

Workers of All Countries, Unite!

World Marxist Review

August, 1959
Volume 2, No. 8
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

O. GROTEWOHL: In Close Unity Towards the Common Goal	3
A. RUMYANTSEV: The Economic Groundwork of the Advance of Soviet Agriculture Towards Communism	9
B. ROCA: The Cuban Revolution in Action	16
B. PONOMAREV: The Inheritance of the World Communist Movement	23

MONOPOLIES AND THE PEOPLE

E. BURNS: New Features in British Capitalism: Reality and Imagination	33
M. SCOCCIMARRO: The Anti-Monopoly Movement in Italy	39
E. VARGA: Crisis and the Working Class	43

IN THE COMMUNIST AND WORKERS' PARTIES

Chronicles of Communist Construction	49
M. JAGIELSKI: Poland's Agricultural Program	51
Resisting Anti-Democratic Forces	53
O. CERNIK: Nationwide Discussions	54
F. FOSTER: The Growing Role of the Party in Industry	56
M. TALALE: The Source of Our Confidence	57
SHORT NOTICES	58

EXCHANGE OF VIEWS

KIA-NOURI: The National Bourgeoisie, Their Nature and Policy	61
I. COX: Study the Particulars of Each Country	66
H. MESSOUAK: The Working Class and the National Bourgeoisie	68
V. TEITELBOIM: Some Experiences of Relations with the Bourgeoisie	72
M. HARMEL: The National Bourgeoisie of Tunisia Before Coming to Power and After	75
W. SAMMAN: The Bourgeoisie of the Syrian Region of the UAR	77
M. LUKMAN: A Correct Party Policy Guarantees a Strong United Front	80

REVIEWS

I.L.: When the Masses Participate in Running the State	82
A. DEWHURST: Illusions and Reality	85
REVIEWS IN BRIEF	88

LETTERS AND NOTES

G. MARTINI: No Halfway House	90
N. CHAOUI: Free Farjallah Helou!	91

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.

Orders from the United States for subscriptions, single copies or bundles should be addressed to the U.S. distributor:

IMPORTED PUBLICATIONS & PRODUCTS, 4 West 16 St., New York 11, N.Y., U.S.A.

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.

World Journal Review

Journal of Peace and Development

The Journal of Peace and Development is a quarterly publication of the World Journal Review. It is a peer-reviewed journal that publishes original research, theoretical analysis, and policy recommendations on issues related to peace and development.

CONTENTS

Editorial: The Role of the Journal of Peace and Development	1
Original Research: The Impact of International Trade on Economic Growth in Developing Countries	15
Theoretical Analysis: The Role of the State in the Development Process	35
Policy Recommendations: The Role of the International Community in the Development Process	55
Book Review: The Role of the State in the Development Process	75
Index	85

In Close Unity Towards the Common Goal

Otto Grotewohl

FRATERNAL friendship and co-operation with the Soviet people are essential to the German Democratic Republic. Our people, and all who stand for peace, know that after fascism was defeated the Soviet Union did everything possible to help the German people build their republic along democratic lines. The land of socialism likewise supports our people in their fight for the regeneration of Germany as a peace-loving, democratic state.

The recent visit of our party and government delegation to the Soviet Union was a landmark in the development of friendly relations between the German and the Soviet peoples.

"The stirring meetings of our people with the German guests," said Khrushchov at a gathering in the Kremlin on June 19, 1959, "testify to the growing friendship between the Soviet Union and the German Democratic Republic. Our peoples are advancing in close unity towards humanity's great goal—communism."

The working people of our Republic are sparing no effort to cement friendship with the Soviet Union, regarding this as an indispensable condition for the victory of socialism, the prosperity of their Republic and the peaceful unification of Germany.

The Russian Workers Opened the Road to Socialism

We are living in the era of transition from capitalism to socialism. This era was ushered in by the Great October Socialist Revolution, when the Russian workers and peasants, led by the revolutionary party of Lenin, cast off the fetters of exploitation and oppression and cleared the way to a communist future for all.

The building of socialism in the People's Democracies is based on the experience of the socialist revolution and socialist construction in the USSR, because this experience is inseparable from the general principles of Marxism-Leninism. The founding of a Marxist-Leninist, militant party, the conquest of power in a revolutionary way and the establishment of the proletarian dictatorship under the leadership of the working-class party and in alliance with the peasantry, the

planned development of the economy, readiness to uphold the new system against any imperialist attack and attempts to restore capitalism, and loyalty to proletarian internationalism — these are some of the basic principles of scientific socialism which enabled the Russian workers to acquire a universally valid, militant experience. The value of this experience is further confirmed by the revolutionary transformations in the People's Democracies.

The building of socialism in the People's Democracies, naturally, has its specific features which have evolved in the course of their history and which must be taken into account. But these features should not be used as an excuse to ignore the general principles — on the contrary, they should facilitate their implementation.

Thus the division of Germany has given rise to many specific features in the process of reconstructing our republic along socialist lines. The economic and political difficulties arising from this are being overcome only because the Socialist Unity Party firmly abides by Marxist-Leninist principles and makes use of the rich experience of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

This policy has ensured considerable gains for our Party. Thanks to the confidence reposed in us by the masses, we are now on the way to the victory of socialism, and, understandably, we are proud of our successes. But we also know that had we stood alone we could never have done so much in such a short time, and we are fully aware that, alone, we could not have upheld and consolidated our gains.

The unity and solidarity of our working people under Party leadership together with the combined might of the socialist world system are the guarantees of our achievements.

Infuriated by the spread of socialism the imperialists unleashed the cold war against the socialist camp. But no matter how they vilify or incite, they cannot halt the march of history. For us the counter-revolutionary putsch in Hungary has been a warning for all times and in all circumstances. Our enemies will always seek to wrest one or another coun-

try from the socialist family; they will try to isolate the socialist states and fall upon them. Against this we have an effective antidote, namely, the unity of the socialist camp and fidelity to the principles of proletarian internationalism. We, the descendants of Marx and Engels, shall always act in accordance with their noble motto, "Workers of all lands, unite!"

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union Enjoys Acknowledged Prestige

The main concern of the imperialist circles is to wrest some of the socialist countries away from the Soviet Union, to drive a wedge between the Communist and Workers' parties and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

To this end they resort to the most abominable slander and provocation. These maneuvers can be nullified as long as we stand firmly by the CPSU, repel the enemy onslaughts and resist all attempts to detach us from the Soviet Union and its life-giving force.

The German working class knows of the provocations to which the imperialists and militarists resorted beginning with 1918 when forged documents were planted in the bags of Soviet diplomats, of the anti-Soviet slanders of the Hitler clique, and right up to the stream of similar falsehoods of the Adenauer adherents.

Ever since the October Revolution anti-Soviet slander has been a major weapon of the imperialists. It is not accidental that in their efforts to split and weaken the militant working-class forces they still prattle about antagonisms between the socialist countries and the Soviet Union. They would like to see disagreements, even the most insignificant, between the socialist states. Our enemies know that the Soviet Union is the mightiest force of the socialist camp. Firm friendship and close co-operation with the Soviet people reflect the unity and solidarity of the socialist nations and of the revolutionary working-class movement of the world.

In the Soviet Union socialism has triumphed completely, once and for all. Under the leadership of their Communist Party, the Soviet people have solved all the problems of the proletarian revolution and of socialist construction, have turned backward agrarian Russia into a country holding second place in the world in industrial output, and are now engaged in the all-round building of communism.

The Seven-Year Plan of the USSR and the fruits of the efforts of the working people of the entire socialist camp will soon demonstrate the absolute superiority of socialism

over capitalism. With the fulfilment of this plan there will not be a single sphere in which capitalism will retain the lead. Socialism will lead in all spheres.

From the day of its inception the Soviet Union has pursued a steadfast policy of peace. It warned the nations about the dangers of Hitler fascism and proposed effective measures to eliminate the threat of war. But the capitalist countries ignored these warnings and suggestions and did everything to incite German fascism against the Soviet Union.

The victory won by the Soviet Union in the Second World War and its resolute peace policy made it the stronghold of peace and socialism.

The Soviet Union holds first place in the family of socialist nations because:

First — it has behind it more than 40 years' experience of socialist construction. The Soviet Union was the first country to build socialism and the first to enter the period of building communism.

Second — it is the strongest power, which, thanks to its achievements, its political, economic, scientific and military superiority, enjoys immense prestige throughout the world.

Third — it is the staunchest champion of the interests of the entire socialist camp. It extends fraternal economic or political aid whenever a member of the socialist community of nations is in need of it. Were it not for the Soviet Union the other countries now engaged in socialist construction might have fallen victims to the imperialists.

Fourth — the socialist countries and the international communist and working-class movement are in solidarity with the Soviet Union and its Communist Party. The CPSU was the first to pave the way to socialism. Its work has enriched the theory and practice of building communism and has proved beyond doubt the strength and vitality of Marxism-Leninism — the ideological basis of socialism.

A correct understanding of the role played by the Soviet Union and the CPSU is decisive for the relations between the socialist states and between the Communist and Workers' parties. The relations between the Communist parties have always been relations of equality. Each party is independent, but in their activities all of them are guided by Marxism-Leninism. The XXist Congress of the CPSU exposed the revisionist slander about the "unequal" relation between fraternal Communist parties. There are no "superior or "subordinate" parties in the international communist movement. But the CPSU enjoys acknowledged prestige among equal parties.

Unity of the Socialist Camp — the Key to the Victory of Socialism

For the first time in history it has become possible to make the dream of peace and friendship among nations come true. Common socialist goals, the common scientific foundation of Marxism-Leninism and mutual aid and support determine the state relations between the socialist countries. As a result of the conquest of political power by the workers and peasants, proletarian internationalism became the basis of their inter-state relations. Proletarian internationalism is the foundation for the state treaties and fraternal bonds linking these countries.

Under capitalism, on the contrary, genuinely friendly relations between states are nonexistent. The alliances between capitalist countries are determined by the correlation of forces at the given moment, by transient political, economic and military interests. Relations between the capitalist states are determined not by considerations of public welfare, but by the desire of the exploiters for profits. The source of their strife and of the ever-present antagonisms is the private capitalist ownership of the means of production and the shameless pursuit of maximum profit. Engaged in ruthless rivalry, the capitalist states strive to outdo one another in the struggle for raw materials and markets. That is why in their relations there can be no sincere recognition of the right of nations to self-determination or real equality.

Genuine sovereignty, the right to self-determination and equality of all nations and peoples have been implemented only under socialism. But the policy of a socialist state corresponds to the principles of proletarian internationalism only when it is not restricted to emphasizing only sovereignty and equality, but when it contributes also to the unity and strength of the socialist camp.

The Socialist Unity Party is convinced that not a single socialist state can exist for any considerable length of time as a neutral country between the socialist camp and the imperialist camp, on a "no man's land" in the sphere of policy. The building of socialism necessitates siding with the socialist world camp where peace, people's rule and mutual aid have found an eternal haven. Those who do not wish to follow this consistently socialist path cannot achieve socialism. Any attempt by a socialist country to go it alone, to stand aloof, is synonymous with rejecting the rich opportunities for mutual aid and support guaranteed by the socialist camp to all countries building socialism.

Unity of the socialist camp is essential from the standpoint of mutual advantage and defense of the working people of the socialist countries. It is a law of socialism. Unity is also a vital concern of the working class throughout the world. In the eyes of progressive people the socialist camp is the bulwark of peace and the guarantee of the rights of all nations.

German-Soviet Friendship is Vital to Our People

The friendship between the advanced section of the German people and the Soviet people arose on the basis of proletarian internationalism in the first years of the Soviet state. This friendship was upheld by the vanguard of the German working class which showed our people the road to a bright future and to friendship between all nations.

The explanatory work carried out by the Communist Party of Germany and the reports made by the delegations that visited the first worker-peasant state made a breach in the wall of anti-Soviet slander and reinforced the movement for friendly relations. Bourgeois intellectuals such as the renowned humanist Thomas Mann, who denounced anti-communism as the greatest stupidity of this century, realized that friendship with the Soviet Union signified peace in Europe and was a matter of vital importance to the German people.

For its part, the Soviet Union even in those early days appeared before the world as a champion of the real interests of the German people and supported them in solving their national and social problems. This is confirmed by its condemnation of the extortionate Versailles Treaty, by the Treaty of Rapallo signed in 1922, and also by a number of German-Soviet agreements in accord with the national interests of Germany. At the same time trade with the Soviet Union, especially during the world economic crisis, provided work and bread for thousands of Germans.

The split in the German working class and the anti-Soviet policy of the Right Socialist leaders cleared the way for an unbridled anti-Soviet campaign and hindered the growth of friendly sentiment for the Soviet Union. Anti-Soviet slander has always been an essential factor in dampening the militancy of the working people. It did much to send Germany to the lower depths of fascism. At that time the German people failed to understand that anti-Soviet propaganda and anti-communism meant war, poverty and annihilation.

It was only later, after the fascist hordes launched their perfidious attack on the Soviet

Union, subsequently bringing Germany to catastrophe, that many Germans came to realize the vital importance of friendship with the world's first socialist state. This, though a bitter and belated realization, has yet come in time for them to take up and continue the struggle for peace.

The victory of the Soviet people over German fascism and its allies enhanced the international prestige of the Soviet Union, changed the world balance of forces in favor of peace, democracy and socialism, and paved the way to the democratic resurgence of the German people. The class-conscious workers and other patriots realized that it was now possible to break with the anti-national policy of the imperialists and militarists and to build a new, democratic system. The imperialist policy of hostility towards the Soviet Union brought nothing but suffering and misery to our people. The democratic policy of peace, co-operation and friendship with the USSR has opened the road to a happy future.

In East Germany the working class, jointly with the other anti-fascist forces, strove to take this part of the country onto the highway of peace and democracy. The decisive condition for this was the merger of the two working-class parties into the Socialist Unity Party. In the Western zones, on the contrary, the imperialist occupation authorities, assisted by those who had long pursued a line so disastrous for Germany and who had fanned the anti-Soviet campaign, prevented real democratization.

