

Workers of All Countries, Unite!

World Marxist Review

November, 1959
Volume 2, No. 11
35 Cents

PROBLEMS
OF PEACE
and
SOCIALISM



**World Marxist Review:
Problems of Peace and Socialism**Theoretical and Information Journal
of Communist and Workers' Parties**CONTENTS**

Disarmament Is Not a Utopia	3
L. ILYICHOV: Peaceful Coexistence and the Struggle of Two Ideologies	7
H. APTHEKER: Public Opinion Opposes the "Cold War" (letter from the USA)	17
T. ULJABAYEV: A Nation Rejuvenated by the October Revolution	22
K. BAGDASH: Two Trends in the Arab National Movement	28
A. GOSH: Kerala	35

JOURNALS OF FRATERNAL PARTIES (REVIEW)

P. TOGLIATTI: History of the Communist International—Some Problems	43
--	----

IN THE COMMUNIST AND WORKERS' PARTIES

Forthcoming Congress of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party	53
The People of Portugal Step Up the Struggle	57
A. SANTOS: Overcoming Sectarian Errors	58
JOHN HILL: Problems Encountered by Party Members in a Factory	59
SHORT NOTICES	62

WORK AMONG THE YOUTH

R. TRIVELLI: The New in Our Movement	65
A. PINIERA: Uniting the Youth of the Country	68
S. MITRA: Our Task—To Organize All Young People	71

EXCHANGE OF VIEWS

J. PRONTEAU: Economic Effects of the Common Market	73
B. MANZOCCHI: Unity of the People and Anti-Monopoly Forces Against European "Integration"	79

REVIEWS

E. TRUSHCHENKO: Art that Serves Mankind	85
J. GIBBONS: What's Wrong With U.S. Foreign Policy?	88
REVIEWS IN BRIEF	92

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW: *Problems of Peace and Socialism* is the Canadian edition of the monthly journal published in Prague under the title: *Problems of Peace and Socialism*. The Canadian edition is published by

PROGRESS BOOKS, 42-48 Stafford St., Toronto 3, Ontario, Canada.

Authorized as Second Class Mail, Post Office Department, Ottawa. PRINTED IN CANADA.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: \$3.50 a year. Single copies, 35 cents. Bundle of five or more, 25 cents per copy. For orders addressed to PROGRESS BOOKS from outside Canada, an additional 25 cents is required to cover bank and exchange charges.

PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM is also published in French, Russian, Chinese, Albanian, Bulgarian, Czech, Dutch, German, Hungarian, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Mongolian, Polish, Rumanian, Spanish, Swedish, Vietnamese (distributors: Press Circulation Agency, Sadova 3, Prague 6, Czechoslovakia). Subscriptions to any of these editions may be obtained through Progress Books, 42-48 Stafford St., Toronto. Yearly Subscription Rates for the edition in the following languages: French—\$6.00. Czech—\$6.50. Russian—\$6.50. Spanish—\$6.50. German—\$3.50.

Received of Mr. M. J. ...
the sum of ...

for ...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

...

Disarmament Is Not a Utopia

THE September day in 1959 when Khrushchov declared before the international forum that "the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics submits for consideration by the United Nations a Declaration on *Universal and Complete Disarmament* with concrete proposals on the question," will without doubt go down in history as an important milestone on the road to a genuinely human civilization.

In the past, noble thinkers, advanced people of their times, offered plans which in one way or another urged world disarmament. This is not the first time that the Soviet Union has submitted to the nations and governments a proposal for universal peace.

Now, however, under the impact of the proposals submitted by the head of the Soviet Government, the people are beginning to feel that a change has taken place, that their cherished dream may come true. They feel, and rightly so, that the way to the elimination of the most terrible danger that has ever threatened humanity is now open.

The reckless arms drive into which the world was plunged hard on the heels of the Second World War is fast becoming an unbearable burden for the working people. At a time when technological progress opens up immeasurable possibilities for higher living standards and cultural advancement, millions of young people whose minds and efforts could be used to conquer the as yet unexplored fields of nature are occupied with cleaning gun barrels. Every year over \$100 billion are squandered on military needs, a sum sufficient to provide the population of the world with bread for a whole year. This money could provide housing for 9-10 million families, build 25,000 hospitals with accommodation for four million, 50,000 schools or thousands of factories in which millions could find employment.

Were the labor wasted on arms production put to proper use it would provide the extra means needed for the satisfaction of the needs of the people, for rendering aid to the undeveloped countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America which are anxious to do away with their age-old economic backwardness. One-tenth of the military expenditure of the NATO countries (\$60 billion in 1958) would suffice to build about a dozen iron and steel plants of the type

now being built in India. The waste of human labor on the arms drive stands out even more clearly if we recall that today, in an era of unprecedented technological progress, weapons become obsolete almost the moment they come off the assembly lines and are scrapped (as is the case with fighter planes in the USA). And this is taking place at a time when the burden of taxes is growing heavier in the capitalist countries, when one-third of humanity is ill-fed and millions of people live in shacks and shanty towns (in the USA with its much-vaunted American way of life, 13 million families live in houses unfit for human habitation), when the children of workers are unable to attend school (in France where the big bourgeoisie clamors about the "grandeur" of the nation thousands of juveniles are unable to get a secondary or technical education because of the disgracefully slow — particularly so this year — rate of school construction). Militarization in the capitalist countries strikes hard at the conditions of the people.

Arms, which are being produced at an accelerated rate, are not intended for military parades, but for war, which haunts the people like a nightmare. The destructive power of the new armaments is such that within a few hours, in the event of a world conflagration, large areas of the globe would be turned into vast Hiroshimas. One H-bomb could reduce a city of the size of London to a heap of rubble. Eight of these bombs would be enough to destroy a country the size of West Germany. One cannot but feel anxiety at the thought that United States nuclear bombers patrol the skies of the NATO countries carrying their lethal loads. How can one have peace of mind knowing that in a number of European countries there are nuclear bomb dumps in the proximity of the missile launching sites? As the Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers put it, "the world has reached a point where, on the strength of some ridiculous accident, such as a technical fault in a plane carrying a hydrogen bomb, or a mental aberration in the pilot behind the controls, war could be translated into reality."

Consequently, the "balance of power" theory which depicts the ceaseless arms drive as a guarantee of genuine security of peoples can be described only as a criminal theory.

People do not want to live in constant anxiety. They have, with renewed hope, welcomed the idea underlying the Soviet proposal: *the best way to prevent war is to abolish the means of waging war*; the best guarantee that means of destruction will not be used is to destroy them.

Now, in the new conditions when the perspective of peaceful coexistence has been opened up, universal disarmament — the long-cherished desire of the people — constitutes a call to action, a realizable slogan. To ensure its materialization the Soviet Union has proposed a concrete program to be carried out within four years. Gradually, in stages, the countries would disband their armed forces (army, navy and air force), abolish the general staffs, war ministries and military training establishments, dismantle military bases in foreign lands and destroy all weapons of wholesale annihilation — nuclear, chemical and bacteriological. Guns, tanks, projectiles and torpedoes would be sent to the furnaces and turned into ploughshares. If such an agreement is reached then only small contingents of police (militia), carrying small arms and intended for maintaining internal order and protecting the personal safety of citizens, would remain.

The Soviet proposals take cognizance of the basic objections raised by the Western powers in the course of the long-drawn out disarmament talks. The new plan makes it possible to overcome the main objection, namely, the question of *control*.

In stipulating strict control at each stage the Soviet proposals again refute the gross lie that the Soviet Union is opposed to all control. In fact, both the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries have always stood for controlled disarmament. The thing on which they insist (and everyone will agree that this is sensible) is that this be *control over disarmament* and not control over . . . armaments. There is no use playing hide and seek: asking for control without disarmament is an only too obvious way of legalizing espionage in the guise of "inspection." Moreover, there is an excellent way to overcome the artificially created difficulties about control: let disarmament be complete and universal whereupon the very *concept of military secret* will be meaningless, and conditions will be created for the fullest inspection and control, because the countries will have nothing to hide from one another.

The Soviet proposals also take into account the doubts voiced on a number of occasions by the capitalist countries — the apprehension that limited disarmament would injure their "security." The complete and universal disarmament proposed by the Soviet Union will place all countries in an *equal* position, none will have a military advantage over the other.

Lastly, these proposals take into account the fears that the banning of nuclear weapons will place the Western powers in an unequal position in respect to the Soviet Union because of its superiority in armed forces and conventional arms. In order to dispel these fears the Soviet Union proposes to *start* disarmament by *reducing* the numerical strength of the armed forces and conventional armaments and thereafter to proceed with the destruction of stockpiles of nuclear weapons and to discontinue the manufacture of all weapons of wholesale annihilation.

Disarmament is possible. To those who try to sow doubts about the sincerity of the Soviet plan the people will say: "Why wait to test the sincerity of the Soviet Union if you want to make it honor its promise? For the first time in history a new kind of challenge has been made (and it has been made by the Soviet Union): a challenge to compete in winning peace on earth. Why do you decline the challenge? What are the reasons, dare you name them?"

★ ★ ★

One would have to have the narrow mind of a bourgeois diplomat to say, as did a member of de Gaulle's delegation at the UN, that there is "nothing new in the Soviet proposals."

True, this is not the first time that the Soviet Union has submitted similar proposals. Leaving aside mention of Lenin's Decree on Peace issued forty-two years ago on the first day of the October Revolution, it will not be amiss to recall that at the 1922 Genoa Conference — *the first* international conference in which the Soviet Government participated — Soviet Russia advanced proposals for disarmament. Later, in Geneva in 1927 and 1932, the USSR staunchly defended before the League of Nations the idea of universal and complete disarmament.

The initiative on disarmament displayed by the Soviet state from the very day of its birth reflects the essence of the socialist system which, by its very nature, is utterly opposed to war. The socialist system is, in effect, power in the hands of the working

class, a class which has never had any stake in predatory wars. Socialist ownership of the means of production in the USSR and in the other socialist countries leaves no room for economic groups which would profit from the arms drive. And proletarian internationalism — the basic principle of the socialist system and the world communist movement — teaches the working people to regard wars in which the imperialists embroil the peoples as a heinous crime. This explains why the spokesman of the Soviet Government told the League of Nations as early as 1928 that "no matter what fate awaits our proposal at the present session of the preparatory commission on disarmament we still believe that universal and immediate disarmament is the only effective guarantee of peace, in keeping not only with the distant ideals of humanity but with the requirements of the day."

However, since in those days world war could yield tremendous profits to the imperialist powers the latter made every effort to bury all the versions of this proposal. The capitalist governments, in order to whitewash themselves in the eyes of the masses, claimed that the peaceful initiative of the first socialist state was simply an indication of its weakness. According to them, the "hidden intention" of the Soviet Union was to overcome its military backwardness as compared with the more advanced capitalist countries by universal disarmament.

Memory of the consequences of the imperialist policies of the arms drive and predatory war is still fresh; many bear the reminders on their bodies.

Immediately after World War II the Soviet Union, whose victory over the Hitler armies tore to shreds the tales about its weakness, submitted concrete disarmament proposals in the United Nations. But these too were turned down. Nevertheless, the Soviet government, proving by deeds its desire for peace, unhesitatingly reduced its armed strength by over two million men, closed the military bases it had on the territory of other states after the war, considerably reduced its military expenditure, unilaterally suspended nuclear weapon tests — in a word, it took the way of disarmament without waiting for the others to follow suit. The other socialist countries are pursuing a similar course. Today the Soviet Union, which has entered upon the decisive stage in its development, which is building communism, which was the first to launch a moon rocket and an interplanetary station, which has demonstrated

its superiority in the sphere of technology, has, without any hesitation, submitted a disarmament program which, if accepted, will make meaningless the concept of military superiority or inferiority. This fact alone creates difficulties for the anti-Soviet and anti-communist ideologists in speculating on the "hidden intentions" of the socialist countries. These countries have only one desire, not a hidden one by any means — to ensure a really stable peace. And they offer the best of guarantees: their immense strength, their scientific and technological superiority, which they propose to place solely at the service of peace.

A new feature of the times, one that opens broad horizons before humanity (which the short-sighted yes-men of the reactionary bourgeoisie fail to see) is that socialism is now in a position to ensure realization of the heartfelt desire for peace on the part of all peoples.

In other words, we are entering the era predicted by Lenin in 1920 in his interview with H. G. Wells. If we were able, Lenin said, to establish interplanetary communication this would signify that the technological potential, having become boundless, would put an end to violence as a means and method of progress. Now, nearly forty years after Lenin spoke these words, we are on the threshold of this great achievement. The first to enter on the road to interplanetary communications — and in this there was nothing fortuitous — was the Soviet Union, the land of socialism! Simultaneously the Soviet Union is revealing to humanity a limitless technical potential and is proposing to go ahead with universal disarmament. This inspires the peoples with confidence that the rejection of force as a method of solving international issues is becoming a reality. Actually universal disarmament is no more a utopia than is peaceful coexistence. And those who still say that universal disarmament is a utopia would do well to recall that only a few months ago some believed that the moon rocket was utopian too. Space flights are no longer a utopia, they are a reality. And disarmament, too, has every chance of becoming a reality, and *for the very same reasons*. Socialism's leap in technological progress is such that its peaceful victory in the struggle for human happiness is all the more assured. This is a prospect about which we can dream, because, as Lenin put it, these dreams are dreams of the future, when man's energy will be freely and fully released. And there is

every reason to believe that they will come true.

★ ★ ★

It would be wrong, of course, to imagine that the process that is bound to lead to universal disarmament will develop of its own volition, and that all man has to do is to sit back and wait for the day of universal joy. History is made by man, by the masses. The favorable conditions for the turn which we now observe in international relations are the result of the struggle waged by the peace-loving forces of the world, the outcome of the persistent efforts of the people of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. This is precisely what lies behind the ever-accelerating changes.

In order to isolate the handful of monopolists who grow rich on war orders, the efforts of all peace supporters should be pooled. This pooling is needed to stay the hand of those for whom the idea of universal disarmament is anathema, and who are blind to everything but the nuclear arms drive. Typical of these forces are the militarist elements in the United States and Western Germany, and the de Gaulle government which is now preparing for nuclear weapon tests in the Sahara, without the slightest regard as to the effect this will have on the health of the peoples of Africa and Southern Europe.

No matter what form imperialism's policy of exploitation and oppression may take at one time or another, its nature remains unchanged and its tendency towards violence is preserved. Even a superficial glance at the reaction of some warlike American monopoly circles, the ruling groups of France, West Germany and Italy to the latest Soviet proposal shows that there are those who have no intention of foregoing the advantages accruing from militarization, all the more so because these advantages bear a dual character. On the one hand, militarization and the arms drive secure a maximum rate of profit for the handful of monopolies who get war contracts from the imperialist governments, and also (as was the case with the United States during the Korean war) exert a certain influence on the cyclical crises. On the other hand, the militarization of the state machine and the maintenance of huge armies are an instrument in the hands of reaction for political coercion of the masses, a weapon against the democratic movement of the peoples. Is it not clear that NATO, in addition to being an aggressive block against the socialist countries, is also — with increasing cynicism — a police force

against the peoples of Western Europe. It was this the *United States News & World Report* had in mind when it emphasized that it was expedient in any circumstances "to maintain a force of adequate size to police the world."

In this respect *the lesson in democracy* which the government of the USSR gave the "free world" is not the least significant aspect of the Soviet disarmament proposal: indeed, now that the governments of the socialist countries are ready to go ahead with complete disarmament, it completely demolishes the slander that in these countries the peoples are "enslaved." This is the best proof of the boundless confidence and support they enjoy among their peoples. On the other hand, if the leaders of the capitalist world fear disarmament, they do so precisely because they fear their own people.

The masses are becoming convinced that in reality the "free world" is a world of violence. The spokesmen of the big bourgeoisie, dreading the inevitable squaring of accounts, are stepping up their propaganda against socialism in the hope of befuddling the people.

The fight against the advocates of the "positions of strength" policy, against all who stand for the medieval method of solving ideological differences by fire and sword, is a necessity. The conditions for this struggle are now more favorable than ever before. The process that has been getting underway over the past few years — *the polarization of the immense forces that stand for peace on the one hand and the bellicose monopolies on the other* — is bound to gain momentum.

And likewise, under the pressure of the masses, the tendency in some bourgeois quarters to revise the hitherto dominant concept of force as a means of resolving outstanding international issues, is likely to become more pronounced.

The working class — the life-giving source of the growing peace forces — is now in a better position to bring larger masses into the peace struggle, including sections of the non-monopoly bourgeoisie. The consolidation of working-class unity — the basis of its militancy — is also facilitated by the development of this process, which is leading to the isolation of the monopoly groups that call for the cold war and sometimes for a hot one.

Indicative of the ideas now engaging the minds of the rank-and-file Socialists are the statements made recently by a number of Social-Democratic leaders in Europe and Asia.

Whereas Paul Spaak bluntly rejected the idea of a ban on atomic weapons, while insisting on increasing NATO's atomic might, the British Labor Party leader, Hugh Gaitskell, welcomed the perspective opened up by the Soviet proposals. Erich Ollenhauer, Chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Germany, also welcomed them, and it is to be hoped that his words will be followed up with deeds. The Socialist Party of Japan maintains that "world peace will prevail in the near future provided the other powers, the United States in the first place, agree with this proposal."

There is, therefore, a sound basis for consolidating united action by all working people, the Socialists and Communists in particular. The time is ripe for all trends in the working-class movement to "brush aside all the tricksters of anti-communism," as was said at the Twenty-First Congress of the CPSU, and to work out a joint program which would redouble the forces of the working class in its struggle for peace. *Even today this joint struggle for immediate aims, the realization of which would facilitate universal disarmament, is both possible and necessary.*

Neither the people nor the countries of the socialist camp are insisting on all or nothing: universal disarmament, or continuation of the cold war. Their desire is that the Western powers agree to take at least some steps towards terminating the cold war. With this end in view they are intensifying their ef-

forts for the immediate implementation of overdue measures for partial disarmament. The immediate discontinuation and ending of all nuclear weapon tests, the establishment of an atom-free zone in Europe, the withdrawal of all foreign troops and the dismantling of all bases on the territory of other countries, a non-aggression pact between the NATO and the Warsaw Treaty countries—these are some of the measures that could be taken in the near future, thus creating conditions for the complete elimination of the cold war.

It is the struggle and cohesion of the masses, a struggle for which the Soviet disarmament proposals open up the possibility of success, that will decide whether the Western powers will come to realize the need for negotiations with the socialist countries, for meetings at different levels to discuss the implementation of these measures.

Down through the centuries war has seemed to people to be a Sisyphean stone which, from time to time, inevitably rolled back on to their heads and before which they were helpless. But the working class is not helpless. Today, rallying the people still more closely, it is acquiring the strength which will enable it to eliminate once and for all this mortal danger and cast it into the limbo of the past. By storming the heavens it is again demonstrating its ability to take into its hands the destiny of mankind and to lead it into the world of prosperity, boundless progress and security.

Peaceful Coexistence and the Struggle of Two Ideologies

L. Ilyichov

THE Khrushchov article in *Foreign Affairs* — a profound development of Lenin's idea of peaceful coexistence of states with differing social systems — was read with interest throughout the world. In London and Paris, Delhi and Tokyo, it was recognized as a contribution to the struggle of the peoples for a new way of social development, a way which would avert war and usher in the era of lasting peace.

Khrushchov's goodwill visit to the United States has demonstrated once again the vital-

ity of the idea of peaceful coexistence and its significance in relaxing international tension. No matter which trend gains the upper hand in international relations in the future it is clear that Khrushchov's visit to the United States will go down in history as an act of statesmanship and farsightedness that is bound to exert a great influence on the questions of war and peace.

The peoples of the whole world have been given a striking manifestation of the Soviet Union's consistency in working to ease ten-

sions and have gained a better idea of its peaceful foreign policy which opens up real opportunities for replacing the "cold war" with a durable peace. The world heard the truth about communism, the new society now being built by the selfless efforts of the Soviet people. The peace-loving forces in all countries got a view of the grand prospects for human development. Khrushchov's visit has raised the international prestige of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, has greatly helped the fraternal Communist and Workers' parties and inspired the progressive forces in their struggle for genuine freedom and democracy, for the victory of socialism.

Whereas a bare ten years ago the ideological opponents of socialism comforted themselves with the thought that communism would be "rolled back," today very few people, even among the hot-heads in the capitalist world, count on this.

History marches onward, its laws are irreversible and only a hopeless doctrinaire could ignore all that has taken place in the past forty years and think in terms of "rolling back" communism. What, then, is the alternative? What is to be done? Act the gambler and drop the H-bomb like dice and trust to luck? That would be rather risky: in the ICBM age such a gamble could bring catastrophe upon the capitalist world. Or, accept the Soviet Union's proposal for peaceful coexistence, which it has championed ever since November 7, 1917? This prospect, too, is a little frightening, because the history of the postwar shows that that part of the world still under the iron heel of capitalism has been shrinking like Balzac's *Piece of Skin*.

And so we have an outpouring of theoretical theses, public speeches, philosophical writings and journalistic studies aimed at finding a way out: if economic and social progress cannot be "rolled back," it should at least be contained, retarded or directed along a course which would help preserve capitalism. Some of the apologists of the moribund capitalist system want to give it a new name. Nonsense, they say, this is not the capitalism that Marx described. We now have "people's capitalism," "humane capitalism" which, in essence, is the same as socialism, if not better

Among the top people in the capitalist countries it has become fashionable to parade their acquaintance with the writings of Marx and Lenin. The new Marxist "scholars" (the late Mr. Dulles claimed to be one of them)

try to prove that the working class, in fighting capitalism, in struggling for power, is simply wasting its time. The revisionists, all too anxiously, give all the help they can to these gentlemen. They say that times have changed, that the old production relations are being infused with a "socialist" content. All that is needed is patience; class struggle should be abandoned.

Then there are those who hasten to distort the principle of peaceful coexistence. They want it extended also to the ideological sphere, demanding, if not peaceful coexistence of the ideas of the exploiting and exploited classes, then at least that the Communists should recognize the "right" of the two ideologies "to equality." But their idea of equal opportunity for the two ideologies is a rather queer one: they want equality only on the territory of the socialist countries. As to the capitalist world, where the press, radio, television, cinema and book trade are controlled by the imperialists, not a word is said about equal rights. Spokesmen of the West, as the facts show, fear cultural exchanges with the socialist countries on an equal basis. Not long ago one of these, speaking with admirable candor, declared that the object of cultural exchange was to transfer the war of ideas to enemy territory.

As a matter of fact the same intention is behind the blatant demands for "free exchange of information and ideas." The purpose here is not to grant access, so far as the capitalist countries are concerned, to the noble ideas of communism but freely to spread in the socialist world all kinds of inventions, to market their cultural rubbish and to fan hatred among peoples.

In vain, however, are their hopes of diverting the minds of the peoples from the key issue — peaceful coexistence — or distorting its essence. Khrushchov's article clearly elucidates the matter. "Let us try out in practice," he writes, "whose system is better, let us compete without war. This is much better than competing in who will produce more arms and who will crush whom. We stand and always will stand for the kind of competition that will help to raise the well-being of the people to a higher level."

This language, plain and understandable, was welcomed not only by working people, but also by many realistic capitalist leaders. Some leading U.S. newspapers reacted to Khrushchov's article with open hostility. When Vice-President Nixon interpreted coexistence as a world divided into two host-

ile camps separated by a wall of hatred and fear, these papers told their readers that this was a new argument. The U.S. press ignored the fact that in this case different concepts — questions of interstate relations and class struggle — had been deliberately confused. Moreover, the opponents of peaceful coexistence claim to see a contradiction between the idea of coexistence and the refusal of the Communists to lower the flag of the ideological struggle.

Khrushchov's article replies to these speculations. It says unequivocally that capitalist spokesmen reason thus: "the Soviet leaders argue that they are for peaceful coexistence. At the same time they declare that they are fighting for communism and they even say that communism will be victorious in all countries. How can there be peaceful coexistence with the Soviet Union if it fights for communism?"

"People who treat the question in this way confuse matters, willfully or not, by failing to distinguish between problems of ideological struggle and the question of relations between states. Those indulging in this sort of confusion are most probably guided by a desire to cast aspersions upon the Communists of the Soviet Union and to represent them as the advocates of aggressive actions. This, however, is very unwise . . .

"We communists believe that the idea of communism will ultimately be victorious throughout the world, just as it has been victorious in our country, in China and in many other countries. Many readers of *Foreign Affairs* will probably disagree with us. Perhaps they think that the idea of capitalism will ultimately triumph. It is their right to think so. We may argue, we may disagree with one another. *The main thing is to keep to the positions of ideological struggle, without resorting to arms in order to prove that one is right.*"

This, as the Communists see it, is how matters should stand in respect to the relations between states with differing social systems if the idea of peaceful coexistence is to triumph. The socialist countries believe that it is possible to exist in the manner described by Lenin as early as 1920: "Let the American capitalists leave us alone. We will not touch them."

The Khrushchov visit was a milestone in the Soviet Union's struggle for peaceful coexistence and for ending the "cold war."

The head of the Soviet Government went to the United States with an open heart. The USSR sincerely wants friendly relations

with the United States. Clearly such relations between the two most powerful states in the world would have a beneficial effect on the international situation as a whole and would help to settle many burning issues. The more far-sighted capitalist spokesmen now realize that for them there is no alternative other than peaceful coexistence.

However, those who say that peaceful coexistence rules out any battle of ideas know little of the laws of social development. Peaceful coexistence between ideologies, about which some muddlers speak, is as unthinkable as reconciliation between light and darkness.

II

The opponents of socialism have long tried to prove that by its very nature Marxist-Leninist ideology and peaceful coexistence are mutually exclusive. In reality any unbiased person with only a slight acquaintance with Marxism-Leninism will readily grant that peaceful coexistence stems logically from this teaching of which it is an inseparable part.

Countries with differing social and economic systems have existed before. Slavery and feudalism, feudalism and capitalism, existed side by side for a long time waging at times bitter economic, political and ideological struggle, often in the shape of armed conflicts. However, because these societies were founded on private property and the exploitation of man by man, the ruling classes, when confronted with a common danger, always called off their feuds and made peace not only in the political but also in the ideological sphere.

No matter what the differences were between the capitalists and the feudal lords, no matter how deep their antagonisms, they always united when it was necessary to defend exploiting society as such and reached a compromise at the expense of the working people.

We recall what Marx and Engels wrote in the *Communist Manifesto* in 1848. A "holy alliance" of Pope and Tsar, Metternich and Guizot, French Radicals and German police-spies was formed to combat the specter of communism. In spite of the war between France and Prussia, the French bourgeoisie joined hands with the Prussian Junkers to crush the Paris Commune, because the oppressors find it far more important to defend their class privileges than the interests of the nation or ideological principles.

Our era, the era of the transition from capitalism to socialism, also sees countries with differing social-economic systems existing side by side. This "also," however, can be used only very conditionally. The present period has no analogy in history. Socialism and capitalism are not simply different, but diametrically opposed social formations.

The class interests of the bourgeoisie and proletarians are irreconcilable: if it is vital for the bourgeoisie to maintain the system of exploitation, the principal object of the working class is to build the new, communist society.

The present period is characterized by the polarization of class forces, when the two opposite poles of contemporary society stand out very clearly: the proletariat and its allies on the one hand, and the monopoly bourgeoisie and its stooges, on the other.

The existence of the two opposed social systems — socialism and capitalism, — and the sharpening of class contradictions complicate the political situation to an unprecedented degree. But precisely because of the powerful socialist world system, new and favorable opportunities are open to mankind.

Whereas under capitalism the contradictions are such that it cannot develop without crises and war, unless part of the products is destroyed from time to time, under socialism peace is the normal, the best condition for its development. The rise of the socialist world system makes feasible for the first time in history the realization of the cherished aspiration of the vast majority of mankind: repudiation of war as a means of solving international issues.

The experience of the last few decades has proved that the stronger the socialist world system, the more stable peace is.

Today the socialist system exerts a tremendous influence on world development. Jointly with the peace-loving non-socialist countries, it is capable of extinguishing at the very outset hotbeds of war wherever they may appear. And in the near future, with the fulfilment of the Soviet Seven-Year Plan and the economic plans of the other socialist countries, *there will be a real possibility of eliminating war as a means of solving international issues.*

However, war can be eliminated only through struggle, above all, through the efforts of the socialist peoples in expanding their own productive forces to a degree which would ensure the superiority of social-

ism over capitalism in the decisive sphere of human activity, namely, that of material production. The economic strength of the socialist countries will enable the peace-loving peoples to impose peaceful coexistence on the aggressive imperialist forces, compelling them to give up any attempt at unleashing a new world war.

We can with full confidence declare that the process of strengthening the peace-loving forces throughout the world will proceed more intensively than hitherto. The working people and the peace supporters in all countries are rallying against the monopoly bourgeoisie to defend the vital interests of the overwhelming majority of the people and to uphold peace. The international situation is changing in favor of peace and progress.

In this age of rocketry and nuclear energy peace is the most vital concern of mankind. Our generation, which has subordinated the mighty forces of nature, can use these forces for the benefit of mankind. But to do so it must prevent the aggressors from unleashing war. Since there is a danger that the more aggressive imperialists may resort to nuclear war, the most important thing is the common concern to preserve peace and not the differences on minor issues that exist between the various countries. It is on this basis that the peace movement has emerged and is growing. This movement has no objective other than preventing a new world war.

The natural leader of the people in the struggle against the threat of war is the most advanced and best organized class — the working class headed by the Communist parties. The Communist parties have no aim other than the interests of the people. And the people want peace.

III

The question may be asked: does not the rallying of the peace-loving forces to combat aggression, for peaceful coexistence of countries with differing social systems, signify abandoning the class struggle? The answer is that it doesn't.

In essence, coexistence signifies continuation of this struggle, but by peaceful means, a form of class struggle, a form born out of the transition from capitalism to socialism. Coexistence implies that, in the sphere of interstate relations, war as a means of struggle assumes the form of competition between the two systems for winning the support of the masses. Victory will go to

the social system which will provide the people with more benefits — genuine political freedom and equality, and satisfaction of their material and spiritual needs. Communism is such a system. The reactionary bourgeoisie, lacking confidence in a favorable outcome of peaceful competition, is doing everything to prevent the implementation of the principles of peaceful coexistence.

Engels pointed out that class struggle was conducted in a threefold way — theoretical, political and the practical-economic. He stressed the importance of the, so to say, concentric attack wherein lay the strength and invincibility of the movement.* In his *What Is To Be Done?*, written in 1902, Lenin emphasized the point that "Engels recognizes not two forms of the great struggle of Social Democracy (political and economic) . . . , but three, adding to the first two the theoretical struggle."** Lenin regarded this point as being instructive from the standpoint of the problems and controversies of the day.

Engel's words retain their validity, because the existence of the socialist world system has made the class struggle more complicated than it was during the lifetime of Marx and Engels.

The Great October Socialist Revolution gave the working people an instrument which they never had before, namely, the State. The consolidation of the dictatorship of the proletariat put an end to the bourgeois monopoly of state power. From then on class struggle was extended also to the sphere of interstate relations.

From its very first day of existence the Soviet State proclaimed peace, non-interference in the internal affairs of other countries, recognition of the right of all peoples to self-determination and the establishment of the system of their choice as the basic principles of its foreign policy. And from that very first day, too, the Soviet State encountered the frenzied opposition of the imperialist forces. Non-recognition, diplomatic moves aimed at isolating it, the notorious "cordon sanitaire," sabotage, aggressive alliances, and, lastly, repeated military attacks (of which the most dangerous was the perfidious Hitler invasion) — make up the incomplete list of the methods to which the bourgeoisie resorted in its *political struggle*

against the first dictatorship of the proletariat.

Economic blockade, efforts to strangle the Soviet Republic with "the bony hand of hunger," economic sabotage, forcing the Soviet Union to spend heavily on defense with a view to making her divert resources from socialist construction — these are some of the forms of *economic struggle* used by the capitalists against the workers' state.

The theoretical field, primarily the sphere of ideology, abounds in propaganda campaigns of the "captive nations' week" type recently staged in the USA, "criticism" of Marxism and "refuting" it, "people's capitalism" theories, "enlightened capitalism," anti-Soviet broadcasts and infiltration of anti-Soviet and anti-communist literature into the territory of the socialist countries. All these efforts, of course, are bound to fail in the long run. However, it would be wrong to close one's eyes to the fact that the imperialists, by resorting to cheap demagoguery, have succeeded from time to time in befuddling unstable elements even among the working people.

These forms of class struggle were encountered in the relations between the land of socialism and the capitalist countries and, with the evolution of socialism into a world system, manifest themselves in the relations between the socialist camp and the camp of imperialism.

Hence, in order not to lose perspective and to act in consonance with the laws of social development it is vital not to lose sight of *the class character of the processes taking place on the world arena*.

It is a feature of the latter-day revisionists to ignore the class character of these processes. They juggle with "non-class" categories, "blocs in general," "groupings in general" and "bases in general." They try to brush aside the fact that *behind international developments there are always real interests, that the class struggle is being waged also on the world arena*, although it differs both in form and content from the class struggle in the individual countries.

There is no reason why, in interstate relations, class struggle should assume the form of armed clashes. The Communists maintain that in the relations between countries with differing social systems the sole method should be peaceful negotiation.

Can there be a more sincere expression of the peaceful strivings of the Soviet Union

*Vide: Marx, Engels, Selected Works, Vol. I, p. 652. Frederick Engels, Prefatory Note to The Peasant War in Germany.

**V. I. Lenin, What Is To Be Done?, pp. 36-37.

than the plan for comprehensive and complete disarmament submitted by N. S. Khrushchov to the U. N. General Assembly? No bourgeois government has ever suggested anything like this. A world without armaments, wrote the Indian paper *Amrita Bazar Patrica*, has been the cherished dream of unsophisticated idealists. Now, however, for the first time in history, a practical statesman — the spokesman for one of the greatest world powers — has submitted such a proposal not merely for the sake of the theoretical principle of repudiating war as an instrument of national policy but for the sake of actually abolishing armaments and the bodies without which war cannot be conducted. Khrushchov, said this paper, has struck at the roots of the poisonous tree to prevent it from growing at all.

The Soviet Declaration on disarmament has confronted the critics of communism with a thankless task, namely, once again and for the *n*th time, to cast aspersions on the disinterested and humane character of the statement. Once again, all over the world, they are harping on the old tune about the Soviet proposals being mere propaganda or a utopia, or just another snare set by Communists to catch the capitalists. The *New York Times*, for instance, said in plain language that the Soviet plan for total disarmament was spearheaded against the internal security of the bourgeois states which may be overrun by spontaneously rising masses of workers and peasants. The lords of the "free world" fear that their people may take advantage of the abolition of armies and stockpiles of weapons to put an end to the capitalist system.

The ideas of communism are the most advanced ideas of our times. The achievements of socialism in the peaceful competition are exerting, and will continue to exert, a beneficial influence on the emancipation movement in the capitalist countries and on the struggle of the working people against the capitalist class. In this struggle the sympathies of the socialist countries are unreservedly with the toilers, the oppressed and the disinherited. Nevertheless, Marxists firmly maintain that social transformation, the change-over from one system to another, is purely the internal affair of the people of the particular country. Everything depends on the conditions prevailing in the country, on the correlation of class forces there. Any attempts to "spur" on the struggle of the working class from outside — either by armed intervention, or by any other means

— can only harm the cause of the working class and socialism. This was repeatedly pointed out by Lenin as, for instance, when he rebuffed the "Left Communists" who maintained that "fomenting" international revolution was the right thing to do. "A 'theory' of this kind," wrote Lenin "would run counter to Marxism, which has always denied 'fomenting' revolutions. They develop in accordance with the sharpening of the class contradictions which engender revolutions."

The hoary tale about the "export" of revolution, propagated by bourgeois ideologists, is a downright lie. They claim that because the Communists are interested in the spread of socialism throughout the world and openly proclaim the inevitability of the downfall of capitalism on a world scale, they are therefore interested in war and internal subversion. Hence, they conclude, peaceful coexistence with countries where Communists are in power is impossible.

This "logic" has nothing in common with the truth. The strength of Marxism-Leninism derives from a knowledge of the laws of the development of society; in disclosing these laws, this theory teaches that one must act in accordance with these laws, not contrary to them. We see the working out of these laws in the replacing of one social formation by another, more progressive one. Such is the law of social development; it is born out of life itself and not invented by armchair philosophers.

On the whole, human society develops on an ascending plane. Socialism alone ensures for all members of society a life worthy of man; it alone guarantees a just distribution of material and spiritual values, genuinely democratic rights and freedoms for all and makes people the masters of their destiny. Socialism alone is capable of putting an end to wars once and for all.

Because of the law of the uneven development of capitalism, the conditions for new, socialist relations of production ripen in one country before they do in another. No matter how eager the Communists may be to spread socialism, it cannot be established in any country until the conditions there are ripe. It should be pointed out that the question whether such conditions are present or not is decided by the course of the struggle in the particular country.

Such is the objective law of history which operates irrespective of anyone's desire, of his good or bad will. That is why "foment-

ing" revolution would be nothing but a political gamble, anarchism, and the reverse of Marxism-Leninism.

And conversely, no forces can for any considerable length of time retard the establishment of a new, more advanced social system provided the material and moral conditions for the change are ripe in the given country, provided the masses are conscious of the need for social change and actively fight to bring it about. This has been confirmed not only by the experience of the Soviet Union, but also by that of the Chinese People's Republic and the other socialist countries.

Allegations about the "export" of revolution have been revived in the guise of the so-called "indirect aggression." Those indulging in these semantics try to make it appear that were it not for the "subversive activity" of the Soviet Union, the "Kremlin," the "hand of Moscow" (their name for the Communist parties), "peace and good will" would reign in the capitalist world.

What purpose do the bourgeois propagandists pursue when they make allegations about "indirect aggression?" Their purpose is to undermine the prestige of the Communists in the eyes of the people. The aim of these inventions is to get the naive to believe that the threat to capitalism emanates not from its own contradictions but from without; that were it not for the threat from without capitalism could exist forever, without crises, without unemployment and without misery.

Precisely because the transition from capitalism to socialism takes place in each country when the internal conditions are ripe for such a change (in some cases—sooner, and in others—later) the coexistence of capitalist and socialist states over a definite period of time is an objective law of history. In the immediate years after the October Revolution Lenin pointed out that such a period was unavoidable, a period "when socialist and capitalist states would exist side by side."

Thus, in upholding the principles of peaceful coexistence, the Communists proceed from Marxism-Leninism, from objective necessity, from the facts of objective reality. In the world of today there are socialist countries, just as there are capitalist countries.

IV

From the standpoint of the opponents of peace, coexistence can be looked at also in the form of constant conflicts between the two systems. After the war this view became widespread in the West. It has been implemented in the "cold war" policy, in the formula: coexist, but wage the "cold war" and keep the world in a state of constant tension.

Peaceful coexistence does not mean merely living side by side without war now, but to constantly guard against it breaking out in the future. The crux of the problem is to find practical ways to normalize international relations. Is it possible to find a formula for coexistence which, while guaranteeing universal peace, would at the same time be acceptable both to the socialist and capitalist states? Of course, it is. Moreover, it has already been found and applied in the relations between a number of countries with differing social systems.

"In its simplest expression," says Khrushchov, peaceful coexistence "signifies the repudiation of war as a means of solving controversial issues. However, this does not cover the entire concept of peaceful coexistence. Apart from the commitment to non-aggression, it also presupposes an obligation on the part of all states to desist from violating each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty in any form and under any pretext whatsoever. The principle of peaceful coexistence signifies a renunciation of interference in the internal affairs of other countries with the object of altering their system of government or mode of life or for any other motives. The doctrine of peaceful coexistence also presupposes that political and economic relations between countries are to be based upon complete equality of the parties concerned, and on mutual benefit."

In present conditions these principles could become a reliable basis for lasting peace among all the countries.

The contradictions between the two systems can neither be eliminated nor ignored. However, they by no means imply war. *Repudiation of war as a means of resolving international issues and differences, their settlement exclusively through negotiations—that is the political platform for peaceful coexistence, which meets the interests of all peoples, of the workers of all countries.*

This, in general outline, is the political aspect of the class struggle in the sphere of interstate relations today.

