prospects of the anti-imperialist struggle to strengthen the alliance between the socialist system, the forces of the working-class movement and national liberation."

From what Lenin wrote on the national question we know that, to develop a principled position on this question, we must make an objective, scientific, Marxist analysis of the given historical situation, proceeding from the interests of the working class, the revolutionary movement and the socialist revolution.

According to the theory of proletarian struggle, national demands must be subordinated to the interests of the class struggle.

gle, a principle in keeping with both scientific practice and the course of development. We Communists operating in an area where the national liberation movement is in progress come up against national problems in all their urgency and complexity, and we find in Lenin's writings advice on the right policy to follow. It is clear to us that in this case the starting point is an internationalist and class approach. Internationalism means unity of the interests of all workers throughout the world in the struggle against the capitalist exploiters. The material basis for internationalism was provided by the development of capitalism and by its growth into a worldwide system.

Marx's and Engels' fighting slogan — "Workers of all countries, unite!" — reflects an objective truth and the basic requirements for overthrowing the exploiting, capitalist system. The concept of internationalism has been extending in step with the transformation of capitalism into imperialist monopoly capitalism, the growth of the revolutionary working-class movement and the beginning and expansion of the national liberation movement in the oppressed countries.

Imperialist oppression and exploitation affected both the proletariat of the developed countries and the peoples of the colonies and dependencies of the East. This is what made it necessary, in our view, to extend the slogan of Marx and Engels and to advance the Lenin slogan "Workers of all countries and oppressed peoples, unite!" Lenin spoke of this slogan at a meeting of the Moscow organization of the Bolshevik Party in December 1920. Answering a question, he said that this slogan was wrong from the point of view of the *Communist Manifesto*, written in an entirely different situation. The new slogan was correct, however, in terms of the present policy. Lenin added that the Bolsheviks regarded themselves as spokesmen of both the proletariat of all countries and the oppressed peoples. This slogan of Lenin's was, and still is, a slogan of an alliance of the two contingents of the world revolutionary movement — the international working-class movement and the national liberation movement.

However, the working class of each country and the oppressed peoples, who are linked by common interests in their fight against the exploiters, operate within national bounds. Hence there is a dialectical connection between the general inter-

national interests of the oppressed and their particular interests within specific national bounds, that is, a connection between the general and the particular. In other words, the struggle of the working class and the masses within specific national bounds is part of the general revolutionary movement, which is international. This struggle is relatively independent for various historical reasons or due to particular conditions or to the position it holds in the anti-imperialist front. As for the criterion, which today is proletarian in content, each national problem should be examined in concrete and not abstract terms, from the standpoint of the interests of the working class and the socialist revolution. It should be considered, however, whether the problem furthers or hampers the advance to socialism on a regional and international scale. In other words, a national program should not, according to Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, be seen as something absolute that we must support or reject in any circumstances. Analysis of the historical and political conditions in which a national problem presents itself, and the interests of the socialist revolution are the criteria for determining one's position in each particular case.

Speaking of Marx's negative attitude to the right of the Czech people to self-determination in 1848, Lenin in his work "The Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination" wrote that "in 1848 there were historical and political grounds for drawing a distinction between 'reactionary' and revolutionary-democratic nations. Marx was right to condemn the former and defend the latter. The right to self-determination is one of the demands of democracy which must naturally be subordinated to its general interests" (Vol. 22, p. 150).

Nationalism as a social phenomenon did not develop overnight but was the product of a long process. It has two poles, one of which is positive and progressive and the other, negative and reactionary. One can take the right stand only if one takes account of both poles and their influence at each stage.

As for the oppressed and dependent countries, the positive aspect of nationalism predominated in their development, for it was the banner under which all parties fought against imperialist domination, for freedom and national independence. To state this fact does not mean minimizing

the danger threatening from the other side. The participation of various segments of the bourgeoisie in the national movement and the ideological influence of the international bourgeoisie stress the influence of the negative aspect of nationalism on the ideological and practical activity of certain elements within the national movement.

The notable progressive political and social changes that have occurred in this century may be said to have benefited the national movement in the developing countries. The victory of the October Revolution and the formation of the socialist world system provided a favorable international climate for the progress of the national movement of the oppressed peoples. The national struggle of these peoples was made easier, not only by the resistance of the Soviet Union and the socialist system to world imperialism in various spheres and by the varied assistance which the socialist countries extended to the national movement, but by a new model of settling the national question in the course of building socialism, a model based on the principles of proletarian internationalism.

The collapse of the colonial system and the rise of dozens of independent national states hastened the progress of the national movement.

All these factors had a share in the changed character of the national liberation movement of these peoples. The tasks of national liberation from imperialism, economic and social progress moved to the forefront, adding to the progressive content of the movement. The national movement of the Arab countries has been following roughly the same course as that of other oppressed peoples. However, it has its peculiarities due to historical conditions. As for the relations between the Arab peoples and imperialism, it should be noted that imperialism succeeded, in our view, in artificially establishing a racist state, Israel, on Arab soil.

After the collapse of the Ottoman Empire and the secession of the Arab territories from it, imperialism split the Arab East. It brought into being numerous political formations controlled by the British and French imperialists. Due to this colonialist partitioning and to other historical factors of a local nature, the national movement followed different paths and produced different results in that some countries won political freedom earlier than others and that there developed dis-

tinctions in regimes. Some Arab countries set out on a progressive course, differing from one another by the degree of radicalism of the reforms they carried out. Many Arab countries and other countries similar to them show an important peculiarity: due to colonialist and neo-colonialist domination, capitalism has not matured in these countries, nor could it have. Consequently, there is no economic unity, with some forms of the feudal or semi-feudal mode of production preserved to one extent or another. This lack of unity in economic development explains why society in its entirety has not yet become an economic organism, each component of which is a complement of another. The delay in economic progress and in the establishment of economic ties in society has retarded the solution of the problem of national unity.

Experience has shown that in the period of far-reaching social change, of the transition from capitalism to socialism, the national bourgeoisie in the developing countries proved objectively unable to create the requisites for national unity. This is due to its narrow class interests, its economic and political weakness, its links with imperialism, and its fear of the popular movement and the prospect of social development, especially after numerous new national states have renounced the capitalist path. This bourgeoisie often opposes economic independence and resists its consolidation and promotion.

Our own experience warrants the conclusion that economic independence and economic, social and national progress in these countries are conditional on the socialist transformation of society. Only socialism can provide the conditions for genuine national unity in the Arab countries and countries similar to them. In our country, only those classes and social strata interested in socialism are in a position to solve the national question in a progressive spirit. The fact that large sections of the petty bourgeoisie in the Arab countries turn to socialist ideas and that some of its progressive elements show an interest in Marxist-Leninist ideas is a positive political phenomenon. However, the indecision of these strata due to their class origin and the lack of perspective in the programs of their political parties have shown that their ability to win social emancipation and radically solve the national problem is limited.

This brings us to the conclusion that

only the working class of the Arab countries and its political spokesmen, the Communists, who constitute the most revolutionary force and are interested in socialism, can provide the conditions for a radical solution of the national problem. They can accomplish their historic mission—the social emancipation of the working people

—provided they play the leading role in the national movement. This Marxist-Leninist approach to the problem of national movements makes the Arab liberation struggle an important factor in the international revolutionary, anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist movement.

Non-capitalist development of backward countries towards socialism

TSOGTYN NAMSARAI

The theory of scientific communism, in arguing that the transition to a classless society is inevitable, was logically faced with the problem of the perspective of the peoples of colonies and dependent countries still at the pre-capitalist stage.

The classics of Marxism-Leninism always approached this problem from the standpoint of concrete historical development and linked it with the victory of the proletariat and the liberation struggle of the peoples of the backward countries.

Marx and Engels, in elaborating the theory of the socialist revolution and training the proletariat for the impending revolution, built up direct and indirect reserves of the revolution. They investigated the most probable lines of its development in proletarian centers and at the peasant periphery, including the colonies and dependencies. In examining the problem of emancipation of the oppressed and backward peoples of various countries, Marx and Engels advanced for the first time the idea of the possibility of economically backward countries going over to socialism without passing through the capitalist stage of development. They knew how the issue of

non-capitalist development was approached by N. Chernyshevsky and N. Dobrolyubov. Marx and Engels made their conclusion that a backward country could develop along non-capitalist lines conditional on the victory of the working class in the developed countries of Western Europe. "If the Russian revolution," they wrote in their preface to the second Russian edition of the *Communist Manifesto* in 1882, in reply to Russian political leaders, "becomes the signal for a proletarian revolution in the West, so that both complement each other, the present Russian common ownership of land may serve as the starting point for a communist development."

Creatively developing the theory of Marx and Engels in the new historical period Lenin comprehensively elaborated the theory of the socialist revolution in the epoch of imperialism, including the way of building socialism in formerly backward countries. He revealed the unsoundness of the assertions that the capitalist way is inevitable for the countries throwing off the colonial yoke but lacking the material and other prerequisites for effecting the transition to socialism. In 1920, at the Second

Congress of the Comintern, Lenin advanced this important conclusion "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" (Vol. 31, p. 244).

Lenin's theory of the non-capitalist development of backward countries was carried into practice by the one-time colonial peoples of the Soviet East, now members of a single socialist state, and by the people of what today is the Mongolian People's Republic, an independent state.

Mongolian Communists are proud of the fact that Lenin himself helped our people to choose the non-capitalist road. It was Lenin who offered valuable advice and recommendations to the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party regarding the perspective of Mongolia's non-capitalist development.

Admittedly, Mongolia was one of the most backward Asian countries, whose population was engaged mainly in primitive nomadic stock-breeding. It had no industry, mechanized transport, nor up-to-date communications, and lacked a national finance and credit system. Its peasant stock-breeders, known as *arats*, were oppressed by feudal lords and foreign exploiters. Their minds were befogged by Lamaist religious dogma. The lamas controlled all education, and, in fact, the very life of the *arats*.

The lamaseries, those feudal estates of the top lamas, were centers of obscurantism and feudal exploitation. Over 100,000 lamas, or 40 per cent of the male population of the country, lived in them.

The immense difficulty of building the new socialist society in those conditions will be readily appreciated.

The revolution of 1921 cleared the ground for fundamental social changes. And the leading force in the struggle for national liberation and social change was the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party.

Our people not merely envisaged, but actually accomplished, the task of eliminating imperialist tyranny and feudal rule and then built socialist society, skipping the capitalist stage of development.

To go over from feudal relations to socialism, backward countries must effect a series of revolutionary democratic reforms and tasks that normally are a result of bourgeois revolution. In Mongolia we abolished feudal serfdom, the duties and tributes arbitrarily imposed on the *arats*

by their feudal lords. We confiscated the property of the feudal lords and high Lamaist dignitaries and distributed the confiscated livestock among the poor and needy *arats*. It took the Mongolian people almost two decades to carry out all these revolutionary democratic changes. The main result of the democratic stage of the Mongolian revolution was the abolition of feudal relations of production and the exclusion of foreign trade and usurer capital from the economy and, on the other hand, the rise of a socialist economic sector and the laying of a solid groundwork for non-capitalist development.

At the second, or socialist, stage of the revolution the Mongolian people, led by the Party, took important steps to develop industry and agriculture and to accomplish a cultural revolution.

The establishment and steady growth of a socialist industry and the development of modern transport and communications turned Mongolia, once an agrarian stock-breeding country, into an agrarian and industrial country.

Far-reaching social and economic changes occurred in agriculture during the same period. By 1959 all *arat* households had joined cooperatives, which meant that socialist relations of production triumphed in the Mongolian People's Republic.

Socialist development was accompanied by a cultural revolution which expressed itself in such deep-going changes as the abolition of illiteracy among the adult population, the introduction of universal elementary education for children in the countryside and incomplete secondary education in the town, the development of a new national culture, literature and art and a modern science, and the formation of a new, people's intelligentsia.

The all-round fraternal assistance we were offered by the Soviet Union, the first socialist country on our planet, was a decisive factor for our country going over to socialism without having to pass through capitalism.

Mongolia has now entered the closing period of socialist development, whose main tasks are outlined in the Party Program adopted by the 15th Congress in 1966.

Thus the Mongolian people, led by their Marxist-Leninist party, put into practice the great theory of Marx, Engels and Lenin about the possibility of the non-capitalist development of backward countries. We must note that in implementing this theory our Party had to overcome furious resist-

ance by the overthrown feudal class, the intrigues of foreign imperialism, the pressure of petty-bourgeois spontaneity, the resistance of Right- and "Left"-wing opportunists inside the Party and recurrent manifestations of nationalism or its survivals.

The historically verified experience of the Mongolian people, once at the stage of feudal relations, in socialist development is an important contribution by our Party to the revolutionary theory and practice of the international Communist, working-class and national liberation movement.

The process of transition to socialism by-passing capitalism has been developing in numerous countries. More peoples are bound to take this path. This is why Mongolia's experience in going over from feudalism to socialism by-passing capitalism is of special international significance today.

For all the diversity of national peculiarities, the process of development of the liberated countries today has much in common with the non-capitalist development of Mongolia. Mongolian experience suggests that to carry out decisive, revolutionary measures aimed at ending their lag, newly free countries must establish and steadily strengthen close relations and all-round cooperation with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and rely on them for fraternal assistance.

In the new period of history, when socialism has become a world economic system and the decisive factor for social progress, and when the national liberation movement has achieved a historic victory and become a component of the world revolutionary process, the perspective of the countries that have won freedom but are behind the times economically is of the utmost importance. This explains why the problem of non-capitalist development of the countries fighting for national liberation was elaborated and specified at all the international meetings of Communist and Workers' parties, held in Moscow in 1957, 1960 and 1969.

This problem is an object of widespread theoretical discussion and ideological controversy. The bourgeoisie and its apologists understandably deny the possibility of non-capitalist development, using various subterfuges and calumnies.

Some theorists take a superficial view of Marxism-Leninism or misrepresent it, claiming that it is applicable only in developed capitalist countries, where the class contradictions between the proletariat and

the bourgeoisie come to the surface. They allege that it is inapplicable in backward, agrarian countries, where peasants make up the bulk of the population. This brings them to the conclusion that the Marxist-Leninist theory of non-capitalist development should be renounced. A reasonably close look at the matter proves them wrong.

Lenin predicted that the struggle of the peoples of one-time colonies and dependencies for their political and economic emancipation, initially directed against imperialism, would, on reaching a definite level, become increasingly anti-capitalist in content. The fact that a number of liberated countries have chosen the socialist orientation and actually taken steps to effect radical social changes shows that Lenin was right.

Imperialism today is particularly hostile to countries with progressive regimes that have chosen the socialist orientation. To divert them from this course, it tries to disrupt their political parties and bring their educational and cultural institutions and mass media under its control. It plants its counter-revolutionary agents in these countries and backs reactionary elements in the administration and the armed forces. It takes advantage of anti-Communist prejudice to sow discord among patriots. Precisely because the imperialists are aware of the existence and significance of the non-capitalist road and fear that more countries will take the same road, they spare neither effort nor means to check the progress of liberated countries.

"Under the impact of the revolutionary conditions of our time," says the Document of the 1960 Meeting, "distinctive forms of progressive social development of the newly free countries have appeared, and the role of revolutionary and democratic forces has been enhanced. Some young states have taken the non-capitalist path, a path which opens up the possibility of overcoming the backwardness inherited from the colonial past and creates conditions for the transition to socialist development. In these countries the socialist orientation is making headway, overcoming great difficulties and trials. These states are waging a determined struggle against imperialism and neo-colonialism."

The advantages of the non-capitalist road of development consist in a considerable acceleration of the historical development of backward peoples, who are, furthermore, enabled to pass through whole historical

epochs in a relatively short time. The non-capitalist road eases the birth pains of the new society. The non-capitalist transition to socialism takes place without the peasants having to become proletarianized first and without the bulk of the population be-

ing ruined, which is inevitable under capitalism. The non-capitalist road of development provides the right solution to the present-day problems of the national liberation movement in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Leninism and some aspects of the ideological struggle

JUAN DIZ

The present period has most convincingly borne out the universal validity of Leninism. Our tasks in the ideological struggle are to defend the ideas of Marxism-Leninism against enemy attacks, spread them far and wide, taking inspiration from Lenin's example in carrying forward the ideas of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels.

The ideological struggle today is characterized by a crisis of bourgeois ideology and by the advance of the Marxist-Leninist ideology, which, however, does not rule out some difficulties.

The common denominator of this twofold evolution is that historical reality proves Marxism-Leninism right. Historical reality is objectively destroying the very principles which ideologists traditionally invoked in an effort to defend or justify regimes based on oppression and exploitation.

In speaking of this advance of the Marxist-Leninist ideology, we can cite the experience of the Communist Party of Spain, which has had to operate underground for 45 years out of 50 and, specifically, to fight against the Franco dictatorship for more than 30 years. As we all know, the dictatorship used the most criminal and barbarous methods to eradicate Lenin's ideas and efface his very name in Spain and to impose clerical fascist ideas. Although Lenin's works are outlawed young Spaniards in the countryside, in factories and universities read them with keen interest. Never have

Lenin's works been read and studied so widely as now. The impact of the Marxist-Leninist ideology is so strong that even *Razon y Fe*, the Jesuits' official periodical, wrote in February 1969 as follows: "Marxism today has attained an *unprecedented* degree of dissemination and ideological influence. Whatever the actual results of this doctrine, Marx today is, *more than ever*, a living leader of many people interested in building life on earth and not in heaven."

Certain developments taking place in the Church are highly symptomatic. A very important trend of the movement, one that came into being after the Ecumenical Council and advocates a renovation of Catholicism, and particularly those of its currents directly linked with the struggle of the workers and other working people (in Spain and Latin America, for instance), have adopted some of the fundamental ideas of Marx and Lenin, saying that these ideas are compatible with their religious convictions. Practice corroborates the thesis advanced by Comrade Santiago Carrillo in his book *New Approach to the Problems of Today*. Commenting on the dialogue between Christians and Marxists, he writes: "In Marxist-Leninist ideology there are propositions permitting not a coexistence, but a coincidence of points of view, which makes actual cooperation more feasible."

Mention should also be made of the role of Leninism in recent political events re-

flecting the new positions of some groups of army officers in a number of Arab and Latin American countries, where there is a combination of anti-imperialist nationalism with socialist tendencies.

Precisely because Leninism is on the rise today, we must frankly ask ourselves: what are the real obstacles or difficulties whose elimination would enable us to step up our ideological offensive?

Lenin's titanic work made him the greatest personality in history. Every worker and every exploited man or woman realizes and appreciates Lenin's decisive role as leader of the Bolshevik Party and the first socialist revolution. Every form or manifestation of the ideological struggle today is pervaded by Lenin's revolutionary ideas and reflects the triumph of socialism in the Soviet Union.

The Soviet people have achieved tremendous progress at the cost of enormous sacrifice, for over a number of years they were alone amid a hostile world. In the formative period of the Soviet state they foiled the armed intervention of fourteen capitalist countries. Later on they defeated the Hitlerite aggressors. Over 20 million Soviet people gave their lives to free their country and save mankind from Hitler's inferno. The epic building of socialism in the Soviet Union, the Soviet Union's generous and disinterested assistance to other peoples in the fight for freedom (we Spanish Communists will say this again and again on the strength of our own experience) won the admiration, love and solidarity of the exploited in the capitalist world. With the same admiration the world followed afterwards the heroic deeds of the Chinese revolution, the Cuban revolution, the liberation war in Korea and now in Vietnam. The enthusiasm millions of people are fired with as they watch the new world whose inviolable law is to eliminate all exploitation and oppression is the main reason for the present advance of the Marxist-Leninist ideology in capitalist countries.

On the other hand, it is becoming evident that the ideological struggle cannot be based solely on laying bare the evils of imperialism and emphasizing the advantages of socialism. To be stronger in the fight against imperialism, Marxism-Leninism must also analyze its own internal problems.

The progress of Marxism-Leninism cannot now ignore the *inner dialectic* born of the triumph of socialism in fourteen countries, in the most diverse forms. The state-

ment that there are different *models* of socialism in these fourteen countries neither minimizes nor detracts from the *exceptional* role which the October Revolution played by opening a new era in man's history, the era of socialism and communism.

The existence of diverse models is in accordance, we think, with ideas contained in Lenin's works. We believe that nothing in Lenin's works contradicts the view that one of the variants of the dictatorship of the proletariat can be brought into being under a multi-party system and even (in some cases) in the presence of a legal opposition. In speaking of the possibility of the dictatorship of the proletariat existing alongside a multi-party system and a legal opposition and in examining at the same time the perspective of the advance of the socialist revolution in new conditions, we have in mind Lenin's theses and what in theoretical substance was Lenin's practice of the first dictatorship of the proletariat. As we know, Russia immediately after the October Revolution had a coalition government, including the Bolsheviks and the "Left"-wing Socialist-Revolutionaries. The Mensheviks, in their turn, were a legal opposition in the Soviets till 1920. Here is a noteworthy statement by Lenin on this point: "We do not at all regard the question of disfranchising the bourgeoisie from an absolute point of view, because it is theoretically quite conceivable that the dictatorship of the proletariat may suppress the bourgeoisie at every step without disfranchising them. This is theoretically quite conceivable. Nor do we propose our Constitution as a model for other countries. All we say is that whoever conceives the transition to socialism without the suppression of the bourgeoisie is not a socialist. But while it is essential to suppress the bourgeoisie as a class, it is not essential to deprive them of suffrage and of equality" (Vol. 29, pp. 184-85). This experience of Lenin's is of great theoretical importance to us because it helps our Party—in entirely new conditions, of course—to work out its own perspective of struggle.

In charting our own road to socialism, we proceed from Lenin's principle of the existence of *variants* of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Being loyal to Leninism, we stress that socialism should mean an extraordinary extension of democratic freedoms, which the bourgeoisie has always provided only nominally and which socialism must raise to a higher plane and give a real political, social and economic content.

The manifestation of this strictly democratic character of socialism, which Lenin stressed to forcefully and which today is of particular significance, is essential in the present ideological struggle. We must expose the bourgeois state at a time when it resorts in increasing measure to coercive methods, fascist forms of violence and a monstrous military-bureaucratic machinery.

In terms of the ideological struggle, of particular importance to the activity of our parties is one of Lenin's counsels—to be uncompromising towards hostile ideas in our midst, and towards every shade of opportunism. Constantly inspired by this counsel of Lenin's the Communists of Spain have resolutely combated, and continue to combat, whenever necessary, the penetration of bourgeois ideas and revisionist deviations, Right and "Left" alike.

However, we should ascertain in this ideological discussion whether we do not come up, in addition to the deviations we have mentioned, against problems of a different kind which could not possibly have arisen two or three decades ago.

The relation between the objective basis of socialism and the superstructure expressed by the Marxist ideology is not passive but *active*. It is not surprising, therefore, that certain divergences or contradictions crop up in Marxism-Leninism today which at the ideological level reflect the diversity existing among socialist societies. These societies are a result of the defeat of capitalists and landowners. They are all part of the socialist world system and a component of the worldwide process of socialist revolution. These divergences or contradictions are therefore *not of a class nature*. They lie *within the sphere of the working class*. In a more general sense, these ideas are current *within Marxism-Leninism*.

In discussing these differences, it would be wrong to use a method by which anyone expressing disagreement is seen as having yielded to bourgeois influence or, in other words, regarded as the Right- or "Left"-wing opportunist. Such a method could complicate theoretical elaboration and concrete analysis of the objective origins of this or that idea. It raises obstacles to the necessary discussion of ideas within Leninism and complicates the confrontation of diverse solutions, that is, the process of developing and enriching our doctrine. It exaggerates the real strength of our enemy, especially in the ideological field.

In our ideological struggle it is important always to remember that Marxism-Leninism is a science. There can be no question that we must always uphold Marxist-Leninist positions. But Marxism-Leninism as a science does not and cannot have a Holy Inquisition deciding on "purity." Indeed, the 1969 Meeting stated with good reason that the international Communist movement has no leading center. The real criterion of Marxist-Leninist ideas as scientific and revolutionary ideas is revolutionary practice and the progress made by the revolution.

It will be seen from the foregoing that we reject every tendency to deny the significance of the achievements and victories of the Soviet Union and the socialist world as a whole. These achievements by rights hold the key position in our ideological struggle, for the workers and the exploited throughout the world regard them as their own.

We must not be afraid to see reality surrounding us in its true light. We have the vivid example of Lenin who even at the most dangerous junctures in the existence of the newly established Soviet state engaged boldly in extensive ideological discussions in which certain aspects of socialist reality were severely criticized. Lenin was convinced that these discussions helped to vindicate and strengthen socialism.

The important thing for us is the will to impart to the ideological struggle the *offensive* character it now needs. This is the spirit in which we also approach the problem of proletarian internationalism. It is no longer a question of defending one socialist country encircled by a capitalist world. We now have the socialist world system, and our proletarian solidarity is and must be with the Soviet Union and the socialist world system.

There is an important thesis in the Document of the Moscow Meeting saying that the winning of power by the working class and its allies is the greatest contribution which a Communist Party fighting under capitalist conditions can make to the cause of socialism and proletarian internationalism. We consider that the main criterion of proletarian internationalism is the ability of each Party to evolve and implement a national and *international* policy promoting the revolution in the country concerned and, at the same time, the *world revolutionary process*.

It follows that the principle of independence of every Party, rightly reaffirmed at the Moscow Meeting, is an objective revolutionary necessity. We are far from underrating or scorning internationalism. On the contrary, we believe that the independence of the parties will help to make our proletarian internationalism more effective.

The Communist Party of Spain works to bring the ideas of Marxism-Leninism home to the workers and the people. We

are well aware of the limited character of our experience and of the need to improve our work in many fields. But we constantly strive to be loyal to Lenin's precept and example, to help Marxism-Leninism as best we can to achieve new revolutionary victories by showing the masses, who are still oppressed, how they can break the chains of imperialism and capitalism and win the genuine freedom that can be achieved only under socialism.

Ideological struggle for the youth

DIETMAR AHRENS

Our Party is marking the centenary of the birth of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, the brilliant theorist, revolutionary and statesman, and leader of the international working class. In celebrating the centenary, we are setting our sights on a creative application of Lenin's ideas to the new developments of our time. We do so with an eye on the wealth of Lenin's heritage, on such universal laws as the hegemony of the working class in alliance with other strata under the leadership of the Marxist-Leninist party and the necessity of a revolutionary reconstruction of society.

Leninism is the Marxism of the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, the time in which socialism and communism are triumphant. Leninism is proving its viability and its steadily growing influence in countries where the working class has already won, in the international revolutionary labor and national liberation movements. A desire to familiarize themselves with Marxism-Leninism is particularly evident among the working youth and the students.

Lenin's works are of invaluable help to us in working out the revolutionary theory and the tactics of class struggle, in the fight against opportunists of all shades.

There are two states in Germany with opposite modes of production and different structures of power—the socialist German Democratic Republic and the capitalist Federal Republic of Germany; besides, there is a special political unit within the GDR, West Berlin, in which capitalism is dominant. And from this basic fact we proceed in assessing all political developments in our country.

As you know, the CDU/CSU, the main party of West German monopoly capital, was pushed out of office in the Bundestag election of September 28, 1969, and replaced by a coalition of the SPD and FDP. The ouster of the CDU/CSU was a positive development, creating opportunities for renewed efforts by the working class in the fight for the workers' social and political rights, against the outdated property relations and power structure. But that is just what the Social-Democratic politicians want to avert by identifying the change of government with change of the power structure. In his *The State and Revolution*, Lenin pointed out that a bourgeois "democratic republic is the best possible political shell for capitalism, and, therefore, once capital has gained possession of this very best shell . . . it establish-

es its power so securely, so firmly, that no change of persons, institutions or parties in the bourgeois-democratic republic can shake it" (Vol. 25, p. 393).

Chancellor Willy Brandt said in his government statement that he would work for "continuity," which, indeed, goes to the very root of this issue. The bourgeoisie need have no apprehensions about the representative of a party leadership which ever since the SDP congress in Bad Godesberg has never even mentioned the task of promoting social reconstruction. And we cannot but reckon with this fact, because it is related to the *fundamental* assessment of the new government's actions.

In our daily practical policy we tie in our fight for democratic demands, in particular the demands for greater workers' representation in running enterprises and the economy and for a democratic reform of the secondary and higher school, with criticism of principle in relation to the modern capitalist system. It is our intention to combat the influence of bourgeois ideology on the working class, to raise its class consciousness and its militancy in the anti-imperialist struggle.

Elucidating the essence and character of the German Democratic Republic is a vital task in the conditions of West Berlin. The more definite the attitude of West Berlin workers will be towards the GDR, the sharper will be their class consciousness and their readiness to fight for radical social change. And, naturally, the bourgeoisie is aware of this. Opportunist apologists, both of the Right and "Left," know it too. That is why they resort to every possible means to discredit the socialist system in the Soviet Union and to distort the socialist reality in the GDR.

In his article on the 52nd anniversary of the October Revolution, Comrade G. Daneilius, chairman of the Socialist Unity Party of West Berlin, pointed out that "the main influence in the ideological domain on the workers of our city is exerted by the big bourgeoisie through the Right-wing leaders of the Social-Democrats. These introduce in the trade unions the 'idea' of subordinating the workers' interests to the power and profits of Big Business. By spreading specious theories of 'social harmony' they impede the development of the class struggle from below and make it easier for the bourgeoisie to wage their class struggle from above. They continue to isolate the workers of our city from the great help they could receive in their fight

for social and political rights through alliance with the workers' organizations in the GDR."*

However, it is becoming more difficult for the Right-wing Social-Democratic leaders to do this. The German Democratic Republic's economic successes, its successes in education, welfare and city planning, and in home and foreign policy, are so convincing that the Right-wing SDP leaders are compelled to maneuver. It is no longer possible to hush up the achievements of the GDR. That is why the "arguments" of the Right-wing SDP leaders are reduced to the contention that GDR successes were achieved "in spite of" the guiding role of the working class and its Party. However, the experience of practical struggle for social change and greater democracy at enterprise level, in education and society, a struggle bitterly resisted by the bourgeoisie, shows our workers that the successes of the GDR cannot be separated from its socio-economic basis and that the worker can participate in resolving the key problems only if the working class is at the helm of power.

Of late the Right-wing Social-Democratic leaders have been resorting to the following maneuver: in word they reject Bonn's old policy with regard to the GDR and no longer repeat Kiesinger's "formula" of a "certain entity" and "a so-called state."** Instead, they speak these days of the need "to see the GDR," "to study it" and, in that sense, to "recognize" it and to act upon the fact of the existence of two German states. However, it is all too obvious that the new FRG government, too, does not intend to do what it should do if it "acted upon" the fact of the existence of two German states, namely, to recognize the GDR in accordance with international law. Yet, unless this is done, signifying a rejection of the claim, contrary to international law, to sole representation of all Germany, there can be no question of any genuinely "new Eastern policy" of the FRG government, for what we have now is but a new variant of the policy that failed in August 1968.

Appreciation of the fact that relations with the GDR must be normalized is gaining ground in West Berlin. As for the working class, we hold that it is in the workers' class interests that the relations be-

*Wahrheit, November 8-9, 1969

**This formula, defining the GDR de jure, was elevated to the status of an official doctrine by Bonn (Ed.).

tween West Berlin and the GDR should be brought into harmony with international law. For the West Berlin workers, the German Democratic Republic is not just any other state. The GDR is their friend and ally in the fight against monopoly rule, an example of how to eliminate monopoly power, an example for radical social reconstruction in the rest of Germany.

At the same time, elucidation of the class character of state power in the Soviet Union, the German Democratic Republic and other socialist countries is a precondition for successfully combating "Left"-opportunist views, the essence of which boils down to counterposing the existing socialism, won in grim struggle by the working class and its allies under the leadership of Marxist-Leninist parties, to the invented extreme individualist models of socialism in the name of which an assault is mounted against genuine socialism. These views have to be combated because they undermine the solidarity of the international revolutionary movement and impede cooperation among the opponents of the modern capitalist system.

In his "*Left-Wing*" *Communism — an Infantile Disorder*, Lenin wrote: "We now possess quite considerable international experience, which shows very definitely that certain fundamental features of our revolution have a significance that is not local, or peculiarly national, or Russian alone, but international" (Vol. 31, p. 21).

As we see it, the existing models of socialism amount to overthrowing the old exploiting system, establishing the power of workers and peasants, jointly with all strata that are their allies, exercising leadership in the state, economy and culture under the guidance of Marxist-Leninist parties, resolving problems posed by the scientific and technological revolution for the good and in the interests of the people, and continuously extending socialist democracy by drawing increasingly broad sections of the people into running the state in order to assure the welfare, peace and happiness of their peoples and the fulfilment of their internationalist obligations. We know of no "new models" that could stand the test of time.

Propagating the theoretical and practical activity of Lenin is of cardinal importance in rallying the working class, the guiding force in the anti-imperialist struggle for peace, democracy and socialism. However, Lenin never regarded the working class as a class withdrawn into itself.

He always regarded the workers as a modern class which, while fighting for its own interests, also represents the interests of its allies and which guides all democratic movement, all actions for reform, along the channel of struggle for the radical transformation of society.

The bourgeois mass information media are doing their utmost to consign this fact to oblivion. The West German journal *Spiegel* published an interview on November 17, 1969, with Ernst Fischer, expelled from the Communist Party of Austria. Fischer, as we know, does not conceal his hostility to Marxism-Leninism and to those states and parties which firmly follow the principles of Marxism-Leninism and are consistently internationalist, allowing no one to distort Lenin's method by raising it to an absolute or divorcing it from the class task. In his interview with *Spiegel* Fischer denies the guiding role of the working class and ascribes to school children and students the role of the "revolutionary vanguard."

To say nothing of their being unscientific, Fischer's statements are evidence of scorn towards the working class.

In recent years, the Socialist Unity Party of West Berlin has built up cooperation with students and the scientific and technical intellectuals, because due to definite social changes caused by the scientific and technological revolution the importance of these strata has increased. Admittedly, most students in West Berlin come from petty-bourgeois strata. However, after finishing their education they usually join the ranks of labor. Hence, we regard it as a mistake to treat the student movement sweepingly as an offshoot of the struggle under way within the bourgeois class. And it is just as wrong to interpret the student movement as a new "main addressee" of the revolution.* The working class has been and remains the main force of history. For this reason it is necessary rapidly to assimilate people from other strata who join its ranks as a result of objective processes. The subjective consciousness of these people must be developed to meet the new objective requirements corresponding to their class identity, and their potentialities must be used in the struggle. This process, coupled with the correct political orientation of our Party as a

*The concept of a new "main addressee" of revolution is actively propagated in the works of bourgeois ideologists, particularly in Herbert Marcuse's book, *One-Dimensional Man*—Ed.

whole is, as we see it, supported by the strong and ideologically stable SUP—West Berlin groups (invulnerable to petty-bourgeois influence and organizationally strong) in the higher educational establishments, groups that carry forward Party policy in a militant spirit directly on the campus, as well as outside it. Recently, members of the Party group in Dahlem University began with Party support to publish a journal polemicizing at a commendable ideological and theoretical level against petty-bourgeois, anti-Leninist views. The journal provides the right orientation in matters of theory and practice of revolutionary struggle for the progressive nucleus of students.

Marxist-Leninist education of Party cadres is essential if we want to resolve the increasing number of tasks facing our Party. We know this perfectly well. The Party leadership and the leadership of district organizations hold regular lectures and seminars, particularly for young Party members and the youth on the fringe of the Party.

Besides, in the past year the Party leadership published pamphlets as aids in

studying Lenin's works *The State and Revolution* and *Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution*. The pamphlets examine the conclusions drawn from the above-mentioned works by Lenin relevant for the struggle with the still widespread anti-Marxist views. This greatly helps our young Party members and, moreover, prompts many people outside the Party to familiarize themselves more deeply with Marxism-Leninism.

In our view, all this will help carry forward the necessary social changes in West Berlin as well. We hold that we are doing the right thing by not turning Lenin's cause into an object of discussion divorced from practice and the universal laws of Marxism-Leninism.

We consider it important that the workers, including the working youth, the office employees and students in West Berlin, should understand our policy and that Marxist-Leninist ideas should gain currency among them. We hold that it is necessary for them to understand the essence of the Marxist-Leninist theory, which is transforming the world, and to accept Marxism-Leninism as a guide to action.