Friendship with the Soviet Union is vital to the German working people. The greater the numbers of those who worked for a peaceful, democratic future, the better they succeeded in overcoming anti-Soviet influence and the sharper was their denunciation of anti-Soviet slander. This, however, was not an easy process. Time was needed for many Germans to get rid of the survivals of fascist ideology—a mixture of aggressive chauvinism, fanatical racism, national arrogance, slavish Prussian docility and anti-communism. At first there was apprehension that the Soviet Union would take revenge on the German people for the damage done during the war and for the Nazi war crimes.

These fears, however, proved to be groundless. Although merciless to Nazism, the Soviet Union remained friendly towards the German people. Our people soon came to know the Soviet people as friends and helpers. The interest and sympathy displayed by the Soviet troops and their readiness to help rehabilitate the economic, political and cultural life

resulted in many Germans abandoning their former anti-Soviet views.

The Soviet Military Administration helped our workers to run the enterprises formerly owned by the monopolists or war criminals; co-operated in the land reform which expropriated the Junkers and the big landlords, in setting up democratic self-government bodies and in implementing other revolutionary democratic measures with a view to abolishing the remnants of the system of exploitation.

During the difficult postwar years, when the USSR itself suffered from shortages, the Soviet people helped us with food and articles of prime necessity. When the Western occupation authorities imposed an economic blockade on East Germany, Soviet workers forthwith supplied our industry with coal, coke and steel to keep it going.

Of great historic and national importance was the transfer of supreme governmental power to the democratic forces in connection with the founding of the German Democratic Republic. The Soviet Union has been a staunch defender of the first German worker-peasant state and, as a disinterested friend, has aided its political, economic and cultural advance. With the establishment of our republic, German-Soviet friendship was placed on a solid foundation of inter-state relations. The attitude towards the Soviet Union became, more and more, the criterion of the progressive attitude of the German working people.

By sharing its experience the Soviet Union helped us to build and consolidate our republic. The presence of Soviet troops in our country prevented armed imperialist intervention against the newly-born people's government and thereby contributed to peace in Germany.

Thus, as a result of the changed outlook of the working people, German-Soviet friendship, which is based on the desire for peace and prosperity for all nations, has won widespread recognition. As the working people see it, German-Soviet friendship is a token of peace, well-being and socialism. That is why this friendship has become a natural component of the socialist consciousness of the vast majority of our people.

Unshakable friendship with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries is essential to the German Democratic Republic. The border between the socialist and capitalist worlds passes through the heart of Germany. As a result of the dismemberment of our country by the Western powers, two German states have emerged: on the one hand,

the peace-loving socialist Democratic Republic, and, on the other, the aggressive, imperialist Federal Republic.

The German imperialists and militarists and the numerous atom-equipped foreign forces stationed in the Federal Republic have turned it into the main atomic war base in Europe.

The Soviet Union and the other socialist states are our true comrades-in-arms in combating this menace. The Soviet Union has repeatedly submitted recommendations and proposals for the reunification of Germany and for a Peace Treaty. The Soviet Union and the other socialist states have supported our proposals for easing the tension in Germany, for agreement between the two German states.

Our Republic — a Sovereign State With Equal Rights

Taking into account the situation in Germany, the consolidation of the people's democratic system in our republic and the existence of the two German states, the Soviet Union has transferred to our worker-peasant government the sovereign right to decide all questions of the home and foreign policy. With the support of the Soviet Union the German Democratic Republic became a sovereign state enjoying equal rights, international respect and recognition.

The Western powers refuse officially to recognize the Democratic Republic. That, of course, is their own affair. But they are not in a position to change the situation. Our republic is growing and becoming prosperous. It remains an important factor for peace in Europe and throughout the world. Its delegation participated on an equal basis in the Foreign Ministers' conference in Geneva, firmly upholding the policy of peace and vividly demonstrating to all that there is a new Germany and there are new Germans capable of resisting the forces of militarism and war. Our delegation in Geneva has made a substantial contribution to the talks on the German and Berlin problems. In common with the Soviet Government, we consider it impossible to effect a radical change in the situation in Germany and Europe as a whole without a peaceful settlement of the German problem and the abolition of the occupation regime in West Berlin.

The best way to consolidate peace in Europe and, simultaneously, to facilitate the national regeneration of Germany as a peace-loving democratic state is to conclude a Peace Treaty. A Peace Treaty with Germany, a

draft of which was submitted by the Soviet Government in agreement with our government for discussion at the Foreign Ministers' conference, would, at long last, end the state of war with Germany and erect a firm barrier to the militarist and revenge-seeking forces.

In our view the time has long been ripe for the German people to exercise their right to self-determination in respect to West Berlin. And we feel sure that this question will be settled satisfactorily.

The peace-loving nations can no longer remain indifferent to the fact that West Berlin is a center for provocative activity against the socialist states, a "front-line city" in the cold war. The German people, particularly those in Berlin, can no longer put up with the occupation status of West Berlin, which is detrimental to their dignity. The present situation in West Berlin is a mockery of the principles of international law. Berlin is situated on the territory of the German Democratic Republic and is our capital. The normal way out would be for West Berlin to merge with the democratic sector. However, in the interests of peace, our government is prepared to accept, until the reunification of Germany, the status of a "free city" for West Berlin, as proposed by the Soviet Union. It is also prepared to guarantee the free-city status of a demilitarized West Berlin and its contact with the outside world.

This proposal has been rejected by the Western powers. Under pressure from the Bonn government, Britain, France and the United States have evaded a business-like discussion of the new proposals made by the Soviet Union and our Republic, which should be quite acceptable to the West and which envisage a transitional period with the temporary preservation of certain occupation rights in West Berlin provided the foreign troops are reduced, the subversive activity and hostile propaganda stopped and nuclear weapons not placed in this part of the city.

It is also envisaged that a body representing the two German states on an equal footing will reach agreement on a Peace Treaty and reunification.

We are profoundly interested in a Peace Treaty being concluded with the two German states. But if the Western powers continue their stalling, we shall conclude a Peace Treaty without Adenauer. When this is done, the occupation rights will cease to be valid in West Berlin—and, consequently, in the whole territory of the GDR.

Some people in the West will not like this. But the responsibility will rest with the governments of the Western powers and chiefly with the Adenauer government, which is now the main enemy of relaxing international tension and is obstinately resisting a peaceful settlement of the German question.

The Western powers have imposed on the Federal Republic treaties which ignore the right of its people to self-determination and rule out an independent policy for the peaceful and democratic reunification of Germany. The Paris military agreements, stipulating the incorporation of the Federal Republic into NATO and the Western Union, contain certain reservations for the Western powers in connection with German reunification, including numerous privileges and prerogatives for their occupation forces, such as the right to declare a state of emergency, reservations which testify to the imperialist character of their policy.

In the understanding of the Western powers reunification is equivalent to annexation of our Republic by the Federal Republic. In practice this would mean that our republic would be brought into the aggressive NATO system and our territory would be turned into a base for an attack on the other socialist countries. But this is crying for the moon. On the westernmost border of our camp we are defending socialism. We know that we are not alone, that we can rely on the might of the entire socialist camp.

The Soviet Union has repeatedly pointed out that an attack on the German Democratic Republic would be regarded as an attack on Soviet territory, that it would support and defend our republic with all the means at its disposal.

We Are Confident of the Future

Our Party and Government have succeeded in creating in West Germany a favorable attitude for our policy of peaceful reunification. Our proposals for a confederation, a non-aggression pact between the two German states, as well as for bilateral rejection of atomic armament, have met with widespread response in West Germany. Our influence there is growing simultaneously with the political and economic growth of our republic.

October 1959 will mark the tenth anniversary of the first German worker-peasant state. All Germans see from the example of this state the real possibility of peaceful development, of economic and cultural advance. And this is one of the most important results of its existence.

The Socialist Unity Party is leading to victory all the progressive and patriotic forces rallied in the National Front of Democratic Germany. The Fifth Congress of the Party stated that, in the main, we have laid the foundations of socialism. The socialist sector accounts for some 90 per cent of industrial output and nearly half of the cultivated land.

Without the Soviet Union, without the socialist camp, the Fifth Congress would not have been able to proclaim the principal economic task of overtaking West Germany by 1961 in the consumption of basic foodstuffs and consumer goods per head of the population. This task is an element of the grand economic sweep of the socialist camp aimed at catching up with and outstripping the highly-developed capitalist countries in per capita output. The Soviet Seven-Year Plan is the mainstay of this offensive. The international division of labor in the socialist camp will, increasingly, acquire the features of a unified and planned world economy in the future.

The Soviet Union is an important trading partner of the German Democratic Republic, holding first place in our export-import operations. We, too, occupy first place in Soviet foreign trade. The volume of goods exchange and the importance of trade agreements with the Soviet Union are increasing year by year, and our relations are being strengthened to the advantage of both parties. Thanks to Soviet deliveries and orders we can plan and organize our work for years ahead. The economic plans of the two countries and of the other People's Democracies are co-ordinated, and each is ensured a steady and balanced development. Our co-operation with the Soviet state and the People's Democracies is based on equality and mutual benefit.

The imperialists dread peaceful economic competition with the socialist camp. Rather than compete peacefully they would prefer to provoke an atomic duel. But the socialist system seeks to prove its superiority by improving living standards and well-being for the people, not by bombs and guns.

The German Democratic Republic has profound faith in its own strength, in the fraternal relations with the Soviet Union and the other socialist states, in the unity and strength of the great socialist family of nations and in the powerful worldwide peace movement. All this inspires us with hope for the future. Our future is that of peace, socialism and happiness of the nations.

The Economic Groundwork of the Advance of Soviet Agriculture Towards Communism

A. Rummyantsev

THE XXIst Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union marked the opening of a new phase in world history: for the first time a beginning has been made on the large-scale construction of communist society.

A highly important aspect of this process is the evolution of socialist relations in agriculture into communist relations. This, beyond doubt, is one of the most complex problems of communist construction—of establishing a classless society with uniform relations of ownership.

The basis for the advance of the countryside towards communism was laid by the dictatorship of the proletariat, by the steady consolidation of the worker-peasant alliance led by the working class and by the triumph of socialism in the USSR, including the socialist reconstruction of agriculture. Collective farming, established with the all-round support of the working class, is developing with the aid of socialist heavy industry—the backbone of the national economy.

Generally speaking, the question of the further development of the collective farms, of their closer integration with socialist industry, of advancing towards a *single national* form of property (communist property) had matured before the Great Patriotic War. The solution of this question lay, naturally, in a gradual development, without bypassing any of the stages on the way; it could not be resolved until all the possibilities offered by each form of ownership, by each consecutive stage, had been fully utilized. The task was to find the concrete ways, means and forms of gradual transition from socialist to communist farming. In practice, however, the job was retarded by the outbreak of the most destructive war in history and also by the difficulties experienced by Soviet agriculture in the postwar years.

The Hitler invasion caused immense damage to the Soviet Union. Industrial output was

greatly reduced. Over 70 thousand villages in the rich agricultural areas were totally or partially destroyed; 98 thousand collective farms, 1,876 state farms and 2,890 machine and tractor stations were plundered and ruined. Livestock losses amounted to seven million horses, 17 million head of cattle, 20 million pigs and 27 million sheep and goats.

The war gravely affected the remainder of the collective and state farms. Many areas had to abandon specialized farming. After the war it was not enough to rehabilitate the ravaged areas, it was necessary to replace all the farm machinery with new equipment.

The key to the rehabilitation and further advancement of agriculture and of the entire national economy lay with heavy industry. All the energies of the people were channeled towards ensuring its reconstruction. And although the national economy was rehabilitated at an unprecedented rate, it was impossible to ensure an equally high rate of development for both industry and agriculture. A certain unbalance set in in the development of the two branches: whereas in 1952 (as compared with 1940) industrial output had risen 130 per cent, agricultural output (in comparable prices) had risen only 10 per cent.

Then there was also an unbalance in agriculture itself: some branches had been neglected, the general rate of growth began to slow down, so much so that between 1948 and 1953 it was actually marking time. Overall grain yields, milk production and state purchases did not show any increase, while the average annual production of meat failed to reach the prewar figure. This situation was fraught with dangerous consequences: the expansion of industry, the raising of the standard of living and the advance towards communism were in danger of being retarded.

These difficulties, it should be said, had nothing to do with the nature of socialism and its economic basis. The peasants who joined the collective farms had seen for them-

selves the advantages of socialist farming. They had become convinced collective farmers. In the occupied territory not even the fascist invader could shatter the collective spirit and restore that of private ownership.

The collective spirit became more pronounced both during and after the war. This was due chiefly to the fact that, in contrast to pre-Soviet times, when the breadwinner went to war the families of the collective farmers called up to the army did not sink into abject poverty. And while it is true that the collective farms did not maintain their advance during the war years, when they were worked by women, young people and the aged (assisted by townspeople during sowing and harvesting), they nevertheless provided grain both for their own needs and for the country as a whole. In the liberated territory the collective farms were immediately aided by industry (although the latter had its own difficulties due to the devastation) and by the collective farms in the East. They were re-stocked with machinery, seeds, livestock and poultry, which enabled them to make good the damage caused by the enemy. These relations between town and village, inconceivable before the revolution, were engendered by the socialist system.

In order to pinpoint the difficulties and eliminate them, it was necessary to undertake a fundamental investigation into the postwar conditions of agricultural production. Headed by their Party organizations the collective farmers sought new ways to increase crop yields, to make animal husbandry more productive and improve labor organization. Local conferences at which the best farmers exchanged their know-how and worked out joint plans began to be held throughout the country.

But at this time we were still gravely handicapped by both prewar and wartime conceptions concerning the state of agriculture and the ways of developing it. Malenkov, for example, who had been entrusted by the Party to exercise direct supervision over agriculture, obdurately clung to the old concepts. Using the pretext of the objective necessity for its rapid rehabilitation, he continued to cultivate the old outdated methods of leadership, methods which hindered progress. The defects that had made themselves felt in various parts of the country were regarded as purely local details, since economic results were, on the whole, good. The slow growth of output was attributed to objective factors—natural conditions and in-

adequate machinery — and to subjective factors — the inability of collective farmers and the personnel of the machine and tractor stations to utilize modern methods and technology to the full. As early as 1948 when agricultural output began to mark time, this point of view prevailed. Malenkov chose to gloss over the difficulties, to falsify the facts and mislead the Party and Stalin, who headed the Central Committee at the time.