The strength of the socialist camp inspires hope in the future: the peace-loving forces now have a real possibility for commanding respect for the principles of peaceful co-existence on the part of those adventurist imperialist circles which would like to plunge mankind into new conflicts. The achievements of Soviet science and technology, the launching of the sputniks and cosmic rockets by the Soviet Union, have shown what enormous possibilities are possessed by the socialist camp.

In the sphere of economy the class struggle assumes the form of economic competition between socialism and capitalism. The socialist countries declare that the competition can and must be peaceful, that it can and must be aimed at raising living standards and not at stockpiling armaments. It is the economy which is the main sphere of the peaceful competition between the two co-existing systems.

Which of the two systems will provide a higher living standard? Under which system is the working day longer, and under which is it shorter; under which system does the working man derive more material and spiritual benefits; which system provides better housing and better opportunities for education?

Peaceful competition can and must supersede the economic conflict which found expression in the forms engendered by the "cold war," such as the ruinous arms drive, the embargo on trade with the socialist countries dictated by the United States to the members of the imperialist blocs.

International trade without restrictions or barriers is a sound *economic basis* for peaceful coexistence.

Trade restrictions, according to the imperialist press, have "boomeranged" against the economy of the capitalist countries. Not only press reports but also the successful steps undertaken by a number of capitalist governments with a view to abolishing trade restrictions testify to the impact exercised by the economy of the socialist countries on world politics. The Soviet Seven-Year Plan and the economic plans of the other socialist countries open up wide vistas for mutually profitable international trade.

Speaking about world economic relations, Lenin pointed out that they constitute a force greater "than the desire, will or decision of any of the hostile governments or classes." They compel the capitalist coun-

tries to enter into contact with us. This force will make itself felt more and more with the growth of the economic strength of the socialist world system.

The establishment of the material and technological base of communism by the Soviet people in accordance with the grand program of communist construction announced by the 21st Congress of the CPSU will decisively affect the balance of forces on the world arena. As soon as the socialist system achieves superiority over the capitalist system in material production—the decisive sphere of human activity—it will have gained an historic victory which will exert a truly tremendous influence on the entire development of human society.

V

Apart from the struggle in the political and economic spheres—which, according to the Communists, should develop in the form of peaceful coexistence, in the form of peaceful competition, there is also the struggle in the sphere of ideology—a major factor in the development of society.

In the latter sphere there has never been nor can there be peaceful coexistence between socialism and capitalism. The Communists have always fought and will continue to fight for their ideas, for the revolutionary ideology of the working class as the most advanced and progressive ideology of our times.

Whereas in the sphere of politics it is possible and necessary within reasonable limits to take into account the point of view of the opponent (otherwise negotiations would be out of the question since the object of the latter is to find points of contact, and rapprochement between the standpoints); and whereas in the economic sphere concessions are likewise natural (on a mutual basis, of course), concessions which in the final analysis benefit the two parties, it would be utterly wrong to imagine that in exchange for concessions in political and economic relations the socialist states would make concessions in the sphere of ideology, to think that normalization of international relations depends on reconciling ideologies and abandoning principles.

The late Mr. Dulles urged the USSR to give up "at least a part of the Soviet communist creed." More recently some Western circles have repeated this appeal, for, it appears, there are those in the imperialist

countries who believe that the socialist countries may make ideological concessions.

It should be said point blank that these are vain hopes. Many in the capitalist countries who have no liking for communism realize this only too well.

A new line has appeared in imperialist propaganda: bourgeois ideologists are trying to benefit from their own defeat. They have disgraced themselves by writing about the "terrible conditions of the Soviet people," about their "going hungry," and about the scientific and technological "backwardness" of the Soviet Union. But who in the West nowadays can deny the achievements of socialism or dispute the leading position of the Soviet Union in a number of fields of science and technology.

Today these propagandists have given currency to another stream of falsehoods. They try to convince the working people in the capitalist countries that communism is the "ideology of the poor," that now, with the rising living standards in the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, with the building of a first-rate industry, the Soviet people have been, so to say, "regenerated." Their ideology has "changed," it is no longer Marxist.

This, of course, is wishful thinking. But that does not make imperialist propaganda less harmful. At the same time it shows that as far as ideological struggle is concerned the bourgeoisie has no scruples, it resorts to lies and inventions.

Hence the need, where principles are concerned, for irreconcilable struggle on the part of the Communist and Workers' parties against any manifestations of bourgeois ideology in all its forms and variations, the need to affirm the scientific, most advanced and humane ideology—Marxism-Leninism. We stand for broad cultural exchanges. But there can be no concessions in the ideological sphere. Any concession to bourgeois ideology means abandoning Marxist-Leninist ideology, and there is no such thing as "partial" abandonment. Anyone who gives way in the ideological sphere, even to the slightest degree, consciously or unconsciously betrays the entire communist ideology and the cause of socialism.

Can the Communists, for instance, relinquish the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat? No, they cannot, because it would mean perpetuation of capitalism.

Can they give up the fight for transforming private capitalist property into state (national) property? No, they cannot, because to do so would mean perpetuating the exploitation of man by man and the existence of classes.

Can the Communists give up the principle of planned development of the national economy owned by the people? No, they cannot, because this would be tantamount to foregoing one of the basic conditions for a high rate of growth of production, it would signify preserving in our economy the evils of capitalism from which millions of working people suffer—crises and mass unemployment.

The mere posing of the question in this way shows that abandoning any of these principles of socialism and communism would signify a return to capitalism.

Bourgeois and reformist ideologists maintain that the Communists contradict themselves when they speak of peaceful coexistence simultaneously with irreconcilable ideological struggle. But there is no contradiction here; on the contrary, ideological concessions could easily lead to serious political and military conflicts. Aggressive imperialist circles would obviously take advantage of these concessions (were they made) in order to carry out their "policy of liberation" of the socialist countries.

Mention has been made of the political and economic foundations of peaceful coexistence. Ideological struggle does not make any inroads whatever on these foundations. The soundness of an ideology is demonstrated not by force of arms, but by peaceful means—persuasion, explanation and polemic. Ideological disputes cannot be settled by force. Although Giordano Bruno was burnt at the stake, his ideas did not burn with him. Hitler enslaved a number of European peoples but he was powerless to force his ideology upon them.

For more than a hundred years the reactionary forces of the capitalist world have sought to "destroy" Marxism—the theory of scientific communism. To this end they have written mountains of books and articles, wasted millions of tons of paper and printer's ink. To this end they are persecuting Communists and progressives. To this end they talk about new crusades against the socialist countries where Marxist-Leninist ideology has firmly established itself.

But all their efforts are in vain. Marxism-Leninism cannot be destroyed; it has opened new horizons before mankind, has captured

the minds and hearts of people, and has enthused millions to work for the common good. Marxism-Leninism alone has been able to translate the noble ideas of the best minds into the revolutionary action of the masses, into the mighty desire of millions for enlightenment and communism.

Ideological struggle is waged by peaceful, not military means.

The working people of the world can see for themselves how Marxist-Leninist ideas are being translated into reality. The one billion people living in the socialist world are building a new society where production is not a means of extracting maximum profit for capitalists but a means for the maximum satisfaction of the constantly growing material and spiritual needs of all members of society. This has been brought about under the leadership of the Communist and Workers' parties which safeguard the purity of Marxist-Leninist ideology and which creatively apply this teaching in solving practical problems.

As time goes on the working people understand more and more that the revisionists and reformists are betraying their interests, that they have only one aim (which, as any Marxist-Leninist knows, is unattainable), namely, perpetuation of the social relations based on the exploitation of man by man.

Even now, though with less success than before, the Social Democrats, with their "new theories" about the "changed character" of capitalism, still manage to deceive some sections of the workers. But with time those who have been deceived discover that these "theories" boil down to one thing—to putting a "socialist" label on capitalism, the same old capitalism with all its contradictions, unemployment, crises and exploitation.

Reformist practices are to a degree linked with the ideas of "social conciliation" promoted by bourgeois circles. The preachers of "moral rearmament," "world government" and other such panaceas which are designed to cure the ills of the world have been rather active of late. That these ideas are unsound is obvious. One has only to ask: has any preacher of "social conciliation" succeeded in providing an example of such "conciliation" here on earth and not in pipe dreams?

Has the bourgeoisie (on its own or with the help of the Right-wing Social Democrats) succeeded in mitigating the class struggle in any of the capitalist countries irrespective of whether or not they have Communist

parties, whether Communist influence on the masses is great or small?

On the contrary, experience shows no let up in class struggle within the capitalist system, not even for a moment. The tendency to establish dictatorial, authoritarian regimes which has obviously gained ground in many capitalist countries, the tendency to do away with the last vestiges of bourgeois-democratic freedoms, towards establishing in one form or another an open ruthless dictatorship of monopoly capital, proves beyond doubt the acuteness of the class struggle. "We need a fuhrer, not a bureaucracy!" proclaimed the Hitler general Staedke. And NATO headquarters printed this slogan in the *Revue militaire générale*. On the other hand, we see that, notwithstanding all barriers, the masses in ever-growing numbers are joining the movements fighting against imperialism, colonialism and militarism.

In an effort to undermine the influence of communist ideology the imperialists and their agents in the working-class movement try to portray the Communists as out-and-out adherents of violence, as "destroyers of world culture" and of the moral standards established by past generations.

These charges have nothing in common with the truth, with the Marxist-Leninist theory and practice of the Communist parties. Marxism cannot be alienated from the development of world thought or contrasted to it. Marxism is the product, the supreme achievement of this development. While not rejecting compulsion, Marxism-Leninism does not consider it to be the sole means of struggle or the sole way to secure the triumph of socialism and communism.

On the contrary, careful analysis of the ideological concepts of modern imperialism reveals that all of them, to a greater or lesser degree, directly or indirectly, lead, in the final analysis, to apologetics for violence. In the sphere of home policy this trend is manifested in the revival of fascist methods. In foreign policy it is manifested, for example, in justifying the claims of one or another imperialist country to world domination, in justifying the exploitation of the underdeveloped countries by the imperialists, in justifying colonialism. In the sphere of relations between the socialist and capitalist systems it is manifested in naked or concealed calls for war with a view to restoring capitalist rule over the world.

To give up the ideological struggle (and some bourgeois leaders are inclined to ask the Communists to do so as a sort of quid pro quo for their consent to peaceful coexistence) would signify voluntary surrender of positions to bourgeois ideology. In ideology there can be no vacuum.

"... The only choice is: either the bourgeois or the socialist ideology," wrote Lenin. "There is no middle course (for humanity has not created a 'third' ideology, and, moreover, in a society torn by class antagonisms there can never be a non-class or above-class ideology). Hence, to belittle the socialist ideology in any way, to turn away from it in the slightest degree means to strengthen bourgeois ideology."*

Our socialist ideology corresponds to the objective laws of historical development. It

*V. I. Lenin, *What Is To Be Done?*, p. 53.

does not "urge the conquest of the world" by the Communists as our enemies claim, it reflects the incontrovertible fact that the establishment of communist society throughout the world is inevitable. Neither the Communists nor any one else can change or annul the laws of historical development. For more than a hundred years our adversaries have never tired of trying to prove the "unsoundness" of the communist teaching. Why, if it is unsound, do the adherents of the old world dread it so?

"The Marxian doctrine is omnipotent because it is true," said Lenin. The capitalist system will perish because it is doomed by history. Communists, in keeping with their ideology, the most humane of all ideologies, are anxious that doomed capitalism should cause the least possible injury to mankind, that it should leave as few ruins as possible after it has passed on.

Public Opinion Opposes the "Cold War"

(Letter from the USA)

Herbert Aptheker

PREMIER Debre, of France, was quoted on August 17 as saying: "History moves quickly and surprising changes can intervene. Who would have said only six years ago that visits of chiefs of state would be carefully organized between Moscow and Washington?"

How shall one explain this change—and one need not go back as far as six years to find it "surprising"—how significant a change is it, really, and how lasting will it be?

Walter Lippman (*New York Herald Tribune* commentator), who possesses perhaps the most penetrating mind at the service of the American bourgeoisie, wrote in his column of August 14:

"There is no great mystery about the significance of the Eisenhower-Khrushchov visits. They are a recognition of the fundamental fact of the world today, that the issue of peace or war will be decided in Moscow and Washington. Only the USSR and USA can wage a nuclear war, and they alone,

therefore, can make the ultimate decisions which mean peace or war."

There are some obvious truths in this paragraph; but it leaves unanswered more than it answers. For the fact that only the Soviet Union and the United States are capable of conducting a nuclear war has been true for several years and everyone has been aware of this truth for all that time; but it is only now that the visits are taking place. Furthermore, it is an undisputed fact that the Government of the USSR has been suggesting and urging such an exchange of visits for years; yet, again, it is only now that a meeting has taken place. And surely here we have an aspect of the current visits that Mr. Lippman's rather glib paragraph failed to consider. Here we come to the heart of the "surprising changes" to which the French Premier referred; it is in the effort to understand these changes—these trends and movements, these dynamics of international rela-

tions — that we will be grappling with the deepest significance of the exchange of visits between the heads of the two greatest powers on earth.

* * *

The fundamental thing is that the foreign policy of the cold war is bankrupt. The policy of "containment" and "liberation," of "strength" and of "massive retaliation," of "brinkmanship," has not worked, and with a people as pragmatic as the Americans, that fact is decisive. The imperialist cold war policy was founded on the assumption of the decisively superior strength of capitalism from both an economic and a military point of view. That assumption was faulty to begin with; in ensuing years this error has become more and more evident, until today, it is plain to the vast majority of mankind, including that portion of it living in imperialist countries, that the assumption does not accord with reality.

The developments of the past six years — to choose the French Premier's time interval — have seen one defeat after another for the cold war policy. Counter-revolution failed; military intervention failed; economic blockade and discrimination failed; "non-recognition" failed. And, positively, the strength of the socialist sector of the world grew enormously in all facets of life — economic, social, political, military, cultural — highlighted by the tremendous "leap forward" of the Chinese people, and culminating in the breathtaking vistas opened up by the Soviet Seven-Year Plan.

Meanwhile, the colonial and national-liberation movements also advanced with seven-league boots, spotlighted in the immediate past by the Iraqi and Cuban revolutions. The former triumphed despite Anglo-American intervention, and the latter occurred right at the doorstep of American imperialism. The Cuban Revolution in particular shook the American bourgeoisie, for it occurred in a land but ninety miles from the U.S. mainland, whose industry, finances, utilities, and markets are dominated by American imperialism, whose armed forces were trained and supplied by the United States, and upon whose territory were American naval and air bases, and in support of whose sadistic dictator, American diplomatic strength was pledged. And all this in the midst of Latin America — special locale of the American "spheres of influence."

Furthermore, despite ruling-class propaganda of enormous intensity and almost unbelievable vileness, the great fact is that the

American people as a whole do not hate any other people and they do not wish to make war upon any other people. On the contrary, their dearest wish is that peace may prevail everywhere. For a multitude of reasons, some of which have been mentioned above, the fact is that never in the history of the United States has there been so widespread and so strong a popular opposition to official foreign policy as there has been for the past twelve or sixteen months.

The leaders of both major political parties know this. That is why they — Stevenson, Harriman, Humphreys, Nixon — have been campaigning in Moscow for the Presidential nomination for the 1960 elections. That forthcoming 1960 election is an important catalyst for the change in foreign policy conduct, but it is a catalyst, and not the source. The source lies in the bankruptcy of the cold war policy as I have stated, a bankruptcy so complete as to defy camouflage. It is this bankruptcy which has produced the alteration in popular opinion — just as, simultaneously, the alteration helped expose and hasten the bankruptcy. At the same time, such an alteration, palpable as it is, induces swift reaction in political circles, especially when those circles stand on the threshold of another election.

* * *

The revulsion against official foreign policy manifests itself on all levels and in varying media. Recent books by Walter Lippman, James Warburg, William A. Williams, C. Wright Mills, Lewis Mumford, Norman Thomas, Reinhold Niebuhr, C. L. Sulzberger, and many others, have attacked that policy more or less directly and vigorously. More and more often now one finds in thoroughly respectable sources quite devastating assaults upon the Pentagon-State Department line. As just one example, a recent issue of *The Christian Century* (August 5, 1959, leading weekly organ of Protestant opinion in the country, carried an article by Stewart Meacham, insisting that U.S. foreign policy was "leading us into greater and greater peril." Continued Mr. Meacham: "NATO is sick because of arms and the only remedy we know is more arms." And his decisive paragraph reads as follows: "Surely we are not called on to plunge ahead following guides who have lost their way. They urge us to continue the bomb tests, to press ahead with the missile program, to refine our capacity for 'limited war' and to stand firm at Lebanon or Quemoy or Berlin. But the only credentials they offer are the evidence that this course leads us into greater

and greater peril. What sort of responsibility is this?"

Early this past summer, so great was the outcry of disapproval, that the Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate asked fifty retired State Department officers to submit in writing their opinions of official foreign policy. Twenty-five replied, and all who did were guaranteed anonymity. The results have just been published by the Committee, in an 81-page pamphlet; they amount to the sharpest kind of criticism of the State Department both in terms of the method by which it conducts its affairs and the line which it has pursued in the last few years. The policy of anti-communism is denounced as one which cannot effectively contribute to American national interests. One of the diplomats points out that "petty, reactionary rulers" — he names Chiang Kai-shek — "are given a determinant role in the formulation of American policy;" he laments that the United States "should thus be cast in the role of Louis XIV with the most reactionary of regimes posing as the champion of liberty." Another reports that "we are placing too much reliance on ineffective, weak, 'paper' alliances of a military nature," and that, furthermore, "a military policy that reaches for nuclear weapons as its main ingredient, is a self-defeating policy, in that it guarantees a dead Europe." Another states that "even in the case of NATO . . . a purely military alliance is the weakest kind, held together only by fear and subject to the fluctuations of emotion."

Of the greatest importance in connection with this document are not the details and the specific criticisms that are made—important as these are—but rather the fact that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee felt it necessary to conduct this poll and then felt it proper, just at this time, to publish its results demonstrating the growing popular dissatisfaction with official foreign policy and with the cold war.

* * *

One of the former State Department officers stated, as we have seen, that the system of alliances built up by the U.S. Government was defective since it was based upon "paper" commitments, or because it was fundamentally military in nature and depended largely upon fear for whatever consistency it might have. This touched upon, rather obliquely, the notorious fact that the "allies" of the United States were *increasingly split amongst themselves*. Anglo-French and Anglo-West German

economic competition is intense and is growing; the Algerian war bleeds France and creates acute propaganda and diplomatic problems for the United States; suspicion concerning West German rearmament is keen especially in France and England, and is by no means absent from American public opinion. Political exigencies in Great Britain relative to the German question are even more pressing than in the United States. To this it should be added that American penetration in Middle Eastern, South Asian and African markets and "zones of influence" traditionally British or French, continues.

The splits among these allies reflected weaknesses in American foreign policy. At times, the differences between Great Britain and the United States appeared in forms close to the ludicrous. Thus, when the first sessions of the meeting of Foreign Ministers in Geneva ended in recess, Secretary of State Herter and Foreign Secretary Lloyd returned home to report the first results. Mr. Herter told the American public that the Soviet delegation "gave no indication of being interested in genuine negotiations." But Mr. Lloyd told the British people that there had been "a considerable degree of success in negotiation with the Soviet delegation." Mr. Herter reported that the Soviet delegation made it plain that it wished to turn West Berlin into a "slave state;" Mr. Lloyd reported that the Soviet statesmen had "declared their willingness for the West Berliners to remain free to choose their own way of life."

Similarly, in the transparently cooked-up Laos provocation, while the American press has been juggling with the facts, the British press has gagged on this one. The *Manchester Guardian*, for example, in its issue of August 11, 1959, pointedly quoted from the handouts of the U.S. Embassy on the Laos matter, and specifically and at length demonstrated that the handout was a concoction of fantastic falsehoods. The *London Times*, also, has reported (August 12, 1959) no evidence of "communist aggression" and has described, on the other hand, the reactionary policy of the American-owned Laotian government as being responsible for genuine and indigenous discontent.

* * *

There is a particular shift in American public opinion that is quite dramatic and of the greatest importance in connection with the Khrushchov-Eisenhower visits. I have mentioned the fact that ever since the launching of the first Sputnik there has been a

developing process of a "second look" at the Soviet reality. That Sputnik, in fact, triggered a revolution in American public opinion relative to the USSR that is comparable only to what occurred here during the first several months following Hitler's attack upon the Soviet Union in 1941, when the peoples of the capitalist world had been assured that Hitler would conquer the USSR in six weeks and when—it is worth recalling—he did no such thing.

The present author summarized the mountain of evidence concerning this shift in a work published at the end of 1958 (*Since Sputnik; How Americans View the Soviet Union*). In the months since the appearance of that work, the trend described therein has accelerated. It has reached the point where the fanatically and professionally anti-Soviet journal, *The New Leader*, is moved to note it. In its issue of August 31, 1959, it published an article by Richard Pipes, of the Russian Research Center at Harvard University, entitled, "America's New Image of Russia," and sub-titled, "Pro-Soviet enthusiasm reflects excessive U.S. respect for technological progress." Mr. Pipes notes: "We are in the midst of a wave of pro-Soviet sympathy of an intensity and grass-roots appeal probably without parallel in our history." This observation is accurate and that most certainly is important. It is this public opinion—really an integral part of the basic American desire to avoid war—which played a magnificent role in leading Mr. Eisenhower to agree to meet with Premier Khrushchov.

The President acted as the spokesman of those circles who, under pressure of public opinion and of the "hard facts" testifying to the Soviet progress in all spheres, have become conscious of the need to revise the foreign policy approach. Theirs was a zig-zag path, but it led eventually to new prospects in the relations with the USSR. At first the U.S. ruling class — having been forced to concede to the exchange of visits — tried to keep that concession on the tactical level. Their line is expressed in these words of President Eisenhower, uttered on September 11, 1959, in connection with his "explanation" for having invited the Soviet leader: "Firmness in support of fundamentals, with flexibility in tactics and methods, is the key to any hope of progress in negotiation." The point is that the overall cordial welcome accorded Khrushchov, his tour, his talks and, lastly, his meeting with the President, have ushered in a climate of optimism. It is

also true that there are many evidences of a deliberate effort to throw every possible obstacle in the path of ending the cold war. And this is understandable.

The commitment of the U.S. imperialist economy to war-making is very great. Hence, the announcement of the exchange of visits created what is called here a "peace scare" and the immediate result was the tumbling of prices on the Wall Street Exchange to the lowest point in the past four years. The July, 1959, issue of *Kiplinger's Newsletter* — the leading "information sheet," prepared especially for the guidance of big-business men — remarked that: "Defense has gotten so big and so ingrained in the economy that it is becoming pretty much a law unto itself." Meanwhile pressure from public opinion and smaller businessmen has produced the revelation that 85 per cent of the billions the Pentagon is spending this year for arms is being spent through what are called "negotiated contracts" — i.e., contracts entered into by the government without any competitive bidding. This results, it has been shown, in the Government paying five or six times as much for a particular item as it would have to if competitive bidding existed; but the more expensive process benefits the monopolies, for it is with them and them alone that the government signs "negotiated contracts." Upon Congressional questioning, even the Pentagon admitted that were competitive bidding used, the government would save about seven billion dollars a year!

It is considerations such as these—plus the political and diplomatic considerations touched on earlier—which account for the prolonged failure to invite Premier Khrushchov. In this light, the recent shift in U.S. public opinion and in top circles acquires still greater significance. The really remarkable thing was that, despite all the efforts of the ultra-reactionary tub-thumpers, particularly during the first days of the visit, the crowds turned out in the streets to give a warm welcome to the envoy of the Soviet people who with great sincerity expressed his sympathies for the ordinary people of America.

Hostile and bitter statements have been forthcoming from individual politicians, while Nixon has reverted to his more normal self of petty and sour sniping. Happily, there have been some exceptions among distinguished public figures. Thus, over 50 prominent Americans, including two trade-union officials, Dr. Martin Luther King, courageous leader of the Southern Negroes' struggles,

three United States Senators, several university presidents, some outstanding scientists, and Mrs. Franklin Delano Roosevelt, signed a statement hailing the Premier's visit and expressing the hope that it would lead to an era of peaceful coexistence.

The general nature of the response in the United States emphasizes the fact that among the U.S. ruling class there are still powerful components hostile to the policy of peaceful coexistence. They want to sabotage the results of the exchange in order to be able to point to their own devised failure as a justification for the continuance of the cold war.

* * *

Norman Cousins, the editor of *The Saturday Review*, — whose general line is favorable to ending the cold war, and who recently returned from an extended visit to the USSR — declared in the issue dated August 29, 1959, that he had discovered while in the Soviet Union that a profound change had been made in Marxist theory. This change, according to Mr. Cousins, lay in the fact that Communists had dropped the idea that war preparation and war-making were inherent in the character of modern capitalism. It is possible that Mr. Cousins actually got that impression; but, of course, Communists hold that the real possibility of an era of world peace exists today not because monopoly capitalism has changed its warlike character but because the relationship of forces in the world has altered decisively in favor of the policy of peace.

World war can be prevented today because the forces seeking its prevention have strength superior to those forces seeking its outbreak. The peace forces are winning all along the line; they have reduced to bankruptcy the policy of enmity and hatred fomented by the ultra-reactionary elements of monopoly capital. But the above analysis that war can be prevented requires and assumes intense, continuous and fierce struggle for peace; without such struggle, the indescribable catastrophe of modern war may engulf mankind.

The beginning of the exchange of visits between the heads of government of the United States and the Soviet Union reflects both sides of this central truth of our epoch. The visits were agreed to as a result of the great strength of the peace forces and as a result of the persistent struggle of those forces led by the Soviet Union.

That the peace forces succeeded in achieving this exchange of visits must encourage and inspire them in terms of the possibilities of really liquidating the cold war and beginning a prolonged era of genuine peaceful coexistence.

* * *

These notes were written in the midst of Premier Khrushchov's visit and it was too early, therefore, to attempt an overall estimate of its impact upon American public opinion. This, however, may already be stated: Premier Khrushchov, with his directness and his sincerity and his quickness, has conveyed the reality of his Government's desire for peace.

He has hammered away at the idea that he has come to find areas of agreement and not themes of discord, and his persistence in this makes sense to the average American, who passionately wishes genuine peace.

Premier Khrushchov has been heard and seen by tens of millions of Americans, and he has conveyed an image altogether different from the stereotypes concerning the "Reds" and the "Soviet Communists" with which the American people have been swamped for many years. All this has had the most wholesome possible effect for peaceful and progressive opinion in the United States.

It happens that the present writer witnessed the historic moment when Premier Khrushchov addressed the General Assembly of the United Nations and made his impassioned plea for good-will and peace in the world. When Premier Khrushchov put forth the proposal of the Soviet Government for complete and general disarmament, to be concluded within four years, one had come face to face with a moment of historic importance.

The tendency of some influential figures and the dominant press is to treat this proposal as chimerical or demagogic, but its grandeur is so manifest and the seriousness with which it was proposed is so clear that ruling circles fear this approach on their part will not do. The result is a paragraph like this in an editorial in the liberal Democratic Party newspaper, the *New York Post*: "The Russian challenge cannot be dismissed merely by ridicule. Until the West comes up with a disarmament plan that is sabotage-proof at home as well as abroad, the headlines Khrushchov made will haunt us in many places."

The Khrushchov proposal will indeed "haunt in many places." This is not the first time in human history that the palaces and

the mansions have been "haunted;" but they are not haunted by mere specters these days. On the contrary, they are haunted by a mighty and increasingly irresistible force for peace representing the vast majority of the ordinary people of the world.

The ice of the cold war has been broken, the thaw has set in. The peoples, nevertheless, will not stand by merely as passive observers, they want the warming up to continue and they will act so that the warming process goes ahead speedily and irresistibly.

A Nation Rejuvenated by the October Revolution

T. Uljabayev

Soviet Tajikistan, "the land of the mountains," lies in the south-east of Central Asia, on the frontier between the USSR, China and Afghanistan.

Fertile lowlands stretch through the south-west, along the River Amu Darya which forms the Soviet-Afghan frontier. Here, in the valleys of the Vakhsh and other right bank tributaries of the Amu Darya—valleys wide in the south and narrow in the north—lies the granary of Tajikistan. The warm climate is favorable for raising not only wheat, barley and other cereals, but also cotton, rice, grapes and, in some parts, subtropical crops.

Tajikistan—one of the fifteen Union Republics—is small in territory and population (some two million). Before the revolution it was a typically backward, underdeveloped region. This year marks the 35th anniversary of Tajikistan as an Autonomous Republic and 30th anniversary as a Union Republic. Below, T. Uljabayev, First Secretary of the C. C. of the Communist Party of Tajikistan, describes the achievements of his Republic which are typical of all the national Republics of the USSR—equal members of the multi-national family of Soviet peoples who have entered the period of all-round building of communism.



I

REVIEWING the long and difficult path traversed by the Tajik people during their centuries-old history one notes that the

most important stage of the journey began after the October Revolution in Russia.

What was Tajikistan forty odd years ago? Frequent and devastating invasions by brutal conquerors, the oppression of the tsarist colonialists and the emirate of Bukhara had long retarded its economic and cultural development. There was virtually no industry, except small artisan workshops. The wooden plough and the hoe were the main implements used in scratching the soil. Modern irrigation installations were unknown. The Emir, the beys, officials and imams owned 85 per cent of the land and 75 per cent of the livestock. For the people even an oil lamp was a luxury.

The overwhelming majority of the peasant-

ry lived in dire straits. Some 200,000 families owned a mere 15 per cent of the land; about three-quarters of their meager harvest went to pay taxes. "Only the air was not taxed in the Bukhara of the Emir," wrote the Tajik writer S. Aini. Territorially dispersed and mercilessly exploited by feudal chiefs and colonialists, the Tajiks were on the verge of extinction as a nation.

The October Revolution brought with it the dawn of better times for the backward, outlying regions of Tsarist Russia, including Tajikistan. In 1918 the newly-born Soviet Russia, then experiencing serious economic difficulties, assigned 50 million roubles for irrigation work in Turkestan. As Lenin pointed out, the greatest need was irrigation which more than anything else would transform and revive the region, bury the past and clear the way to socialism.

Russians and the other peoples helped the Tajiks to crush counter-revolutionary gangs known locally as basmachi, who, with the backing of the Whiteguards and foreign imperialists, tried to overthrow Soviet power and restore the old regime. Tajiks, Uzbeks, Russians and Ukrainians fought shoulder to shoulder in the mountains of Tajikistan. The joint struggle against the common enemy stirred the people of Central Asia to greater activity, rallied them into the united Soviet family. An expression of this unity was the formation in August 1920, on the initiative of the Bukhara Communist Party, of the united front of the democratic and revolutionary forces of Bukhara.

The uprising in Bukhara (September 1920), under the impact of the October Revolution, led to the establishment of the Bukhara People's Soviet Republic. This, however, was not yet a socialist republic, the conditions were not ripe for this at the time. Tajikistan became a socialist republic four years later when the Tajiks, with the fraternal aid of the peoples of Russia, gradually developing their economy and culture, took the first steps towards building socialism.

II

Like many other outlying regions of Tsarist Russia, Tajikistan began to build socialism without passing through the capitalist stage of development.

Marx and Engels pointed out that given certain conditions such a development of backward nations was possible and even inevitable. Lenin took up this idea, which had been buried in oblivion by the opportunists

of the Second International, and enriched it with the experience gained in the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions.

"... Can we," he asked, "recognize as correct the assertion that the capitalist stage of development of the national economy is inevitable for those backward nations now gaining freedom and among whom, now, after the war, we observe an advance in the direction of progress? To this we reply in the negative. If the revolutionary victorious proletariat conducts systematic propaganda among them and if the Soviet governments come to their aid with all the means at their disposal, it would be wrong to assume that the capitalist stage of development is inevitable for the backward nationalities . . ., with the aid of the proletariat of the advanced countries, the backward countries can go over to the Soviet system and, after a definite stage of development, to communism, by-passing the capitalist stage of development."*

In the example of Tajikistan we have striking confirmation of Lenin's words. Our Party pursued a carefully thought-out policy of enlisting the formerly backward nations of the Soviet East for socialist construction, calling on its members to display the maximum caution, flexibility and patience. The Party held that "... only the closest attention to the interests of the different nations can remove the grounds for conflict and mutual mistrust . . . "**

The Communist Party was able to overcome the mistrust that had existed among the peoples of Tsarist Russia and to unite them in bonds of friendship because it had always devoted close attention to their interests, to their national peculiarities and aspirations, because it combined this with educating the working people of all nationalities in the spirit of the socialist community and of care for the common state interests.

The first decrees of the October Revolution, for example, the "Declaration of Rights of the Peoples of Russia," abolished national inequality and guaranteed the right to self-determination, respect for and protection of national rights for all the peoples of Russia. In March 1921, shortly after the founding of the Bukhara People's Soviet Republic, it concluded a treaty with Soviet Russia in which the latter confirmed its recognition of the independence and sovereignty of Bukhara.

*The Report of the Commission on the National and Colonial Questions at the Second Congress of the Communist International, July 26, 1920.

**From Lenin's Interview with Farbman, *Manchester Guardian* correspondent.

The territorial demarcation of the Central Asian Republics in 1924 was further striking proof of the consistent Leninist policy of our Party on the national question. The sovereign Uzbek and Turkmen Union Republics, with the Tajik Autonomous Republic as part of Uzbekistan, were established. Later, in December 1929, by which time the reunited Tajik people had acquired experience in state affairs and had made appreciable progress in economic and cultural development, Tajikistan was raised to the status of a Union Republic.

The sovereign Tajik Soviet Socialist Republic has its Supreme Soviet, Council of Ministers and local Soviets. The administrative bodies are genuinely popular bodies since nearly all the voters take part in the elections. For instance, 99.94 per cent of the electorate voted for the deputies of the present Supreme Soviet who represent all nationalities inhabiting the Republic. Among them are 198 Tajiks, 42 Uzbeks, 42 Russians, Kirghizians, Turkmenians and Ukrainians.

The abolition of everything that could in any way detract from *political* equality was supplemented by overcoming the former *economic and cultural* backwardness. The Communist Party and the Soviet government adhered to the view that the juridical national equality brought about by the October Revolution, and which is a great gain for the peoples, does not in itself solve the national question.

The Party has always concentrated on overcoming the economic and cultural inequality, as vestiges of the pre-revolutionary past. This inequality, said the Twelfth Party Congress (1923) in its resolution on the national question, can be overcome "only through effective and long-term aid by the Russian proletariat to the backward peoples of the Union in their economic and cultural advancement."* Four years later, the Fifteenth Party Congress envisaged in the directives for the first five-year plan "a corresponding . . . higher rate of their economic and cultural development . . .".**

The aid extended by the Russian Federation, the most advanced in economic and cultural respects, and also by other Soviet Republics, played a decisive role in building the socialist economy in Tajikistan and in its industrialization. This was a manifesta-

tion of the profound internationalism of the Soviet people and their Communist Party.

The Party and the government sent to our Republic experienced cadres, experts in the various branches of the economy, and cultural workers; supplies of building materials, industrial plant, motor vehicles and agricultural machinery poured into our Republic; it also received generous financial aid.

This fraternal aid ensured *accelerated* industrialization, the numerical growth of a Tajik working class and the training of national cadres. By 1956 gross output of heavy industry was over a thousand times greater than in 1913 (as compared with 42 times for the Russian Federation). Coal and ore-mining, oil extraction, metal-processing, textile and other industries were developed and hundreds of enterprises were built.

The more rapid industrialization in Tajikistan as compared with the other more developed republics—this is a striking manifestation of one of the objective laws of socialist society, that economically backward countries or regions catch up with the advanced ones with the help of the latter. While it took centuries for the people of Russia to pass from feudalism to modern socialist industry, the Tajiks, like the other peoples of the Soviet East, traversed this path in the space of two or three five-year plan periods.

III

Every nine days Tajikistan manufactures goods equal to its annual industrial output before the First World War. The Leninabad and Stalinabad silk mills, the Stalinabad textile works, the mining and non-ferrous metallurgical plants are the pride of the Republic. Tajik cotton and silk fabrics, tinned fruit and vegetables and many other products are known far beyond its borders.

Big hydro-electric stations on the Syr Darya and Vakhsh Canal, and a number of others have been built during Soviet years to meet the needs of the industries and of the population. Their capacity can be judged by the fact that the Syr Darya station alone generates 100 times more electricity than the entire Turkestan region produced in 1913. Last year the power stations of the Republic generated nearly 2,400 times more power than in 1929 when the Tajik Soviet Socialist Republic was proclaimed.

Sweeping changes have taken place in the countryside. Vast areas which had lain fallow for ages have been irrigated and converted

*The C.P.S.U. in Resolutions and Decisions of Congresses, Conferences and Plenums of the Central Committee, Vol. I, p. 714.

**Ibid., Vol. II, p. 463.

into fertile cotton fields, orchards, vineyards. In Soviet times about 1.5 billion roubles have been invested in irrigation, increasing the irrigated area eightfold. The construction in 1937 of an irrigation network turned the Vakhsh Valley, a backward and sparsely populated area in the recent past, into one of the main producers of fine-fibre cotton. Tajikistan holds first place in the world for raw cotton productivity and is second to Uzbekistan in gross cotton yield in the USSR. Compared with pre-revolutionary days the area under cotton has grown sixfold and the overall crop more than 14-fold.

Similar progress has been made in other branches of agriculture, now based on collective farming. A feature of collectivization in Tajikistan and the other Soviet Republics of Central Asia was that it was carried on in the struggle not only against capitalist elements—rich peasants, merchants, etc. — but also against feudal elements. This, naturally, complicated the switching of small peasant households to socialist farming. The example of the Tajik and other eastern Republics confirms the significance of Lenin's co-operative plan for the formerly backward countries. By drawing the small and middle producers into the simpler forms of co-operation—marketing, for example—the way was prepared for involving them in collective farming. This accelerated the disintegration of the tribal mode of life and educated the peasants politically.

Collectivization was accompanied by mechanization. At present there are twelve tractors per thousand hectares of farm land, compared with Italy's 9.8 and Pakistan's 0.2.

The collective-farm system put an end to the poverty and ignorance of the Tajik peasants and helped them on to the highroad of socialism and communism. Many examples could be cited of the changes that have taken place in rural life.

Take, for instance, the Moscow Collective Farm (Leninabad District) led by Saidkhoja Urunkhojayev, twice Hero of Socialist Labor. Last year its income exceeded 27 million roubles, and the value of its non-distributable fund reached 57 million roubles. The collective farm has a fine house of culture, a well-equipped hospital, 17 kindergartens and creches, 11 secondary schools, a radio transmission center and a telephone exchange. The number of cottages increases year by year; in 1958 alone over 200 families moved to new dwellings. Electricity is used in all homes. All the children of school age attend

school—4,850 in elementary and secondary schools, and 236 in higher educational establishments and specialized secondary schools. Over 100 college-trained experts work on this collective farm.

IV

The year 1957 marked the 1100th anniversary of the birth of Abul-khasan Rudaki, the founder of Tajik literature, "the prince of poets," as he is known in the East. A few years earlier the literary public celebrated the 1000th anniversary of Abu Ali ibn-Sina (Avicenna), the famous encyclopaedist, whose discoveries were widely known in Asia and Europe. This shows that our people have an ancient and rich culture.

Yet the majority of the people comprising this nation, a nation which has made a notable contribution to world culture, had no access to learning under the feudal system; they lived in misery and ignorance. Prior to Soviet power the Tajiks, like all the peoples of Central Asia, were illiterate. Only one person in two hundred could read and write. The working people had never heard of a theatre or club; no books, newspapers or journals were published.

After the October Revolution things changed. Illiteracy was wiped out. At present some 30,000 students are enrolled in nine higher educational establishments and in secondary professional schools. Every fifth Tajik is studying in one way or another.

In the sphere of higher education Tajikistan has the lead over quite a number of western countries (not to speak of its eastern neighbors). Its figure of 92 students per 10,000 of the population is 11 times that of Pakistan, eight times that of Turkey, two-and-a-half times that of France and three times that of Italy.