Lenin's immortal ideas are our guiding star

GUSTAVO COLMAN

Soon Communists the world over and all working people fighting for socialism, democracy and peace will mark the centenary of the birth of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin. This event will again bring into prominence throughout the world the grandeur of Lenin's victorious ideas, of Leninism as an immortal international teaching exercising a powerful influence on world development.

The revolutionary achievements of our epoch were all inspired by Lenin's ideas,

materializing in the auspicious changes witnessed in the Soviet Union, where the successful experiment has altered the face of the earth, and in the achievements of the peoples of the socialist countries. Lenin's ideas are the guide in the great battles fought by the international labor, national liberation and Communist movements. They bring together and inspire the fighters for democracy, national independence, peace and socialism.

The October Revolution, the most im-

portant revolutionary achievement of the 20th century, is linked unbreakably with Lenin's ideas and works. In the course of that revolution, ushering in a new epoch in the life of mankind — that of transition from capitalism to socialism and communism — Lenin's figure rose to its gigantic stature as that of a brilliant leader of the world proletariat who showed all the peoples of the world the way to a happy life, true freedom and social justice.

The October Revolution is significant not only because it was the world's first victorious socialist revolution, and not only because it became a powerful catalyst of history. Its materialization and development are evidence of its historical universality and its relevance for the world as a whole. It combined splendidly the objective and subjective factors of the revolutionary process, the requirements of social development and their reflection in the consciousness of the working class, the spontaneous movement of the masses and the creative guiding activity of the foremost Party.

More than half a century has passed since the October Revolution. In this time many events occurred which are by themselves unprecedented in history by reason of their depth and breadth and the revolutionary change they entailed. And still, it may be said safely that the correct orientation, the confidence, speed and effectiveness with which the revolutionary process unfolded to its successful culmination in the difficult conditions of the Russia of 1917, remain unsurpassed. Although today we have at our disposal the new experience of other revolutions and social reconstruction in countries and continents at different phases of historical development, the experience of the first socialist revolution and the persevering struggle waged by its brilliant architect, Lenin, arouses deep interest.

Forging the victory of the working class, Lenin scientifically elaborated the ways, conditions and means of the struggle for socialism.

In sharp clashes against the Right and "Left" opportunists, Lenin upheld and developed the revolutionary essence of Marxism.

He worked out in detail the teaching of a revolutionary party of a new type, the party as the highest form of working-class organization, the main weapon of the workers, without which the proletariat cannot depose capitalist rule, win

political power and build socialism. On the basis of that teaching Lenin created and built up the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. He stressed that the Party could fulfil its role only if closely linked with the labor movement, consistently expressing and defending the vital interests of the workers. And the struggle of the workers, in turn, would not be successful, he said, "until their struggle is led by a strong organization of revolutionaries" (Vol. 5, p. 475).

Lenin attached immense importance to Party unity, because he saw clearly that unity was the guarantee of successful action. He insisted on the strictest discipline, equally obligatory for all members of the Party, both those in the leadership and the rank-and-file, calling for irreconcilable struggle against panic-mongers, defeatists and opportunists, against all those who deviated from the Party's general line and tried to corrupt its ranks. Democratic centralism, in which democracy and centralism comprise inseparable elements of a whole, is the basic organizational principle of Lenin's party of the new type.

The right application of democratic centralism enables the Party to make the activity of its members more effective, to concert the energy of all on the same objective and direct that energy to transforming society along revolutionary lines. It is no accident, therefore, that the enemies of the Communist Party, whether "Left," Centrist or Right, are mounting ceaseless attacks on democratic centralism, the Party's fundamental organizational principle.

Lenin made an invaluable contribution to the international labor movement and all movements for national independence. He called emphatically for enduring international cohesion and unity of the revolutionary forces. He proved beyond a doubt that the need for cohesion and unity flowed from the changing historical situation, the development of capitalism to imperialism and the accentuation of proletarian revolution as the most urgent task.

Lenin worked out in theory the important role of the national liberation movement in the world revolutionary process. He said 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 imperial-

ism" (Vol. 30, p. 159). From this he deduced the need for the international proletariat to support the national liberation movement of the oppressed and dependent countries and the need for united action by all revolutionary forces against imperialism. This postulate is of invaluable and lasting significance for the Marxist-Leninist parties and all revolutionary forces fighting against imperialism.

Consistently and unerringly Lenin always fought for the purity and creative development of Marxism as the revolutionary teaching of the working class, of which his life and activity are a brilliant confirmation. He exposed all distortions of revolutionary Marxism and repulsed all attacks on it by opportunists and nationalists of all shades. He always called to be on guard against sectarian petty-bourgeois "Leftist" adventurism, ultra-revolutionary in word but not at all revolutionary in actual outlook.

At the beginning of the century, Lenin wrote: "The only choice is—either bourgeois or socialist ideology. There is no middle course." And he drew the inevitable conclusion: "Hence, to belittle the socialist ideology in any way, to turn aside from it in the slightest degree means to strengthen bourgeois ideology" (Vol. 5, p. 384).

The development of the revolutionary process led to considerable changes in the world Communist movement, which grew into the most influential political force of our time. With its numbers growing rapidly, the social structure of many Communist parties began to change, the result being that petty-bourgeois ideology penetrated into some of the contingents of the Communist movement, giving rise to harmful phenomena.

International reaction and imperialism combine direct attacks on socialism and the world Communist movement with attempts to distort Marxism. The bourgeoisie exploits the modern revisionists, who attack the basic principles of scientific communism, chiefly the idea of the historic mission of the working class, the proletarian dictatorship, the Party and the partisan nature of the working-class ideology, on the pretext of fighting dogmatism, eliminating "distortions" of Marxism-Leninism, "humanizing" socialism, etc.

The emergence on the political scene of large sections of the urban and rural petty bourgeoisie has a strong bearing on the features of the present-day ideological

struggle. The powerful national liberation movement lays an imprint on the nature of the alliance of the anti-imperialist forces. The revolutionary impatience of the petty bourgeois, which tries to seize ideological ascendancy in the world revolutionary process, is greatly in evidence. All this is connected with the revival of opportunism in diverse forms and with the pressure it exerts on the Communist and labor movement.

Maoism is the most conspicuous political and ideological expression of that kind of opportunism. The events in China in recent years show that the political line of the Maoist group has precipitated a profound socio-political crisis in the life of the Chinese people, jeopardizing their socialist gains. The Chinese example shows that the danger of "Left" opportunism grows to alarming proportions when it afflicts a Party leadership standing at the helm of a state. Quite obviously, this does grave harm to the socialist ideas and, consequently, grinds the axe of anti-communism.

One of the characteristic features of modern revisionism is that the "Lefts" identify themselves almost completely with the Rights in substantiating and defining their propositions, and this to so great an extent that sometimes it is difficult to distinguish between them. For example, anti-Sovietism and slander against the USSR and the CPSU are a common platform of all opportunists, linking them, moreover, with the professional anti-Communists.

Narrow nationalism is also an obvious danger for the world Communist movement and proletarian internationalism. In combination with revisionist trends of all kinds it is, as a rule, a component of all the opportunist conceptions that try to substitute "national" variants of Marxism-Leninism for Marxism-Leninism as an international teaching.

All the same, a considerable upswing of creative Marxist thought has come into evidence in various contingents of the Communist movement, seeking to understand and creatively to elucidate the new phenomena of social life in order to work out a strategy and tactics of class struggle consistent with the historical conditions in different countries and regions of the world. It was in this spirit, under the banner of loyalty to Marxism-Leninism, that the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties was con-

vened in Moscow in June 1969 and proved a grand success for the world Communist movement.

The work and results of that Meeting refuted the pessimistic forecasts of the enemies of communism who nourished hopes of the Meeting never taking place or, if it did convene, of its ending in failure. The Meeting produced a profound analysis of the new phenomena in the development of mankind since the 1957 and 1960 international Communist forums. It strongly emphasized the historic validity and international relevance of Leninism, adopting a special address in connection with the coming centenary of Lenin's birth.

The main political and theoretical propositions contained in the Document, "Tasks at the Present Stage of the Struggle Against Imperialism and United Action of Communist and Workers' Parties and All Anti-Imperialist Forces," and in the other documents adopted by the Meeting, are imbued with the creative spirit of Leninism.

It follows from the analysis of the new social phenomena of our time that the present stage is marked by increased opportunities for the further advancement of the revolutionary and progressive forces. The Meeting was an important milestone in cementing the unity and cohesion of the Marxist-Leninist parties on the basis of proletarian internationalism.

Although, unquestionably, imperialism cannot turn back the clock of history, it is still able to cause immense suffering and great damage to the peoples. It interferes in the internal affairs of other countries and provokes armed conflicts. For more than five years the U.S. imperialists have been waging a barbarous aggressive war against the people of Vietnam, who want only to live in freedom and to arrange their life in their own way. U.S. imperialism continues to plunder the natural wealth of, and keep in a state of backwardness, poverty and oppression, the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, resorting more and more frequently to police repressions. It is trying to contain the democratic gains of the peoples, organizing coups in order to establish terroristic forms of domination, as in Brazil, Paraguay, Argentina, Greece, etc. It has organized an economic blockade of revolutionary Cuba and threatens it constantly with provocations.

The imperialist policy of plunder and aggression attempts to prevent by all means every progressive development, weaken the positions of socialism, crush the liberation movement of the peoples, impede the workers' struggle in the capitalist countries for democratic rights, peace and socialism, and, above all, to hold up the inescapable aggravation of the general crisis and collapse of capitalism.

Lenin's behest to cement in every way the alliance of international socialism, the national liberation movement and the international working class, has stood the test of time. Its effectiveness in the fight against imperialism, in safeguarding peace and promoting the progress of the nations, has been proved by history over and over again.

"World imperialism," Lenin wrote, "will fall when the revolutionary onslaught of the exploited and oppressed workers in each country . . . merges with the revolutionary onslaught of hundreds of millions of people who have hitherto stood beyond the pale of history, and have been regarded merely as the object of history" (Vol. 31, p. 232).

The general onslaught has continued for more than half a century. The socialist world system headed by the Soviet Union, whose might in all areas of modern development is growing constantly, the national liberation movement and the international working-class movement have struck home powerful blows at imperialist domination and have radically changed the relationship of forces on the world scene. They have made a wide breach, opening the way to a happy future, to socialism and communism, for all the oppressed and exploited peoples.

The Paraguayan Communist Party, which came into being 41 years ago under the direct influence of the great October Socialist Revolution, has always held high the banner of Leninist proletarian internationalism and has defended it, as it will continue to defend it, because it regards proletarian internationalism as the best guarantee of victory for the cause of the world proletariat.

Long live Leninism, its experience, which is of lasting revolutionary significance for the whole world. Long live its glorious offspring, the great Soviet Union!

Lenin and the problems of the social revolution in Iran

EHSAN TABARI

The question of the social revolution is a cardinal one for scientific communism. According to Marxism-Leninism, human society in its long history has passed through certain qualitative stages defined by science as "socio-economic formations." The transition from one formation to another, which brings about deep qualitative changes in basis and superstructure, occurs spontaneously or is directed by the conscious vanguard. History has recorded, in particular, instances of spontaneous "decay" or "downfall" and peaceful or non-peaceful social revolutions. These qualitative, revolutionary leaps are due to the fact that the society in question enters a period of historical crisis expressing itself in the disharmony between the productive forces and the relations of production. This crisis culminates in the transfer of state power from the given classes of society to other classes.

However, a social crisis is not enough in itself to cause a social revolution. In the absence of the objective and subjective conditions for revolution, the ruling classes can for a long time retain power either by *force* or by *fraud*. Lenin described a revolutionary situation as the totality of *objective* conditions determining the *possibility* of a social revolution. He stressed that to carry out the revolution, it is not enough for the "lower strata not to want" to live in the old way but it is also necessary for the "upper strata not to be able" to live in that way. Such a situation is known as a general national crisis of society. Besides, Lenin spoke of the need for a considerable increase in the militancy of the masses, who are drawn

both by the crisis situation and the "upper classes" themselves to launch *independent* historical action (see Vol. 21, p. 214 and Vol. 31, p. 35). But these objective conditions (which together create a revolutionary situation) are far from being sufficient for the victory of the revolution. There is also a need for subjective conditions, that is, the ability of the revolutionary class for courageous and selfless struggle, and the existence of an experienced revolutionary party providing correct strategic and tactical leadership.

Without a revolutionary situation there is no favorable basis for the revolution. And in the absence of subjective factors such a situation may be temporarily missed because it was not used in time. Such is the complex dialectics of the social revolution, in which subjective and objective factors intertwine.

Marx, Engels and Lenin repeatedly stressed that the social revolution is a complex historical process governed by the general and particular laws of social development. Revolution is made by the entire people, it is not a result of improvised moves by individual leaders, heroes or advanced groups. Revolution without the masses is adventurism. Engels wrote: "The time of surprise attacks, of revolutions carried through by small conscious minorities at the head of unconscious masses, is past. Where it is a question of a complete transformation of the social organization, the masses themselves must also be in it, must themselves already have grasped what is at stake, what they are going in for, body and soul." And he added: "But in order that the masses may

understand what is to be done, long, persistent work is required. . . ." (Marx and Engels, *Selected Works*, Moscow, 1962, Vol. 1, p. 134).

It is impossible to accomplish the revolution by relying only on the revolutionary vanguard or revolutionary impulses, on illusions and phraseology. On the other hand, to renounce sustained, concrete and real training of the masses for revolutionary action on the plea of combating revolutionary adventurism and phrase-mongering also means going against the revolution and giving in to spontaneity. The complex dialectics of various concrete situations must be fully taken into account in developing the strategy and tactics of the revolutionary party of the working class. To overrate the revolutionary potential of the masses would be as wrong as to under-rate it.

In addition to their social nature, different revolutions invariably have characteristics that assume international significance. However, the form of every revolution depends primarily on its motive force, on national conditions and the international situation.

It would be wrong, on the other hand, to try *mechanically* to duplicate a revolution on the plea that it has triumphed, if in a different set of circumstances. To be sure, it is very difficult properly to combine the general and particular laws of the social revolution. It is highly important to know one's own people thoroughly and find the forms of revolutionary action that are understandable and close to them. To determine the specifics of each given country and to apply a general proposition to these specifics is the essence of creative Marxism. Lenin said that the parties of the working class must "learn to apply the general and basic principles of communism to the *specific relations* between classes and parties, to the *specific features* in the objective development towards communism, which are different in each country and which we must be able to discover, study, and predict" (Vol. 31, p. 89).

The People's Party of Iran in recent years has been fighting against various "Left"- and Right-wing groups that falsify the meaning and content of the social revolution in the spirit of Leftist adventurism or reformist opportunism. The internal and international situation of our country make for the rise of these "Left" and Right deviations among the petty-bour-

geois elements of our society and among the revolutionary democrats.

The Leftist elements we come up against are, first of all, petty-bourgeois opposition-minded intellectuals of a nationalist brand or one-time members of our Party who have yielded to Maoist influence. The petty-bourgeois opposition-minded intellectuals have no clear world outlook and advocate as their own platform an eclectic hodgepodge of fashionable "Left"-wing theories of neo-anarchism.

The petty-bourgeois "Left"-wing nationalists and Maoists of Iran, united in several groups and living almost exclusively in Europe, carry on a rabid anti-Soviet campaign and revile our Party, putting various labels on it for its staunchness and consistent internationalism. They publish periodicals and pamphlets setting out their ultra-"Left," adventurist ideas.

The common platform of these groups, which, incidentally, are engaged in bitter political strife among themselves, may be summed up as follows:

They consider a revolutionary situation and regard for the subjective factor of the revolutionary movement entirely unnecessary. They maintain that the revolutionary situation is ever-present on three continents—Asia, Africa and Latin America—which are the vortices of the world revolutionary storm. To wait for the rise of a revolutionary situation would be a waste of time, in their view, hence it is necessary to act immediately, or so they think. As for the subjective factor, they allege that the armed fight itself against the existing regime leads to the rise of class-conscious elements of the revolution. True, some of them, especially orthodox Maoists, admit the necessity for an advanced revolutionary organization. However, they, too, believe that a minimum of organization is enough to begin the armed struggle during which the revolutionary movement will grow in scale and strength.

The only form of revolution, as the Leftist elements see it, is the non-peaceful one, that is, revolutionary guerrilla war. "Everything for the armed struggle!" is what they write and say. Iran's Maoists talk a lot about the towns being surrounded by the countryside and about the key role of the peasants as the main motive force of the revolution. Making an absolute of a definite non-peaceful form of the revolution and the appeal for immediate action have already given rise to

some thoroughly adventurist and futile moves that ended in bloodshed and defeat.

The Leftist elements consider tactical methods of struggle immaterial. They minimize the importance of everyday struggle for democratic rights and reforms, legal trade union activity, all of which they dismiss as reformist and opportunist distortions. They do not see the national democratic character of our revolution nor its motive forces and deal with the issue of the hegemony of the proletariat in this revolution incorrectly and in abstract fashion. They fully reject the fight for the non-capitalist road of development. These false views, couched in high-sounding, ultra-revolutionary terms, may occasionally mislead young and inexperienced people, particularly students. Gnoseologically, they are due to subjectivism and voluntarism, a faulty notion of the relation between the revolutionary vanguards and the mass of the people, and misconception of Lenin's idea of the revolution as the activity of the people.

However, those who stick to these wrong views are not alike. Some of them err in good faith and we must concentrate on winning them over through calm counter-propaganda based on logic and persuasion. On the other hand, there are rogues whose policy often leads to the abuse of the revolutionary energy of the people.

As for the Right-wing elements, some of them once held radical views but now cooperate with the establishment or are even members of the government party, *Iran e Navin* and other legal organizations. Significantly, the newspaper of this party freely uses Marxist terms and propositions, but, of course, it does so with the aim of serving the ruling classes.

What the Right opportunist elements of Iran say about the social revolution boils down to the following. There are two kinds of revolution: (a) *red*, which is alleged to be necessarily accompanied by violence and bloodshed; (b) *white*, which can be carried out without violence or bloodshed, without a rising from below, within the framework of the legal institutions and possibilities.

Those Rightists who already cooperate openly with the regime describe certain bourgeois-reformist measures adopted by the government in recent years as a "white" revolution and even a "national democratic revolution." Other Right-wing elements, those in the opposition, speak

of the regime's reforms in flattering terms but still consider them half-hearted and inadequate. To their mind, the task is to urge the government on along its chosen path by peaceful, legal means.

The Right opportunist elements, those in the opposition, make an absolute of tactical and legal methods of struggle. By adducing various arguments to the effect that the revolution should not be hastened or furthered artificially, they virtually deny the imperative task of training the masses for the revolution, both organizationally and ideologically. Their line of reasoning does not rule out the possible convergence of capitalism and socialism. Accordingly, they reject the "classical" forms of revolution.

The Party takes a fundamentally different view of the situation in the country and in its statements about the pressing revolutionary tasks of the working class in the difficult conditions of today proceeds from the following.

The past decade has seen certain changes in the socio-economic situation whose historical substance is the development of capitalist relations of production in urban and rural Iran. The remnants of feudalism are fast disappearing. All government reforms, including the agrarian reform, are intended to accelerate capitalist development, which goes on in close cooperation with imperialist countries. These reforms are a belated by-product of the Iranian bourgeois revolution of the early twentieth century and of a revolutionary movement that assumed a vast scale after World War II but was defeated due to various objective and subjective causes. Like all bourgeois reforms, the Iranian government's measures, advertised as an unprecedented "white revolution" or a "revolution of the Shah and the people," are half-hearted and inadequate. They can by no means resolve the profound contradictions of our society, in particular the contradiction between the Iranian people, who want political and economic independence for their country, and imperialism, or the contradiction between the people, who are striving for democracy and progress, and bourgeois and landowner reaction. However, these reforms may for a time stabilize the situation in favor of the ruling circles, hold back, check or slow down the people's liberation movement for a while, create illusions and make for the rise of opportunist views.

We know that all this is temporary, that

the revolutionary movement will reach a new high and that the bourgeois and half-hearted character of the reforms will soon come out. Nevertheless, we cannot in our daily struggle act on prerequisites that are still lacking. The revolutionary movement is at an ebb, having suffered a severe defeat and great losses in sanguinary battles. The task is to re-establish the organization destroyed by the enemy and train the masses for new political and economic struggles. We must educate new revolutionary cadres in the spirit of revolutionary staunchness, creative Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. This requires calm, persistent and imaginative effort. It is in this situation that Leftist

elements call for immediate armed action while the Rightists claim that the era of classical revolutionary battles is over and that we are now in a period of legal evolutionary struggle within the framework of the regime. Both positions are absolutely wrong and prejudice the cause of the revolution.

Lenin's theory of the social revolution is our only guide in these complicated conditions of ideological struggle. On the eve of a memorable event, the centenary of the birth of Lenin, to whose genius and titanic exploit progressive mankind pays tribute, we all turn again and again to his immense ideological legacy for advice on how to carry on our difficult struggle.

Interconnection of struggle for democracy and struggle for socialism

ERKKI RAUTEE

Shortly before the October Revolution Lenin sharply criticized fellow-Communists who did not realize the interconnection of the struggle for democracy and the struggle for socialism. Although capitalism in general and imperialism in particular make an illusion of democracy, capitalism arouses democratic aspirations among the masses and creates democratic institutions. This aggravates the contradictions between imperialism, which denies democracy, and the masses, which strive for democracy. "The Marxist solution of the problem of democracy," Lenin wrote, "is for the proletariat to *utilize all* democratic institutions and aspirations in its class struggle against the bourgeoisie in order to prepare for its overthrow and assure its own victory . . . Marxism teaches us that to 'fight opportunism' by renouncing utili-

zation of the democratic institutions created and distorted by the bourgeoisie of the *given*, capitalist, society is to *completely surrender* to opportunism" (Vol. 23, p. 26).

Lenin took a most ironical view of those who visualized the socialist revolution merely as a struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. "So," he commented, "one army lines up in one place and says, 'We are for socialism,' and another, somewhere else and says, 'We are for imperialism,' and that will be a social revolution! . . . Whoever expects a 'pure' social revolution will *never* live to see it. Such a person pays lip-service to revolution without understanding what revolution is" (Vol. 22, pp. 355-56).

The advocates of "pure" revolution tended to isolate the working class from

the anti-imperialist, national liberation movements for democratic change and from other powerful allies. Lenin pointed out that the common interests of the struggle for national liberation and democracy, like the struggle for socialism, call for a united revolutionary front. The socialist revolution, he stressed, is a many-sided process which develops differently in different conditions and consists of diverse liberation movements—socialist, democratic and national. "We would be very poor revolutionaries," he wrote, "if, in the proletariat's great war of liberation for socialism, we did not know how to utilize every popular movement against every single disaster imperialism brings . . ." (Vol. 22, p. 357).

The task of uniting the revolutionary forces holds a key place in Lenin's theory of the socialist revolution. Lenin considered that to accomplish it, one must correctly combine the struggle for democracy with the struggle for socialism.

The Document of the 1969 Meeting notes that it is a common feature of both "Left"-wing and Right-wing opportunism that either trend underrates the real forces that can and should be brought into the struggle. The two trends are also united by the fact that they set the struggle for greater democracy apart from the struggle for socialism and oppose one to the other. Right-wing opportunism maintains that it is enough to fight for democracy while "Left"-wing opportunism rejects it altogether and insists on heading straight for the socialist revolution. The Communist position is stated in the Document of the Moscow Meeting as follows: "In contrast to the Right and 'Left' opportunists, the Communist and Workers' Parties do not counterpose the fight for deep-going economic and social demands and for advanced democracy to the struggle for socialism, but regard it as a part of the struggle for socialism. The radical democratic changes which will be achieved in the struggle against the monopolies and their economic domination and political power will promote among the broad masses awareness of the need for socialism."

We Finnish Communists follow the Leninist method of uniting forces, striving to combine the struggle against the monopolies with the struggle for socialism. According to our program, the range of social, economic and political demands should widen in step with the common struggle of the democratic forces against

the monopolies, reaching deeper and deeper into the social system and the political relations of power and property prevailing under it. As the struggle goes on the majority of our working people is coming to realize the necessity for socialist change. It follows that every notable democratic reform is also a step towards socialism. The fight for democracy is, in effect, part of the fight for socialism.

We are also trying to reveal the forces that should be united in the anti-monopoly front. Favorable objective conditions for their unity are created by the fact that the contradiction between the overwhelming majority of the nation and the financial oligarchy is increasing, as the Document of the Moscow Meeting points out. The new program of our Party, for its part, speaks of the intensification of this contradiction and the shrinking of the social base of the monopolies resulting from it. The monopoly oligarchy is not only causing resentment among growing segments of the population, but is bringing the forces opposed to monopoly closer together. This, our Party program notes, means that the prerequisites of forming a broad anti-monopoly alliance of diverse groups of the population and the organizations representing them are already at hand.

Both the Document of the Moscow Meeting and our Party program emphasize that the working class, the main force of this alliance, must play the decisive role in establishing the anti-monopoly, anti-imperialist alliance. Due to the mounting influence of the working class, other social strata are drawing nearer to this alliance, which is growing stronger as a result. Closer unity of the working class implies cooperation between Communists and Social-Democrats. In our country the parties of the working class representing these two political trends of the labor movement are supported by the bulk of the working class and a substantial proportion of other groups of working people. This is why the success of the anti-monopoly struggle for democracy and socialism hinges in decisive measure on their cooperation. The program of our Party addresses to the Social-Democrats striving sincerely for socialism the following appeal: "Those Finnish Social-Democrats who really want socialism can only achieve their goal through joint effort with the Communists. Anyone who wants to bring about socialism by peaceful methods and to prevent and repulse violence against socialist develop-

ment should strive to ensure that the combined forces of the working people gain in strength and the partisans of socialism grow in numbers."

We can now state that our appeal did not go unheeded. More and more Social-Democrats are demanding a socialist policy and lasting cooperation between the parties of the working class. Indeed, some leading Social-Democrats in important positions take what is to a degree a favorable stand on this demand. The socialist-minded Left wing of the Social-Democratic Party, composed mainly of young intellectuals, enjoys widespread support among the party rank-and-file. This came out during the recent nomination of Social-Democratic candidates for election to the Diet throughout the country. It seems that the Left Social-Democrats have a particularly strong following among young worker Social-Democrats.

The Left wing of the Social-Democratic Party, which insists on a socialist policy and united action by the parties of the working class, is trying to establish contacts with like-minded people all over the country. A short time ago it published on its own initiative a statement reading in part as follows:

"The oligarchic power of big capital, backed by the Constitution, must be replaced by power of the working majority. In striving for this goal, the working-class parties should become the shock brigade that will lead the struggle for socialism, raising the class consciousness of the

working people and harnessing their energy to meaningful action."

The statement emphatically demands preserving the basis of the present government also after the forthcoming general election. It insists that the future government declaration should be "directed in content towards a real transformation of society."

This revival of socialist thinking and the Social-Democratic Party's growing desire for unity of action bear out the correctness of the Document of the Moscow Meeting, which says that the experience gained by the working class in struggle and the criticism levelled at opportunism by the Communist parties are aggravating the crisis of reformism and hastening differentiation among the Social-Democrats.

We Finnish Communists are doing our best to achieve unity of the working-class parties. We always stress, however, that the Social-Democrats must put paid to their policy of class cooperation with the bourgeoisie. At the same time we try to end underestimation in our own ranks of united action by the working-class parties and the fight for democracy. Right-wing opportunism, which follows a policy of compromise with the bourgeoisie, forgetting the socialist objectives of the working-class movement, and "Left"-wing opportunism, which blocks united action by the working-class movement and minimizes the struggle for democracy, are an equally grave menace to the movement for socialism.

ORDER NOW

Peace and Socialism Publishers are putting out the full texts of all the contributions to the international theoretical conference "Leninism and Our Time." Abridged texts will be found in this and the previous issue of **World Marxist Review**.

The book will appear in English, French, German and Spanish editions. Orders should be addressed to Peace and Socialism, Thakurova 3, Prague 6, Czechoslovakia.

Lenin on fight for democracy in capitalist countries with particular reference to Britain

BETTY MATTHEWS

At a time when reaction in Europe was trying to drown the revolutionary upsurge following on the October Revolution and in the aftermath of the world war, Lenin wrote his penetrating analysis of the nature of capitalist democracy. His polemic with Kautsky cut through all the talk about democracy in general and "pure" democracy, which was used by Social-Democratic leaders to mask capitalist society and to pose parliamentarianism against revolution.

By treating the question of democracy in relation to *classes in society* and in relation to the *state* he brought out the *class* character of democracy. Historically, capitalist democracy was an advance on feudalism, but in essence it is the expression of the political power of the capitalist class, wielded in order to protect an economic system based on the exploitation of the majority of the people.

To illustrate:

"If we are not to mock at common sense and history, it is obvious that we cannot speak of 'pure democracy' so long as different *classes* exist; we can only speak of *class* democracy (Vol. 28, p. 242).

"'Pure democracy' is the mendacious phrase of a liberal who wants to fool the workers. History knows of bourgeois democracy which takes the place of feudalism, and of proletarian democracy which takes the place of bourgeois democracy" (Vol. 28, p. 242).

"Bourgeois democracy, although a great historical advance in comparison with mediaevalism, always remains, and under ca-

pitalism is bound to remain, restricted, truncated, false and hypocritical, a paradise for the rich and a trap and a snare and a deception for the exploited, for the poor" (Vol. 28, p. 243).

The deeply entrenched influence of reformism has served to dress up the state in neutral clothing, presenting it as impartial and above classes. And at the same time reformist leaders have assiduously cultivated false ideas to the effect that Britain is the pinnacle of democracy. These ideas have been spread under conditions in which the ruling class has cleverly presented victories won by workers and progressives through struggle—such as the right to vote, to organize in trade unions, to demonstrate — as if these rights are inherent in capitalist democracy. In fact, each of these rights has been wrested from the ruling class through sharp battles.

Lenin's study of reformism in Britain in the imperialist epoch, his knowledge of leaders and trends in the movement and his direct experience of living in London enabled him both to develop on Marx' and Engels' treatment of the roots of reformism and to make an outstanding contribution to combating the ideas of leaders like Ramsay MacDonald.

While exposing the class character of democracy under capitalism and the role of Labor leaders who buttress up the system, Lenin did not take a negative attitude to the struggle for democracy under capitalism. He brought out the importance of this struggle, the necessity of it as part of the

process of preparing for the socialist revolution and the fact that the working class must be in the forefront of the democratic struggle.

To illustrate:

"All 'democracy' consists in the proclamation and realization of 'rights' which under capitalism are realizable only to a very small degree and only relatively. But without the proclamation of these rights, without a struggle to introduce them now, immediately, without training the masses in the spirit of this struggle, socialism is impossible" (Vol. 23, p. 74).

"In the same way as there can be no victorious socialism that does not practise full democracy so the proletariat cannot prepare for its victory over the bourgeoisie without an all-round, consistent and revolutionary struggle for democracy" (Vol. 22, p. 144).

This approach was applied by Lenin to specific questions in the struggle against capitalism. In particular he combated tendencies on the part of class-conscious workers to cut themselves off from the masses. He argued against those who refused to make use of all forms of struggle under capitalism, including the parliamentary. While appreciating the revolutionary spirit of this Left trend, which rebelled against the corruption and class collaboration of reformist leaders and their identification with parliamentarianism, he showed how their attitude made the task of undermining reformism more protracted, more difficult.

Lenin's dialectical treatment of capitalist democracy—its class and restricted character on the one hand and the importance of the fight for democracy on the other—has profound implications for the struggle today. For reformism, though undermined by the weakening of imperialism, exerts a deep influence and prevents the working class from fully using its power.

Writing in 1916 about the economic essence of imperialism and its political expression Lenin said:

"Economically, imperialism (or the 'era' of finance capital—it is not a matter of words) is the highest stage in the development of capitalism, one in which production has assumed such big, immense proportions, that *free competition* gives way to *monopoly*. That is the *economic* essence of imperialism. Monopoly manifests itself in trusts, syndicates, etc., in the omnipotence of the giant banks, in the buying up of raw material sources, etc., in the concentration

of banking capital, etc. Everything hinges on economic monopoly.

"The political superstructure of this new economy, of monopoly capitalism (imperialism is monopoly capitalism) is the change from democracy to political reaction. Democracy corresponds to free competition. Political reaction corresponds to monopoly . . . Imperialism is . . . the 'negation' of *democracy in general*, of *all democracy* and not just one of its demands, national self-determination" (Vol. 23, pp. 42-43).

The insight of these remarks and their implication for the class struggle can be fully appreciated today. In the intervening period that "negation of democracy" has been expressed in fascism in Germany, Italy and Spain. It is expressed at present in trends towards authoritarianism in the major capitalist countries and in the dictatorships of Greece and Portugal.

For the socialist, working-class and progressive forces, it has been a period of challenge to extreme reaction, in which major victories have been won and imperialism breached by the Great October Revolution and since then the development of socialism in Eastern Europe and in the Far East, arising out of the anti-fascist war.

In the course of the past 50 years and especially in the struggle against fascism the importance of the struggle for democratic rights and demands has been proved again and again. As Dimitrov expressed it at the 7th World Congress:

"We are not anarchists and it is not at all a matter of indifference to us what kind of political regime exists in any given country; whether a bourgeois dictatorship in the form of bourgeois democracy, even with democratic rights and liberties greatly curtailed, or a bourgeois dictatorship in open fascist form.

"We shall defend every inch of the democratic gains which the working class has wrested in the course of years of struggle, and shall resolutely fight to extend such gains" (Dimitrov Speech in Reply to Discussion on the Working Class Against Fascism. 1935).

A feature of state-monopoly capitalism today is the rapid growth of monopoly in the capitalist countries, straddling frontiers and creating supranational monopolies. This has brought about a new stage in the crisis of capitalist democracy and a new threat to the people.

As John Gollaan expressed it at the 31st Congress of our Party:

"This menacing growth of monopoly is one of the biggest issues of British politics. The super trusts not only dominate the Government, they are in effect a government within the Government. They dominate all the economic departments. The democratic process is undermined. The trusts control the press and the mass media. They are becoming increasingly impatient with Parliament as such. They want to hamstring the unions."

The erosion of democratic rights, and trends towards authoritarianism are being accompanied by ideological currents aimed at assisting extreme reaction, as demonstrated in Enoch Powell's racist propaganda. At the same time the ultra Lefts are attacking Parliament, and on this question they meet on common ground with the Right.

There are growing signs of the possibilities for defeating the challenge from monopoly. An outstanding feature of the political scene is the many-sided struggle for economic, political and democratic demands. This was shown by the industrial action of the Trade Union Movement, when it defeated the attempts of Wilson's Government to impose penal legislation against the right to strike. It is demonstrated in the civil rights movement, in mass actions on many issues by the youth.

Today the struggle to defend and extend democracy in Britain is of supreme importance if the working class and progressive forces are to defeat the attacks of monopoly and open up the path to social advance.

The relationship between the struggle for democracy under capitalism and the fight for socialism was brought out very clearly when Lenin wrote:

"Socialism is impossible without democracy because: (1) the proletariat cannot perform the socialist revolution unless it prepares for it by the struggle for democracy; (2) victorious socialism cannot consolidate its victory and bring humanity to the withering away of the state without implementing full democracy" (Vol. 23, p. 74).

Our Program, *The British Road to Socialism*, sees the fight for democracy as an integral part of preparing for the socialist revolution. It shows how the fight for democratic demands both strengthens the people in the movements of today and helps towards the winning of political

power, through a broad popular alliance, led by the working class.

Such an alliance takes shape in the course of class struggles on wages, peace, housing and rents, education, democratic demands and many other questions. Its growth depends on uniting the working class and freeing it from the grip of Right-wing Social-Democracy and to effect this a mass Communist Party is indispensable.

The dynamic of this development is massive class struggles, expressed in strikes and in popular pressure through demonstrations and other forms of action locally and nationally. The battleground is in the factories, the streets, the mass organizations, Parliament and the Councils.

These struggles help bring about profound changes in the outlook of the people and are reflected in a new relationship of forces in the organizations of the Labor Movement and in Parliament, resulting in a new kind of parliamentary majority, able to form a Socialist Government, pledged to fight for a socialist program.

So the process of challenging the monopolists on the many issues of struggle and of making inroads into their rule, leads to a position where conditions are created for challenging their political power. This challenge is made through a combination of the strength of the working class and its allies in action outside Parliament and the expression of this power inside Parliament itself.