Stalin enjoyed enormous and well-merited prestige in the Party and among the people. The successes registered in socialist construction and the wartime victories were associated with his name. But in his last years, when he was divorced from the social life of the people, Stalin began to violate the Leninist standards of Party life. Many questions were decided without regard for practical experience and often by Stalin alone.

Basing himself on a wrong estimate of the postwar state of agriculture and failing to see the mistakes that had been made in conducting it, Stalin concluded that the kolkhoz (collective farm) as a form of production would in the near future exhaust its possibilities and that even now it was beginning to hinder the state planning of agricultural output. Stalin linked the transition of the countryside from socialism to communism, not to production but to distribution. He averred that inasmuch as the collective farms owned only the fruits of their labors (agricultural produce), the transition would be effected in the near future by turning commodity circulation between the state-owned industry and the collective farms into direct goods exchange. This, then, was the source of the erroneous perspectives for the development of agriculture.

The views of others were flatly rejected as not conforming to reality. For example, the proposals made by Khrushchov for better utilization by the collective farms of their incomes were turned down; such, too, was the fate of the proposals made by Mikoyan for raising the procurement prices for agricultural produce, and other measures submitted with a view to stopping the violations of the Leninist principle of incentives for the collective farmers. This attitude stifled the initiative of the working people in the countryside.

But this state of affairs was not immediately realized by the Party and the people, the reason being that both correct and incorrect decisions were interwoven. It was vitally important to carry out a number of measures

as, for instance, to replenish the inventories and stocks used up during the war. The people, as the thrifty master of the country, fully understood the need for these measures and co-operated wholeheartedly. The decisions on the irrigation of drought-affected areas, afforestation belts, abandonment of the team system in grain cultivation and particularly the amalgamation of collective farms (initiated by Khrushchov, who summarized the Ukrainian experience) likewise met with the approval of the people. However, no generalized conclusions were reached concerning the need to boost output and to adapt agriculture to the new conditions. Theoretical dogma was in profound contradiction with reality.

Practice testified not only to the undoubted progress of socialist agriculture but also to a number of defects and errors in leadership. Theory, divorced from practice, naturally, failed to disclose the defects and mistakes and the difficulties engendered by them. While practice testified to the skill of the members in running their collective farms in the interests of society as a whole, and also to the failure to make full use of the possibilities for their further development, theory, alienated from practice, failed to see the new features, turned a blind eye to the unused potential. The alienation of theory from practice hindered creative thinking and made it difficult also to assess the real conditions for development and to apply the conclusions of Marxist-Leninist theory. The search for truth was intensified and by the autumn of 1953 the Party found the solution.

The September (1953) meeting of the Central Committee, with communist straightforwardness, analyzed and brought into the open the defects and mistakes in the management of agriculture. No one before Khrushchov had spoken of them with such clarity and fullness. Only a Party convinced of the justness of its cause, closely linked with the masses and enjoying their confidence and wholehearted support can indulge in such merciless self-criticism.

Relying on the creative activity of the masses in town and countryside, generalizing the achievements of research establishments, the experience of the best collective farms and innovators, taking into account the economic conditions, the degree of mechanization and structure of agriculture, and the potentialities of industry, the Party drew up a bold program for the accelerated development of agriculture, for elimination of the defects hampering its advance. The people

welcomed this program enthusiastically.

But the Party and the people also had to face opposition on the part of concealed enemies—Beria and his henchmen—and of the anti-Party elements. These important measures, aimed at consolidating the collective farms and improving the conditions of the farmers, were opposed sometimes individually or collectively by Malenkov, Kaganovich, Molotov, Bulganin and Shepilov. Later, they combined in an anti-Party group for the purpose of changing the Leninist course. The Party, supported by the people, quickly overcame all the obstacles and swept them from its path. Summing up the results, the December 1958 meeting of the Central Committee registered the success achieved in agriculture and on this basis adopted the control figures for the 1959-65 period that were laid down in Khrushchov's report to the Extraordinary XXIst Congress of the CPSU which ushered in the period of all-round communist construction in our country.

I

Fulfilment of the agricultural program will speed the advance of the Soviet countryside towards communism. The program embraces agriculture as a whole, in all its complexity: property relations, labor inter-relations and, consequently, utilization of technological and scientific achievements in agriculture, and relations in the sphere of distribution. The aim is to provide an abundance of agricultural products so as to satisfy the constantly growing needs of the people. The key-note is the further consolidation of the collective farms as diversified economic units, developing in accordance with a general plan and exchanging advanced experience.

The program outlined steps for accelerated growth of the productive forces in the countryside and, on this basis, an increase in labor productivity and agricultural output. Fulfilment of the program necessitates maximum utilization of the energies and initiative of the rural population. It is understandable, therefore, that in rectifying the grave errors of the past, the September 1953 meeting of the Central Committee called for strict observance of the Leninist principle of incentives for the collective farmers. *This is one of the fundamental principles of socialist management in general and in agriculture in particular.*

This principle means that production in the collective farms should be organized on the basis of economic accounting; and this

requires that not only the overall quantity of the produce be taken into account but also its cost, reflecting the relation between labor expenditure locally and the socially necessary labor-time per unit of product. Only in this way will it be possible to determine both the quantity and the quality of labor contributed to society by each worker; socialism cannot dispense with this method. This also helps to avoid equalitarian distribution, and thus stimulates labor productivity.

This program has induced each collective farm to assess fully its production capacity; without this there can be neither rational utilization of capacity nor realistic planning. In other words, it is necessary to take into account the value and the prime cost of the product, and to relate the expenditure of labor to the end result. This is the only way to ensure efficient supervision over the work of each collective farm.

Economic accounting in the collective farms was opposed by the members of the anti-Party group. *This was because of their conservatism, their incorrect approach to the collective farmers who in their view were a force retarding the progress of the countryside towards communism; it was, moreover, the outcome of their disregard of the revolutionary possibilities of the worker-farmer alliance.* They regarded the application of the law of value in the collective farms, and the calculation of the prime cost of the product as strengthening what they imagined were tendencies to retard progress and abandon the building of communism.

In order to introduce economic accounting in the collective farms it was necessary to revise the antiquated procurement and purchasing prices for agricultural products. These prices, fixed during the prewar five-year plans as a result of the changes in the general level of prices in the postwar years, no longer corresponded to the expenditure of living and materialized labor. There were signs that the principle of exchange of equivalents between town and countryside were being violated. Extended reproduction in agriculture was threatened. By raising the procurement and purchasing prices which differed according to zone (although the complicated multiple-price system still remained), the Party and the Government established a realistic basis for economic accounting.

The collective farm system, now functioning in accordance with the socialist principle of incentives, has every opportunity to secure a further growth of the productive forces,

and the initiative of the farmers themselves is encouraged in every way. The growth of the productive forces has manifested itself in the accelerated mechanization of agriculture and also in the influx of skilled personnel to run the farms, which are large-scale socialist enterprises. By 1958 the power supply for agricultural areas had increased by more than 40 per cent compared with 1953. The average rate of mechanization during those four years was 25 per cent higher than that in the preceding eight-year period. This growth has been ensured by the increased machine-power which now comprises 95.3 per cent of the total traction facilities. The tractor fleet, which has increased by nearly 500,000 units, now comprises 1,700,000 tractors (in terms of 15-hp. units). The truck park has grown by 236,000 units (55.4 per cent), the harvester-combine fleet has been replenished by 165,000 units, an increase of nearly 52 per cent compared with 1953.

Basic field work (ploughing, sowing and harvesting) has been almost completely mechanized (92-98 per cent in the various types of work). And this has been achieved over a territory of 22,400,000 sq kilometers. In the same period electric-power consumption in agriculture has risen nearly 100 per cent—for the collective farms the figure is 120 per cent. Practically all the machine and tractor stations are on electric-power supply, and 93 and 40 per cent of the state and collective farms respectively.

Large numbers of agricultural experts with a higher or specialized secondary education are now working in the rural areas. By the end of 1957 their ranks had increased three-fold compared with 1953—all in all they add up to half a million. Each collective and state farm is staffed with skilled personnel. Moreover, the general educational level of the collective farmers has risen. The majority have a seven-year school education, and men and women with secondary education are now common in the countryside.

Having stepped up the mechanization of agriculture and having staffed it with skilled personnel, the Communist Party has now set the task of solving the grain problem once and for all. That is the *chief* point in the program, since grain farming is the basis of agricultural production.

To satisfy the needs of our country we must produce not less than 130 million tons of grain per year. But it was precisely this vital branch that had lagged behind. In terms of crop area, per hectare yield and overall

yield, the 1949-53 level barely exceeded that of 1913.* Malenkov concealed this serious failure and, juggling with figures of grain on the stalk, misled the Party and the people when at the XIXth Party Congress he declared that about 130 million tons of grain had been harvested in 1952. Actually, as was revealed later, the total harvest was only 90 million tons.

It was necessary to increase the output of grain. But it was impossible to do this in a short time by raising per hectare yields in the traditional cultivated areas. To achieve this the collective farms, industry and the country as a whole would have had to incur expenditures beyond our possibilities. The Central Committee, on Khrushchov's initiative, adopted a number of urgent, economically justified measures for a rapid expansion of grain production. It was vital to bring virgin and long-fallow lands under the plough, and to extend the corn acreage.

New land was brought under the plough on a scale and at a rate unheard of in history. In the course of three years (1954-56) an additional 36 million hectares were sown. This was more than the combined grain acreage of nine European countries—France, Italy, Spain, West Germany, Austria, Belgium, the Netherlands, Denmark and Sweden. The whole nation — collective farmers, factory, office and professional workers—took part in this grand undertaking. It was indeed a heroic feat of the Soviet people, particularly the youth. In response to the call of the Party the people left their homes and pioneered in what until then had been uninhabited areas to provide the country with the grain it needed. The joint effort of the collective and state farms, and industry which supplied the farming equipment, resulted in the grain crop area being extended from 106 million hectares in 1953 to 125 million in 1958. Per hectare yield was raised by nearly 50 per cent. The overall grain yield was raised from 89 million tons to 136 million. Deliveries to the state were stepped up from 30 million tons to 56 million.

Within a short time the country had produced grain in quantities never known in her history. It should be recalled that from the outset the anti-Party group had argued that the virgin lands scheme was economically disadvantageous and predicted its failure. The group cited the pessimistic views of doubtful specialists, referred to the unfavor-

able climatic conditions in the areas scheduled for development, claimed that the scientific principles of farming were being violated, and that this would mean a return to backward, extensive farming.

The people refuted these allegations. They proved that cultivation of the virgin and long-fallow lands, with all their climatic and other difficulties, was possible. They demonstrated that the scheme was by no means a return to extensive farming. In fact the plan is a harmonious combination of extensive (enlarged crop area) and intensive methods (greater efficiency and increased soil fertility).

Hundreds of state farms — each several thousand hectares in size — were created in the uninhabited steppes. The electric-power supply on these farms, labor productivity and per hectare yield considerably surpass those of the state farms in the traditional agricultural areas. The new farms are making more rational use of the natural factors. And these were described as extensive methods! As a result of the scheme the prime cost per unit of product is now much lower. The new farms are diversified enterprises: in addition to grain cultivation they are now raising sugar beet, cotton and other crops. Animal husbandry in the new areas is highly productive. Modern settlements have sprung up with crèches, kindergartens, schools, hospitals, and village halls. Power stations and grain elevators have been built and railway lines laid. The millions of tons of grain produced have not only covered all the expenses of the scheme, they have yielded a clear profit of 18 billion rubles.

The cultivation of these lands has shifted the grain-producing center to the east, making it possible to alter the specialization of the traditional areas and to accelerate the economic development of the collective farms. In the past five years collective farmers in the Ukraine, North Caucasus, Byelorussia, the central and northwestern regions have considerably enlarged the production of highly profitable industrial crops. This has helped to overcome the lag in flax and hemp, to step up the yield of oil-seed, tea, sugar beet, cotton, fruit and berries, potatoes and vegetables. The per hectare cotton yield is now the highest in the world—50 per cent higher than in the United States. This, too, compensates in still larger measure for the expenditure involved in bringing the virgin and long-fallow lands under the plough.

With the cultivation of the new lands the

*Economically the most favorable year in pre-revolutionary Russia.

share of the *state-owned* enterprises in agriculture has gone up to 30 per cent in respect to the area under crops and up to 40 per cent in respect to grain procurement (compared with 12 per cent for 1953). This marks a new stage in the development of Soviet agriculture. Beyond doubt it will further the general advance of the countryside towards communism. In the virgin lands priority has been given to the state farms which are a more advanced form of organization with higher labor productivity and a higher marketable output than the collective farms. Compared with 1953 the number of the grain-producing state farms in 1958 has risen by 130 per cent and their crop area by 350 per cent. These state farms have played no small part in stimulating better organization on the collective farms, higher labor productivity and bigger yields.

Special attention is now devoted to corn cultivation which in the years before 1953 had been curtailed. In that year 3.5 million hectares had been planted to corn, 700,000 hectares less than in 1945. In accordance with the new program, the area has been considerably enlarged. In 1958 the Ukraine alone had over 6 million hectares under corn. The leading collective farms began to plant corn farther north—in areas where it is raised only for silo conservation. In setting the task of extending the corn crop in the traditional areas and growing it in new areas, the Central Committee revised the crop distribution with a view to replacing low-yield crops with high-yield crops.

This task could be accomplished only on the basis of zonal agriculture. Grassland farming which had proved its worth in the central and northwestern regions had long been copied mechanically in other areas. This had resulted in the ousting of grain by grasses yielding low, unprofitable harvests. The Party has suggested that the collective and state farms should apply scientific achievements more widely with a view to creating new systems of cultivation in keeping with the specific conditions of the particular agricultural zone.

The strength of agricultural science, as Khrushchov put it, lies in its close contact with practice. Soviet scientists have every opportunity to carry out their experiments in the fields of the collective and state farms. Both practice and science benefit from this. Hundreds of thousands of collective farmers learn from science and apply it. Our best farmers have won wide recognition by their scientific achievements. For instance, T. Malt-

sev, an agronomist on the Lenin's Behests Farm, has been elected an honorary member of the USSR Academy of Agricultural Science for devising a system of cultivation applicable to his particular area. There are many outstanding agriculturists in the Soviet Union.