A numerous Tajik intelligentsia has been trained. More than 44,000 men and women with higher and specialized secondary education are now employed in industry, agriculture and trade. The young Tajik Academy of Sciences has become the center of extensive research work. Four hundred and fifty of the staff of 1,500 research workers have science degrees.

Socialist culture has penetrated to all parts of the Republic. Clubs, houses of culture and libraries function both in towns and in remote mountain villages. It should be recalled that before the October Revolution there was not a single library on the territory of present-day

Tajikistan. At present the Republic has over 800 libraries, many of them with hundreds of thousands of books. The Firdousi library, for example, has over a million books. Sixty-three newspapers and twelve journals (with a circulation of nearly 500,000 copies) are published, and four million books are put out annually. These figures speak for themselves.

One of the greatest gains of the socialist revolution is, undoubtedly, the emancipation of women. For centuries Tajik women lived under the yoke of Shariat* which prohibited them from participating in public life, from studying literature and art or going without the veil. Today, 108 Tajik women are deputies to the Supreme Soviets of the USSR and their Republic; nearly 4,000 women have been elected to the local Soviets. Thousands more are innovators, hold responsible posts in the Party and government, run factories and offices and manage collective and state farms.

Prior to the Revolution the vast majority of Tajiks had never seen a doctor or a hospital. There was only one hospital with 40 beds and 11 out-patient clinics in Tajikistan. The people were treated by quacks. Today, the Republic has 58 hospital beds per 10,000 population, which is eight times more than in Iran and six times more than in Turkey. It has surpassed Britain and Finland in the number of doctors (over 2,000 in all) per 1,000 of the population, to say nothing about such countries as Iran, Turkey and Pakistan.

This concern for public health together with the general rise in the standard of living has led to a big fall in mortality and sickness incidence, to a rise in the birth rate. During the past twenty years infantile mortality has declined by 75 per cent. In 1956 the natural growth of population (per 1,000) in Tajikistan was five times greater than in Britain and the German Federal Republic, four times greater than in France and three times that of Italy.

Tajikistan has changed beyond recognition. Small wonder therefore that many foreign visitors, who previously obtained information on our Republic from doubtful sources, speak with admiration about our achievements. Here are the impressions of Mr. Sharma, a government consultant on agriculture (Nepal), who made a tour of our Republic in October 1958: "During our stay here we have satisfied ourselves that you have wrought miracles, especially bearing in mind that you started from

scratch. We see, for example, that you have wiped out diseases such as typhus and small-pox, and this should give us food for thought. However, we know what can be done since we have seen it for ourselves. You have carried out a series of measures to build medical and educational institutions and also measures in the sphere of industry, for example, the manufacture of agricultural machinery and the textile and canning industries. I must say that what you have done in industry adds up to a great achievement. We think that your experience will be very useful for our countries."

Mrs. Haliman, member of a delegation of British women who visited our Republic in September 1957, said that before their visit they had believed the stories about squalor, bare rocks and deserts. But they had become convinced that life had changed under the collective-farm system, that agriculture was thriving, and that the collective-farm incomes benefited the people and their Republic. Instead of bare rocks they saw fertile cotton fields, vineyards and orchards. They found Tajikistan a blossoming orchard and admired its progress. Such are the impressions of foreign guests who have visited us.

V

The prospects opening up before our Republic in the next seven years are truly magnificent. The new plan (1959-65) envisages further economic and cultural progress. This plan, on which the people are now working with enthusiasm, tears into shreds the inventions of bourgeois propaganda about the one-sided, "purely agricultural" development of the Soviet Asian Republics.

Capital to be invested into the Tajik economy in the next seven years will be as much as was invested in all the years of Soviet rule. The share of *heavy industry* in the total industrial output will grow considerably.

Together with expansion of the existing industries new branches will make their appearance—chemical, cement, electro-technical and engineering—for which our Republic has favorable natural and economic conditions. Output of cement will rise 18-fold and that of the engineering and metal-working industries more than 2.5-fold. By 1965 the Republic is expected to turn out 6,500 textile machines a year.

New power stations will be put into operation, and electric power output will rise 2.4-fold.

*The canonical law of Islam.

A considerable increase in the output of consumer goods is contemplated. More fabrics, footwear, clothing, meat, butter, tinned food and other products will be available. When the second and third sections of the Stalinabad cotton mill are commissioned it will be one of the biggest textile enterprises in Central Asia, producing annually about 100 million meters of fabrics. A creamery planned for Stalinabad, will produce more butter than all the creameries of the Republic produce today. A carpet mill in Khojent, clothing factories, a footwear factory, a confectionery factory and a number of others will be put into operation during the seven-year plan period.

The plan envisages agricultural investments of 2.6 billion roubles—2.5 times more than in the previous seven years. Cotton growing—the main branch of Tajik agriculture—will be extended, as will animal husbandry, orchards, vineyards and vegetable growing. Cotton output will increase primarily due to higher yields which by 1965 will reach an average of 2.97 tons per hectare.

Wages and pensions will rise further, working hours will be reduced, and housing construction will proceed at a still greater rate.

The experience of Tajikistan, like that of the other Republics of the Soviet East, is of great international significance. It demonstrates that the colonial peoples need not necessarily pass through the capitalist stage of development.

"Everyone can now see," said N. S. Khrushchov in his report to the 21st Party Congress, "the immense socialist achievements of the peoples of Kazakhstan and Central Asia, who at the time of the Socialist Revolution had either not reached the capitalist stage or were only just entering it. They did not have to go through the entire tormenting stage of capitalist development. They were able to bypass that stage and effect the transition to socialism with the support and assistance of the more advanced socialist nations, notably the Russian socialist nation."

The example of Tajikistan demonstrates the utter groundlessness of the racist "theories" to the effect that "backward nations" are incapable of running their countries without the bourgeoisie. The achievements of Tajikistan are an inspiration to all the peoples fighting for national independence and social progress.

Among Our Contributors

L. ILYICHOV: Head of the Department of Agitation and Propaganda, C.C., Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

HERBERT APTHEKER: Editor of "Political Affairs" (USA).

T. ULJABAYEV: First Secretary of the C.C., Communist Party of Tajikistan.

KHALED BAGDASH: General Secretary of the C.C., Syrian Communist Party.

AJOY GHOSH: General Secretary of the National Council of the Communist Party of India.

Two Trends in the Arab National Movement

Khaled Bagdash

THE victory of the Iraqi revolution of July 14, 1958, raised the national-liberation movement of the Arabs to a higher level. It enthused the popular masses and all Arab patriots. New vistas opened up for the liberation of all the Arab countries from the imperialist yoke and for a further advance along the road of social reforms, democracy and progress.

Soon, however, storm clouds gathered over the Arab East and Arab solidarity was put to a severe test when tension set in between the United Arab Republic and the Republic of Iraq. The anti-imperialist national fronts in a number of countries were split or threatened with a split. It would not be an exaggeration to say that the end of 1958 marked an extremely difficult time for the Arab national-liberation movement. And for this the ruling circles of the UAR are wholly to blame.

What caused these complications? How can the situation be remedied?

The Attitude Towards Imperialism Is the Main Issue

First and foremost we should proceed from the fact that in all the Arab countries the struggle against imperialism is far from being completed. Some are directly oppressed by imperialism, others indirectly. The imperialists still retain strong economic positions even in countries with anti-imperialist governments. Oil extraction and the pipelines are in the hands of United States and British companies; a major portion of the banking operations (credit, loans, etc.) are performed by the imperialists. International monopolies which control the market all too often dictate export-import deals and fix prices for raw materials. Nor have the liberated countries got rid of the effects of imperialist rule, they are still industrially backward, feudal survivals remain in the countryside; the people live in poverty and, for the most part, are illiterate.

The imperialists are doing everything to maintain their rule and to restore it where it has been abolished. Yet, the absurd claim is made by some newspapers—mouthpieces of influential Cairo circles—that the struggle against imperialism has ended.

The national-liberation movement is faced with the task of consolidating the independence of countries which have won political freedom, of achieving economic independence, raising living standards and extending democracy. Still ahead is the struggle to liberate the colonies occupied by imperialist forces or indirectly dominated by imperialism.

These objectives (including the agrarian reform) naturally do not go beyond the bounds of capitalist production relationships, nor do they go beyond the limits of the bourgeois-democratic revolution; they by no means signify the transition to socialism.

There is not a grain of truth in the assertions made by Right-wing spokesmen to the effect that the choice facing the national bourgeoisie and petty bourgeoisie is: either a terrorist dictatorship of the UAR type, or communist rule.

Actually the point which is giving rise to controversy inside the Arab liberation movement is the attitude towards imperialism, particularly American imperialism.

Some bourgeois circles in Egypt—the big financiers as represented by the Misr bank,* for instance—would like to direct the movement for Arab unity along their particular line and to subordinate the people of Egypt, Syria, Iraq and the other Arab countries. With this in view they abandoned Egyptian democracy, trampled on democracy in Syria, and are now striving to extend their influence to Iraq. These circles are plotting conspiracies

*In a speech on July 24, 1959, President Nasser referred to the Misr bank as a "people's institution in which all the sons of the country participate." In reality this bank which controls 20 large industrial and commercial companies is the stronghold of the big bourgeoisie. *Al Ahram*—Nasser's mouthpiece—lauds the Misr bank as a "fourth Pyramid."

(the Mosul for example) and slandering Iraq, despite the fact that all Arab patriots want to see an independent Iraq develop along democratic lines. That is why they, at the international level, are pandering to the imperialists, primarily those of the U.S., and in home policy are currying favor with the reactionary forces.

Hence their first slogan: the struggle against imperialism has ended or is about to end; and second: the "communist danger" at home must be combatted (this slogan was later broadened to "international communism").

The disgusting way in which this anti-communist campaign was launched at the end of 1958 has shocked the Arab world. Nasser, his press, radio and stooges have vilified the Soviet Union, the true friend of the Arab people. They screamed that the Soviet Union was interfering in the internal affairs of the Arab countries and was aiming to dominate them. In reality the successes of the Arabs in their fight against imperialism were won thanks to the support of the socialist camp, and above all the Soviet Union.

The line pursued by the Right-wing circles of the Arab national movement fully suits American imperialism which tries to undermine Arab-Soviet friendship and to create tension between the UAR and the socialist countries.

The anti-communist diatribes have greatly alarmed the masses and considerable sections of nationalists in all the Arab countries. Patriots have tried to fathom the real reasons for the campaign for which they could not find any justification. They feared that the campaign would have grave consequences for the Arab countries.

Events were to confirm that there were grounds for the bewilderment, anxiety and apprehension.

The facts revealed that the UAR was inclining more and more towards compromise with the imperialists, and with the American imperialists in particular.

First, an Anglo-Egyptian financial agreement—detrimental to Egypt's interests—was concluded. This was followed by other agreements with Britain, which restored to the latter her former imperialist positions. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (under American control) is increasingly interfering in the economy of the UAR. In the guise of observing the use to which the credits are put the Bank has sent numerous missions to Cairo which, on the

pretext of drafting reports on the budget and the country's economic development, meddle in all branches of the economy.

The UAR has opened its doors also to West German, Japanese and Italian capital. Particularly significant is the penetration of West German capital, chiefly in the Egyptian region. These countries are acting not only on their own, but also in the interests of U.S. imperialism.

Yielding to Washington's pressure, the rulers of the UAR are becoming increasingly indifferent to the plight of the one million Arab refugees banished from Palestine by the Israeli government, as well as to the cause of the Algerian freedom fighters. Instead of tangible aid there is lip service to "solidarity" with Algeria.

This turn in the political course of the Nasser government, which has opened the doors to foreign capital, is accompanied by rapprochement with the most reactionary pro-imperialists in the Arab East. Cairo has widely publicized the renewal of friendly relations with King Saud and King Hussein on the basis of complete agreement on all the issues confronting the Arab world. This news was received with displeasure in the Arab countries. Only a few months before that Nasser had accused King Saud of plotting against Arab nationalism, and King Hussein of being an agent of imperialism and an enemy of Arab unity. What has happened? Certainly, neither of the kings has changed! Who has, then? That is the question now being asked in Arab nationalist circles.

Arab patriots, including those who at first were taken in by the slogan of struggle against the "internal and international communist danger," a slogan allegedly engendered by the policy of "positive neutrality," have begun to realize where this new policy is leading, a policy which coincides with the selfish interests of some sections of the Egyptian bourgeoisie, chiefly the Misr financial group. As a matter of fact, this group still advocates the sterile "Eisenhower-Dulles doctrine" — filling the vacuum created in the Middle East by the ending of Anglo-French imperialist domination. It is common knowledge that the people of the Arab countries turned down this doctrine. Afterwards, Egyptian monopoly circles conceived the idea of filling the "vacuum" themselves, with the help of and in co-operation with American imperialism.

But what is the Misr Bank compared with the power of U.S. imperialist capital! Is it

not clear how this "co-operation" will develop when the forces are so unequal? A near-sighted policy such as this is fraught with the danger of U.S. imperialist domination of the Arab world.

Thus, the aforementioned trend is gradually degenerating and evolving into its antithesis.

The other trend stands for continuing the national-liberation struggle with the object of achieving political and economic independence, extending democracy, cementing Arab solidarity and furthering friendship and co-operation with the socialist countries. This line is supported by the people, by all Arab patriots.

The fact that the working class and its vanguard—the Communist parties—rank high among the patriotic forces and enjoy prestige in most of the Arab countries is explained above all by the consistent anti-imperialist struggle waged by the workers under Communist leadership. It should be said that the major share of the losses is sustained by the Communists.

Another important force in the movement are the peasants and the middle sections in the towns—handicraftsmen, small shopkeepers and intellectuals. These sections are vitally concerned with furthering the anti-imperialist national fronts of Arab solidarity and Arab-Soviet friendship.

A considerable part of the national bourgeoisie also realizes that the U.S. imperialists are interested not only in persecuting Communists and other democrats—this is but a step towards a more important objective, namely, isolation of the Arab countries and undermining their political and economic relations with the socialist countries—but also in establishing full domination over the Arab world. This part of the national bourgeoisie does not relish the idea of being placed at the mercy of U.S. imperialism. It has seen that co-operation with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries is economically beneficial to the Arab countries, since there are no political strings of any kind attached to the aid granted by the socialist countries.

Thus now, as in the past, the interests of most classes and sections—working class, peasants, national bourgeoisie, urban petty bourgeoisie—are threatened by imperialism, and, as in the past, the conditions exist for a united national front of all anti-imperialist forces.

Arab Nationalism and Arab Unity

The Arab Communists and other progressives are by no means opponents of nationalism or Arab unity. On the contrary, they are anxious to see both Arab nationalism and unity develop along the road of progress and democracy.

Arab nationalism, a movement aimed at unifying the Arab countries, arose out of the struggle waged against imperialism, and this distinguishes it from nationalism which took shape in Europe before the advent of imperialism. As Lenin put it: "The bourgeois nationalism of every oppressed nation has a general democratic content which is directed against oppression, and it is this content that we support *unconditionally*"

It is a fact that every step of the Arab nationalist movement in all the countries was violently resisted by the imperialists. This circumstance largely determined the democratic and progressive content of Arab nationalism, which is expressed in the striving to abolish imperialist domination and also in the solidarity with the peace forces of the whole world.

The Right wing wants to destroy this progressive content by converting the nationalists into the allies of U.S. imperialism. However, it would do them no harm to recall that none other than Nuri Said claimed to be the standard-bearer of "Arab nationalism." Nuri Said rallied all the reactionary elements round this banner, proclaiming that international communism was enemy No. 1 of nationalism.

What would remain of the nationalism of a nation disunited and oppressed for generations by imperialism, weakened by it economically, politically and militarily, were that nationalism to abandon the aspirations of the masses and isolate itself from the progressive forces on the international arena? Clearly it would degenerate into a movement of a small, isolated group, into a cover for an alliance between that group and the imperialists.

Experience has shown that Arab nationalism can develop into a considerable force only in the common struggle of the Arab peoples for their liberation. Arab unity has a real basis. The Arabs belong to a common race speaking a common language and with a common culture; they are gradually acquiring other features essential to the formation of a nation. However, of overriding impor-

*V. I. Lenin, *The Right of Nations to Self-Determination*.

tance is the fact that ever since the downfall of the great Arab state which had its capital first in Damascus and later in Baghdad, the Arabs have lived for centuries in different countries and under varying conditions. Long before World War I the imperialists seized a considerable portion of the Arab East and established their domination (in Egypt, the Sudan, Maghreb, Aden and in the Emirates in the southern part of the Arabian Peninsula, etc.). After World War I they seized the whole of the Arab East.

It is obvious that the unity of the Arab countries depends on their liberation. That is why their solidarity in the anti-imperialist struggle for winning and maintaining their independence is the decisive factor in the Arab unity movement. We should bear in mind the different conditions in each country as well as the fact that the forms of the unity may vary; moreover, at the present stage a complete merger of all the Arab countries into a single state is by no means imperative.

Lebanon is a striking example in this respect. Even the ardent supporters of Arab unity recognize, in their overwhelming majority, its specific position and have never suggested including it in the plans for inter-Arab unification. This does not mean, however, that Lebanon is not an Arab country and that the patriots there do not support the establishment of firm political, economic and cultural relations between the Arab countries.

Let us take those countries which stand for unification, or even those like Syria and Egypt which have already achieved this. Some of these, for instance, have textile industries. In one country the cost of production is lower than in another. Without taking this into account a hasty unification could have the effect of the industry of one country impairing that of the other. And in the outcome a clash between the two groups of industrialists could evolve into a conflict between the two countries.

Or another example: the average wage of the Syrian worker (Syria has a population of four million) is twice or even three times that of the Egyptian worker (Egypt has a population of 24 million). Is it possible in the space of a few years after unification to raise the level of Egyptian wages to the Syrian level? Of course, not! The reverse is more likely: the standard of living in the smaller country will fall to that of the larger country, that is, the conditions of the Syrian workers will deteriorate, while those of the Egyptian

workers will remain unchanged. Only a section of the Egyptian bourgeoisie will benefit from this move.

One more example: Syria has an established democratic tradition — freedom of speech, press, assembly, trade unions, political parties, etc. — which is not confined to a privileged circle of feudal lords, capitalists and professional politicians. These traditions have made their way to the masses who used them in the fight for their rights and to exercise control over their rulers. Is it possible to abolish democratic traditions by a single stroke of the pen without evoking censure and protests?

Towards the end of 1958 one of the ideologists of the Baas Party described as "reactionary" the objective conditions in Syria "lamented" by the Communists. But is industry in one or another Arab state a reactionary phenomenon which should be abolished? Or what is there reactionary about a high level of wages? Perhaps the democratic freedoms enjoyed by the people are likewise reactionary and should be annulled?

In the year that has passed since this statement was made, the Baas Party, thanks to its policy, has lost the last vestige of the trust reposed in it by the Syrian people. It found itself so completely isolated that even Nasser decided to get rid of it in a bid to win the confidence of those sections in Syria which are hostile to it. We would like to ask the Baas leaders whether they agree that they, too, should be classed with "reactionary objective conditions" which should be abolished? As the Syrian saying has it, "experience opens the eyes even of the blind." But it is doubtful if this saying can be applied to the Baas Party.

Any attempt to ignore or distort objective conditions is bound to fail. Prior to the unification, both Egyptian and Baas propaganda claimed that to make it a success the conditions in the two countries should be brought "into line." This was their argument for the dissolution of the political parties and parliament in Syria and the elimination of freedom of speech, press, assembly and trade unions. They told the people that these "minor sacrifices" of a temporary nature were nothing as compared with the blessings that would flow from unification.

What are the "blessings," and what are the results of the two years of unification?

Prior to the merger the Syrian economy as a whole was doing well. Today Syria, a traditional exporter of grain, imports grain

from the United States, Italy and other countries. The area under cotton has been reduced and rice cultivation has also declined.

Trade is stagnant. Industrial output is falling. In the textile industry—a major branch in Syria—many small mills and shops have been closed down. The Haleb textile mills, the largest in the country, are curtailing production, laying off workers or putting them on short time. Leather tanning, sugar refining and furniture making are in a similar plight. The owners of a number of soap factories have been ruined. Thousands are out of work, to say nothing of the tens of thousands who, in the hope of finding jobs, have migrated to neighboring countries, Lebanon for instance. According to Beirut statistics some 50,000 Syrian workers are registered in Lebanon.

Syrian currency has declined in value and investments are reduced to a trickle—much of the capital is finding its way abroad. The cost of living has risen; not since World War II has Syria known such high prices for meat and butter.

The basic reason for this deterioration lies in the policy of Cairo in respect to the Syrian area, a policy adapted to the interests of the Egyptian monopoly circles who regard the unification as a means for capturing the Syrian market and dominating the Syrian economy.

For this purpose cotton growing in Syria should either cease, or if not, the growing, marketing, exporting and processing of it should be completely subordinated to the interests of the Egyptian money bags. Syrian rice is also to yield place to Egyptian rice. Syria's textile industry must either disappear, ceding its market in the country and elsewhere to Egyptian textiles, or be taken over by Egyptian capital. Cheap Egyptian fabrics (resulting from the low wages in the Egyptian area) have inundated the Syrian market, causing heavy losses to the owners of the Syrian textile mills. While the small mills are being closed down and the large ones are expecting the same fate, a new textile mill is about to be built in the Syrian area on money granted by the Misr Bank.

Syrian intellectuals are also suffering from unemployment, being ousted from Syrian schools by Egyptian instructors and teachers.

If to this we add the dismissal of thousands of civil servants and military officers we will get a complete picture of the situation in Syria 18 months after the unification.

The Syrian people are asking what has happened to the plans outlined in the economic agreements with the socialist countries. True, construction of the Homs oil refinery started by Czechoslovakia prior to the unification has been completed. And what about the other projects mentioned in the Soviet-Syrian agreements of 1957? Nothing is heard of them, though more than two years have passed. The people know that the Soviet Union has always lived up to its promises. The public express anxiety in connection with reports that have leaked through the press to the effect that the Cairo government intends to revise these projects and hand them over to the Western powers.

Political life in Syria is characterized by an arbitrary rule unprecedented in the modern history of the country. All the national parties have been dissolved. Even the fundamentals of the provisional constitution unilaterally proclaimed by Nasser on the morrow of the unification, have been consigned to the waste paper basket. The provisional parliament, the deputies of which were to be appointed by the President and which was to function throughout the transitional period (it was to include half the former members of both the Egyptian and Syrian Parliaments), never saw the light of day, despite the fact that its prerogatives were considerably whittled away.

The elections to the National Union last July were a farce and left no noticeable trace in public life. The "elected" local committees have no idea of how they should function. When they made timid attempts to act, they were given to understand that they had "exceeded" their powers and that the authorities knew their business. Very soon the committees were completely forgotten.

The best sons of the people—thousands of democrats: workers, peasants, handicraftsmen, officers, intellectuals—languish in prison in Syria and in Egypt. Many (except the 64 Egyptian patriots tried behind closed doors in Alexandria last August and September) have been jailed without trial. In Syria the post of investigator in the prosecutor's office has been abolished and all investigations are carried out by the police.

The torture is similar to that practised by the fascists: needles are thrust under the finger nails; prisoners are dipped into icy cold and scalding hot water; they are beaten until they lose consciousness; they are subjected to torture by fire and electricity; air is pumped into their bodies; they are starved,

deprived of sleep by blinding light or noise, and buried to their necks in earth.

Many have died, including the teachers Said Drubi, Muheddin Faliun and the student George Adass.

The secret police resort to gangster methods. Farjallah Helou, a prominent figure in the Arab liberation movement and secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Lebanon, was seized in Damascus. The secret police refused to admit the fact of his arrest. Rumors of the torture to which he was subjected aroused indignation. In Lebanon, as in the other Arab countries and all over the world the democratic public initiated protest campaigns which evolved into a movement for the liberation of the courageous fighter Farjallah Helou.

In autumn 1958, a few months after the unification, when Syria experienced economic and political difficulties, the Communist Party advanced a political platform which could be a sound basis for developing the United Arab Republic.

The platform proposed the setting up of separate governments for the Syrian and Egyptian areas (side by side with the central government of the United Arab Republic which would concern itself with defense, foreign policy and other questions of common interest); the establishment of economic relations between Syria and Egypt on a basis which would further the economic, primarily the industrial, development of both areas; free elections; safeguards for freedom of speech, the press, assembly, political parties, trade unions and peasant organizations; an extensive agrarian reform which would guarantee land and implements to the landless peasants.

In the sphere of foreign policy the platform called for fraternal relations and close co-operation with the Republic of Iraq, friendship with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries so as to ensure the independence and economic development of the UAR; for countering the imperialist intrigues, particularly the American, protection of the economy against penetration of imperialist capital.

The Communist platform aroused the wrath of the Misr Bank. In a speech at Port Said on December 23, 1958, Nasser accused the Syrian Communist Party of separatism and resistance to Arab unity and nationalism. This started savage reprisals against the national democratic forces of Syria and Egypt. The Syrian Communist Party was forced to go underground for the fourth time in its history.

Yet the people have wholeheartedly supported this platform, which has become a kind of national charter. All patriots see that it proposes a correct solution to the problem of Arab unity while rebuffing the imperialist attempts to split this unity and to provoke inter-Arab strife.

The Arab Liberation Movement, Democracy and Social Reform

It is impossible to separate the national-liberation movement from the question of democracy and fundamental social reforms, which is what the Right wing in the Arab national movement, primarily the UAR ruling circles, would like to do.

Were we to believe what the UAR rulers say, then they, far from being opposed to social change, are engaged in building a "democratic, co-operative, socialist society." So far they have not defined this system. Their statements on the subject are exceedingly vague. In a speech at Damascus Nasser claimed that the object of his brand of "socialism" was to prevent both exploitation of workers by capitalists and exploitation of capitalists by workers (!). To date, however, this "socialism" has brought the workers of Syria and Egypt nothing but the banning of their parties, trade unions, press, the arrest of union leaders, unemployment and higher prices.*

The "co-operative" nature of this system can be seen from the compulsion brought to bear on the peasants to join the co-operatives together with wealthy farmers and landlords. Although there is no question as to who will dominate these co-operatives, even these have not met with much success either in Egypt or in Syria.

While the so-called "social democracy" (which the UAR rulers oppose to political democracy) is designed, in their words, "to abolish feudalism," and "put an end to the domination of capital over the government," the actual trend in the UAR is totally different.

Let us take the so-called agrarian reform law. In reality it is not a law on agrarian reform but at best a law providing for a certain restriction of feudal landownership. An examination of its application in Egypt would show that real power in the village is still basically in the hands of the big landlords. The peasants who qualified for plots under the law are in grave difficulties and

*In a speech on July 24 Nasser admitted that Egypt had approximately one million unemployed.

many have again become landless. As to Syria, the chances are that the results will not be any better, if anything they will be worse.

How are they "putting an end" to the domination of capital over the government? It is universally known that the entire activity of the UAR government is subordinated to the interests of the big bourgeoisie in Cairo. The new line in UAR policy—opening the doors to imperialist capital—indicates that the comprador bourgeoisie too is beginning to exert an influence on the government.

The Arab peoples have sacrificed much for freedom. They encountered the frantic resistance of the imperialists, who loathe democratic freedoms and who stop at nothing to strangle them. Such is the truth which can neither be ignored nor denied. The outcome is that the struggle for independence will inevitably merge with the struggle for democracy.

If we turn to the experience of the Syrian Republic in 1954-57 when the country enjoyed broad democracy, we will see that neither imperialism nor feudalism could make use of the democratic freedoms to their advantage. On the contrary, these freedoms sapped the positions of imperialism, feudalism and the reactionaries generally. And yet some people claim that Syrian democracy benefited

chiefly the imperialists! Far from it — the experience of Syria and Iraq proves beyond doubt that only under democracy is it possible to mobilize the forces of the people for the struggle against imperialism, for progress and prosperity.

Any attempt to deprive the Arab liberation movement of its democratic content is bound to fail. The working class of the Arab countries has grown not only numerically, its political consciousness has likewise grown. It is better organized. It has been tempered in the battles against imperialism, and there is no force capable of removing it from the arena of struggle.

The working class of the Arab countries is confronted with an historic task: to rally around itself the peasant masses and all working people, all progressives, with a view to achieving complete victory over imperialism.

In its grim struggle for independence, peace and democracy, the politically conscious workers and peasants, all patriots and democrats hold aloft the banner of the national and democratic traditions in which the liberation struggle in Syria, Egypt, Lebanon, Iraq, Jordan and other Arab countries is so rich. Marching beneath this banner they will add new pages to the glorious history of the Arab peoples.

Kerala

Ajoy Ghosh

ON July 31, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, the President of the Indian Union, on the advice of the Union Cabinet headed by Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, issued a proclamation dismissing the Government of Kerala, dissolving the elected State Legislature, suspending even the limited autonomy of the State and imposing the President's rule on the State. Thus was brought to an end the first Communist-led Government in an Indian State.*

For the first time in the history of the Indian Republic an elected State Ministry found itself dismissed at a time when it enjoyed the support of the majority in the State Legislature.

The ousting of the Kerala Government was followed by spontaneous strikes and demonstrations in Kerala and in many parts of the country. This was the prelude to the massive protest demonstrations that took place on August 3, the day when the Indian Parliament reassembled after the summer recess.

Why did this happen? Why was the Kerala Government dismissed? Why did its dismissal evoke such protests?

No answer can be found to these questions if one studies the Presidential Proclamation of July 31 alone. That Proclamation merely stated that the President is "satisfied that a situation has arisen in which the government of that State (Kerala) cannot be carried on in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution of India." No charge was levelled against the Kerala Government, not a word was said as to how the Kerala Government had violated the provisions of the Constitution or what was eloquently indicative of the guilty conscience of those who were responsible for the President's Proclamation and of their unwillingness to come before the people with their real reasons.

To know what these real reasons were, it is necessary to state how the Communist-led Government of Kerala came to be formed, what it did, which classes and interests its

policies and measures benefited and whom they harmed, what impact Kerala had on the other States.

The Communist-led Government of Kerala was formed in April 1957 after the Second General Elections. These elections marked an impressive advance of the forces of Indian democracy at whose head stood the Communist Party of India. Belying official expectations and the fears of some of its own friends, the Communist Party polled over 12 million votes (11 per cent of the total), double the votes it had polled in the 1951-52 elections. It won a majority of the seats in the predominantly working-class constituencies. It increased its strength in most of the State Legislatures, retaining its position as the second party in the Indian Parliament.

But by far the most significant result of the General Elections, one that was to exercise profound influence on Indian politics in the forthcoming period, was the success of the Communist Party in winning, together with five progressive Independents whom it supported, an absolute majority of seats—65 out of 126—in the Kerala State Legislature. This caused consternation in the ranks of reactionaries and in the dominant leadership of the Congress Party. They would have liked, even in those days, to prevent the formation of a Communist-led Ministry. But democratic opinion in India would not have tolerated that.

The formation of the Communist Ministry, headed by Comrade E. M. S. Namboodiripad, a member of the Political Bureau of the Communist Party of India, was hailed with joy by workers and peasants all over the country. Democratic-minded people in all parties, including those in the Congress, welcomed it, hoping that the measures taken by the Kerala Government would be emulated by other State Ministries and that the movement for democratic reforms would receive a powerful impetus.

The hopes reposed in the Kerala Government by the masses were not belied. It did not lie within the power of the Ministry, circumscribed as it was by the provisions of the Indian Constitution and the general poli-

*The Kerala Government consisted of 11 members, nine Communists and two Independents who accepted the Communist electoral program and were elected with the support of the Communists—Ed.

cies laid down by the Indian Government, to introduce radical reforms such as immediate transfer of land to the tillers, nationalization of the British-owned plantations and effective democratization of the administrative apparatus. It was a Government with limited powers. Nevertheless, right from the outset, the Namboodiripad Government set about its tasks in a manner which left no doubt in one's mind that, unlike Congress Governments, it was serious about implementing the pledges that it had given to the people during the election campaign.

Frankly placing before the people the difficulties and limitations under which it had to work, the Kerala Government proclaimed that it could not build socialism in Kerala, nor even lay the basis for it, but would strive to carry out what the Congress Party itself had always declared but had not implemented. In other words, its effort would be to carry out those democratic reforms which the national movement as a whole had accepted as desirable and necessary. It sought the co-operation of every party and individual in the State for this task.

Space does not permit a detailed narration of what the Kerala Government did in 28 months. A few facts, however, can be mentioned.

The police in every State in India had won unenviable notoriety in British days for its oppressive and corrupt character. This tradition was continued by the Congress. Ever ready to come to the help of big capitalists and landlords, the Congress and Praja-Socialist Governments had used the police to suppress struggles of the working class, peasants and other sections. The Namboodiripad Government formulated a new police policy, granting full freedom to the masses to conduct peaceful action to win their legitimate demands.

The Kerala Government passed the Minimum Wages Act for workers in eighteen factories and for agricultural workers. The Maternity Benefit Act made things better for women workers. The National and Festival Holidays Act provided for seven paid holidays, including May Day. Contract labor in road building and in some other industries which had been a source of corruption and ruthless exploitation was handed over to 42 labor contract societies.

The Government also helped the workers to secure higher wages. Wage increases ranging from 10 to 100 per cent were effected in the various industries. Practically all

workers received annual bonuses and improved their conditions to some extent. The Agriculturists Debt Relief Act gave substantial relief to the peasantry, safeguarding them from the rapacity of moneylenders. A comprehensive Education Act raised the status of teachers and freed them from the arbitrary rule of corrupt and oppressive managers. Changes were made in the taxation policy—putting as far as possible the main burden of taxation on the wealthier classes. Simultaneously work was begun on a plan for full and all-round utilization of the water resources of the State.

The Kerala Government, whose head, Namboodiripad, has been one of the foremost leaders of the Indian peasant movement, paid special attention to the basic problem of India—the land reform.

The contrast between words and deeds, ever a feature of the Congress Party, stood out sharp and clear in its attitude to the agrarian problem. As for the Communists, they earnestly set about solving this vital issue. One of the first acts of the Kerala Ministry was to prohibit the eviction of peasants. In recent years vast numbers of peasants in every State had been evicted from their land. The big landlords, fearing the distribution of their land under a possible agrarian reform, sought to keep it in their possession as "self-cultivated" land by evicting the peasants. The Kerala Government put an end to this arbitrary rule.

After intensive study and preparation the Government worked out a comprehensive Agrarian Relations Bill which, when implemented, would go a long way to free the peasantry from the evil of landlordism. This bill was hailed by the peasantry all over the country. These measures enabled the Kerala Government to win increasing support among the workers, peasants and working intelligentsia. This was strikingly seen in the by-election that took place last year at Devicolum and in the results of the local elections. The masses all over the country began to look upon the Kerala Government as the champion of the working people. The demand was voiced that other State Governments should do what Kerala was doing.

The reactionaries in Kerala — landlords, British plantation owners and big capitalists — resented these reforms. So did their political allies — the Congress Party, the Praja-Socialist Party and the Muslim League leaders. In the forefront of the opposition stood the Roman Catholic Bishops. The

Catholic Church, which receives heavy subsidies from America, is a powerful force in the social, political and economic life of Kerala; it controls a large number of private schools and owns vast landed and other property.

In these conditions every progressive measure of the Kerala Government had to be carried out in the teeth of bitter resistance. The resistance grew in intensity with every measure. It became most fierce when the reactionaries realized that the Government was determined to carry out the land reform. At no time during its existence was the Government given any respite. Seizing upon every pretext, utilizing every grievance of every section of the people, resorting to every tactic, the opposition forces tried to hamper its work, to foment struggle against it.

But alone they could achieve little. And so they sought the support of the all-India leaders of the Congress Party who controlled the Central Government and the Governments in the other thirteen States. In this, they were not disappointed. From the time of the formation of the Communist-led Government of Kerala, some all-India Congress leaders, headed by the then Congress President, Mr. U. N. Dhebar, slandered the Government and called for Central Government intervention against it. They were directly aided by a number of Ministers in the Central Government, including Mr. Morarji Desai—the present Finance Minister.

It was argued by the supporters of Big Business that the existence of a Communist-led Government in one part of India was a hindrance to aid from the USA. It should be mentioned that a few months after the second general elections in India, in September 1957, Mr. John Foster Dulles said at a press conference: "Local election victories by Communists in India and Indonesia is a dangerous trend. It is a dangerous trend whenever Communists move towards political control."

A few days after this and as though commenting on Mr. Dulles' observations, Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari, then Finance Minister of the Government of India, said in the course of an interview to an American paper on the eve of his departure to Washington for American aid: "We have to try to explain to them (Americans) that the battle in India is a battle against Communism too. We lost the State of Kerala to the Communists and one of the reasons behind it was that we

could not spend enough money for development there."

Not one of the top leaders of the Congress alleged at any time that the Kerala Government was trying to carry out "communist measures." Not one of them dared assail any of the specific policies of the Kerala Government. The hostility sprang from the fact that the Kerala Government was serving the interest of the workers, peasants, working intelligentsia and the impact that this was having on other States — discrediting the Congress and giving impetus to the demand for democratic reforms. The reactionaries feared the growth of the democratic movement and the strengthening position of the Communist Party of India. At a meeting of the All-India Congress Committee a Congress leader frankly stated that if the Kerala Government was allowed to continue, the "infection" would spread all over the country. Kerala also caused apprehension among the leaders of the Praja-Socialist Party because they realized that the continuation of the Communist-led Government would swing increasing sections of the masses still under their influence towards the Communist Party.

All this led to a continuous and sustained campaign on an all-India scale against the Kerala Government. This, however, was effectively countered by the work of the Kerala Government and by the campaign carried out by the Communist Party in co-operation with democratic elements all over the country.

A year ago, in alliance with reactionary forces, the Congress and the Praja-Socialist Party in Kerala launched a campaign of violence and lawlessness, trying to provoke a crisis which would justify intervention by the Central Government. The attempt failed, thanks to the support the Kerala Government enjoyed among the people in the State and the all-India campaign conducted in defense of Kerala; but it revealed the gravity of the peril. Reviewing these and earlier developments, the National Council of the Communist Party of India which met in October 1958 stated in its resolution:

"The danger and threat of the Central intervention are by no means gone. The Congress leaders know that the Kerala government is gaining in prestige and stature every day, while their chances of returning to power in that State through elections are fast receding. With the Congress Governments becoming increasingly discredited and isolated in other States, they are afraid of the

success and achievements of the Kerala Government."

The offensive launched against the Kerala Government in June this year and which culminated in its dismissal was, therefore, not unexpected. However, some features of this offensive merit attention.

First, it was launched at a time when the Kerala Government had considerably strengthened its position among the masses, when it was about to implement a number of measures passed by the State Assembly and aimed at substantially improving the conditions of the people. Most important of these was the Agrarian Relations Bill.

Second, the agitation this time was not begun by the political parties. Conscious that their earlier agitation had failed to secure mass backing, they turned for support to organizations which could work up religious, communal and caste passions and hysteria—the Catholic Church and the Nair Service Society. It was these organizations that spearheaded the agitation and behind them marched the Congress and the Praja-Socialist Party, drawing into the combination the Muslim League.

Third, the agitators did not put forward any specific demand. Not daring to assail any specific policy of the Kerala Government except certain clauses of the Education Act on which they too were not united, they put forward only one demand—the Kerala Government should resign.

Fourth, their open and declared tactic, publicized in the press, preached from the pulpit and at hundreds of meetings, was to paralyze the administration and on this basis secure Central intervention to overthrow the Ministry.

Fifth, open backing and active support was given to the agitation by the all-India leaders of the Congress. Significant in this respect was the role played by Mr. Nehru. Here was the open declaration by members of his own party in Kerala that they wanted to "paralyze" the administration of the State. Judging by the attitude Mr. Nehru had taken in relation to the peaceful struggles of the workers and peasants in other States for modest demands, one would expect him to denounce the anti-Government struggle in Kerala. Not merely did he not do so, but in his very first statement on the Kerala crisis, made on June 3, nine days before the launching of the struggle, he spoke of a "considerable upsurge among large masses of people against the

Government of Kerala," which in his opinion was "due to a feeling of distrust against the Government that has grown in the course of the past many months." From time to time, confronted with sharp criticism even from circles which generally support him, Nehru made half-hearted criticism of the tactics of his party functionaries in Kerala. But these were always hedged in with reservations which rendered them worse than useless and actually encouraged the lawlessness. As for most of the top leaders of the Congress, including Mrs. Indira Gandhi, Nehru's daughter and the Congress President, their attitude was one of consistent hostility towards the Kerala Government and full support for the opposition.