Speaking of the importance of democratic demands in the battle for social change, our Program says:

"This aspect of the struggle assumes greater importance than ever as the power of the monopolists grows, and the threat to democracy becomes more open. The British people have a long, deeply rooted history of struggle for democratic rights; and this makes it possible to win wide sections of them in action to preserve what has been won, and to make new gains. Every step that extends the people's control over the affairs of the country weakens the power of big business.

"Freedom of speech, of meeting, the right to organize, demonstrate, lobby, picket and strike—all are vital in securing any economic and political change."

This struggle not only makes inroads into the rule of monopoly, but in the course of it the confidence of the working people in their power is built up. Those in action on democratic demands are brought up against the limitations of a society

based on economic exploitation and against the real character of the capitalist state. Such experiences develop understanding of the need to break through the confines of

the present system, to challenge the ruling class, to take political power and open the way for a new and higher form of democracy—socialist democracy.

Lenin's cooperative plan in Bulgaria

IVAN PRYMOV

The Bulgarian Communist Party's main point of departure has always been Lenin's theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat as the instrument of the proletarian revolution and the principal prerequisite of the socialist remaking of society, agriculture included.

Lenin's principle of establishing cooperatives on a voluntary basis does not rule out and, indeed, implies and requires decisive assistance from the socialist state to overcome the working peasants' private-ownership mentality.

After the victory of the socialist revolution in Bulgaria the Party launched on a policy of building socialism at once in town and country, a policy embodied in the historic decisions of the 5th Party Congress.

Addressing the 5th Congress of the BCP in 1948, Georgi Dimitrov said: "Nationalized industry, developing according to the laws of extended socialist reproduction, that is, increasing output year after year and setting up new enterprises, will require increasing quantities of foodstuffs and agricultural raw materials. Small-commodity individual farming with its low productivity cannot meet the growing needs of industry, the urban population and the army in adequate measure. This poses the problem of reshaping agriculture on socialist principles simultaneously with the socialist reshaping and development of industry. People's democratic power and socialist development cannot rest long on two different pillars: a large-scale, centralized socialist industry

and a fragmented and backward agriculture with a low output. We must gradually but systematically and perseveringly put agriculture on a new technical basis — large-scale production — through cooperation of individual peasant farms and establishment of large mechanized agricultural cooperatives."

By 1958 and 1959 agriculture had been fully reorganized on a socialist basis. The establishment of the cooperative system in agriculture meant that Dimitrov's line approved by the 5th Congress had become reality. The BCP adopted Lenin's cooperative plan as the theoretical basis on which to reorganize agriculture along socialist lines.

Our Party's modest contribution to the application and promotion of this plan lies in the fact that the form of production cooperative was discovered and put to use in our conditions. This form preserved small private ownership of the land which the peasant brought into the cooperative. Another contribution made by the BCP to the application of Lenin's cooperative plan was that we began the socialist reorganization of agriculture before we had a developed industry of our own, using the assistance of the Soviet Union with its developed industry.

We had no need for nationalizing land, because when the people's power was established there was an ocean of small holders and only an insignificant number of large estates. In our conditions, nationali-

zation of land would, in effect, amount to expropriating the small holder.

The right of private ownership of land in the cooperatives was in evidence in the distribution of incomes. The peasant members of cooperatives received emoluments not only for labor done, but also for the land which they made available for cooperative use. This distribution, through which the members' private ownership of land based on their labor was realized, played a positive role in attracting the middle peasants to cooperatives. *However, when the cooperatives became stronger organizationally, economically and financially, their members gradually and voluntarily accepted the socialist principle of distribution for labor only. Thus, what happened was a socialization of land without nationalization. The agricultural cooperatives turned into consistently socialist farms, without survivals of non-labor distribution and leaving no room for the exploitation of man by man.*

Formation of cooperatives in Bulgaria was accompanied by a sharp class struggle against the big bourgeoisie in the town and the kulaks in the countryside, who put up fierce resistance.

At first the BCP pursued a policy of restricting the kulaks and forcing them out of their positions. This policy expressed itself in a number of anti-capitalist measures in the rural areas that were enthusiastically supported by the peasants. The main task was to wrest the means of production from the capitalist elements in rural Bulgaria, to close all channels to the exploitation of working peasants.

The policy of restricting and ousting the kulaks in the countryside, coupled with a drive to draw working peasants into cooperatives with extensive help from the state in consolidating the cooperative system, brought about the elimination of kulaks as a class. By spring 1956, having analyzed the new conditions, the Party and Government considered it possible to admit ex-kulaks to cooperatives, withholding from them the right of serving in executive posts. In the cooperatives, a section of the former exploiting elements successfully underwent a process of re-education.

The cooperative system radically changed the class structure in the countryside. The stratification of peasants with contradictory, even opposite, interests is a thing of the past. After entering the cooperatives, agricultural laborers and poor and middle

peasants consolidated into one class, the class of cooperative peasants.

The deep-going socio-economic changes, including the victory of the cooperative system in the countryside, have radically changed the mentality, ideology and psychology of the peasants. The spirit of collectivism is increasingly gaining ground and a socialist consciousness is emerging among cooperative farmers.

The peasants' personal interests blend in the cooperatives with the interests of the collective. As he works in the cooperative, the farmer learns from experience that his higher standard of living and cultural level stem not from actions against the collective, but from the success of the collective and of all society. This is typical also of our entire society. The interests of workers and peasants coincide because they have the same economic basis. This being so, we are astonished when some comrades speak of the need for opposition under socialism. To demand an opposition under socialism is the same as to demand opposition to socialism, to the people. Acceptance of this demand is tantamount to creating favorable conditions for the anti-socialist elements and international imperialist reaction.

In consolidating and advancing the cooperative system, the Party acted on the Marxist-Leninist teaching about the determinative role of the material and technical basis in building socialism and communism. The government gave extensive material, financial and organizational assistance to the cooperatives. As a result the agricultural cooperatives possess a powerful and steadily growing modern technical basis. Mechanization, chemicalization and melioration are now the pillars of agriculture. At present, 30 times as much farm land as in 1944 is irrigated. This comprises 21 per cent of the country's total arable land. The total of tractors (in terms of 15-hp units) in the People's Republic of Bulgaria was in excess of 84,000 in 1968 against 3,500 in 1944.

We now have 17.5 tractors per thousand hectares of arable land, whereas Greece had 5.6 and Turkey 1.4 in 1967-68. Total harvester combines exceed 15,000 and trucks 18,000.

In 1968, the farms were supplied with 842,000 tons of mineral fertilizer (pure substance) or 175 kilograms per hectare against 4 kilograms before the war. In contrast, Greece used 30 kilograms per hec-

tare, Turkey 5.3 kilograms and Italy 55 in 1966-67.

The modern image of the material and technical basis of agriculture includes *irrigation*. At present about one million hectares of farm land is irrigated. It may be noted that 70 per cent of the new irrigation schemes in our country are either stationary or semi-stationary.

Fruit growing and viniculture have been reconstructed. The cooperatives and state farms have developed some 300,000 hectares of new industrialized complexes, cultivated with both ground machinery and from aircraft.

The rapidly growing *fodder industry* is another new element of our material and technical basis, its capacity climbing to 1,500,000 tons of fodder mixtures annually in the past four or five years. Other highlights are *rice plantations, vegetable plantations, modern storage facilities, handling centers, fruit storage facilities, refrigerators, and poultry and animal farms producing eggs, milk and meat.*

Agricultural science and agricultural specialists are the reliable support of socialist agriculture. They are the immediate bearers of scientific knowledge and are continuously and successfully introducing science into practice with the object of raising the agricultural production of Bulgaria to the highest world level. There are today about 13,000 specialists in the 857 cooperatives and 150 state farms. Some 88 per cent of the specialists have a higher, and the rest a secondary, education.

The modern material and technical basis, extensive application of science and technical progress have provided conditions for the continued growth of agricultural output.

The distinctive feature of the present stage is the steady and considerable growth of the role played by cooperatives in increasing production, increasing the national income and raising the productivity of labor. Total agricultural output more than doubled between 1949 and 1968, while the productivity of labor in farming rose more than fourfold. The yields of the main crops and the productivity of animal husbandry have likewise increased.

Considerable changes have also taken place in the farmers' way of life. The payment they receive for work in cooperatives has increased considerably. The big gap in the past between the incomes of the urban and rural population — 3:1 — has been closed. The annual income of a cooperative

member is nearly equal to that of an industrial employee. Back in 1957, cooperative members became eligible for pensions and social insurance in the event of accident or incapacitation. Medical and community services have been organized on a broad scale.

The face of the Bulgarian village has changed beyond recognition. Ninety per cent of the village dwellings are new and all villages have electricity.

Education is now tuition-free and extends to all children of school age. Secondary schooling has been provided to more than 80 per cent of the children of cooperative members and state-farm workers. There are many villages these days, where almost all young people get a secondary or specialized education, and quite a few even a higher education. This notable fact will have a great bearing on socialist Bulgaria's successful development in the coming period. *There is every reason to say that the cultural revolution is making momentous strides in the modern Bulgarian village, as well as in the town. In that respect, too, the village is increasingly approaching the town.*

At present, our cooperative system is on the threshold of a new stage of development. The Party has directed the attention and energy of the leading cadres in agriculture, as well as those of all people working in agriculture, on the main issues, the issues of intensification and of equipping all branches of agriculture with modern technology, and of substantially increasing the productivity of labor. The Party has issued directives centering attention on the maximum use of the intensive factors of economic growth: a high degree of concentration and specialization in production, and extensive introduction of industrial methods and all the achievements of science and technical progress.

The most urgent task in agriculture today is technical reconstruction of production and management, establishing enterprises and producer organizations of a new type, based on comprehensive mechanization and automation.

The cooperatives become stronger and more viable with the development of the socialist system as a whole. The swift rate at which the scientific and technological revolution is unfolding in the socialist agriculture of Bulgaria is a logical effect of its development along the way charted by the immortal Lenin. Materializing before our very eyes are the aspirations of Marx, Len-

in and those outstanding leaders of our Party, Blagoyev and Dimitrov, who spoke of a large-scale machine industry in agriculture, of the growth of farm labor into a variety of industrial labor, and of the village rising to the town level.

The modest experience of our country attests that Leninism, the Marxism of the modern epoch, is and always will be a pro-

found scientific and theoretical foundation for the struggle to eliminate capitalism and assure the victory of socialism in all countries. That is why we must be unshakably loyal to Leninism and must apply it creatively in accordance with the concrete conditions, never departing from the universal laws discovered by Leninism on the excuse of national or other specific features.

Leninism and topical problems of revolutionary struggle in Latin America

LONGINO BECERRA

Latin America is passing through a difficult and complicated period. The peoples in our countries are beginning to understand the causes of their hardships and are becoming determined to remove them. Broad sections view North American imperialism and the local oligarchies associated with it as their bitterest enemy. And this, despite frantic propaganda to the contrary. The realities of the existing system, fashioned to exploit and oppress the vast downtrodden majority, are an objective factor in the revolutionary awakening of the masses. The growth of the process is a natural tendency, evidenced, among other things, by the upswing of democratic sentiment among the youth, intelligentsia, churchmen, military, peasants, etc. The mass manifestations during Nelson Rockefeller's recent Latin American visit, and class battles in Argentina, Uruguay, Brazil, Mexico, Chile and elsewhere, are, as we see it, a clear indication of the growth of anti-imperialist feeling and revolutionary action.

The Moscow Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in June 1969 pointed rightly to a most important factor in the revolu-

tionary movement on our continent: "Wide sections of people, students, progressive intellectuals and the urban middle strata are forming an alliance with the proletariat. Joint action and anti-imperialist unity against reactionary regimes are gaining in strength."

Naturally, this sharpening of the class struggle is creating serious problems for the most advanced revolutionary forces. The fact that objectively the struggle is expanding does not mean that activity by the foremost forces should be relegated to the background. On the contrary, a clear theoretical program is needed more than ever, coupled with vigorous revolutionary action. And this will be so as the class struggle expands in each country.

What is the main problem facing our revolutionaries in the present historical phase? Many problems could be named, but the main one is: What must be done to give added impulse to the class struggle, paving the way for decisive action in this or that Latin American country at the propitious time? Clearly, the question applies to tactics, not strategy. Hence, work-

ing out the tactics for the present historical moment is the main task. As for strategy, we hold it has been sufficiently well defined for the entire present stage, serving as the guiding star for concrete mass action. The strategic aim is to accomplish a democratic revolution of liberation, the most vital necessity in Latin America today. The main object of the revolution is to eliminate imperialist domination and the associated power of the ruling oligarchies, and carry through structural changes essential for the future building of socialism. The motive force of the revolution is a broad popular front based on the worker-peasant alliance, with the working class playing the guiding role. The main direction of the entire movement is to isolate the most reactionary sections, the neo-colonialist agents and the mercenary oligarchy in each country and to organize joint struggle by all forces with a stake in radical reconstruction.

To accomplish this cardinal task we must creatively apply Lenin's teaching to the concrete conditions in each of the countries. There is no other way. It would be a trial-and-error approach to search for solutions dissociated from Lenin's principles, principles borne out in world revolutionary experience. This approach distinguishes the Latin American Communists from other revolutionaries. For the former Leninism possesses universal significance. It is tied in with the essence of materialist dialectics and therefore applicable to the specific conditions of the Latin American countries. In the case of the latter, though some distinctions exist between them, Leninism is reduced to merely a definite doctrine based on conditions that existed in pre-revolutionary Russia and therefore inapplicable to the social problems of a different time and place.

In contrast to this and other concepts, all of them symptoms of the "infantile disorder of Leftism" in Latin America, the continent's Communists proclaim and defend the principles of Leninist tactics. To be sure, these are no magic prescriptions, no set formula relieving revolutionaries of the difficult and complicated task of analyzing concrete problems in accordance with the specific conditions and the times. Lenin wrote: "It would be absurd to formulate a recipe or general rule . . . to suit all cases" (Vol. 31, p. 68). And he added: "In this question too, as always, the task consists in learning to apply the general and basic principles of communism to the *specific relations* between classes and parties, to the *specific*

features in the objective development towards communism, which are different in each country and which we must be able to discover, study, and predict" (Ibid., p. 89).

The relevance and scientific worth of Leninist tactics is confirmed by the facts of the class struggle throughout the world. It is not because it suits them or because of a dogmatic turn of mind that the Latin American Communists counterpose Lenin's tactical principles to the ideas of the ultra-Left forces.

The Communist parties in Latin America endeavor to be consistent in applying Lenin's tactics to the concrete conditions of their particular countries. As a result, we have a diversity of forms of action, designed to assure an advance of the class struggle. Strikes, demonstrations, parliamentary activity, seizure of latifundia or enterprises, ideological struggle, agitation and, to some extent armed action, are all elements of the revolutionary struggle on the Latin American continent. The Moscow Meeting pointed to the following on this score: "The struggle of the broad masses for their economic and political demands, and for their revolutionary aims assumes diverse forms. The popular movement in Latin America is gaining momentum in a grim struggle against aggressive imperialism and internal reaction. In some countries it takes the road of armed struggle."

Working out strategy and tactics, we must take note of and understand each new phenomenon, each new fact. An objective and profound analysis in the spirit of creative Marxism-Leninism is the key to questions arising in a given situation. *Marxism is not a dogma, but a guide to action.* What this means is that theory must take into account all changes in order to improve and enrich itself on their basis and that under no circumstances must facts be adjusted to fit theory. At present we in Latin America are witness to new phenomena and processes reaffirming the significance of the great Marxist-Leninist principles. Take Peru and Bolivia: only yesterday their armies were an instrument of reprisal against workers, peasants and students; today they have declared themselves the standard-bearers of a national patriotic revolution. Not only did they declare it, but are acting accordingly. What is at the root of this phenomenon? What are the prospects? How are we to fit it into the framework of the national liberation, democratic revolution which the working class in the

Latin American countries has accepted as the means of resolving our problems? As we see it, all the things about us need to be studied and analyzed. If we succeed in finding the right answers to this diversity of burning questions, and do so in good time, we shall not go wrong in assessing the situation.

However, the new emerges not only in big events. It is also evident in minor facts, daily and everywhere. And Marxism-Leninism requires of us to consider and assess all things, however insignificant they may appear against the general setting of the class struggle, for they are liable in certain places and certain circumstances to determine the general political situation. The

scientific anticipation so extensively displaced by the classics of Marxism-Leninism stems from complete and conclusive knowledge of the concrete, though perhaps insignificant, facts of the daily struggle. This knowledge makes it possible to determine the necessity or transient historical nature of phenomena and thereby avoid surprises, avoid a situation in which the working class, the vanguard of the revolution, would fail to react to social processes correctly and in time. Definite events are unfolding these days in all the Latin American countries. And it is up to us Marxist-Leninists of Latin America to analyze and study them as closely as the more momentous events that reverberate throughout the world.

To fight opportunism— Lenin's behest

JAN FOITIK

We are entering the year of Lenin's centenary, and none knows better than we that our Communist movement owes its big successes to the fact that it draws upon Lenin's immortal heritage, upon Marxism-Leninism. Every departure from the teaching of Marx, Engels and Lenin was always inevitably accompanied by great difficulties, sometimes even critical situations.

Everybody knows about the 1968 events in Czechoslovakia. January 1968, which gave rise to great hopes, was grossly perverted by the Right opportunist forces. Our Party leadership is now making a detailed analysis to define the causes of the distortions of the post-January policy and the more profound reasons for the crisis that resulted from this policy. Although the analysis is not ready yet, we can now state that one of the causes of our crisis lay in the unprincipled, even off-hand attitude towards the complex problems facing our society.

The need to go over from an extensive to

an intensive economy became evident at the end of the fifties and early sixties. We had to work out answers to various questions concerning socialist management, improving the entire system of leadership, based on the principles of democratic centralism. It was most important to find such ways of effecting the Party's guiding role as would rally the creative forces of our society in the new conditions and cut short the tendency towards stagnation that had appeared in some areas of our work.

The Party leadership of that time underestimated the difficulties, failing to find the appropriate ways of resolving them. As a result, they began to snowball. The fact that we were carried away by the notions of the politico-moral unity of our society achieved by then and of socialist democracy, the basic guarantee for which we automatically associated with the existence of the new system, also played a distinct role in the development of the crisis. This over-confidence was one of the reasons be-

hind the deterioration of our political work and its excessive replacement with administrative methods of guidance.

In a situation where it was necessary to take bold action, facing up to the newly arising challenges and at the same time taking a stand of principle in relation to the exponents of hostile views who began to question the Party's ability to lead society, the Party proved incapable of mobilizing its forces in the theoretical and ideological sectors.

On the pretext of combating dogmatism and conservatism; the opposition elements took advantage of the Party's efforts to improve the system of leadership to launch an offensive against the Party's guiding role and undermine the centralized direction of society. Gradually, the campaign against dogmatism and conservatism developed into a crusade against Marxism-Leninism.

Awareness of the need for rational change became universal. A critical attitude towards the existing situation was natural, but the opposition forces deliberately aggravated it. This colored the acute crisis at the end of 1967 and also the method of resolving that crisis by means of the so-called post-January policy. What particularly confused people was that the struggle for the so-called democratization was conducted on the surface as a struggle for a new, better, kind of socialism. Yet, as we saw later, the objective was not democratization at all, but liquidation of socialism.

The big question is: how could this tragic substitution of one aim for another occur and so many people in the Party and outside it fall victim to demagoguery? We have replied to this question in general terms. Ideological work and education in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism was neglected for a number of years. The Party tolerated in its ranks not only people who were passive, but also those whose beliefs were alien to the Party. Underestimation of ideological work, the formal way in which it was conducted, coupled with tolerance of double-dealing, created favorable conditions for the offensive of opportunism.

Those who have studied the history of our Party and movement closely enough, will attest that there is doubtless evidence of a tendency towards Right opportunism. Speaking at the Third Congress of the Comintern in July 1921, Lenin denounced ultra-Left adventurism and called on a number of parties to display prudence, to

concentrate on work among the masses, but at the same time criticized the leadership of our Party at that time, and particularly Comrade Smeral, for excessively fearing "Left" mistakes. Referring specifically to the situation in Czechoslovakia, Lenin then stressed: "In the commission I said that in order to find the right line, Smeral must take three steps left and Kreibich a step right. Regrettably, Smeral said nothing about taking these steps. Neither has he said anything of what he thinks of the state of affairs. Concerning the difficulties, Smeral only repeated the old and said nothing new. Smeral said that I have dispelled his worries. In spring he feared that the Communist leadership would demand ill-timed action from him, but events have dispelled his fear. However, we are now worried about something entirely different, namely: will matters in Czechoslovakia really go as far as preparations for action or will they remain mere talk about difficulties? The Left mistake is simply a mistake; it is not a great one and is easily reminded. However, if the mistake concerns the determination to act, that is no small mistake, but betrayal. Such mistakes are incomparable. The theory that we shall perform the revolution, but only after others take action first, is basically wrong" (*Complete Works*, Russ. ed., Vol. 44, pp. 60-61).

That is what Lenin said of our Party soon after its founding. In recent years, allegedly in the interests of restoring the truth, many of our historians obscured the role of opportunism in the Czechoslovak Party and, what is more, cast doubt on the period when our Party endeavored to root out opportunism.

Opportunism is dangerous, because it disarms the Party, weakens its political and ideological influence, reducing it to impotence. It relies on spontaneity, is a naive optimism blind to the needs of purposeful intervention in the development of events, reacting solely to the momentary demands of the people. That is why Lenin warned that it leads to betrayal of the workers' interests, betrayal of the socialist revolution.

Monopolizing the mass information media, the Right opportunists succeeded in discrediting the principled Marxist-Leninist approach as "bureaucratic fossilization." Those who placed the interests of socialist society, the main aims of the working people, above momentary and transient group or individual interests, they portrayed as people who not only failed to under-

stand the needs of the nation, but were all but its worst enemies.

It was this demagoguery that disarmed many a Party functionary and disoriented many an honest citizen, causing a dislocation of the single system of leadership, the breakdown of the central authority. The opportunists cloaked this process in high-flown verbiage about the "unprecedented activeness of the people," about "the people possessing their own mind" and "managing splendidly without advisers," etc.

To appeal to the people, while acting against it, is an old dodge.

Lenin insistently pointed to the connection between opportunism in the socialist movement and philistine liberalism; he showed that opportunists succumbed to liberal illusions, obscuring liberalism's reactionary role in relation to the labor movement; last but not least, he also defined the contradictory role of the *intelligentsia*. This latter point merits a thorough and keen analysis. Here, we can only touch on just a few of its aspects.

To begin with, we must never allow the Leninist approach to this question to escape our field of vision. Lenin never used the term "intelligentsia" to denote anything homogeneous: he differentiated the roles of the intelligentsia, depending on which social class it associated with and whose interests it expressed. His criticism of "intellectual anarchism" referred to that intelligentsia which, while professing allegiance to socialism, introduced into the labor movement not scientific knowledge, but notions alien and hostile to the working class. And he was irreconcilably opposed to this intelligentsia.

Lenin pointed to the contradiction between contempt for organization typical of the so-called intellectual anarchism that shied away from responsibility for practical activity and the deliberately demonstrative position intended to prove "interest" in the working class and the masses.

Back in February 1905, in his article, "Two Tactics," Lenin wrote that the opportunists "plunged from one extreme to another, and in all cases reduced the scope of activity of the revolutionary proletariat and its faith in its own strength" (Vol. 8, p. 148).

On the other hand, Lenin in every way emphasized the need to win over to the side of the workers the creative forces of that intelligentsia which by its knowledge and creativity could help elevate the consciousness of the working class,

could organize and head its revolutionary struggle, could enrich its outlook, extend its scope, and raise its educational and general cultural level. The Marxist-Leninist proposition that "without revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement" emphasizes the role of the intelligentsia, while expressing intolerance of those who try to fool and misguide the working class, pushing it into the embrace of the bourgeoisie.

While he recognized the important role of the intelligentsia, Lenin levelled sharp criticism at all tendencies to deny the hegemony of the working class, which tended to weaken or reject the leading role of the revolutionary party as an organized and disciplined political vanguard of the proletariat.

It was this organization and discipline that had always been a thorn in the side of the Right opportunists. Their refusal to accept organization and discipline is rooted in a mistrust of working-class hegemony, in illusions about the supra-class position of the intelligentsia as society's leading force. The idea of the guiding role of the intelligentsia is paraded as the last word in progressiveness. The argument is that the scientific and technological revolution and the achievements of civilization have put mankind in a position from which it can save itself only by submitting to the spiritual dominance of the intelligentsia operating at present "irrespective of camps," whereas the "masses" fall prey easily to manipulations and can serve as passive objects for the centers of power.

This complete departure from the class position, disguised by references to new phenomena of the "atomic age," is the fruit of impotence and depression, of doubts generated by some of the phenomena of modern capitalism. At the same time, it is the result of pressures exerted by forces which pretend to be opposed to all the great powers, but which quite obviously try to undermine the international prestige and position of the Soviet Union, the mightiest of the socialist countries, the only one able directly to withstand all aggressive designs of imperialism.

Lenin wrote that opportunism, with its illusion of the intelligentsia's supra-class position, tries to conceal the class contradictions and, therefore, inevitably grows into nationalism, culminating in cooperation with its own bourgeoisie. Besides, now that socialism has become a world system, this time-serving nationalism, easily grow-

ing into chauvinism, is tantamount to cosmopolitanism, to cooperation with the world bourgeoisie. In the final analysis, the opportunists, liberals and anti-socialist counter-revolutionary elements in our country made good use of everything directed against the interests of the Party and the countries of the socialist community, especially the Soviet Union. To confuse the masses, they changed positions almost daily, but in so doing methodically and steadily campaigned against the Soviet Union and our other allies, true friends of our socialist state. Their first crime was to attempt to break up the socialist system of power, and their second, no less grave, was to try to destroy the guarantees of Czechoslovak sovereignty as a state ready to fulfill its international obligations. That is why all anti-Communists looked forward so impatiently to the final results of the Czechoslovak Spring and why they were so taken aback when the troops of the five friendly countries, the Warsaw Treaty states, entered Czechoslovakia.

It was quite obvious that the applause the enemies of socialism lavished on Dubcek and their solidarity with him were anything but evidence of their concern for socialism in our country. Their concern for our special model of socialism was part of a program that would ultimately dislocate our fraternal relations with the other socialist Warsaw Treaty countries and, first and foremost, bring on tensions between ourselves and the Soviet Union. We sincerely regret that misunderstandings have arisen over this issue, which, to some extent, are the result of unobjective information or a lack of understanding of Czechoslovakia's position and traditional relationship with the Soviet Union. Subse-

quent developments will, beyond doubt, expose the slander about "tank-supported communism," a slander stemming from a non-class approach, a minimization of the perils of imperialist subversion and anti-socialist activity.

We take a positive view of the Moscow Meeting of the 75 fraternal parties and of the fact that the vast majority of Communists and revolutionary workers' parties adopted a class attitude and sought united action against imperialism. Acting on Lenin's behests, the Communists must resolutely combat all those who introduce either "Left" or Right ideological confusion in their ranks.

Lenin stressed that new problems should always be resolved in accordance with the scientific principles of Marxist theory, the principle of the guiding role of the workers' Communist vanguard and the axiom of proletarian internationalism.

Those are the guidelines followed by our Party, as evidenced by the many public statements of Comrade Gustav Husak, the First Secretary of the CC CPC, and by the documents adopted by the Central Committee meetings since April 1969, carrying forward the Party program. This program, centered on consolidating the authority of the Party and the socialist state, will deliver our society from the crisis which it has been experiencing in recent years.

The centenary of the birth of Lenin, the greatest genius of our century, underscores the importance for us not only of Lenin's method of solving problems, not only the creative approach he so skillfully used, but also the basic content of his ideological heritage.

Coming issues of **World Marxist Review** will contain articles by leaders of Communist and Workers' parties, devoted to the 100th anniversary of the birth of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, the founder of the Communist Party and the Soviet state, the leader and teacher of the international working class and all working people.

Lenin's theory of revolution

MARTA BORQUES

The world situation of today, on the eve of the centenary of V. I. Lenin's birth, fully bears out the relevance and topicality of Lenin's teaching. The scope and depth of Lenin's thought and revolutionary action is brought home still more distinctly.

I would like, on behalf of the Mexican Communist Party, to present a few ideas about Lenin's theory of revolution and the different forms it takes in the present-day world. I shall speak about the development of the revolution on our continent and in my own country.

In 1918 Lenin wrote: "Not only the general European, but the world proletarian revolution is maturing before the eyes of all, and it has been assisted, accelerated and supported by the victory of the proletariat in Russia" (Vol 28, p. 293). Now, 50 years later, having carried through the proletarian revolution and following different ways in accordance with their specific conditions, 14 countries on different continents or one-third of mankind make up a powerful socialist system. Day after day this system gains new victories in building socialism, thereby accelerating the ripening of proletarian revolutions in other countries.

In June 1967 our 15th Party Congress said that for some time Latin America has been one of the world's main seats of revolutionary struggle. I should like to examine some of the characteristic features of that struggle, extending from the frontiers of my country with the United States to the southernmost point of our Hemisphere. The struggle is becoming more acute as the conditions ripen for the victory of the proletarian revolution, a fact substantiated not only in the documents issued by Communist parties, but also in the materials of the UN Economic Commission for Latin

America, where eloquent figures may be found on that score. Take the Rockefeller report on Latin America. As the bourgeois press reported, it was presented in "pessimistic shades," for it referred to the aggravation of the situation in the Latin American countries, saying that our continent was "at the crossroads." But that is not true. The peoples of Latin America know perfectly well that there is no way for them to end poverty, backwardness and cruel exploitation other than that of struggle by workers, peasants, students and the rest of the people in advancing the revolution. That precisely is the reason for the pessimism of the imperialists; that is what makes us feel optimistic, despite imperialist efforts to promote and conduct a regular war against what they call "Communist subversive activity"—in reality the movement of the peoples, headed by the Communist parties, against military dictatorships and oligarchies, the allies of imperialism, a movement against exploitation and hunger.

At present Latin America is determined to end a situation in which the continent is treated as the "backyard" and private preserve of the United States imperialists. That is why the revolutionary struggle in Latin America is daily growing sharper. Hence the dread shown by the imperialists of a possible recurrence of the Cuban revolution.

What our struggle has in common with the movement of all the peoples of the world is that it is being fought against the most powerful imperialism in history, the common enemy of all nations. The specific features of our struggle are due to the conditions in which it develops, distinguishing it from the movement of the peoples in the highly developed countries, and, also,

from the struggle of the Asia and African peoples.

The Cuban revolution, for example, is the best possible proof that democratic revolution, paving the way for an early socialist revolution, is not only possible in the immediate proximity of the citadel of imperialism but also, as Lenin taught us, inevitable, being a process not far removed in time, contrary to the expectations of imperialists. That does not mean that the Cuban experience may be applied mechanically in the other Latin American countries. The conditions of struggle differ from country to country, being determined by such objective factors as the level of economic, political and social development, etc., and such subjective ones as the degree of organization and the strength of the working class, the political parties (particularly the Communist), the degree of political consciousness, the prevailing sense of determination, etc. Thus, in some countries the struggle will assume a different complexion, and in others may even follow a different way.

What is important, however, is that all countries, regardless of the different ways they may follow or their different stages of development, face the task of bringing about the revolution, with the working class winning power in alliance with the peasants and with all other democratic forces joining the revolutionary struggle.

There are as many different ways of approaching the revolution as there are different situations. As we see it, we may speak of two stages of revolution in our country—the anti-imperialist, people's democratic revolution, which opens the way for socialist revolution as a result of an uninterrupted process, and this without a transitional period. In view of the present general tendency displayed by the bourgeoisie in their methods of government and the sharpness of the class struggle due to the application of these methods, and due to the external factors of the revolution, even due to existing traditions, that is, the historical experience of the masses, we assume that the most likely way in Mexico will be that of armed struggle.

We consider the armed way the most probable. But we also realize that this depends not only on the bourgeoisie, but also on our own resources and ability, as well as the resources and ability of the revolutionary movement as a whole, to follow the other possible way of developing and performing the revolution.

That is why we think that the crucial

task of today, for the fulfilment of which the working people and all democratic forces must apply all their energy, is to block the road to dictatorship and win genuine democratic freedoms.

The events of the past year in Mexico show clearly that the reactionary section of the bourgeoisie is prepared to go to all lengths, including resort to arms, in defending its privileges, retaining control over the masses, averting the elementary forms of protest and preventing the people from presenting their demands. We hold that consistent struggle for democracy with the participation of the working class and its political party leads to the struggle for socialism and that socialism secures the consolidation and development of genuine democracy.

In his *Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution*, Lenin pointed out: "The very position the proletariat holds as a class compels it to be consistently democratic. The bourgeoisie looks backward in fear of democratic progress which threatens to strengthen the proletariat. The proletariat has nothing to lose but its chains, but with the aid of democracy it has the whole world to win" (Vol. 9, p. 51). Thus, struggle for democracy is at present the crucial task, lying at the root of all the problems facing the Mexican people. This was evident during the popular and student movement that shook our country between July and December 1968. Elementary democratic demands were presented in the course of that movement. Each day larger sections of the people express their discontent and growing anger over the methods of reprisal adopted by a government representing the interests of the big capitalists and the monopoly bourgeoisie, economically dominant in the country in close alliance with U.S. imperialism.

In 1968 unrest gripped the mass of the people. The scale of the movement was far greater than at any other time in the past 30 years of the working-class, peasant and student struggle. In that way, the masses gave expression to the Mexican spirit of independence, displaying a model of combat-readiness, fighting spirit and heroism. Those were qualities most strikingly in evidence among the younger generation. Although the popular and student movement was suppressed by methods of violence, it was an instructive lesson for future battles, because considerable experience was gained from it.

The attitude of the ruling bourgeoisie

towards the 1968 democratic movement was no more than a logical culmination of the past attitude. The bourgeoisie had no other recourse but genocide, a cold-blooded collective killing, fulfilling its class mission of grave-digger of freedom and democracy. Last year's cruel reprisals, still continuing today, were prompted less by the nature of the demands or the methods used by the masses, and much more by the main aim of preventing the emergence of an independent force in opposition to the bourgeois policy. However, by doing so the bourgeoisie only adds to the causes likely to lead to new explosions, explosions that will be increasingly powerful. And each time the bourgeoisie will have greater difficulties in coping with them, in suppressing them. The policy of the bourgeoisie is shortsighted, though the bourgeoisie thinks that it is acting long-sightedly. In other words, it is creating conditions in which the class struggle and the fight for the democratic demands acquires extremely acute forms. The bourgeoisie has seemingly forgotten that he who sows the wind will reap the whirlwind.

Thus, the task of winning *political democracy* has forged to the forefront, for without it the masses, the entire Mexican people and, first of all, the working class, will not be able to safeguard their rights and resolve the problems facing the country. That is the task which can—and already does—bring together not only the most conscious elements of the working class and the farmers, but also the intellectuals, students and increasingly large sections of the petty and even middle bourgeoisie.

However, despite its importance, the fight for civil rights and democratic freedoms does not lead to the solution of all the problems, a solution which may secure a new type of development for our country. For that it is necessary to change the present power structure and eliminate the basis for the dictatorial methods of the government; namely: the economic power of the financial oligarchy closely connected with U.S. imperialism. In present Mexican conditions, the fight for democracy is a necessary step helping to pave the way for proletarian revolution.

In his *The State and Revolution*, Lenin wrote: "To develop democracy to the utmost, to find the forms for this development, to test them by practice, and so forth—all this is one of the component tasks of the struggle for the social revolution. Taken separately, no kind of democracy will bring socialism. But in actual life

democracy will never be 'taken separately'; it will be 'taken together' with other things, it will exert its influence on economic life as well, will stimulate its transformation; and in its turn it will be influenced by economic development, and so on. This is the dialectics of living history" (Vol. 25, pp. 452-53).

That is exactly how we see the probable development of the fight for revolution and socialism in our country. We hold that we still have a long way to go, that we must organize and gather strength to resolve the tasks facing our people and to fulfil the responsible role that devolves on our Party. Our 15th Congress said: "The entire development of the internal and international situation confronts the revolutionary movement in our country with new, more important tasks, calling for a greater sense of responsibility, for greater skill in guiding the increasing activity of the workers, peasants, and other sections. The need to orientate the mass movement, leading it towards the main political aims of the present period, is now increasingly great. Only a party possessing extensive and close ties with the masses, *guided by the scientific theory of social development*, a party that, leaning on the main revolutionary class, will unite all the revolutionary forces and trends in the fight for common objectives, only such a party can fulfil this task."