Assisted by industry and employing scientific methods, the farmers have, in the main, solved the grain problem and have laid a firm foundation for its final solution. This in turn has eliminated the lag in animal husbandry, formerly the most backward branch. Its development has been assured by providing a solid fodder base.

Expansion of the area under corn supplied the growing fodder needs of animal husbandry. In 1958 the share of corn in silage was 73 per cent (10.6 tons per cow, three times the supply of 1953). Extension of the area under corn and other forage crops has resulted in a substantial increase in the head of cattle and in the output of animal produce.

In setting the task of expanding animal husbandry, the Party, as was the case in all other matters affecting agriculture, consulted with the farming people. Numerous local and nationwide conferences of leading farmers and agricultural experts were held. Central Committee meetings were attended by leading and rank-and-file Party and non-Party people from the collective and state farms, machine and tractor stations and research institutes. Among them were chairmen of collective farms, state farm managers, machine and tractor station managers, specialists, cattle breeders and tractor drivers. The key to the solution of the animal-husbandry problem was likewise found in restoring the Leninist principle of incentives.

Soon the long existing lag in stockbreeding was overcome and considerable gains were recorded. Whereas in 1953 the total head of cattle was below the 1916 level* and even displayed a tendency towards further decline, by January 1, 1959, the head of cattle had increased by 14.2 million, giving a figure 12.4 million in excess of the 1916 level. Within the same period the number of hogs increased by 20 million, surpassing the 1916 level more than two-fold. The number of sheep increased by 35.3 million, or 44.5 per cent in excess of the 1916 figure.

Growth of output of animal produce was no less impressive. During five years, for example, from the end of 1953 to the end of 1958, output of meat (in terms of live weight of animals) showed an increase of 35 per cent,

*The year of the last livestock census in pre-revolutionary Russia.

whereas in 1953 as compared with 1950, it increased by 19 per cent, and this increase involved a fall in the productive stock. Many of the targets for 1960 have been reached ahead of schedule. Those for milk yield in the collective farms and for milk deliveries were fulfilled in 1957. Overcoming the resistance of the red-tape elements, the collective farmers initiated in 1955 a movement which won the wholehearted support of the Party: to outstrip in the course of a few years the United States — the country with the highest indices for agricultural output in the capitalist world—in the production of milk, butter, meat and other products both as regards overall volume and per capita production. With regard to overall output of butter, the Soviet Union outstripped the United States in 1957, for milk in 1958; it is now working to outstrip the United States in per capita production of these items. The USSR is now producing 2.3 times more wool than the United States.

In the matter of a few years the Soviet people, led by the Communist Party, have greatly extended the productive forces of the collective and state farms. Big strides are being made to achieve an abundance of agricultural products, a matter which is vital for the future introduction of communist distribution according to needs.

The rapid development of agriculture has resulted in higher incomes for the collective farmers. The overall cash income of the collective farms has risen from 42.8 billion rubles in 1952 to 95.2 billion in 1957, and to 130 billion rubles in 1958. These figures do

not include the incomes received in kind, that is, products which the collective farms distribute among their members in accordance with work-day units and expend for various public purposes. In terms of value the share paid in kind is far greater than the cash income received by the farms from the sale of their products.

The greater part of the farm's income is distributed among the members in accordance with the quantity and quality of work done. A smaller part (about 20-25 per cent according to the Rules of the Agricultural Artel and the decisions of the general meetings of the members) is utilized for extended reproduction and other common needs of the farm. In 1958 the real incomes of the collective farmers per working member were 60 per cent higher than in 1952.

Growth of income has stimulated the collective farmers to display more efficiency. Carelessness, disregard for agricultural science, lavish expenditure of manpower, and poor use of the machines and other means of production are no longer tolerated. The interest displayed by the people in the fruits of their labor has stimulated the search for ways and means of expanding production, raising labor productivity and reducing costs. Lowering costs is especially important for the farmers, since it raises the demand for their products, adds to their incomes, helps to lower the cost of industrial goods and consequently raises the real incomes of the farmers.

(Part II will appear in the next issue)

The Cuban Revolution in Action

Blas Roca

THE events which have taken place and which are developing in Cuba constitute a revolution. The situation is characterized not only by the fact that tyranny was overthrown by revolutionary means through the armed action of the people, but also by the fact that new social forces have come to power, that a government has been set up whose composition and policy are not influenced by Washington. The revolution has vested power in the alliance of the popular forces headed by representatives of the middle class sections.

In plain language our revolution has registered the following successes:

1. The overthrow of the Batista tyranny.
2. The destruction of the political and military machine of the stooges of Wall Street, the power of the latifundists, sugar magnates, merchants and other big exploiters.
3. The formation of a revolutionary government without foreign interference.
4. The organization of new armed forces (army, air force, navy and police) with democratic and progressive tendencies, forces imbued with the spirit of patriotism.
5. The expulsion of the U.S. military mission which had "trained" and controlled the armed forces of the country.
6. The elimination of the treacherous clique of splitters, strike-breakers and imperialist agents who had entrenched themselves in the Confederation of Labor and in the trade unions generally.
7. Abolition of the anti-democratic organs of repression such as the bureau for combating communist activity, the military intelligence, the investigation bureau; the establishment of revolutionary security bodies.
8. Punishment by military tribunals of criminals, executioners, special police, informers and other agents of the tyranny and imperialism.
9. Confiscation of the property of the officials of the tyranny, their agents and stooges, who made fortunes out of graft, concessions and other shady dealings.
10. Deprivation of political rights for a period of thirty years for all who served the Batista reaction as senators, deputies, councillors, mayors, and those who figured as

candidates in the last rigged elections and also for the leaders of the parties who supported the Batista regime or who collaborated with it.

11. Purging and reorganizing the judiciary.
12. Granting extensive democratic freedoms and rights to the people.
13. Abolition of the compulsory trade union dues; granting of trade union rights to the workers.
14. Adoption of measures aimed at improving conditions for the people, such as lower charges for telephones and electric power in many towns, wage increases, instalment purchase safeguards and curbs on usurers and gambling halls. Rent reduction ranging from 30 to 50 per cent, enabling working people in the towns to save from 10 to 40 pesos a month.
15. An agrarian reform law which provides for abolishing the latifundia, transferring the land to the peasants, credits and state aid to peasants and encouragement of co-operatives.
16. The statement by the Prime Minister condemning race discrimination.

The "Buy Cuban" campaign initiated by Fidel Castro and supported by the people is also an achievement which can be included in this list, because it protects the national economy against the pernicious trade policy of the North American imperialists.

The basic aims of the revolution, which reflect the needs of the country, are: independence and sovereignty, abolition of the latifundia and the feudal survivals in the countryside, division of the land among the peasants, agricultural development in order to meet the needs of the country, the return to the nation of the natural resources, industrialization, abolition of one-crop farming, abolition of the semi-colonial dependence on foreign trade virtually monopolized by one country, and rapid expansion of the national economy. Other aims are increased employment, higher living standards for the workers, poor peasants and the people as a whole, the extension of democratic rights, an end to race discrimination and full integration of the ethnical groups comprising the Cuban nation, development of the national culture and abolition of illiteracy. A particular aim is pursuit

of an independent foreign policy in the spirit of Jose Marti* — to uphold peace, the principles of non-interference, peaceful coexistence, and trade and diplomatic relations with all countries.

The driving forces of the revolution are the peasants, the working class and the urban petty and national bourgeoisie. We consider that, on the strength of the historic tasks of the revolution, of the social forces participating in it, the revolution should be defined as a progressive popular revolution, a revolution of national liberation, an agrarian and democratic revolution.

The revolution is still in its early stages. Its development, its progress or stagnation, its victory or defeat depend on a variety of factors. North American imperialism is enemy Number One of the revolution, for it is doing everything to stifle it.

While the internal counter-revolutionary forces have suffered a fiasco, they have not been completely routed; they still retain their economic power and will stop at nothing in their efforts to divert the revolution onto another road, or to defeat it. These forces are allies of North American imperialism.

A Severe Blow to Imperialism

The U.S. imperialists inspired the coup d'état of March 10, 1952. Washington supplied Batista with arms, supported his regime at diplomatic and political levels, collaborated in the police persecution and helped to combat the democratic and anti-imperialist forces. The United States military mission, which functioned under cover of agreements for "defense of the continent" against a non-existent "danger of world communism," trained the Batista armed forces to fight the people.

Some opposition organizations and their leaders curried favor with Washington and pledged to be more anti-communist than Batista himself and more docile in obeying the orders of the North American authorities. It was these organizations that launched the anti-communist campaigns and hindered the broad unity of forces for which our Party fought.

When, as a result of the armed insurrection, the tyranny was overthrown, Washington made several attempts to set up a military junta, then a provisional government and, finally, a military administration designed to save the supporters of the tyranny and its armed forces. But, thanks to the resolute action of the rebels and their leader, Fidel

Castro, thanks to the general strike, the imperialist maneuvers were frustrated.

In 1898 North American intervention strangled the revolution for independence led by Marti, Gomez and Maseo.* After the war against Spain, the Cuban liberation army was unable to march into the towns; revolutionary power was not established because Spanish colonialism was superseded by the military occupation of Cuba by the United States. In 1933, after the overthrow of the Machado tyranny, there came to power not a revolutionary government but a government formed through "North American mediation." In 1959, however, the rebel army took power and formed a government without consulting Washington.

Features of the Revolution

The Cuban revolution, while it developed in original forms, was characterized by certain peculiarities which however were not unique.

The reactionaries and imperialist agents claimed at the outset that the Cuban revolution refuted the materialist conception of history and the fundamental propositions of Marxism which they tried to ridicule. The course of events, however, has forced both the home reactionaries and the foreign imperialists to change their tune. They are now trying to prove that the Cuban revolution is a communist or a nearly-communist revolution, that there is "a grave danger of communist inroads," etc. These claims, too, are false.

It is not a communist revolution. The measures adopted by the revolutionary government and its laws are not of a communist nature. There is not a single Communist in the government, although the Communists render it wholehearted support and uphold it against counter-revolutionary attacks. The Popular Socialist Party maintains that the government's measures are vital for a solution of the country's problems and has always supported them. The road to socialism lies through full and consistent implementation of these measures.

What, in effect, are the basic features of the revolution?

The revolution developed out of the action of guerrilla units reorganized into a revolutionary army of insurrection, which defeated the pro-imperialist army of the reactionaries. The revolution destroyed the old armed forces and police, overthrew the tyranny and estab-

*Ideologist and leader in the Cuban war of independence at the end of the last century.

*Maximo Gomez and Antonio Maseo were prominent military leaders in the Cuban war for independence from Spain at the end of the last century.

lished a revolutionary power. In the conditions of today, even such a small country as Cuba found it possible to wage guerrilla warfare, to overthrow the imperialist stooges and establish a democratic and independent government.

Another feature of our revolution is that the main form of struggle was an armed one in the countryside while the strikes, boycott of elections and other actions by the working class and the urban masses played only a subsidiary role.

The armed struggle was initiated by the petty bourgeoisie. Working-class action could not be the decisive factor of the revolution owing to a number of circumstances, such as the split in the ranks of the working people brought about by the pro-imperialist bourgeois elements; the bureaucratic control of the trade unions by Mujal* and his gang who, relying on the police, disorganized and disorientated the working masses; the weight of "economism" in the labor movement and the tendency to solve all issues through the official trade union leadership; the lack of unity among the revolutionary forces in the trade union committees functioning outside of the official machine.

The revolution marched triumphantly from the countryside to the towns, from the provinces to the capital. The political leadership of the armed struggle was in the hands of the petty bourgeoisie, while the rebel army consisted mainly of poor peasants and farm laborers.

The following lessons emerge from this:

1. Some strata of the petty bourgeoisie, who swung to the left as a result of intensified imperialist oppression on the one hand, and the growing influence of the socialist world and national-liberation movements on the other, can play an important revolutionary role in the Latin American countries.

2. In developing the revolution a big part is played by the peasant movement.

3. Unity, independent action and correct guidance to the working class and the trade unions are needed to enable the working people to fulfil their revolutionary role. Our experience has also shown that even in conditions of police and bureaucratic control over the trade unions the committees of working people set up on a united front basis can organize and direct the activity of the masses.

*Eusebio Mujal, former Secretary-General of the Cuban Confederation of Labor, the protégé of the reactionary governments, was an ardent supporter of the tyranny; to save his skin he fled to Argentina.

Another important feature of the revolution was that although the imperialists granted all forms of aid to the tyranny they did not dare launch military intervention during the long-drawn-out armed struggle.

This testifies to the weakness of imperialism as a whole, to the fact that the North American imperialists can no longer dictate their terms nor impose docile governments on the Latin American peoples. They can no longer, with the ease of the thirties, embark on armed intervention in those countries. The present international situation is not favorable for imperialist intervention.

The Cuban revolution has refuted the myth of geographic fatalism, of the invincibility of professional armies and the omnipotence of North American imperialism. Its experience proves that a government that has the courage to stand up to imperialism, that works on behalf of the people and, because of this, enjoys the wholehearted support of the masses and of the organized revolutionary forces, can withstand imperialist pressure.

Our revolution shows that even a small country situated in close proximity to the United States can successfully fight the pro-imperialist tyranny, establish a system in keeping with the national interests and boldly resolve such basic issues as agrarian reform and the building of an independent economy.

It has solved a number of important questions, but it is faced with still more complex problems.

Our difficulties are as follows: the country is small, with a population of six million, and geographically close to the United States; the economy is based on a one-crop system, with the result that we are dependent on foreign trade not only in respect of fuel and manufactured goods but also with regard to food. We point out these difficulties not to retreat before them as is done by the Plattists*, but in order to overcome them and ensure the further advance of the revolution.

For this at least three conditions are essential:

1. Maintaining and strengthening the co-operation and unity of all the revolutionary forces; in working for this it is essential to isolate the Plattists.

2. No Leftist mistakes that play into the hands of the enemies of the revolution and alienate some circles that are capable of

*Adherents of a pro-U.S. policy in Cuba. They take their name from U.S. Senator Platt whose amendment to the Cuban Constitution in 1901 enabled the United States to interfere in the internal affairs of Cuba. The amendment was repealed in 1934.

supporting the revolution or displaying sympathy for it. Vigilance should be observed with regard to the Rightist elements, since realization of their designs might dampen the enthusiasm of the workers, the poor peasants and the other revolutionary forces, and weaken international solidarity.