Armed with this support and plentifully supplied with funds* by vested interests in Kerala and by big business from other States as well as by the Catholic Church, working up religious hysteria, caste sentiments and communal passions, the Vimochan Samar Samiti (Liberation Struggle Committee) of Kerala, in close collaboration with the Congress, Praja-Socialist Party and Muslim League, on June 12 launched their "direct action" against the Kerala Government. Managers of many private schools closed educational institutions. Attempts were made to close others by intimidation, physical assault on teachers and students and even burning of schools. Attempts were made to disrupt the State transport system by damaging buses and boats and by attacking passengers. In the name of peaceful picketing, organized raids were made on Government offices. Several police stations were attacked. Landlords threatened to refrain from sowing crops and to bring about a state of starvation. Banks declared they would not subscribe to the development loans to be floated by the Government. Big industrialists tried to hamper production. Terror was unloosed against citizens who supported the Government and resented hooligan tactics.

Simultaneously efforts were made to incite the officials against the legally-constituted Government; Congress leaders hinted that officials who obeyed the orders of the Government would be punished when it was dismissed and the Congress returned to power.

In this way the reactionaries sought to disrupt the economy of the State, sabotage education, prevent normal life and create a

*According to the leader of the "liberation struggle", Mr. Mannathu Padmanabhan, five million rupees were spent.

state of chaos. In order to overthrow the constitutionally elected Government, violence and lawlessness were let loose, with the open connivance and support of the Congress leadership which never tires of preaching the virtues of non-violence, the necessity to adhere to constitutional and peaceful methods and the sanctity of the verdict of the ballot box.

All in all, this was a striking manifestation of the length to which the party of the bourgeoisie and landlords is ready to go and of their scant respect for their own principles whenever their class interests are threatened. Mr. Nehru would do well to ponder over the significance of the Kerala crisis and the behavior of his party as well as his own behavior in this crisis. If he does so, he will refrain from repeating his pet thesis that Marxism is out-moded.

In these circumstances the Kerala Government behaved with admirable restraint and moderation. It used the minimum possible force. Throughout the violent opposition, the Preventive Detention Act, which proclaims that a citizen can be arrested and detained without trial by mere executive order, never was invoked, nor were meetings and processions banned—a striking contrast to what Congress Governments do. The Kerala Government, expressing its readiness at all stages to negotiate with the opposition, made repeated overtures. All these had no effect because the opposition did not want a settlement and counted on the support of the Central Government. Successive statements by members of the Central Cabinet, above all, by Prime Minister Nehru, strengthened their hopes and created the impression that Central intervention against the Kerala Government would be forthcoming in the event of the law and order situation becoming more acute.

No one should think, however, that the opposition forces in Kerala had an easy success. They had openly bragged that they would win "within a week." Actually they failed to paralyze the Government, and Central intervention came full fifty days after the struggle had been launched. This was due to two factors—mass support for the Government inside the State and the powerful rally of Indian democratic opinion in defense of Kerala.

The vast majority of the working class, agricultural laborers and toiling peasantry stood firmly by the Government. The opposition call for a general strike on June 29 was a miserable fiasco. A big majority of teachers

opposed the struggle. So did important sections of the intelligentsia. Vast meetings took place in Kerala opposing the school-closure movement, condemning the hooligan tactics of the opposition and calling upon the Congress and the PSP to break with avowedly communal* and caste elements.

The campaign in defense of the Kerala Government developed into one of the most powerful campaigns that India has ever known. Workers, peasants, teachers, students and office clerks demonstrated in tens of thousands all over the country. Among them were many supporters of the Congress and the PSP. The majority of the leading newspapers which have never been known to harbor friendly feelings towards the Communist Party, nevertheless, criticized Congress tactics in Kerala as fraught with grave danger to parliamentary democracy. Criticism was voiced by such eminent public men as Mr. Patanjali Shastri, the ex-Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of India, Mr. C. Rajagopalachari, former Governor-General of India, Mr. Gadgil, the Governor of Punjab, and others.

Backed by growing mass support inside the State and helped by democratic opinion all over the country, the Kerala Government frustrated the efforts of those who tried to paralyze the administration of the State. Each of their moves for six weeks ended in fiasco. Though successful in bringing much suffering upon the people of Kerala and damaging public property, they were unable to achieve their objective of paralyzing the Government. Nor did they succeed, despite all the efforts, in provoking clashes between their supporters and the masses supporting the Government, which could give the Center the pretext for intervention.

The struggle, instead of ending in short and swift victory, was dragging on—doomed to inevitable defeat. Then towards the end of July the leaders of the struggle, in collaboration with several members of the Congress leadership, worked out their new plan. They announced that a "massive" march would be staged on Trivandrum, the State capital. Twenty-five thousand volunteers would "besiege" the Government Secretariat, determined not to quit until they had overthrown the Government. The purpose was to provoke clashes on a vast scale and enact a bloodbath in the capital.

*Communalists uphold the division of society into close religious communities—Ed.

Within four days of the announcement of the plan, the Union Cabinet met and decided to dismiss the Kerala Ministry, dissolve the State Legislature and impose President's rule on Kerala. No reason was assigned for this drastic action. The sequence of events leaves one in no doubt that the crisis was manufactured, in order to justify intervention.*

The National Council of the Communist Party of India which met at Trivandrum on July 15 and 16, called for meetings and demonstrations all over the country on August 3, in defense of Kerala. After the dismissal of the Government, August 3 became a day of countrywide protest against Central intervention. At least thirty thousand people marched to the Parliament in Delhi, condemning the Central Government's intervention, denouncing it as an attack on the working people and on democracy and praising the achievements of the Kerala Ministry. It was a demonstration the like of which the capital city had seldom seen.

The demonstrations were not confined to Delhi. Tens of thousands, including peasants who had walked all the way from villages, took part in them in every place, especially in every State capital. But, what took place in Calcutta, the biggest city in India, was something unprecedented. An avalanche of humanity descended on the streets, forming a mighty stream stretching over five miles. This was the biggest procession in the city's history since Independence—about one hundred thousand took part in it. Earlier, a rally of two hundred thousand had been held, addressed by Jyoti Basu, the Secretary of the West Bengal State Committee of the Communist Party of India, and Indrajit Gupta, the working class leader.

Commenting on the demonstration in Calcutta, the *Statesman*, organ of British big business in India and an outspoken opponent of the Communist Party, wrote on August 4: "If number is any index, the procession organized by the Communist Party in Calcutta was a massive demonstration of the Party's strength."

*Even before the struggle began we had anticipated the course that events might take. On June 3, after discussion in a joint meeting of the Kerala State Committee Secretariat and Central Executive Committee Secretariat, I wrote:

"The Congress Party in the State, with the blessing of the Congress High Command, supplied by funds subscribed by British planters, landlords and other vested interests and in alliance with PSP, RSP and dark forces of reaction, is out to create disturbances and deliberately bring about a situation of chaos and lawlessness. The Central Government, led by the same Congress Party, they hope, will step in to dismiss the Ministry for its alleged failure to put down lawlessness." What happened, therefore, did not surprise us.

The participants in all these protest demonstrations which included a large number of women, were workers, peasants, office employees, teachers, students and others. The indignation of the masses, therefore, which found expression in these protest actions was not confined to followers of the Communist Party. It affected the membership of all parties, including the Congress Party.

This was seen even in the meeting of the Congress Parliamentary Party which took place on August 2, to hear Prime Minister Nehru's explanation as to why the Central Government had intervened. "Seldom has the Congress Parliamentary Party been in such a highly critical mood," said the New Delhi despatch of the *Hindu*, the most influential paper in South India and a supporter of the Congress, "as this afternoon when Prime Minister Nehru addressed it." Summing up the speeches made by a number of Congress members of the Indian Parliament, the despatch commented: "The Prime Minister has never faced such a critical party meeting as he did today."

It can be stated without fear of contradiction that no single issue during the last twelve years dominated the Indian scene as Kerala did in the past three months. Never was condemnation of the Congress so outspoken. Never did Prime Minister Nehru and his Government come in for such criticism at the hands of their own supporters. And never did the people of India, the workers, the peasants, the working intelligentsia and democratic-minded people in general rally so powerfully as in the defense of Kerala.

The Kerala Government has been removed, but it has been a magnificent battle, a battle which has raised the prestige of the Communist Party, which has exposed the democratic and constitutional pretensions of the ruling classes and inflicted a political-moral defeat on the Congress. It has taught the people of India a lesson they will never forget.

The dismissal of the Kerala Government was an outrageous attack, in violation of the spirit of the Constitution, on the masses, on their democratic right to elect the Government of their own choice and the right of that Government to carry out its policies and measures consistent with the provisions of the Constitution. It was also an act of grave provocation against the Communist Party of India and the democratic forces.

Some members of the Central Government had hoped that, blinded by anger, the Com-

munist Party would resort to "retaliatory" actions of a violent nature—thereby giving the pretext for repression. In this, they were disappointed. The mighty but peaceful and disciplined protest actions that took place all over the country on August 3, were unmarred by a single violent incident.

Central intervention in Kerala was followed by numerous acts of violence by the "liberation movement" volunteers, Congressmen and others against the offices of the Communist Party, Party cadres and people generally. Attempts were made to terrorize agricultural workers and evict them from their homesteads. These seemed to be part of a plan to keep up the tension and prevent free and fair elections at the end of President's rule. Also, efforts are being made by the reactionaries to bring pressure to modify the progressive measures introduced by the Communist-led Government.

Undaunted by what has happened, with its mass base intact and its ranks more firmly united than ever before, the Kerala State Committee of the Communist Party issued a stirring call to the people to defend the gains of the past 28 months. The Communist Party demands that the Agrarian Relations Bill, passed by the State's Legislature in June, immediately receive Presidential assent and be implemented. The other measures enacted by the Ministry such as the Education Act should not be modified. The Party has appealed to all sections in Kerala, irrespective of the attitude taken by them during the struggle, to ensure that the gains of the past 28 months are upheld, for they serve the interests of all except a handful of vested interests. In the days ahead the Party in Kerala will make strenuous efforts to see that the Catholic masses, many of whom were misled by their so-called leaders, become conscious of where their real interests lie.

In the grave and difficult conditions, our Party in Kerala, preparing for the forthcoming elections, is confident that once again the masses will demonstrate their support for the Party and the progressive forces with which it is allied.

The developments in Kerala were not an isolated event. They are the product of certain trends that have developed in Indian politics in recent years.

In 1947, when British power was forced to quit India, the Indian people hoped that now that freedom had been won after many years of struggle, suffering and sacrifice, rapid and effective steps would be taken to liqui-

date the heritages of imperialism, to eliminate the grip of British capital on our economy, to carry out basic agrarian reforms, to democratize the state apparatus and to ensure all-sided national advance. And they ardently believed that the Congress Party which had led the battle for freedom, which enjoyed a position of unrivalled prestige and authority and had now come to wield power, would lead them to carry out these new tasks—thus completing the national democratic revolution.

Since then many things have happened. The democratic movement has gone forward achieving many new successes. India has won a proud and honored place in the comity of nations by her independent foreign policy and her role in defense of peace. Certain sectors of national economy have grown, substantially aided by the agreements which India has made with the USSR and other socialist countries. There have been other changes too. But it cannot be denied even by the staunchest supporters of the present Indian Government that, by and large, the hopes and aspirations of the masses remain unfulfilled.

British capital still occupies a strong position in our economy. Despite a certain amount of curbing of landlordism, the condition of the vast mass of peasantry has registered practically no improvement and even the half-hearted agrarian reforms have been and are being sabotaged. Unemployment has assumed alarming proportions. Despite official claims of "record" food production this year, food prices have risen steeply. Recently, the rate of industrial growth has slowed down. Tax burdens on the common people have grown intolerable. The contrast between the wealth of a handful of multi-millionaire monopolists on one hand and the vast majority of the people on the other has grown more glaring than ever.

Utilizing the difficulties which our economy is facing and emboldened by the concessions made to them, extreme reactionaries who have powerful allies inside the Congress and in the Government have launched a furious assault against the policy of extending the state sector of economy, against even the limited agrarian reforms, against state trading in food grains and so on. Ardent advocates of "free enterprise," and of "aid" from America, these elements, among whom are to be found the biggest monopolists of India, have been systematically striving to sabotage economic relations with the socialist states and

even demanding a "modification" of India's foreign policy.

A phenomenon of grave significance is that in vital respects, the Indian Government itself is succumbing to the pressure of these extreme reactionary elements.

Inevitably, therefore, though the Congress remains immensely powerful, there has been growing disillusionment of the masses with the Congress. The Congress is torn with dissension and internal conflict. Had there been another powerful party of the bourgeoisie and landlords or a strong social-democratic party, the mass discontent could have been directed into "safe" channels. Such, however, is not the situation in India. Except the Congress, there is no other strong bourgeois party yet in the country. As for the Praja-Socialist Party which at one time hoped to become an "alternative" to the Congress, it has lost heavily in prestige and influence—thanks to its utterly reactionary and anti-national stand on foreign policy, its sabotage of mass struggle and its opposition to a united front with the Communist Party.

The party which is winning more and more support among the people in this situation is the Communist Party of India. This is the most important development in Indian politics since the attainment of freedom—growing realization by the people of the need for basic reforms, growth of mass struggles in volume and intensity and the emergence of the Communist Party of India as the spearhead of the democratic movement. No wonder, therefore, that the extreme reactionaries and their allies, who want to thwart national progress and democratic advance are raising the bankrupt banner of anti-communism.

The victory of the Communist Party in the Kerala elections and the formation of a Communist-led government there, itself a product of this entire process, carried it forward still further. It gave the masses new courage and confidence. It created consternation among the imperialists, big British capitalists, Indian monopolists, landlords. Also it gave rise to fear among many of the top leaders of the Congress, especially its Right wing, that even the limited democratic rights which the Indian people enjoy under the present Constitution may create serious difficulties for them.

Hence, the paradoxical spectacle that India witnessed recently—the resort by the Congress Party which rules the country to violent and illegal tactics in order to overthrow a legally-formed government in one State of

India, subversion of the Indian Constitution by the Government of India itself, the use of the special powers of the President for a purpose which was not visualized when the Constitution was formed. In this sense, the Kerala crisis has a deeper import. It is a manifestation of the crisis which bourgeois democracy is facing in India. It confronts Parliamentary institutions in our country with a grave peril. It gives a shattering blow to the illusion entertained by many people that the ruling circles in India, reared in so-called Gandhian traditions, will necessarily respect the verdict of the ballot box and that the path ahead is a path of smooth and continuous advance—free from crisis and sharp conflicts.

The attack on the Kerala Government was spearheaded by the forces of extreme reaction—those who want to destroy what the democratic movement has achieved during the last twelve years and take the country backward. There can be no doubt that emboldened by the successes they have won, they will intensify their attack on the toiling masses, on democratic rights and civil liberties, on parliamentary institutions and even try to reverse our foreign policy. Ahead of us lies a critical period, a period of acute conflicts and sharp changes which would demand utmost vigilance.

At the same time, the conclusion would be entirely defeatist and unwarranted that the triumph of reaction is inevitable. Far from it. The Kerala crisis has revealed not merely the length to which certain bourgeois circles would go in their attack on the people but also the tremendous volume of democratic opinion that exists in our country, the forces that are there which, if mobilized and united, can defeat reaction and frustrate its designs.

We have already referred, in this article, to the powerful democratic upsurge which grew in the whole country in opposition to Congress tactics and in defense of the Kerala Government, an upsurge which prevented Central intervention for full fifty days. Hence the Communist Party has reiterated its decision, adopted at the Amritsar session of its Congress sixteen months ago, that it will continue its policy of peaceful methods, defend parliamentary institutions and democratic rights with all its might, and strive to unite for this purpose all the patriotic and progressive forces in the country, including the vast number of democrats in the Congress. Our Party is confident that the

Indian people who have achieved impressive successes in their struggle till now, will be able to defeat the new plans of reaction and

take the road that will eventually lead to socialism.

Delhi, August 1959

JOURNALS OF FRATERNAL PARTIES

(REVIEW)

Rinascita

Anno XVI — N. 7-8

Luglio-agosto 1959

History of the Communist International— Some Problems

Palmiro Togliatti

UNDER this title *Rinascita*, in Nos. 7-8 (July-August, 1959), published an article by Palmiro Togliatti on the Fortieth Anniversary of the founding of the Communist International. The Comintern's nearly 25-year activity coincided with one of the most tense and tragic periods in European and world history.

Never had history developed so rapidly as it did during these years. The revolutionary ferment after the October Revolution and the end of the First World War, in contrast to anything that had taken place before, was felt not only by a restricted group of countries but, in various forms and in varying degree, all over the world. Despite differing situations, differing economic conditions, political systems, class relationships, national interests and traditions, the aims of the struggle were strikingly similar. Some of them stand out: complete liberation from capitalist exploitation, abolition of colonial and tyrannical regimes, freedom for all peoples and the road to socialism and peace. The conquest of power, the building of the first socialist state and its triumphant advance made the world more united and brought the peoples closer together in their struggle for the day when world unity would rest upon a single solid foundation and universal fraternal co-operation.

The significance of the Communist International is to be sought in the fact that from first to last it was in the center of this grandiose process of remaking the world. What is more, it was one of the main driving forces and guiding elements of this process. Throughout its activities there was not an event of any importance on which the leading bodies of the International or its national sec-

tions failed to adopt a definite stand; and this stand was arrived at not with the cold indifference of the pseudo-scientist, but with the keen mind of the scientific Marxist, with the zeal of the political leader and fighter who knows that his opinion, always a spur to action, can influence and change the course of events.

It is not surprising that the ruling capitalist classes and all their groupings and lackeys were consumed with hatred of the Communist International. And when that gang of blood-thirsty brigands who dreamed of plundering the world and destroying every vestige of freedom and civilization was organized it took the name of "Anti-Comintern Pact." And it was precisely the Communist International which, at its last Congress, charted the principles of the broad political strategy the purpose of which was to destroy this butcher gang and to open before humanity a new prospect of political and social progress.

Serious historical works about the Comintern are few, says Togliatti, and even these are either extremely general in character, or they describe the rise and development of the Communist movement in the different countries or at various stages. Yet there is a great need for books that would weave into a single pattern everything associated with the International.

Nor should we close our eyes to the fact that the position of the Comintern was not always absolutely correct and in keeping with the actual situation. Neither can it be denied that along with a thorough and exact Marxist analysis and definition of the development of the crisis of capitalism, which set in together with the First World War, and along with correct revolutionary work

to build and consolidate Communist parties in conditions which at times were extremely difficult, there were also vacillations justly deserving of criticism, positions which subsequently had to be abandoned because they did not correspond to all the requirements of social and political reality; there was a slowing down of tempo and there were propaganda exaggerations. And lastly, let us add that the criticism made at the 20th Congress of the CPSU of Stalin's work, although Stalin was never directly responsible for the activity of the Communist International, undoubtedly necessitates a careful reappraisal (both in the sense of judgments on individuals and leading groups of some of the Communist parties and in the sense of ascertaining the correctness and timeliness of certain decisions and campaigns) of events and the activities of individuals in order to elucidate them correctly.

* * *

The second part of the article begins with an analysis of the conditions in which the Communist International arose. Emphasis is laid on the fact that it was *before* and not *after* the triumph of the October Revolution and the seizure of power by the Russian working class and the Bolshevik Party that Lenin proclaimed the need unhesitatingly to sever political and organizational connections with the Social-Democratic parties of the Second International and to establish a new international association of the working people. This is an extremely important point, no so much for the purpose of dealing a blow at those who claim that the Communist International was merely an "instrument" of the Soviet state, as to determine what historic and political considerations led Lenin to insist on the creation of a new international organization.

Lenin was already waging an open and relentless struggle against the opportunism of the leaders of the old Social-Democratic parties before the outbreak of World War I, and an entire wing of the working-class movement participated in this struggle, although it did not always act consistently or from well-defined Marxist positions. When the war broke out the opportunists at the head of the Second International parties went beyond all bounds in their shameful activities. This fact alone justified a final rupture with the opportunists and called for a new international revolutionary organization. But Lenin did not confine himself to stating this fact. In examining the causes that led to the betrayal, he analyzed the sources of opportunism in the working-class movement, which were to be sought in the very structure of capitalist society, in the changes which had taken place in it, in the rise of a labor aristocracy and in the particular form of solidarity established between this aristocracy and the ruling

classes to the detriment of the working masses and the principles of socialism. ". . . Opportunism is not an accidental thing, not a sin, not a slip, not the treachery of individual persons, but the social product of a whole historical epoch."*

Opportunists who have become social-chauvinists and traitors are the product of the objective process peculiar to a definite phase of capitalism. In this Leninist definition of opportunism we find a profound historical substantiation for the new and necessary development of the working-class movement. But in my view, writes Togliatti, that is not the most important thing in Lenin's analysis. Most important and decisive is the objective statement of fact that world war opens up a new stage in history and that this new stage **confronts the** working class and its parties with completely new tasks. The capitalist world is so organized, continues Togliatti, that the growing disproportion between oppressed and oppressors creates the prerequisites for an inevitable revolutionary explosion. And this explosion, thanks to the objective conditions engendering it, will, when it occurs, place on the agenda not only separate questions of an economic and political order, but problems connected with the "very existence of capitalist society," that is, problems of the socialist revolution.

The guiding principle underlying the founding of the Comintern and its activity has its source in the scientifically established truth that capitalism has reached the last stage of its development, and that the historical period in which we are living is the period of the collapse of imperialism and the revolutionary triumph of socialism. Hence the imperative need for an uncompromising struggle to extirpate opportunism in the working-class movement, for a complete break with the old parties of the Second International, for a revolutionary party—the vanguard of the working class—equipped with Marxist-Leninist theory. Hence, in conformity with Marxist principles, there arises the need for strategy and tactics in keeping with the general character of the historical period and with particular situations. And, lastly, because the revolution had taken place in Russia and resulted in the victory of the working class, it followed that the hub of the entire revolutionary working-class movement of necessity shifted away from Western Europe to the country in which the proletarian revolution had triumphed, which had a Party capable of leading it to victory, a Party destined to undertake and resolve the gigantic task of building a socialist economy and a socialist society.

After the founding of the Communist International Lenin, on the basis of the experience of the October Revolution, developed and deepened the foregoing propositions, which were adopted by

*V. I. Lenin, *Collapse of the Second International*.

the best and most active part of the working class and became the property of thousands of champions of socialism, and of millions of people who believed that the future lay with socialism.

After the first Congress of the Communist International Lenin indicated the place of the new International in history:

"The First International laid the foundation of the proletarian, international struggle for socialism.

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

"The Third International gathered the fruits of the work of the Second International, purged it of its opportunist, social-chauvinist, bourgeois and petty-bourgeois dross, and began to effect the dictatorship of the proletariat."*

At the Second Congress of the Comintern, Lenin stressed that the heart of the matter lay in the "economic relations of imperialism." These relations had led to war, and the war had destroyed the former equilibrium. All the basic principles underlying strategy and tactics—particularly those concerning the need to fight for power in the developed capitalist countries, and the potential allies of the proletariat in this struggle—and the thesis that in the anti-imperialist struggle the efforts of the proletarian masses in the West fuse with those of the oppressed colonial peoples fighting for independence, are linked with the principled stand deriving from Marxist teaching and confirmed by the experience of history.

This stand was, and remains, correct. The march of events has confirmed it, providing new and irrefutable proof of its soundness. If we compare the experience of the Communist movement, inspired and guided by the Communist International, with that of other movements and particularly with the experience of the Social-Democratic parties, the comparison will undoubtedly be in favor of the ideas upheld by us in following the great behests of Lenin. Today no one can deny that the period since the First World War has been marked by the rise of socialism and the decline and fall of capitalism. The dictatorship of the proletariat, the power of the working class and its peasant ally, has become the decisive historical force, extending its range of action, resolving its problems and confidently solving new ones. The general crisis of capitalism, passing through stages of cyclical boom, depression and crisis, has deepened. The colonial system is disintegrating. The sphere of imperialist domination has shrunk and is continuing to contract. And in the changing world of our day not one of the old Social-Democratic parties has succeeded in bringing the working class of its country

anywhere near to the role of the leading class, to the conquest of power. Quite the reverse. All, or nearly all of them have rushed in to save the capitalist system from the proletarian revolution. The Social Democrats have affirmed that they were forced to do this to save democracy. But the moment the danger of revolution had passed, the bourgeois classes brought fascism to power, and fascism plunged the world into another devastating war. Almost the same thing is being repeated today, the Social-Democratic parties are still active supporters of the capitalist system and opponents of every revolutionary movement and of socialism—of the socialism now established over one-third of the globe and marching confidently to its goal.

There can be no doubt on this point: history has proved that the complete break with opportunism, the formation of new revolutionary parties and the founding of the Communist International, and its work, were fully justified. In keeping with Lenin's appeals and behests, everything was done to meet the historical situation and to provide the international proletariat and the people with the leader they needed. The grand perspective which the Communist International placed before itself was perfectly sound; the principles which inspired its work were correct; on the basis of these principles the Comintern elaborated a revolutionary strategy of world-wide significance; it acted in accordance with these principles, and it summoned the working people to action in the most diverse situations.

* * *

The revolutionary ferment resulting from the First World War spread to nearly all the countries of Europe. But the revolutionary movement was not successful, despite the sweep of the mass movement and the selflessness with which the minority organized in the Communist parties, or those rallied around them, fought. The working class failed to seize power (a task posed by history and for the solution of which all the objective conditions were to hand). Had this goal been attained in at least one or two of the main capitalist countries, periods of sharp struggle would undoubtedly have followed, but then mankind would not have known the terrible crisis of 1929, fascism or the Second World War.

Togliatti shows how wrong are those who maintain that the Communists made a mistake when they advanced the aim of seizing power, that by so doing they estranged part of the masses, and, what is more, the most advanced part, from the section which continued to follow the old Social-Democratic parties; that in consequence these parties have not been able to come to power everywhere and carry out far-reaching reforms. Nothing could be more false. First, in no European country whatever did the Social-Democratic leaders in the

* V. I. Lenin, *The Third International and Its Place in History*.

reformist wing of the working-class movement put forward this kind of program for democratic regeneration. The ultra-reactionary regimes were overthrown under the impact of the first onslaught of the masses, and important democratic reforms were won under mass pressure. When, subsequently, the Social-Democratic leaders came to power and exercised it alone, they never hesitated to use their rule to prevent the growth of the mass movement and to restore the old bourgeois order. And where these movements were not halted but continued to seek radical changes, the Social-Democratic leadership entered into an alliance with the most reactionary section of the bourgeoisie in order to crush the popular movement by force of arms.

The sections of the Communist International—some of which had been formed at times of acute revolutionary crisis—did not, on the whole, rise to the occasion, and this was the key problem during the first period of the existence of the International. Victory in the revolution they were working for, namely, seizure of power in some of the big Western countries, was everywhere closely linked with the time factor, that is to say, with the rapidity at which the movement developed and, particularly, with the need quickly to form revolutionary vanguards capable of winning decisive influence among the workers and the people as a whole without loss of time. This had to be done before the bourgeois classes and their administrative and coercive apparatus recovered from the acute crisis which had somewhat cramped their activities, that is, it had to be done during the revolutionary struggle. But it was here that lapses and mistakes made themselves felt. This end was not achieved. It turned out to be much easier to break with the Social-Democratic leadership than to get rid of "social democratism." Many of those who loudly proclaimed their affiliation to the new International in practice adhered to their old social-democratic views on basic questions of the revolutionary movement such, for example, as the alliance between the working class and the middle sections in town and countryside.

From this Togliatti draws the conclusion: the victory of the October Revolution in 1917 was achieved because there was a well-organized vanguard—the Bolshevik Party—because in the course of a twenty-year struggle against all manifestations of opportunism this vanguard, under Lenin's leadership, had worked out a revolutionary strategy and tactics based not only on Marxist principles, but wholly in keeping with the economic, political and social conditions in Russia. There was not a single party or political group in any other European country which could have possessed such richness of principle, such scientific knowledge not only of Marxist teaching but also of the conditions of their country; that had behind it the store of revolution-

ary experience which brought the Russian Communists to victory in October 1917. The founders and leaders of the Communist International, with Lenin at their head, understood perfectly that this was the gap that had to be made good.

* * *

An analysis of Lenin's activities during the period of the imperialist war and the founding of the Communist International demonstrates that, simultaneously with waging irreconcilable struggle for a complete break with social-democratic opportunism, Lenin worked to unite the revolutionary forces on a platform of correct Marxist principles, and, while ridding themselves of opportunism, to avoid the danger of falling into incorrect and barren Leftism. Togliatti cites a number of examples from Lenin's activities in this direction, and stresses that he never failed to draw attention to the different conditions in each country and, hence, to the different political aims. Speaking on the Italian question at the Third Congress of the Communist International Lenin severely criticized the policy of Serrati who had preferred 14,000 reformists to 58,000 Communists; he said: "We never wanted Serrati to imitate the Russian revolution in Italy. This would have been stupid. We are sufficiently wise and flexible to avoid such stupidity." Thus on questions of theory Lenin would admit of no interpretation contrary to Marxist principles being placed upon his statements. It is noteworthy that in his report to the Second Congress of the Comintern Lenin, having defined and drawn in an incomparable and forceful synthesis a picture of the crisis which capitalism was then experiencing, hastened to add that it would be wrong to try to prove there was absolutely no way out of the crisis. "The bourgeoisie is conducting itself like a desperate robber who has lost his head. It is committing blunder after blunder, aggravating the situation and hastening its own downfall. . . . But one cannot 'prove' that there is absolutely no possibility for the bourgeoisie to lull this or that minority of the exploited, by means of some concession; that it cannot suppress this or that movement or crush an uprising of some section of the oppressed and exploited."* From this Lenin concluded that only struggle by the revolutionary parties could "prove" that there was no longer any other way out for the bourgeoisie.

It cannot be said that the Communist movement as a whole was guided during those years by these clear-cut Marxist principles. The specific conditions in the particular countries were underrated and inadequately studied; there was a tendency to confine oneself to the formal and superficial wish to "do what had been done in Russia," without under-

*V. I. Lenin, *The International Situation and the Fundamental Tasks of the Communist International*.

standing what this could and should signify for each country. The rupture with opportunism was accompanied by sectarianism, and this isolated the Communists, often small numerically, from the organized and unorganized workers. There were, moreover, those who made a theory of this isolation affirming that we should wait until the "masses come to us;" there were those who advocated the "theory of the offensive" according to which the small minority, even though isolated from the masses, could victoriously storm the bastions of power. There was at the time a lack of understanding of national demands, and the view was held that, with the onset of the revolutionary period, democratic demands were no longer of any importance. That the ability of the bourgeois classes to recover their strength and to maneuver had been underrated is obvious from the fact, let us say, that in Italy (1922), Bulgaria (1923) and Poland (1926) the Communist parties were caught unawares and found themselves confronted with the fascist offensive because they failed at first to realize its real scope and significance. Considerable ideological and political spadework and effort to educate and reorganize the leading cadres were needed in order to make the movement, rallied under the banner of the Communist International, a genuinely Communist movement. This work was undertaken by the early Comintern congresses, under the leadership of Lenin, and his contribution was decisive.

In speaking about the work of forming the Communist parties one usually has in mind the 21 conditions of affiliation to the Communist International, adopted at its Second Congress. At that time these conditions were of the utmost importance in defining the type of Party to be counterposed to the Social-Democratic parties, but, says Togliatti, in my view they were not the decisive factor. Of greatest significance were the strategy and tactics of the Communist parties worked out at the first three congresses. Decisive in the first place, in addition to the Theses on the National Question, were Lenin's "*Left-Wing Communism, an Infantile Disorder*," and his speech on the Tactics of the Communist International at the Third Congress.

Comrade Togliatti devotes several pages to "*Left-Wing Communism, an Infantile Disorder*" which elaborates the Party's tactics and methods of work. In those days the attention of the working class of the world was focused on the Bolshevik Party—the organizer of the victorious revolution—renowned for the discipline and valor of its members. Everybody wanted to imbibe the qualities of this party which was regarded as an international model. Lenin agreed with this, and recognized the international importance of what the Bolsheviks had accomplished, but he immediately added that "it would be a very great mistake to exaggerate

this truth and to apply it to more than some of the fundamental features of our revolution." He acknowledged further that "strictest discipline" was one of the chief conditions for victory, and stated that "far from enough thought has been given to the question . . . under what conditions it is possible." There will be no discipline if the vanguard is unable "to link itself with, to keep in close touch with, and, to a certain degree, if you like, merge with the broadest masses of the toilers—primarily with the proletarians, but also with the non-proletarian toiling masses." Discipline, moreover, depends upon the correctness of the political leadership, on the condition "that the broadest masses become convinced of this correctness by their own experience." Without these conditions "attempts to establish discipline inevitably fall flat and end in phrasemongering and grimacing." But these conditions are created only by prolonged effort, in the practical activity of a truly mass and a truly revolutionary movement.

Many pages of Lenin's work—those, for instance, which explain what had to be done by the Communists in order to vanquish the more powerful enemy (only by exerting the utmost effort . . . taking advantage of every, even the smallest, "rift" among the enemies, every, even the smallest, opportunity of gaining a mass ally, even though this ally be temporary, vacillating, unstable, unreliable and conditional, etc.)—are devoted to the principles now generally accepted throughout the working-class movement.

After the Second Congress and on the basis of the work done by Lenin in the International, the need to settle accounts with the Left deviation became imperative. This was done at the Third Congress where Lenin, taking part in the debate, elaborated the Theses on "Left-Wing Communism," defeated the advocates of the "theory" of the offensive, insisted on the need for the Communists to "win over the majority," and secured the incorporation of this principle into the Theses on Tactics. Thus a correct line was worked out for forming and organizing the Communist parties as mass parties on the one hand, and, on the other, the united front policy in relation to the working-class and Social-Democratic organizations, which found expression in the call for united action and negotiations between both Internationals, was substantiated.

At first this policy met with strong opposition even among the Communists. There were sharp controversies and conflicting views: some sections rejected the new tactics, others accepted them conditionally and with reservations which in point of fact nullified them. It was claimed that the united front could be built only on a trade union basis, not on the basis of political organizations and activities; a scholastic distinction was made between

unity at the top and unity at rank-and-file level or both from top and bottom simultaneously. The first demand was tantamount to rejecting the unity tactics and even contained something in the nature of a threat to trade union unity; as regards the various ways of attaining unity, these are conditional and always lose their meaning when people desire and really achieve unity, for it is not easy to make a clear distinction between the leaders and the rank and file in a well-organized movement: there is a constant interdependence and interaction between them.

The decision to combine the united front slogan (developing it) with the slogan of a workers' government, was both correct and interesting. This can be done where there is unity between the Communists and Social Democrats. Here we have an attempt to find the ways and means by which the working class can come to power in accordance with the specific situation and without repeating the Soviet experience to the letter. The point was warmly debated and the conclusion was drawn that the slogan should be understood as a synonym for the dictatorship of the proletariat; but this was tantamount to depriving it of all practical significance. Beginning with 1934, however, the searching necessitated by this formula was renewed and far more significant results were achieved.

On November 13, 1922, Lenin, now very ill, addressed the Fourth Congress of the Communist International—the last which he attended. His speech, in which the problems of the international working-class movement were only touched upon, contained certain criticisms. He mentioned the resolution adopted at the Third Congress on the organizational structure of the Communist parties and their methods of work, and severely criticized it as being "too Russian." He added that by adopting this resolution "we ourselves have blocked our own advance," although the content of the resolution was correct. "All that has been said in the resolution has remained a dead letter" and unless we realize this "we shall make no progress."

Not enough thought was given to these words; they were regarded as being the usual and superficial criticism of a document that had not been drawn up with sufficient clarity for the "foreign comrades." Lenin undoubtedly considered that the foreign comrades should take over a "part of the Russian experience" and, upon doing so, they should be capable of developing the Communist movement in all countries in keeping with the conditions obtaining in each country.

* * *

The next section of Togliatti's article begins with a characterization of the Comintern's activities after Lenin's death. New people came, the methods of leadership and work changed; the analysis, pos-

sibly, was less profound, the conclusions less certain; there were sharp differences, too, among the leadership, mainly in connection with the struggle waged by the Soviet Communists against the opposition groupings. Not infrequently these differences were accompanied by factional struggle in individual Communist parties. But those who concentrate on these episodes and see nothing but these should be reminded that the struggle was both necessary and inevitable, and that the work begun by Lenin was successfully continued by the Communist International.

The campaign for the "Bolshevization" of the Communist parties, aimed at helping the foreign comrades to assimilate "part of the Russian experience," acquired a much greater significance. In many countries it helped to further the formation of the Communist parties and the molding of leading cadres, to remove from these parties the individuals and groups who refused to master the deep principles of Marxism-Leninism, refused to submit to discipline or to adopt the methods of work typical of a revolutionary party. Thus the aims which it was necessary to pursue in the different sections of the International varied with local conditions and traditions, but the need "to work among the masses" was emphasized everywhere. During this campaign some of the Communist parties began to acquire the character of truly mass parties, and this was essential in the new situation then taking shape.

In the period between 1924 and 1930-31 the center of gravity shifted. The German section of the Comintern continued to be the strongest, and the greatest responsibility rested on it; the sections in France and Spain likewise began to acquire greater weight, while in other countries the parties were persecuted and had to go underground. A real leap forward, one which changed the situation and opened a broad new perspective, was made in Asia, where the Communist Party of China, founded in 1921 and at first very weak, had grown in the space of a few years into an important political force and was now in the center of the political life of the country. The Communist International discussed at length the problems of this Party and helped to specify its strategy and tactics. But the Chinese Party, more quickly than the other parties, began to advance independently along the Marxist-Leninist path, studying the situation in the country, adapting its activities to this situation and boldly rectifying its mistakes. In a short time it had acquired the experience and militancy which enabled it after the Second World War to win victory, take power and put China on the road to socialism.

But the most important factor of this period was the change that took place in the objective situation. This was correctly noted at the Fifth Congress of the Comintern which, it is true, made the

proviso that a new and rapid revolutionary development was possible and, later, at the Sixth Congress, which worked out the thesis of the "three periods"—the period of acute postwar crisis, the period of relative stabilization and the period of a further aggravation of the contradictions of capitalism and a new upsurge of the mass movement. In the main this division was correct, and it should be borne in mind in any "periodization" of the history of the Comintern. The 1929 economic crisis strikingly confirmed the forecast made in 1928 that the conditions of capitalism would deteriorate. Here, by way of criticism, it should be said that not always and not in all Communist parties was the thesis on the "third period" correctly understood as a simple premise for an investigation of the definite changes then setting in everywhere; sometimes it was regarded as something cut and dried and was substituted for direct research. Internationally the new upsurge of the popular movement was entirely different in character from that which set in immediately after World War I. This, too, was not correctly understood at first. The international situation was complicated. Fascism, the new aggressive force which had grown out of imperialism, had added to the antagonisms, rendering them more acute and foreshadowing armed conflicts. Fascism confronted the working-class and the popular movement with new problems, with the task of defending the democratic system and achieving unity in the struggle against the common enemy.

Can one say that the attitude of the Comintern and its activity at the time of the turn in world politics were absolutely correct and timely or that it failed to realize in good time the importance of some of the new facts and, as a result, was unable to adopt a correct political line?

In my view, writes Togliatti, there were mistakes and tardiness and these were manifested chiefly in a belated and inadequate appraisal of the fascist danger and, consequently, in an incorrect posing of the problems of unity and a wrong attitude towards the Social-Democratic parties.

Togliatti holds that the gravest error was made in defining Social Democracy as social fascism, and that the political consequences of this were likewise erroneous. It is true that the Social-Democratic leaders resisted the mass revolutionary movement, crushed it by force of arms, in the same way as did the fascists. And it is equally true that an analogy can be drawn between the ideology of the reformists—the advocates of class collaboration—and some of the ideological tenets of the fascists. But the social nature of these two movements was profoundly different. Behind the fascists stood the diehard capitalist reactionaries, while the reformist leaders were linked with essentially different groups that had not as yet broken

with certain democratic traditions and bourgeois pacifism. The mass base of the two movements was different: in many countries the organizations led by the reformists consisted largely of working people; the fascists ruthlessly fought these organizations and sought to destroy them.