This means that we consider as an imperative precondition of revolution, whose inevitability Lenin proved in practice, a party capable of taking the lead, of guiding the masses, on the basis of the scientific theory worked out by Marx and Engels and brilliantly developed by Lenin.

The principles of that theory are extraordinarily rich in content, and its scientific character enables us to apply it in practice in any situation, at any moment, provided this is done creatively, avoiding a mechanistic or dogmatic use of formulas which rob it of effectiveness and force. It is futile to apply that theory out of context with the diversity of our complicated and continuously changing reality. The scientific theory of Marx and Lenin requires a complete, not a one-sided, analysis of the situation. Marxism-Leninism is for us an instrument whereby we apprehend reality such as it is, not such as we should like it to be, an instrument for working out the orientation of our activity. To turn Marxism-Leninism into a mould and try to fit reality into it, is to distort it entirely.

Lenin wrote in his *Letters from Afar*: "There are no miracles in nature or history,

but every abrupt turn in history, and this applies to every revolution, presents such a wealth of content, unfolds such unexpected and specific combinations of forms of

struggle and alignment of forces of the contestants, that to the lay mind there is much that must appear miraculous" (Vol. 23, p. 297).

Lenin and labor movement in Sweden

KNUT BECKSTROM

The Socialist labor movement and other progressive, democratic forces in Sweden have always followed revolutionary developments in Russia with keen attention and great hope. Axel Danielson, a leading spokesman for the Socialist labor movement in Sweden, said as far back as the 1890s that in Russia socialist ideas had acquired "much greater importance than in our country."

K. N. Karlsson, a Marxist journalist writing for *Socialdemokraten*, described the news of the revolutionary events in Russia in January 1905 as the "dawn of a new day."

In April 1917, when it became known that Lenin would return to Russia via Stockholm, *Politiken*, the paper of the Swedish Left Socialists, wrote: "The man whose portrait appears in this paper is one of the best known leaders of Russian Social-Democracy. He has grown with the mass movement of the Russian proletariat. His life and all his thoughts and deeds are inseparably linked with the destiny of the Russian proletariat. In good and bad times alike, at the culmination of the revolution as in the long years of counter-revolutionary persecution, Lenin remained loyal to the interests of the working class and the International. His only goal is socialism. Lenin only recognizes one method, the class struggle. He only recognizes one hero, the international revolutionary proletariat."

Politiken, noting Lenin's salient characteristics, wrote of "the unfailing energy and the extraordinary clarity of principles

which in the years of reaction helped him remain loyal to revolutionary Social-Democracy and unite his fellow-thinkers under the banner of the International."

Lenin visited Sweden six times. For all the brevity of his visits, he always used them to study Swedish conditions and strengthen his links with spokesmen of the Swedish labor movement. In 1910, when he stayed there longer, Lenin used the time at his disposal to study, among other things, social relations in Sweden and to talk with Swedish labor leaders, primarily Left Social-Democrats.

In 1910 Lenin arrived in Stockholm from the congress of the Second International in Copenhagen, where he had had talks with C. Hoglund, leader of the Swedish Left Social-Democrats. In 1908 Hoglund started *Stormklockan*, a revolutionary weekly, which afterwards became the periodical of both the Social-Democratic Youth League and the Left Social-Democrats. The Youth League, the largest and most active organization of its kind in the Europe of the time, was the Left Social-Democrats' organizational basis.

Lenin formed a clear idea of Hoglund at once. In October 1914 he wrote to A. Shlyapnikov, the Bolshevik representative in Stockholm, asking him to acquaint Hoglund with the manifesto of the CC RSDLP on the war and adding: "... He is only a naive, sentimental anti-militarist: these are the very people who should be told—either the watchword of civil war, or remain with the opportunists and the chauvinists" (Vol.

35, p. 169). However, Lenin wanted Shlyapnikov to "sound out" whether Hoglund was "ideologically close to us" (ibid.).

Regarding A. Kollontai's articles, Lenin wrote to her in May 1915: "Can one praise and find correct the position of the Left Scandinavian Social-Democrats who reject the arming of the people? I argued about this with Hoglund in 1910 and tried to prove to him that this was not Leftism, nor revolutionism, but simply the philistinism of petty-bourgeois provincials" (Vol 35, p. 189).

Nevertheless, Lenin asked both Kollontai and Shlyapnikov to continue their effort to bring Scandinavian representatives to the Zimmerwald Conference. "The Swedish Left with Hoglund," he wrote to Wijnkoop of Holland on July 30, 1915, "is on our side. I have received a letter about it today" (*Complete Works*, Russ. ed., Vol. 49, p. 114).

Hoglund was perfectly right in joining at Zimmerwald the Zimmerwald Left led by Lenin. The Zimmerwald Left found itself in a minority at the Conference, as we know. The Zimmerwald Conference condemned the war but advanced no revolutionary slogans to give the campaign against it a concrete form as Lenin and his group, including Hoglund, proposed.

Hoglund tended to confine his activity to what came to be called the Zimmerwald line. When Lenin heard that the Swedish Left was going to found its own party in accordance with the "Zimmerwald principles" he asked his Russian comrades in Scandinavia to try to dissuade the Swedish Left Socialists from the idea and "to help them work out a good program and tactics for themselves, for the new party" (Vol. 35, p. 291). "The struggle with Branting and Co.," he wrote, speaking of the Swedish Left Socialists, "is a serious business: necessity must force them to take a more serious attitude to questions of the theory and tactics of revolutionary Marxism" (Ibid., p. 292).

The Rightist leaders, with Branting at their head, moved at the Party congress in February 1917 that the Left be presented with an ultimatum: either complete political submission to the Right-wing leadership, or expulsion from the party. The Left, which earlier had often secured a majority at party congresses, was this time defeated in the delegates' elections, an outcome largely due to its desire to avoid a split in the party. And this explains why the Right

Social-Democrats' ultimatum was accepted by the congress.

The congress delegates of the Left immediately called a national conference. It met on February 20 and resolved to found a new party, setting its constituent congress for May 1917.

Hoglund was in prison at the time. He had been convicted for organizing the most important anti-war demonstration to be held in Sweden in war time. The action, known as the Labor Peace Congress, was launched in March 1916 by the Social-Democratic Youth League. But Hoglund greatly influenced the preparations for the congress.

Lenin realized better than anyone else the significance of the decision to found a Socialist Left party in the circumstances. The task of such a party would be to serve as a united class-conscious Marxist vanguard at a time when the revolutionary movement was beginning to gather strength. But the preparatory committee of the new party did not prove equal to its task. It took its cue from Hoglund's idea of uniting the widest possible range of elements, to which the most arbitrary yardsticks were applied. The only stipulation was, in fact, that prospective members of the party-to-be had to be against Branting.

At the height of these preparations Lenin and other Russian revolutionaries, who were on their way back to Russia, stopped over in Stockholm for one day, April 13, 1917. Part of the time spent by the group in Stockholm was devoted to exposing, by means of various communiques and statements, the falsehoods put about first of all by Branting and the leaders of the Right wing of the Social-Democratic Party, as well as by the press. The Right Social-Democratic leaders went so far that one of them, a Baron Palmstjarna, wrote in his diary, published later on, about his desire to take the initiative in destroying Lenin on his return to Russia.

Swedes who met the Russian revolutionaries described Lenin as an unassuming man who, however, was the dominant and uniting force. It was on Lenin that attention focussed first and foremost.

Lenin had a long personal talk with Fredrick Strom, the Left Socialist closest to Hoglund and for several years secretary of the Social-Democratic Party. Strom and other Left Socialists underrated the Swedish working people's readiness to fight. Lenin took a resolute stand against these views. "The Swedes," he said, "are an or-

ganized and educated nation. But you are pacifists. Even you who are on the Left flank are bourgeois pacifists." Lenin told Strom that the Swedish big capitalists and Branting had a clearer insight into the situation than did Strom and his comrades. This was a scathing criticism of the Left Socialist leaders. Lenin added, however, that he was sure history would teach them the right method.

In speaking of the Swedes as an organized nation, Lenin undoubtedly meant, first of all, the organizations of the Swedish working class, which already were widespread and well-knit, the exception being the political party, which was based on the principle of collective membership. Lenin greatly appreciated the readiness of the Swedish working class to fight. Special mention should be made of Lenin's estimation of the Swedish workers' campaign against the military mobilization in reply to the Norwegian people's demand for dissolving the union, in 1905. "The Swedish workers have proved," he wrote, "that in spite of *all* the vicissitudes of bourgeois policy . . . they will be able to preserve and defend the complete equality and class solidarity of the workers of both nations in the struggle against both the Swedish and the Norwegian bourgeoisie" (Vol. 20, p. 429). Lenin regarded the long general strike in Sweden in 1909 as "one of the biggest general strikes of the recent period" (Vol. 16, p. 141). It is not surprising, therefore, that he found it necessary to correct Strom's view of the potentialities of the Swedish working people.

As for the subsequent course of events, less than three days after Lenin and his comrades had left Sweden there came a series of powerful strikes and hunger demonstrations. They caught the Left Socialist leaders unawares. How correct Lenin had been in saying that history would teach them!

While in Stockholm Lenin told the Swedish Left Socialists that the Bolsheviks would shortly advance "a proposal of an international character." As soon as he was back in Russia he declared that one of the Party's tasks was to "take the initiative in creating a revolutionary International, an International against the *social-chauvinists* and against the 'Center'" (Vol. 24, p. 24). The new Swedish party became one of the founders of the new, Third, Communist International.

However, the party leadership made serious mistakes from the outset, precisely because it ignored the advice offered by Lenin, in particular during his stay in Stockholm. On the other hand, the party was composed mainly of workers and this naturally helped gain important experience in the years of revolutionary upsurge. It took increasing account of Lenin's advice, which was becoming more important, primarily in the effort to make the new party a Communist party. The 21 conditions for admission to the Communist International, which Lenin upheld with reference, in particular, to the situation in the Swedish party, were accepted by the overwhelming majority of worker members of the party. This put the petty-bourgeois elements Hoglund had brought into and around the leadership outside the Swedish party.

Such was Lenin's direct influence on the Swedish labor movement. There was hardly any other foreign leader who showed himself to be as well posted on the Swedish labor movement as Lenin. No one could match Lenin's ability to estimate it. We in Sweden certainly have no reason to maintain that Lenin's teachings are a purely Russian phenomenon.

Nor does the significance of Lenin's advice and theory, the significance of Marxism-Leninism, apply to the past only. Despite almost four decades of Social-Democratic government and all the talk about the "welfare society," there is a mounting demand in Sweden for genuinely and thoroughly renovating society by abolishing the power of monopoly capital and by transferring the management of all public affairs to the people.

Now that people are coming to realize the danger emanating from the reactionary forces of capitalism and the need to establish socialist social forms, Lenin's writings are still more pertinent. They are disseminated and read in Sweden more than ever before. Young workers and students are particularly keen on them. To counter this, an effort is made to mobilize anarchist and Trotskyist elements, above all abroad, who are bent on distorting Leninism and historical reality.

The Communist Party has the important duty of helping young people and others who turn to Marxism-Leninism to find solutions to difficult problems and acquire a reliable guide to action.

Leninism and struggle against chauvinism and for proletarian internationalism

WOLFF EHRLICH

The struggle against chauvinism and for proletarian internationalism is one of the basic tenets of the struggle of the working class through its history. Vladimir Ilyich Lenin has given it its theoretical foundation and has raised it to new heights in the Russian and international working-class movement. It has become even more important today. This is shown also in my country—Israel.

The ideological arsenal of imperialism is becoming more and more empty. Capitalism is becoming less and less attractive for the mass of the people. Therefore, the ideological specialists in its service are looking for making full use of the remaining weapons. Chauvinism has been and is still one of the main weapons in this arsenal.

A special role in Israel in strengthening chauvinism and Right Social-Democracy is played by Zionist ideology and practice. Zionist ideology is spoon-fed to the young generation through the school system, the synagogue, the mass media, the army. Zionist doctrine is taught as self-evident. It teaches that there is a worldwide Jewish nation and a worldwide Jewish national liberation movement, that Palestine has been promised by God to the Jewish nation, that the Jewish State is the fulfilment of the nation's destiny, that the government of Israel is entitled to speak in the name of the worldwide Jewish nation, including and foremost in the name of the Jews living in the socialist countries. As the Chosen People, the Jews in Israel and their spokesmen in government and the army command are, according to the Zionist doctrine, the sole

arbiter of all political and military acts to be decided upon, while the Arab peoples are obliged to make "peace" on the terms of the sole arbiter.

Zionist theory teaches that 'all Jews are brethren,' that their presence in the hostile environment of the Middle East compels them to forget all that divides them, especially the class division of capitalist society in Israel and to subordinate all particular questions and demands to the overall demands of national unity.

While indoctrination has not been fully effective, it has given an unusually big weight and specific direction to the still strong Right Social-Democratic tendency within the Israeli labor movement.

Class peace found its strongest prop in Zionist ideology. Chauvinism enhanced reformism and both combined into a special variety of social-chauvinism, closely connected with imperialism. The sharpening of the Israeli-Arab conflict did much to contribute to the preaching of nationalism within the Jewish working people. Nationalistic utterances of certain Arab leaders, like the threat to destroy the state of Israel and to throw the Jews into the sea, was a godsend to the chauvinist preaching of Israel's leaders.

All this fitted in with a kind of global foreign policy, adapted to the global strategy of imperialism. Zionism could not be a self-sustaining ideology and practice, but had to be and is in fact dependent on imperialism. From its inception. Zionism based itself on imperialism and the ruling circles

in Israel continue this line of going with imperialism against the Arab peoples.

An economic policy of massive capital import and of transfer of the riches of the country to foreign capital, complement the picture.

Zionism is not only dependent on imperialism; it is also a weighty ally of imperialism in its worldwide struggle against the anti-imperialist forces, especially against the three main streams of the revolutionary movement.

The Communist Party of Israel which has fought against Zionist ideology and practice for many decades, gave a thorough analysis of the Jewish question and Zionism in our days at its 16th Congress at the beginning of 1969. Particularly, the Congress material proved that the Zionist movement is not a movement of national liberation and not a national movement at all, but a reactionary political movement of the Jewish bourgeoisie. Congress stated that the Leninist premise that bourgeois ideology and proletarian ideology cannot co-exist has been verified in the case of "socialist Zionists" too. Congress underlined that Zionist policy is to the detriment of the Israeli people.

The struggle of our Party against Zionist ideology and practice is part and parcel of its general struggle against chauvinism and for proletarian internationalism.

Imperialism and its agents direct the main edge of their reactionary attack on communism and the international Communist movement against the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. They have learned that from a propagandist point of view, it is effective, for their whole building of lies, to combine all their enemies under one name, and they have chosen for it: Communism. Thus they label all parts of the anti-imperialist forces "Communist" whether they are Communists or not. They label every progressive man or woman in their countries a Communist. They call every militant trade union secretary, defending the rights of the workers, a Communist. They call the Front of National Liberation of South Vietnam: Vietnamese Communists ("Vietcong").

There is a grain of truth in all this propaganda. All the anti-imperialist forces in the world find in the international Communist movement their unifying and helping hand. They find strongest and most effective assistance in the CPSU. Every progressive movement, every progressive man and woman in the world, knows from ex-

perience that success depends on the assistance of Communists or at least on cooperation with them, that any movement wanting to go along without Communists or even against them, is doomed to failure and to defeat.

Even if imperialist reaction is unable to start a frontal attack against the Soviet Union—militarily, and in an increasing degree, even politically—it can try to depict it as the enemy of the people, the enemy of democracy, the enemy of national independence, the enemy of progress and peace. Remember only how every anti-socialist and anti-Soviet man in Czechoslovakia in the crisis year was labelled by reaction as "progressive" and every Marxist-Leninist as "conservative." This example shows the importance of semantics in propaganda.

Imperialist reaction still uses the totalitarian trick, i.e., identifying communism with fascism and contrasting both to bourgeois democracy of the Free World. Imperialist reaction and its organs even use the trick of identifying the Soviet Union with imperialism, borrowing a leaf from ultra-Left and Chinese propaganda.

Anti-Communist and especially anti-Soviet propaganda is being carried out in Israel systematically and continuously, with a high degree of consequence. The dominant factor in official Israeli propaganda is the pro-imperialist class point of view.

Even regarding the Arab peoples, propaganda is in the main subordinated to the dominant theme. While there is also anti-Arab incitement as such—in general mass media know how to differentiate between "bad" and "good" Arabs, according to whether they are anti-imperialist or pro-imperialist. While the propaganda is usually presented in the form of analyzing whether a person, a group or a policy is good for Israel or bad for Israel (meaning, of course, official Israeli policy), in fact the underlying criterion is the position towards imperialism. Official Israeli propaganda which sides with reactionary Arab forces against the national liberation movement of the Arab peoples, has a clear class attitude against the anti-imperialist struggle of the people. This was again proved lately in the Lebanese crisis.

It is not, of course, only a question of propaganda, but also of policy and of warfare, with the highpoint in the June 1967 aggression, aimed at overthrowing anti-imperialist regimes in neighboring countries, in the service of the global strategy of imperialism, in addition to the specific expansionist aims of Israel's reaction.

This holds true also regarding the German question. Although there is also a fascist school of thought that sees in all Germans the enemy—the official and influential opinion differentiates between good and bad Germans, again according as to whether they are imperialist or anti-imperialist, i.e., Bonn versus the GDR.

This pro-imperialist, anti-Communist and anti-Soviet stand is nourished by Zionist ideology. *In many parts of the world, and not the least in Israel, the Zionist organizations and the Israeli government have become major instruments of the imperialist political and ideological struggle against socialism and communism, against the socialist countries and especially against the Soviet Union.*

The anti-Soviet campaign in Israel centers mainly around two subjects. The first subject is the alleged oppression of peoples in socialist countries. This campaign is carried out both in the general aspect and the specific Jewish aspect. In the general aspect, Zionist and official Israeli propaganda was vehemently on the side of the Hungarian counter-revolution in 1956—the Hista-drut organizing a solidarity strike — and was in the two last years on the side of counter-revolutionary forces in Czechoslovakia, while many Zionist and Israeli forces are doing their utmost to assist the anti-socialist forces in the CSSR.

I am proud to state that our Party has, from the morning hours of the 21st of August 1968 onwards, considered the action of the Soviet Union and the four other socialist countries in those critical days as a necessary act of international solidarity with the Czech and Slovak peoples; our Party has, in face of wild incitement, carried out its internationalist duty and has done everything possible to explain the truth to the people of our country.

In the Jewish aspect, Zionist and official Israeli propaganda directs the fire against the Soviet Union, Poland and other socialist countries, alleging discrimination against and oppression of Jews in these countries. This propaganda uses the trick of identifying Zionism with Jews, of depicting condemnation of Israeli policy and of Zionism as anti-Semitism.

As expressed and explained by Lenin, foreign, non-proletarian elements continuously enter the working class and infiltrate bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideologies into it. Neither is the party of the working class, the Communist Party, immune from these influences.

This is true also today, and more dangerously so. The process of infiltrating the Communist Party is consciously promoted by the vast enemy apparatus of imperialism and its grand global strategy. The recent example of our Party, the Communist Party of Israel, with the Mikunis-Sneh group may serve as a classical example of the infiltration of hostile ideology. Two features were characteristic: that hostile ideology entered under a Marxist-Leninist cloak and that not the full breadth and depth of the ideological and political deviation was revealed at once, but gradually.

When Mikunis and Sneh started their ideological offensive inside the Party before the split, the following fields of deviation became visible: abandoning the proletarian class standpoint; weakening anti-imperialist positions and propaganda; sowing mistrust towards the Soviet Union and the international Communist movement; starting to infiltrate Jewish nationalist ideology; looking for and underlining mistakes made by forces within the national liberation movement of the Arab peoples and converting such mistakes into the dominant element of the movement; equating Jewish and Arab nationalism, and depicting the difference between them as the main contradiction of the region; undermining the Leninist norms of Party life; developing the theory of the higher specific weight of the Jewish Party members than that of the Arab Party members; attempting to divide the Party along national lines.

After the split, the Mikunis-Sneh group, becoming more and more the beloved and pampered child of Israeli reaction, developed these features and clarified them. They dropped the anti-imperialist position and became in Israel the spearhead of the reactionary attack against the international Communist movement, against the Soviet Union and against our Party.

Summing up, it may be said:

The struggle against chauvinism and for proletarian internationalism remains as important as it was in Lenin's days, and has acquired even greater importance. It is not a marginal struggle. It is not a one-time task, but a continuous one, demanding a principled proletarian class approach, permanent ideological awareness, permanent political-educational work among the Party cadre and the working people.

Any achievement of one Party in this task advances the common cause of our international movement.

Lenin's teaching on imperialism and our time

MILTON JIJON

A hundred years ago Marx showed that free competition generated concentration of production and that concentration of production led to monopoly. When no monopolies were yet in existence, this concept was regarded absurd by the "official" science.

In Lenin's time, the monopolies became a reality, but bourgeois scientists persisted that Marxism has been refuted.

Lenin proved that imperialism is the highest and last stage of capitalism, the eve of socialist revolution. And at a time when no victorious socialist revolution had yet occurred in the world, "official" science would not take the idea seriously. In 1917 the socialist revolution took place in Russia, and then became a reality in other countries, including Cuba. Beyond question, socialist revolutions will occur in more countries, though bourgeois scientists keep saying that Leninism is refuted.

The new form of monopoly capitalism, the so-called state-monopoly capitalism, generates a high degree of socialization in capitalist production and, according to Lenin, is a full-scale material preparation for socialism. However, the new form does not change the nature of capitalism, deepening its main contradiction and bringing it closer to final collapse, for which reason Lenin also described imperialism as capitalism in its death throes.

The monopolies, merging with the state, guide production to suit their own selfish interests and also use public funds, taxes and credits for the same purpose, plundering the nation outrageously; this leads to a still more accelerated concentration of capital both in industry and agriculture.

The penetration of finance capital into American agriculture put huge areas of land into the hands of landowners and magnates, as a result of which the small and middle farmers are deprived of their plots.

"Those who control the banks," Lenin wrote, "directly control one-third of America's farms, and indirectly dominate the lot" (Vol. 22, p. 100).

The expropriation of small and middle farmers became more intensive after the Second World War. "The development of capitalism," says the CPSU Program, "dissipated the legend of the stability of small peasant farming once and for all . . . Agrarian crises are bringing ever greater ruin to the countryside. Unspeakable want and poverty fall to the lot of the peasantry in the colonial and dependent countries; it suffers the dual oppression of the landlords and the monopoly bourgeoisie." The main factors which hamper the progress of the country within the framework of our socioeconomic system and doom the people to poverty, says the Program of the Communist Party of Ecuador, are the colonial oppression by imperialism, especially U.S. imperialism, and the existence of many feudal survivals. Big foreign companies control our land, our natural resources, the seas and other natural wealth. They control oil production and the banana trade and own hundreds of thousands of hectares of fertile land. U.S. pirates rapaciously rob the sea of fish. Imperialist banks exert an ever greater pressure on the market through their branches. Agriculture, the main branch of our economy, suffers the consequences of these semi-feudal and semi-colonial forms of production and ownership. A handful of

big landowners possess vast areas of farmland, most of which remains uncultivated. They lease but a minor part to the peasants, exacting exorbitant and constantly growing rents. The agricultural laborers' wages are so low that they are doomed to a life of poverty. Small owners are ruined by the low prices imposed on their produce by imperialism.

Export of capital and, in particular, loans and credits are above all a means of winning new markets and sources of raw material. Of late, Latin America has been getting loans and credits, chiefly from the U.S. government, that is, the state. That is one of the ways whereby the financial oligarchy ensures its investments of capital. Export of capital is also practiced through international finance organizations controlled by the U.S. and the U.S. monopolies, such as the Export-Import Bank, the International Bank of Reconstruction and Development, the International Monetary Fund and the Inter-American Development Bank.

In Latin America, state loans are designed to consolidate the semi-colonial structure of our countries, promote export of U.S. goods, facilitate plunder of raw materials, exercise pressure on economic policy and create the appearance of aid. If in 1961-1965 the total sum of loans to Ecuador amounted to \$45 million, the amount of money repaid, as well as the interest, reached the figure of \$72,400,000. In 1966, as much as \$28,200,000 was shipped abroad as profit, and if we add to this the \$14,200,000 paid to cover the state debt, the total will equal all loans received by Ecuador in five years.

But loans are not the only source of income for the monopolies. Huge profits are derived from export operations; these profits, received outside the country, are not reflected in Ecuador's balance of payments. The profit of the banana exporters is \$40 million a year, and an equal sum is obtained by traders in the consumer markets.

Lastly, the continuous decline of prices of our export products is yet another blow to the national economy. Back in 1961 the manager of the Central Bank of Ecuador, who analyzed the losses we sustained due to the drop in prices, drew the following conclusions: "Thus is revealed the ineffectiveness of foreign aid plans. Ecuador, and possibly the other Latin American countries too, would be able to develop more rapidly, needing no foreign credits, if they received fair prices for their exports." The situation has deteriorated still more be-

tween 1961 and 1967, and only at present has there appeared a tendency towards improvement thanks to trade with the socialist countries.

The state-monopoly economy is growing vigorously due to production for military purposes. Wars have always yielded great benefits to the monopolies. During the Second World War the U.S. monopolies pocketed fabulous profits. After the war they gained new opportunities for enrichment. Most enterprises built on Treasury funds during the war were sold at ridiculously low prices to big monopolies. Billions of dollars paid by the taxpayers were thus presented by the government to the big industrialists and financiers.

The United States is the most militarized country of the capitalist world, in which the entire economy serves militarist aims, the arms drive and an aggressive policy. An economy of that type cannot be of any useful service to society.

The Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow pointed out: "The spearhead of the aggressive strategy of imperialism continues to be aimed first and foremost against the socialist countries. Imperialism does not forego open armed struggle against socialism. It ceaselessly intensifies the arms race and tries to activate the military blocs organized for aggression against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. It steps up its ideological fight against them and tries to hamper the economic development of the socialist countries."

Imperialism is a decayed, parasitical capitalism in its death throes, which has become a bitter enemy of mankind. That is why it is still more imperative now to fight imperialism and to go over to the new, more advanced, socialist society.

All these circumstances add to the sharpness of the contradiction between the Latin American countries, on the one hand, and imperialism and neo-colonialism, on the other, a contradiction resolvable only by a national liberation revolution that will grow over into a socialist revolution.

The program of the national liberation revolution is that of democratic revolution, of the economic independence of colonial and dependent countries, a program that goes beyond the narrow framework of the present-day moribund capitalism and predicates the nationalization of foreign monopolies, industrialization in the context of an independent economy, one favoring the growth of the state sector and agrarian

reform in order to end large-scale land-ownership and the old feudal forms of exploiting land and labor.

The aims of socialism in our country, the Program of the Communist Party of Ecuador says, can be achieved only after the tasks of the preceding stages, which will pave the way for the aims of the national liberation struggle in its triple aspect (anti-imperialist, anti-feudal and democratic), are accomplished in the process of revolutionary social reconstruction.

At the Third Congress of the Communist International in 1921, Lenin pointed to the revolutionary role of the national liberation movement in the impending decisive battles of the world revolution when that movement, initially directed towards national liberation, will turn against capitalism and imperialism. These words, indicative of the richness of ideas and the long-sightedness of the greatest revolutionary thinker of our age, are fully valid in our time.

If in its time the industrial revolution laid the technical foundation of capitalism, and completely undermined the position of the feudal classes, in these days the scientific and technological revolution is one of the decisive factors speeding the disintegration and collapse of the old, outworn capitalist system. Each day modern capitalism acts more and more as a brake on the growth of the productive forces.

Imperialism's decay is also reflected in its ideology. Imperialist ideology penetrates even into the midst of the working class, because it is not separated from the other classes by a Chinese wall. The smokescreen of imperialist ideology is designed to befog the working people, to conceal the reactionary essence of imperialism, to window-dress capitalism and even to drape it in a socialist garb. That, precisely, is the purpose of the notions about the American way of life, "people's capitalism," "the welfare state," "the affluent society" and other dodges in the ideological arsenal of imperialism.

At the same time, attempts are made to establish contacts with the socialist countries in order to export counter-revolution. Use is being made against them of a new ideological weapon, such as the theory of the "convergence" of the two systems and their fusion into a "single industrial society." The same purpose is pursued by the dissemination of "national socialism," "democratic socialism," "liberal socialism" and other nonsense.

Furthermore, nationalist and chauvinist

attitudes, revisionism, Right and "Left" opportunism, reformism, anarchism, and the like, are being spread in the international revolutionary movement. Lenin—and that is one of the elements that makes his theory always up to date—fought uncompromisingly against all these ideas, showing that they contradict the basic interests of the labor movement. No one who regards himself a revolutionary can fail to recognize the fact that it is impossible to fight imperialism consistently without actively combating all these theories and trends.

Lenin wrote: "The questions as to whether it is possible to reform the basis of imperialism, whether to go forward to the further intensification and deepening of the antagonisms which it engenders, or backward, towards allaying these antagonisms, are fundamental questions in the critique of imperialism" (Vol. 22, p. 287).

The socialist countries and countries that have flung off the imperialist yoke, are compelled to fight off imperialism's armed aggressions. And in this confrontation imperialism has suffered repeated defeats. "The heroic struggle of the Vietnamese people against the U.S. aggression is a key component of the worldwide battle between socialism and imperialism, between the forces of progress and those of reaction," says the Appeal of the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, "Independence, Freedom and Peace for Vietnam!"

The anti-imperialist forces oppose this aggressive imperialist policy with the principle of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, a principle formulated by Lenin which does not contradict either the right of the oppressed peoples to fight for their liberation or the class struggle against imperialism on a national and world scale. If the imperialists persist in their war policy, they will only bring closer their own destruction.

The socialist world system, with the Soviet Union in the van, is the decisive force in the anti-imperialist struggle. The socialist world system, the working class in the capitalist countries fighting vigorously against monopoly power, and the national liberation movement, comprise the core of the anti-imperialist front, the bulwark of world revolution. Lenin said in 1919: "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 coun-

tries, of all dependent countries, against international imperialism" (Vol. 30, p. 159).

Such, in aggregate, are the forces which at present determine the main direction of

mankind's historical development. That development follows the path predicted by Marx, Engels and Lenin, the path of socialism and communism.

Leninism and some problems of national liberation movement

AHMED KARIM

We think it would be a fitting tribute to Lenin on the centenary of his birth to begin very earnestly—or to continue where begun—serious scientific analyses of social development in the Asian and African countries. If it is true that our societies suffer from a low standard of development, it is just as true that they suffer from the fact that they are known still very insufficiently. Lenin left us a model of concrete analysis of the realities of his country, whose working class he prepared for struggle and then skilfully led to victory. In this case we have in mind Lenin's work *The Development of Capitalism in Russia*.

This work reveals the method which Lenin used and which should serve us as a model. "A concrete analysis of the status and the interests of the different classes must serve as a means of defining the precise significance of this truth when applied to this or that problem" (Vol. 3, p. 32). Thus, the opposite method, which does not consist in "elucidating at each given stage of the process the form of class antagonism typical of it" but in abstract and dogmatic arguments about the "inexorable" logic of economic development, in academic discourse about necessity inherent in the social process, was exposed and rejected. This method, which is as barren as it is harmful, was replaced by the Marxist method, whose main object is to ascertain real social contradictions, investigate their forms and their evolution, "prove their transient character" and provide in this way objective conditions

for the working class to abolish relations of exploitation.

Regrettably, the metaphysical — in the sense used by Engels — or undialectical method predominates in analyzing the situation in our countries, that is, the countries of Asia and Africa. According to Lenin, this method consists in "the endeavor to look for answers to concrete questions in the simple logical development of the general truth . . ." (Vol. 3, p. 32). To use this method in explaining social phenomena and in elaborating pressing tasks would mean, Lenin pointed out, proceeding from an *a priori* definition of the character of the historical stage in which this or that society finds itself instead of proceeding from a concrete analysis of the real economic and social situation and its real contradictions.

Lenin's method has proved its worth and can be effectively applied because it is based on a general scientific conception of history, on historical materialism. Lenin shows us, specifically in *What the "Friends of the People" Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats*, that the central idea of historical materialism, an idea raising the study of social phenomena to the level of genuine science, is the concept of *socio-economic formation*.

By approaching a new social phenomenon, the countries that have taken the non-capitalist road, from the standpoint of historical materialism, we can:

1. Show that despite the diversity of the conditions of socio-economic and political

development typical of these countries, and despite the highly varied relations linking the various classes and political forces in each country, there is a number of general social laws of development common to these countries. These objective laws tell us that these countries do not constitute an entirely new socio-economic formation that is neither capitalist nor socialist.

2. Prove beyond question that the petty-bourgeois and revisionist concepts alleging the possibility of a third road of development, which some African and Asian countries are said to have taken, are purely subjectivist and wrong.

3. Establish that the historical stage reached by these countries is transitional to socialism.

4. Accurately ascertain the dialectical connections between the national democratic and the socialist revolution. However, account should be taken of the fact that some tasks typical of this or that revolution intertwine at a certain stage of development. We therefore think we should refrain from concentrating on those tasks of the socialist revolution that have not matured as yet, and should remember that the main tasks of the national democratic revolution have not yet been fulfilled or have not received adequate attention. Lenin's remarks in *Philosophical Notebooks* are very useful as a guide to developing proper flexibility of thinking in examining phenomena of this kind.

In studying the role of the working class and its party in the Third World, we are undoubtedly proceeding in a spirit of unshakable loyalty to Lenin and his teaching. For it was Lenin who said that "the chief thing in the doctrine of Marx is that it brings out the historic role of the proletariat as the builder of socialist society" (Vol. 18, p. 582). Lenin also noted that "all classes and all countries are regarded, not statically, but dynamically, i.e., not in a state of immobility, but in motion (whose laws are determined by the economic conditions of existence of each class). Motion, in its turn, is regarded from the standpoint, not only of the past, but also of the future, and that not in the vulgar sense it is understood in by the 'evolutionists,' who see only slow changes, but dialectically" (Vol. 21, p. 75).

We are convinced that the Document of the 1969 Meeting is prompted by these considerations and proceeds from this perspective in stressing the steadily growing role which the working class plays and must play today, when the revolutionary forces

of the world have grown immensely and the class struggle has gained in intensity.

A new development of historic significance which in late years has been in evidence in a number of countries and was predicted by Lenin is the rapid process of social differentiation leading to the formation of two poles: the pole of progress, which unites the working class, the petty bourgeoisie of town and country, progressive intellectuals, army officers and some groups of the national bourgeoisie, and the pole of reaction, which unites the big landowners, the comprador bourgeoisie and some segments of the bureaucratic bourgeoisie. This struggle is not going on in isolation but is part of a more complex and vast process exerting tremendous influence on its forms, development rate and degree of sharpness. We mean the worldwide struggle against imperialism and neo-colonialism, for peace, democracy and socialism.

The working class holds a special place in the conflicts between various social classes and forces, in the struggle between the antagonistic camps.

In Algeria as in other Asian and African countries that have taken the non-capitalist road, certain economic achievements, in particular the setting up of new industries, make for an increase in the numbers of the working class and a rise in its technical and cultural standards. From this point of view the four-year plan (1970-73) is expected to play a notable part in Algeria. There is no doubt that the working class will be the main factor in carrying out the plan.

To cope with the tasks prompted by its own interests and those of the whole nation, the working class must make a strenuous effort in every field, the political and economic spheres included, as well as in the field of technological and scientific education. Thus, we are aware of the tremendous responsibility falling on the working class even at this stage of development.

It would be very wrong, however (as Lenin's entire work proves), to imagine that the workers will become class-conscious by themselves, *spontaneously*, and will make their class the decisive factor of national policy.

All that Lenin wrote in *What Is to Be Done?* and what he repeated and steadfastly put into practice throughout his life, all that the history of the working-class movement has proved everywhere since the days of Marx and Engels, namely, that the proletariat will become class-conscious

only if this consciousness is brought from without, in the form of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, fully applies to Algeria and, we think, to any Asian or African country that has taken, or will take, the non-capitalist road of development.