3. Securing international support for our revolution and primarily the support and solidarity of the peoples of Latin America, Canada and the United States.

The Cuban revolution has evoked enthusiasm and raised the hopes of all the working people of Latin America. Latin Americanism has now taken on a new connotation of liberation, since it is opposed to the official Pan-Americanism, which is an instrument in the hands of the imperialists for meddling in the affairs of other countries. That is why, apart from anything else, the North American imperialists would like to crush the revolution in Cuba and thus end the "bad example" which it sets to the whole of Latin America.

Imperialist Conspiracy

The imperialists are making every effort to subvert the revolution or to bring it under their control. In order to disarm the revolutionaries and to force them to withdraw, to split their ranks and defeat them, they resort, to use a colorful expression of one of the yellow journalists, to the "smile and sword-thrust" policy, to flattery and concealed threats, to intimidation and blackmail.

The purpose of the recent meeting in Salvador of United States ambassadors to the Caribbean countries was to coordinate the activities directed against the Cuban revolution. The anti-democratic and anti-labor drive as well as recent anti-Soviet provocations in Mexico and Argentina were undertaken on the instructions of the United States to balance the anti-imperialist wave in Latin America, to counteract the effect of the events in Venezuela and Cuba on the peoples of the continent.

The U.S. imperialists are hastily arming Trujillo and Somos* in order to use them for aggressive purposes. Talks are being held with a view to using the Organization of American States against Cuba.

In the United States, Mexico and other countries, the former stooges of the tyranny are being organized and mercenaries are being recruited from the dregs of society. The idea is to use them as a political screen for intervention against Cuba. The U.S. naval

base in Guantanamo has been reinforced with several thousand men.

The "attack" on Panama, undertaken by a group of Cubans — some of whom were victims of deception while others were adventurers — was part of a design to justify the action of the Organization of American States against Cuba on the pretext of an alleged threat to peace in the Caribbean. The choice of Panama as the victim of the provocation was not fortuitous. Panama had claimed 50 per cent of the profits made by the Canal and had extended its territorial waters to twelve miles with a view to combating smuggling in the Canal Zone.

The North American imperialists are not confining their measures to military preparations. Naturally they would like to crush the revolution by means of threats and blackmail, without outright warlike actions. They would like, by winning over some circles in the revolutionary camp, to subvert it from within and force it to surrender and abandon the revolutionary program, to force it to follow Washington. They are now using economic levers, playing on the difficulties experienced by the revolution, fomenting discontent and supporting Plattist and Rightist elements both in the government and in the revolutionary camp.

The main weapon of their campaign is anti-communism, which unites all counter-revolutionaries. Anti-communism is used as the pretext for covert attacks against the revolution, for the insistence on refraining from urgent measures on the grounds that the Communists benefit from them. In the name of anti-communism the imperialists insist on Cuba relinquishing an independent foreign policy, on accepting all pro-imperialist arguments favoring the cold war, arguments set forth by J. Figueres, Munos Marin* and others, who are now spreading among the Latin American peoples the treacherous propaganda of subordination to imperialism.

The Rightist and Plattist elements in the revolutionary camp, charmed by the "smile" of the imperialists and blissfully forgetful of the "sword," display a tendency towards anti-communism and disruption. As long as the Plattists are represented in the government they will be a grave threat to the revolution.

Conspiracy is threatening the revolution from without, while the activities of the Plat-

*Dictators in the Dominican Republic and Nicaragua.

*Jose Figueres, ex-President of Costa Rica; Luis Munos Marin, Governor of the U.S. Colony of Puerto Rico which is called a "self-governing community in voluntary association with the United States."

tists, the Rightists and the splitters are undermining it from within.

These groups, waging a persistent struggle against the Left, tend to underestimate the danger of an imperialist and counter-revolutionary conspiracy. Opposed to our struggle against imperialism, they thereby endanger the revolution. The disruptive activity of the Rightist elements, particularly their policy in the trade unions, is another grave danger to the revolution, since it plays into the hands of the imperialists and is used by the Mujalists and other counter-revolutionaries in an effort to regain their positions.

In order to combat the imperialist and counter-revolutionary conspiracy, our Party is urging that revolutionary vigilance be strengthened, that the people be rallied and that the workers and peasants should undergo military training.

The Party and the Left revolutionary forces are exposing anti-communism. They are telling the people that imperialism and counter-revolution are using it as a cloak for their sinister designs, that anti-communism is a weapon used to weaken the revolution and defeat it. While resolutely repelling the attacks of the Rightists, the Party, avoiding involvement in a futile struggle, is constantly upholding unity and proving that it is indispensable for the revolution.

Agrarian Reform — Decisive Step

Implementation of an agrarian reform is of immense importance for the further development of the revolution.

Agrarian reform is now the imperative demand of the nation. There have been differences as to the scale of the reform. The latifundists and big landowners would like to confine it to the draining of marshlands and distribution of the reclaimed land. Others say that it would be irrational to break up the large holdings and try to prevent any substantial curtailment of the latifundia.

The first steps in the reform were made during the armed struggle. The so-called Law No. Three proclaimed by Fidel Castro in Sierra Maestra on October 10, 1958, provided for the transfer of holdings up to two caballerias (about 66 acres) to the tenant farmers, sharecroppers, farm laborers, etc.

After the overthrow of the tyranny and the reinstatement of the Constitution of 1940 as the basis for a new Constitution, the provision that the land expropriated in the public interest should be paid for was revised. This provision was a serious handicap to the re-

form because it necessitated the accumulation of millions of pesos for compensation to the latifundists before the reform could be started. The new provision envisages obligatory preliminary payment of the compensation for the expropriated property, which, however, can be paid in bonds redeemable within the time fixed by the law.

Some of the big estates confiscated from the supporters of Batista, where production was conducted on capitalist lines, have been turned into co-operatives with the laborers as members. Some of the other land, the distribution of which had been requested under former governments, has been divided among the tenants without compensation.

The last few months have seen a propaganda campaign waged for the reform as a necessary step towards raising national output and satisfying the needs of the country, towards industrialization and a substantial reduction of unemployment. This campaign has stimulated a movement among the urban population in support of the land reform. Factory and office workers, professionals, students, shopkeepers and industrialists have donated some 13-14 million pesos to the agrarian reform fund.

Despite the objections of the Plattists and the stalling of some ministers, the land reform law has been passed. The land is to be transferred to the peasants, state credits will be granted and co-operatives encouraged.

A campaign is being launched to ensure implementation of the law, to rally the peasants and farm laborers in order to frustrate the maneuvers of the latifundists who seek to evade the law and to bury it in bureaucratic red tape.

The agrarian reform will bring about a new alignment of social forces, as a result of which the forces of the revolution and counter-revolution are bound to clash. This will rally, organize and revolutionize the peasant masses and will emphasize the importance of their alliance with the working class as the only class which unreservedly stands for the abolition of the latifundia.

The agrarian reform will be a decisive blow to the main enemies of the revolution because in Cuba the imperialists also happen to be big latifundists. The outlawing of the latifundia will abolish the economic base of the power of the latifundists, a parasitical and pro-imperialist class which breeds anti-popular dictatorships, a class whose interests are incompatible with progress and independent development.

The transfer of the land to the peasants will make them active supporters of the revolution. Upon getting land they will devote themselves whole-heartedly to the revolutionary cause.

Peace and Contact With All Countries

The overthrow of the tyranny and the formation of a government relying on the people and the rebel army have strengthened peace and the independence of the nation.

To maintain the cold war, the arms drive and preparations for war, the imperialists are forced to establish their supremacy over other countries. They need puppets who would be prepared to carry out their orders by fire and sword and sacrifice the national interests. That is why the liberation efforts of any country from the imperialist yoke and for economic independence weaken the militarists and strengthens the peace camp.

The cold war, international tension and war preparation are used by the imperialists as an excuse for their intervention in the internal affairs of the Latin American countries, for supporting the tyrants, combating revolutionary and democratic movements, and also for exerting pressure on these countries with a view to isolating them and hampering trade and beneficial economic relations with the socialist camp.

Cuba's independence and advancement require that she should oppose the cold war, support relaxation of international tension and work for a settlement of conflicts through negotiations, for prohibition of nuclear weapons, disarmament and peaceful coexistence.

Cuba should put an end to her isolation on the international arena, an isolation forced upon her by Washington and the pro-imperialist tyranny. She should establish contact with the socialist countries and take advantage of the benefits from trade, economic and cultural exchange with them.

Difficulties in Our Struggle

The conditions in which the Popular Socialist Party is waging its struggle in defense of the revolution and its progress are very complicated.

On the one hand, the Party has to take into account the difficulties confronting the revolution and to combat any extremism. On the other hand, it should oppose any attempt to narrow the tasks of the revolution, to prevent its further development or to reverse it.

The Party is rallying and uniting all the forces opposed to the imperialist and counter-

revolutionary conspiracy. At the same time it is forced to repel the attacks of the Plattists and Rightists who are sabotaging the rallying of the popular forces. While supporting and defending the government it is working to change its composition through isolating the Plattists and others who are retarding the advance of the revolution and trying to change its course. The Party demands that spokesmen of the working people, including Negroes, should be represented in the government.

The Party must combat the policy of disruption pursued by the Rightists. It must uphold its ideological and political principles against any distortions and protect its positions in the eyes of the masses and at the same time cement unity and solidarity in the revolution. It places emphasis on demands that rally all the forces of the revolution.

The Party must be flexible and practical as well as staunch in matters of principle, faithful to the revolutionary theory of Marxism-Leninism so as not to commit grave errors and to steer a correct course. It should guard against dogmatism, that is, any attempt to borrow mechanically the experience of other countries or a stereotyped repetition of its own past experiences. It should also be on guard against revisionism, that is, attempts to belittle the role of the basic tenets of theory in revolutionary practice.

The main slogans and demands of the Party at the present moment coincide with those of the entire revolutionary movement. Some of these slogans are opposed not only by the imperialists and reactionaries but also by the Rightists in the revolutionary camp. The people and the Party are faced with the task of overcoming this resistance.

In our struggle against the Rightists and bureaucrats we painstakingly discuss the problems and at the same time point to the questions on which our views coincide, that is, to those tasks that have won general approval in the revolutionary camp and await solution.

In order to accomplish the revolutionary program and implement the tasks of the revolution, our Party is working:

1. To unite and rally all the revolutionary forces and mass organizations and coordinate their activity; to extend and strengthen unity in the trade union movement, in the peasant, student and other organizations on the basis of advancement of the revolution and the specific demands of the various strata within the framework of the general demands of the

revolution. Unity and co-operation do not preclude discussion and differences among the revolutionary forces. But discussions should be held and differences settled in a way that strengthens unity and does not subvert it.

2. For better agitation and propaganda among the working people with a view to helping them to become conscious of their revolutionary duty and their tasks. It is imperative that the trade unionists should deepen their revolutionary consciousness and break with the Plattist ideology, with narrow-minded economic syndicalism, with its concern solely for the demands of a definite group while oblivious to the general tasks of the revolution. The Party aims at getting the workers, the trade unions and the Confederation of Labor to become conscious of

their responsibility as a revolutionary social force.

3. For a revolutionary organization of the poor peasants.

4. For a worker-peasant alliance which would ensure the further advancement of the revolution.

5. For the organizational, ideological and political strengthening of the Popular Socialist Party and the Socialist Youth Organization. In order to achieve this task members should be admitted on the basis of selection, and their training as well as that of the masses should be conducted in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism.

Our Party is resolved to carry out these tasks, to justify the trust of our courageous and freedom-loving people.

Havana, May 1959

Among Our Contributors

OTTO GROTEWOHL: Member of the Political Bureau of the C.C., Socialist Unity Party of Germany, President of the Council of Ministers of the GDR.

A. M. RUMYANTSEV: Soviet economist, professor.

BLAS ROCA: General Secretary of the National Committee of the People's Socialist Party of Cuba.

B. PONOMAREV: Soviet historian, Corresponding Member of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR.

EMILE BURNS: Member of the Executive Committee of the Communist Party of Great Britain.

MAURO SCOCCIMARRO: Representative of the Control Commission of the Communist Party of Italy, member of the leadership of the C.C., CPI.

E. VARGA: Soviet economist, academician.

The Inheritance of the World Communist Movement

B. Ponomarev

(Apropos of the New Textbook on the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union)

THE Communist Party of the Soviet Union has traversed a glorious and heroic revolutionary path. Just over a half a century ago it was a small underground organization working in the serf-like conditions of the tsarist system. Today it is the ruling party of a powerful socialist state.

Naturally, a correct elucidation and generalization of the rich experience of the Party and the study of this experience are of vital importance for the ideological education of Communists. That is why the XXth Congress of the CPSU, which played an outstanding role in the international communist movement, advanced the task of preparing a textbook on the history of the Party as one of the main problems in the Party's ideological work. In his report on behalf of the Central Committee, Comrade Khrushchov said: "In the future, too, the glorious history of the Party must serve as a cornerstone of our work of education. In view of this, it is necessary to publish a popular Marxist textbook on Party history, a textbook based on historical facts and giving a scientific generalization of the epoch-making struggle waged by the Party for communism and bringing the story up to the present day."

Marxism-Leninism, which is the theory of the revolutionary struggle of the working class, of the toiling masses and the oppressed peoples, is being developed by all the Communist parties of the world. But by virtue of historical conditions the experience of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is of special importance for the world communist movement.

With its founding there appeared the first party of a new type. The period of the Second International was characterized by a type of party which made a fetish of bourgeois legality, tolerated opportunists in its ranks and actually followed their lead, a party which scorned revolutionary struggle for the interests of the working people. The efforts of

Lenin and of the Marxists who worked under his leadership resulted in the formation in Russia of a party which was irreconcilable towards opportunism, revolutionary in relation to the bourgeoisie, a party of social revolution and proletarian dictatorship, namely, the Bolshevik Party. The history of this Party testifies that the rise and consolidation of Marxist-Leninist parties of the working class were conditioned by social development.