But it was most important to realize in good time what the outcome of the fascist offensive would be. The prospect was one of an all-out attack on democratic institutions and liberties. To speak about social fascism signified, in essence, that the reformist leaders and Social Democracy as such pursued exactly the same aim. But this was contrary to truth, for what was bound to occur, was that part, and quite a significant part, of the Social Democrats came to the defense of the democratic institutions.

The term "social fascism" expressed the profound resentment felt by that part of the working-class movement in many European countries, particularly in Germany, which had been thrown back by the betrayal, treachery and ruthlessness of the Social-Democratic leaders. This resentment was justified, and many of these leaders were deserving of worse epithets. But politically it was a mistake, and, regrettably, a widespread one. It was a mistake not to have distinguished between different things and, what was worse, to have furthered the rapprochement of the forces which, in the interests of the working-class and communist movement, ought to have been divided, kept apart and counterposed to each other. And, lastly, inside Social Democracy the drawing of a line between the opponents of unity, the real advocates of fascism (De Man, Deat, etc.), and those who were beginning to realize the need for unity and resolute anti-fascist struggle, was rendered difficult.

Obviously to get unity of action with the social democratic masses and their organizations on the basis of this theory was far from being an easy matter; where it occurred it was sporadic and had no impact on the situation as a whole; and worst of all, the dogmatism and sectarianism against which Comrade Dimitrov waged an open struggle at the Seventh Congress of the Communist International were widespread in many Communist parties. After the Sixth Congress the struggle inside the Communist parties was spearheaded almost exclusively "against any tendency towards an opportunist adaptation to the conditions of capitalist stabilization and against any infection with reformist and legalist illusions" (Dimitrov).

Sectarianism, which was not effectively combated and the spread of which was furthered by the definition of Social Democracy as social-fascism, became a "deep-rooted vice" (Dimitrov). It had to be extirpated at all costs if a broad and effective proletarian front was to be built capable of blocking

the path to the growing threat of a fascist offensive and the danger of a second world war which was then looming up.

In my view, Togliatti continues, defining communist policy as a policy of "class against class" was also essentially erroneous and the source of dangerous sectarian distortions. Our policy is the policy of a working class fighting for democracy and socialism, but the strength of the Communist Party consists precisely in its ability to isolate the most reactionary groups of the bourgeoisie by means of a broad and flexible system of alliances, by ascertaining common views and interests with other forces, by neutralization, etc.

Rectification of this mistake was dictated by the course of events, first and foremost by the tragic example of Hitler's advent to power in Germany. Hitler came to power with the support of the masses of electors whom the Social-Democratic leaders had estranged by their reactionary policy, but who could not take part in a united struggle in defense of democracy because of the yawning split in the working-class movement and the absence of successful united actions. Events in Germany profoundly alarmed the working-class movement; the masses realized the imperative need for a united anti-fascist movement. The Communist International and its parties were at their posts. They adopted a correct attitude, criticized the Social-Democratic parties, stressed the responsibility of the latter for the advent of fascism to power. Above all they worked for unity of action in the countries threatened by fascism or already enslaved by it. The obstacles in the way of carrying out this task were overcome without any great difficulty, and at the new and last stage of its existence the Communist International was a truly worldwide force guiding and at times directly leading the mighty united movement which in one way or another embraced all countries.

* * *

When in 1935 our Seventh and last Congress assembled, the balance of forces in the working-class movement had changed radically. This demonstrated the degree to which the ability of the Communist parties to act in keeping with the situation had grown. The Seventh Congress was significant because it posed and resolved the task of generalizing the experience of united action already acquired. The Congress placed this experience upon a solid principled foundation and, on this basis, formulated an internationally important strategic line of development.

And today, recalling the events which preceded the outbreak of the Second World War, and above all the perfidy of the bourgeois rulers who, not without the connivance of the Social Democrats, sought, without a twinge of conscience, to incite

the fascist aggressors against the Soviet Union, recalling the confusion and dangers of the first years of the war, and recalling how at last a way out was found in the unity of the democratic and anti-fascist forces, and hearing this unity praised or cursed from different sides because it brought victory, it must be acknowledged that, if the strategy of unity was the means that made it possible to destroy fascist barbarism, this strategy was worked out and placed before the world by the Communist International at its Seventh Congress.

Undoubtedly the prerequisites for this are to be sought in the preceding activity of the International and not only in all that concerns the united front. Dimitrov himself regarded as a precedent the call made in the past, given the existence of a united front, for a workers' or a worker-peasant government. In the same way the transition was now being made from this broad unity of action to demands for a proletarian united-front government or for an anti-fascist popular front. But now this demand was based on the proof that fascism was not simply the substitution of one government for another, but a change in the form of rule, that is, the turning of bourgeois democracy into terrorist dictatorship.

The Communists, far from ignoring this distinction, came to the defense of the democratic system, and "took into their hands the banner of democracy." This opened the way to co-operation and alliances, on the condition however that the Social Democrats and capitalist politicians were not lumped together, that a distinction was made between them and action taken accordingly. This, then, was at once a tactical and a strategic line. In the new situation, which Lenin could not have foreseen, the principles of revolutionary policy which he had worked out and defined were implemented on a broad plane, with boldness of aim and perspective, and without overlooking any of the fundamentals of our doctrine. On the contrary, the facts confirmed that these fundamentals were absolutely correct, for they alone, and not the opportunist ravings of the Social Democrats or the confusion of the bourgeois democrats or the stunts of the anarchists, enabled the Communists to offer to all who were ready to combat fascism and to avert war a platform of unity of action which in the crucible of the grim struggle demonstrated how necessary and effective it was.

An objective study of the decisions of the Seventh Congress thoroughly exposes the slanderers who depict the communist movement as one that from beginning to end is associated with stereotyped attitudes, that is incapable of understanding the new in life and of rejecting obsolete formulas. The Congress, in examining the many vital questions, took into account the new reality and this

enabled it unhesitatingly to change some of the former theses of the Communists. As regards the problem of war, as distinct from the attitude during the 1914-18 war, the slogan of struggle for peace and in defense of peace was approved and substantiated as being both correct and necessary; secondly, the possibility of averting a new imperialist war, provided a combination of forces was established that would force the aggressor to retreat, was pointed out for the first time. In both instances cognizance was taken of the fact that a new, impressive and real force had appeared in the constellation of world powers—the Soviet Union with its socialist industry, collective farms and all its other forces.

As regards the question of government and the state, the participation of the Communists in a government which is not a dictatorship of the proletariat, was substantiated and recognized as correct and desirable. There was nothing in common here with the old collaboration practised by the Social Democrats with the object of holding back the movement of the masses and preventing revolution. The Communists were eager to participate in government bodies in order to destroy fascism and save democracy. But they openly declared that the democratic order could not be preserved or developed unless it acquired a new content which would be imparted to it by the participation of the masses and by political and economic reforms, reforms that would uproot reaction and fascism. Thus it was that the concept of a democracy of a new type began to take shape, and no one can rebuke the Communists, fighting as they were for socialism, for thinking in terms of a democratic development along these lines.

Seeing the sterility and cowardice of the political thinking of the Social Democrats, who, much against their will, agreed to anti-fascist unity, and then at the first opportunity broke their vows of fidelity to the united front and who, upon encountering the upheaval which shook the old political and social foundations, had nothing to offer but the doctrine of the need to govern on behalf of the bourgeoisie in order, subsequently, to cede power to it; seeing this the Communist International boldly developed the teaching on state power, opened before the mass democratic movement the perspective of successful advance and linked the struggle against fascism and for peace with the need to change the structure of the capitalist world. The political activities of the Communists in the postwar years were already implicit in this attitude.

It is easy to understand why the policy of the Seventh Congress exerted such a tremendous influence on all continents, and why it enabled the communist movement to make a big leap forward similar to the advance immediately after 1919. This

policy was the guiding force which the working class, the democratic masses and the peoples needed at the time. But this time the leap forward was made by parties which, thanks to nearly 20 years of experience, had acquired internal cohesion and kinship, had mastered the principles of Marxism-Leninism, "digested" a good part of the Russian experience, rid themselves of much "ballast" in the shape of the opportunists, factionalists and careerists, and which to a considerable extent had become "Bolshevized." The way had been paved by two decades of discussion, theoretical elaboration, propaganda, political action and internal struggle. In Spain and France, China and America the fruits of this labor were being garnered. And it is interesting to note that during this period the internal differences and the factional wrangling, which in the past had been frequent and serious, disappeared almost entirely, and in the main the democratic life of the Communist parties proceeded normally. As is always the case, the correct political line strengthened the organizations and improved the situation in them. All the parties made special efforts to associate themselves closely with the life in their respective countries, in order to take into account and utilize the progressive traditions of the popular movement, overcome national nihilism and acquire the true sense of nationhood without which the working class cannot hope for leadership of the working masses and the country. This was a period of preparation for solving the tasks which arose later, during the Second World War, when the Communist parties, leading the struggle against fascism, proved their mettle as the finest representatives of the nation and embodied in themselves the characteristic features of a national party, features which none can dispute and of which no one can deprive them.

The Seventh Congress of the Communist International opened up a new period in the relations between central leading bodies and individual Communist parties. I adhere to the view, Togliatti writes, that the impossibility of exercising from a single center effective leadership of the work in both near and distant countries had become obvious earlier and, what is more, at crucial moments. Operative leadership never wholly corresponded to the fluid situation: it was either not understood, came too late, or could not reach those who were leading the struggle. At the Seventh Congress and afterwards it became clear that, when the mass movement—approximately from 1934 onwards—was beginning to acquire an unprecedented sweep, it was impossible, or simply absurd to think that real leadership could be exercised from a single center. The Communist parties had to become a political factor in their countries by virtue of their own efforts and, consequently, had to be able to act independently and in keeping with developments,

with turns, successes and failures. And so it was that, in a sense, the documents of the Seventh Congress contained the decision to dissolve the International, a decision which was adopted in 1943, when it was publicly stated that the previous form of central organization no longer conformed to the situation and the level of development of the movement itself.

The fact that in 1943 a decision of this kind could be taken shows how extremely important was the work that had been done and the long and arduous path traversed, at times with zigzags. Those who are surprised that after the Second World War the Communist parties in a few years became the ruling force in so many countries—beginning with China and Poland and ending with the Danube and the Balkan countries and the German Democratic Republic—should glance back for a moment at the work done by the Communists, if only in the struggle against fascism before and during the war. The place we now occupy in the world at the cost of incredible sacrifice and heroism was won thanks to a correct political line and the struggle for the happiness of mankind. What is more, the place that rightly belongs to us is far more important; and that which has been taken from us we must and will regain.

The Communist movement has become what it is today as a result of the objective development of the contradictions of capitalism, of the fact that in 1917 the chain of imperialism was broken for the first time, and of the subsequent tragic events link-

ed with the general crisis of the capitalist system. But objective conditions create only the prerequisites for a movement which becomes firmly established, disciplined and consolidated, advances and wins thanks only to the conscious activities of an organized vanguard. The Communist International was such a vanguard and the present situation in the world confirms that it succeeded in accomplishing its task, the task set by Lenin. It may seem strange to some that the considerable influence wielded among the masses in some countries in the past has now been lost, or nearly so. Further study is needed in order to establish the reasons for this; what cannot be denied is that this disparity in the development of individual countries has always existed, and while it can be explained in part by shortcomings in orientation and in the work, the basic reason points to the objective changes which first of all we should be able to understand.

The main point is that today, under communist leadership, the broad masses, hundreds of millions of people, are in motion, and that the Communists, although working and fighting in different conditions, different countries and continents, are united by revolutionary teaching, invincible international solidarity, the identity of the noble aims of their struggle and by the discipline common to the working-class vanguard. As an organization the Communist International no longer exists, but its cause lives on.

*In the Communist
and Workers' Parties*

Forthcoming Congress of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party

THE Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party has issued a set of documents highlighting the points to be discussed at the Party Congress which will open on November 30. This will be the Seventh Congress—this figure emphasizes the continuity of the revolutionary tradition in the Hungarian working-class movement and the fact that the Socialist Workers' Party is the heir to the Communist Party and to the Working People's Party which emerged from the fusing of the Communist and Social-Democratic parties.

The previous Congress was held in 1954. This means that the Central Committee's report will cover a long period, including the difficult days of the counter-revolutionary putsch. Naturally, not only the immediate causes of the counter-revolution but also matters relating to the preceding years will be discussed. The documents, therefore, sum up the important lessons of the 14 years since the Liberation, and analyze the outstanding events in the life of the Party.

Notwithstanding the grave errors committed during 1949-56, the years of people's democratic development were years of remarkable democratic and socialist gains made under the leadership of the Party. But beginning with 1949 the Rakosi cult developed in the Party. Vested with power Rakosi, who had had a record of fine service on behalf of the people, together with his immediate associates began to drift away from the Leninist standards of Party life. Turning a blind eye to law, and distorting the line of the Party, they gravely injured the cause of socialism. After 1953, the Imre Nagy revisionist group, cashing in on the Party's exposure of its mistakes, proclaimed the slogan of righting the wrongs. In an attempt to break up the Party the Nagy group sided with the class enemy and resorted to outright treachery.

In December 1956 the Central Committee gave a clear explanation of the reasons for the counter-revolution. This explanation is included in the theses for the Seventh Congress: "... The counter-revolution was generated by four closely interwoven factors—the mistakes made by the previous sectarian leadership of the Working People's Party,

the treachery of the Imre Nagy revisionist group, the internal counter-revolutionary forces of the bourgeoisie and, above all, international imperialism."

The lessons of suppressing the counter-revolution and the experience acquired in subsequent years of socialist consolidation pose a series of questions which are of paramount importance for the successful building of socialism, above all the question of the leading role of the Party. Under the difficult conditions of the all-out revisionist attacks the Party upheld the undeniable Marxist truth that unless the Party plays the leading role there can be no socialist construction. But to uphold this principle was not enough, it was likewise necessary thoroughly to analyze how this role should be carried out. Although the membership is now less than it was before the counter-revolution, the leading role of the Party has become more effective. The staunch and reliable members rallied around the Party during the struggle against the counter-revolution, while the careerists and other hostile elements were ejected. Gone too are several hundred thousand working people who for one reason or another showed indecision and lack of confidence, but who still support the aims of the Party. And, though their sympathy and support are appreciated, the Party nevertheless has become ideologically stronger as a result of shedding them. The forthcoming Congress will discuss what should be done to enhance the leading role of the Party, how the reduction in membership has affected its methods of work; new forms of work; the relationship between the Party and the mass organizations, and how to enhance the role of these organizations.

The past few years have amply confirmed the significance of political and organizational unity and, above all, of ideological unity. At one time this unity was disrupted by the dogmatic and revisionist trends then current in the Party. The rebuilding of the Party and the suppression of the counter-revolution were part and parcel of the struggle against these two trends. Both the counter-revolution and the struggle waged in the subsequent years demonstrated that the main danger came from revisionism which, as we all

know, has taken final shape in the views of the leaders of the Yugoslav Communist League. The struggle against deviations is still an important ideological task—sectarianism and revisionism still have roots in the Party. Erroneous trends are tenacious, they hang on and flare up at times. Consequently the Party regards ideological struggle on the two fronts as a task of both the preparatory work for and of the Congress itself.

The defeat of the counter-revolution and the progress made in recent years—progress greater than might have been expected—testify to the significance of one of the most important features of the Party—faith in the masses and in their loyalty to socialism. No matter what the difficulties were, the Party frankly and openly appealed to the people; it did so even when it had to oppose the incorrect demands put forward by those who were misled. The contact between the Party and the masses is characterized by growing confidence and sincerity. This is expressed in the greater initiative displayed by the masses, and in the trust reposed by the Party in the non-Party people devoted to people's democracy, who are encouraged to perform all leading state and public functions with the exception, of course, of Party functions. Building socialism is not a matter for the Communists alone, but of the community as a whole. More and more people are taking part in public life. The Patriotic Front movement, revitalized under Party leadership, is forging ahead. Through it, large masses of people are taking an active part in the political life of the country.

The Party, for which frankness and mutual trust is one of the principal guarantees of success now and in the future, highly appreciates these developments. For this reason it devotes close attention not only to preserving the gains, but to further improving its relations with the masses. These relations were harmed by sectarian errors which, although they have been overcome for the most part, still crop up from time to time. For example, one consequence of the successes achieved by socialism both nationally and internationally, was the development of complacency. The Party resolutely combats this and similar manifestations. Far from being satisfied with its achievements, it attentively studies where and how the contact with the masses has been consolidated, and how it can improve its methods and style of work in order to build up more confidence among the people.

The crushing of the counter-revolution and the economic rehabilitation were major political victories. At the moment economic and cultural construction are in the foreground and are acquiring decisive significance. In addition to the report of the Central Committee, the Congress will discuss the directives for the second five-year plan. Aided by the fraternal countries our people quickly made

good the damage caused by the enemy and are successfully coping with the three-year plan (1958-60). Fulfilment of this plan will clear the way for resolving the important socio-economic problems of the new five-year plan. Industrial output is at a higher level than it was before the counter-revolution; in agriculture the socialist sector includes half the cultivable land; by 1958, compared with 1955, real incomes of factory and office workers had risen 20 per cent. The structure of industry is more in line with the country's potentialities; management, too, has improved. These developments will enable us, in the course of the next five years (after 1960), to complete the foundations of socialism and to accelerate the building of socialist society. Slightly over a year remains before the three-year plan schedule runs out. The interval should be utilized most effectively, all the more so because there is every possibility that we shall considerably overfulfil the plan.

Work on the new five-year plan will not begin before 1961, so that now only the general outlines are being prepared. The draft directives envisage a 65-70 per cent growth of industrial output (as compared with 1958). Branches which do not require great expenditure of raw materials and electric power—for example, the chemical industry—and which therefore are particularly important and profitable, will develop at a faster rate. Labor productivity is scheduled to rise by 37-40 per cent. Whereas in the first five-year plan only one-third of the growth of output was achieved by means of greater labor productivity, the draft directives provide for a two-thirds increase by way of higher output per worker and one-third by means of greater employment. And since labor productivity depends primarily on technology, the Party is making technological progress the pivot of economic activity. Much has been done in this respect; centralized management and the incentives have yielded fruit, but the unused reserves are very great.

Capital investments will amount to at least 170-175 billion forints, 50 per cent more than under the first five-year plan. The greater part of these funds will be used for technological progress, and in the first place for renewing and extending the aggregate machine-tool plant and for developing new branches of industry. The accelerated growth of the national economy and a steady rise in the standard of living will necessitate more funds being allocated from the national income for production investments.

By 1965 agricultural output should increase 30-32 per cent compared with the average for the years 1954-58. At the same time the Party will work to win the individual peasants for co-operation to complete the socialist reconstruction of agriculture. To do this, and to do it in a way that will

ensure higher output, considerable investments will be needed. Compared with 1958 the tractor fleet will be doubled, and three times more fertilizer will be used. The aim is to achieve higher output primarily by developing the socialist sector. Hence attention is centered on increasing production and on consolidating the socialist sector which this year has shown a marked increase. This will pave the way for a planned advance.

By 1965 real income per capita will rise by 26-29 per cent, and consumption by 40-45 per cent. The standard of living of the less well-off will rise more quickly than that of the other sections. Much will be allocated for social and cultural needs, particularly housing. A fifteen-year plan **has been drawn up for a final solution of the housing problem.** Some 250,000 flats will be built in the next five years.

The Party insists on realistic and well-founded plans, and the Central Committee maintains that all conditions obtain for reaching and surpassing the goals now being set.

One of the guarantees of fulfilment of the plans is further improvement of economic management. Economic policy since the counter-revolution has been characterized by the desire to make management more effective, to abolish excessive centralism and do away with bureaucracy. But some of the old mistakes typical of the past still occur: there are, for example, instances where the autonomy of local authorities has been underrated, to say nothing of cases of bureaucracy. The Party is taking steps to ensure that economic management keeps abreast of the initiative and enthusiasm of the masses, that everything hindering realization of the correct policy is resolutely eliminated.

In cultural construction too we have impressive plans. Continuation of the cultural revolution is an important condition for accelerated socialist construction. The country has to its credit important achievements in education, science, literature and the arts. Particularly gratifying is the interest shown by teachers in Marxism-Leninism.

The intellectuals, who were ideologically most affected by the counter-revolution, work in what can be described as a generally healthy atmosphere. The unions of art and literary workers, including the Writers' Union, have been re-established. But there are still weaknesses on the ideological and cultural fronts. Quite an important section of the intellectuals, including scientists and educational workers, have not yet mastered Marxism-Leninism and are exposed to the influence of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois views. Progress is hampered by the survivals of capitalist views, by the way of thinking of the urban petty bourgeoisie and peasants. Even among the more backward sections of the working class, petty-bourgeois ideology, individualism and indifference to public interests are encountered.

The Congress will discuss how to strengthen Marxism-Leninism in all spheres of public life, how more actively to combat bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideology.

Much more attention will be paid to public education, to the preparation of a school reform and its subsequent implementation, to improving trade skills and the political knowledge of the workers.

Past experience obliges us to devote special attention to proletarian internationalism. The Congress will be held at a time when the socialist countries are winning victories of worldwide importance, when the Communist parties, after repelling the revisionist onslaughts against the unity of the socialist camp, have closed their ranks. The experience of the Socialist Workers' Party testifies to the decisive importance of proletarian internationalism for each of the socialist countries and to the harm which can be caused by revisionist and nationalist views. The pre-Congress activity and the discussion of the Congress materials show that the Seventh Congress will reinforce the spirit of proletarian internationalism among the Hungarian Communists, and facilitate still closer relations with the fraternal parties.

The People of Portugal Step Up the Struggle

THE policy of the Salazar dictatorship is resulting in growing impoverishment for the people. The numbers of jobless and those working short time are growing notwithstanding the emigration. Factories are being closed; production in the mining industry declined 20 per cent in the past year. Many small and medium trading enterprises are being closed. Agricultural output shrank by 10 per cent in the past year. About six thousand landlords own half the land, while well-nigh a million peasants are landless. More and more small owners are going bankrupt.

Relying for support on the home and foreign monopolies, primarily American, Salazar has opened the doors of the country and of the Portuguese colonies to them. The establishment of land, naval and air commands in the colonies and the despatch of fresh military contingents to them have only served to aggravate the situation.

Popular discontent is assuming more active forms. Fishermen in Matozinhos, Povoia do Varzim, Afurada, Murtosa and Vila do Conde fought a seventy-day strike. Almost every day thousands of strikers and their wives marched in demonstrations, warmly supported by the workers of the canning industry, by shop-keepers and the people of the northern coast. The strike was a splendid example of staunchness and unity.

Some 2,000 dockers, 4,500 fishermen and 2,900 transport workers and office employees in Oporto won wage increases after a prolonged struggle. The strike movement is being joined by miners in Aljustrel and S. Domingos; metal workers in Lisbon, Santaren, Braga and Viana de Castelo; textile workers in Oporto, Minho, Covilhao and Tortosendo; by building trades workers, railwaymen, bakers, workers of the chemical, ceramics and cork industries, fishermen in the Algarve Province, and by agricultural laborers in Alpiarca and Alentejo.

Intellectuals are fighting for abolition of the censorship, for the solution of their specific problems, and for the democratization of education and justice. Students, who have established a National Students' Movement, are calling for educational reform, reduction of fees, freedom of association and academic freedom for the universities.

Small and middle landowners, manufacturers and traders are protesting against the unbearable tax burden. Discontent with Salazar's anti-national policy is growing in the armed forces. People are indignant at government propaganda which lauds Americo Tomas who became president as a result of rigged elections. In an attempt to show that the

President enjoys popular sympathy, the authorities timed his visit to Oporto, Braga, Aveiro and Vila Franca de Xira to coincide with the big turn-outs for local celebrations. To the embarrassment of the organizers, the President's arrival was greeted with thousands of anti-Salazar manifestoes and leaflets; slogans on the streets read: "Clear out!"; "Down with Americo Tomas, the Puppet President!"; "Down with Salazar!"; "Amnesty! Amnesty! Amnesty! Amnesty!."

Last May eight thousand students, workers and soldiers demonstrated in Castelo Branco; other demonstrations took place in Couco, Nenavila and Aviz, in Coimbra, Lisbon and Oporto; soldiers' families protested in Beja against their relatives being sent to the colonies in India; an artillery regiment in Sacaven mutinied.

In Catholic circles, too, there is growing opposition, and Salazar's supporters, such as the Archbishop of Evora, are losing prestige among the faithful. There is growing mistrust for the regime also among national capitalists and bankers. Many capitalists have refused to have anything to do with government measures both at home and in the colonies.

Recently the Central Committee of the Communist Party called on the people, on all the anti-Salazar forces, to organize peaceful action on a national scale to force Salazar to go, and to win democratic liberties.

The appeal called for a peaceful solution of the country's problems, for Salazar's removal from office without civil war. The possibility of a peaceful solution, the appeal continued, was pointed out by the opposition candidates for the presidency; it was expressed in statements put out by democrats in Braga and Beira, and in a document signed by forty well-known personalities, including six clergymen. Salazar and his clique, however, are retaliating with reprisals, torture, shootings and wholesale arrests; by proclaiming a state of siege (as was the case in Sousel). They are bent on provoking violence, in the course of which they hope to crush the popular movement. "The fascist resistance," reads the Communist appeal, "may compel our people, anxious though they are to achieve the necessary political change without a profound upheaval, to use force which will end once and for all the privileges of the ruling clique."

Stressing that responsibility for the violence rests solely with the ruling bourgeoisie, the Central Committee explains what should be done in order to resolve the political problem peacefully. The main thing is "that all the anti-Salazar forces—

from Communists to Liberal Monarchists, all who want a different government and a different regime—should unite in a militant front for the attainment of a single goal: the replacement of Salazar and the formation of a widely-representative government capable of realizing the ideas expressed in the electoral programs of the opposition candidates. . . . Given broad unity the present campaign against Salazar could develop rapidly, and a powerful national action which would further sap the regime, could be organized in a relatively short period of time."

The masses are beginning to realize the significance of the unity of the anti-Salazar forces. "Consequently the people are saying with every justification: if the Communists, Socialists, Republicans, Conservative Democrats, Liberal Monarchists and even many of those who have supported Salazar, want to change the destiny of our country, if all of them fight in one way or another against the Salazar dictatorship, then why do they not combine in a united militant front? Why do they not organize a broad national movement for the overthrow of Salazar?"

The document examines the reasons why the desired unity is hampered. There are some who wish to achieve political changes without the people. Although they protest against violence and lawlessness, their efforts are doomed to failure because they represent exclusive groups who fear the people. Others prefer a purely military solution and even terror. Salazar has always suppressed such actions for they have never won the support of the people. Still others fear that the downfall of Salazar would be followed by a "vacuum," that the masses who have endured thirty years of oppression and exploitation, would wreak vengeance on their oppressors. Not everyone is aware that Salazar has broken his links with the national bourgeoisie, that he has become a stooge of the monopolies.

However, the main obstacle to unity is the anti-communism propagated by the ruling clique. Anti-communism has always been the main instrument used by the Salazar regime to stave off unity of the opposition forces. The Communists are always the first victims of repressions; it is against them that the propaganda machine daily pours out its slander. Even the ideological opponents of the Communists are forced to admit their courage. Dozens of clergymen, protesting against repressions, recently addressed a letter to Salazar admitting that ". . . the courage and spiritual staunchness with which the Communists, for the sake of their ideal, endure violence and persecution arouse the admiration of the people. . . ."

The Central Committee states that in resorting to anti-communism the government is trying to turn the national bourgeoisie against the working

class, to convince them that the present regime is the sole barrier to communism. "Adamantly resisting any wage increase even when the employers agree to it, making the wage freeze the cornerstone of its economic policy, the government is trying might and main to sharpen the class antagonism between the non-monopoly bourgeoisie and the working people in town and countryside in order to prevent their alliance in the national struggle against the Salazar regime. . . ." The Communist Party points out that sometimes this propaganda has its effect, so much so that some sections of the national bourgeoisie reject alliance with the Communists.

The Party, refuting the slanders of government propaganda, is doing all it can to develop legal action for the demands of the working people; it proclaims a policy of reconciliation and peaceful settlement of the national problem. "At present all the aspirations of the Communist Party are centered on the fight for democratic liberties, for better conditions for the people and a system under which they themselves could determine their destiny. . . . All future revolutionary social changes can take place only by the will of the people, a will which the Communist Party has always respected and will continue to respect." The appeal declares that: "The policy of the Portuguese Communists does not pursue secret aims. Their aim is to rally the people against Salazar, for democracy and social progress."

The Party is proposing national peaceful action for the replacement of Salazar. "This action, the date of which will be fixed jointly by all the democratic and anti-Salazar forces . . . should be the immediate task of the entire opposition, and all efforts should be directed towards its realization. . . ."

"This action can assume various forms: petitions, demonstrations outside the offices of the local authorities, work stoppages, closing of shops and schools, boycott of city transport and entertainments, street demonstrations, meetings at the point of production and in educational establishments—all leading to a political strike which would paralyze the actions of Salazar and his clique."

The Party holds that in the event that this action, in which the decisive role must be played by the working class and all working people, is a success, it can lead to the removal of Salazar and the establishment of a new, widely representative government capable of restoring democratic liberties and taking the country along the path of progress. "The objective conditions obtain for this action, all that is needed is that the democratic and anti-Salazar forces negotiate immediately."

The Communist Party's call has met with an impressive response. Hundreds of thousands of copies of manifestoes, leaflets and placards are being

circulated all over the country, walls are covered with inscriptions calling for the resignation of Salazar. A sign of the growing unity is the fact that Communists, Socialists, Republicans, Liberal

Monarchists, Catholics and even many of those who recently supported Salazar, are acting jointly against the repressions and calling for a general amnesty for the political prisoners.

Overcoming Sectarian Errors

IN THE past the Communists in Brazil adopted a wrong attitude towards the trade unions. Since the unions were run by employers and the Ministry of Labor and headed by their stooges, the Communists abandoned all work in the unions. An attempt to establish parallel unions proved for the most part ineffective. The outcome was that the Communists found themselves cut off from the working masses, and their influence declined.

Seven years ago this wrong approach was changed and its consequences are being overcome. In 1952 the Party adopted a resolution entitled "Unity and Organization of the Working Class" which trenchantly criticized the wrong attitude in relation to the unions. The new approach was: work in the unions, since these mass organizations, irrespective of their leadership, unite the proletariat whose interests the Communists are called upon to defend.

Our object is to win new members for the unions, to strengthen the working-class organizations and to achieve organizational unity throughout the country. At the same time we support unity achieved at lower levels in the fight for economic, social and political demands. The Communists work not only in each local trade union, but also in the federations and confederations. They realize the need to improve the leadership of the unions by electing the best representatives of the working class and thus turn the unions into instruments of struggle of the working people. Having abandoned their sectarianism, the Communists are working actively in the enterprises, campaigning for unity at meetings, conferences and congresses, seeking to unite Catholics, Trabalhistas* and non-affiliated workers around their demands. Thanks to these efforts, united action has been achieved on the national plane; this unity is spreading from the socio-economic front to the political field. Communists are being elected to leading positions in the unions and their prestige is growing.

A few examples of the work carried out by Communists in Sao Paulo will illustrate the benefits of their new approach. Their efforts to establish closer contact between various categories of the working people and to achieve a unified leadership which would co-ordinate their actions, have

produced new forms of organization. Thus, there appeared the Inter-Trade-Union-Unity Pact which united over 125 unions representing most of the trades in the state. The organization founded on the basis of this Pact guides the economic, social and political struggle. Workers all over the country are closely following its work. Although the Pact has not been officially recognized by the Ministry of Labor, which opposed its formation, its prestige is such that the government is often forced to turn to it.

Many congresses have been held recently in Sao Paulo—those of the metal and textile workers, bank clerks and others. The Communists took part in preparing these congresses.

Along with the work in leading trade union bodies, we are paying more attention to work in the enterprises. Here, however, we still have shortcomings, and we are aware that our success in the leading bodies is not always the result of our good work among the rank and file. But effective united action can be achieved only with the active support of thousands of working people.

The trade unions are now being attacked by reactionary propaganda emanating from official circles and from the U.S. Embassy and consulates, and also from some religious groups. Despite the variety of means employed, this propaganda has only one aim—to befuddle the minds of the working people with anti-communism. We on our part are intensifying educational work. Some of the unions have arranged classes on political economy, and conferences and talks are being held on current problems. In Sao Paulo there is an inter-trade-union department of the social sciences which studies socio-economic and political problems and supplies the unions with research material for use in talks with workers. These talks have proved very popular.

Now there is hardly an important political problem that does not attract the attention of the working people and their unions which, as a rule, exert a considerable influence on the march of events. We could mention the struggle waged by the working class against soaring prices, in defense of the state monopoly of oil and rubber, against imperialism, and in defense of democratic liberties and peace. Indicative in this respect was the first conference of the working people of Sao Paulo which was convened to discuss the struggle

*Members and supporters of the Trabalhista (Workers') Party, the party of former President Getulio Vargas.

against high prices and which provided a good example of united action.

Soaring prices, which weigh heavily on the workers, are the source of growing alarm all over the country. The unions decided to convene a special conference on the prices issue. The Communists wanted to impart a broad character to the struggle, since high prices also affect landowners, cattle-breeders and shopkeepers. We explained the reasons for the high cost of living and their close relationship with the policy imposed on us by the North American trusts. This approach gave the movement an anti-imperialist character. In addition to the unions the conference was sponsored by shopkeepers, landowners, students and representatives of various organizations. It was warmly supported by many organizations which co-operated in drawing up the rules and draft resolutions. The conference, which lasted three days, was attended by about a thousand delegates representing six workers' federations, 80 trade unions, 46 societies of different kinds, sports clubs, two students' associations, three women's and three peasants' organizations, ten local legislatures, the Chamber of Commerce, a grain firm, a shopkeepers' association, the Catholic Church, etc. The conference met with wide response all over the country and contributed to establishing a united front with anti-imperialist features.

Recent months have witnessed a big campaign for higher wages, for social insurance legislation,

and the right to strike; against rising prices and police interference in trade union affairs. In Rio de Janeiro and Sao Paulo the struggle has been joined by over a million working people. Their actions are characterized by better organization and new forms of struggle. Recently, for example, the main unions in Rio de Janeiro and Sao Paulo formed a "permanent assembly" to fight for the adoption of social insurance legislation.

The growing cohesion and awareness of the working-class movement is the result of objective factors which prompt the masses to take more vigorous action in defense of their rights. But we should not underestimate the work done by political forces, above all by the Communists, who are educating and organizing the working people.

The Communists are exerting every effort to get rid of the last vestiges of sectarianism which in the past caused so much harm. The Party recently published a document entitled "The Working-Class Movement and Communist Policy in the Trade Unions" which condemns the sectarian mistakes of the past, sums up the first successes in the trade unions, and outlines a broad program of action among the masses. Thus equipped, the working class, led by its vanguard, will be able to take an active part in the general struggle for the solution of important national problems, for the economic independence of the country and well-being of its people.

Antonio SANTOS

Problems Encountered by Party Members in a Factory

THESE remarks are about problems our rank and file face in a middle-sized factory where business machines are made, employing about 1,300 workers, 900 of whom are manual workers. Here I shall not speak about the clerical and office workers, for unfortunately they are quite separate from the manual workers and do not consider that they have the same problems. They, lacking organized strength, remain weak and dependent upon the employer.

Among the manual workers there is about 100 per cent membership of the trade unions, mostly the Amalgamated Engineering Union. The political background of most of these workers is based upon acceptance of the British political system as being the most democratic possible. They are accustomed to seeing government alternating between the two large political parties, Labor and Conservative, and do not see that this is an illusion of democracy, that real power has always remained

in the hands of the capitalist class. This, together with the relatively good standard of living enjoyed since the end of the last war, with the absence of large-scale unemployment, accounts for the fact that the previous periods of mass unemployment (such as in the 1930's) are either not known or are forgotten. Political news and developments come to them from the radio, television and newspapers, either owned or controlled by the capitalist class.

This does not mean that they support capitalism. They know that the capitalist class has always exploited them and their fathers before them and they wish to end this. The majority of them vote for the Labor Party at election time. The Social-Democratic leadership persuades them that in order to end capitalist exploitation there is no need to change the political system. The majority of the trade union leadership in the factory are

Social Democratic in outlook, but there is no Labor Party organization in the factory.

There is a small group of Communists in this factory and, as a result of their work, also a core of workers who understand and support the viewpoint of the Communist Party on most questions. These Party members are acknowledged as active trade unionists utterly loyal to the working class. About 20 per cent of the shop stewards are Communists. The negotiating committee, which is elected each year at a general meeting of shop stewards and which negotiates directly with the factory management, is made up of seven shop stewards, two of whom are Communists.

How do the Communist Party members work in this situation?

Their task is to counteract capitalist propaganda and to explain to the workers the correct working-class viewpoint. Here are examples illustrating how we try to overcome the erroneous views current among the workers.

A worker who reads the *Daily Express*, a capitalist newspaper, spoke to his friend (a Communist) complaining that the nationalized coal industry had run at a loss that year, and so nationalization must be a bad thing for the country. "The capitalists would not have suffered a loss if they had been running it," he said.

The Communist showed him a copy of the *Daily Worker* which contained the financial report of the coal industry, and pointed out to him that the industry had suffered a loss solely because many thousands of pounds had been paid to the former owners; had it not been for this, the industry would have made profit. This worker also did not know until the Communist told him, that before the war when the coal industry was still privately owned, it was in a critical condition because of lack of proper machinery, and profit was made only out of the inhuman conditions in which the miners worked. After a few talks of this kind this worker became a regular reader of the *Daily Worker*.

Another worker, who reads the *Daily Herald* (the so-called Labor paper owned by capitalist publishers), was arguing with a Communist. He said: "Why do you Communists say that the last Labor government was not a socialist government — did it not take the coal industry away from its private owners and make it a state industry — isn't that socialist?"

The Communist explained that the coal industry was so obsolete that it was unprofitable for the capitalists and the Labor government had to take it over, otherwise crisis would have resulted. This suited the former owners quite well, for the Labor government was prepared to pay them good compensation, which it did. Why did the

Conservative government not give the coal mines back to the former owners when it came to power afterwards? Also, why did the Labor government not nationalize industries which were in a sound condition and making good profits for the private owners? In the end the worker agreed with the Communist. These and similar questions make the workers ponder over things which they are daily fed by the capitalist press.

The most important help in our work is the *Daily Worker*. An important aspect of our work is selling this newspaper. In the morning when papers are brought to the factory, each Party member distributes a certain number of copies among his work-mates before they start work. The money is collected at the end of the week. Gradually, the number of papers sold grows. Now some 60 workers take a copy each day. In addition to these an unknown number of workers also see the paper in the course of a day. Each month a sum of money averaging £5 is sent from the factory to the paper's Fighting Fund. The money comes from weekly collections made for that purpose, and donations are frequently made by workers who do not read the paper but have a general understanding and approval of what it stands for.

When discussions occur, the Party comrades follow them up by showing the workers copies of the *Daily Worker*, and thus they raise their interest in it. Our experiences in gaining readers for our paper vary from person to person. Some workers like it because it is a serious and dependable paper and always has articles from which they can learn. But also there are workers who quite agree with Communist policy, but do not want to read the *Daily Worker* because they find it requires more studious reading, and they class it as being "too dull." It is certainly true that were the *Daily Worker* a larger paper it could carry a greater variety of articles, and undoubtedly we must try to make it as colorful as possible, but we do not turn our backs on those who do not take our paper, for they as a rule reflect their years of experience of capitalist newspapers. The capitalist newspapers aim at directing the workers' attention away from the important items of news and for this purpose print humorous and sensational articles, cartoons and comic strips. Our general experience is that when we help those who find it difficult to read the Communist paper at first, and explain things to them, most become permanent readers fairly quickly. However, even those in the factory who read the *Daily Worker* also continue to read a capitalist paper of one sort or another.