If this is so, it means that we must fight for the existence of the Marxist-Leninist party because only a party of this kind whose structure, work and principles of action are based on the scientific theory of Marxism-Leninism, should and can make the working class aware of its historic mission, organize its fight and the fight of all its internal and external allies for power and the building of socialism and communism. There is no other way of solving problems if we want to approach them from the standpoint of the future, which, needless to say, will not come from heaven nor be presented to us as a gift but will be a result of persistent, peaceful or armed struggle over a long period.

In upholding this concept, which is resolutely projected into the future, we must not lose sight of present-day reality or its exigencies. However, we must determine the tasks of today according to the objectives of tomorrow. In so doing we must proceed from a scientifically based perspective, and surely Marxism is the philosophy of the future since, having been evolved over a century ago, it is widely practised today.

To preclude every possibility of misinterpretation, we must stress the above demand, which a Marxist normally takes for granted, and on the other hand, the fact that the thesis of the special place and role of the working class by no means implies a scornful attitude to the other classes and social strata making up our society, nor even underestimation of the positive role they play now or can play in the future. Our actions in this case meet the requirements of reality which determine and give rise to our movement and accord with Lenin's following important postulate: "Only an objective consideration of the sum total of the relations between absolutely all classes in a given society, and consequently a consideration of the objective stage of development reached by that society and of the relations between it and other societies, can serve as a basis for the correct tactics of an advanced class" (Vol. 21, p. 75).

Such an analysis, even in sketchy form, is hardly possible within the framework of

the remarks made today. Nevertheless, we would like to specify the following:

1. The tasks of a national democratic revolution with remote socialist prospects facing the countries that have taken the road of non-capitalist development can and should be carried out in our day by a broad patriotic and anti-imperialist front uniting the working class, the petty urban and rural bourgeoisie, and that part of the national bourgeoisie not linked with foreign capital.

2. The working class and its party, taking account of the situation and the alignment of forces in the country, must not make their participation in this front, their constructive support—from critical positions—for a correct policy of the front conditional on the winning and exercise of their hegemony.

3. The record of recent years shows that the petty bourgeoisie in power in the countries following the road of non-capitalist development not only strive in reality to fight against neo-colonialism and imperialism, against the feudal lords and the big bourgeoisie, as well as against the comprador bourgeoisie, resorting, in particular, to nationalization, but have definite anti-capitalist *potentialities*.

4. Obviously, it is Marxist-Leninists that must play the *indispensable* role in this process, and it is they who have the important duty of searching for forms of participating in it and elaborating them in a creative spirit. We believe this role will be played more effectively if it is undertaken by the Party, even if it is in the formative stage.

5. Experience shows that the question of the existence and unfettered activity of such a party in Asian and African countries having progressive regimes is one of the most pressing. It is probably safe to say that some leaders of these countries, representing fairly large sections of the progressive petty bourgeoisie and proceeding from their present positions, have not treated this matter constructively.

6. As the process of socio-economic and political development cannot be considered irreversible in any country, the working class must be vigilant and do all that is necessary to provide *conditions guaranteeing* the normal development of this process, or at least the gains of the revolution, particularly in the socio-economic field. The main earnest of this is, in our view, the existence of a Marxist-Leninist party.

Our Party—the Socialist Vanguard Party of Algeria—which is still young like the

independence of our country, is striving to carry on the struggle in the Leninist spirit and will continue to fight in the arena where the future of Algeria is being decided, so

as to be able fully to play its role and enable the class to which it has devoted itself without qualification to fulfil its mission.

Sources of opportunism today

WILLI GARNIS

Lenin taught us Communists that to be able to evolve a correct policy, we must make a careful analysis of the changing political situation with all its concrete contradictions and draw proper conclusions.

The replacement of a government led by the CDU with a government at whose head is the SDP does not mean any change in the socio-economic or political structures of the FRG. Nevertheless, it is not immaterial to the working class which of the political alignments in the service of state-monopoly capitalism is in the government. The years of fascist dictatorship in Germany brought this home to the working class only too well. Seen from this standpoint, the SDP/FDP government constitutes a certain advance in comparison with all the previous government coalitions led by the CDU.

However, we are by no means forgetting that the big capitalists pin definite hopes on the new cabinet, which they expect to maintain their home and foreign policy interests more effectively than the government led by the CDU did. This applies above all to the desire of these quarters to "integrate" the working class into the state-monopoly system. It is beyond question that the working people's autonomy and independence today are in even greater danger than at the time of the "grand coalition." And it will depend primarily on the militancy of the working class in upholding its interests how far the new government will justify these hopes of big capital. For the most reliable means of heading off the threat of the working class being "incorporated" in the state-monopoly system of the

Federal Republic is active class struggle against monopoly capital.

At the same time the change of government puts higher demands on the Communists' ideological work because the danger of Right and "Left" opportunist influence is undoubtedly growing. Both Right- and "Left"-wing opportunism hamper effective action by the working class and other democratic forces for their interests and prevent unity of action by the Communists and Social-Democrats, the formation of a broad alliance of all anti-monopoly forces for the democratic renovation of state and society and the subsequent success of the struggle for socialism in the FRG. However, it is not only to the situation created by the change of government that opportunism owes its influence on the working-class movement in West Germany. Its influence has deeper origins which make themselves felt in both the FRG and other developed capitalist countries, if in varying degree.

Marx, Engels and Lenin laid bare the main roots of opportunism, which stems, first of all, from the small proprietors' loss of their independent position and the proletarianization of the petty-bourgeois strata, that is, from processes that are concomitants of capitalist development. These strata bring into the working class and the labor movement a petty-bourgeois ideology fostering Right-wing trends and the spread of ultra-"Left" ideas and currents.

There are also special sources of opportunism whose effectiveness is limited to a particular stage in capitalist development. A classical example of revealing these sources is Lenin's investigation of the con-

nection between imperialism and the labor aristocracy as a source of opportunism in the working-class movement.

Putting definite segments of the working class in a privileged position and throwing them crumbs from the monopolies' superprofits constitute another source of opportunism, which, needless to say, has changed somewhat under state-monopoly capitalism.

We believe the important thing in the Federal Republic today is that the big bourgeoisie has succeeded politically, economically and ideologically to "integrate" the Right-wing top of the SDP into the state-monopoly system. It is trying with the aid of this top to "incorporate" the entire SDP, the trade unions and the working class in the system.

I think there are a number of new economic, political and ideological factors that are coming to play an important role in spreading opportunism. The sources on which opportunism in the various countries can draw today in definite conditions of development of the working class lie primarily in the objective process of the further rapid growth of the productive forces, in the scientific and technological revolution, the increasing socialization of production that goes with it, and the expansion of state-monopoly capitalism.

State-monopoly regulation and the scientific and technological revolution undoubtedly account in part for the fact that industrial production in the leading capitalist countries today is growing faster than before and that economic crises comparable to the upheaval of the period between 1929 and 1933 could be avoided. This process is impelled, first of all, by the mounting competition between the socialist and capitalist systems. Economic development in the capitalist countries, more favorable than in the past, fosters illusions about capitalism and breeds doubts as to the need or possibility of replacing capitalism by socialism.

The scientific and technological revolution and the further socialization of the production process are causing deep changes in the structure of the working class. The numerical strength of factory workers is decreasing while the number of professional and office employees, first of all technicians, engineers and experts in the natural sciences, is growing in both absolute and relative terms. Many of these employees come from petty-bourgeois strata and bring a petty-bourgeois mentality into the working class. Even with those who come

from the working class, awareness of their social condition is generally below that of industrial workers.

In the postwar period the living standards of the working people in the industrial capitalist countries, specifically in the Federal Republic, their real wages and the social benefits they enjoy, have gone up to a certain extent. This is due to the rapid growth of the productive forces and a change in the pattern of skills, but above all to a strengthening of the positions of the working class in the social struggle as a result of the competition between the socialist and capitalist systems. The latter circumstance is of special importance to the Federal Republic, since on German soil it is directly confronted by the socialist German Democratic Republic.

The scientific and technological revolution and increasing concentration are aggravating the problem of capital accumulation. Monopoly capital and its state are intent on using every source of accumulation. The so-called "policy of creating property" serves the same purpose. This phrase is applied, for example, to the issue of small shares and investment bonds for industrial and office workers. In the FRG this takes, first of all, the form of so-called "accumulations in the hands of wage-earners." This is, in effect, nothing but a policy approved and promoted by the state to induce workers and office employees to save money and thus rob themselves of part of their pay so as to meet the investment needs of big capital.

Monopoly capital tries to make the working people believe that they are co-owners of the means of production. In this way it wants to refute the conclusion borne out by socialism that capitalist property is historically obsolete.

On the one hand, certain aspects of modern capitalism provide fertile soil for Right-opportunist theory and practice, and facilitate for the ruling class the "integration" of the workers and their organizations into the system of big capital, particularly during a boom. On the other hand, they make for the appearance of petty-bourgeois and anarchist theories alleging that the working class of the developed capitalist countries is no longer a revolutionary force and drawing anarchist conclusions from this allegation. But the contention that the working class has lost its revolutionary character is defeated whenever the workers launch major actions.

I think we may list as other sources of

opportunism today primarily the following factors:

1. Under the impact of the contest between socialism and capitalism and the sharpening contradictions of the capitalist system, monopoly capital and its parties are compelled to speak of reforms and to present their policy as one of reforms. This is also true of the Federal Republic. All official parties affirm that they want to reform society and prepare it for the future. In reality all that the ruling classes want is to raise the efficiency of the system of big capital and strengthen the system.

2. As there simultaneously exist socialist and capitalist countries, the socialist countries' policy of peaceful coexistence is an objective necessity, for without it there is no staving off a devastating nuclear war. This policy is a specific form of the class struggle in present-day conditions. False notions of the problem of peaceful coexistence which deny or minimize the war danger emanating from imperialism are a political and ideological source of Right-wing opportunism. This applies, among other things, to points of view scorning the ideological fight against every variety of bourgeois ideology or dismissing it as unnecessary. It is also true of Leftist views denying that resolute action for a policy of peaceful coexistence, particularly in countries as aggressive as the United States and the FRG, is one of the more important tasks in the anti-imperialist struggle.

3. The less favorable, first of all economically, historical points of departure of the socialist countries in their competition with the developed capitalist countries are exploited by big capital and its parties, as well as by Right-wing Social-Democratic leaders, to call in question the need for socialism, insist on the "superiority" of capitalism and stir up anti-communism.

4. Politically and ideologically, opportunism also originates in nominal bourgeois democracy, the parliamentary system as a disguise for the domination of big capital, and in the growing possibilities of manipulating public opinion.

5. With the present balance of forces, which has developed in the specific conditions of the class struggle in some countries, the very possibilities of a relatively peaceful development of the socialist revolution may become a source of opportunism. This applies, first of all, to cases in which the peaceful progress of the revolution is reduced to parliamentary activity, it being forgotten that in this instance, too,

mobilization of the working class and other working people for extra-parliamentary struggle plays a decisive part. On the other hand, "Left" opportunism stems from the denial of these new aspects.

6. The world revolutionary process gives rise to numerous forms of revolutionary class struggle in various countries. This is dangerous insofar as certain national peculiarities are overemphasized, made an absolute and counterposed to the general laws of the class struggle of the proletariat. It is admittedly a source of nationalism, which fosters the most dangerous forms of opportunism in the international working-class movement.

7. The scientific and technological revolution leads to identical technological achievements in both social systems. Bourgeois ideologues take advantage of this circumstance to peddle the idea that capitalism and socialism are "converging." They deliberately ignore the fact that the scientific and technological revolution under capitalism and socialism proceeds on the basis of opposite relations of property and production and is therefore entirely different in social content. When ideological work by Marxists is inadequate, bourgeois theories of this kind also affect the labor movement and breed opportunism.

8. The use of natural and social sciences to maintain bourgeois interests and raise the efficiency of the capitalist system leads, in particular, to a positivist dissociation of scientific methods from social interconnections and from general historical and social laws, to dissociation of method from theory. Should such a methodology make its way into the labor movement, it may become a further source of opportunism, which manifests itself, for example, in dissociating Lenin from Marx and in counterposing one to the other, or in setting Russian peculiarities against the universal validity of the main content of Lenin's teachings, and Lenin's theory against his method. That is why the address of the Moscow Meeting "Centenary of the Birth of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin" stresses Lenin's uncompromising stand on every form of opportunism. The address testified to the loyalty of the Communist and Workers' parties to Leninism, the Marxism of our epoch.

I have tried to point to some factors which today may engender opportunism. This is not to say, however, that they necessarily result in opportunism gaining ground. In dialectical terms, it means

rather that many of these factors can also be used in heightening the class and socialist consciousness of the working class and in stepping up the fight against monopoly. Thus, the development of state-monopoly capitalism leads to a certain rise in the efficiency of the capitalist system and, on the other hand, makes it less stable and, owing to the closer interlocking of economy and politics, affords new opportunities of fighting the monopolies.

Which of these two aspects of present-day phenomena will prove stronger will depend primarily on the revolutionary party of the working class, on its ideological staunchness and organized strength, on its links with the mass of workers, on how far we Communists will be able to use new points of departure to extend the anti-imperialist front. For both Right and "Left" opportunism can best be overcome by combating the monopolies.

Leninism—banner of our movement

KONSTANTIN ZARODOV

Ours is the first international theoretical conference after the 1969 Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties. The task we undertook was not an easy one. For the greatness of Lenin is such that more than three days could have been devoted to a discussion of his teaching, and we would surely have found new problems, and new facets of his work.

Speakers here dealt with a wide range of theoretical problems, and exchanged experiences in popularizing and developing Lenin's heritage. Many fruitful and interesting ideas were expressed. Each of us has acquired something new, has enriched his knowledge. And it is important that in this exchange of views we attentively listened to the opinions expressed and advanced towards closer harmony of viewpoints.

Ours was a constructive conference. Different opinions were put forth on a number of questions. But it is gratifying to note that, on the whole, the discussion was imbued with a comradely spirit. The conference displayed unity in its approach to most of the problems and social phenomena it analyzed. It was guided by the desire jointly to work out an assessment of the new problems raised by life and the prac-

tical activity of the Communist and workers' movement. And this, in the final analysis, assured its success.

As a rule it is not customary to deliver summing up speeches at international conferences. And I do not propose to deliver one either. But I do wish to emphasize some of the more essential features which, in our view, characterized the content, the spirit and style of our three-day session.

The keynote and central conclusion of the conference was that Leninism is the Marxism of the present era—the era of revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism, an era rich in fundamental social transformations, the era of the scientific and technological revolution which, on the basis of socialism, holds out thrilling prospects for mankind.

One of the most brilliant chapters in the history of Marxist thought is intimately associated with the name of Lenin—a chapter which furnishes answers to the fundamental questions of socialist revolution and the revolutionary refashioning of the world. Associated with Lenin's name is the accumulated experience of socialist development which convincingly shows that to follow the path of socialism and communism

means faithfully and consistently to be guided by Lenin's teaching.

Our conference has reaffirmed the basic Leninist propositions, among which are the following:

—Lenin's proposition that the only road to socialism lies through socialist revolution, in whatever form, whether violent or peaceful revolution;

—Lenin's proposition on the leading and guiding role of the working class in modern society; Lenin's teaching on the Party of a new type, the party of socialist revolution, of the building of socialism and communism, the supreme form of socio-political organization;

—Lenin's proposition on the building of the material foundation of socialism and communism, on the formation of a new type of social relations and on the education of the builders of communist society; Lenin's principles of scientific direction of socialist and communist construction, his theory of democratic centralism as the fundamental principle of the organization and administration of socialist society;

—Lenin's theory of imperialism, which discloses the nature of modern state-monopoly capitalism and provides a guide to the revolutionary overthrow of the exploitive system;

—Lenin's proposition that international consolidation of all the working people, all the progressive forces in the struggle against imperialism and imperialist aggression must be based on the principle: peoples of the socialist countries, workers, democratic forces in the capitalist countries, newly liberated peoples and those who are oppressed, unite!

Lenin's outstanding contribution to the treasure-house of Marxism was fully assessed at the conference. Speakers exposed the fallacy of contrasting Lenin to Marx and Leninism to Marxism. They emphasized that there is no, nor can there be, a multiplicity and diversity of Marxisms.

The only correct, indeed the only scientific, interpretation of Marxism, its continuation and development is, and always has been, Leninism—the ideological and theoretical weapon of the working class and its party in the battle for socialist revolution and for the socialist reconstruction of society.

The underlying thought emphasized by speakers is that Leninism is an international doctrine.

Lenin was a great son of Russia. But his ideas, which are the creative development

of the great Marxist teaching, do not know national boundaries. And their extension across these national boundaries began with Lenin's early works written even before the Bolshevik Party was founded. Like Marx and Engels, Lenin belongs to the whole of mankind.

Speakers from different countries and continents cited impressive examples of the victories scored by the Communist movement under the banner of Leninism. Lenin played an outstanding role in the organization of most of the Communist and Workers' parties, many of which are now celebrating their half-centenary. And it was under the banner of Leninism, that international doctrine, that the Communist movement became really worldwide, a movement that is shaping the destinies of this the 20th century. Everyone who not merely in words but in deeds is fighting for national and social emancipation, for peace and progress, for socialism, turns to Leninism.

Our conference has shown that the international character of Leninism manifests itself in the following:

—Originating on the firm basis of Marxism, Leninism was able to express and generalize the experience not only of the Russian, but of the entire Communist movement, of all its contingents;

—In the new conditions of world development, Leninism revealed the organic interconnection between the three main streams of the world revolutionary process—the building of socialism and communism, the development of the Communist and workers' movement in the capitalist countries and the national liberation struggle—and showed how they could be unified;

—Leninism raised aloft the banner of internationalism in opposition to chauvinism and national-patriotism. It saved Marxism from the degeneration into which the leaders of the Second International Social-Democrat parties were trying to plunge it;

—Leninism is the ideological basis for cultivating in the working class, in all the working people, in all the Communists, fidelity to the noble principles of international solidarity, and to the communist cause.

It is by no means accidental—and this was justly emphasized by speakers here—that where the Communist movement and its individual contingents remained true to Leninism, they scored victories. And conversely, where our movement or its individual detachments departed from Leninist

positions, they suffered defeat, partial or complete. In such cases Right and "Left" opportunists were quick to rear their heads. In such cases centrism flourished, and the struggle against it is today too a major problem for the Communist movement.

That is one of the lessons of the entire history of the international Communist movement and more particularly of the recent years.

Speakers at this conference convincingly demonstrated that Lenin was and remains for us the supreme master and theorist of materialist dialectics. His ideas on the dialectics of social life have stood the stern test of time. Lenin's approach to dialectics as a science, the struggle against the danger of Right revisionism, dogmatism and relativism, the creative development of our revolutionary theory found expression in many contributions to our discussions.

In this dynamic age of ours, an age of rapidly changing events and of fundamental transformations in the social and scientific fields, we must as never before be equal to the achievements of Leninism, be able to develop it creatively and fully master its dialectical method. For without this we cannot properly understand and interpret the prospects ahead and answer the question as to the path mankind should follow.

If we were to give a terse generalization of the propositions enunciated here on the essence and implications of Lenin's dialectics in our day, we would have to single out the following major points:

1. The source of the all-conquering strength and viability of Leninism has always been its truth, its ability to provide answers to the questions raised by life, by social reality and practice and by modern science. Leninism has become the brain in the building of communism, the brain of the Communist and liberation movement.

Marxists have never slavishly clung to the letter of Marxism. They have always checked their thoughts, conclusions and practice against the authoritative positions and views given to us by Lenin. They have always sought and taken counsel—and will continue to do so—with Lenin, just as Lenin always took counsel with Marx. For Communists Lenin's teaching is not merely a method and a theory, but also a guide to action in the revolutionary struggle of our time.

2. Leninism is an integral revolutionary teaching. And in accordance with Lenin's behests we regard our theory as a monolith cast from one piece of steel from which not

a single component can be removed. Speakers have criticized attempts to undermine the unity and integrity of the scientific outlook of the working class and its Communist vanguard. They have criticized attempts to interpret Lenin by tearing out of his works only such sentences and paragraphs as will suit certain concepts, while at the same time ignoring other pronouncements of Lenin, indeed, the sum total of his views on one or another problem. That is an old trick of using one's own interpretation of a doctrine to fight that doctrine, its true spirit and meaning. Leninism rejects all such methods.

Leninism abhors schematism, routine and inertia in theoretical thought. One of its categorical demands is clarity in formulating basic principles, theoretical penetration, boldness in posing and solving new problems, defense of class interests. The spirit of Leninist partisanship and class approach was well to the fore at our conference.

3. Leninism is by its very nature a creative teaching. And the present stage of our development provides convincing proof that we have very favorable conditions for enriching Leninism with new conclusions, with theoretical generalizations of the new social practice and the new data of science.

Leninism lives and develops as a theory because it lives and develops in the practice of socialist construction, in the practice of the Communist movement and of the liberation struggle, because it rests on the solid foundation of modern science.

By demonstrating our fidelity to Leninism, by boldly and creatively discussing and solving new problems, we strengthen the Communist movement, enable it to resolve the tasks jointly formulated by the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties.

I have enumerated these conclusions as the central ones though, naturally, many more could be mentioned. But even these conclusions show that we have a true compass in our theoretical and practical work, that we have reliable criteria showing the implications, in present conditions, of being guided by Leninism and creatively developing it, and of departing from Leninism and distorting it.

Our conference convincingly demonstrated that the choice today can only be: for or against a Leninist approach to cardinal problems in every field.

Lenin said that he could not tolerate any attacks on Marx and Engels. Paraphrasing his words, the Marxists of today say that

they cannot and will not tolerate any attacks on Lenin and Leninism. The defense of Leninism against bourgeois and opportunist distortions is a tradition of the Communist movement. And at our conference we have demonstrated that we remain faithful to this sacred tradition of the movement.

In its address on the Lenin centenary, the International Meeting urged all of us:

"Let us raise higher the banner of Lenin-

ism in the struggle for the revolutionary renewal of the world!"

Let us remain true to that sacred appeal. May the voice of Lenin's truth be a clarion call to the working people of the planet for new advances for the men of labor, for the triumph of communism.

Till we meet again, dear comrades, at other theoretical conferences and forums.

Long live Leninism, the Marxism of our epoch!

Lenin's analysis of imperialism and some developments of monopoly

JOHN GOLLAN

The International Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties rightly drew attention to the importance of the new stage of monopoly concentration.

What characterizes the new stage is the rapidity with which monopoly concentration is proceeding in the major capitalist countries, the sheer size of the economic giants resulting, and the fact that the new super-trusts are international in scope—the truly multinational company is now a new and dominant feature of imperialism.

All the facts confirm Lenin's basic analysis of the economics of imperialism. Not surprisingly, however, developments since the Second World War and more especially over the last decade have given rise to new forms of imperialist penetration and exploitation.

THE GROWTH OF MODERN MONOPOLY

"Monopoly"—wrote Lenin—"this is the last word in the 'latest phase in the development of capitalism'" (Vol. 22, p. 210).

In the last decade monopoly growth has strikingly proved Lenin's thesis. The new impetus to monopoly growth, especially in capitalist Europe, has its roots first in the fact that the process of monopolization has gone on for over half a century, so that today it is the big firm taking over the big firm to form the super-firm or super-trust.

Secondly, with the emergence of the U.S. as the dominant imperialist super-power, the trusts in Britain and Western Europe have been forced into mergers of a size capable of confronting and competing with the American giants. Before the present wave of mergers, the largest European firms were well below half the size of the major U.S. firms.

Thirdly, the new scientific revolution has put a premium on capital intensive units which can only be organized and financed on a large scale. This is particularly the case with the new "technological" industries, oil, petrochemicals, chemicals and synthetics, computers and electronics, cars, aviation and space technology, man-made

fibers, etc. These industries have huge research and development costs of a size which can only be undertaken by the super-firm.

These new growth industries play the role in the development of modern imperialism which railways and mining played in Lenin's day.

Fourthly — the merger process, linked with the development of modern technology intensifies the two "normal" forms of monopoly, the vertical and the horizontal. The vertical trust, encompassing the complete process from the raw materials to the finished product in all its aspects, becomes more complex. For example, the electrical trusts branch into or take over firms concerned with telecommunications, electronics, TV, micro circuits, etc. The horizontal trusts, resulting from amalgamations based on similar branches of industry also tend to extend their spheres of operation. For example the oil firms into petrochemicals, the combined whisky firms into chemicals based on alcohol derivatives, the chemical by-products of the gas industry and further cross amalgamations result.

Under the compulsion of this complex process, the new "conglomerate" monopoly has rapidly emerged, with amalgamations or takeovers to eliminate rivals or potential rivals based on new competing products. They take in the most diverse and often totally unrelated products. These great and ever-extending financial combinations, with extreme diversification of products seeking a greater return on capital based on adaptation to demand and the search for new products, are arising everywhere. This process is most marked in the U.S. where, the *Economist* has noted, conglomerate mergers accounted for 45 per cent of all U.S. mergers in 1968.

The distinctions between the various forms of monopoly thus tend to become increasingly blurred and the net result is still greater financial and industrial units now characteristic of state-monopoly capitalism.

American imperialism's invasion of Europe has enormously speeded up during the past decade. Since 1958 the U.S. has invested 10,000 million dollars in West Europe. While still currently less than 10 per cent of the total value of the European corporations U.S. investment is growing swiftly and is of great strategic value. According to Servan Schreiber (*The American Challenge*) U.S. firms controlled, on a European scale, 15 per cent of the consumer goods

industry, 50 per cent of the semi-conductors, 80 per cent of the computers and 95 per cent of the integrated circuits. This, of course, is apart from the oil, automobile, machine tools, and many other industries.

Ten per cent of British manufacturing industry is U.S.-owned and if present trends continue, by 1980 20 to 25 per cent will be in U.S. hands (Dinning: *The Role of American Investment in the British Economy*).

Capitalist Europe's answer to this American challenge has been the creation of the West European super-trusts by a wave of mergers, take-overs and amalgamations on a scale never seen before. The capitalist state in a number of countries has played a vital role in this process.

In Britain the Labor Government created the Industrial Reorganization Corporation, with a capital of £150 million to promote mergers. It is controlled by a Board composed of the Chairmen or Managing Directors of Britain's greatest industrial and financial corporations. In France, a similar body, the Société Industrielle d'Investissement et de Développement, has been set up.

The results have been striking, particularly in Britain. The most important giant mergers pushed through in Britain recently include the amalgamation of British Motor Holdings and Leyland Motors, the National Provincial Bank with the Westminster Bank and the General Electric Company with English Electric. The super-firm has now emerged in Britain of a size in capital value and number of workers employed never before seen in the country.

There are now three super-trusts in Britain with a capital of over £1,000 million. They are Shell Transport (£1,603 m. capital and 69,000 employees); British Petroleum (£1,445 m. and 75,000 employees); Imperial Chemical Industries (1,390 m. and 187,000 employees). There are only three such super-trusts in the whole of the rest of Western Europe. In other words, this process of super-monopoly is proceeding faster in Britain than the rest of capitalist Europe.

As a result of mergers the number of companies engaged in manufacture in Britain fell by one-third from 1961 to 1968. Excluding the nationalized industries, two per cent of firms are now responsible for 50 per cent of total production by value.

The same merger process has been taking place all over Western Europe.

In West Germany Rheinstahl and Daimler-Benz are merging their truck-making to give them two-thirds of the total West

German market. Kloeckner, Ilseder Huette and Salzgitter are merging their steel plants. Mannesmann and August Thyssen Huette are to merge their steel tube production. Siemens and AEG-Telefunken have merged their power engineering to give them 10 per cent of the capitalist world turbine generator capacity. Twenty-three Ruhr coal mines with names like Gelsenkirchen and Niederrhein, household words for a hundred years, have been pooled into one company, Ruhrkohle, with an output of 90 million tons a year.

In France, there were 250 mergers in the eighteen months ending 1968. Since 1969 France has seen mergers in chemicals and between its two largest electrical firms, Thomson-Brandt-CFS and Cie General d'Electricité. In Italy, ENI/IRI have taken over the chemical, metal and electrical combine Montecatini-Edison.

In general the position has now been reached where of the 200 biggest corporations outside the U.S., 65 are British, 26 are West German and 23 are French. Of the 20 biggest corporations in Western Europe, eight are British or mixed Anglo-Dutch, seven are West German, one French, one Italian, one Swiss and two Dutch. (By capital, measures by sales, these figures would be slightly different).

One important result of this merger process has been the change in the relative power of the trusts in the vital chemical industry. The European based firms had been threatened by their bigger U.S. based rivals. Now, of the world top twelve chemical trusts, five are U.S. (Du Pont, Union Carbide, Monsanto, W. R. Grace and Dow), one is Italian (Montecatini-Edison), one is British (ICI), three are West German (Hoechst, Bayer, Badische Anilin und Soda-Fabrik), one French (Rhône-Poulenc/Pechiney, St. S Gobain/Progil), and one Dutch (AKU/Koninklijke Zout-Organon). Source—*Chemical Age*. (The French chemical merger has not been confirmed by other British sources to date.)

THE MULTI-NATIONAL FIRM

Multinational firms in the sense of companies operating abroad are not entirely new. This important characteristic of imperialism was already dealt with by Lenin.

What is new is that under the compulsion of mergers and the resultant super-firms, these firms need a world market. They are all becoming multinational, acquiring subsidiaries, opening plants or mak-

ing transnational mergers in the various countries.

In addition to the giant combines which for long have exploited the colonial raw materials to be worked up in the imperialist metropolises, the main manufacturing super-firms in each country (e.g. cars) have established branch plants in the main countries.

The new techniques are also a powerful factor for multinationalism. The great chemical trusts are all multinational with plants more or less everywhere, sometimes concentrating the production of a basic product in one country, to be shipped and worked up in another country.

All the major oil companies are multinational in operation with the crude oil, mainly Asia, Africa or Latin America based, shipped to refineries all over the world, the new petrochemical industry has led to merged operations between the oil giants and the chemical giants. B.P. (British) has linked with Pechiney of France to establish a joint chemical plant at Marseilles. Royal Dutch Shell (Anglo-Dutch) has entered into an agreement with BASF of West Germany. The West German chemical industry is carrying through a huge DM 7,139 m. (£811 m.) investment program, the main investors being Deutsche Shell, Hoechst (West German), Du Pont (U.S.), Bayer (West German) and Monsanto (U.S.) ESSO (U.S.) and Mobil (U.S.).

Old established giants like Unilever (foods, fats and soap), colonial based, have "naturally" gone into detergents which threatened its soap market. Detergents have become a world market. Four firms now account for two-thirds of the capitalist world market in detergents, Unilever (Anglo-Dutch) 25%, Proctor and Gamble (U.S.) 25%, Colgate (U.S.) 10% and Henkel (West German) 10%.

The net result of all this has been the vast expansion of the multinational firm and its ramifications.

One of the classical multinational firms was Unilever, with its colonial base. Today this Anglo-Dutch super-trust with annual sales of £2,300 m., is the ninth biggest business in the world. It has a capital of over £1,000 million and 320,000 employees in 130 countries. It is outranked in corporate terms only by Detroit's big three car companies, three international oil companies and the U.S. giants General Electric and IBM.

The British-based oil giants are multinational in scope. Royal Dutch Shell with

174,000 employees has worldwide ramifications. Thirty per cent of the capital is British, twenty per cent American and twenty per cent Dutch. The all-British Petroleum Company (half the stock is government owned) also operates on a world scale. It has 75,000 employees and has just broken through into the American market.

Britain's chemical trust, the ICI with 187,000 employees was formed in 1926 to counter the German chemical cartel, I.G. Farben. It is increasingly operating on a world scale. Through its holding company in Brussels (ICI Europe) it has more than 60 manufacturing plants and sales outlets on the Continent. One of the main advocates of entry into the Common Market, it seeks a transcontinental merger with one or more of the German, French and Italian chemical giants.

British Leyland (cars and trucks) employing 168,000 in Britain and 20,000 outside, are steadily extending their branch plants in various countries. A growing number of other British trusts are operating in the same way.

So it is all over Western Europe. Holland has two great multinationals, Philips (Electrical) and AKU (Chemicals) with international ramifications on a scale which dwarfs Holland's entire economy. Philips, which employs 244,000, has subsidiaries in 40 countries and is responsible for one-eighth of Holland's exports.

In 1964 the top 20 Swiss corporations were reported as employing 94,000 people in Switzerland compared with 264,000 abroad. The giant Nestle's combine does 95 per cent of its business outside Switzerland.

The Hoechst chemical trust of West Germany has factories in 35 countries including the U.S. Siemens of West Germany with 257,000 employees operates all over Europe.

In Japan, despite a restrictive attitude to foreign investments, there are 150 fully foreign-owned firms and double that amount of joint ventures. Japanese companies, for their part, are looking outside the country, prompted by government encouragement of the concentration and centralization of capital at home. There were no Japanese firms in the world's 100 top companies in 1957, in 1962 there were two, and in 1967 there were eight.

Because of the growth of the multinational firm, the process of imperialist penetration in each capitalist country and between the capitalist countries and the newly-freed colonial countries is becoming fierce. National based trusts fight other

national based trusts, but in the process link up with trusts in other countries. In addition, the formation of the Common Market spurred on the U.S. and Britain to establish branch plants or acquire subsidiaries or affiliates within the six countries of the EEC.

American, British and Swedish firms are already inside the Six. There are virtually no important British firms which do not have plants or joint ventures that produce and sell inside the Common Market. The same is true for most American corporations and banks. In reverse, there is virtually no important corporation of the Six which does not have production facilities and commercial outlets in the EFTA countries and the United States.

These multinational firms, explains Charles Levinson of the International Federation of Chemical and General Workers' Unions, "have begun a process of integration on a global scale which invalidates accepted theories of the importance of regional markets and industry. Because they are both in and out of trade zones and customs unions, they are able to leap through and around them, to take advantage of different rates of exchange, income and turnover taxes, of inter-company transfer prices between plants. In other words, of minimizing taxes and costs and maximizing profits in spite of national and regional regulations designed to protect markets internally" (In an interview in *The Guardian*, Sept. 3, 1969).

He states that by the late 1970's or early 1980's, 200 to 300 multi-national corporations will dominate capitalist world production and trade, and own 75 per cent of the corporate assets of both industry and finance of the capitalist world.

BANK INTERNATIONAL

A fundamental characteristic of imperialism, Lenin stated, was the role of the banks in promoting monopoly and the fusion of banking and industrial capital to form what he called finance capital.

The headlong pace of monopoly concentration has been accompanied by increased banking activities, the further growth of monopoly in banking and the growing international role of the major banks.

Only a few points can be made to illustrate what is happening.

To take Britain first. British banking was dominated by the Big Five (Lloyds, Westminster, National Provincial, Barclays and the Midland). This has now become the Big

Four, with merger of the Westminster and the National Provincial. All have assets in the £2,000 m. scale, with massive industrial shareholding and extensive international operations. The role of the big insurance companies as investment bodies should also be noted. The Prudential has £1,738 m. of capital, and the Legal and General £850 m.

Before the Second World War only a handful of U.S. giants — notably Chase Manhattan, First National City, Morgan Guaranty and First National Boston operated overseas. Now this has become a flood. In the '50s U.S. banks had ten branches in London. Today there are thirty.

Japan has a huge payments surplus and Japanese banks have long been active overseas. The activities of Mitsui, Mitsubishi and Sumitomo are well known. These have now been joined by Fuji, possibly the biggest. The special privileges overseas enjoyed by the Bank of Tokyo are being challenged within Japan by the other big Japanese banks.

The dominant role of the big three commercial banks in West Germany, the Deutsche, the Dresdner and the Kommerz is commonplace. The Deutsche has 34 different stakes in foreign banks in 31 countries. The mergers taking place are not between the biggest three or four, but between the big regional banks and the private banks. The West Deutsche Landesbank is now ahead of the Deutsche (according to the *Economist*). After the merger of two savings clearance banks in 1968 it has given the biggest ever credit in West Germany—DM 1.4 billion to Du Pont!

With the growth of the multinational firm and increasing financial and capital restrictions imposed by the different imperialist states in balance of payments difficulties, the financing operations of the banks regarding the international trusts have grown.

For example, because of official curbs on investment flows from the U.S., the American multinationals are currently financing an increasing proportion of their overseas investments from local sources. They took up 2.2 billion dollars of funds abroad in 1968 against only 446 million dollars in 1967.