Russia was the first country in which the great popular revolutions of the epoch of imperialism occurred, both bourgeois-democratic revolutions and the socialist revolution. The history of these revolutions enables us to understand the laws of class struggle in the epoch of imperialism. Thanks to the theoretical work of the Communist Party and its leadership of the struggle of the masses, a socialist society emerged for the first time in history, and the science of socialist construction was verified by practice. In the process of building socialism the Party had to settle complex theoretical, political and organizational questions pertaining to the transition from capitalism to socialism and then to communism.

It is this that makes the experience of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union extremely valuable for the international working-class and communist movement. In his day Marx studied the laws of capitalist development on the basis of the example of Britain. In our times it is the Soviet Union that demonstrates to other countries their "morrow." The history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is a source of knowledge for the fraternal parties, from which they can derive theoretical and practical lessons. The new book draws a magnificent and inspiring picture of the epic struggle waged by the Bolsheviks, by the Communist Party which, at the head of the working class, "turned Russia upside down," took her onto the high road to communism, and paved humanity's

way from the realm of necessity to that of freedom.

The new book, unmarred by the defects of the previous histories, gives a detailed account of Lenin's role, sets forth the vital problems of Leninism as they developed and assesses the new contribution made by the Party and its Central Committee to Marxist-Leninist theory right up to the present day.

The authors depict the role played by the masses at the various stages of struggle and the relationship between masses, class, party and leaders. Resolutely opposed to the personality cult which is alien to the spirit of Marxism-Leninism, the new history, while not denying the role played by individuals in history, describes the many-sided work of both the Party organizations and outstanding leaders. In the course of the struggle of the Party—a body cemented by Marxist-Leninist unity—dozens and hundreds of leaders whose names deserve to be recorded in the annals came to the fore.

The Party's road to victory was not a continuous triumphal procession. The purpose of the compilers was to give an objective picture of this complex struggle—the overcoming of difficulties, accumulation of experience, rectification of mistakes and the fight against opportunists, dogmatists and doctrinaires.

The book derives from a study of considerable documentary material, in keeping with the principle of partisanship and historicism, which demands that the facts and events be examined from the standpoint of the conditions which engendered them. This approach alone can ensure objectivity and a Marxist-Leninist interpretation of events, which rules out any arbitrary juggling with facts.

Stalin's role is elucidated objectively. As Secretary-General of the Central Committee he, together with the other leaders of the Party and Government, worked actively to implement Lenin's behests. His name is associated with the remarkable socialist changes effected in the USSR. An outstanding theoretician and organizer, he headed the struggle against the Trotskyites, the Right opportunists, bourgeois nationalists, and against the machinations emanating from the capitalist encirclement. Stalin played a notable part in the development of the world communist and liberation movements. At the same time, the book examines the grave mistakes made by Stalin, particularly in the last years of his life; it examines the reasons which contributed to the personality cult, sets forth the

measures taken by the Party to overcome it, and points to the positive results of these measures. In essence, the Party's denunciation of the personality cult was designed to eliminate the harmful consequences of the cult and to consolidate the positions of socialism, *not* to make a sweeping denial of Stalin's positive role in the life of the Party and the country.

The work of local Party organizations is dealt with as far as space allowed, so that the reader has before him a comprehensive picture of the activity of the entire Party from top to bottom.

The international situation in which the CPSU had to conduct its work is characterized and the basic principles of the Leninist foreign policy as applied throughout the Soviet period are set forth. This enables the reader, whether Soviet or foreign, to get a better understanding of the conditions in which the Party developed. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union is described as a unit of the world communist movement, and its role in the struggle of the working class of the world is brought out.

I

The experience accumulated by the CPSU is extremely varied. Its activity and its influence are felt in every sphere of public life. The significance of the new textbook is that it shows the basic trends of the Party's theoretical, political, organizational and educational activity.

On the basis of vast historical material the book shows the strength of the working class led by a Marxist-Leninist Party. The experience of all revolutions and of the liberation struggle of the oppressed classes, wrote Lenin, teaches that only the working class is able to rally and lead the dispersed and backward sections of the working people. The history of the CPSU confirms this fundamental Marxist proposition. The working class displayed its revolutionary strength in the struggle for the liberation of the working people; the same is true of its leading role in building the new society after the overthrow of the bourgeoisie.

In building the new society the Party always relied on the working class. Lenin said: "Whenever the Soviet Government encounters obstacles in the extremely difficult matter of building socialism it knows only one way of overcoming them, it turns to the workers, each time to bigger and bigger sections of them." The Communist Party of

the Soviet Union has always found new strength in the working class, boldly promoting young people without any fear that at first they will inevitably make mistakes. Profound faith in the creative abilities of the working class has imbued the entire activity of the Party, and experience has confirmed that the Party was right in this.

The history of the CPSU is proof of the soundness of the theory of scientific socialism. History has known numerous organizations and parties which played a positive role in the movement for emancipation. The revolutionary working-class Party differs from these organizations of the past, in that it is equipped with the most advanced scientific theory of modern times—Marxism-Leninism. Thanks to this the initiative of the Party and its influence on the course of history have grown enormously.

It is only natural that the book should devote much space to the basic problems of Marxism-Leninism: the Party of a new type as the principal weapon in the struggle for the interests of the working class and the victory of communism; the socialist revolution and its motive forces; proletarian dictatorship and its forms depending on the specific conditions; the ways and means of building socialism and communism; the worker-peasant alliance; the national question; proletarian internationalism, and others.

The Party has been trained in the spirit of fidelity to Marxism-Leninism, irreconcilability towards any deviation, and it has been tempered in the struggles against revisionism. Its fidelity to Marxism-Leninism is combined with the creative approach to theory, with persistent struggle against dogmatism. Theory and practice are organically combined; theoretical and practical work fuse into a single, indivisible whole.

The history of the CPSU is Marxism-Leninism in action. The book shows the development of Marxism-Leninism as a law-governed process of enriching theory in keeping with the changing conditions of society and the new tasks confronting the Party. Study of the fundamental problems of theory helps one to gain a more profound understanding of Leninism as the continuation and further development of Marxism, as Marxism of the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, of the epoch of socialist and communist construction in the USSR, of the rise and consolidation of the socialist world system, of the transition from capitalism to communism.

At each stage the Party worked out its strategy, tactics and general line, rallied the masses and solved the most complicated political, economic and ideological problems.

II

An important place is accorded the Leninist teaching on the Party and its application—the need to organize the proletarian vanguard into a militant Marxist-Leninist Party, the struggle waged by Lenin and his followers to preserve and consolidate the Party and its leading role both before and after the Revolution.

The historic mission of the Party and the basic content of its work consist in heading the struggle of the working people for the revolutionary transformation of capitalist society into communist society. In the final analysis, the structure of the Party, its composition, rules and the training of its members are determined by the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat and the toiling masses, and are subordinated to the task of establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat and building communism.

The Leninist teaching on the Party encompasses two closely-linked sides: inner-Party life and contact with the working class and the masses. By inner-Party life we mean a system of definite standards and rules elaborated and implemented by the Party: democratic centralism, Party unity, the rights and duties of Party members, admission into the Party of the best of the working class and the toiling masses, the training and ideological molding of the Communists. Party contact with the working people implies its activity in fighting for their interests and leadership of the masses. This leading role is formulated in the Party's program and is implemented in its policy; it is ensured by its organizational work. To a considerable degree this role is determined by the character of inner-Party life.

The book outlines the Leninist teaching on the Party in its historical development. At the dawn of Bolshevism, Lenin emphasized in his book *What the "Friends of the People" Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats* (1894) the indissoluble link between the task of building the Party and the historical mission of the Russian working class. Only when the Marxists have created a strong party, he pointed out, will the Russian workers, at the head of all democratic elements, overthrow absolutism and lead the working people to a victorious communist revolution.

In the Iskra period Lenin, in his *What Is To Be Done?* (1902), elaborated the fundamentals of the teaching on the revolutionary Marxist Party. This book draws a sharp line between two irreconcilably opposite views—the opportunist philosophy of bowing to spontaneity and the Leninist teaching on the Party as the revolutionizing, leading and organizing force of the labor movement.

After the Second Congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party Lenin, in his struggle against the Mensheviks, developed his teaching on the Party. In his *One Step Forward, Two Steps Back* (1904), he elaborated chiefly the organizational principles of the Party and the standards of inner-Party life. Of special importance is the principle of democratic centralism which combines strict centralism with broad democracy, the unchallenged authority of the leading bodies with their being subject to election and responsible to the membership, and discipline together with the initiative of the rank and file.

The first Russian revolution confirmed the vitality and soundness of the Leninist teaching on the Party and provided new material for its further development. On the basis of the revolutionary experience Lenin enriched Marxist theory on the leading role of the Party in the mass struggle and showed the role played by the Party in the activity of the masses. "Policy, properly speaking, can be shaped only by the masses," wrote Lenin, "and the non-Party masses who do not follow a solid Party are dispersed, lack political consciousness, have no will and can become a plaything in the hands of crafty politicians who always appear 'on time' from the ranks of the ruling classes to take advantage of the 'opportunities.'"

The Party lives up to its vanguard role only when it does not alienate itself from the masses but works with them, when it convinces them of the correctness of its cause, when it raises them to the level of advanced fighters for communism. Both sectarian aloofness from the masses and opportunist adaptation to backward sentiments are equally alien to the Party. Lenin teaches, and the experience of the Party confirms it, that a party is invincible if it is able to maintain close contact with the working people and if it is able to align itself with the life of the working class and all the people. A party loses its vanguard role if it retires into its narrow shell and becomes a

sect, if it evolves into a purely propagandist organization.

The Great October Socialist Revolution opened a new chapter in the Leninist teaching on the Party. From a force for overthrowing the system of exploitation the Party became a force for building the new, socialist society. The book shows how tremendously the role of the Party grows under proletarian dictatorship. This follows from the nature of the socialist revolution as well as from the fact that, with the establishment of socialist relations of production, an immense role is played by political consciousness, the supreme manifestation of which is the Communist Party. The development of Soviet society testifies to the steady growth of the role of the Party in building socialism and communism, in the political and ideological leadership of society and in the economic and cultural life of the country. The Party draws up economic plans on the basis of the laws of social development, taking into account the specific conditions obtaining in the country. It studies the experience of the masses, generalizes and popularizes what is best in it. The Party concentrates the attention and efforts of the working people on the main tasks facing the nation; it directs the activities of all public organizations towards a common aim; it rallies the masses for overcoming the difficulties of socialist construction; it removes all obstacles standing in the way of mass initiative; it combats the narrow, shop tendencies of individual groups of workers; it inculcates in the masses an understanding of the national interests and tackles things from the standpoint of these interests.

Much space is devoted to the role of the Communist Party as the leading force of the Soviet state; this role is substantiated theoretically; the reader learns how the Party lays down the general principles and the concrete program of action in the home and foreign policy of the Soviet state. Party guidance ensures that all state bodies work in a single direction; it overcomes local and departmental tendencies, teaches the personnel of the state apparatus to be servants of the people and combats bureaucracy.

Experience teaches that with the victory of the socialist revolution the class struggle does not cease, that proletarian dictatorship is necessary first of all to suppress the resistance of the overthrown exploiters and of all the anti-socialist class forces in the country. It is necessary also for the defense of the gains of socialism against external enemies.

But the dictatorship of the proletariat means far more than coercion, it is a specific form of class alliance of the working class with the millions of working people, primarily the working peasants, whose aim is to build and consolidate socialism; and for the working people it is the highest type of democracy. The Party works tirelessly to strengthen and develop socialist democracy. It develops in the people the feeling that they are the masters who are responsible for the destiny of their country, and it enlists the entire working population in management of the state.

The book arrives at the following conclusion: the methods of Party work and the forms of Party organization depend on the given conditions, on the peculiarities of the country; however, the basic principles of the Leninist teaching on the Party remain inviolable. The working class can achieve victory only under the leadership of the Marxist-Leninist Party. It is not surprising, therefore, that the struggle against the socialist revolution and against communist construction finds expression in attempts to weaken and undermine the leading role of the Party. At present this is one of the principal manifestations of revisionism.

The book records the long and bitter ideological and political struggle waged by the Party against all sorts of anti-Leninist trends, factions and groups—Mensheviks, Trotskyites, the Liquidators, Otszovists, "God-builders" and other revisionists on the theoretical front; and during the Soviet period—against the "Left" Communists and Trotskyites, the "Democratic Centralists," the "labor opposition," the "new opposition" headed by Kamenov and Zinoviev, against the Right opportunists and a variety of bourgeois-nationalist groupings.

The history of the Party teaches that without this struggle it could not have maintained its militant unity or fulfilled the role of leader in the socialist revolution and in communist construction. Party unity based on the ideological principles of Marxism-Leninism has always been the main condition for the successful fulfilment of its leading role.

III

Our Party's history is divided into two major periods: the struggle for the overthrow of tsarist autocracy and capitalism, and the struggle for the building of socialism and communism. About one-third of the book is devoted to pre-revolutionary history. The first

seven chapters show how the Party worked in different conditions: the rise and decline of the revolutionary movement, the crest of the revolution and the triumph of the counter-revolution. The Party used different forms of struggle and organization, combining irreconcilability in matters of principle with the utmost political flexibility.

On the basis of facts from the pre-revolutionary history of Bolshevism the book shows the decisive role played by the Marxist Party in the struggle for winning over the majority of the working class and the masses; it shows how Lenin developed the idea of the worker-peasant alliance and the leading role of the working class in revolutionary struggle. Under the leadership of Lenin, the Party waged a victorious struggle against the Mensheviks in defense of these fundamental tenets of Marxism. Basically this was a struggle against revisionism.

The Party program drawn up by Lenin and adopted in 1903 played a particularly important part in ensuring the leading role of the working class. Comparing this program with those of other parties in tsarist Russia, the book demonstrates that the Bolsheviks alone correctly solved the basic problems of life in the interests of the people: state structure, the working-class question, the peasant and the national questions.

But the program had to be reinforced by the everyday political activity of the Party and by its tactics. The first task was to convince the majority of the people of the correctness of the program and policy. The Party had to work among the masses and spread its ideas and slogans with very limited means and in conditions of illegality and police terror. The ruling classes had a huge, well-equipped and generously subsidized apparatus for exercising ideological influence over the masses; their propaganda machine vilified the Bolsheviks in every way. Yet, notwithstanding the extremely unfavorable conditions, the Party managed to convince and win over the masses.