After workmates have been reading the *Daily Worker* for a time it is possible to have discus-

sions with them at a more advanced political level. But we do not delude ourselves, for although a man can agree with us on many issues certain basic ideas can still remain.

One man who has been a reader of our paper for a long time was asked to join the Party. He said he would not. This was a surprise, but later we realized how much was needed to overcome the ideas instilled by capitalist propaganda. When asked the reason why, he replied that he had a fear that he might lose some of his freedom if the Communist Party came to power. He said that he felt there would be greater discipline in the factories and he was not sure if he wished this. Also, one could fight against the imposition of discipline by the capitalist class, but would one, or could one, under communism? In short, the worker was thinking about utterly different conditions, in terms of capitalism to which he is accustomed. It is not so easy for everyone to realize what life will be like when the working class comes to power. It was interesting to note that this worker supported the Communist Party, and when he was shown how illogical his standpoint was, he agreed that this was so, but still there was a feeling that we failed to convince him.

Another comrade we failed to persuade at once said he would not join the Party because he was not prepared to give up his leisure time for political work. "The people," he said, "don't deserve it. They can see as well as I what ought to be done but they are too selfish to do it. They will stand aside and watch others do their fighting for them." After discussion this comrade agreed that his attitude was wrong, but we realized that he was still not prepared to join the Party.

We often feel that a person should not be hurried, that time is needed for his political growth. In these circumstances we appreciate the support that this comrade gives the Party, maintain close and friendly relations and continue to work patiently with him.

Another man, also a strong supporter, said one day: "Why cannot the Communist Party change its name. People would listen to you more readily then. As it is, they are so prejudiced, you only have to mention communism and they close their ears. If the Party changed its name, things would be easier." We explained to this comrade that the press, radio, and television attacks us because of our policy which is spearheaded against capitalism and in defense of the workers and whatever name we called ourselves, they would still attack us. If they had managed to blacken the name of communism this only showed their propaganda had succeeded where ours had not, and the only way forward was to fight harder against capitalist propaganda and to be proud of being called a Communist.

Many cases can be cited of workers who are at the threshold of the Party but are so confused that they still have not taken the step of joining. The new members we have won in the recent past were rather different cases. They were younger men, free from Social-Democratic ideas, who decided to join the Party without great personal difficulty. Their political views have been moulded as a result of the work of the Party organization, and under the impact of developments. It is perhaps of interest to note here that our present Party members joined either before, during or immediately after the war, or are new members; no one appears to have joined between 1950 and 1958.

Our Communists are all active members. Much of the good work they do is of a trade union nature. They are to the fore in getting improved working conditions in the factory and are considered to be good shop stewards. We must put our Party organization into the forefront so that collective discussion of all factory questions takes place and a lead given to the workers on these questions. We must be seen by the workers as an organized political party and not as individual Communists.

John HILL
Factory shop steward

Short Notices

Belgium

COMBATING THE MONOPOLY OFFENSIVE

ONE of the results of the strike in Borinage last February was that the government and the employers promised to close the mines only when suitable alternative employment would be found for the redundant miners. Now it appears that the government is about to abandon its promise. The contemplated closing of 34 pits will leave 27,000 miners jobless and entail additional redundancy at auxiliary enterprises.

The enlarged meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party held recently in the coal-mining centre of Charleroi and attended by trade unionists and miners discussed ways and means of combating the closures. The resolution regards this struggle as the most pressing task and calls on all Communists, Socialists and Catholics to take part in it. Given unity of action by the miners, technicians, workers of other industries and shopkeepers whose livelihood depends on the conditions of the workers, the working people will be stronger than the handful of monopolists, and victory will be secured.

The Central Committee calls for unity in the struggle to prevent any closing of mines during the time needed for consultation in the country and in Parliament on the status of the pits (during this consultation workers' representatives will submit their own proposals for reforms); for the early convening of both Houses of Parliament to hear the government's reports on arbitrary acts which imperil the future of the country; for legislation prohibiting the closing of enterprises; for guaranteed subsistence for the workers at the expense of the employers wherever dismissals take place, and weekly benefits of 700 francs for the unemployed.

The Central Committee maintains that the time is ripe for the Belgian trade unions to establish contact with those of "Little Europe" with a view to pooling their efforts in the fight against the European Coal and Steel Community and the Common Market.

The Communist Party is conducting a campaign to explain its policy. In Borinage the Communists organized a motorcade equipped with loudspeakers to explain the Party's proposals for the coal industry. In the General Federation of Labor the Communists are working hard for

unity of action. Communist members of Parliament have spoken in defense of the workers and have exposed the anti-labor policy of the government.

U.S.A.

TWO-MONTH 40th ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION

THE 40th anniversary of the Communist Party was observed in a number of towns and cities here. Two thousand people attended a rally in New York. The hall was decorated with posters and slogans calling for an end to the cold war, for banning nuclear tests and outlawing the manufacture and use of atomic weapons. One slogan urged peaceful coexistence and friendship with the Soviet Union. Another called for support of Negro rights in schools and in housing and for an end to segregation. Still others stressed that a socialist America signifies peace, economic security, equality and affluence.

Eugene Dennis, National Secretary of the Party, spoke about the historic significance of the Khrushchov-Eisenhower meeting. The American Communists, Dennis said, would work together with all progressive and democratic forces to bury the H-bomb in this decade and secure universal peace.

In a message to the meeting William Z. Foster, Honorary Chairman of the Party, called for a revival of the militant spirit of fighters for socialism, for active participation in building the party of socialism in the United States.

The atmosphere at the meeting was one of enthusiasm. For the first time in many years a meeting of the Communist Party was reported in the capitalist press.

The statement issued by the National Committee on the occasion of the 40th anniversary said: "That the Communist Party has survived every attack and that its enemies cannot succeed in their efforts to destroy it is due to the fact that it owes its existence not to sinister machinations or conspiracies, but to the class struggle which, in this as in every other capitalist country, inevitably gives birth to a working-class political party guided by the principles of scientific socialism."

The National Committee has decided to mark the 40th anniversary by a two-month celebration in the course of which steps will be taken to strengthen the unity of the Party, its contact with the masses, and to educate the members so that they can confidently look forward, and step out "more firmly on the road ahead."

SOLIDARITY WITH C.P. OF ARGENTINA

A MESSAGE of fraternal solidarity from the Central Committee of the French Communist Party to the Communist Party of Argentina in connection with the banning of the latter reads:

"Repressions launched in Argentina against the Communists, against the working-class press and organizations, testify to the impotence of the financial and landed oligarchy which is closely linked with foreign imperialists and which is trying to unload the burden of its reactionary policy onto the masses and to doom them to rigid economy. By its repressive measures against the Communists the Government wants to prevent the Party from taking part in the forthcoming election—a sign that it fears the popular discontent.

"Faced with this situation the Communist Party is working hard to achieve unity of the working class and united action by the masses, and shows the path which should be taken in order to effect the change in policy needed by the country.

"The French Communists greet their Argentine brothers who are marching in the front ranks of the fight for independence, peace and socialism."

Federal Republic of Germany

CIRCULATING THE ILLEGAL PRESS

THE 150th number of *Freies Volk*, central organ of the Communist Party, appeared in August, on the third anniversary of the banning of the Party. During all this time the paper has been regularly circulated among the different sections. Lately Communist publications have increased in number—this year alone another 50 illegal papers, 28 of which are factory and 16 district papers, have appeared. There is now a paper for agricultural laborers. With a view to establishing contact with Social Democrats some Party organizations are putting out special papers. Thus, the Rhein-Wupper District Party Committee is putting out a paper entitled *Der Sozialist*; in Hagen there is *Die Linke* (The Left), and in Duesseldorf—*Der Feind steht rechts* (The Enemy from the Right). Sales, while not always the same, tend to grow. Particular increases are achieved during political campaigns. During the Landtag elections in Schleswig-Holstein the local Communist paper *Norddeutsches Echo* increased its circulation by 30,000.

Party members are always on the lookout for new ways of distributing their publications. On the anniversary of the banning of the Party, some

France

3,000 copies of the paper issued by the Recklinghausen District Party Committee were distributed by attaching bundles to trees. Passers-by took them as if from a newsstand. The police moved into action but too late—not a single copy was left on the trees. In some factories in Aachen leaflets against atomic armament were put up on hooks on the walls, so that each worker could pick one for himself. This "self-service" device is exceedingly popular with the workers.

A recent issue of *Badisches Volksecho*, a local Communist paper, carried an interview with a young worker who always finds *Freies Volk* and other Party publications in his mailbox. "Who supplies me with the Communist Party publications I don't know, but I am always glad when I find them in the box and I pass them on to my friends. From these materials we have satisfied ourselves that the Communist Party alone really champions our interests. My friends and I look forward to every number of the paper. And if I only knew our supplier, I would discuss some points with him."

Originality and initiative are features of the work of distributing the illegal Party newspapers.

Chile

A REGIONAL COMMITTEE NEWSPAPER

THE national paper of the Communist Party of Chile reaches Punta Arenas, capital of the Magallanes province in the extreme south of the country and about 1,500 miles distant from Santiago, only after great delay. Sending the paper by airmail adds to its cost and hampers distribution. Moreover, the national paper cannot, for obvious reasons, cover all the issues, even the most important, affecting the southern part of the country.

Last year the Regional Party Committee decided to publish a local paper, *Avance*. Numerous difficulties, both financial and technical, had to be overcome. The south, more so than any other part of the country, was affected by the postwar anti-communist repressions and the banning of the Communist Party (1948-50). Contact and influence were maintained only among the miners and among the middle sections in Punta Arenas.

Although two bourgeois dailies have a fairly big circulation in the province, the Communist paper is becoming increasingly popular. At first, some of its articles, too general in character, did not deeply analyze local problems. But it improved with time and its prestige rose so that now it has a constant and fairly wide readership. It is sold by Party members and by special groups drawn

from the Communist Youth League. Available also on some of the usual newsstands, it is sold out and more copies could be disposed of were it not for technical difficulties. The paper has re-established contact between the Party and the workers in many enterprises, especially in the oil fields—the basic industry on Tierra del Fuego.

The paper has many voluntary correspondents in the enterprises, including those in which there is not as yet a Party organization; it has still to establish itself in the countryside.

The launching of the paper and its successful work are due in large measure to Communist-Socialist co-operation. The Socialist, Communist and a number of other influential parties are united in a Popular Action Front which was formed after the conclusion of a Unity Pact. Socialists are helping the paper in many ways. The print-shop, for example, is located in the premises of the Socialist Party Committee, and some Socialists help to distribute the paper. At the end of 1958, when police action was taken against the paper, the Socialist Party protested jointly with the Communists. The authorities had to give way, pleading that a police official had "exceeded his duties."

The Communist and Socialist parties have conducted joint campaigns against the so-called hunger law, for the economic demands of the southern workers, in defence of oil, etc. An important part in these campaigns was played by *Avance*.

Japan

WINNING NEW MEMBERS

THE Central Committee of the Communist Party of Japan, after having discussed the results of the local elections and those to the House of Councillors, has sent a letter to all Party members urging them to build and strengthen the ranks of the Party.

The letter noted that joint action by the democratic forces was a feature of the election campaign. In some places the Party nominated its own candidates, in others it did so jointly with the Socialist Party. As a result the two parties won more votes than in the previous elections, gaining

eight seats in the House. The Communist Party, however, did not get the anticipated number of votes and seats. This is explained not only by the intensified drive of the reactionaries and by the dithering of the Socialist Party which evaded active struggle against reaction, but also by the shortcomings of the Party—poor contact with the masses and the weakness and passivity of some of its organizations.

In the growing struggle the Party was now a force which could not be disregarded. But in order to justify the trust and hopes of the working people it was necessary to increase the membership, to make the Party a really mass party and to improve its organization. "Notwithstanding the extremely difficult conditions, we have millions of loyal supporters. This is a solid base on which it is possible to strengthen and extend the Party. If we neglect this base and notice only the difficulties, we will never build a strong party. . . . We must get rid of the fear of difficulties, overcome these difficulties, advance and win. In this lies the pride and glory of Communists. Unfortunately, however, our Party, having experienced numerous hardships and trials, has become accustomed to a membership of a few tens of thousands. For a long time it has not conducted planned work to build a strong party, which would be the true vanguard of the working class."

The Central Committee strongly criticized the so-called "theory of spontaneous growth," and stressed that in order to extend and consolidate the Party it was not enough to have a clear-cut political line, a program of action and rules—needed also was a systematic and sustained effort by the Party as a whole and by each member.

The letter calls for doubling the membership before the next congress, for strengthening and activating the branches, for a bigger circulation of the Party press and for sharply improved propaganda.

The C.C.'s decision and its letter have met with a warm response on the part of the members. They are being discussed throughout the Party and the organizations are drawing up plans to improve work among all sections of the population. New branches are being formed in the factories and in the rural areas.

WORK AMONG THE YOUTH

The New in Our Movement

The Editorial Board requested youth leaders from a number of capitalist countries to share their experiences.

Each national youth movement has its own special features arising from the peculiarities, traditions and the stage of development of the country. These, naturally, were reflected in the points made by the comrades.

In publishing the talks with Renzo Trivelli (Italy), Arnolfo Piniera (Argentina), and Sarda Mitra (India), the Editorial Board invites readers to express their views on work among the youth.

Renzo Trivelli

NUMEROUS questionnaires, articles and a broad discussion in the press—all devoted to youth questions—indicate that the relations between the young people and society, their way of life and their thinking, are attracting more and more attention in the capitalist countries, including Italy.

The bourgeois press and sociologists are more interested in the sensational aspects, such as rowdiness and violence, although these, of course, are not the basic aspects of the life of the rising generation. Still it would be wrong to disregard the apathy now prevalent among youth in relation to the problems posed by life, their openly cynical attitude to political and moral values. Some sociologists believe that a kind of conflict has arisen between society and some sections of the youth. They incline to the view that some young people, seeing no purpose in the life of the world around them, take refuge in solitude and passive protest. Although such sentiments are far from being decisive, they cannot be ignored.

In Italy, in recent years, far-reaching socioeconomic changes have created new conditions for the teenagers. The first thing to note is the radical change in the social structure of the countryside. As a result of the agrarian crisis and growing monopoly rule, the zones where farm laborers were traditionally employed have disintegrated. The ruin of the smallholders and sharecroppers led to the impoverishment of vast agricultural areas. Large capitalist farms began to appear. Hundreds of thousands of young peasants, unable to find employment on the land, leave the countryside for the towns or go abroad in search of work. In many areas the young farm laborers, mostly unskilled, have been replaced by tractor drivers and others who have specialized in crop-growing, etc. Thus, new problems are cropping up, and we must reorganize our work accordingly.

The appearance of new branches of industry in recent years (which were characterized by favorable business activity) has resulted in the working class being reinforced. At present there are some 500,000 apprentices and young workers in Italy. These youngsters came to the factories for various reasons. Of no small importance was the fact that employers prefer to take on young people, who master the new techniques more quickly, and that the trade unions forced Parliament to adopt a law on the status of the apprentices.

But the social consequences of these changes, far from solving the problems of youth, have added to them. Youth unemployment (some 500,000 young men and women are looking for their first jobs) is a chronic feature. Those lucky enough to get jobs become the object of ruthless exploitation. They arrive in the factories after careful selection, and often replace political "suspects." Their industrial training is inadequate; their knowledge lags far behind modern requirements, largely because of the high fees charged for vocational training.

Thus the life of the young people is rendered gloomy by mass unemployment, abject poverty, intensified exploitation, restriction and even denial of democratic rights to large numbers of them. All this, naturally, is reflected in the mood of the young people, makes them despondent, dissatisfied, uncertain of the morrow and impels some to seek an outlet in reckless protests or to withdraw into their shells.

The new situation poses new problems both in trade union and in political work. In those places where the Communist Party, the unions and the Communist youth organizations have properly assessed the situation, where they direct their efforts in the right way, there has been a distinct rise in the activity of the young people. The new entrants into industry who, although they had been

thoroughly screened, encountered discrimination, soon became aware of the reality of class struggle. Most of them, naturally, sided with those who defend their rights in the fight against the employers. This circumstance has had its effect on the youth as a whole.

This brings us to a new feature—the participation of students in the working-class struggle. In Florence, Ancona, Civitavecchia and Nocera, in a word, wherever the workers were fighting against factory closures and curtailment of production, the students rallied to their support and conducted strikes. This shows that a new attitude to the working class is developing among the students.

For this there are a number of reasons. First, the social base of education has been extended: more working-class and peasant children are now attending school, although illiteracy, the absence of compulsory education and the defects in the educational system are still strongly felt. Second, the students are beginning to realize that they can find a place in society only in a regenerated Italy. And, finally, our political work has not been in vain. We placed before the students not only their own particular problems but also the need for a close alliance between them and the working people for the regeneration of society.

Bitter experience impels the young people to seek the unity and mutual understanding so essential for the solution of their pressing problems. And here we come to a question which requires special consideration. In the conditions of Western Europe it is imperative not only to organize a strong Communist youth movement but also to achieve the broadest possible unity of all the youth.

In Italy, as in other West European countries, there are broad Catholic and Social-Democratic youth movements. And even where there are no organized movements of this kind, the ideological influence of Catholicism and Social Democracy should not be underestimated. Is understanding and co-operation with these movements possible? Is it possible through this co-operation to bring the unorganized youth into action? We say yes, and we have ample grounds for our confidence.

The different youth movements tend to co-operate in the fight for their particular issues, for peace and socio-political reforms. Numerous campaigns, mainly on local issues, have been conducted unitedly. And yet we should remember, if we want to pursue an effective policy of unity, that in these actions not everything goes smoothly, that in order to achieve understanding it is necessary to fight grimly, and to repel the opponents of unity. Sometimes unity is disrupted because of internal weaknesses or formal conflicts; at other times it proves to be unattainable because of our incorrect posing of the questions.

At present the youth movements are co-operating, exchanging views, discussing issues and arguing. Actually, unity of action is established not formally but by convincing the youth of the need to take a common stand. Arguments there must be. But this signifies something more than “exposing” the youth leaders who argue against unity. The main thing is to find out, by studying the other movements, what we have in common. We sincerely believe that common interests will eventually gain the upper hand. It cannot be denied, for example, that the Communist Youth Federation and the Christian-Democratic or Social-Democratic youth movements have entirely different views. Still, we know of instances when all the youth movements, the fascists excluded, agreed to unity of action on pressing local issues. This was the case in Terni when we campaigned for jobs for young people. The same thing took place in Reggio di Calabria where the youth, jointly with other democratic forces, took action for the regeneration of their province, which is one of the most backward in the country.

Unity can take a variety of forms. In our opinion, this variety helps in reaching a common stand on a number of issues. Were we to seek unity by calling on everyone to join forces with us this would simply mean boosting our own policy. It goes without saying that the content of the policy of unity cannot be ignored. We define our attitude to the urgent problems calling for solution, suggest how they can be solved, conduct our discussions on this basis and compare the different viewpoints because in this way the young people gain experience and find opportunities for contacts which would form the basis of and define the forms of broader joint activities.

Here we should raise the question of the relationship between the policy of unity and the struggle for socialism. It is not always easy to get clarity and a correct understanding of this basic question, with the result that “schematism” often prevails. We try to explain the tie-up between the struggle for unity and the struggle for socialism. Our policy rests on the identity of youth interests and the struggle for adherence to the Constitution. Every step forward in realizing unity, in safeguarding the interests of the youth and in the struggle for socio-economic and political reforms envisaged by the Constitution, is a vital necessity for the people and, objectively, is a step towards socialism. Far from concealing this connection, we, on the contrary, speak about it openly, because for us united action is inseparable from the struggle for the Italian road to socialism.

Thus, our work in the sphere of socialist education is imbued with the spirit of struggle and understanding of life as it is; filled with a new

content it helps us to demonstrate the superiority of socialism, to popularize the achievements of the Soviet Union, China and the other People's Democracies and to show the international conditions of the fight for socialism. Propagating our views and the fundamentals of Marxism among the youth acquires special importance in view of the growing class struggle in Italy.

If we take cognizance of the difficulties encountered in pursuing this policy, it will become clear that its success depends on the initiative and the strength of the Communist youth organization. Our Youth Federation is a truly mass organization, a school of communism, constantly replenishing the Communist Party. Still, it is not as broad as it could and should be. Unless our movement acquires a really mass character it will be impossible to work for broad unity of the young generation, and its role as a school of communist education will be limited.

The job of establishing a really mass Communist Youth Federation capable of participating in national campaigns and in the day-to-day political struggle in the factories, educational establishments and in the streets, confronts us with new problems. The working class and the Communists, who play an important part in the country, are the force capable of leading the country in the fight for adherence to the Constitution and for socialism. Our Federation must be in a position to cope with these great tasks. In other words, it should admit to membership young people of every walk of life; it should embrace all aspects of life and the interests of the young generation. It should not be a narrow organization that takes pride in its isolation, but a broad youth movement working in all spheres of political, social and cultural activities, a movement maintaining close contact with the unorganized youth.

To make our Federation conform more closely to this type of youth organization it was necessary to study its basic unit—the youth group. We defined the group as the center of political struggle of the youth movement and of communist education. Hence there arose the need for local committees capable of displaying political initiative and giving proper guidance to the groups. An organization of this kind requires a larger number of activists and all-round practical work. For this purpose we are trying to improve the composition of our activists and to add to their numbers not solely by mere admonitions. We want our young functionaries and activists to carry out decisions

in a creative way. We insist on their taking part in elaborating policy, in discussing international and home issues, displaying initiative and keenness and ability to find their bearings in the rapidly developing political struggle. Slowness and delays in this direction took place when we failed to take into account the economic and political changes or when our young Communists did not participate in formulating and carrying out our policy.

Experience has shown that without a strong youth federation our unity policy and unity itself will never gain the necessary scope.

The fight for the young generation has been waged in Italy for years. The main forces involved are the same as in the socio-political struggle. The revolutionary forces know that winning the youth is essential to victory; the reactionaries on their part are working hard to achieve the same end. And in this they are displaying the utmost resourcefulness. This job has been entrusted not only to the bourgeois youth movements; it is carried on by all the conservative forces backed by Government machinery and with crude interference by the Church through Catholic and other youth organizations.

Clearly, in this situation the working-class and democratic organizations can no longer confine themselves solely to the activity of the youth movements; new ways of winning the youth must be found. This work should be conducted in common by all the democratic forces. In other words, it is necessary to co-operate in helping the youth, in safeguarding their interests and educating them in the spirit of democracy. This should be done by the democratic organizations, each in its own sphere. We have in mind here the trade unions, the co-operatives, the popular clubs and the democratic municipalities. These forces are really capable of opposing the ruling class because the struggle for the youth is, in essence, a struggle for a just cause. Not only are the democratic forces defending the interests of the young people, they are calling on them to take their place in the socio-political struggle for the regeneration of Italy. The activity of the monopoly forces, on the other hand, is reactionary by nature and, at best, is of a paternalist, oppressive character, aiming at making the youth the buttress of the clerical state.

We hold that the activity of all the democratic forces is decisive for winning the youth, and in this respect our past work has been wanting.

Uniting the Youth of the Country

Arnoldo Piniera

THE reactionary policy of the ruling classes of Argentina and the intrigues of North American imperialism are aggravating the situation in the country. Simultaneously the working people are stepping up their resistance and the anti-imperialist forces are intensifying the movement for unity, with the youth playing a bigger role in the movement.

Recent developments indicate growing activity among the youth. Three general strikes took place in the early months of the year with more than a million workers involved in each. The working youth were in the vanguard—functioning on strike committees, taking part in demonstrations, picketing and erecting barricades in the struggle against the police and the army.

Last year thousands of school pupils and students protested against attempts to establish private universities of a religious character. U.S. imperialism is attacking our national culture mainly through the clergy. The youth advanced the slogans: "No Private Universities," "Defend Secular Education," "Fight Imperialist Penetration into Education and Culture." The pupil-student action culminated in a broad demonstration during which they chanted: "State Monopolies—Yes! Standard Oil Company—No!" The 500,000-strong meeting held at the end of the demonstration in Buenos Aires was addressed by members of all parties, including the Communists. Meetings and demonstrations swept the country. The movement brought the entire youth into action. Closer ties have been established between the students and workers. The call: "Workers and Students, Forward in Unity!" became one of the slogans of the movement.

Our young people react quickly to political events. The youth organizations of the Radicals and other parties protested against nuclear tests in the South Atlantic. Youth political organizations, federations of university students and secondary school students in Buenos Aires jointly protested against the U.S.-Argentine naval maneuvers.

Many examples could be cited showing how the young people — workers and other sections — are rallying in the struggle against imperialism. This indicates the possibility of establishing a patriotic anti-imperialist youth front as a component of the national democratic front for which the Communist Party is working.

What does the term "patriotic youth front" imply? It implies building up the youth movement with the united working youth as its core. The

youth front, like the national democratic front, can take shape under working-class leadership and on the basis of the worker-peasant alliance; it can include also the middle sections and some sections of the national bourgeoisie — those not tied to imperialism. The front should fight for economic demands, for national independence, democracy and peace. We see this front not as an alliance between leaders but as a mass movement of young people and their organizations.

To lead the youth successfully we must take into account their specific interests. And this sometimes is underestimated. Some Party organizations do not send their young functionaries to help the different sections of the youth whose specific interests and requirements call for forms of work different from those among adults. We record progress wherever we vary our approach and support the demands of the different groups of young people.

Take first the *working youth*. They participate in struggles of the working class as an active and militant force. At the same time they have their own demands, cultural requirements and sports interests. These demands can best be defended by the trade unions. That is why we are setting up youth commissions first of all in the unions. Some think that in doing this we will be tying the youth to the trade union movement, but these fears are groundless. The commissions will study the demands of the youth, submit them to the union leadership and incorporate them into the general program of workers' demands.

The commissions are formed in a variety of ways. As a rule they appear when the young workers in one or another factory put forward demands concerning vocational training, wages, etc. The factory organization of the Communist Youth Federation invites union members to attend a meeting; at this meeting the commission is elected. In other instances football clubs are formed on the initiative of the CYF members. Matches are arranged with the clubs in other factories. Football, as is known, is the national sport in Argentina, and the young people are very fond of it. The club meetings discuss, in addition to sport, economic and other questions. Not infrequently commissions are elected at these meetings. Sometimes the commissions are set up at factory clubs where they are readily attended by young people.

The setting up of the youth commissions depends largely on the attitude of the trade union leaders. Wherever they appreciate the significance of com-

missions and help them they are formed at once in the unions, and wherever they oppose them, the young workers have to act through other organizations and in this way gain recognition of the right to form their commissions. A typical example in this respect: Young Communists of a large textile factory organized football clubs which were joined by young workers in ten factory shops. When the strike issue arose these clubs became the core which rallied the youth for the struggle. The strike struggle, in turn, accelerated the forming of a commission.

The number of these commissions is growing. In addition to those in the factories, others have been formed by the central committees of ten trade unions.

We pay special attention to the young people attending vocational schools. It is most important that these youngsters should get accustomed to organization and act in unity. Not long ago we formed a federation of trainees in the vocational schools in Buenos Aires.

But, granting the significance of the youth commissions in trade unions and in the sports and public organizations, we should not forget that they will function all the better the stronger the factory branches of the Communist Youth Federation are. These, too, are growing in number. We have about 100 of them in the capital, and more and more branches are being formed in the Buenos Aires, Santa Fé and other provinces. We are building strong organizations in the large mills and factories.

A specific approach is needed in the countryside where we have to overcome the influence of the Agrarian Federation and the Youth Co-operative Federation both of which are dominated by wealthy farmers.

We work mainly through the clubs of these federations, and are trying to turn them into centers of struggle for land by uniting the young peasants — members of the different organizations, students, agricultural laborers and tenants — especially in areas where there are big latifundia, into rural youth leagues.

Here is an example showing how these leagues are formed. The Party organization in the north of Buenos Aires province helped us to prepare for a gathering of rural youth. The gathering was attended also by factory workers, railwaymen, secondary school pupils, students and members of political parties—500 people altogether. As a result a rural youth league was established.

Successful meetings are taking place between young workers and peasants. "Caravans" are being formed in towns, including singers, dancers, elocutionists, football players, etc. The "caravans" travel to the villages and organize outdoor events

—singing, dancing, games—winding up with talks; addresses and presents are exchanged at these gatherings which are very popular.

It is sometimes difficult to assemble the young people because the villages are few and far between, but the chief difficulty is the scarcity of organizers. There are 40 rural Communist youth groups in the Buenos Aires province and about 30 in Santa Fé province. But they are weak organizationally and they function badly. Our task is to strengthen them and to form new groups.

We have made good progress in the work among the students. From contacts with their leaders we have passed to broad student action. We discuss with them the pressing issues of student life and link these with the question of safeguarding the national culture and public education as a whole. Each faculty has its student center with committees which handle issues such as protecting the country's oil resources, civil liberties, committees for action against high-handed officials, committees for culture, sports and others. Members of the Communist Youth Federation take an active part in these centers and committees. There are now about 1,000 CYF members in Buenos Aires University. They do not conceal their views, and thanks largely to their work many students now hold progressive views on international and home problems.

We have been working for some time to establish united centers in the secondary schools, with the result that each school now has its center. Here our members co-operate with the Socialist, Catholic and Independent youth. Secondary school federations have been organized in Buenos Aires and in other provinces.

Last year secondary school pupils supported the big strike called by university students. Teenagers erected barricades, clashed with the police, caught the tear-gas bombs before they exploded and threw them back at the police. Some 400 youths and girls, mostly pupils, applied for CYF membership during this strike. We now have Communist youth organizations in most (32) of the colleges in Buenos Aires. The same is true of the provincial colleges.

Taking into account the specific family features in the Argentine we work separately among the girls for whom special organizations have been formed for the purpose of bringing them into social activity. In the people's clubs in residential areas girls attend dress-making classes, take part in amateur theatrical groups and basketball teams and help to distribute the journal published by the Union of Argentine Women. Special attention is given to work among girls living in the so-called poor (working-class) districts where we have about 40 girls' organizations, some in the capital, others in Buenos Aires province.

We conduct work also among the *unorganized youth*. Someone suggests, for example, that a sports competition be arranged. But there is no sports ground. A special group is then organized which visits the municipal council and asks for playing field facilities. This group wins the support of all the young people in the given area. It is not easy to get the playing fields, but once obtained the young people learn from their own experience how things can be done by joint action. In this way the youth are drawn into higher forms of action as, for example, in defense of the oil resources.

The membership of our Federation has grown from 3,500 in 1953 to 28,000 at present. It is the largest and most stable youth organization in Argentina. Our journal *The Youth* is exceedingly popular. However, much remains to be done to make all members active and to conduct work among young people.

In recent times we have improved the work of our groups; we have diversified it and have brought it into line with the requirements of youth organizations. In addition to political education, we have developed sport and recreational work, arranged evening parties, visits to the countryside and celebrated national and revolutionary holidays. Every summer 250 active members spend some time at our youth camp. We arrange things so that workers, peasants and students meet there; so that students can learn something from young workers and peasants, and vice versa. The groups choose the members for the camp. The camp program combines instruction with entertainment, so that visitors acquire knowledge and good habits. As a rule, heart-to-heart talks are held round the campfire at the end of the stay. The youngsters talk about home life, about their ambitions and about our common cause. The camp visits leave a deep impression.

We insist on all our members working in other organizations in order to win the confidence of young people. The policy of unity with other youth organizations is yielding fruit; it is facilitated by the fact that the rank and file of most youth organizations are, as a rule, more advanced, more democratic than the corresponding political parties.

Whenever the need arises to fight for any demand we turn to the other youth organizations for joint action. In many instances they respond to our call. For example, the youth organizations of the Communist, Intransigent Radical, Progressive-Democratic and other parties conducted a joint campaign against the nuclear tests in the South Atlantic. All youth organizations rallied to protest against the U.S.-Argentine naval maneuvers in Mar del Plata. They held numerous demonstrations and street meetings, and distributed leaflets.

Many provincial youth organizations of the Socialists, Intransigent Radicals and other parties took part in preparations for the World Youth Festival in Vienna. And if unity on a national and provincial scale is not broad enough, this is mainly because of the obstacles raised by the leadership of some of the parties. However, we are working perseveringly to strengthen unity on a national scale.

When at the beginning of 1959 the government, in an attempt to crush the strike movement, called up the 1936-37 age-groups for military service, the youth organizations jointly opposed the action with the result that the government had to abandon its intention. Now that the U.S. imperialists are threatening Cuba, the youth organizations of the Intransigent Radicals, Progressive Democrats and the Communist Youth Federation are calling on the young people to volunteer for defense of the Cuban revolution.

Experience has shown the importance of strengthening the Communist Youth Federation. In this we are guided by Lenin's concept of what the Communist Youth League should be. In his article *The Youth International*, Lenin wrote that not infrequently the middle-aged and aged do not know how to approach the youth in the proper way, that of necessity the youth would come to socialism in a different way, by other paths, in other forms, in circumstances that differ from those of their fathers. "Incidentally this is why we must be decidedly in favor of the *organizational independence* of the Youth League, not only because the opportunists fear this independence, but because of the very nature of the case; for unless they have complete independence, the youth will be unable either to train good Socialists from their midst or prepare themselves to lead socialism forward."*

In our declaration on "The Principles of the Communist Youth League" we pointed out that our Federation educates the youth in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, on national and democratic traditions and in the struggle for their demands. The Federation acquaints the youth with the policy of the Communist Party and helps them to master it. It works under the guidance of the Party. In the past we tended to neglect the study of theory and political problems. Some thought that the youth should not take any interest in politics, that they should confine themselves to sports and entertainment. This tendency did much harm to our cause.

Our experience teaches us that the Communist Youth Federation is the vanguard of the young people, that its members should be an example to all working youth and student organizations. They

*Lenin, *The Youth International*, 1916.

should popularize their political views and outlook and the achievements of the socialist countries. The Federation is a school of communism through which the Party carries on its work among the

youth. Consequently there can be no two lines, there is only one line, that of our Party, and this line we are carrying out with due regard to the specific features of the youth movement.

Our Task—To Organize All Young People

Sarda Mitra

IN India and, I think, in some other Asian and African countries which recently suffered under colonialism, the young people believed that their job was to fight for the liberation of their country, that without winning freedom they could not gain their specific demands.

Although under colonial rule attempts had been made to establish youth organizations, these organizations did not develop beyond the embryonic stage. The political parties paid little attention to shaping and strengthening the youth organizations.

It was only in the postwar that youth organizations began to be formed. A big contribution in this respect was made by the World Federation of Democratic Youth which in 1948 held a conference of the young people of South-East Asia. By this time the Indian National Congress, the Socialist Party and others had begun work among the youth. In 1954 the Congress Party organized a special youth department. Similar departments were set up in the state and district organizations of the Congress Party. This Party does not spare funds in its efforts to win over the youth.

It was in this situation that our organization began to take shape. Attempts to organize the democratic youth had been made before, but they were sporadic affairs and there was no exchange of experience between the various organizations. In December 1958 we sponsored a conference at which we formulated the policy of our youth movement.

Discussion centered round two questions: should socialism become the aim of the All-Indian Federation of Democratic Youth, and what should its attitude be to political issues and the political parties? All agreed that the issue of socialism was so topical that our organization could not evade it. Although socialism is popular in our country, there are different ideas about it. Some accept the government's concept, others believe in "democratic" socialism, and still others propagate a Hindu (religious) socialism. Growing numbers of young people are taking up the ideas of scientific socialism and adopting the Marxist-Leninist teaching. But no matter how varied the concepts of socialism may be, ideas such as equality and the need to abolish the division into privileged and non-

privileged classes are warmly supported by the overwhelming majority of young people. These ideas have found expression in the program of our Federation.

As regards our attitude towards politics and the parties, we can say that there is no tendency in our ranks to turn the Federation into a mere sports and recreational association. An organization which strives to uphold the interests of the young people and effectively serve the nation cannot ignore such burning issues as unemployment, the lack of opportunities for education and recreation, safeguarding sovereignty and national independence. The Indian youth want to participate in the worldwide struggle against colonialism and for peace. In our conditions this struggle does not signify affiliation to any party. It affects the interests of various sections of the young people, the overwhelming majority of them. For this reason a youth organization can be independent, without Party affiliation. The Communists work actively in our Federation, but this does not necessarily mean that it must be a Communist organization.

We arrived at this conclusion because in the different states people who fight for democracy but are not yet prepared to join the Communist Party work together with us in the ranks of the youth movement. Were we to create a Communist youth league we would narrow the ranks of our organization, whereas the situation is such that there are opportunities for winning large numbers of young people. It is better to have an organization of a general democratic type.

The tasks facing the country call for a widely representative youth organization. The program of this organization is a democratic one, expressing the interests of the youth of India. We are working for peace, to preserve national independence against any imperialist encroachments. We call for solidarity with the young people of other countries that are fighting against colonialism. We are fighting also for the democratic and economic rights of young people, for the right to organize, against unemployment, to provide our youth with better opportunities for sports and for satisfying their cultural needs. This program makes it possible to unite the various sections of the youth.

I shall cite a few examples to show how we carry on our work. I come from Bengal and for this reason my examples will be from that state.

We base our activity on concrete things. For instance, in March 1958, when there was an outbreak of cholera in the state and in Calcutta, the local authorities were hard put to it to halt the epidemic. Our organization assigned 500 members to aid in the matter. They were taught how to make injections. Working in the streets and in the slums our comrades helped to save some 48,000 lives.

In June we conducted a large-scale peace campaign and celebrated the anniversary of the Pancha Shila principles. We held 22 youth meetings and organized a strike of 100,000 students. Ten thousand postcards protesting against Anglo-American aggression in the Middle East were distributed among the young people to sign and send to the corresponding embassies. Demonstrations were held outside the U.S. and British embassies. This year we conducted a campaign of solidarity with the Algerian youth, collecting clothing, medicines and money for them.

A festival of children's films, the first of its kind in India, was a big success. We received 96 films from 25 countries. The owners of 36 cinemas in Calcutta allowed us to use their premises free of charge. One of the cinema owners acted as chairman of the festival committee. The committee also included the secretary of the Cinema Workers' Union who found the necessary personnel for showing the films. The festival lasted fifteen

days in Calcutta and its suburbs and aroused considerable interest among the public. These examples give an idea of our activities.

Needless to say we are organizing the young people to fight for economic demands. Last year we studied the conditions of the young workers and launched a campaign to improve them. We demanded equal pay for equal work, vocational training, etc. We discovered, however, that it was difficult for the youth organizations to fight for their demands without the co-operation of the trade unions. The unions have their own problems and do not always pay attention to the questions worrying the youth. True, we have the moral support of the unions, but we need more than that.

Quite a few Communists tend to underestimate work among the youth. Some hold that the youth movement is associated with sports and recreation and is not a really militant movement.

In the struggle to solve the general democratic tasks the young people come into contact with the Party organizations. We are trying to consolidate this contact. The youth movement is growing much faster than our organizational opportunities. We have our organizations in 11 of the 14 states; some of these are rather large. The All-Indian Federation of Democratic Youth has more than 200,000 members. We badly need functionaries. The Party organizations have gained a better understanding of the significance of contact with the young people and are devoting more attention to their organizations.

European "Integration" and Contradictions of Capitalism and the Working Class

(Continuation of the exchange of opinions begun in No. 10, 1959)

Economic Effects of the Common Market

J. Pronteau

1. Why the French Monopolies Agreed to "Integration"

IN THE advance to "integration" the political factors mentioned by Comrade Arzumanyan in his interesting report are indeed important—even of major importance. But, as he pointed out, they should not be taken out of the context of capitalist economic development and the particular situation in which the monopolies and bourgeoisie of the Western European countries find themselves.

These political factors correspond to the objective economic processes; and the policy pursued by state monopoly capitalism consists precisely in multiple attempts to adapt itself to the tendencies of present-day economy without, however, being capable of solving the contradictions engendered by capitalism.