The logical outcome of this has been the formation of the new form of multinational banks—joint concerns of the powerful banking trusts.

Details have been given in the *Economist* International Banking Survey, Nov. 1969.

Atlantic International, based on London, has joint shareholders Banco di Napoli, Neuflyze (de), Schlumberger, Mallet; F. Van Lanschot; Charterhouse Japhet and Thomasson; National Shawmut (Boston); Manufacturers (Detroit); United California; First Pennsylvania.

The *Banque Occidentale*, based on Paris, has as participants Societe Generale Foncière; Union Los Angeles and Central National Cleveland. The *European-American Banking Corporation*, New York has as shareholders the British Midland; Amsterdam Rott., Deutsche and Société General de Banque. The remaining eight such multinational banking concerns are just as broad in composition.

These banking multinationals are a veritable roll call of finance capital and their number will grow. Again, they show the increasing complexity of the international ramifications of finance capital.

CAPITAL EXPORT AND THE DIVISION OF THE WORLD

Lenin stressed the role of the export of capital as compared with the export of goods, as a new phenomenon of imperialism and in the development of the international ramification of the monopolies. This led in turn to the physical division of the world between the imperialist powers, which could only be changed by war, and the division of the world market between the great trusts.

The great new historical fact since Lenin wrote *Imperialism* is the change in the balance of world forces ushered in by the October Revolution, the growth of the socialist world, and the victories of the national-liberation movement.

Lenin's famous table on the territorial division of the world in 1914 showed 74.9 m.sq.km. as the colonial possessions of the imperialist powers; 14.5 m.sq.km. as semi-colonies; 16.5 m.sq.km. as the home territories of the six Great Powers, and 28 m.sq.km. as the remaining countries.

The new map of the world in 1969 which shows 35.2 m.sq.km. of the socialist world, 12.3 m.sq.km. as big imperialist powers and their colonies; 84.1 m.sq.km. as colonies and semi-colonies that have gained their freedom, and 4.2 m.sq.km. as the remaining countries illustrates that the course of history has borne out Lenin's prophecy in the imperialist epoch.

There have been four important repercussions on the world scene as a result. First,

the rivalry among the imperialist powers for the shrunken capitalist and colonial world has sharpened. Second, the imperialist powers have adopted the new technique of neo-colonialism in the former colonial countries. Third, the tenacity and ferocity with which the imperialist powers wage colonial wars to retain influence (Vietnam, British wars in the Middle East, British support of racist South Africa and fascist Portugal, etc.). And finally the dominant role of the U.S. as the premier imperialist power.

And this is underlined by the character of capital exports which, with the growth of monopoly and especially the multinational firms, have increased as a factor in imperialist economies.

Today the U.S. is responsible for sixty per cent of the world total of direct foreign investment. The following figures show some interesting new features.

U.S. Direct Foreign Investment (in billions of dollars)

By Area	1960	1967
Canada	11.2	18.1
Latin America	8.4	10.2
Europe	6.6	17.9
Others	6.6	13.1
	32.8	59.3
By Industry		
Manufacture	11.2	24.1
Petroleum	10.4	17.4
Mining/Smelting	3.5	4.8
Others	7.7	13.0
	32.8	59.3

(Source: Survey of Current Business—U.S. Department of Commerce).

These figures show the growing importance of Europe as a sphere of U.S. investment and at the same time, as was to be expected, the growing relative importance of manufacture both absolutely and in terms of rate of growth. U.S. imperialism therefore is expanding not only in direct colonial and semi-colonialist spheres, but in Europe. Europe and Canada have replaced Latin America in relative importance of capital investment. It should be noted, however, that colonial investment brings super profit. One United Nations study calculates that every dollar of U.S. investment in Latin America brings 3.1 dollars in return.

Britain's foreign investment figures unfortunately exclude oil, banking and insurance. But relative figures are as follows:

United Kingdom Direct Foreign Investments (in billions of dollars, excluding oil, banking and insurance)

By Area	1960	1965
USA	0.8	1.1
Canada	1.3	1.5
Europe	0.8	1.5
Latin America	0.4	0.6
World Total		
of which so-called		
Developing Countries	3.0	3.9
By Industry		
Manufacturing	4.1	5.9
Mining	0.6	0.8
Agriculture	0.8	1.0
Distribution	1.2	1.9
Others	1.6	2.2
	8.3	11.8

(Source: Board of Trade Journal)

British oil investment figures which are excluded would change this picture quite a bit, but with this proviso again we see the importance of manufacture in the total. In addition, compared with the U.S., a somewhat greater relative proportion of colonial and neo-colonial investment and therefore super profit.

One further fact should be noted in relation to British private overseas investment. Since 1966 it has doubled to reach £736 m. in 1968. As against this, private foreign investment in Britain reached £573 m. Of the British private investment abroad, the City banking institutions now play a relatively less important role. The big corporations themselves, or their subsidiaries abroad, provide an increasing part of the money. In 1962, for example, 46 firms accounted for 73 per cent of the total investment abroad by Britain in manufacturing.

During the last few years German, Italian and Japanese firms have increased their overseas investments dramatically. Between them these three countries increased their foreign investment (according to IMF and OECD sources) from an annual rate of 230 million dollars a year in 1957/1960, to 840 million dollars a year in 1968. Between them they now invest as much overseas as Britain. In the case of West Germany 70 per cent of this investment went to industrial countries. In chemicals, firms such as Hoechst and Bayer have been investing heavily in the United States.

Another consequence of the multinational firm is the change it brings about in the direct export of goods.

Mr. Judd Polk, of the U.S. Council of the

International Chamber of Commerce, has calculated that a dollar of investment abroad produces two dollars of foreign output. This would put a value of 110 billion dollars on the output of foreign affiliates of U.S. corporations in 1966, roughly equal to the 1966 gross national product of West Germany and the United Kingdom respectively. The foreign based output of U.S. firms is increasingly outstripping direct exports from the U.S. in some of the more important sectors of manufacturing. (Quoted in *The Growth and Spread of Multinational Companies*, published by the *Economist*.)

The output of British subsidiaries abroad has also reached the point where, in many cases, it is larger than the direct exports from the parent company in Britain.

A growing proportion of world trade is being done by the multinational firms. A U.S. Department of Commerce Study of 320 firms responsible for one-third of U.S. exports in 1965 showed the following picture.

Fifty-two per cent of this trade was channelled through foreign affiliates of the U.S. firms and 48 per cent went to unaffiliated foreign purchasers — 29 per cent went to affiliates for direct re-sale — 18 per cent went to affiliates for further processing—3 per cent was made up of capital equipment purchases of affiliates from the U.S.—and the remaining 2 per cent went to affiliates, but was unallocated. (Quoted by the *Economist*.)

The multinational firms carve up their world markets solely to suit their own needs irrespective of the national interests of the countries concerned. For example, General Motors of the U.S. could have tackled the Japanese market through its Australian subsidiary, Holden, or from America. It chose to do the latter. It concentrates its truck activities in Britain and its European-wide car-making activities in its West German subsidiary OPEL, which does most of the small-car exports to the U.S., despite General Motors' car production in its smaller subsidiary Vauxhall in Britain.

* * *

We have given in brief form some of the most important data concerning the new stage of monopoly concentration and imperialist forms of penetration today.

Big political questions are presented particularly in connection with the relations of the multinational supertrusts with the imperialist state.

The so-called military-industrial complex, the alliance of the largest monopolies with the military in the state apparatus is the subject of growing concern. The closest working of the electrical, chemical, oil, aviation, engineering, automobile, aircraft and other trusts with the military is obvious. They not only supply the arms, have a vested interest in war, but are bound up with the highest state authorities in fundamental research and its application (guarded by the Official Secrets Acts). In turn, the military expenditure, the bases and deployment of troops is for the purpose of protecting the worldwide interests of the international trusts.

Apart from the special state bodies, dominated by the representatives of the trusts to encourage mergers, the trusts dominate the quasi-state bodies and departments concerned with incomes policy, production, trade and economic policy, including research and even higher education.

The state supplies huge sums in subsidies and loans to the trusts. In Britain, for example, in the financial year 1967-68, outright grants by the Labor Government to the industrial concerns equalled £1,010 m., with another £450 m. in loans. They enjoy the full results of state research and the commercial application of the "spin-off" of military and space research.

The growing conflict between the worldwide interests of the multinational firms and the particular policies of national governments regarding exports and imports, the balance of payments and movements of capital has already been noted.

The political, social and economic power of the trusts in particular menaces democracy and democratic development and tends to authoritarian rule. Monopoly is profoundly anti-democratic. As Lenin wrote: "the political super-structure of the new economy, of monopoly capitalism (imperialism is monopoly capitalism) is the turn from democracy to political reaction. Democracy corresponds to free competition. Political reaction corresponds to monopoly." (*A Caricature of Marxism*.)

Above all, the new stage of monopoly concentration intensifies the basic contradictions of society. The concentration of production in super monopolies deepens the contradiction between the social character of production and the private appropriation of wealth.

The extreme concentration of monopoly means the extreme concentration of wealth

in fewer and fewer hands, and the clash of the interests of the wealthy with the rest of society and not only the working class. The other pole is the growth of poverty in capitalist society. In Britain, for example, one tenth of the population is sinking deeper into poverty and the next twenty per cent receive no benefits from the growing national wealth.

As a consequence in every capitalist country the class struggle is growing, not

only for immediate demands but for aims of a more far-reaching character.

For the Communist parties in the capitalist countries these developments underline the need for the broadest anti-monopoly front to curb the monopolies, to protect and extend democracy and ultimately to take over the trusts and open up the road to socialism, the only means by which this basic contradiction of capitalist society can be overcome.

Meeting of European Communist and Workers' Parties

Representatives of 28 Communist and Workers' parties of Europe met in Moscow on January 14 and 15, 1970.

The meeting was attended by representatives of the Central Committees of the Communist Party of Belgium, Bulgarian Communist Party, Progressive Party of the Working People of Cyprus, Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, Communist Party of Denmark, Communist Party of Finland, French Communist Party, Socialist Unity Party of Germany, German Communist Party, Communist Party of Germany, Socialist Unity Party of West Berlin, Communist Party of Great Britain, Communist Party of Greece, Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, Irish Workers' Party, Communist Party of Northern Ireland, Italian Communist Party, Communist Party of Norway, Polish United Workers' Party, Portuguese Communist Party, Rumanian Communist Party, San Marino Communist Party, Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Communist Party of Spain, Left Party—Communists of Sweden, Swiss Party of Labor, Communist Party of Turkey and the League of Communists of Yugoslavia.

The participants in the meeting exchanged views on the problems of European peace and collective security. They informed one another on the measures they were carrying out in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of V. I. Lenin.

The meeting proceeded in a spirit of comradely cooperation.

Leninism and fight against anti-communism

An international theoretical conference dedicated to the Lenin centenary was held in Moscow on January 19-23, sponsored by the USSR, the Bulgarian, Czechoslovak, GDR, Hungarian and Polish Academies of Sciences. The theme was Leninism's Increasing Role in the World of Today and Critique of Anti-Communism. Papers were read at the plenary sessions by P. N. Demichev, alternate Political Bureau member and Central Committee Secretary of the CPSU; Academician B. N. Ponomarev, Secretary of the CC, CPSU, and the following delegation heads: Bulgaria—R. Avramov, Party Central Committee member; Czechoslovakia—J. Fojtik, Party Central Committee Secretary; GDR—O. Reinhold, Director of the Party Social Sciences Institute; Hungary—S. Lakos, Director of the Party Social Sciences Institute; Mongolia—S. Natsagdorz, Presidium member of the Mongolian Academy of Sciences; Poland — A. Weblan, Party Central Committee member; Rumania—S. Voicu, Party Central Committee member; also Khaled Bagdash, General Secretary of the Syrian Communist Party; D. Currie, National Organizer, Communist Party of Canada, and R. Steigerwald, editor of the West German magazine *Marxistische Blätter*.

Panel discussions covered a wide range of political and theoretical problems related to the struggle against anti-communism. Altogether, there were over 150 research papers and communications.

There was a comprehensive analysis of the vast influence Leninism exerts on social development in the modern world. Its international significance—and this was convincingly demonstrated — has been fully confirmed by the class struggles of our century and by the continuous development of world socialism and of the workers' and national liberation movements. Lenin's ideas have now acquired unconquerable

force; their material embodiment is the powerful socialist world system and the national revolutionary struggles for emancipation from capitalist oppression.

The discussion fully reaffirmed the appraisal given by last year's International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties: "Today we have every justification for saying about Lenin's teaching what he himself said about Marxism: it is omnipotent because it is true. Marxist-Leninist theory and its creative application in specific conditions permits scientific answers to be found to the questions facing all contingents of the world revolutionary movement, wherever they are active.

"Loyalty to Marxism-Leninism, to this great international teaching, holds the promise of further successes of the Communist movement."

The Lenin centenary is an epochal landmark. And many of the speakers cited facts showing that the Communist and Workers' parties are marking the centenary by activating their revolutionary work, intensifying mass political and ideological activity, and strengthening and extending their ranks. The Lenin jubilee is an international event of first-rate importance, one that contributes to the battle against imperialism and for united action of the Communist and Workers' parties, of all the anti-imperialist forces.

The Marxist-Leninist fight against anti-communism can be divided into three distinct stages. The *first*—from the rise of Marxism, which found its continuation and development in Leninism, to the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution. The *second*—from the founding of the world's first socialist state to the emergence of the socialist world system. The *third* — the present stage, with its confrontation of the two mutually-opposed world social systems. And in each historical period anti-com-

munism assumed some new traits, some new distinguishing features, as the bourgeoisie adapted itself to the concrete and changing conditions of the worldwide class struggle.

In our day, bellicose anti-communism has become the essential content of the ideology of the bourgeoisie and its petty-bourgeois lieutenants. However, anti-communism goes far beyond ideology. For besides a definite system of views, it encompasses a whole complex of political, military, economic and other actions by the imperialist bourgeoisie and its allies.

The point was made that present-day anti-communism is the epitome of the century's most rabid reaction, a weapon with which imperialism hopes to contain the world revolutionary movement and keep capitalism afloat. Anti-communism is a screen and cover for an offensive against all the forces of social progress. Marx once remarked that for the bourgeoisie the anti-Communist witchhunt was but the prelude to a crusade against all recalcitrants. In our time this has become a salient feature of anti-communism, which can be more clearly seen as a means of suppressing all progressive and democratic movements. In short, anti-communism has become the quintessential expression of imperialism's anti-revolutionary ideology and policy.

But imperialism cannot regain the historical initiative—there is no turning back the clock. And Lenin's optimistic words resounded with new force at the conference: "Communism is emerging in positively every sphere of public life; its beginnings are to be seen literally on all sides. The 'contagion' (to use the favorite metaphor of the bourgeoisie and the bourgeois police, the one most to their liking) has very thoroughly penetrated the organism and has completely permeated it. . . . Communists should know that, in any case, the future belongs to them; therefore, we can (and must) combine the most intense passion in the great revolutionary struggle with the coolest and most sober appraisal of the frenzied ravings of the bourgeoisie" (Vol. 31, p. 101).

Anti-communism, speakers noted, offers nothing positive to society, nor can it, for its sole purpose and content is negative and destructive. Its method is tendentious criticism and outright slander of the Marxist-Leninist parties and the socialist system, the forces that can solve—and are solving—mankind's fundamental problems. Anti-communism is a ramified and constantly

increasing collection of brain-washing techniques, a system of indoctrinating a social psychology that tolerates reaction, imperialist aggression and police terror. Anti-communism implies methodical inculcation of hatred for socialism and progress.

In its broader implications, present-day anti-communism coincides with the policy and ideology of state-monopoly capitalism, a system that has no historical perspective and is in a state of profound social degradation. That explains the fact that, in present conditions, every species of reaction usually assumes an anti-Communist coloring. Present-day anti-communism, it was pointed out, has set itself three interconnected aims: undermine socialism, or, at the least, weaken the position of the socialist countries that are the van of the world revolutionary process; prevent revolution in capitalist countries; prevent ex-colonial countries from setting foot on the socialist path and keep them under imperialist domination and exploitation.

The point was also made that anti-communism is manifold in its forms and activity. Its most common expression is the official anti-communism of the ruling element in the imperialist powers, and, now as always, it relies mainly on American military strength. Behind the anti-Communist strategy one can clearly discern the gigantic military-industrial complex of the chief imperialist power, that alliance of the most reactionary section of the monopoly bourgeoisie and the militarists, complemented by a far-flung system of aggressive military blocs directed against the USSR, other socialist countries and, in the final analysis, all opponents of imperialism.

The tactics in relation to the socialist countries is to break up, fragment socialism as a world system and, on the other hand, erode the socialist countries and eventually set them on a capitalist course.

In its attempts to fragment the socialist world system anti-communism tries, first of all, to counterpose the socialist countries to the Soviet Union, incite anti-Sovietism and nationalist prejudices and views. This, in fact, is the hard core of imperialist strategy, and its far-reaching aim is to change the basic world alignment of forces. In its attempts to erode the socialist countries anti-communism relies mainly on altering their "internal evolution," "softening them up" politically, de-ideologizing their public life, etc. A key feature of this tactic is that it depends for its success not only on the remnants of the defeated exploiting classes

and their fellow-travellers, but also on revisionists and opportunists.

But there is a new element in this fight against the international Communist movement, that vanguard of the world revolutionary process. Reference is to attempts to weaken the link between Communists and other progressive social forces, prevent Communists from advancing to leading positions or, failing that, minimize their leading role. The idea, in other words, is to undermine the Communist movement from within, destroy the Parties' combat ability, inflate differences within the movement and sap its international strength.

Another line of attack—and this, too, was discussed at the conference—is against the fundamental principles of Communist Party policy and structure. The chief targets are democratic centralism, proletarian internationalism and the Marx and Lenin theory of proletarian dictatorship. And here the anti-Communists are getting a good deal of help from Right-wing Social-Democrat ideologists, "Left" and Right revisionists and all manner of renegades and splitters. Still another anti-Communist ploy is to use various political parties and public organizations within the labor and democratic movement in a bid to influence all social forces opposed to imperialist policy and exploitive regimes.

Anti-Communist tactics towards the national liberation movement were discussed in some detail. The imperialists use anti-communism to hamstring the anti-capitalist orientation of national-liberation revolutions and hold back the revolutionary process in emergent countries. This is neo-colonialism — an attempt to keep these countries under the sway of world capitalism, harden their unequal and exploited status, block their path to social progress and socialism. In this context, it was pointed out that the anti-Communists are particularly anxious to sever the national liberation movement from the socialist countries and the other revolutionary forces. The neo-colonialists are drawing heavily on anti-communism to impose on the newly-liberated countries puppet regimes, venal and tyrannical, and thwart independent and progressive development. The attack is aimed not only at the Communists of these countries, those intrepid champions of the people's freedom and independence, but at all patriots and progressives. No sooner does a country introduce radical socio-economic reforms, or encroach on the interests of the foreign monopolies and Big Business

generally than its leaders are denounced as Communists. It is no exaggeration to say that no genuine national-liberation leader, no real patriot, has been spared that treatment.

Anti-communism is making frenzied attempts to split the patriotic ranks and bring the national bourgeoisie into an alliance with the imperialists. Anti-communism is utilized also to influence the foreign policy orientation of developing countries and involve them in imperialist policies.

Lenin pointed out that, 'the more victorious we are, the more the capitalist exploiters learn to unite and the more determined their onslaught' (Vol. 30, p. 450), and he emphasized the need to "overcome resistance from the capitalists in all its forms, not only in the military and the political spheres, but also ideological resistance, which is the most deep-seated and the strongest" (Vol. 31, p. 370).

In the imperialist powers anti-communism has been elevated to the rank of official policy. It is the organizing and directing factor in the huge subversive campaign against the socialist countries, against the workers', Communist and national liberation movements. Anti-Communist strategy and tactics are especially dangerous if they are not properly revealed and properly appraised. That is why the battle against anti-communism has, in a way, become the focal point of anti-imperialist policy and action. And that battle goes beyond proletarian class interests; it is a general democratic task involving the interests of all people. In exposing anti-communism, the Communists are upholding not only the class interests of the proletariat, but are acting as the vanguard of all the forces of progress, as pioneers in devising solutions for the vital problems of our time, and as champions of the democratic ideals attacked by reaction.

To anti-Communist negativism the Communist movement opposes a positive and scientifically grounded program for social progress. Collectively elaborated at last year's International Meeting and clearly formulated in its documents, it provides a blueprint for united action of all opponents of imperialism, of everyone who stands for peace, freedom and progress. It calls for concerted action in support of the Vietnamese people, for peace and peaceful co-existence of states with differing social systems, prohibition of nuclear weapons, solidarity with peoples fighting to break out of colonialism, stepped-up effort against fascism and racist ideology and practice,

for freedom, democracy and national independence.

This program, spearheaded against anti-communism, was concretized at the conference in adaptation to the specifics of the fight against present-day anti-communism, that concentrated expression of imperialist ideology and policy. The following, in brief, are the principal elements formulated at the conference:

The international working class and the socialist world system are the decisive force ranged against anti-communism. Hence, success in the fight against it depends primarily on the workers' resolute struggle against world capital, on success in solving the problems of building socialism and communism by making maximum use of the potentialities of the new social system, resolving problems as they arise and eliminating shortcomings and defects. Constant perfection of socialism's economic and political system, of socialist democracy and culture, increases the attraction of socialism, makes it harder for the anti-Communists to speculate on our shortcomings and defects and attracts more and more supporters to our ideas and policy;

The anti-Communists know only too well that the Soviet Union and the socialist world system are the mainstay of all the revolutionary and anti-imperialist forces. To weaken this mainstay is to weaken each of its elements. Hence, the defense of socialism and propagation of its achievements are an internationalist duty of all Communists, all revolutionaries;

A major factor in combating anti-communism is closer unity of the international Communist movement to increase its combat capacity. And unity hinges largely on the strengthening of each Communist Party on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and pro-

letarian internationalism. The pre-condition for this is unremitting struggle against Right and "Left" opportunism and diverse forms of nationalism, through which anti-Communist influence penetrates the workers', Communist and national liberation movements;

The bourgeoisie uses every conceivable means in its effort to bring the masses under its ideological sway. Hence, exposure of anti-communism and successful struggle against it cannot rely only on popularizing socialism's achievements. This must be complemented by broad and effective ideological work, systematic and resolute defense of Marxism-Leninism, creative development of revolutionary theory, extensive propaganda of the ideas of Marx and Lenin, the ideas of socialism. In short, there must be determined action against conscious advocates of anti-communism, all apologists of imperialist reaction, to wrest the masses from anti-Communist influence.

However, neither Marx, Engels nor Lenin confined their criticism of hostile concepts to mere exposure. The force of their criticism lay in the fact that they did not allow the enemy to exploit our unsolved problems, boldly tackled these problems and showed how they could be solved.

The international theoretical conference on present-day anti-communism, held shortly before the Lenin centenary, was a clear demonstration of the Communists' unswerving fidelity to the all-conquering doctrine of Marxism-Leninism, irreconcilability to all manifestations of bourgeois and opportunist ideology, determination to strengthen the unity and cohesion of our ranks in the battle against imperialism and reaction, for peace, democracy, national independence and socialism.

V.T.

A year of headway

ALVARO CUNHAL

The eventful 13 months between September 1968, when Salazar became incapacitated and Marcelo Caetano was appointed Prime Minister, and October 26, 1969, the day of the bogus elections, have left the Portuguese people much richer in political experience.

For this period saw the further deepening of the crisis of the fascist regime, added to its difficulties and aggravated its inner contradictions. The working class and the anti-fascists achieved considerable success and won important positions. The democratic movement, having gained strength, is now in a much better position to continue the fight for freedom.

"LIBERAL" SIGNBOARD FOR FASCISM

Salazar quit the political scene at a time when the foundations of his dictatorship had been undermined by steady contraction of its social base. That can be attributed to the widespread public resentment, the economic stagnation, the hopeless seven-year colonial war and the growing international isolation. With the departure of the dictator, who had held the country in his grip for 40 years, the ruling classes had somehow to remove the main sources of discontent in order to avert a sharp flare-up of the popular struggle. The monopolies entrusted the job to Marcelo Caetano, a former Salazar aide, former Minister of Colonies, theorist of fascism, and director of several banks and companies.

In his first public statement as head of government, Caetano promised "necessary reforms," spoke of the freedom he would "wish to see re-established" and said he would work for an atmosphere of "ideologi-

cal tolerance" from which, incidentally, the Communists were there and then excluded. His speech was followed by a high-pressure propaganda campaign to instil the belief that the new government was set on a liberal course.

The fascists hoped that this maneuver would pay off in more public support for the regime at home and abroad, would lull the public into a state of passivity, encourage the more hesitant of the opposition to collaborate with the government, isolate the Communist Party and thus rob the democratic movement of its sole truly revolutionary force.

Of course, there are conflicts of interest within the fascist camp: there is a power struggle; there are differences on the ways and means of handling difficult situations. But the Caetano government, far from being liberal, is, in fact, an unholy alliance of several fascist clans to salvage the dictatorship and bolster it at a time of dire crisis.

Monopoly control is tighter than ever. The new Prime Minister has said he will encourage centralization and concentration of capital, provide government subsidies for big monopoly groups capable of engaging in "socially useful activity" and encourage foreign investments. No wonder the world capitalist press has been markedly sympathetic to his "liberalization" pronouncements, and no wonder 829 Portuguese bankers and industrialists have presented him with a written testimonial of support.

Like his predecessor, Caetano is trying to deal with the country's economic difficulties and to finance the costly colonial war at the expense of the working population. Wages are still frozen, speed-up is being accelerated and every hard-won wage

increase is matched by a steeper rise in prices.

Retention of the colonial empire and continuation of the war against the peoples of Guinea, Angola and Mozambique remains the focal point of fascist policy. There is, however, this difference: Salazar, who had a more realistic view of the situation, maintained that the purpose was to "hang on"; Caetano says the purpose is to win the war. Accordingly, he has stepped up operations, sent fresh contingents to Africa, instituted terror against the national liberation movement and staged provocations against neighboring Zambia, Tanzania, Guinea (Conakry), Senegal and the People's Republic of Congo. The idea is to instigate reactionary coups in these countries in order to deprive the liberation movement of an important source of support. Similarly, Caetano has strengthened his alliance with the racist regimes of South Africa and Rhodesia, and with the government of Malawi. NATO countries are granted more concessions in Angola and Mozambique (oil, ores, diamonds, etc.) and in Portugal itself in the hope of more military, economic, financial and diplomatic aid.

And as in the Salazar days, this policy is imposed by terror. The repressions are aimed primarily against the Communist Party, which continues to work underground. Caetano boasts that "there is not a single political prisoner on Portuguese soil," but sterling Communist fighters are held in close confinement, men like Pires Jorge, Blanqui Teixeira, Dias Lourenco, Octavio Pata and many more. The repressions are aimed also at workers and students, at participants in democratic demonstrations. The political police and the fascist militia kidnap and beat up democrats and break up public meetings. Student activists are drafted into the army.

For all their "liberalization" talk, the Prime Minister and his Defense Minister are threatening the country with civil war. The much-advertised "liberalization" program boils down to hollow promises, temporary suspension of arrest and imprisonment of non-Communist anti-fascists, temporary and slight moderation of censorship (but now just as stringent as before), and to certain measures which seemingly satisfy public demands and might appear to undermine the traditional structure and methods of the fascist dictatorship, but are really designed to retain and strengthen both.

The fascists deny that Portugal is governed by one party, for, they argue, the

fascist National Union is not really a party since "its doors are wide open to all Portuguese of good will." But this demagogy is contradicted by the official statement that the National Union is "the only legal channel of political action," and that all other organizations and groups are illegal because they represent political parties.

The fascists say they have "dispelled the myth of the police state" (Interior Minister, April 10, 1969). Indeed, they issued a much publicized decree (November 17, 1969) "dissolving" the abhorrent PIDE, the political police. But shortly afterwards they admitted that the PIDE organization and personnel have been retained under the new signboard of General Security Board.

The fascists claim that the elected leadership of the National Trade Unions no longer has to be approved by the government. But they have got around that by introducing "prior approval" by fascist commissions in the trade unions which can veto the nomination of any or all candidates.

Caetano is fond of repeating that his program can be capsuled into the formula "continuity and evolution." That has little claim to originality, for it has been used by every reactionary government everywhere: with the policy of its predecessor hopelessly discredited, the new government tries to counter public pressure and avert sharp class conflicts by going through the motions of "revising" policy and by taking credit for concessions won by the people. The accent in Caetano's formula is clearly on "continuity," for fascism thrives in Portugal under a "liberal" signboard.

True, there have been some changes in the past year. Wages have risen somewhat; some political detainees have been released, the democratic movement has come out in the open and is conducting wide propaganda and building up an organization. Progressives have taken over the leadership of some trade unions, student associations and other mass organizations. Government policy, especially the colonial war, is now openly discussed. The democratic opposition ran its candidates in the fascist "elections" and conducted a national campaign. But these are not concessions granted by a "liberalized" fascist regime—they are the result of hard struggle by the working people and democrats in the face of unceasing repressions; the result, also, of skilful use of the limited legal opportunities to wrest from the fascist regime, step by step, what it has so adamantly denied the people for so many years.

THE POPULAR STRUGGLE IN 1969

Communist tactics in relation to the Caetano government, formulated by the Party Central Committee immediately after the takeover, have two main aims: first, to expose the demagogy of "liberalization" and the efforts of the ruling clique to continue Salazar's policies without Salazar. Second, boldly to utilize the new situation created by the deepening crisis of the regime (of which the "liberalization" demagogy is a major indicator) in order to break out of the political stagnation, force the government to fulfil its promises and win new positions for mass political action in support of immediate concrete demands.

Developments have fully vindicated that line. But it required a serious ideological struggle before the democratic movement would accept it, for we had to overcome the indecision and wavering caused by the first flush of fascist demagogy.

Some groups (for instance, the semi-legal intellectual Socialist Action, which leans towards the Socialist International) took the line that the situation had been radically transformed and that Caetano—whom they described as a "faint ray of light"—was determined to write *finis* to the dictatorship and launch out on political democratization. From this they concluded that the government should be "helped along." In no circumstances should mass action be encouraged, lest it "frighten away" the liberal-minded element. Other groups (the liberal bourgeoisie and "Lefts") took the opposite view: nothing had changed, "everything is as it was," and they concluded that there were no opportunities for legal action, no prospect of a rise in the popular movement, in short, the outlook was as bleak as ever.

These attitudes fostered a wait-and-see atmosphere in the democratic movement. "Differences in or between political parties," Lenin wrote, "are usually resolved not only by polemics over principles, but also by the course of political development" (Vol. 9, p. 146). The truth of that has been confirmed time and again. In Portugal, as events substantiated our analysis of the political situation, opportunist illusions were dispelled and the proletarian party's decisive role in the anti-fascist struggle was demonstrated with the utmost clarity.

By following the old Salazar policy, Caetano has only succeeded in exposing the true character of his regime. His fascist maneuvers have boomeranged as a result of

popular struggle, a struggle waged on three main fronts: in support of the workers' demands, political action by the democratic opposition, and the student movement.

As soon as the new government was installed, our Central Committee declared that it "would be a grave error to allow the exigencies of the political struggle to overshadow the movement for economic demands." The Central Committee further emphasized that "the time was especially favorable for a victorious campaign for the workers' immediate demands." Right and "Left" opportunists rejected that reading of the situation. Their own reading was that the movement had "gone beyond" economic struggle, and that the Communist Party was guilty of "economism." Others maintained that strikes would only provoke an all-out attack by the ultras.

The facts were to show who was right and who was wrong. On December 31, 1968, 2,000 workers downed tools in the Lisnave shipyards in Lisbon; on January 2, 1969 there was a major railway stoppage; on January 9, a mass workers' rally at the arsenal; on January 12, sit-in strikes and rallies at the Tejo cement mills and towards the end of the month in the Trefilaria factory in Sacavem. These are all large enterprises with a long militant tradition. Some of the strikes ended in a quick victory and this greatly stimulated the movement throughout the capital, sparking off a wave of strikes and workers' rallies in the early months of 1969, in which more than 100,000 were involved.

These strikes were important not only because they resulted in an appreciable increase in wages, but also because of their political implications. By mounting this offensive, the working class, acting in behalf of the people of Portugal, pronounced its emphatic "No" to Caetano's "liberalization" demagogy. The strikes pierced the atmosphere of passivity the regime had been at such pains to build up; they exposed the fascist demagogy, disclosed the difficulties besetting the regime and showed the people that the conditions for struggle were now more favorable. Lastly, they helped to reduce and neutralize opportunist influence in the democratic movement and to promote political action and anti-fascist unity.

Last year's economic struggles stimulated and radicalized the general political movement. The one-hour token railway strike on October 20, 1969, at the height of the opposition campaign, was the culminat-

ing point in the fight for economic demands. But it was also a very valuable form of the fight for democratic rights, notably the right to organize and strike. And that, along with economic demands, was voiced at every meeting and in numerous collective statements. The decision to hold the railway strike was taken on October 12 at a conference of more than 100 delegates from all railway lines. The conference set up a national railwaymen's council, which issued the strike call, distributed in 30,000 copies throughout the country. The government, as was to be expected, retaliated with repressive measures. But to no avail: between 3 and 4 in the afternoon of October 20, all railway traffic was brought to a standstill in Lisbon, on suburban lines and on the Lisbon-Porto line. Work also stopped in the Barreiro (2,000 workers), Entroncamento (2,500 workers) and other rail shops. More than 2,000 demonstrated at Lisbon's Central Station. In Portugal, where strikes are a criminal offence and workers' organizations are banned, the October 20 stoppage, six days before the fascist "elections," laid its imprint on political life and showed that the working class was in the van of the anti-fascist movement and capable of effective independent action.

It was at this time, too, that the democratic opposition heightened its political activity. In defiance of government bans, it launched a vigorous campaign for freedom of speech and organization. Legal activity, ostensibly in preparation for the October "elections," enabled it to extend its appeal to the people and to build up a broad semi-legal, flexible mass organization. Its public statements sharply criticized the dictatorship and pressed the demands for basic democratic rights. Thousands took part in its demonstrations and in conferences, symposiums, round-table discussions and public forums on national problems. The congress at Aveiro on May 15-17 brought together 1,500 delegates representing all opposition trends. Thousands more were involved in the work of local democratic organizations, youth, women's and other groups. There were national conferences of representatives of regional organizations. On June 15, 1969, one such conference adopted the Unity Platform which, alongside the general aims of the democratic revolution, contained more immediate objectives: the right of assembly, freedom of speech, the right to organize and to strike, release of all political prisoners, abolition

of the political police, an end to the colonial war and self-determination for the Portuguese colonies.

The fight for legalization of the Democratic Commissions continues. Time and again the government has declared them "illegal" and "subversive," but they have been able to operate openly because they have the backing of a widespread and militant movement. In fact, during the election campaign, they were even officially recognized, for one month, as Democratic Election Commissions (DEC). They opened canvassing centers and published and circulated election literature. True, soon after the sham elections, on November 8, they were again declared illegal, but the democratic movement continued to grow in defiance of this and other bans.

It put up 130 candidates in 18 of the 23 constituencies, but its election campaign spread to every part of the country.

To understand the situation in Portugal and see the democratic movement in proper perspective, it should be borne in mind that there have never been real elections, only what might be termed "electoral mystifications" carefully prepared and stage-managed by the dictatorship. In the last election—as in all previous ones for that matter—the results were crudely rigged. The Democratic Commissions set up to promote voter registration were banned. Out of four million officially recognized potential voters, a mere 28,000 took the trouble to register, but the government went ahead and registered 1,800,000 without any control. The regime did not feel secure even behind this impressive facade, and it did everything it could to hamper the opposition's campaign—its nominations were annulled, its election literature was draconically censored, meetings were banned, control at polling stations was allowed only in those rare cases where the government was obliged to reckon with the strength of the opposition.

It might be asked: would it not have been wiser, in these circumstances, to have had no part in the elections? That was suggested by the liberals of the Democratic and Social Action group, who argued that putting up opposition candidates was tantamount to "underwriting the dictatorship." The "Lefts," who also counselled an election boycott, coined the absurd slogan: "Voting is a betrayal." However, keeping out of the elections would have fostered more passivity, and we would have let slip

a rare opportunity for public action. Running candidates and intensive campaigning help expose fascist policy, advance the struggle for immediate demands and for long-range democratic aims. Furthermore, the campaign helped to strengthen the organization, to form closer ties with the masses, to alert public opinion and to win new positions from which to continue the struggle.