It urged the workers to react to every case of arbitrary action and oppression no matter what class or which section was involved, to support every protest against the tsarist autocracy. The Party was invariably in the van of the struggle for the solution of any democratic problem. It prepared the political actions of the working class: strikes, demonstrations, speeches and questions of deputies in the State Duma, the appeals of working-class organizations and separate groups of

workers. It prepared the working class for the role of the leader in the nationwide struggle against tsarism.

To organize this struggle it was essential to involve the peasant masses in it. The agrarian-peasant question was an important aspect of the work of the Party from its formation right up to the victory of the collective-farm system. For the first time in history a party of the working class aroused and led the peasantry. Under Party leadership they cast off the yoke of autocracy and capitalism and took the socialist road of collectivization which brought well-being and happiness. The book contains a theoretical elaboration of the agrarian-peasant question by Lenin and his followers, the political line of the Party, its tactics, and the tremendous work carried out among the peasantry.

The national question occupied a prominent place in the activity of the Party and in building it. Tsarist Russia, a multi-national country, a prison-house of peoples, exercised the most vicious forms of national oppression. The bourgeoisie of the oppressed nationalities in their turn endeavored to poison the working people with the venom of nationalism.

It was very important to fuse the class struggle of the workers of both the oppressor and oppressed nations. Without this working-class unity, and eventually victory over tsarism and capitalism, would have been impossible. Secondly, in order to become the leader of the people the working class had to rally round itself the working masses of all nations. And thirdly, the working class as the vanguard in the struggle for democracy had to offer the most democratic solution to the national question.

Lenin substantiated the internationalist theses of the Marxist program for the solution of the national question: full equality for all citizens irrespective of nationality; recognition of the right to self-determination up to and including secession for all nations comprising the state; the principle of uniting the workers of all nations in class organizations, such as the Party, the trade unions, etc. The Party resolutely combated any manifestation of national oppression; fought irreconcilably against Russian chauvinism and severely criticized the attempts of local bourgeois nationalists to sow national strife among the workers. The Bolsheviks did much to instill in the working people of the oppressed nations faith in the Russian working class which was a staunch fighter against all forms of national oppression.

The pages on the work of the Bolshevik Party characterize it as a Party of irreconcilable struggle against economic, political, social and national oppression.

IV

No matter how important the pre-revolutionary experience of the Communist Party may be, its experience under the proletarian dictatorship is still richer and more varied. Two-thirds of the book—eleven chapters—are devoted to the post-revolutionary period.

When the Party emerged as the leading force of a powerful state, it tackled the job of building the new society. The world revolutionary movement had no experience in socialist construction, nor did it know of any form of organization of public life on a new basis. Previously socialism had been only a theory, an idea. It had now to be built for the first time in a country with a relatively weak economy, a country in which peasants comprised the vast majority of the population, a country of many nationalities at different stages of social development. The building of the new society had to be resolved without trained cadres, with a culturally backward population, in conditions of economic devastation caused by imperialist and civil war.

The difficulties were aggravated by the fact that Soviet Russia, the only socialist country at the time, found itself in capitalist encirclement. The imperialist states had no desire to resign themselves to the victory of the working people; they tried to overthrow the power of the people by military means and by economic blockade; they exerted diplomatic pressure, and resorted to intimidation and slander. The defeated exploiters stubbornly resisted socialist construction. All this contributed to the vacillations of the petty-bourgeoisie. The Trotskyites and other anti-Party groupings, denying the possibility of establishing socialism in Russia, sabotaged the building of the new society.

The Party boldly led the people along the new, untrodden path. It elaborated a detailed plan for socialist industrialization and in an unprecedentedly brief space of time, with only internal resources to fall back on, completed the plan. This success made it possible to establish a production and technical base which paved the way for the socialist reconstruction of the entire economic life.

Almost simultaneously with industrialization, the Party embarked on the solution of a highly complicated task of the transitional

period, namely, winning over the small owners, primarily the peasants, for the building of socialism. Much political and organizational work had to be done in order to overcome the private property instincts and the individualist traditions of the small owners, to help them to see in the Leninist co-operative plan the only way to a prosperous life, to complete emancipation from all forms of slavery, and voluntarily to accept the socialization of their property. The experience of the collectivization of agriculture has proved beyond doubt that the small owners do not take the socialist road spontaneously. Planless development of small commodity production, even in the transitional period, engenders capitalist elements. Socialization of the peasant holdings and other small property is impossible without the aid of the working class and without state support. Socialism cannot be established in the countryside without waging economic and political struggle against the wealthy farmer who upholds capitalism.

The book shows how the Party re-educated the old intellectuals and won them over to the side of the working class, how it worked to train a new generation of intellectuals, having carried out a genuinely cultural revolution and having made science, culture and art accessible to the working people.

The building of socialism and communism is the result of planned and conscious activity on the part of the masses. The Party constantly deepens the consciousness and encourages the initiative of the masses.

One of the reasons for the Party's prestige among the masses is that the people see in it a Party standing four-square for peace. The first slogan of the new-born Soviet power was the slogan of peace. New principles were elaborated in the relations between nations, principles corresponding to the interests of the Soviet people and of the working people of the world. In the ever-changing international situation the Communist Party and the Soviet Government have persistently pursued the Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence of countries with differing social systems. The people also know that the Party is safeguarding the interests of the Soviet state, firmly upholding its independence and doing everything to increase its defensive might. During the war the Party rallied the people, led them to victory and liberated the European nations from Hitler slavery.

Of special interest is the section (two chapters) dealing with the past six years.

The years 1953-58 marked a new stage in the development of the Party, in its struggle to reinforce the might of the USSR, to build communism and to consolidate peace.

The Party and the Central Committee on the initiative of Khrushchov theoretically elaborated and, with nationwide support, carried out a series of important political and economic measures. The Stalin personality cult was denounced and much done to overcome its consequences. The management of industry was radically changed. National economic planning was substantially improved and technological progress was accelerated. During these years the most far-reaching changes since collectivization were effected in agriculture; and these have greatly stimulated the growth of its productive forces, consolidated the collective-farm system and improved the well-being of the peasants. These practical measures were accompanied by an advance in Marxist-Leninist theory.

The Party decisions and Khrushchov's reports to the XXth and XXIst Congresses of the Party theoretically substantiate and concretely outline the road to communism. Experience has proved that the Party and its Central Committee were right when they defeated the anti-Party group of Malenkov, Kaganovich, Molotov, Bulganin and Shepilov who opposed the line laid down by the XXth Congress. The exposure and defeat of the anti-Party group signified strengthening the Leninist unity of the Party and a victory of Marxism-Leninism. This testified to the monolithic unity of the Party leadership, its Central Committee, and to the unanimous support of the people for the Party line.

In the course of the development of the Leninist Party its militant, revolutionary traditions took shape and the splendid qualities of its members were forged—fidelity to the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, readiness to make any sacrifice when called upon by the Party, devotion to the country and the people, unbreakable ties with the masses, monolithic unity, irreconcilability towards the class enemy and staunchness in struggle, intolerance towards shortcomings, bureaucracy and complacency.

No matter what sphere of life of our country is taken—whether it is the construction of power stations on the Volga and the Angara, the bold and unprecedented cultivation of the virgin lands, the launching of the Sputniks or the triumph of Soviet culture abroad; whether it is the scientific achievements which have won world renown or the

solicitude for children—it is imbued with the inspiring and guiding role of the Party, with the light of Leninist ideas, the daring and selfless work of Communists who are in the van of the people in organizing these feats. The Communist Party is a powerful, closely-knit, multi-million body of active fighters inspired by a common ideal.

V

The book emphasizes that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has always been a component of the international communist and working-class movement.

For many years Lenin waged a consistent struggle against opportunism in the Second International; the history deals with the main events in this struggle which helped to mold and organize, within the Social-Democratic parties, Left internationalist groups and trends which at a later stage became the core of the Communist parties. The book describes the work done by Lenin to rally and consolidate the unity of the international communist movement, to create the Communist International. It briefly reviews the more important stages in the history of the international organizations of the communist movement. None of the previous histories had analyzed Lenin's "*Left-Wing*" *Communism, An Infantile Disorder* (1920), although this work played an outstanding role in consolidating the Communist parties of the world. The basic propositions of this book, valid to this day, are dealt with in the new history.

The Communist Party has always upheld the principle of proletarian internationalism not only in matters pertaining to Party development and the relations between the different nationalities in the country. In contrast to the philistine nationalism of the parties of the Second International, which narrow the meaning of internationalism to recognition of the equality of nations while retaining national egoism, proletarian internationalism is, for the Communists, the indissoluble combination of the interests of the working-class struggle in one country with that in other countries, with the interests of the entire international working-class movement.

The Communist Party has always performed its sacred duty to the international working class. Its program, strategy and tactics, all its activity, are imbued with the spirit of proletarian internationalism. In rallying the working people of Russia for the socialist revolution the Party, in addition to performing its national duty, inflicted a telling blow

on world capitalism, thereby facilitating the struggle of the working class of all countries. The Party and the Soviet people, by embarking on socialist and communist construction, have rendered great assistance to the international communist and liberation movements. This has always been the chief international duty of the Communists and the entire Soviet people. For their part, the Communist parties and the working class of the capitalist countries regard the Soviet Union as their shock brigade and render it essential aid, thereby facilitating the struggle of the Soviet state against imperialist threats.

Lenin wrote: "Capital is an international force. To vanquish it, an international workers' alliance, an international workers' brotherhood, is needed." These words are most appropriate today when the socialist world system is developing, and the forces of the old moribund world of capitalism are combining against it. Under these conditions the most important requirement of proletarian internationalism is the struggle to preserve and consolidate the socialist system against those who seek to subvert and divide it.

The relations between the socialist countries are based on completely new principles. They are not only principles of full equality, respect for territorial integrity, independence and sovereignty, non-interference in the internal affairs of other states—that is, the principles which the socialist countries observe in relations with all countries and peoples, and which they regard as the basis of universal peace—but also fraternal friendship, all-round co-operation and mutual aid. The working people of the capitalist countries, all the oppressed peoples, regard the socialist camp as the stronghold of peace and friendship among nations.

In its relations with the other fraternal parties the Communist Party of the Soviet Union consistently implements the principle of proletarian internationalism. All Communist and Workers' parties are equal. Among them there are neither leading parties nor subordinate parties. Each is responsible to the people of its respective country and to the communist and working-class movement; they all have a common outlook and common aims, although the road to the realization of their aims may be different as far as particulars and details are concerned.

While the Communist Party is a party of internationalists, it is at the same time a genuinely patriotic party. The path traversed demonstrates that it acts as a truly patriotic

force, that it expresses and consistently upholds the interests of its people and country. The Party came to power in a country which the ruling classes had brought to the verge of ruin, which was in danger of being dismembered by the imperialist states. It assumed responsibility for the destiny of the country, it organized and inspired the people to combat the backwardness, devastation and the threat of foreign enslavement and to work for the building of socialism. The fetters that had shackled the productive forces were discarded and unprecedented economic, technical, scientific and cultural progress was ensured. By its correct policy the Party raised the country to a level never before reached in its history.

All the other parties that appeared on the political arena in Russia, although they professed "love" of country, in reality defended not the interests of the nation but the mercenary interests of the capitalists and landlords; having doomed Russia to backwardness and stagnation, they were ready to surrender it to the foreign imperialists. Beginning with February 1917, the political parties in Russia functioned legally and the people could compare their programs, promises, declarations and activity with the words and deeds of the Bolsheviks. Having put the parties to the test, the people placed their destiny in the hands of the Communist Party.

When the Bolsheviks came to power they did not prohibit other parties. On the contrary, they invited the co-operation of all who recognized Soviet power. They granted seats in the government to the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries. The Menshevik leaders were present and expressed their views at a number of congresses of the Soviets. But all these political parties fought against the Bolsheviks and aligned themselves with the counter-revolution and the imperialist powers and were caught red-handed in conspiracies against the Soviet state. This was the case not only of the Monarchists, the Constitutional Democrats (Cadets), the Octobrists and other Right-wing parties, but equally of the so-called "Socialist" parties — Mensheviks, Socialist Revolutionaries, Ukrainian Social Democrats and Socialist Revolutionaries, Georgian Mensheviks and Armenian Dashnaks. Together with Kolchak and Denikin they waged an armed struggle against Soviet power and tried to assassinate Lenin. Their agents murdered such leaders as Volodarsky and Uritsky and thousands of other Communists. The political evolution of these parties which were in the service of the imperialists

shows that they were not only anti-socialist but also anti-national and anti-patriotic.

Leninism teaches, and experience confirms, that only a Marxist-Leninist Party can be truly patriotic. This has now become a common feature for all the parties of a new type and is treated in detail in the new history.

* * *

The history of the CPSU is a powerful ideological weapon in the struggle for the victory of communist views. Never have the forces of reaction waged such a bitter struggle against Marxism-Leninism, against communism, as they are waging now. The instigators of a new war are behind the anti-communist campaign, they are spreading vile propaganda about the Soviet Union. Knowledge of the victorious record of the Communist Party imparts strength and confidence to the working class and to the toilers of all countries in the struggle against the war danger, the imperialist onslaught against democracy and the economic interests of the masses.

The history of the Communist Party equips the reader with a knowledge of the laws of social development, of class struggle and the motive forces of revolution, with the laws of building communist society. The experience of the struggle for the victory and consolidation of socialism in the USSR, of the development of society over the past fifty years, has convinced every sincere person that the Communist Party was right in its historical conflict with the parties of the Second International, with the ideology and policies of the Social Democrats.

From the very first days of its existence the Communist Party followed the path of revolution. It invited all the forces of the international working-class movement to join it. However, the Social-Democratic parties chose another, the reformist, path. The working class and the toilers of the world can compare and assess the results of the development of the parties and countries following the two different paths.

The Communist Party ensured the victory of socialism and raised the once miserable and weak Russia into a mighty socialist power exerting tremendous influence on world developments. This Party is leading the Soviet people to communism—the ultimate goal of the socialist movement of the working class.

Where have the reformist leaders brought the working class?

In the past few decades not a few of the parties affiliated to the Socialist International have had experience of Government office.