Among the constant and deep-going economic processes, mention should be made of the tendency of the productive forces to develop under the impact of technological progress. In a way, "integration" is needed by the monopolies with a view to overcoming some of the contradictions that arise out of the general crisis of capitalism and are aggravated by it, to removing obstacles to centralization of capital and concentration and specialization of enterprises. Evidently, at the present level of interlocking of international groupings, the structure of state capitalism in each individual country is no longer able to meet the requirements of the monopolies. International cartels are trying to acquire supranational legal status and to assume a supranational state structure in a wide range of international relations. From this point of view trade quotas, customs barriers and the difficulties

caused by diverse rates of exchange are impeding consolidation of monopoly rule. The various protection systems which have been in force for the past few decades (and this is particularly true of France where for more than 60 years protection has been the cornerstone of bourgeois policy) have enabled large numbers of small and medium enterprises to stay in business. Although poorly equipped, they have fought the monopolies, and, what is more, have at times under bourgeois democracy exerted considerable political influence.

Since the end of the 19th century protection has been the policy of the French bourgeoisie. French imperialism aimed at conquering as many colonies as it could, and at exporting capital in the form of loans. This usurious nature of French capitalism was, as Lenin noted at the time, its main feature. Its negligible home investments went mainly into the manufacturing industry in the metropolis. This brought into being many enterprises whose high production costs determined market prices. In such conditions, and thanks to industrial and trade agreements between themselves, the big enterprises—those with considerably lower production costs—were able to secure very high rates of profit, which doomed the national economy to general stagnation.

After the Second World War, however, it was no longer possible to keep to this general political and economic line. In order not to be squeezed out of existence the French imperialists had to make good a lag of many years' standing and to increase their investments, chiefly through self-financing, as well as (especially after the Liberation) by having recourse to state funds; the latter

were most important because the working class and the democratic forces had succeeded in bringing about the nationalization of a big sector of the economy. Self-financing and recourse to state funds made it possible to obtain the capital needed to run big modern enterprises capable of standing up to competition which promised to become sharper in a contracted capitalist world market.

Politically, the French imperialists had to block at any cost the workers' emancipation movement at home and the national-liberation movement in the colonies. Accordingly, they intensified the exploitation of labor at home, plunder of the colonies and unleashed war in Indo-China and North Africa.

Utilizing the split in the working class, the monopolies and the big bourgeoisie began in 1947 to pursue a policy of supporting American imperialism in Europe and restricting the democratic rights of Parliament to the point of annulling them almost completely in June 1958.

"Integration" offered French imperialism a way out of its international difficulties and provided it with a powerful weapon for use against the people at home. The monopolies and the bourgeoisie had a common aim—to get the working class under their thumb—a top priority task for the French and Italian capitalists, who feared working-class unity and the rallying of the democratic forces.

Why is it that, despite the industrial might of the Federal Republic of Germany, the big French capitalists voluntarily agreed to set up a common market? What were they banking on in the face of the threat from their dangerous partner?

First. Between 1953 and 1958 large-scale concentration, based on increased capital investments, took place in the French manufacturing industry. This process was supported by the government, which carried out a series of currency and tax measures. These factors helped to expand the productive forces in a number of key industries and to some extent enabled France to catch up with her West European rivals.

Second. The phase of the cyclical boom was especially manifest over the years 1954-58. In the period 1956-58 the rate of growth in France was higher than elsewhere in the capitalist countries, West Germany included. This fact apparently gave birth to the illusion that the market could be expanded indefinitely, an illusion that temporarily took the edge off some of the antagonisms between the monopolies, and weakened the opposition to "integration" by small and medium employers, who thought they would be able to maintain their position on this market.

Third. The compromise reached between the German and French capitalists on the Saar brought certain economic advantages, notably to the iron and steel industry in eastern France, which, in

addition to maintaining control over a number of Saar enterprises, has considerably strengthened its position in the Ruhr mines.

Fourth. The exploitation of the Lacq natural gas deposits, which recently started in the South-West, will enable some industrial groups to gain a more advantageous position in the Common Market. Saint Gobain, Pechiney, Pierrefitte, Rhône Poulenc and Kuhlmann—the big chemical companies—have pooled their resources to produce ammonia, acetylene, nitrogen fertilizers, urea, plastics and methanol from natural gas. And, lastly, Pechiney and Ugine, the monopoly-producers of aluminum in France, who before the devaluation of the franc were quoting lower prices than their European competitors, are building two aluminum plants, based on the cheap electrical power produced from Lacq gas. The combined output of these firms, together with that of a subsidiary in the Cameroons (Alucam), will make them the biggest aluminum producers on the European continent. An output of 250,000 tons is envisaged by 1961 as against the 1958 figure of some 170,000 tons.

Fifth. The discovery of important resources of uranium will make France the biggest producer in Western Europe. From 550 tons in 1958 production will rise to 1,500 tons in 1962. The Crouzille plant alone covers the uranium requirements of the French industry at the same prices as foreign firms are asking. Rich deposits, including the Gabon, have been discovered in Black Africa, exploitation of which will begin in a couple of years. French capital interested in the production of uranium, and in association with German capital, hopes to play a major part in the "Six," and Euratom will help in part to ensure this.

Sixth. The discovery of oil and gas in the Sahara has undoubtedly been a decisive factor in the agreement of the French capitalists to "integration." *La Vie Francaise*, a financial newspaper, wrote on November 29, 1957, apropos of the Sahara deposits: "This highly important fact has more than an economic significance. It will again give us the right to make ourselves heard, first and foremost in Europe. If we can interest the Germans, Italians and others in exploiting the wealth of the Sahara, our entry into this community will make sense." And on January 10, 1958, this paper reiterated the same idea: "Attracting German, Italian and Dutch capital will give full meaning to the creation of the European Economic Community. France can then, with head erect and through the front door, enter the Common Market, whereas in other fields she is patently backward."

French capital needs vast markets for North African iron, lead, zinc, manganese and phosphates. This explains why, among the groups favoring the Common Market, we see companies

already engaged in the exploitation of, or about to exploit, Sahara oil and other African riches as well as monopoly manufacturing enterprises.

The extractive industry and the biggest companies in the basic industries are controlled by the same financial groups. For them there are no contradictions between the political considerations which dictated the need for the Rome Treaty and their own economic interests. They have no fear of their West German rival, whether because of the means at their disposal (the trusts of the chemical, glass, paper, aluminum, electronics and even the automobile industries), or of their association with the big American monopolies, or, mainly, because of their agreements with big German capitalists.

These agreements, which play a decisive role in the Common Market, are founded upon cartel arrangements between the big enterprises with a view to crushing outsiders in the manufacturing industry, stepping up exploitation of the working class and utilizing the natural wealth of Africa. Thus the profoundly reactionary socio-economic nature of the Common Market is already apparent.

2. The Common Market and Intensified Concentration of Capital

It can be said that the first consequence of the Common Market appeared before the Rome Treaty was signed, or at any rate, before it came into force. This form of "integration" has led to greater concentration—a feature of French and West European economy in the postwar period.

Hitherto "integration" of capital had taken place at the bank level, and the centralization of money capital on an all-European scale paved the way for industrial concentration. This process began at the end of 1956 with the formation of the European Consortium for the Development of Africa (Consafrique), already mentioned here, and the establishment in September 1957 of the European Society for Industrial Development, followed in 1958 by a series of other agreements. As a rule, the French banks were the initiators, with the Banque de Paris et des Pays-Bas leading the movement.

Accelerated industrial concentration began long before the Rome Treaty was signed, and even before preparations for it were under way. In this respect the following main trends could be noted in the policy pursued by the French monopoly groups:

First, the strengthening of their subsidiaries in the Common Market countries.

Early this year, for example, the Compagnie Française des Pétroles increased the capital of Société Total Belgique, its Belgian subsidiary, from 30 million to 50 million Belgian francs and that of Deutsche Total Treibstoff, the German subsidiary,

from five to 15 million DM. The latter has undertaken to create a fuel distribution network throughout the Federal Republic. The German branch of the Michelin company resumed activities in 1958 and contemplates doubling its output; this will ensure it a 10 per cent share of the West German market instead of five per cent.

Second, attracting more U.S. capital.

One of the aims of the currency measures taken by the deGaulle government at the end of 1958 and early in 1959 was to attract U.S. capital investments. A number of technical and financial agreements have been signed since 1958 between U.S. and French industrial groups; these cover, among others, the automobile and oil-chemical industries and nuclear energy.

Third, agreements with leading Common Market firms, especially with West German companies.

These associations are assuming diverse forms. One is the creation of new companies for joint production of certain kinds of goods. Compagnie Française des Matières Colorantes (a subsidiary of Kuhlmann), in association with Badische Anilin, has started a joint subsidiary, Dispersions Plastiques, which has built a plastics plant in France. Other agreements envisage *specialization*—that between the German Auto-Union and the French Manurhin companies, for instance. There are also trilateral agreements between French, West German and American companies. The Forges de Châtillon Commentry has signed an agreement with the U.S. Armco Steel Corporation and the German Thyssen Huette.

Joint use of technical services is still another form of these agreements. The arrangement between Renault and Alfa-Romeo is a case in point. These two companies use each other's distribution network: Renault distributes Alfa-Romeo's products in France, while Alfa-Romeo does the same with Renault's cars in Italy.

There are also groupings of several big European monopolies for the joint conquest of foreign markets. This chiefly concerns agreements between big French and West German companies with the object of preventing competition between them and of sharing orders for supplying equipment to the underdeveloped countries.

The Franco-German group, which in addition to the Badische Anilin and Soda Fabrik includes the Schneider concern, will build a fertilizer works as part of the Aswan Dam scheme.

A summing up of the repercussions of this concentration and centralization of capital shows that the first general result of the Common Market has been to intensify the process of channelling capital and profits to the big enterprises—first and foremost the monopolies—to the detriment of the less developed branches. The same process will take

place in agriculture, trade and distribution. The Common Market is simply a very powerful stimulus to the development of processes which preceded it, processes which, no matter what the perspectives of the Rome Treaty are, will determine the monopolies' policy at the present stage.

3. The Common Market Intensifies Uneven Economic Development

The Common Market will have still another grave consequence—the further widening of the disproportion between industries, and between individual regions in the "Six" and aggravation of their uneven economic development. Some factories will be closed, while the modern and dynamic enterprises will profit both from the ruin of the smaller ones and from the territorial expansion of markets. New factories will continue to be built, and in some cases this will involve greater investments. But the crux of the question is, where will they go?

In our view the capital will flow into the dynamic and highly concentrated industries. Industries that have recently been established, certainly the electronics, electro-technical, automobile and chemical, will be expanded to the detriment of the more scattered industries with a greater number of small factories which are often in a state of relative stagnation (for example, clothing, food, leather and other branches in France).

The UN European Economic Commission has pointed to the grave danger of widening the rift—already a feature of the French and Italian economies—between the modern, one might say ultra-modern, sector with its concentration and monopolies, and the technically backward sector.

With growth of the disproportion in industry, there will be increasing unevenness between regions. In France, for example, this will be to the detriment of the west, south-west, and part of the south. But France is not alone in feeling the adverse effects of regional imbalance. Even in Luxemburg there is a disparity between the north and the more industrialized south. Borinage with its coal and Flanders with its textiles are, I think, confronting Belgium with the painful problem of regions and industries in decline. In Germany the net income per capita in the Hamburg, Bremen and North Rhine-Westphalia provinces is twice as high as in Pfalz and Schleswig-Holstein. But South Italy and South-West France undoubtedly present the biggest problem. Only 26 per cent of the total capital, most of it government and not private, is invested in South Italy, which accounts for 41 per cent of the territory of the country, 38 per cent of the population and 65 per cent of the natural increase.

Frontiers and national economic barriers, even with the exercise of strict control, have, as we

know, never been insurmountable obstacles to the export of capital. But they have (particularly over the past thirty years) been instrumental in setting geographical limits to the disproportion without any appreciable upset of the international economic equilibrium.

If the Rome Treaty is carried out as conceived, the situation will certainly change and capital will move to the most attractive regions of the "Six." There is now what might be called a geographical circle with a radius of 500 kilometers from the center in Ostend (Belgium) in which are concentrated 95 per cent of the Common Market's iron and steel, 90 per cent of its coal, the seven main automobile manufacturers, and seven major ports (excluding Hamburg and Marseilles) with a freight turnover of ten million tons. Heavy industry is concentrated in West Germany, the Benelux countries and the North and East of France. And notwithstanding a possible decentralization arising from new sources of power (nuclear energy, gas and oil) and from new synthetics which may well replace the traditional raw materials (coal and iron), the Ruhr-Belgium-Northeast France area will for a long time continue to attract capital and labor. The Euratom commission has confirmed this, indicating that there is no purpose in building an atomic power station in a region where the power cannot be used. Since it is uneconomic to build plants in places without power resources, it is difficult to foresee by what miracle the Common Market can develop such backward areas as South Italy or Brittany (France).

The European Economic Commission has pointed out in connection with France that there would be a surplus of labor in the west—from Normandy to Vendée. We would add that there is also the danger of a surplus in the North and a scarcity in the East. The importance of regulating the supply and demand of labor in the regions should not be underrated. The problem is likely to become more acute. It was precisely with a view to absorbing the surplus labor that the Common Market treaty envisaged the gradual abolition of so-called obstacles to the free movement of workers. This formulation is undoubtedly convenient for the purpose of covering up one of the most tragic developments of our epoch, one which the Common Market can but aggravate. Needless to say this is not a matter of making business or pleasure trips, but of the migration of workers driven by unemployment and poverty from areas falling into ruin and obliged to leave their familiar environment and not infrequently to part with their families in order to fall in with the will of capitalists seeking maximum profit.

We cannot but repeat that if the provisions of the Rome Treaty are carried out to the letter, the "Six," and France and Italy in particular, may in

the next few years become the scene of a grave social tragedy.

The Common Market will mean greater impoverishment for the working class, for all who sell their labor-power. More dismissals and short-time, greater exploitation, speed-up and migration of labor can be expected. There will be no respite in the bourgeoisie's efforts to achieve a wage freeze and suppress any action by the workers for social gains; for the sake of the "common interest" and "competitiveness," the monopolies will try to get the working class to relinquish their demands for social progress.

4. Common Market Repercussions on Agriculture

It goes without saying that the Common Market also covers agriculture. Big industrial capital has always pursued a policy of low prices for farm products, at least whenever market conditions have been conducive to this. At the same time it hopes to keep wages as low as possible. Peasants, on the other hand, have had to pay high prices for manufactured goods. Since 1948 there has been a growing disparity between the prices of farm products and manufactured goods. This is one of the ways of diverting surplus value from the agricultural to the industrial sector.

The French agricultural "market," open as it is to foreign competition, provides industrial capital with an excellent means of maintaining this state of affairs.

There are two types of agricultural production in France: modern capitalist agriculture and peasant agriculture. The former, developing rapidly, is growing stronger economically; the second is in a state of decline. But modern capitalist agriculture is not yet producing enough of some items to satisfy the demand, which is one of the reasons why we still have large numbers of small and medium producers.

Thus, alongside a technically-equipped agricultural sector with high labor productivity and low production costs, there are in France large numbers of backward farms not in a position to stand up to competition. Many of these went out of business after the First World War, but the big capitalists think they are not being wiped out quickly enough.

The third modernization plan recently announced in France officially envisages that annually some 80,000 rural dwellers will have to give up working on the land over the next few years. The low priced products of capitalist agriculture are, like world market prices, factors accelerating concentration.

As in industry, there have been numerous meetings between representatives of capitalist agricul-

ture in the different countries, and a number of agreements are under discussion.

French agricultural capital is not alarmed by the competition that has begun within the Common Market and for the following reasons:

First. The Common Market will further accelerate the ruin of the small producers and free considerable areas of land. This will accelerate land concentration and expand the market for capitalist farm products.

Second. Current prices for farm produce were fixed by the government on the demands of the small farmers, and the big landowners are making good use of these demands in their political struggle. By simply maintaining the present price level they will pocket considerable superprofits.

Third. French capitalist agriculture possesses up-to-date means of production and its high productivity has assured it a good competitive position on the world market.

Fourth. The prospect of an influx of foreign workers raises hopes for cheap labor.

And, lastly, in view of the competition of foreign manufactured goods, notably German, on the French market, the agricultural capitalists hope to buy them at cheaper prices.

It can be said, then, that an identical class policy is being conducted in agriculture and industry, and the general consequences are the same: concentration of production, super-exploitation of labor, and disregard for genuine national interests.

5. Some General Conclusions

In summing up we would like to draw a few conclusions. Some may be regarded as final, others as provisional, for we are speaking of things in a state of flux and this obliges us to be prudent in our judgment.

The Common Market has been in existence for only a few months, and it is still too early to say if this form of "integration" will prove firm and durable, if it will be subject to considerable revision and many infringements, and how, in the long run, the need will arise to abandon it in favor of other forms. This will be shown in the course of further economic and political developments.

1. In any event it can definitely be said that the Common Market has its roots in the processes of the development of productive forces which induce widening markets, technological progress, intensified concentration and consolidation of the monopolies. These processes enable the monopolies to concentrate in their hands a large part of the industrial plant, and make bigger markets imperative; they are accompanied by greater interlocking of capital and thus pose new problems of competition and agreements between the mono-

polies. But this is the general trend in present-day capitalist economy, and the Common Market is merely one of its possible manifestations. Political factors have undoubtedly played a decisive role in establishing the particular form of "integration" implied by the Rome Treaty.

2. The Common Market is a consequence and, at the same time, a stimulus to the concentration of capital on an international scale. It is, above all, a network of cartels, associations and agreements between industrial and financial groupings, between industrial monopolies and big landowning capitalists to the detriment of small manufacturers and small farmers.

3. West Germany undoubtedly plays first fiddle in the Common Market, if one were to judge by the industrial plant and the amount of capital owned by the German monopolies. French capitalism, however, and this point should, we think, be stressed, is not completely subordinate and holds a number of trump cards. The odds are not equal, but it would be erroneous to conclude on this basis that West German domination is absolute. Many aspects of the process of concentration are still obscure—cartels, the movement of capital, exchange regulations, the forms of competition and the contradictions need closer study.

4. The repercussions of the Common Market on the balance of payments, and everything connected with upsetting the balance of trade, particularly in France, should also be studied more thoroughly. From a legal standpoint the Common Market is first and foremost a means of breaking down customs barriers. As we know, there was only a slight reduction in tariffs during the first year. But they will undoubtedly be further reduced, and this merits attention, irrespective of the cause. Unless policy changes in any of the major Common Market countries, or an acute economic crisis sets in, we may expect barriers to continue to fall.

One of the gravest political and economic consequences of "integration" is that it is now far more difficult for any country to back out and free itself without at the same time breaking the economic and political net enmeshing it in the Western Union.

It must be admitted that, given the Common Market and convertibility, the working class and the democratic movement rallied around it will find it harder to carry out democratic reforms, for instance, nationalization. And indeed the monopolies will have more opportunities of taking capital out of the country and of rapidly undermining the national economy in the event of government or political coalitions not to their liking being formed. Conversely, the strengthening of proletarian unity in these countries can undermine the international monopolies.

5. The Common Market, as a political mechanism of the monopolies, is being used to attack and restrict parliamentary democracy and the possibilities of control, and to curtail the independence of each of the "Six."

In assessing the perspectives of the Common Market these factors should be taken into account, but at the same time—and perhaps above all—we should bear in mind that the community of six is *not an isolated bloc*, it is an element of the capitalist world economy in which the law of uneven development operates with iron logic.

The French employers would naturally like to turn the Common Market into a bloc protected by as high a general customs tariff as possible and based on a durable and long-term agreement between the French and West German ruling elements. But they do not rule the roost. Customs tariffs were accepted only in principle and the compromise reached through the Rome Treaty on this point has not been finally ratified. Before it is, the groups interested in low tariffs (the Dutch, Belgian and partly West German) will have to put in a lot of spade work to attain their objective. What the end result will be is difficult to say, especially since it will depend on the economic climate.

But the main point is that Britain has not relinquished its hope of depriving the Common Market provisions of their content. Britain's rulers will not let themselves be squeezed out of the European continent without a struggle, while the French employers, and still less the West German, are reluctant to and cannot enter into an open conflict with Britain. Here we see the first, fairly considerable crack in the European Economic Community.

The second crack is the result of the presence of the United States. If the latter upholds and urges European "integration" and furthers the resurgence of West German imperialism, it does so not in order to create a market that will be closed to its goods, and not to see an economic bloc of greater competitive strength emerge on the world market.

The U.S. rulers regard economic blocs, including the Common Market, not as an ultimate objective, but as the best way of building a capitalist world market that would present no obstacles to their expansion.

And, lastly, the socialist world and the national-liberation movement are making themselves felt more and more, and are felt by the Six too. The Common Market holds out the possibility of a certain reorientation of German economic policy towards the "Free Trade Area," and even eastward. This, undoubtedly, is a political bogey in

the eyes of the French bourgeoisie who have always regarded the Common Market as a means of binding the Federal Republic tightly to the Western bloc. But the possibility exists and numerous facts show that it is not being ignored by the big German capitalists.

In the light of this perspective the Bonn-Paris axis—the political foundation upon which the Common Market rests—will be considerably weakened and European “integration” may develop along entirely different lines.

The national-liberation movement in Africa is also making itself felt. Economic absorption of a large part of Africa into the Common Market to the benefit of the French, German and Italian monopolies can take place only with the consent of the African peoples.

The Common Market is thus threatened by internal contradictions which will grow with the counteroffensive of the working class and the rallying of all the victims of monopoly policy—artisans, small farmers and small and medium manufacturers. It is also menaced by Britain's

defensive moves, by U.S. plans and by the possibility of a German reorientation.

In its present form the Common Market strikes me as being a somewhat rickety structure which might well develop along lines other than those planned by its initiators. The basic factors of the evolution of capitalist economy and imperialist strategy are still valid. In one form or another they lead to market expansion, to the concentrations of productive forces in the hands of powerful monopolies closely linked with the government, that is, to economic “integration” in a variety of forms.

With developments taking this turn the peoples in our countries cannot remain passive. The internationalization of the economy is having ever greater repercussions on their lives. Consequently the job of the Communist parties is to secure co-ordinated action to unite the victims of the monopolies around a united working class. This will help to preserve democracy in some countries, to restore it in others, and its regeneration will pave the way to a Europe without trusts, to a socialist Europe.

Unity of the People and Anti-Monopoly Forces Against European “Integration”

B. Manzocchi

MONOPOLY capital is using the Common Market Treaty to implement a far-reaching policy.

The November 1957 Declaration of the Communist and Workers' parties of the socialist countries pointed out that the capitalist countries have entered a period of “a sharpening of contradictions not only between the bourgeoisie and the working class but also between the monopoly bourgeoisie and all sections of the people, between the U.S. monopoly bourgeoisie on the one hand, and the peoples, including even the bourgeoisie, of the other capitalist countries, on the other. The working people of the capitalist countries live in conditions that increasingly bring about a realization that the only way out of their grave situation lies through socialism. Thus, increasingly favorable conditions are being created for bringing them into active struggle for socialism.”

Unity of the working-class and all other democratic forces in the struggle against the reactionary policy and the new international deals of the monopolies, is indispensable in working to trans-

form society in a situation and aggravated capitalist antagonisms.

To specify the aims and forms of joint anti-monopoly action on the basis of experience accumulated by the working-class movement in each country—that is the task facing the Communist parties, the organized workers and all democratic forces. This task is determined by the fact that the social forces that have fallen victim to European “integration” are, for different reasons and in varying degrees and ways, resisting this policy.

1. The Common Market and the Need for Unity of the Anti-Monopoly Forces

The common problem of the Western European democratic forces is determined by the international monopolies' policy of maneuvering, which, in effect, is designed to prevent the Common Market countries from pursuing an independent economic policy in keeping with the national interests.

At home this policy is expressed in the establishment of governments from which all political

groupings, other than overt Right-wing, are excluded. On an international scale the monopolies fall back on the "supranational" bodies of the European Economic Community set up under the Common Market Treaty, and are finding new economic and organizational forms to co-ordinate the actions of big employers.

A growing number of economic and political bodies is thus not subject to any kind of democratic control.

The effects of this on the working class and other sections are easy to perceive. Wages, living and working conditions and democratic rights are under attack, and increasing discrimination is being shown against the working people and their organizations.

The non-monopoly sections—small producers in town and countryside and small and medium employers—face the prospect of acute crisis and curtailed production, greater subordination to the monopolies and the loss of economic independence.

Up to now monopoly capital has maintained an alliance of a sort with independent producers and non-monopoly capitalists both in industry and agriculture. It was able to do so because the obsolete equipment of these sections functioned alongside the streamlined enterprises of the big capitalist groups. This enabled the monopolies to obtain extra profits, and the technically-backward factories to exist alongside monopoly production. This precarious equilibrium is likely to be upset by the "integration."

The biggest blow to the non-monopoly groupings comes from the abolition of customs tariffs and import quotas, because as long as these operated they could get along somehow.

These sections, needless to say, hope to retain tariffs and other aspects of protection as a means of self-defense, and it is on these grounds that they are strongly resisting the Common Market and displaying the greatest apprehension.

This fact is acquiring very great political importance, being a reflection of the shift now taking place in the system of political alliances in favor of the working class and to the detriment of the monopolies. This should be borne in mind in developing action to isolate big capital in the conditions arising out of the "integration."

Attempts to preserve protection may prove sterile unless other efforts are made to change the economic policy — and not merely because of the corporative tendency of this policy which seeks to maintain a state of affairs running counter to the interests of national economic development, but also because the onslaught of the monopolies on the non-monopoly sector is being made both in the sphere of customs tariffs and in other

economic spheres, first and foremost in matters affecting accumulation and investments.

It is the task of the working class to make good use of the anti-monopoly sentiments of the non-monopoly social and political groupings associated in one way or another with the popular forces. The working class should establish closer relations with them and consistently develop political initiative in order to impart concrete content to economic development and social progress, the reverse of that contained in the policy of "integration."

The attitude of European Social Democrats on the problems of economic "integration" is, as we know, in large measure determined by their ideological standpoint in which elements of anti-communism are interwoven with abstract speculation on the new demands arising out of technological progress, particularly automation.

A similar stand has been taken by those Catholic organizations that have closer links with the people, especially with the trade unions.

In working with these trends and groups, the Communist parties and Left working-class organizations can go much farther than engaging in purely ideological discussion, because a good basis exists for reaching mutual understanding and waging a common struggle by all the people and their political parties in Western Europe. This struggle should follow two main directions:

- a) against the Common Market Treaty;
- b) for international action under the leadership of the trade unions and the political organizations of the working class with the aim of blocking the way to the reactionary "international."

We cannot dwell at length here on all the possibilities for action obtaining in each country. Social Democracy, the Catholic organizations linked with the masses, and the numerous trade unions do not adhere to the same standpoint in their respective countries, and any assessment of their attitude would have to take into account all aspects of their policy and the situation in the particular country.

For instance, the ill-starred experience of economic "integration" in such key industries as coal and steel, seen in the acute crisis in the European Coal and Steel Community, has resulted in a considerable part of the Belgian workers — under Social-Democratic influence — openly expressing disagreement with "integration."

The governments of the Little Europe countries are beginning to get around the ECSC Treaty provisions. The French and West German governments are even contemplating annulling the formal Treaty articles providing for certain guarantees for maintaining the level of employment.

The hope of the Social-Democratic leaders that by participating in the leading Common Market

bodies they would be able to carry out a "common economic policy aimed at improving conditions for the workers, have also been dashed to the ground. This is not surprising for neither the representatives of the trade unions—affiliated to the World Federation of Trade Unions—nor representatives of the workers' parties in parliaments are admitted to the Common Market bodies.

The task now is to establish contact with the Social-Democratic forces, to point out their error in supporting the system of political and economic relations existing in Western Europe and the general policy which the monopolies want to impose on Europe through "integration."

2. An Alternative to European "Integration"

The content of the economic policy proposed by the working-class movement as an alternative to European "integration," and the forms of the struggle to implement this policy, are dictated by the specific features of the socio-economic system in each country. The national struggle acquires special importance in view of the attack of the international monopolies on the independent economic policy pursued by each country.

"Integration" gives birth to problems common to the working people and the non-monopoly sections alike. And the demand for international economic ties from which the national economy as a whole, and not exclusive social groupings, would benefit, is an integral part of the policy of independent economic development.

European "integration" aims also at maintaining and defending the colonial regime. This is yet another important reason why the working class and the masses fight against the Common Market.

Independence for the colonies and all-round economic and political progress for the underdeveloped countries are essential if the Western European countries are to achieve the social and economic progress which "integration" is obstructing. To this end the working-class and democratic movement in the Common Market countries should show initiative in establishing relations with the colonial and underdeveloped countries based on equality and mutual benefit.

The people in the Common Market countries are quite clearly interested in the independence and development of the colonial and underdeveloped countries. The working-class movement in all countries is also opposed to imperialist policy because it aims at maintaining a "labor aristocracy" — the product of exploiting dependent countries, a section created for the political purpose of dividing the working people and weakening their militancy.

Peaceful coexistence and more trade with all European countries are decisive factors in the policy being put forward as an alternative to "integration."

The economic policy pursued by the socialist countries in relation vis-à-vis the underdeveloped countries, in addition to extending the political and economic influence of socialism, is having an impact on the economic relations between the underdeveloped and advanced countries.

Action against European "integration" should be orientated towards establishing a broad popular movement capable of abolishing monopoly rule and offering in its place a policy envisaging economic and social progress. This idea is underlined in the joint statement issued by the Italian and French Communist parties (December 23, 1958), which points to the need for "struggle for a series of economic and social transformations aimed at limiting the rule of the monopolies, and foiling their attempts to establish absolute domination over the life of the country." The statement defines the major demands advanced by this struggle: "nationalization of certain industries, agrarian reform and protection for small peasant property against arbitrary monopoly action, democratic administration of the state sector of the economy, and democratic control over plans for state investments in industry and agriculture. All this will help to safeguard the common interests of the working people and the small and medium producers in town and countryside; stimulate economic advance on the basis of technological progress; put a stop to predatory capitalist concentration under monopoly guidance. In this plan a definite place is allotted to the struggle against the Common Market Treaty"

It is evident that the development of political initiative by the working-class movement on each of the points listed will depend on the objective economic and political conditions obtaining in the respective countries. But the main political line for which it is fighting is the same in all countries. Objectively the opposite of the Common Market policy, it is a policy in the interests of all social sections suffering under the monopolies, and paves the way to the economic and social advancement of all the Common Market countries.

As we know, the international monopolies are screening the establishment of the Common Market with talk about "raising productivity" and "reducing production costs." To this end they are demanding lower living standards and the closing down of hundreds of thousands of "unprofitable" enterprises and farms. But despite this propaganda, it is obvious that if productivity is low and production costs high, the reason is to be sought in the nature of the capitalist production

relations and the burden of monopoly profits and ground rent borne by the national economy.

The production costs of handicrafts, small and medium industry and peasant farms should be reduced at the expense of monopoly profits and ground rent. One of the most urgent tasks of the working class is to win allies on this basis.

With regard to nationalization, under the existing forms of state capitalism it is clear that nationalization alone cannot change the character of production relations. This was noted in the policy statement of the Eighth Congress of the Italian Communist Party and in the Theses of the Fifteenth Congress of the French Communist Party. The latter state: "However, nationalization may become a national demand, inasmuch as it is in a position to prevent foreign capital from seizing the country's wealth. . . . It can become a legitimate democratic demand inasmuch as nationalization facilitates the struggle of the working class against capitalist exploiters and the monopolies."

The policy statement of the Eighth Congress of the Italian Communist Party said: "The danger that nationalization, instead of abolishing monopoly rule merely creates another form of centralized and reactionary capitalism, can and should be averted by broad action on a democratic and constitutional basis aimed at giving priority, in running the economy, to the interests of the working people and the community as a whole."

The nature of the tasks and the form of the struggle, we repeat, depend in large measure on objective conditions and the political situation in each country.

3. Italian Working People Oppose European "Integration"

The experience of the struggle waged against "integration" in Italy has confirmed that political initiative and the ability of the political and trade union organizations of the working people to mobilize the masses are the decisive factor. This determines not only the scale and intensity of the movement but the way in which the problem should be resolved.

The imperative need for social reform is determined by the general character of the economic and social development of our country. The traditional system of reactionary compromises between powerful capitalist groups and die-hard conservative ruling elements representing the interests of the old classes, has retarded the development of the productive forces. It has aggravated the pronounced disproportion in the development of the various parts of the country to the detriment of the southern regions, and this has given rise to the beginning of chronic mass unemployment and widespread partial unemployment—chiefly in the

countryside. On the whole this state of affairs still continues, although industry has expanded, and changes have been carried out in the rural areas, mainly in the north. Oppression by big landowners and industrial monopolies in the past led to a situation which resulted in provisions for nationalization and agrarian reform being incorporated into the Constitution of the Republic (1947).

Thus the movement for agrarian reform, nationalization of industry, and non-monopoly development of state-owned enterprises is embracing vast sections of the people. The policy of economic "integration," on the other hand, implies rejection of social reform.

That the struggle waged by the working class and its allies for nationalization and control of the state-owned enterprises hits the monopoly interests hard is confirmed by the counterattack launched by the monopolies against the state-owned plants. This counterattack has found strong support among government circles and in the Christian Democratic Party.

It is essential to develop political initiative in the working-class movement which would expose the class nature of the government's economic policy, undermine the mass basis of the government parties and help change the balance of forces on the political arena. Actions to liberate the non-monopoly sections from monopoly pressure and to develop industrial activity on the basis of sound economic expansion and increased employment, follows the same aims. This will lead to eliminating backwardness and low productivity in small and medium industry and handicrafts.

A national conference on the Common Market and Italian Industry, organized by the Communist parliamentary group in Turin last January, discussed these problems.

The conference program lists the following demands: a credit and investment policy which would deprive the monopolies of domination over the process of accumulation; a price policy for the state-controlled enterprises on electric power and raw materials which would undermine the monopoly domination of the market.

Having due regard for the specific features of national legislation and other points, this program could well serve as a basis for economic and political action in the handicrafts and non-monopoly industries of other Common Market countries.

What is needed is a broad movement to work out forms of economic activity which would be independent of the monopolies and opposed to their policy.

The working-class struggle for a new trend in economic policy, for higher wages and better conditions, acquires a clear-cut political character; and this applies not only to the working class

but to all social sections suffering at the hands of the monopolies. First, this struggle is one of the major factors furthering a more even distribution of the social product and raising purchasing power on the home market. Secondly, and this should be emphasized, it strikes a blow at the monopoly-dominated capitalist structure.

The offensive launched against the working class is counterposed by a unified program advanced by the working people in the Common Market countries. This program was worked out at a meeting of Common Market countries held in Rome last April. It lists wage and social security claims and incorporates demands for increasing employment.

Working-class struggle for these demands was waged with particular intensity in Italy and other countries during the summer and autumn.

Action against the closing of factories is still going on, and the support accorded it by the anti-monopoly sections is an indication of its scope. Economically this struggle does not always achieve its aim of stopping the closures. But the practical result politically is that it is broadening the anti-monopoly front, drawing in new social forces.

The struggle waged in the Italian countryside (by agricultural laborers, sharecroppers and small producers) is also marked by specific features. While it has registered some important successes in recent years, the majority of the small producers continue to be influenced and led by the big bourgeoisie. The reactionary bloc, relying on this base, is entering a period of new contradictions and growing difficulties, which the Common Market policy only serves to aggravate.

To achieve their objectives in the new conditions of "integration" the monopolies are going back on one of their political traditions in the Italian countryside. Whereas formerly they "supported" the small peasant households and helped to increase their number in order to exploit them more easily and divert them from the struggle for land, they are now trying to liquidate them altogether.

Initially the struggle of the Italian peasants and, in part, of the small producers, was an expression of their reaction to the general consequences of the rapid monopoly penetration of the countryside. Now, with the implementation of the Common Market policy, the struggle has sharpened and has become typical of those social sections who have always sought a corporatist solution of their economic problems. But as the working-class struggle and the consequences of monopoly policy acquire concrete forms, conditions are created which make it possible to overcome the sporadic nature of the demands of these sections and to

put forward demands envisaging a solution of agricultural problems along anti-monopoly lines.

With the new balance of forces and modern social relations typical of the Italian countryside, the demand for radical reform, above all agrarian reform, becomes an objective necessity. Agrarian reform is essential not only because of the imperative need to overcome the backwardness of the countryside, but also because of the repercussions of the agricultural crisis and the Common Market on the peasants. The agricultural laborers and small peasants are fighting for the progressive development of farms and agricultural co-operatives; for the economic reconstruction of agriculture and for a credit and tax policy in keeping with the progressive development of the peasant farms; for full employment and higher wages for agricultural laborers, and assured incomes for the peasants. The winning of these demands would safeguard the interests of the rural workers and be a major factor in expanding the home market.

This general line in agrarian policy, a counterweight to monopoly policy, unites the landless peasants and the smallholders alike. The struggle for agrarian reform has a mass base among all sections of the peasantry.

4. Immediate Aims

The working-class struggle against "integration" affects all spheres of economic and political life both on a national and international scale, and boils down to one principal aim: to replace monopoly power by democratic rule which, by carrying out a policy that is objectively the reverse of the policy of the monopolies, could create conditions for stable economic development and social progress in the European countries.

The forms of struggle derive from the nature of the common aim, and from the concrete conditions in each country.

The experience of the Italian working-class movement shows that political and economic conditions are such that the diverse social forces suffering at the hands of the monopolies and also the political groups representing these forces can take their place alongside the working class and its trade union and political organizations in the broad and multi-form movement against European "integration." They can unite with the workers' movement on some issues, irrespective of whether the aims are restricted or, as frequently happens, of a corporative character. The task of the working-class organizations, first and foremost the Communist Party, is to formulate these aims and establish the alliances needed to achieve them in order to deal a decisive blow to monopoly rule.

A vital factor that assists the struggle, right up to the conquest of power, is the entry of progres-

sive forces into existing democratic institutions; for example, in parliament and in other democratic bodies, and particularly in the organs of local autonomous governments and decentralized local administrations. The establishment of permanent ties between the activities of the masses and the struggle within the democratic institutions for extension of their authority takes on primary importance.

Recent political developments in Italy show that much can be achieved in this sphere. In the struggle for autonomy in the provinces of Valle d'Aosta and Sicily (where special provisions and conditions for autonomy are envisaged) prejudice against Communists was overcome, and non-proletarian political forces joined in a united front with the working-class parties during the election campaign and after the electoral victory of the progressive forces.

Commenting on the election results in Sicily, Comrade Togliatti noted that the political monopoly of the Christian Democratic Party could be broken only "with the help of political movements and agreements going beyond the framework of the traditional homogeneous alliances, which the working-class parties seek to conclude. In this sense frontism has had its day, but the need to establish contacts and co-operation with new forces striving for democracy, regeneration and economic progress, for which we too are working, still exists" (*Unita*, June 10, 1959).

The experience of anti-monopoly action in Italy shows that the forms of struggle depend on the actual situation. The important thing is to give full play to initiative in all spheres of activity: legislation, parliament, municipalities and other local government bodies, political, trade union and co-operative organizations, mass struggle (strikes and trade union actions). Formulation and implementation of policy should be carried beyond the narrow confines of the monopolies and their governments. The issues should be placed before the people. The masses with their energy and ability should help in formulating this policy, in supervising its implementation. The Communist Party, the vanguard of

the working class, plays an important part in leading the movement and defining its aims.

In face of the international alliance of the monopolies, unity and concerted action by the working-class and democratic movement in all the Western European countries constitute the cardinal factor in developing the struggle against economic "integration." This should be brought about in each country with the object of achieving the common democratic aims—political and economic independence, higher wages and full employment, protection of the social sections threatened by economic "integration." Only by effecting far-reaching social changes can these aims be attained.

United and concerted action should first be implemented in the trade union struggle and in joint action for common aims.

This action should involve as many trade union and economic organizations as possible (and not only among the workers), and the social forces interested in seeing the working-class movement win its demands. This applies above all to the co-operative and peasant associations as well as to industrial associations embracing the urban middle sections.

In the course of this struggle and parallel with it, there can emerge initiative to establish contacts, alliances and agreements with the political forces and groups, including those political parties that traditionally uphold the conservative social structure. Joint action by the representatives of workers' parties in parliament and other elected bodies can play a big part. It is a matter, in the final analysis, of proceeding along the path charted by Lenin in *The State and Revolution*, which pointed to the need "to develop democracy to its logical conclusion, to find the forms for this development, to test them by practice, and so forth."