The official "election results"—as was to be expected—gave the fascists all the seats in the National Assembly. But they also showed that the regime was isolated. Where the opposition was able to watch the voting—and this was emphasized by the press—the turnout was especially high, though the national average was low (less than 50 per cent in Setubal and Lisbon). This means that the fascists were unable to build up even a semblance of popular support. But where there was no democratic control, "polling" was surprisingly high, though the polling stations were empty. In short, the fascists simply produced whatever "returns" they wanted. And yet the government did not venture to declare that it had obtained more than 50 per cent of the registered vote. Actually, less than 25 per cent of the electorate supported it. There is also this revealing detail: according to the official results, 130,000 registered voters cast their ballots for the opposition. The figure is even more impressive in some of the more important areas: in Lisbon, for instance, the opposition (according to government returns) obtained 25 per cent of the vote, 34 per cent in Setabal, and 54 per cent in the industrial communities south of Lisbon. If we add to this that the bulk of the democratic-minded population was not registered, that the returns were carefully sifted, and that nowhere was democratic control complete—it should be perfectly clear that the democratic movement enjoys wide support even among the carefully picked voters included in the electoral register.

In fighting the fascist-staged "elections," the democratic forces were not out to gain parliamentary seats, but rather to broaden the popular movement. And in this they succeeded. For hundreds of thousands were in one or another way involved in rallies, demonstrations, etc., and the circulation of leaflets, statements, manifestos and similar material ran into the millions. It can be safely said that never before in the 43 years off fascist dictatorship had Portugal witnessed such an intensive legal and semi-

legal opposition propaganda and organization campaign.

True, there were shortcomings. In some cases the opposition, seeing the "elections" as an end rather than a means, became engrossed in the petty details to the detriment of mass work; there were organizational defects in campaigning for partial demands. But the biggest defect was the lag of the movement in rural areas. All this was emphasized by our Central Committee.

And yet these shortcomings notwithstanding, the movement made a big step forward. Today it is stronger than a year ago and much better equipped to continue the fight.

The student movement, which in Portugal has a grand militant tradition, played an important part in this period.

The November 1968 student rally (about 5,000) in Coimbra adopted the student charter, known as the "Coimbra Declaration." It was the starting point for the growth of the movement, as evidenced by the anti-fascist victory in the elections to the student associations, which hitherto had been administered by government-appointed commissions. The elections were followed by demonstrations and strikes in the Lisbon, Porto and Coimbra universities. The biggest was the Coimbra "examination strike." Called by a student conference, it involved 96 per cent of the student body. The government, as usual, retaliated by dispersing student meetings, beating up their participants, prohibiting the student associations and arresting their leaders. None of these actions, nor all of them in combination, could stem the movement.

And its growth reaffirmed that most of the students, the overwhelming majority, in fact, were opposed to the fascist regime. It also showed that while the student movement had a great militant potential, it lacked proper political orientation and was influenced by the ultra-Left, radical extremists and Right opportunists. Where the movement was able to set itself a definite aim and mobilize the students to fight for it, it made significant headway. Conversely, where there was no correct understanding of the alignment of forces, where the aim of the movement was relegated to the background and positions already won were not consolidated, the fight for particular aims was superseded by abstract agitation for the "revolutionary" slogan and for a "fight-back," and mass action was superseded by over-dramatized attitudes of a small "activist" minority—

in all these cases the movement was doomed to stagnation and retreat, losing important positions, including leading posts in many associations.

Political radicalization of the student movement and its anti-imperialist orientation are doubtlessly positive factors, the result of socialism's worldwide success and of the fight and advance of the working class. Attempts to present the students as the "vanguard" of the revolutionary movement, deny the revolutionary role of the working class and its party, convert student organizations into "student political parties," set them on an anarchist, Leftist and adventurist course—these are the hallmarks of petty-bourgeois attitudes which, objectively, tend to sever the student movement from the working class and the fight for socialism and, naturally, weaken its effectiveness in the battle against the fascist dictatorship.

This is the Party's attitude towards the students: we recognize the movement's broad initiative and have no intention of placing it under authoritarian bureaucratic control. The Party's task is to help the movement assimilate the experience of proletarian revolutionary struggle, win it over to Marxism-Leninism, give it an overall perspective and an understanding of the revolutionary process, so as to bring it into the joint anti-fascist mass struggle to topple the dictatorship and give Portugal a democratic regime. That struggle is part of the advance to socialism.

Though petty-bourgeois radicalism has had an adverse effect on the movement at certain stages, or at certain turning points, the students' actions are strongly influenced by the Communist Party and are a valuable contribution to the development of the democratic opposition.

Last August, our Central Committee stated that fascism had not attained the basic aims it counted on in its "liberal" demagogy. It failed to split the democratic movement, isolate the Communists and prevent intensification of the class struggle. Nor could it win more international support for fascism and induce the people to support its policy of "renewal" and "liberalization." Contrary to all the regime's plans and expectations, the Portuguese people broke out of the political apathy, went over to the offensive and won substantial gains. This was the conclusion drawn by the Central Committee: "This year of 'liberalization' demagogy and of selfless struggle by the masses and the democratic movement

has resulted in major set-backs for fascism and in important achievements for the people."

UNITY AND THE FIGHT AGAINST OPPORTUNISM

In the past year anti-fascist unity reached a level rarely achieved in the 43 years of fascist rule. This is due to the ceaseless struggle and better organized political action. The unfolding of a broad movement and the emergence of mass organizations attracting people of all political views (progressive Catholics, liberals, Socialists, Communists) demonstrated the urge for unity in the democratic movement and among the masses. They also reaffirmed that unity is established and strengthened not by concessions to opportunism but, on the contrary, by energetic struggle against it. It can be said that in this period the democratic movement grew as opportunism in the ideological, political and organizational fields, in all practical activity, was neutralized, isolated and overcome.

In line with his demagogy, Caetano said he would allow legalization of all groups supporting his "liberal" program. What he wanted was a tame opposition firmly committed to anti-Communism. In a speech delivered on December 27, 1968, he declared: "Those who do not want to see the country under communist rule must determine their attitude." The opportunists accepted that compromise. In their Appeal to the Nation (December 16, 1968) they rejected "totalitarian socialism" and urged Caetano to grant the people freedom inasmuch as this "was the only shield against totalitarianism" (meaning, of course, Communism).

The opportunists were full of praise for Caetano and his "liberalization," in the hope that this would win them the promised "priority legalization" and a monopoly position as the sole legal spokesmen of the opposition, and with it hegemony of the democratic movement. They even negotiated with the fascist party and though the content of the negotiations was never made public, the fact that negotiations had taken place was confirmed by the fascist leader Melo-e-Castro (December 16, 1968) and by the Social-Democrat opposition leader Mario Soares in an interview a few months later. More, the opportunists tried to talk various democratic groups into breaking with the Communists as "compromising allies." In short, they wanted a monopoly of the political initiative and legal activity.

The desire for unity is keen in various democratic circles; and unity was achieved in workers' and students' actions, in the fight for immediate political aims and in all the grass-roots organizations. This was a telling blow to the splitters, anti-Communists and collaborationists. So much so, that, in the end, to ward off complete isolation, the opportunists had to come out for unity without discrimination. But they persisted in their intrigues to divide the movement. For example, they opposed united action, mass organization and mass struggle; insisted that Communists in the DEC's identify themselves as such. They used all manner of pettifogging to demand half the seats on the DEC's and half of the candidates. This was firmly opposed by the entire democratic movement and, on July 16, they withdrew from the DEC's in Lisbon, Porto and Braga and set up their own commissions and put up their own candidates, on the pretext that the DEC's were subservient to the "monolithic Communists." Meant to intimidate everyone advocating unity with the Communists, this could only rob the united movement of opportunities for legal work.

But again they miscalculated. The DEC's continued and proved that they had the following of the bulk of the democratic movement. Even in the "elections," on which the opportunists had pinned so much hope, they failed to make anything resembling an impressive showing. Though voters had been crossed off the electoral register and though the returns had been faked, the splitters obtained only one-third of the vote cast for the DEC, Communist-supported candidates, and only one-quarter in Lisbon.

These repeated discomfitures of the opportunists and splitters have helped to strengthen democratic unity. Our Party stands for unity of all anti-fascists to put an end to fascism and attain the primary goal of the democratic and national revolution, namely, political freedom. Our Party upholds unity in the struggle; united action as opposed to passivity and collaboration; it wants unity not as an end in itself, but as a weapon for common action and struggle by diverse social and political forces. Our unity policy presupposes political agreement and a common platform, but the working-class revolutionary party cannot sacrifice its basic aims in the name of supposed unity, nor can it renounce independent political action by the proletariat, or its consistent internationalism.

Now and then the opportunists declare

that they welcome unity with the Communist Party, but not the Communist Party that now exists. They want a Communist Party more to their liking, a pliant ally rather than a revolutionary working-class party, a party prepared to accept the political dominance of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois groups. Accordingly, they have tried to pressure the Communist Party into renouncing its class positions. They have sought to exploit our Party's unswerving friendship with the Soviet Union and the CPSU, declaring that our approval of the action of the five socialist countries in Czechoslovakia would have "grave repercussions" (of which there is no evidence in Portugal) for alliance and cooperation of the democratic forces.

All this had no impact on anti-fascists and the masses generally. Those who wanted to isolate the Portuguese Communist Party have only isolated themselves, and certainly have not severed the Communists from the democratic movement.

The past year has brought fresh evidence that our unity policy, based on principle and never departing from the class positions of the proletarian revolutionary party, is correct and effective. That evidence is the growing unity of the democratic movement; united action by anti-fascists of all trends, Communists, Catholics, Socialists, liberals; the emergence of a broad united organization which, despite police terror, is acting as the sole mass opposition force; participation in joint actions by all sections of the population, including those influenced by opportunism. It was our unity policy that made these successes possible and is helping to bring the democratic forces together in a united movement.

PARTIAL DEMANDS AND THE REVOLUTIONARY PERSPECTIVE

Developments during the "liberalization" year have greatly narrowed fascism's room for maneuver. It is hardly likely that the country will ever return to the apathy of the Salazar days; the growth of the democratic movement will prevent that. On the other hand, a renewed wave of repressions would offer no way out of the difficulties in which the regime is caught. On the contrary, it would trigger off a chain of events the regime is so anxious to avoid. And though the government wants to drive the opposition underground again and regain some of its lost positions, we can expect it to go on with its "liberalization" farce.

Before the sham elections, the Party warned that there would be a renewed onslaught and more demagoguery. The government would use the "renewed" National Assembly and, possibly, a Cabinet reshuffle in another attempt to deceive the people. For, as Lenin wrote: "Historical situations arise when reforms, and particularly promises of reforms, pursue only one aim: to allay the unrest of the people, force the revolutionary class to cease or at least slacken, its struggle" (Vol. 23, p. 247). That is exactly what is taking place now in Portugal. Less than a month after the bogus elections, the government announced "dissolution" of the PIDE which, however, continues to operate under a different name. We can expect other "reforms" and promises of "reforms"—for instance, a "press law" and "university reform," perhaps even more "administrative autonomy" for the colonies.

But the democratic movement and the public at large are not being taken in by Caetano's celebrated "liberalization." Demagoguery cannot stop the public ferment, nor can it prevent democratic action. The strike of 5,000 Lisbon shipyard workers only two weeks after the "elections" was the first demonstration of that. "Reforms" and promises of "reforms" are meant to paralyze the people's will to fight. But, at the same time, they underscore the legitimacy of the people's democratic demands and thereby stimulate the fight for their satisfaction. The fascists are caught in their own demagoguery and will have to agree to more concessions, provided the democratic movement staunchly defends its positions, fortifies its unity and continues the fight. Demagoguery is a double-edged weapon, and events in the past year have shown that the organized movement can turn it against the regime.

We are now concentrating on immediate aims, among them *de facto*, if not *de jure*, legality for the democratic opposition as an organized public movement. But it would be sheer illusion to believe that the government will yield without stubborn resistance,

that by making one concession after another the fascist dictatorship will vanish through a process of evolution. Yet that is exactly what the fascist demagogues want the people to believe. And it has been swallowed by the opportunists, who argue that though "evolution is not as quick as we would wish, there is no cause for despair" (*Republica*, October 23, 1969). And demagoguery is complemented by harsh repressions whenever the conflict assumes menacing proportions, or whenever the regime considers that the democratic movement and the popular struggle have gone beyond its "lifeline." The fascists have no intention of surrendering. They control the machinery of government, a well-organized machine of repression, and can be relied upon to use both to start a civil war to stave off any threat to the existence of the regime.

The very process of struggle leads to its intensification. There are many battles ahead on the Portuguese people's path to freedom. The democratic movement is combining legal and semi-legal with illegal work; it does not shirk "lower" forms of struggle; is steadfastly fighting for partial demands. Its basic task is to raise the popular struggle to a higher level and to direct popular discontent, indignation and revolt into a victorious revolutionary stream. The Portuguese people can hardly avoid a violent clash with the fascist dictatorship. That is the prospect of political action for partial demands, of our organizational work, of our mass activity.

The Communist Party is the country's only revolutionary party, the only one conducting systematic illegal activity, the only one closely linked with the masses. Only our Party is in a position to act as the motive force of democratic unity and to direct the movement towards achievement of the primary aim of the present stage of the revolution, namely, the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship and the winning of political freedom. And the Portuguese Communists will spare no effort to be equal to their great responsibility.

Engineers and technicians, and the working class

JOE METZGER

The number and the role of engineers, technicians and administrative personnel are growing rapidly with the accelerated growth of science and technology, which is strongly stimulating production.

For many years, the French Communist Party has followed this evolution, and not for any transient motives, but for reasons of principle. The party of the working class, the most revolutionary of all classes which by liberating itself also liberates the entire nation from the clutches of the monopolies, it is working for a broad alliance of all anti-monopoly and democratic forces.

For more than thirty years the Party has concerned itself with cultural matters and the problems of intellectuals. Its activity in this domain is evidence, too, of the national role of the workers in the struggle for emancipation.

At present, engineers, administrators and technicians are troubled about the future, associated with that of their industrial branch, that of the whole economy. They are becoming aware that they are powerless in face of the employers and the monopoly power, that they must concert their efforts with those of all working people.

The working class, too, cannot expect to go it alone. It needs allies: the traditional middle strata in town and country, the intermediate salaried category and, particularly, the intellectuals.

That is why, after the powerful strikes of May-June 1968 in which engineers, administrators, technicians and other groups of intellectuals participated more actively than ever before, the *Manifesto for an Advanced Democracy, for a Socialist France*,

adopted by our Central Committee in December 1968, especially stressed that "the number of engineers, technicians, researchers and teachers is growing continuously. Intellectuals run into the millions in all fields of endeavor. Despite considerable differences in their situation, the vast majority is subjected to the increasing pressures of capitalist exploitation. The monopoly regime denies them creative participation in shaping the economic and political destiny of the country and in cultural affairs. Their role in the class struggle is growing. To be sure, their development and their social origins do not dispose them to acknowledge lightly the decisive role of the working class. But the spring battles of 1968 showed that a part of them, a much more considerable part than at any previous time, is preparing to participate actively in the struggle by the side of the factory and office workers. The French Communist Party regards this necessary alliance of the working class and the intellectuals as a cardinal matter deserving of its utmost attention."

A few weeks later the Central Committee organized a national conference in Pantin, a Paris suburb, to examine the situation of the administrative personnel, engineers and technicians, and to determine the tasks of the Party in relation to them. The two days of discussion, in which many members of the Political Bureau, notably the Party's General Secretary, Waldeck Rochet, participated, witnessed a fruitful exchange of opinion, probing deeply into a number of problems with an eye to unfolding political and ideological work among engineers, administrative personnel and technicians.

This is a time of upheaval in all areas of life. This is the epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism on a world scale, an epoch of the liberation of the peoples. At the same time, it is highlighted by the beginning of the greatest scientific and technological revolution.

This revolution is creating considerable political contradictions in the capitalist world, particularly in relation to the situation and role of engineers, administrative personnel and technicians in modern society.

Examining the social and political implications of that revolution, we must not abstract ourselves from the nature of the socio-economic system in which it unfolds. Although we are still at the beginning of the process, we can neither ignore nor underrate the technico-scientific revolution. Nowadays, machines are increasingly invading the functional domain of the human brain. The capacity of human labor is considerably reinforced by the rapidity, capacity and precision of the electronic computer.

Discoveries and inventions are multiplying prodigiously. New sciences and new branches of old disciplines are emerging continuously. But more than anything, it is the relationship between science and production that is changing, seeing them draw ever closer to each other.

Science is becoming a productive force in its own right. That aspect is not new, for Marx observed it back in his day but now it has become deeper and more sweeping. The capital allocated for scientific research is expanding constantly. To take only investment in research-development, that is, only that sector of research whose impact on production is immediate, research expenditure in France has climbed from 1,760 million francs in 1960 to 3,580 million in 1964. Research spending in electronics, for example, amounts to 11 per cent, in aviation 24 per cent and atomic energy 32 per cent of the total turnover in the respective industries.

The time interval between a discovery and its industrial application on a large scale is visibly shrinking. Some of the research is performed directly in the factories. Many of the investigations can no longer be accommodated in laboratories by old methods. Modern research necessitates the collaboration of large teams involving engineers and technicians in addition to researchers, as well as workers and a

varied administrative personnel, with all assembled in huge centers whose dimensions and organization approach those of industrial enterprises.

The revolution, it should be stressed, concerns the productive forces. Though it entails definite social change, it does not as such entail a social revolution. For the passage from capitalism to socialism, the class struggle was, and is, the decisive factor.

The passage from capitalism to socialism, whatever its forms and means, is always a qualitative change, a revolutionary leap, implying a change in the system of the ownership of the principal means of production, a transfer of political power from the bourgeoisie to the working class and its allies, a superior phase in the moral and cultural evolution of society.

The scientific and technological revolution imposes certain requirements, which state-monopoly capitalism endeavors to use in its own interests.

Among these new requirements are those for incomparably higher proficiency on the part of the labor force, a higher level of education and professional training on a broader cultural foundation.

Yet the mobility of labor prevalent these days in the capitalist environment is a consequence of the technical flux, pushing up unemployment, disqualifying workers and creating a sense of insecurity among increasingly broader strata of wage-earners.

Utilization of scientific and technical progress by capitalism for purposes of the maximum profit accelerates monopoly concentration of production. As a consequence, in the framework of state-monopoly capitalism, the technico-scientific revolution, a factor in the socialization of the productive forces, exacerbates the contradictions of the system.

There is a dialectical interdependence between the class struggle and the scientific and technological revolution. The former stimulates the growth of the productive forces, while the consequences of the latter raise the class struggle to a higher level, forcefully demonstrating the necessity of socialism.

Thus, in the capitalist environment the effects of the scientific and technological revolution are dual: on the one hand, it is of a progressive nature, impelling the growth of the productive forces, accelerating socialization and backing up the premises of socialism, while, on the other, progress is constantly retarded and deformed,

and utilized for the purpose of the maximum profit and the intensified exploitation of labor.

In our analysis of this conflicting process, we must attack on two fronts: against Right opportunism, which underscores the progressive character of the technico-scientific revolution and deduces therefrom that it leads automatically to socialism, without class struggle or the revolutionary leap, and also against "Left" opportunism, which contends that the technico-scientific revolution reinforces the imperialist system. In both cases, an error in the analysis may lead to a renunciation of the class struggle and to justifying the existence of capitalism.

* * *

One of the most spectacular consequences of scientific and technological progress is the rapidly increasing number of engineers, administrative personnel and technicians. According to the early results of the 1968 census, engineers, administrators and technicians represent a mass of some two million wage-earners, amounting to nearly 10 per cent of France's active population. In six years, from 1962 to 1968, the number of engineers increased by 37.9 per cent, that of the higher-level administrators by 19.3 per cent, and of technicians by 55.2 per cent. This increase is important, though still short of the national requirements, and even of the governmental estimate of them.

Engineers, administrators and technicians are a special category of intellectuals. In the production of material values they constitute the indispensable element of intellectual creativity, assuring the realization of the results of scientific research. At the same time, they are the bearers and makers of culture because, in our time, science and technology occupy an increasingly important place among the components of human culture.

The actual place in production of engineers, administrators and technicians is highly diverse. The factory-employed technicians are directly associated with the production process. In his report, "The Concept of Class and the Historical Role of the Working Class," made in 1963, Maurice Thorez indicated that technicians of shop-floor level are a constructive element of the working class, while with engineers in factories things are more complicated, because they are often burdened with the responsibility of command and with some other non-productive function.

However, the importance and nature of the organization factor in modern production makes the rigid divisions between engineers and technicians and the administrative personnel more and more artificial, and doubly so since the mechanization and automation of office work increasingly identifies it in form with work in the factory.

Designing bureaus, methodology, management and planning are, these days, indispensable elements of production. And their role is increasing continuously.

Further, because research is linked more directly with production, the social function of the researcher brings him closer to the working class.

All engineers, technicians and administrators referred to earlier, participate in one way or another in the production of material values. Other administrative personnel, bank employees, shop workers, etc., are active not in production, but in realizing the profits, that is, in the sphere of distribution and, to use the fashionable term, in the services. This sector the capitalists are inclined to develop, sometimes out of all proportion, though that mere fact should not lead us to deny its usefulness.

In the final analysis, the personnel in the different sectors, be it the factory or the bank, possess a common characteristic despite certain differences: in either case, like the workers, they are deprived of the ownership of the means of production and mercilessly exploited.

This exploitation is all the more intensive, because in some factories and industries their proportion in the total labor force (in electronics, for example, engineers, technicians and administrators comprise about half that force) is very considerable, consuming the lion's share of the total wages and salaries, as a consequence of which the employer is inclined in the name of profit to press down their salaries and working and living conditions.

However, although like the workers, engineers, administrative personnel and technicians sell their labor in exchange for a wage, there is a difference in how they are exploited. Because of the nature of their work, the mental workers retain a part of their initiative, an irreducible part. And because of the shortage of highly qualified specialists, some of them can sell their labor on relatively less disadvantageous terms than the workers.

One tends to distinguish between engineers, technicians and administrative personnel performing purely technical func-

tions and those who exercise managerial responsibilities. This distinction seems somewhat artificial, because both types of activity often intertwine. In the course of his career an administrator may be repeatedly shifted from one job to another, because his training qualifies him for both technical and managerial duties.

Furthermore, we should not forget that for the employers maintenance of discipline, introduction of new technology in production and management and improvement of this technology pursue the same aim, that of obtaining the maximum profit by increasing the rate and amount of the surplus value.

In *Capital* Marx offers highly valuable ideas about the character of capitalist management:

"The control exercised by the capitalist is not only a special function, due to the nature of the social labor-process, and peculiar to that process, but it is, at the same time, a function of the exploitation of a social labor-process, and is consequently rooted in the unavoidable antagonism between the exploiter and the living and laboring raw material he exploits. Again, in proportion to the increasing mass of the means of production, now no longer the property of the laborer, but of the capitalist, the necessity increases for some effective control over the proper application of those means. . .

"If, then, the control of the capitalist is in substance twofold by reason of the twofold nature of the process of production itself—which, on the one hand, is a social process for producing use-values, on the other, a process for creating surplus-value—in form that control is despotic" (Marx, *Capital*, Vol. 1, pp. 331, 332).

In state-monopoly capitalism the problems of management have become infinitely more complicated. To be sure, state-monopoly capitalism is still capitalism, and command, that is, the function of management, is still, in essence, delegated by capital to a definite group of people with the same purpose of obtaining the maximum profit.

However, this function has undergone important changes. The technical aspects of production are gaining ascendancy and fusing gradually with the social. Through capitalist socialization of the productive forces and of production, division of labor and specialization have spread also to the domain of management.

At the summit of the pyramid in modern capitalist society a few monopoly groups

control the bulk of production, and thereby the entire economic and political life. They are the ones who wield the real power, exercising it through a closely associated machinery of state.

The parasitic essence of capital is such that even at the highest level the capitalist relieves himself of most managerial duties, entrusting them to people of high technical capacities—managers and technocrats. Although these are closely linked with the capitalist class, they do not have the final and decisive say. Only a tiny section of them participate in elaborating the more important decisions; however, not solely by reason of their knowledge and competence, but also due to the degree of their connection with the financial oligarchy. This is not the "managerial era" at all, for it is not managers who control and direct economic development, but a small number of monopolists representing an unprecedented concentration of ownership of the principal means of production.

At a lower level, even the shop superintendent is no longer the man on whom the performance of his shop depends. The tempo is imposed on him, because other employees, the staff of the designing office or that of labor organization, have worked out all the main points, leaving him to implement them in technical terms.

For this reason, we hold, the mass of engineers, technicians and administrative workers should be regarded as a technico-managerial personnel with special features and distinctions, but consisting of paid workers whose nature of work is totally determined by the relationships reigning in the capitalist system.

The owners of the means of production try to shift the responsibility for the exploitation of the labor force on this category of personnel and thus alienate them from the other groups of employees. At present, that is not a maneuver confined to merely separate factories, but has assumed the scale of a national policy.

The question of the class affinity of engineers, technicians and administrative personnel is not yet exhaustively explored, leaving unsettled a number of controversial factors. As we see it, although the tendency is for a definite section of the technico-engineering staff to come closer to the working class, the situation as a whole, if the other groups are considered, is still highly complicated and confused, and doubly so because it is hardly possible in all cases to draw a precise line between classes

and social strata.

As the number and concentration of the technico-engineering personnel increase in some enterprises, they are subjected to increasingly direct capitalist exploitation. The working conditions imposed on them by big capital result in more immediate and more intensive exploitation.

Growing unemployment (with about 30,000 administrative staff unemployed in France) and disqualification are among the dire consequences of the scientific and technical revolution, and this at a time when the country experiences a shortage of engineers and technicians.

In recent years, employers have tried time and again to intensify the exploitation of engineers, technicians and the administrative staff. That, in particular, was the purpose of the recent campaign against hierarchic wages, which evoked a favorable response among the leaders of reformist trade unions and Left groups. The authorities, acting in concert with the employers, describe this hierarchic principle as a privilege of the office employee, indicating that raising the wages of the underpaid is impossible, unless employees give up part of their "privileges," which, of course, would enable the employers to keep their profits intact.

Admittedly, the value of labor, expressed through wages, varies in accordance with the different types of labor and with proficiency. It is these differences in value that determine the differences in wages, that is, the hierarchy in wages and salaries.

Hierarchic wages are in no way related to the existence of capitalism. In the socialist society, too, wages express the quantity and quality of work, and the differentiation inevitably remains. Its removal would impede economic and social growth, whereas wage differences stimulate growth of production and the productivity of labor, thereby benefiting all society. Marxists are on no account proponents of "egalitarianism."

However, we should not regard the existing wage hierarchy as immutable. That is important, among other things, from the standpoint of the practical struggle. Proficiency improvements and improvements in the wage-earner's knowledge must be reflected in his income. The fight in defense of the differentiated wage principle should not be opposed to the fight for higher wages for the underpaid. Obviously, it is an important aspect in the fight for the material demands of engineers, technicians and the administrative personnel.

Gradually, the latter are coming to realize the contradictions between their interests and those of the monopolies, to realize that their aims and those of the democratic and working-class movement are identical. This is evidenced by their participation in the common struggles of the working people, by the gains registered by the General Confederation of Labor and the affiliated General Union of Engineers, Technicians and Administrative Workers.

However, the big capitalists will not resign themselves to seeing their influence wane among these brackets of employees. They resort to a variety of methods, not short of repressive ones, to prevent them from organizing and from acting, and try to isolate the militants of the revolt.

In particular, the bourgeoisie is stepping up ideological pressure on the technical intelligentsia, perverting the ideas and attitudes of the Communist Party and trying to drive a wedge between the Party and the engineering and technical workers. It flatters engineers and technicians by portraying them as a "new guiding class" and maintaining that in our time technical knowledge takes precedence over capital, thereby belittling the role of the working class and subordinating it in word to the intelligentsia while, in effect, trying to perpetuate the oppression of workers in capitalist society.

The present-day bourgeois ideologists endeavor to conceal the contradiction between capitalism and socialism behind the quasi-scientific notion of a single "industrial society," defined exclusively by the degree of development of the productive forces. This approach eradicates the distinctions between the two opposite social systems, their class essence, and the like.

The facts show that in capitalist countries technical progress is utilized by the ruling class to enrich the monopolies, not to improve the lot of the people. Capitalist monopolies select and use discoveries and inventions not in the interest of society, and certainly not in that of the working people, but above all to secure the maximum profit. As a result, modernization of production often tends to depress working conditions and add to the unemployment.

The French Communists are fighting for socialism, a new system which will by socializing the principal means of production create the most favorable conditions for scientific and technical progress, and for its utilization in the interest of society as a whole. Socialist society assures a genu-

ine alliance of science and labor, securing the flowering of all human faculties and creating the right conditions for the harmonious development of all strata, including engineers, technicians and the administrative personnel.

In the fight for socialism, the working class, the most united, most organized and politically conscious section of the people, is the decisive revolutionary force whose role is constantly increasing. Whatever bourgeois ideologists may say about its "extinction," it is growing in physical and relative terms, and is steadily building up resistance to the exploiter regime.

In view of the growing number and role of engineers, administrators and technicians, the working class is now gaining allies directly in production. To an increasing degree, the alliance of the workers and other sections of the people is taking place within the walls of capitalist enterprises, a factor that is of extremely great significance.

The working class faces the task of striking at the capitalist monopolies, of isolating them and paving the way for radical social change. The Communist Party is working for the replacement of the present regime with an advanced economic and political democracy carrying forward a policy of peace and progress and breaking the way to socialism. With this aim in view, our Party offers all working people, all democrats, a bold and realistic program of solutions for the most urgent socio-economic problems, in particular by nationalizing the monopolies dominating the key sectors of our economy.

The Communist Party holds that its organizations should seek the participation of engineers, technicians and administrative personnel by the side of the working class in the battle for the essential economic and political reconstruction.

The Party organizations are throwing the weight of their support behind the engineers' and technicians' fight for their rights and for appropriate government measures. Those engineers, technicians and administrators who are Communists participate actively in this effort, helping in the work of their trade unions and other professional organizations in which they undertake jobs of responsibility.

This is a necessary part of the common

struggle for democratic change. But, despite the registered gains, it cannot meet the demands and live up to the possibilities deriving from the scientific and technical revolution, the demands of the country's national growth. Nothing but an advanced democracy can make use of the country's resources to the fullest, ensuring growth of a peaceful, up-to-date economy.

This is why the Communist Party, using all opportunities and all forms of struggle, seeks for its program the approval of engineers and technicians, accentuating its national and democratic significance, and calling on them to support its proposals, aimed at drafting a joint government program of all Left parties.

Communist engineers, technicians and administrators play an important role in this by participating in the framing and implementation of the Party's policy among their colleagues. They strive to win them for socialism in massive and open action, applying the maximum of effort to win their respect, including respect for their professional integrity.

To improve ideological and political work among engineers, technicians and the administrative personnel, the Party has begun publishing a monthly journal, *ITC-Actualités*, which, apart from Communists, is intended for engineers and technicians who are not members of the Party, but are interested in the Party's policy and ready to discuss with it the economic future of the country and its prospects of growth.

The task is to draw the mass of engineers, technicians and administrators into the fight for democracy and socialism, a thing of the utmost importance for modern France. That is why R. Leroy, member of the Political Bureau, was perfectly right in closing the conference in Pantin with the following words:

"The alliance of engineers, technicians and administrative personnel with the working class is a question that arises each day, and will continue to arise in future . . . We are convinced that thousands of engineers, technicians and administrators will take an active part in the struggle of the working class and the democratic forces against the reactionary policy of capital, in the struggle for advanced democracy, for a socialist France."

In brief

IRAN

The 13th Plenum of the People's (Tudeh) Party discussed a report of the Executive Bureau on preparations for the Lenin centenary and arranged for the organization of seminars and the publication of books and pamphlets on Lenin and Leninism. It instructed the Executive Bureau to issue an Address to the people of Iran calling for active participation in the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of the leader of all toiling and oppressed peoples of the world.

The plenum noted Lenin's popularity among wide sections of the Iranian population, recalling that Lenin and the Bolshevik Party supported the 1907-11 Iranian revolution and that after the Great October Socialist Revolution the Soviet Government, on Lenin's initiative, repealed the capitulations, annulled all unequal treaties concluded by the tsarist government and transferred certain property to Iran. All this won Lenin the warm affection of the Iranian people, among whom he came to be known as the "Kaveh of the 20th century" (Kaveh was the legendary leader of the people's revolt against despotism).

The plenum resolution states: "Devoted revolutionary activity by our Party in Iran is the best tribute we can pay to Lenin."

ITALY

The Milan and other Communist Party organizations in Lombardy have introduced a new form of shop activity—Communist worker councils. There are already about 500 members of these councils in Lombardy factories and arrangements are being made for a residential-area council to cover the entire province.

A. Tortorella, member of the Political Bureau, says in *Unita* that the innovation has produced good political and organizational results, though, of course, some problems have still to be resolved. The new councils, Tortorella writes, have not, as some feared,

lessened the leading role of elected Party bodies, nor deprived them of their function of directing factory work. These elected bodies are responsible for Party policy and this includes policy on shop-floor activity. In Tortorella's view, the councils will strengthen the organizing role of Party committees and give the Party a better understanding of working-class problems.

COLOMBIA

Preparations for the Lenin centenary were initiated by the Communist Party Central Committee in September 1968. The best way to celebrate the jubilee, the Central Committee statement said, is to accomplish our political and organizational tasks and strengthen the Party.

The Fourth National Conference and Central Committee plenum in September-October 1969 called on all democratic and revolutionary organizations, on students and progressive intellectuals to join in this campaign and a similar appeal was issued by the Young Communist League.

The jubilee program was inaugurated on August 24, 1969 with a worker-peasant rally at Fusagasuga. The Party General Secretary, Jose Vieira, who addressed the 6,000 audience drawn from every part of the country, said that in marking the anniversary of Lenin's birth all Colombian revolutionaries, and not only Communists, must popularize Lenin's principles as the basis of the revolutionary transformation so vitally needed by Colombian society.

A national workers' rally which brought together delegates from 110 trade union organizations, was held in Cali, an important industrial center, on December 8. This was the first time in Colombian labor history that so representative a forum had been held, and moreover to mark so important an occasion as the Lenin centenary. It highlighted the importance of Marxist-Leninist theory for the revolutionary movement.

The rally was held on the 41st anniversary of the dastardly attack, in 1928, on banana plantation workers when, at the order of the United Fruit Company, troops shot down more than 1,500 people. And this underscored the importance of the struggle the Colombian working class has for so many years been waging against North American imperialism. The statement adopted at the rally contains this passage: "For the working class to exercise its leading role in the revolutionary process, beginning with the present stage and ending with the building of socialism and communism, it must assure proper leadership not only of its own fight, but also of the actions of all the exploited and oppressed classes and strata of society; it must act from its class positions, avoid over-emphasis on economic demands, organize its forces in a political party of its own, the Communist Party, and make scientific socialism the guiding theory of the whole movement."

Towards the end of last year Lenin commemorative meetings were held in many parts of the country. The centenary was celebrated by ceremonies at the Cartagena University, where Jose Arizala spoke on behalf of the Communist Party. In Ibague, Tolima Province, the local democratic women's union held a meeting in tribute to Lenin. In Bogota, Comrade Vieira addressed a trade union conference on "Lenin and the Labor Movement." Central Committee member Varela was one of the main speakers at centenary ceremonies at the San-

tiago de Cali University and at the Casa Valencia Library. A session of the Boyaca Provincial Assembly was addressed by Central Committee member Manlio Lafont. Another Central Committee member, Juan Viana, lectured on "Lenin and Our Time" at a round-table discussion in Sagamoso. Comrade Vieira addressed a meeting arranged by the Workers' Federation of Cundinamarca Province.

The Communist Party's competition for the best Lenin poster has met with a wide response from Colombian artists.

The Party is out to increase its membership by 50 per cent, and extend the circulation of its weekly paper *Voz proletaria*. It is anticipated that most of the new members will come from the working class and peasantry, which will improve the Party's social composition. Another aim in the Lenin centenary campaign is general improvement of the Party's mass political, organizational, ideological, propaganda and financial work.

The celebration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin in Colombia is closely tied in with the problems and struggle of the masses, and is a means of establishing closer contact with them, conducting more effective propaganda in order to wrest from reactionary influence elements that can be recruited for the popular movement for national independence, peace and socialism.

Arturo RIVERA

Collapse of imperialism's strike force

Yearly, the nations celebrate May 9 as the day, twenty-five years ago, of the victory over fascist Germany, which delivered the world from the prospect of Nazi enslavement, paying homage to those who gave their lives to save mankind and civilization and securing progressive advancement by their military prowess, fortitude and power of spirit.

The main contribution to the victory over Hitler and his satellites was that of the Soviet Union, its gallant armed forces and the Soviet men and women who helped forge victory in the rear. Fascism was crushed jointly by the Soviet Armed Forces, the armed forces of the other members of the anti-Hitler coalition, and by the Resistance Movement in many countries.

DISTORTION OF THE FACTS

The literature about the war against Hitler Germany is extremely prolific. Much of it is truthful and unprejudiced. But as the events recede, bourgeois ideologists show little or no compunction in distorting the facts to win the minds of the new generation by fostering a spirit of anti-communism. And the barbs are aimed especially at the facts of the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union. This unscrupulous treatment of the truth is designed to promote far-reaching political and ideological ends: subvert the popular effort to safeguard peace, check the revolutionary movement, drive wedges between its various contingents, weaken the community of socialist countries, justify the present aggressive policies of the United States and its allies and vindicate the new war preparations against the USSR and other socialist countries.

The accents in the anti-Communist war histories differ. Typical of the reactionary U.S. circles are their great-power attempts

to portray their country and its armed forces as the greatest "single factor" that tilted the scales in the Second World War. The West German neo-Nazi militarists harp on the "forfeited victories," overworked already by the former Hitler generals and aimed at justifying their drive for armed revenge.

The slander follows several distinct trends:

Firstly, efforts are applied to misrepresent the cause and culprits of the Second World War, to whitewash German imperialism and militarism and to cast aspersions on the Soviet Union's prewar policy. What is concealed is that the war was bred by the imperialist system as such, and made possible by British, French and U.S. encouragement of Hitler's "Drang nach Osten" policy.

Secondly, the story of the war is deliberately distorted to minimize or totally conceal the Soviet Union's contribution as the decisive force that crushed fascist Germany and her satellites; the Soviet-German hostilities are devaluated while the war effort of the other members of the anti-Hitler coalition is inflated out of all proportion. Soviet warcraft is slighted and as little as possible is said of the fighting on the Soviet-German front and its results, while U.S. and British operations are exaggerated.

Thirdly, the Soviet liberation mission in the Central and Southeast European countries in 1944-45 is misrepresented, with falsifications of Soviet aims in the countries liberated from the Nazi invader, especially Germany, being employed to give credence to the specious charge of "exporting revolution."

Fourthly, anti-Communist writers deny the advantages of the socialist system as the main factor in the Soviet victory over fascist Germany; they pervert the role of the Communist Party, leader and organizer

of the victory. This they do in order to conceal the organic sources of the politico-moral unity of Soviet society, which assured the might of its economy, the effectiveness of the Soviet military art and evoked the patriotism and internationalism of the Soviet Army and people.

We shall here endeavor to bring the truth into proper focus and to set out the facts deliberately perverted by the imperialist ideologues.

SOURCES AND CAUSES OF THE WAR

The Second World War was bred by imperialism, by the acute contradictions between its various groupings in the scramble for world supremacy. It was started with the prompting of the German monopolies, by the General Staff in Germany, but was prepared—and that is its most conspicuous feature—by world imperialism as a whole with the original purpose of destroying the Soviet Union, the world's first socialist state.

The imperialists of Britain, France and the United States aimed at goading Germany and Japan, their main rivals, into attacking and crushing the Soviet Union. Not only would that bring about the end of the world's first socialist state, but also weaken their competitors. German imperialism, for its part, was eager to win world supremacy, making the most of the myopic anti-Soviet policy of the Western powers.

To restore the facts of the pre-war period we must recall the following aspects of political and economic international relations.

Germany's military-industrial potential was restored by the monopolists of the United States and Britain. By the mid-thirties foreign credits and loans to Germany reached RM27,000 million, with U.S. capital accounting for at least 70 per cent of the long-term allocations.

Hitler's seizure of power and the fascist dictatorship steeply increased German aggressiveness. In the politico-military alliances of the 'thirties' fascist Germany acted quite brazenly as the mailed fist of international reaction. Of the blocs, the Anti-Comintern Pact, concluded between Germany and Japan in Berlin in 1936 and joined by Italy the following year, was the most ominous, and in 1939-1940 was transformed into an outright military alliance.

The aggressive policy of the Anti-Comintern Pact countries was condoned by the ruling circles in the United States, Britain

and France, who endeavored at any cost to strike a deal with fascist Germany and her allies based on common anti-Soviet interests. The actual encouragement of Italy's aggression against Abyssinia, Japan's rape of China, the "non-intervention" in the German-Italian intervention against Republican Spain and, last, but not least, Munich, which sold Czechoslovakia down the river—all were links in a chain of moves hammering out an anti-Soviet front of the imperialist powers to crush the working class and national liberation movements in all countries. And the screen for this was the notorious "appeasement" policy, which actually encouraged the aggressor.

Republican Spain's heroic resistance, supported by the world Communist and labor movement, revealed the power of proletarian internationalism. Although in Spain fascism ultimately won, her people and those of other countries displayed a capacity for repelling the threat of a world war.

Eager to whitewash the "appeasement" policy, various historians exploit the version of the military unpreparedness of Britain, France and their allies in 1938 and 1939. But the facts disprove this version, showing that Britain and France had a sufficiently powerful military-industrial potential to grapple with and repulse Nazi Germany. It was just that their imperialist policy pursued an entirely different aim, that of directing fascist aggression eastward.

As was the case with some other European countries, Czechoslovakia was the ransom that the Western powers paid Hitler in the big-time political game. The only country that offered Czechoslovakia aid in the tragic days of Munich was the Soviet Union. However the bourgeois Benes-Hodza government ignored the Soviet proposal and preferred to surrender rather than resist aggression.

Munich, the deal concluded by Germany, Britain, France and Italy with the backing of reactionary U.S. quarters, made the Soviet Union face up to the fact of a combined anti-Soviet bloc of imperialist powers. But the Soviet Government continued its vigorous efforts for a collective security system to block the road to war. The men of Munich, who strove to direct the Hitler aggression against the Soviet system and enter into a compact with the Nazis, obstructed these efforts; in this situation the USSR signed a non-aggression treaty with Germany, which gave it time to reinforce its defenses.

Acting on Lenin's ideas about the defense

of the socialist homeland, the Communist Party worked to strengthen Soviet defenses and redouble preparedness. The Party knew that sooner or later capitalists would attack the Soviet Union in an attempt to destroy socialism, and in the face of unfolding fascist aggression and the mounting war danger, undertook a series of measures to enhance the fighting capacity of its armed forces. Between 1939 and June 1941 the numerical strength of the Soviet Army increased nearly threefold. As many as 125 new divisions were formed. Troops were being equipped with new technology and the latest weapons. But the process had not been completed by the time the enemy struck.

The developments related to the outbreak of the Second World War were, in effect, a continuation of Munich. In September 1939 Hitler smashed Poland, the initial result of the policy of channeling his aggression against the Soviet Union. The Western powers hoped that henceforth Hitler would act as they hoped he would. But their expectations were dashed. Soon France and practically the entire continental part of Western Europe were overrun, and Hitler's troops reached North Africa.

On June 22, 1941, Nazi Germany perfidiously attacked the Soviet Union. The Great Patriotic War of the Soviet people began.

SOVIET WAR EFFORT DECISIVE

For fascist Germany to defeat the Soviet Union was the main link in its drive for world supremacy. Yet it was the Soviet Union that crushed the Nazis. Led by the Communist Party, the Soviet peoples fought the war as a battle for freedom. Their task was of historic and worldwide significance: they battled for the freedom and independence of the world's first socialist worker-peasant state, smashing the invader and aiding peoples of other countries in the struggle for liberation from the Hitler conquerors.

The Soviet people and its armed forces wrought the victory over fascism in unprecedentedly bitter and arduous combat. The ordeal was particularly grim at the beginning of the war, for the aggressor, who had so perfidiously attacked, had a number of very important, albeit temporary, advantages. Take some of the following figures:

As many as 190 full-strength excellently equipped and perfectly trained divisions (5,500,000 men) of the Wehrmacht and

Germany's satellites, 3,712 tanks, 4,950 warplanes, 47,260 guns and mortars and 193 warships were hurled against the Soviet Union.

The surprise factor in the attack caused the Soviet Union and its armed forces terrible losses. The invasion deep into Soviet territory did tremendous damage to the economy. By November 1941, 63 per cent of coal extraction, 68 per cent of iron production, 58 per cent of steel and 60 per cent of aluminum were lost to the country, at least for a time. No other state could have survived such a blow. The Soviet Union did.

The gradually mounting resistance was the result of extensive work in the rear, of the labor exploits of the people. The war-time conversion of the economy was completed by mid-1942 and by the end of the year the country had a well-gearred and rapidly growing military industry. Not only the factories available locally worked in the war effort, but also 1,360 plants evacuated to the East in the summer and autumn of 1941. Furthermore, another 10,300 industrial enterprises were being built in 1942.

Fighting bitter defensive battles, the Soviet Army struck back at the enemy, inflicting heavy losses in men and materiel, making him pay a high price for each metre of land. Even in the early frontier-zone fighting the enemy came to feel the Soviet power of resistance. The frontier troops defended the borders tenaciously, and the garrison of the Brest fortress, for example, held out against the besieging enemy for a month.

Thanks to the staunchness of the Soviet people, the developments on the front followed a course unexpected by the Hitler generals. In the battle for Smolensk, enemy designs to break through to Moscow on the march were effectively frustrated. At Leningrad, too, the offensive was stemmed. That city soon became the symbol of resistance, tenacity and boundless determination.

The defenders of Odessa, Kiev and Sevastopol inflicted heavy losses on the enemy, and the powerful Soviet counter-attacks at Rostov, Tikhvin and at Moscow developed into a counter-offensive and later into a general offensive by the Soviet armed forces along the entire Soviet-German front.

Hitler's blitzkrieg plan was put out of gear once and for all in the battle of Moscow. The myth of German invincibility vanished. This first large-scale Soviet victory showed the world that the USSR was capable of delivering mankind from the fas-

cist plague. Victory at Moscow was the beginning of a radical turn. For the Nazis the hostilities became a war of attrition.

Then came the crushing blow in the battle of Stalingrad. Throughout summer and autumn 1942 the world followed with bated breath the epic struggle for the Russian city on the Volga, where the fascist armies were first held and then crushed. In the counter-offensive, mounted on November 19, 1942 and consummated on February 2, 1943, the Soviet troops wiped out 32 enemy divisions and three brigades, with another 16 divisions losing from 50 to 70 per cent of their personnel. This was the decisive turning point in the Great Patriotic and Second World War. The aggressor was checked, eliminating the threat of fascist enslavement, which had loomed big for many nations.

The brilliant victories at Stalingrad and in the Caucasus paved the way for a large-scale strategic offensive and the mass expulsion of the Nazis from Soviet territory. Whereas for Hitler Germany the word Stalingrad symbolized mourning, for the enslaved European peoples it shone like a beacon, infusing joy and a real hope of early deliverance from the fascist occupation.

Yet many bourgeois researchers serving imperialist ends distort the past, casting doubt on concepts such as the defense of Leningrad, the battle of Stalingrad and others that are forever the epitome of the grandeur of spirit, the will, heroism, sacrifice and exploit of the Soviet people.

After Stalingrad, Hitler tried once more to regain the strategic initiative. He carried out a total mobilization and, making the most of the absence of a second front in Europe, moved more divisions to the East. By summer 1943 the Nazis had massed 232 divisions against the Soviet Army, aiming to destroy the Soviet troops in the Kursk bulge to develop the offensive to the east and northeast. A powerful strike force totalling more than 50 divisions, of which 16 were panzer and motorized, was deployed in the Orel and Belgorod areas, the scene of tank battles of unprecedented magnitude. Defeated at Kursk, fascist Germany lost all hope of victory. The collapse of Nazism became a certainty.

The 1943 victories of Soviet arms over the Nazi war machine turned the tide not only of the Great Patriotic War, but of the Second World War as a whole. In those 12 months the Soviet Army fought its way from the Volga to the Dnieper and from

the Main Caucasian Range to the Crimean Isthmus, driving 500 kilometres westward in the center of the Soviet-German front and some 1,300 kilometres in the south. Two-thirds of the enemy-occupied territory was liberated. The USSR regained important industrial and agricultural areas, and tens of millions of Soviet people were delivered from captivity.

In 1944 the Soviet Army struck anew at the enemy along the entire Soviet-German front, from the Barents Sea in the North to the Black Sea in the South, clearing Soviet territory and reaching the frontier. This was followed by operations liberating European peoples overrun by the Nazis.

The partisan movement was part of the war against Hitler. Its scale and organization are illustrated by the following figure: towards the end of 1943 more than a million armed Soviet partisans operated behind the enemy lines, coordinating their actions with the regular troops, hitting out strongly and striking terror into the enemy.

The final blows were struck in 1945—in Hungary, East Prussia, Western Poland, Austria, in Berlin and in Prague, bringing about the downfall of Hitler and German fascism.

The storming of Berlin merits closer examination. In scale, the battle was the biggest of the Second world War. To defend Berlin the German Command deployed a million-strong army, building deeply-esche-loned defenses. What the Nazis hoped to accomplish was to draw out the war until a split occurred in the anti-Hitler coalition. The Soviet Command, on the other hand, was determined to crush the enemy rapidly and afford the people the long-desired peace. On May 2, 1945, overwhelmed by the massive Soviet blows, the Berlin garrison laid down arms, with all Germany surrendering on May 8. Next day the Soviet troops wound up their last operation in Europe, that of Prague, coming to the aid of the Czechoslovaks, who had risen against the invader, and crushing the Nazi army group that surrounded the capital.

Throughout the war (from June 1941 to May 1945) the Soviet-German front was the main theatre of the Second World War, pinning down the bulk of the enemy's forces. Until mid-1944 from 62.7 to 76.3 per cent of Germany's ground forces were deployed in the East, while only 1 to 6.2 per cent were engaged in North Africa and, later, in Italy. Even after the Second Front opened in Europe (in June 1944) only about one-third of German ground strength

was deployed on the Western and Italian fronts.

The main German forces and those of the fascist bloc countries were destroyed on the Soviet-German front. All in all, the Soviet armed forces wiped out or captured 607 divisions, including 100 belonging to Germany's satellites, while our Allies wiped out or captured 176 divisions in North Africa, in Italy and in Western Europe. German casualties in the war against the Soviet Union added up to something like 10 million men, amounting to three-quarters of the total German losses in the Second World War.

Hitler's Luftwaffe, too, was essentially defeated in the East, where it lost 62,000 planes, whereas losses in Western Europe, the Mediterranean theatre and the Balkans totalled 24,000 and some 13,500 over Germany proper. Thus, more than three-fifths of the Luftwaffe losses were inflicted on the Soviet-German front.

This shows that the Soviet-German front was the crucial theatre of the Second World War and that the decisive contribution to the victory was made by the Soviet Union.

The Great Patriotic War was victorious because socialism secured the unity of Soviet society, the unbreakable friendship of the peoples, the power and unprecedented mobility of the economy, a high standard of military science, and because it produced soldiers of extraordinary prowess and many brilliant generals. The campaigns and strategic operations were worked out by the commanders and staffs of the various fronts, the General Staff and the Supreme Command headed by J. V. Stalin. The Communist Party, founded by the great Lenin, was the organizer and moving spirit of the Soviet victories, the victories of the people and the armed forces.

SOVIET ARMY—LIBERATOR OF NATIONS

From the beginning of the war, the Soviet Army was engaged in a mission of liberation. By smashing Hitler's war machine and expelling the fascists from Soviet territory, it made a decisive contribution to the subsequent liberation of the European and Asian peoples.

The victory saved the peoples of the world from barbarism. Not only was fascism intent on eliminating the socialist system and seizing the wealth of the Soviet Union, but also on winning world supremacy, on enslaving and exterminating other

peoples. All Nazi-occupied territory was covered with concentration camps. Oswiecim, Maidanek, Buchenwald and the other death camps have gone down as symbols of fascist savagery. In those concentration camps alone 12 million people were put to death.

The victories of Soviet arms, the valiant struggle of the partisans and the devoted labor of Soviet workers, farmers and intellectuals inspired the peoples of occupied Europe to mount a heroic fight for freedom and national independence. An important part in the defeat of fascism was played by the active resistance of working people in the European countries, headed by the Communist and Workers' parties. The growth of the Resistance Movement in the occupied areas gave impetus to the national liberation and social struggle, yielding important advances towards the end of the war and bringing about the victory of people's democratic revolutions in a number of countries. Soviet citizens cast adrift by the vagaries of war in European countries exerted a strong influence on the Resistance Movement. Tens of thousands of Soviet patriots fought in partisan units abroad.

Devoted to proletarian internationalism, the Soviet Union rendered all-round aid to the peoples of the occupied countries. With the support of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party and of the Soviet Government, many leaders of the world Communist movement carried on their work in Soviet territory. Resident in the USSR, they gave their political experience to the liberation of their peoples.

Polish, Czechoslovak and other foreign military units were formed on Soviet territory and took part in the anti-Hitler war shoulder to shoulder with the Soviet Army. Their participation in the war effort symbolized common aims and the peoples' desire to consolidate friendship with the Soviet Union in the post-war.

Its role in forming and consolidating the anti-Hitler coalition is a convincing example of how the Soviet Union performed its international duty to the freedom-loving peoples. It took into account the acute and irreconcilable contradictions in the capitalist world, especially between Britain, the United States and France, on the one hand, and Germany, Japan and Italy, on the other. The powerful popular movement against fascist aggression, the readiness and determination of the peoples to fight for the independence of their countries, to dispel the danger of Hitlerite enslavement, facili-

tated the formation of the anti-Hitler coalition. The Communist and Workers' parties were the moving spirit in the fight of the peoples against fascist aggression.

Soviet efforts to build up a broad anti-Hitler coalition were a projection in a new situation of the consistent policy of organizing collective resistance to aggressors in the pre-war.

Thanks to the political awareness of the Soviet soldiers, their skill, valor and endurance, the Armed Forces of the Soviet Union went on, after clearing their own country, to liberate the enslaved peoples and fulfil their lofty mission. On entering enemy countries, the Soviet soldiers did not allow the thirst for revenge to get the better of them. They carried the glorious banner of their liberation army untainted across the European and Asian states.

In 1944 Soviet Army operations were complemented by Allied operations in Western Europe. The might of the anti-Hitler coalition, of which the Soviet Union was the core, grew steadily. As from the autumn of that year, not only Czechoslovak, Polish and Yugoslav troops, and French airmen, fought shoulder to shoulder with the Soviet Army, but also Bulgarian and Rumanian troops, who had turned against fascist Germany. The fascist bloc crumbled.

The crushing defeat of German fascism and, later, of Japanese militarism, and the fulfilment by the Soviet Army of its mission of liberation, facilitated the success of people's democratic revolutions in a number of European and Asian countries. That is the light in which the people of those countries regard their liberation by the Soviet Army, which they consider the key factor in the emergence and growth of the system of people's democracy, because it was the Soviet Army that, for them, fulfilled as Gottwald stated, "the most difficult part of the work—the defeat of the invaders."

The moral fiber of the Soviet soldier and liberator evoked in the world genuine respect and admiration for the Soviet people and its socialist ideals. It evoked admiration for its victories in building the new life and moulding the new man. Veterans of the anti-fascist struggle and all who lived through the Second World War will never forget the role played by the Soviet Union in the battle for the freedom of nations, its sacrifices, the heroism of its people and its army. It was this heroic struggle and unparalleled sacrifice that enabled

many nations to regain their national freedom and independence and to begin the struggle for the victory of the working class, for socialism.

THE LESSONS OF THE GREAT PATRIOTIC WAR

The highlight of the Great Patriotic War was that the victory was won by the forces of progress and socialism over the most reactionary imperialist force, German fascism. As a result, socialism safeguarded its gains and proved its viability and superiority over capitalism not only in the socio-economic, political and ideological fields, but also militarily. The balance of strength in the world arena shifted in favor of socialism. The Soviet victory predetermined the growth of socialism into the decisive factor of world development. And this amounted to a major defeat for imperialism, a defeat second only to that inflicted on reaction by the Great October Socialist Revolution.

The Soviet Union performed its international duty to the working class of the world, to all working people, by creating favorable conditions for socialist revolutions in countries of Central and South-eastern Europe, and in East Asia, and for the emergence of the socialist world system—the proletariat's citadel in the struggle for social progress. The first socialist state of the German nation, the German Democratic Republic, a mighty bastion against militarism and revanchism, was built on German soil liberated from fascism. Imperialism has lost the historical initiative for ever. It is the socialist world system, the international working class and all revolutionary forces that now chart the main road of human development.

From the outcome of the Great Patriotic War, the outcome of the Second World War, and from the sources of victory scored by the progressive and revolutionary forces over fascism and militarism, over the reactionary imperialist forces, we can draw conclusions and lessons for the future.

The main lesson is that, as a system, socialism, the future of the world, is invincible. The wheel of history cannot be reversed.

The second lesson is that imperialism is the source of aggressive wars and bears the onus of responsibility for starting them. It follows that the main efforts of the people in safeguarding peace and promoting progressive development must be directed

against imperialism in order to avert a new war.

The third lesson applies to the experience of the progressive forces, with the Soviet Union at their head, in safeguarding the world from a new war. The experience of history shows that active effort by all peoples, by all progressive classes, parties and public organizations is today necessary more than ever to prevent war. History shows that war can be prevented only by concerting the efforts of all the anti-imperialist forces and rallying them around the socialist world system.

From this derives the fourth lesson: the only political force able to organize, unite and direct the mass of people in the fight against imperialism, that breeder of wars, in the fight for democracy and social progress, are the Communist and Workers' parties.

Last but not least, the experience of

history shows that the military power of the socialist community, above all the Soviet Union, the main and leading political, economic and military force able to bridle imperialism's aggressive aspirations, is a dependable guarantee of socialism and an effective safeguard of world peace.

"As the Soviet people build up the economy and reinforce the country's defensive potential," say the Theses of the CC CPSU on the centenary of V. I. Lenin's birth, "they consider it their international duty to contribute to the utmost to the economic and politico-military consolidation of the socialist world community as a whole, and of each of its member countries. To the imperialist policy of exporting counter-revolution, our community opposes its invincible might and its determination to safeguard the revolutionary gains of the peoples."

T. YEROFEEV, A. KISELYOV,
O. RZHESHEVSKY

BOOKS AND JOURNALS

GDR scientists on the economic laws of socialism

This recent study of the economic laws of socialism* has attracted much attention and a wide readership. The collective effort of research workers at the Karl Marx Higher Party School, it sets out to analyze the mechanism through which the economic laws of socialism operate and their conscious, purposive practical application.

Much attention is devoted to the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist party in the economic and political life of socialist society. And in this context the authors examine the new phenomena resulting from centralized economic planning and management, the basic problems of accumulation of social capital and the higher responsibility that devolves on factory managements and collectives.

**Ökonomische Gesetze im gesellschaftlichen System des Sozialismus*. Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1969. S. 392.

All these questions are discussed in the light of the latest achievements of economic science, the use of computer techniques and system analysis.

Socialism's economic laws—and this is emphasized from the very outset—are objective in their operation, but under socialism subjective factors play an increasing role. From this the authors deduce the following definition of the GDR's economic system: "A concrete manifestation of socialist production relations in their interconnection with the productive forces and the political and ideological superstructure" (p. 8).

In this age of technological revolution, scientific achievement exerts a much greater influence on all facets of practical activity. And the practical work of the Marxist-Leninist party, the authors stress, is the

concentrated expression of scientific approach to the organization of social life. The Party's scientifically-based and consistently pursued policy is becoming more and more a necessary objective component of social practice. And from this standpoint the authors examine the leading role of the Party in socialist social relations. "The Marxist-Leninist party is, primarily, the collective intellect of society and scientifically directs the law-governed interaction of the various elements of production. The Party's ideological and organizational work helps individual groups and collectives to perform their work as a direct social function regulated by an all-embracing economic plan" (pp. 34-35).

Much of the study deals with commodity-money relations under socialism and, in this context, the role of the market and the plan. The market, the authors say, "is not the only and primary form of contact between socialist commodity producers. . . . Commodity-money relations are the expression of socialist cooperation, not competition. They are the element that lends concrete form to the social nature of labor. . . ." (p. 151). With the existence of socialist production relations, development of the market—as of all other elements of the reproduction process—must be governed by the plan.

In defining the role of planning, the authors emphasize that "central planning must concentrate primarily on economic structure, effectiveness and basic proportions" (p. 313). They criticize the erroneous views (still current) on the role of the market in a socialist state and its interaction with central planning.

Referring to Lenin's teaching on the relation of politics to economics, they show that politics, that concentrated expression of economics, are a powerful weapon of economic advance.

One of the last chapters deals with the problem of shaping the mechanism through which economic laws operate in building the GDR's developed socialist society.

The problems stemming from the technological revolution and the way that revolution affects operation of socialism's economic laws, is still another subject of this interesting study. Science has become a direct productive force and exerts a definite influence on the content and operation of the economic laws of socialism. On the other hand, society's economic requirements are an important propellant of scientific advance. Consideration must also be given to the fact that the processes of socialization and concentration increasingly influence all aspects of research. Hence, "development of the material and technical basis of research and experimental work (equipment, research gadgetry, etc.) has been exceptionally rapid, and the effect it produces depends on overcoming individualistic and departmental isolation. Reconstruction of research along socialist lines and on a large scale is economically inevitable" (p. 245). The socialist state is devoting an increasing share of the national income to research which, the authors emphasize, should be concentrated on major projects that assure rapid change of the economic structure and higher returns.

It is only natural that not all of the questions dealt with in this study are comprehensively discussed. Some of the authors' propositions are open to controversy. But this is a valuable study, for it can serve as a starting point for discussion, for the search for optimal forms of planning, regulating and organizing all social processes in a socialist society.

J. KNOP
V. WACKER

OUR MAILBAG

Our journal receives mail from different countries—appeals and statements of public organizations, responses to articles and suggestions of how to improve our content and the presentation of our material.

In this issue we present a statement received from Venezuela and report on some of the letters to the Editor.

"RELEASE" OF 130 POLITICAL PRISONERS

Statement of the Venezuelan League of Former Political Prisoners and of the National Inter-Prisons Committee

The Venezuelan League of Former Political Prisoners and the National Inter-Prisons Committee consider it their duty to inform the public at home and abroad that the press report of December 24, 1969, referring to official sources, on the so-called release of 130 political prisoners by decree of Venezuela's President Dr. Rafael Caldera, is untrue.

Only four people were actually released: retired Captain Pedro Vegas Castejon, Lieutenant Hector Fleming Mendoza, Mrs. Laura de Prada and Hildebrando Mendez Arelano, a student and journalist. Like the other political detainees, these four were, indeed, victims of injustice. Yet the situation must be changed, and justice must triumph all down the line in the name of genuine pacification and national peace, ending the suffering of the mothers, wives and children of prisoners. It is high time to end the abuse of the Venezuelans' sense of human solidarity; a stop must be put to the deceit of the press.

People flung into prison by previous governments for political reasons expect to be released by the constitutional powers vested in the President of the Republic in keeping with the repeated promises of "change" made by Dr. Caldera's Copei party government, which, in reality, hands out promises merely as a political maneuver. Despite the spacious official report distributed to the press about the release of political prison-

ers, some 150 persons are still languishing in the country's prisons—the Modelo prison in Caracas, the San Carlos barracks (where engineer Juan Vicente Cabezas is being kept), and Maracaibo, San Juan de los Morros, Tocuyito, La Pica, Barquisimeto, Los Teques, Yaracuy, etc.

Prisoners, exiles, deportees, persons persecuted for political motives and people who "disappear"; repressions and violation of the national constitution and the rights of man; concentration camps and the so-called anti-guerrilla camps—all these are facts which deprive our government of the right to speak of pacification and democratic aspirations. What it says to this effect is received by the people with sarcasm. The nation has lost faith in the words and promises of its successive rulers; from the government it demands not words and not demagogic promises.

The Venezuelan League of Former Political Prisoners and the National Inter-Prisons Committee again declare their firm determination to build up a broad and powerful movement in this new year that will secure the release of the political prisoners, put an end to repressions and to the violations of civil rights.

For a broad amnesty!
Respect human rights!
Against police repressions!
For the closure of anti-guerrilla camps!

READERS' SUGGESTIONS

In response to the Editors' invitation in issue 12, 1969 of our journal, we received letters containing advice and critical remarks. These include from Jean Pierre Ghesquiere, France; Y. R. Karatavtsev, USSR; Ambrose Thensekhien, Nigeria; Celso Martinez Araujo, Peru; the Spanish Communist Jose Franco, Portuguese emigres Maria and Jose Rafael, and Karl-Friedrich Schwabe, a GDR student.

Jean Pierre Ghesquiere wants to see more concrete accounts in the journal of the experience of fraternal parties, so that it can be utilized by Communists in other countries. Soviet Communist Party member Kartavtsev asks for better coverage of the economic and technico-scientific growth in the socialist countries, and Karl-Friedrich Schwabe, a student of Leipzig's Frederick Engels University, lists suggestions for improving the appearance of the journal.

The Editors thank the writers and assure them that their suggestions will be taken into account.

Books listed here are in the language of the country of publication

LENIN, V. I. *O rukovodyashchei roli partii v sotsialisticheskom stroitelstve* (On the Leading Role of the Party in the Building of Socialism). Collection. Moscow, Politizdat, 1969. 400 pp.

Lenin V. I. — *vozhd Oktyabrya* (Lenin — Leader of the October Revolution). Moscow, Politizdat, 1969. 320 pp.

Leninizm i ekonomicheskiye problemy kommunisticheskogo stroitelstva v SSSR (Leninism and the Economic Problems of Communist Construction in the USSR). Moscow, Politizdat, 1969. 228 pp.

Tovarishchu Leninu (To Comrade Lenin). Moscow, Politizdat, 1969. 528 pp.

BONCH-BRUYEVICH, V. *Vospominaniya o Lenine* (Recollections about Lenin). Moscow, Nauka, 1969. 518 pp.

XII Congresso del Partito comunista italiano (12th Congress of the Italian Communist Party). Rome, Editori Riuniti, 1969. 910 pp.

Congresul al X-lea al Partidului Comunist Roman (10th Congress of the Rumanian Communist Party). Bucharest, Editura politica. 1969. 781 pp.

CORNU, A. *Marx és Engels 1844-45* (Marx and Engels. 1844-45). Budapest, Kossuth Konyvkiado, 1969. 336 pp.

YEZHOF, V. *Rabocheye dvizheniye v Zapadnoi Germanii. 1945-68* (Working-Class Movement in West Germany. 1945-68). Moscow, Mysl, 1969. 384 pp.

Dr. BURGERNE, Dr. GIMES ANNA. *A mezogadasag szerepe a nepgazdasag novekedeseben* (The Role of Agriculture in Economic Development). Budapest, Kossuth Konyvkiado, 1969. 395 pp.

JANKOWSKI L., FOLTYNSKI Z., JACHNA M. *Ropa naftowa na rynku swiatowym* (Oil on the World Market). Warsaw, PWE, 1969. 292 pp.

JEMNITZ, J. *A szocialista partok es a harboru 1914-1918* (Socialist Parties and the War of 1914-1918). Budapest, Kossuth Konyvkiado, 1969. 327 pp.

Klassovaya borba v sovremennoi indiiskoi derevne 1947-1965 (The Class Struggle in the Indian Countryside. 1947-65). Moscow Nauka, 1969. 222 pp.

LASCHITZA, A. *Deutsche Linke im Kampf fuer eine demokratische Republik* (The German Left in the Fight for a Democratic Republic). Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1969. 294 pp.

NORDEN, A. *In Aktion fuer das sozialistische Vaterland* (In Action for the Socialist Fatherland). Selected Works and Speeches 1964-69. Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1969. 658 pp.

PEVZNER, Y. *Metodologiya "Kapitala" K. Marksa i sovremenny kapitalizm* (The Methodology of Marx's Capital and Modern Capitalism). Moscow, Mysl, 1969. 228 pp.

Romani in Rezistentia franceza in anii celui de-al doilea razboi mondial (Rumanians in the French Resistance during the Second World War). Bucharest, Editura politica, 1969. 366 pp.

Stany Zjednoczone a Afryka (The United States and Africa). Collection. Warsaw, KiW, 1969. 295 pp.

TITARENKO, A. *Moral i politika* (Morality and Politics). Critical Survey of Modern Conceptions of the Relationship Between Morality and Politics in Bourgeois Sociology. Moscow, Politizdat, 1969. 263 pp.

SHEINIS, V. *Portugalsky imperializm v Afrike posle vtoroi mirovoi voiny* (Portuguese Imperialism in Africa after the Second World War). Economic Problems of the Last Colonial Empire. Moscow, Nauka, 1969. 439 pp.

Zur Geschichte der marxistisch-leninistischen Philosophie in Deutschland (History of Marxist-Leninist Philosophy in Germany). Volume I. Dietz Verlag, 1969. Part One, 626 pp.; Part Two, 571 pp.

Editions of the journal

"PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM" 1970

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)

Societe d'Edition et
d'Information 9, Boulevard des
Italiens
Paris (2e) France

Editions Progressives
C.P. 175, Sta. E
Montreal, Canada

Librarie Du Monde Entier,
5, Place St-Jean,
Bruxelles

Librairie Rousseau,
36. rue J.-J. Rousseau,
Geneve

RUSSIAN EDITION

Stredisko pro rozsirovani tisku,
Praha 6, Thakurova 3
Czechoslovakia

BULGARIAN EDITION

"Russki" 6,
Sofia

CYPRUS EDITION

(in Greek)
Laikon Praktorion,
Tricoupi Street, 53 r. Nicosia

CZECH EDITION

Artia, Praha 2,
Nove Mesto, Ve smeckach 30

DANISH EDITION

Förlaget Tiden
Dr. Tvaergade 3,
1302 Kobenhavn K.

GERMAN EDITIONS

Deutscher Buch-Export und
Import GmbH,
Leipzig 701, Leninstrasse 16

"Globus"

Vertrieb ausländischer
Zeitschriften, Wien XX,
Höchstädtplatz 3,
Austria

Genossenschaft

Literaturvertrieb Zürich,
Zürich 4, Feldstrasse 46,
Switzerland

GREEK EDITION

Akadimias 57 (Siné Opera)
1 etage Athènes 143

HUNGARIAN EDITION

Kossuth Kiado, Budapest, V,
Steindl u. 6

ITALIAN EDITION

Libreria Rinascita,
Via delle Botteghe
Oscure 4, Roma

MONGOLIAN EDITION

Mongolgosknigotorg,
ul. Lenina 41, Ulan-Bator

NORWEGIAN EDITION

Boks 3715
Oslo 1

POLISH EDITION

P. K. W. Z. "RUCH",
Warszawa, Wilcza 46

RUMANIAN EDITION

Directia Difuzarii Presei,
Palatul administrativ C.F.R.,
Bd. Dinicu Golescu, Intrarea G.
Bucuresti

EDITIONS IN SPANISH

Agencia de Distribucion
de Prensa
Praha 6, Thakurova 3

Ediciones Paz y Socialismo,
Apt. Nacional 1253,
Bogota, Colombia

Ediciones Pueblos Unidos,
Casilla Correo 589,
Montevideo, Uruguay

Fondo de Cultura Popular
Apdo. postal 2352
Mexico 1, D.F.

Empresa Editora Austral
San Francisco 36,
Casilla 13201
Santiago, Chile

Editorial "Anteo,"
Entre Rios 1033,
Buenos Aires,
Argentina

VIETNAMESE EDITION

So'o xuất nhập khẩu
sach bao 32,
Hai Ba trung, Hà-noi