Lenin stressed that, "taken separately, no sort 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 the economy, will stimulate its transformation; and in turn will be influenced by economic development, and so on. Such are the dialectics of living history."

Reviews

Art That Serves Mankind

CANDOR and sincerity are the distinguishing features of *I Put My Cards on the Table*,* the new book by Louis Aragon.

The new work is a collection of articles and speeches written and delivered during the past five years. In its pages we find the ready response of a famous writer to events in political and literary life, and reflections on current problems of creative art.

The issues on which Aragon speaks his mind are not unimportant ones. The writer opens wide the doors of his "laboratory" and engages in a lively conversation with the reader. What is more, he makes his reflections known not only to friends but also to those who reject his ideas. And this leaves an imprint on the character of the dialogue.

The contents range in time from the speech delivered by Aragon at the French Communist Party Congress in June 1954 to a brief talk about his poem *Elsa* in Moscow last May. This period, quite an eventful one, witnessed a keen struggle in the sphere of ideology and aesthetics. The wave of revisionism, as we know, also affected the realms of artistic creation. However, forward-looking intellectuals in all countries, including France, rallied to resist the nihilistic onslaughts against the ideological and aesthetic principles of progressive art.

Aragon has always been in the vanguard against the reactionaries; his creative work is closely linked with life. His best works appeared during these years—the poems *The Eyes and Memory* and *An Unfinished Romance*, which are artistic reflections of events taking place in the world, of the problems engaging the minds of people.

Aragon responded to all burning issues in articles and speeches. Addressing the Second Congress of Soviet Writers he dealt with the need for socialist realism, and its prospects under capitalism, particularly in France. At the 13th Congress of the French Communist Party he raised the question of partisanship in art, of using literature and art in the struggle for emancipation of the working class, for a cultural renaissance. Resolutely denouncing the revisionist attempts to dethrone socialist realism, Aragon upheld this creative method. "Socialist Realism Is Not Dead"—runs the headline of an article (May 1957) levelled against ideological opponents. In a contribution to the

journal *Europe* on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the Soviet Union and of Soviet literature, the birth of socialist realism is described as "a revolution in the dreams" of humanity.

In the polemic which developed around his *Holy Week* (1958), he defends his principles passionately and consistently against the bourgeois men of letters. In the course of the argument Aragon wrote the articles "The Author Speaks about His Book," "Call Things by Their Right Names," and "The Secret of Creative Art" in which he championed the progressive aesthetic outlook.

One of the features of the book is that Aragon examines the vital problems of ideology and aesthetics in the light of his own writing experience, agonized thinking and searching. Pondering over the highly complex and contradictory problems and describing his doubts, Aragon, however, never betrays the firm convictions of the realistic writer.

Noteworthy is the brief preface to the book under review. Using the expressive medium of jargon, Aragon tells us that in his own work and in the ideological and aesthetic struggle in which he is taking part, he constantly comes up against people playing with marked cards. "I am playing . . . in a world in which all cards are manipulated." But this does not worry him. His intentions are honest and he plays honestly. He denounces the card-sharpers, boldly showing his own hand, convinced that he will win. "I want to win not by a fluke . . . but by virtue of obvious superiority."

Aragon does not name his opponents, but they can be discerned easily among the bourgeois critics of his *Holy Week* and, of course, among the publishers of the weekly *Arts* who, not without ulterior motives, hastened to reprint this preface. "I know that in putting my cards on the table," Aragon writes, "I am presenting you with a weapon that can be turned against me . . . However, beware. My weapon cuts the hands of those who take it. Don't rejoice, thinking that I have exposed my defense, that I have left my flank uncovered. Don't be in a hurry to rejoice, thinking that you have won a point. When the game is played in the open everyone can see and judge the chances."

There is a logical connection between this allegory and the article "Call Things by Their Right Names" (actually the speech delivered to the youth in the Mutualité Hall), his statements about *Holy Week* and his reaction to the bourgeois critics. Those who delight in sensations or, to use Aragon's

* L. Aragon, *J'abats mon jeu*, Paris, Les Editeurs Francais Reunis, 1959.

words, play with marked cards can, of course, quote out of context phrases from the above-mentioned article and interpret them in their own fashion, indulging in wishful thinking. Aragon, they will say, has seen the light, he has feelings of remorse. Then, seizing on the point about the need to "revise" socialist realism, they will triumphantly exclaim: "Bravo! Aragon has changed his views."

Aragon, however, indignantly denounces this kind of juggling. In the article "Call Things by Their Right Names" he makes an excursion into the history of the writing of the series of books entitled *The Real World*—from *The Bells of Basel* to *The Communists* and his latest *Holy Week*. The critic and the literary historian will find in these works brilliant samples of progressive writing, of the realism known as socialist realism. Aragon poses interesting general problems, problems that are still unresolved, or only scantily explored. He expounds his views on art. The reader of this series will not fail to notice a desire to "interpret, elucidate and assimilate" the experience gained by literature in other countries, to "imbibe from it everything that furthers human progress."

The consistency with which Aragon upholds the principles of realistic art is worthy of the deepest respect. "... For a quarter of a century I have upheld the concept of realistic art in conformity with my socialist outlook." The method of socialist realism, he maintains, should be carried forward and enriched, with due account being taken of all that is progressive in other literary trends.

The discoveries made by others, says Aragon, should not be ignored, we can make them purposeful. "... If by my own writing and by the attention I give to the writing of others, I am able to contribute more to this cause, this means that I am making better use of my life and of my abilities. . . ."

Aragon is interested in the "variety of the ways taken by people, the stages through which uncertain thought advances towards the truth." In this connection he shows how he understands the tasks of socialist realism which embodies and expresses artistic progress. His concept, he tells us, is an open one: "As distinct from the dogmatic approach I have an open mind about socialist realism, a concept which enables the writer claiming to be a socialist realist to enrich himself and to enrich his art, imbibing it not only from the particular corner in which he stands but from the world at large, testing himself through the critical eyes of his outlook."

Aragon's views on the indissoluble bonds linking socialist-realist art with the national tradition and the entire experience of world literature are most important. They are of particular value especially

if we bear in mind the conditions in which socialist realism is developing in France, where reactionaries are doing everything to isolate this trend, depicting it as sectarian, alien, and imported. Aragon's experience and his striving to assess and foster everything clean and healthy in the works of other writers in France and elsewhere is the experience of the struggle to extend the sphere of influence of progressive writing.

For Aragon socialist realism is "the wings which give flight to literature." You will but clip your wings, he says, if you alienate yourself from other writers.

And, further, had there not been in socialist literature a bridge connecting it with the whole body of literature, he would not have been able to approach those writers in the capitalist countries who previously "had written in a different way or had been unaware that their writing had something in common with socialist realism." Therefore, it is easy to understand the keen interest displayed by Aragon in the works of young French writers in his article "Eternal Spring."

At the Second Congress of Soviet Writers Aragon spoke about the relationship between socialist realism and the national tradition in art. He referred to this also at the French Communist Party Congress in June 1954. We cannot but agree with him when he says that every important work of art reflects life and is linked with the national tradition. It does not appear as the work of some genius cut off from life, it is part of "the body of literature, of the literary legacy of the nation." From this indisputable truth Aragon draws far-reaching conclusions for socialist realism in general and for his own work in particular. The aim of socialist realism is not "the triumph of a definite style but the triumph of a world outlook."

Aragon uses the expressive medium and artistic methods found in other trends in French literature (interesting in this respect are his poem *An Unfinished Romance* and *Holy Week*). Because of this he had to engage in a sharp polemic with bourgeois critics who divorce form from content, and who, ignoring the ideological design of the author and resorting to distortion, claim that Aragon is abandoning for formalistic trends the very principles of realism he himself proclaims.

Counterposing living, creative thought to scholasticism and dogmatism, Aragon holds that socialist realism is not a rigid concept which can be studied once and for all; there is no prescription for it. Socialist realism, he says, should be considered not as a metaphysical category but as a constantly developing trend. "Nowhere can it be set in the mould of a fixed definition."

Aragon does not pose as an evangelist of the infallible. He stresses the need for constant searching. ". . . I respect those who make no claim to knowing all the answers, those who are searching . . ." And he himself seeks a solution to his burning problems through the "pain of experience." "Every man," he says frankly, "comes to the truth in his own way, and if I can discern the weakness in this or that movement, still fresh in my memory are the false steps I made myself, fresh enough to enable me to realize that I may repeat them."

It would be wrong to say that the judgments pronounced by Aragon in his articles and speeches are indisputable, correct in every detail. He writes, for example: "In my view it would not be serious to look on socialist realism as an established art, opposed to other competing trends." How to understand this phrase? Judging by Aragon's works we know that he in no way denies the fact that socialist realism has firmly established principles. Behind this art is a wealth of experience and tradition — the experience of Gorky, Mayakovsky, Sholokhov, Neruda, Becher and many other distinguished writers, including Aragon himself. The reader would fall into error were he to take this, and other phrases (that appear vague to us) out of context and judge the book in isolation from the other works of Aragon. In other books, for instance in his *Soviet Literature*, Aragon pinpoints those features of socialist art which have taken shape and which have been already defined by progressive aesthetic thought.

Aragon shows in his latest book that socialist literature is not something stagnant and inert, that it is a living and developing literature constantly in need of enrichment. He rejects the allegations and prejudices of the critics in the anti-socialist camp who repeat ad nauseam that socialist realism calls for cut-and-dried schemes, formulas and stereotyped methods. Aragon refutes these inventions; he points to the freshness, the diversity of forms of socialist realism and its irreconcilability with any dogma. We would not do him justice were we to select quotations out of context and interpret the occasional vague phrases.

We agree with Aragon on the main thing, that is, when he says that artistic practice should be variegated, that creative work is least of all subject to regimentation and that works of art are not created "by voting." The reader objectively perceives his depth of thinking and the nobility of his aspirations.

The issues confronting him as an artist are viewed by Aragon from the standpoint of the interests of progressive art. He opens wide the doors of his "creative laboratory," unfolds before the reader the secrets of his "trade," and the views and principles which he upholds passionately and with firm conviction. The writer stresses that he stands for an effective realism, which is far removed from the "realms of pure art," for a realism which "aspires to help man and to light his way forward."

If we were to speak about the observations which the reader could make after becoming acquainted with Aragon's "laboratory," the first would be his concern for truthful reproduction of events recorded. In a speech delivered in Saint-Denis, in the talk "The Author Speaks About His Book" and in the article "Call Things by Their Right Name," Aragon reveals the secret which enables him to achieve this fidelity. The secret is contained in the vast amount of work he has done in studying history. Aragon tells us how he studies the scene of the events he describes, how the fresh impressions help him to animate his characters.

The wealth of his observations is embodied in his characters, whether they are contemporaries or personalities drawn from history. I wrote *The Communists*, he says, at a time when I was "intoxicated with the feeling that I could check my writings against the background of current events."

In the symposium *I Put my Cards on the Table*, attention is drawn by the elaboration of the "particular," purely professional problems confronting the writer: for example, his view on the role of detail in realistic works, which enables the writer to describe both the "trees and the wood," or the account of how really vivid, stereoscopic characters are created.

"One Should See Clearly in His Sphere of Activity"—is a subheading in his speech to the 1954 Congress of the French Communist Party. ". . . When people enter upon a new and decisive period of their struggle," says Aragon, "the duty of the artist and of the communist writer is to see clearly in their spheres of activity and to define the means needed in order to serve the future of humanity."

The book *I Put my Cards on the Table* is permeated with this idea.

E. TRUSHCHENKO

What's Wrong With U.S. Foreign Policy? *

Mr. C. L. Sulzberger, the author of this thoughtful and painful inquest on the postwar foreign policy of his country, is a man with first-hand experience of his subject. Of him it can be said that he was born into the newspaper world with a portable typewriter in his hand. The Sulzberger dynasty has long been associated with the *New York Times*, and the forty-seven year old author, continuing the tradition, has spent nearly half his life as a roving reporter for that newspaper.

He has, we are told, met almost every important political military and economic figure in Europe, Asia, Africa and the United States both during and since World War II, and he justly claims that the "laboratory where our diplomatic actions may best be observed is the world in which they are applied."

Sulzberger is forthright and outspoken in his judgments. "In 1945," he tells us in the preface, "we were the greatest nation in terms of physical strength and in terms of an unchallenged moral position . . . Yet, and there I will quote a former American ambassador, William C. Bullitt: 'Since the Second World War our foreign policy has led us from a pinnacle of power and security into the valley of the shadow of death.'" The United States, he continues, "has lost the initiative in its propaganda contest with the Soviet bloc. Recently we have gone from defeat to defeat."

Let us dwell for a moment on these truly doleful words and particularly on the defeat suffered in the propaganda competition. If the United States has lost the race it has certainly not been for lack of trying. In recent years dollars have been lavished by hundreds of millions on worldwide propaganda. The countries of Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America have been inundated with journals, newspapers, books and pamphlets subsidized by Washington—all of them lauding U.S. foreign policy and the American way of life and, of course, by way of contrast, denouncing communism and the way of life in the socialist countries.

Every day Radio Free Europe and the Voice of America blare forth in the same strain. And as if radio and press were not enough, the balloon-borne leaflet—the latest propaganda gadget—is brought into action. Yet, after years of this sustained effort, with dollars flowing like the Mississippi in flood-time, the result, as Sulzberger puts it, is "defeat after defeat."

Why is this so? After all, American businessmen are unsurpassed in the art of salesmanship, in advertising and "selling" things to the public, from baby powder to kitchen gadgets. The trouble is that not even the slickest salesman can sell goods that smell, no matter how glossy the wrapping. And anti-communism, the main product offered over the past decade by the super-salesmen of the Voice of America, smells far too much of the late Dr. Goebbels.

"Anti-communism," writes Sulzberger, "as Hitler discovered, is no policy." He puts the blame for this squarely on the State Department and on its sister body the Central Intelligence Agency headed by Allan Dulles. In his view the shaping of American foreign policy is left too much in the hands of whoever happens to be Secretary of the State Department—in the years covered by the book this was mostly the late John Foster Dulles. "From Truman's administration on," he writes, "there has been a steadily increasing tendency by our executive branch to involve us in a condition of war (as in Korea) or to risk involving us in such a condition (as in Lebanon) without prior legislative approval" (my emphasis — J.G.) (p. 29).

During the Dulles regime the State Department revelled in what Sulzberger describes as "apocalyptic" jargon, expressed in such phrases as "agonizing reappraisal," "brink of war," "retaliatory striking power," etc., which, he says, frightened America's friends more than "its enemies." Apropos of this he relates the following: On the eve of the Republican Convention (July 1952) that nominated Eisenhower for President, he (Sulzberger) met General Lucius Clay, an ardent Eisenhower supporter. Clay, for reasons of his own, was greatly disturbed by the use of the words "retaliatory striking power" in the national-defense plank of the Republican platform. Later that same day Sulzberger had lunch with General Eisenhower and his brothers, Milton and Earl. Eisenhower in reply to a question by Sulzberger, said that he had not seen the actual text of the draft program, but that Dulles had given him a verbal outline.

What did you think of the reference to retaliation, asked Sulzberger.

"Do they use that word," exclaimed Eisenhower. "I simply won't accept it. I would rather not run than accept it."

The evening of the same day found the indefatigable Sulzberger having a drink with Dulles. When told that Eisenhower was angry about the re-

*C. L. Sulzberger. *What's Wrong with U.S. Foreign Policy*, Harcourt, Brace and Company, New York, 1959, 255 pp.

taliation phrase, Dulles (who had got it included) said, "Maybe I can do something about it." He did. It disappeared from the text. But, says Sulzberger, "both the words and the theory crept back into Dulles's public statements. And they became the heart of his famous 'brink of war' approach as Secretary of State."

We talk glibly in our propaganda, Sulzberger continues, about the "free world" as distinct from the "captive peoples." But, of the seventy-two countries comprising this free world "forty-nine are governed either by dictatorships or oligarchies." Why, he asks, do we deceive ourselves?

Turning to another State Department deception, the boast that it never interferes in the internal affairs of other nations, the author bluntly declares: "... This is simply not the truth. We interfered up to our elbows to assure a government in Greece upon which we could look with favor. We interfered in France, during the late nineteen forties During the 1948 Italian elections we grossly interfered; our ambassador toured Italy making speeches deliberately calculated to sway voters." And further "when a regime sympathetic to our opponents was installed in Guatemala, we ousted it."

Sulzberger is equally outspoken in condemning the witch hunt practices which have hounded "brilliant individuals" out of the professional Foreign Service.

The policy and personnel blunders of the late Secretary of the State Department can be traced, he thinks, to the Central Intelligence Agency headed by his brother Allan Dulles. So suspicious is this body and so little confidence has it in the people that it takes "from six to nine months for American citizens to have their loyalty checked." What is more, U.S. secret police abroad "go around interrogating the families, friends and acquaintances of respectable American citizens in foreign countries."

These are courageous words, and Sulzberger is to be commended for saying them, but after doing so and after his debunking of the "free-world" demagoguery, one rubs one's eyes upon encountering the sentence: "The philosophy of democracy and those freedoms it implies are still the free world's exclusive property"! (p. 79.)

That, to put it mildly, is a rather dubious conclusion. It would hardly be shared by statesmen, say, like Prime Minister Nehru of India and President De Valera of Eire, who were incarcerated in jails for fighting for freedom from Sulzberger's "free world."

This kind of thinking shows that symptoms of the ills which he finds in the State Department

can be found in the author too. The impression is heightened when we read the words: "Many of our friends in Asia are confused by our failure to meet communism's race-color Hate-America campaign" (p. 77). The words are by an American Negro and apparently for this reason they are quoted with relish by Sulzberger to impart strength to what, one infers, he feels is a pitifully weak argument.

As a seasoned traveller and experienced observer, Sulzberger, who has visited the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, cannot but know that hatred of America or of any other country, capitalist or not, is utterly alien to their people. If he really has doubts on this question we would recommend him to have a word with his friend Mr. Harriman, or better still with Vice President Nixon. Nixon, during his visit to the USSR, complete with seventy-two newspaper men, far from finding the slightest trace of anything even faintly resembling a "Hate-America campaign," was pleasantly surprised both by the warmth of his welcome and by the respect in which the Soviet people hold his country.

Before visiting the Soviet Union Mr. Nixon took the trouble, and this is to his credit, to memorize in Russian the words *Mir i Druzhiba* (Peace and Friendship), which achieved worldwide currency at the time of the Youth Festival in Moscow in 1957. Heaven also knows what the deceased McCarthy would have thought or done had he heard his friend, Mr. Nixon, proudly chanting *Mir i Druzhiba* in Moscow, Leningrad and beyond the Urals. For our part we are glad that the words of friendship coined by young people were used to such good purpose by a visiting statesman. It shows that even capitalist politicians can pick up pearls of political wisdom from the mouths of babes and sucklings.

Sulzberger protests angrily that the American Negroes are regarded as "second-class" citizens, that the "cancer of Little Rock has eaten deeply into our cause."

We would go farther and say that nearly a hundred years after the Civil War, a war fought to abolish slavery, the 18 million Negroes in the United States of America constitute truly captive people. And when we, like Sulzberger, sympathize with these captives, does that mean that we (and Sulzberger) preach a Hate-America campaign?

Needless to say, the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe, loud and eloquent about the need to "free the unfortunate captives of communism," maintain a discreet but hardly reputable silence about this aspect of the American way of life. And Sulzberger, too, closing his critical eye, accepts the absurd captive peoples thesis.

What manner of people are these "captives of communism" for whom crocodile tears are so freely shed?

In the Soviet Union, the first of the socialist countries, they are the scientists and workers who sent up the first Sputniks and whose Lunik—the Moon rocket—has ushered in the space age; they are the men who built the atomic power stations, the atomic-powered icebreaker, and the airplane which made the non-stop flight from Moscow to New York; they are the workers whose production achievements have enabled their country to reach a rate of industrial growth several times that of the United States; they are Ulanova and her sister "captives" who when they appeared in "Romeo and Juliet" in New York and other American cities the theatre critics exhausted their stock of superlatives in describing the performances; they are the Soviet film producers who have won a place of honor in world cinematography; the Soviet athletes who only recently were roundly applauded by their American rivals when they carried off the honors in an American-Soviet contest; and at Melbourne three years ago where the cream of the world's athletes gathered for the Olympic games, the Soviet contingent returned home with a splendid collection of world records and Olympic gold, silver and bronze medals. As to the military prowess of the Soviet soldier "captives" in defending their country, the one word Stalingrad tells the story. Some slaves! Some captives!

Or take China. For generations before China's 650 million people became State Department "captives" ten years ago, that great country had been the happy hunting ground of all the imperialist powers. Foreign police patrolled the streets of the so-called International Settlement in Shanghai, foreign gunboats patrolled the Yangtze and other rivers and more than once bombarded China's cities and killed her citizens. Down the years Chinese patriots had dreamed of the day when their country, having smashed the fetters of feudal and semi-colonial bondage, would take its rightful place among the nations of the world. That day came in 1949 when the people, led by the Communist Party, after routing the last of Chiang Kai-shek's American supplied and equipped armies, proclaimed their republic. Now there are no imperialist concessions and settlements and no foreign police in Chinese cities; the days of gunboat and dollar diplomacy have gone forever. The people are industrializing their country with seven-league strides; they are taming their turbulent rivers, winning the battle of both floods and droughts, long the curse of China, and, as Sulzberger tells us, their educational program is "turning out more teachers, doctors, and

engineers each year than the United States" (pp. 194-195).

His judgment on the U.S. ostrich policy of denying diplomatic recognition to China, "this is insanity," is one with which few will disagree.

It is a pity that Sulzberger, who, as we have seen, is an acutely critical American, fails to prescribe with the same skill as he diagnoses. His cure for the afflictions of American foreign policy is every bit as bad as the disease corroding it.

What is one to think, for example, of the words: "We must convince our own populations that this is a time to spend more on guns than on butter" (p. 63). Does not this echo the sinister slogan with which Hitler plotted and prepared World War II?

For a man who loathed Hitlerism and all its works, it is strange to find Hitlerian overtones, as in the case of the guns before butter slogan, creeping into his prescriptions. In 1952, we read, General Eisenhower, then NATO commander, before presenting his annual report, consulted the author about the advisability of using the term "international communism." Eisenhower, opposed to rhetoric of this kind, wanted something better. Sulzberger advised the general that it would be wiser to use more "realistic" expressions such as "Soviet imperialism" or "Russian expansionism." To his regret other editors took the matter in hand—his suggestions were rejected and the "ultimate draft emerged with all references to 'international communism' back." Sulzberger's formulation clearly echoed the "stem-the-flood-of-Bolshevism" propaganda artfully used by Hitler in his dealings with the men of Munich.

It is in the discussion of what he terms "Soviet imperialism" that the Sulzberger story is most contradictory. He reproduces an interview with Nasser which completely explodes the myth of his own creation: "They" (the Soviet Union), said Nasser, "have helped us greatly . . . When we faced great economic pressures and really needed aid, they gave it. Our money was frozen in Britain and America; so we asked Russia for petroleum. They agreed at once. When you refused to supply us with wheat, they did. When we asked for a loan, they lent us 200,000,000 roubles. And there are no ties. They haven't made a single political request. It may seem strange; but that's what happened—no single request" (p. 166). Thus President Nasser, who will hardly be offended if we describe him as an anti-Communist, exposes the nonsense of the "Soviet imperialism" charge. And as it was with Egypt so it is with all the countries benefiting from Soviet aid.

Can the same be said about U.S. aid? Sulzberger writes about the "generosity" of it. The plain fact

is that little of this aid finds its way to the poorer countries. Political and military considerations, not the poverty of the recipient, determine the scale of the U.S. aid, its purpose and its geographical direction. West Germany, for example, a much more developed country than, say, India, and with a much smaller population, qualified between 1945 and 1954 for \$3,659 million in grants compared with India's share of about \$100 million; in 1951-54 the Latin American countries with an overall population of 170 million shared \$101 million in grants, while Yugoslavia with 17 million inhabitants qualified for \$325 million. According to Sulzberger, Yugoslavia's isolation from the socialist countries is "a consequence of U.S. foreign policy" (p. 102). In the Far East untold billions are expended on Chiang Kai-shek, who, protected by the guns of the U.S. Seventh Fleet, must surely be the costliest of the State Department's motley legion of displaced pensioners.

Does democracy follow in the wake of the "aid"? Let us turn to Sulzberger for the answer. "One consequence," he says, "is the spread of military dictatorships imposed by armies we build up." Who are the friends of the State Department, its cronies? "We preach democracy," he writes, sardonically, and with "no sense of embarrassment, we ally ourselves with Franco, Salazar, Batista, Field Marshal Sarit, and the slave-owning King Saud" (p. 234).

How can the United States claim to be anti-colonial when it retains "absolute control of Okinawa for an indeterminate period." Our presence there, he continues, is "a form of that colonialism which we condemn in others." And he foresees Okinawa becoming "the Cyprus of the Far East."

Sulzberger seems to think that if only American diplomatists and propagandists were as clever as their counterparts in the socialist countries, all would be well with U.S. foreign policy. Now that, while complimentary to the socialist world, is hardly the nub of the matter. If American foreign policy has failed to win popular support the reason is not that the U.S. lacks skilled diplomatists and voluble propagandists. These it has. What it hasn't got, as Sulzberger points out, is a policy in keeping with the times. That is why it is going "from defeat to defeat."

Unlike their NATO counterparts, the statesmen and diplomatists in the socialist part of the world offer not the negative policy of using force against capitalism, although, naturally, they dislike capitalism every bit as much as the capitalists dis-

like socialism, but a positive policy, the policy of peaceful coexistence.

Instead of Sulzberger's "guns before butter" prescription, their prescription is one of more butter. The Soviet Union, for instance, which has already surpassed the United States in overall output of milk and butter, has announced its readiness to compete with the great transatlantic power not in making guns, H-bombs and nuclear rockets, but in creating an abundance of the good things of life for all people.

The socialist countries' prescription for the ills now besetting the world were clearly formulated in the far-reaching proposals for universal disarmament which Nikita Khrushchov submitted to the United Nations during his historic visit to the United States. His idea to destroy the stockpiles of all armaments, disband all armies, abolish the war ministries and general staffs has gripped and enthused the masses in all countries.

Humanity, relaxed, is breathing much more freely after Khrushchov's mission of peace to the United States, after his stirring call for universal disarmament at the world's greatest forum—the tribune of the United Nations.

Here, surely, we have confirmation of the Sulzberger thesis that if U.S. foreign policy grounded on cold war and anti-communism is going from "defeat to defeat," the foreign policy of the socialist countries, grounded on peaceful coexistence and competition with the capitalist countries, is going from victory to victory. The moral should be clear, even to the Pentagon.

And in spring, when President Eisenhower returns the visit to the USSR, he will be received with a warmth and hospitality that will convince all his countrymen of the friendship of all the Soviet people for the people of the United States.

It may be that Mr. Sulzberger will be among the journalists accompanying the President on his Moscow visit. If so, he will be able to tell the readers of the *New York Times* that the "Hate-America" campaign in the Soviet Union is yet another myth fabricated by the mischief-making cold war propagandists. And it may well be that the outcome of this historic exchange of visits by the heads of the two great world powers will mark a turning point in their relations as will enable Mr. Sulzberger to devote his considerable journalistic talent to another book which this time, in the new era, could have for its title: "Righting the Wrong in U.S. Foreign Policy."

John GIBBONS

Reviews in Brief

Luiz Carlos Prestes. *A situacao politica e a luta por um governo nacionalista e democratico*. The Political Situation and the Struggle for a Nationalist and Democratic Government. Rio de Janeiro, Editorial Vitoria, 1959, 74 pp.

THE booklet under review is the first in the *Series of Political Documents* put out by the Vitoria Publishing House in Brazil. Its aim, as the author (leader of the Communist Party) notes in the preface, is to "compare the policy outlined by the Declaration (March 1958) with the objective facts and experience gained by the Communists . . . to define the perspectives and tasks posed by the present-day situation."

Prestes cites facts testifying to the economic progress made by the socialist countries and their policy of peace. He reviews the events that have taken place in the world since the publication of the Declaration, and shows how the world communist movement has grown. The international climate being what it is, North American imperialism is finding it more difficult to retain Latin America as a reliable hinterland. The people in Venezuela, Colombia and Cuba have overthrown the tyrants of U.S. imperialism. The Communist parties in the Latin American countries are growing in numbers and strength.

The author examines the situation in Brazil and points to the sharpening antagonism—the main one at the present stage—between a developing nation, on the one hand, and the U.S. imperialists and their agents inside the country, on the other. The government's financial and economic policy, mainly subordinated to U.S. monopoly capital, aggravates all the other antagonisms in Brazilian society and worsens the conditions of the working people. This situation cannot but lead to mass action for a new policy by the government. Conditions now favor extending the national front.

"At the present stage," writes Prestes, "the class struggle is subordinated to the national struggle against U.S. imperialism. The primary duty of the Communists is to take an effective part in the nationalist movement, constantly to strengthen it and to act jointly with the other forces. This in turn calls for combating dogmatic and sectarian concepts which are often cloaked in ultra-left phraseology and, while invoking 'defense' of principles, simply lead to opportunist passivity."

In conclusion, Prestes sets forth the urgent problems facing the country: an independent foreign policy of peace, independent and pro-

gressive economic development, agrarian reform in the interests of the peasants, a higher standard of living, strengthening and extending democratic law. The Communists, he says, are convinced that the people will take the road of progress.

Proletarian Solidarity in the Fight for Peace (1817-1924).

Moscow, Sovetskaya Rossia Publishing House, 1958, 560 pp.

THE World Peace Movement recently marked the tenth anniversary of its first World Congress (Paris-Prague, 1949). The movement is the product of the long struggle waged by the peoples against war and those who plot war. It had its sources in the Great October Socialist Revolution, which inscribed on its banner Lenin's humane appeal: "Peace to the World."

The book under review, a collection of documents, was prepared for publication by the Central Archives of the Soviet Union in co-operation with the archives of Albania, Bulgaria, China, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Korea, Poland and Rumania. It describes the solidarity of the peoples in the fight for peace during the years immediately following the October Revolution. It contains 445 documents which reflect the action taken in defense of the young Soviet republic during the war of intervention (1917-1920), against the war threat and for recognition of Soviet Russia (1921-1924).

Before the Revolution Lenin wrote: "Only the working class, when it wins power, can pursue a peace policy not in words . . . but in practice." The first decree of the Soviet Government was the Decree on Peace. All over the world the people hailed this revolutionary call and demanded universal peace. In Berlin, London, Hamburg, Vienna, Budapest and Paris workers, soldiers and sailors held meetings and demonstrations in support of this Decree.

Reproduced in the book are press reports on the anti-war movement and the peace resolutions adopted at public meetings. Here is how the Rumanian Socialists expressed their sentiments: "Working people! Peace, the most precious possession of the people everywhere, was secured not by Pope, emperors, kings, landlords or factory-owners; it was won on the barricades in Russian towns by the blood of the revolutionary workers and peasants inspired by socialism." On January 4, 1919, *L'Humanité* reported that it lacked space to publish all the reports of resolutions expressing the "socialist and revolutionary sentiment" of the workers.

The revolutions in Germany and Austro-Hungary, the revolutionary battles in Finland, Poland, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, the acute class struggles in Britain, France, Italy, the United States and other countries, the appearance of Soviet republics in Hungary and Bavaria, and the rise of the national-liberation movement in the colonies and dependent countries—all testified to the international solidarity of the working class and its ability to uphold the October Revolution as their creation, as their future. Working-class action in the capitalist countries, which tied the hands of the imperialists, facilitated the victory of the October Revolution.

Those present at the Jubilee Session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, devoted to the 40th anniversary of the October Revolution, applauded N. S. Khrushchov when, on behalf of the Soviet people, he expressed heartfelt gratitude to the working people of all countries for their aid and sympathy.

The book, a vivid, moving picture of the recent past, shows the struggle and international solidarity of the masses in the fight for peace and progress.

Reminiscences of Anti-Japanese Guerillas. Volume I. Pyongyang, Institute of Party History of the Central Committee, the Korean Party of Labor, 1959, 227 pp.

IN the communist education of the people, so important at this stage of completing socialist

construction, a prominent place is allocated to study of the revolutionary traditions of the Party. The book, a good help in this respect, was published as study material for a future textbook on the history of the Party.

The authors draw a vivid picture of the guerilla war. The anti-Japanese war waged by the revolutionary workers, peasants and intellectuals, under the leadership of the Korean Communists headed by Kim Il Sung, developed in the northern border regions of Korea and in the eastern areas of Manchuria. It continued for fifteen years, until the liberation of Korea by the Soviet Army. The guerillas delivered telling blows to the Japanese invaders.

The guerilla warfare, the highest stage of the liberation movement of the Korean people, was accompanied by Communist-led political and economic action—the founding of underground organizations, strikes, peasant actions, student demonstrations, sabotage and by boycott of the measures taken by the occupation authorities. A broad anti-Japanese United Front was established and conditions created for building a Marxist-Leninist party in Korea.

The book shows the high morale of the Communists—their confidence in the triumph of Marxism-Leninism, love of country, the fellowship forged in the grim battles, the will to achieve the victory of the revolution, indissoluble bonds with the people and a profound spirit of proletarian internationalism.

NEW BOOKS

(Books are printed in the language of the country of publication; the titles here are given in English.)

- G. Atanasov. *Impact of the First Russian Revolution on the Working-Class Movement in Bulgaria, 1905 - 1907*. Sofia, the BCP Publishing House, 1959, 280 pp.
- Bourgeois Nationalism and Socialist Patriotism (Theses)*. Budapest, Kossuth konyvkiado, 1959, 38 pp.
- R. Vetiska, C. Hruska, P. Reiman, *The Communist International and the Czechoslovak Working-Class Movement*. Prague, Statni nakladatelstvi politicke literatury, 1959, 158 pp.
- I. Dvorkin. *Critique of the Economic Theories of the Right-Wing (West German and Austrian) Socialists*. Moscow, Socekgiz, 1959, 467 pp.
- Gh. Gheorghiu-Dej. *Articles and Speeches*. Bucharest, Editura politica, 1959, 679 pp.
- C. Godoy Urrutia. *Education and Politics*. Santiago, Tierra y escuela, 1959, 230 pp.
- G. Grilli. *Big Capital and the Right-Wing Catholics*. Milan, Parenti editore, 1959, 548 pp.
- O. Grotewohl. *Towards a Peaceful, Democratic and Socialist Germany*. Symposium. Berlin, Deutscher Zentral Verlag, 1959, 140 pp.
- The 21st Congress of the CPSU on Theoretical Problems of Communist Construction*. Collection of Articles. Moscow, Pravda Publishing House, 1959, 135 pp.
- Law in the Hungarian Soviet Republic*. Budapest, Kozgazdasagi es Jogi konyvkiado, 1959, 391 pp.
- K. Marx, F. Engels. *The German Ideology*. First Edition in Spanish. Montevideo, Ediciones pueblos Unidos, 1959, 684 pp.
- G. Mozhayev. *International Cultural Contacts of the USSR*. Moscow, Znaniye Publishing House, 1959, 48 pp.
- The Polish United Workers' Party. Resolutions, Appeals, Instructions and Documents of the Central Committee. VII.1944—XII.1945*. A volume of documents compiled by the Party History Institute of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party. Warsaw, Ksiazka i Wiedza, 1959, 296 pp.
- Fifteen Years of the People's Democratic State and Law. 9.IX.1944—9.IX.1959*. Sofia, Science and Art, 1959, 483 pp.
- W. Ulbricht. *Socialist Economic Development since 1945*. Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1959, 796 pp.
- Ho Chi Minh. *Selected Articles and Speeches*. Moscow, Gospolitizdat, 1959, 802 pp.
- S. Herzog. *The Agrarian Movement and Land Reform in Mexico*. Mexico-Buenos Aires, Fondo de cultura Economica, 1959, 604 pp.
- Economic Progress in Bulgaria. 9. IX. 1944—9. IX. 1959*. Symposium. Sofia, Science and Art, 1959, 327 pp.

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW:

Problems of Peace and Socialism

(monthly)

3-Month Special Subscription Offer

(December 1, 1959 to March 1, 1960)

RATES:

\$5.00 for 18 issues; \$3.50 for 12 issues.

**VALUABLE BOOK PREMIUMS FREE WITH EVERY
NEW SUBSCRIPTION.**

Your Choice of One of the Following Clothbound Marxist Classics:

- #1. DIALECTICS OF NATURE—F. Engels (496 pp.)**
- #2. MATERIALISM AND EMPIRIO-CRITICISM—V. I. Lenin (391 pp.)**
- #3. THE HOLY FAMILY—K. Marx & F. Engels (299 pp.)**
- #4. THE DEVELOPMENT OF CAPITALISM IN RUSSIA—V. I. Lenin (751 pp.)**

Subscribe NOW!

PROGRESS BOOKS

42-48 Stafford St.

Toronto 3, Canada

Please enter my subscription for **World Marxist Review**.

Enclosed is \$5.00 for 18 issues ☐; \$3.50 for 12 issues ☐

Please send me premium 1. ☐; 2. ☐; 3. ☐; 4. ☐

NAME _____
(please print)

ADDRESS _____

Please include 25 cents for exchange and bank charges.

WORLD'S FAIR

Official Program of the

World's Fair

1904

St. Louis, Mo.

June 1 to October 31, 1904

Admission Free

Free of Charge

Free of Charge

Free of Charge

Free of Charge

Free of Charge

Free of Charge

Free of Charge

Free of Charge

Free of Charge

Free of Charge



Editions of the Journal

"PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM"



EDITIONS IN ENGLISH
(World Marxist Review):
Central Books Ltd.,
37 Grays Inn Road,
London, W.C. 1., England

Progress Books,
42-48 Stafford St.
Toronto 3, Ontario,
Canada

FRENCH EDITION:
(La Nouvelle Revue Internationale)
Société Parisienne d'Édition et
d'Information 9, Boulevard des Italiens
Paris (2e) France

Librairie Du Monde Entier,
5, Place Saint-Jacques
Bruxelles

Librairie Rousseau,
36, rue J. J. Rousseau,
Geneve

RUSSIAN EDITION:
Stredisko pro rozširovani tisku,
Praha 6, Sadova 3
Czechoslovakia

CHINESE EDITION:
Guozl Shudian,
38 Suchouhutung,
Peking, China

ALBANIAN EDITION:
Ndermarja Shtetnore Botimeve
'Naim Frasheri'', Tirana

BULGARIAN EDITION:
Raznoiznos,
1, Rue Tzar Assen,
Sofia

CZECH EDITION:
Artia, Praha 2,
Nove Mesto, Ve smeckach 30

DUTCH EDITION:
Progressief Algemeen Vertaalbureau,
Chr. Snouck Hurgronjehof 22'',
Amsterdam-W

GERMAN EDITION:
Deutscher Buch-Export und -Import
GmbH,
Leipzig C 1, Leninstrasse 16

HUNGARIAN EDITION:
Kossuth Kiado, Budapest, V,
Vorosmartyter 4

ITALIAN EDITION:
Libreria Rinascita, Via delle Botteghe
Oscure 2, Roma

JAPANESE EDITION:
Nauka Ltd.,
2, Kanda-Zinbocho
2-chome, Chiyoda-Ku, Tokyo

KOREAN EDITION:
Central publications distribution office,
Phyongyang, Korea

MONGOLIAN EDITION:
Mongolgosknigotorg,
ul-Stalina, Ulan-Bator

POLISH EDITION:
P. K. W. Z. "RUCH", Warszawa,
Wilcza 46

RUMANIAN EDITION:
Directia Difuzarii Presei,
Palatul administrativ C.F.R.,
Bd. Dinicu Golescu, Intrarea G,
Bucuresti

EDITIONS IN SPANISH:
Agencia de Distribucion de Prensa,
Praha 6, Sadova 3
Administracion,
Apt. Nacional 1253,
Bogota, Colombia

SWEDISH EDITION:
Arbetarkulturs forlag,
Kungsgatan 84,
Stockholm K

VIETNAMESE EDITION:
Nha xua't ban Hoc tap,
61, Rue Nguyen-Du,
Hanoi.