The Social Democrats and the Socialists of Germany, France, Belgium, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, the Netherlands, Britain and Australia, have since 1918 been either Government parties or associated in coalition governments with the bourgeois parties. They had the support of the working class and could have taken their countries along the socialist road, thus fulfilling the promises of their election programs. They could have posed the question of abolishing the capitalist system with its exploitation of man by man, misery, unemployment and wars. Alas, nothing like this occurred. All the countries in which the so-called Socialist parties were in power for many years are still capitalist.

True, in some of them the working class has gained certain improvements in conditions and wages together with certain democratic freedoms and rights. But it has paid for these gains by leaving the exploiting system intact, by retaining bourgeois power under which at any moment it may lose all its gains, as demonstrated by Germany when Hitler came to power.

The main reason why capitalism has been preserved in the countries where the Social-Democratic parties have been or still are in power is to be sought in the theoretical views of their leaders, which run counter to Marx-

ism-Leninism, and in their opportunist practices. The Social Democrats preach class collaboration between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie; they have rejected the basic principles of Marxism, and many of them have publicly renounced it. But the Communists, as the history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union confirms, have never confused the Right-wing leaders with the Social Democratic rank and file. The overwhelming majority in the ranks of the Socialist parties stand solidly for peace and social progress, though their understanding of the ways and methods of struggle differs from that of the Communists. This is the basis for joint action by the Communists and Socialists against imperialism, for uniting the forces of the working class.

The experience of the Communist Party fortifies the confidence of the working people and the exploited masses in a better future and shows them that their destiny lies in their own hands.

The new history of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, shedding a clear light on its more than half a century of experience of struggle in the most varied conditions, is an ideological weapon for the working class of all countries in the struggle for peace, democracy and socialism.

Monopolies and the People

New Features in British Capitalism: Reality and Imagination

Emile Burns

This number continues the discussion of state-monopoly capitalism and of anti-monopoly movements in the capitalist countries.—Editor's note.

IN *New Fabian Essays*, published in 1953, C. A. Crosland wrote: "It is now clear that capitalism is undergoing a metamorphosis into quite a different system and that this is rendering academic most of the traditional socialist analysis" (p. 35). Seven pages later he wrote: "By 1951 Britain had, in all the essentials, ceased to be a capitalist country." Crosland, one of the "theoreticians" of the British Labor Party, was here expressing a general trend in Right-wing Labor circles—a trend which was in fact common to Social Democrats and revisionists everywhere. They proclaimed that contemporary capitalist society is something new, quite different from capitalism of the past. It was alleged that, thanks to the Labor government, Keynesian theories and the new tax policy, imperialism was dead and the big capitalists had disappeared; that the state had learned how to avoid economic crises and the big monopolies were controlled not by shareholders seeking profit, but by a managerial caste which worked in the national interests. In this way Right-wing Labor tried to persuade the workers that the socialist doctrine too had to be brought up to date, that the "traditional socialist analysis" — Marxism — no longer applied, and that in fact modern capitalism and modern socialism were practically identical.

It is true, of course, that new features have appeared in capitalism since the Second World War. The part played by the state in the economy of all capitalist countries, and particularly Britain, has grown considerably. Secondly, because of the consequences of the war and the different ways in which the economy of each capitalist country was affected, there was no general economic crisis for

a relatively long period after the war. Thirdly, under pressure of the national liberation movement, imperialism was compelled to grant concessions and even independence to certain colonies. Fourthly, and particularly in Britain, the postwar relation of class forces brought certain gains for the working class.

Exaggerating these new features, the Social Democrats and revisionists ignore their class content, misinterpreting their significance in the development of the general crisis of capitalism.

Whatever changes have occurred in the capitalist economy, the nature of capitalist exploitation has remained the same, and the contradiction between the productive forces and the relations of production — between social production and individual appropriation — has become increasingly acute. Such changes as have taken place in the structure and working of capitalism since the Second World War have one general character: *the further development of that trend towards concentration of production and centralization of ownership in the hands of powerful finance-capital groups, and the merging of these with the state, which characterizes the whole imperialist stage of capitalism.*

The development in different capitalist countries was intensified not only by growing economic difficulties. It was influenced also by the increasing might of the socialist world, the rise of the national liberation movement, the strengthening of the working class and its Communist parties, and the particular circumstances in which each country emerged from the war.

The Growing Role of the Capitalist State

In the postwar stage of the general crisis of capitalism many extremely serious problems faced monopoly capital in every capitalist country. For British monopoly capitalism the situation was exceptionally difficult. Im-

portant sections of British industry were backward, or were not able to produce enough for the needs of manufacturing industry. The increasingly rapid disintegration of Britain's colonial empire and the challenge of the powerful United States monopoly capitalism required centralized control of the British economy, and this could be organized only through the state. A Labor Government had been elected, and the masses were pressing for radical measures of social advance.

The nationalization of basic industries in Britain helped to strengthen the illusion of a benevolent state, all the more because the demand for nationalization had been widespread in the Labor movement since the First World War. In the Labor Party's program for the 1945 general election, nationalization was one of the main slogans differentiating Labor from Tory policies and contributing to Labor's victory. The Labor leadership presented state control or regulation of any part of the economy as "an instalment of socialism." Its 1945 program promised to apply state controls "in the interests of full employment and British economic expansion," while the Tory slogans called for "setting the people free" from state controls.

Under cover of this battle "for" and "against" state controls in the abstract, many war-time controls were abolished, but others were maintained in so far as they continued to serve the interests of monopoly capitalism (exchange controls, trade controls, control of new capital issues). The controlling machinery was kept safely in the hands of the big monopolists: for example, the Capital Issues Committee consisted of seven members representing between them twenty-eight large financial and industrial concerns. This committee controlled the capital issues of the smaller firms—the big monopolies did not need to make capital issues, because their expansion was financed out of their profits. Certain other controls (such as control of food prices) helped to moderate demands for higher wages, and were only gradually abolished. Thus the abolition of some controls was accompanied by the strengthening or adaptation of others.

The direct participation of the state in industry through nationalization established state control of some twenty per cent of British industry. But as in the case of other "controls," the nationalized industries were kept under the actual control of the monopolists. The nationalization of a number of industries in the form in which it was carried

out by the Labor Government, served the direct interests of the monopolists.*

The Effects of Nationalization

Nationalization of the Bank of England, and of the coal mining, electricity, gas and railways industries, and of sections of road transport and the steel industry (the two latter having since been returned to private ownership by the Tory Government), created the illusion of a "socialist sector." But this sector in fact strengthened the position of the monopolies, reinforcing their control of the state.

The key positions in the economy were held, as before, by private capital which accounted for 80 per cent of total production. Nationalization of certain industries — under the control of the monopolies — was an economic necessity for them. The coal mining industry, in particular, was in the hands of several hundred different companies, and only a few mines were equipped with modern plant. The railways were divided between five main companies; there was considerable overlapping, and much of the rolling stock and equipment was out of date. Even electricity production, although in a much better condition than the other branches, was quite inadequate to meet the needs of manufacturing industry.

It was therefore vital to the monopolies, especially in the newer sections of engineering and chemicals, that the basic industries supplying them with power and transport should be rapidly modernized. Centralization of control and heavy capital expenditure were necessary to bring this about. Nationalization provided the conditions in which this could be done — on the assumption that the terms given to the former shareholders were favorable and that the new Boards set up to administer the nationalized industries were composed of former directors of the companies which were taken over, or of other capitalists linked with privately-owned industry. In his recently published book *Power at the Top* Clive Jenkins gives details of the business connections of directors of the nationalized industries. His conclusion is that certain private-enterprise organizations, through com-

*While rejecting Right-wing Labor methods of nationalization, the British Communist Party stands for nationalization in the interests of the people, not of the monopolists. Its pre-election statement published last January says: "We must . . . have a government that puts the interests of the people before profits. To do this the Government must have control over the basic industries of the country. This means taking the key industries out of the hands of the capitalists and nationalizing them—not in the old way, but by putting workers and technicians in to run them from top to bottom, and refusing to pay huge sums to the former owners." **Editor's note.**

mon directorships, in fact link up together almost all the nationalized industries (p. 119). The private-enterprise organizations referred to include the big banks and financial houses, great combines like Unilever and Imperial Chemical Industries, and the big insurance companies.

In what ways has the nationalization — on the terms given by the Labor Government — been of service to the monopolists?

In the first place, the compensation paid to the former owners of the enterprises that were nationalized was very high, and interest had to be paid by each industry on the securities issued as compensation. Moreover, the money needed for modernization was largely raised from private sources, also at high rates of interest, so that after nationalization the industries concerned were providing larger sums to the capitalist class than their former owners had ever drawn.

Secondly, the compensation paid to former shareholders was in many cases used as the basis for financing new private enterprises. Thus Tillings, former owner of a section of road transport which was nationalized, has invested capital in engineering, building, glass and clothing industries.

Thirdly, most of the machinery and equipment needed by the nationalized industries is supplied by privately-owned enterprises, which are thus assured of a reliable and profitable market. Many of the directors of the firms supplying the nationalized industries are also on the Boards of the latter.

Fourthly, in their dealings with monopolies, the nationalized industries charge lower prices than the prices charged to consumers or smaller companies.

Nationalization of about one-fifth of Britain's industry is, undoubtedly, an important new feature in the economy. For the working class, it has brought intensified exploitation; but it has also meant that a single employer has replaced hundreds, and that trade union organization has been strengthened. In relation to the future, it lays a certain basis for socialist reconstruction. But nationalization in the form in which it was carried out by the Labor Government has not in any way weakened the monopolies; on the contrary, it has given them a new and more concentrated form of control of the economy, and increased the total surplus value drawn by the capitalist class.

Other Forms of State Intervention

Apart from nationalization, there are other new features in the British economy which

mark the strengthening of state-monopoly capitalism since the Second World War. The state's role in providing a guaranteed market for the products of the monopolies is shown particularly in armaments orders, which since 1950 have absorbed eight to ten per cent of national production. The development of nuclear energy has been financed by the state, and also research and experimental work in the aircraft and other industries. Capital grants have been given to cover expenditure on new plant in the arms industries. State controls have also been strengthened in the newer sections of industry.

State controls of imports and exports, and the export of capital, have operated more widely than similar controls before the war — the controls being manned by representatives of big business. The special difficulties of British monopoly capitalism since the war have led to its more open and direct use of the state in connection with foreign trade and the exchange rate of the £, and the general relation of British industry to rival industries.

The greater extent of state intervention in Britain's economy is shown by the fact that in 1938 the State Budget of £927 million was 18 per cent of the national income; in 1958 the Budget of £5,074 million* was 25 per cent of the national income. Another indication of the increased role of the state is that in the six years, 1953 to 1958, capital investments by the state, local authorities and the nationalized industries totalled £8,253 million — 47 per cent of total capital investments in Britain during that period.

But this by no means signifies a "socialist sector" depriving the capitalist class of some part of the surplus value created by British workers. State expenditure and state investment provide the capitalist class with more profit or interest.

The "Managerial Class"

Crosland develops the thesis, advanced by James Burnham, that the important economic grouping today is the "managerial class," of which he writes: "Top management today is independent not only of the firm's own shareholders, but increasingly of the capitalist or property-owning class as a whole." (*The Future of Socialism*, p. 34.)

The argument, which is also developed by John Strachey in *Contemporary Capitalism*, is that companies have got so big that only professional managers could run them. Be-

*The expenditure of the nationalized industries is not included in the State Budget.

cause they may not hold many shares in the company which they run, these professional managers are not interested in profits, and therefore are concerned with "prestige and power rather than wealth." This is the basis of the extraordinary statement in the Labor Party's policy document *Industry and Society*, that the big firms "are serving the nation well" — a document issued in a year of colossal profits for the monopolies.

In so far as it is true that managing directors are not necessarily big shareholders — and the facts show that it is by no means generally true — these managers are controlled by the big shareholders, who in fact appoint them. In any case, the outlook of such managers is identical with that of the larger shareholders and of the capitalist class as a whole, and the making of profit remains the driving force of the capitalist system. The new "managerial class" has made no change in this, as the constantly expanding profits of the monopolists show.

Expansion of the Monopolies

With the help of the state, the mass of profits made by the monopolies has grown, although the rate of profit in relation to capital employed has shown a decline. The *Investors' Chronicle*, analyzing the profits of British industrial companies and their "net worth," shows that between 1951 and 1957 — that is, before the crisis began to affect turnover and profits — net profits rose by 43 points (on the basis 1953=100) while "net worth" rose by 64 points. Only a small part of the profits is distributed as dividends, two-thirds or even three-quarters being kept by the larger companies to finance capital expansion. This strengthens the monopolies and leads to the absorption of small by larger companies. Larger companies more and more often buy up the shares of smaller companies. The number of independent companies is falling year by year. This process is being intensified by crisis symptoms which have checked the normal expansion of production. The buying up of shares is practised, in particular, by American companies seeking to extend their hold on the British economy.

But the main basis for the extension of the monopolies in the period since the war has been the use of undistributed profits to expand their productive capacity. A feature of the massive new investment in the capitalist countries up to 1956-57 has been its concentration in the big monopoly concerns, financed almost entirely out of profits. For example, the British steel industry invested £427 mil-

lion in new capacity (besides considerable modernization of existing capacity financed through depreciation accounts) in ten years, providing three-quarters of this total out of undistributed profits. The capital employed by the Unilever group rose from £238 million in 1948 to £526 million in 1958, as a result of the reinvestment of profits.

In order to accumulate big enough reserves to finance large-scale investments, the monopolies push up prices, thereby increasing their profits. This is not prevented in fact by "monopoly commissions" and alleged state control. Professor Galbraith of Harvard University, giving evidence before the United States Senate Anti-Trust Sub-Committee, stated that "large firms in industry... could set their prices virtually without regard to competitive market forces and so were in a position to increase their expansion out of retained earnings" (*Times*, July 15, 1957.)

The Chase Manhattan Bank, dealing with the sources from which United States oil companies financed their capital expansion between 1951 and 1955, showed that of a total capital expenditure in those years of \$24 billion, no less than five-sixths had been provided from undistributed profits. The *Economist* (June 1, 1957), reporting the high margin of profit made by the Royal Dutch Shell oil group, said: "The Royal Dutch Shell group needs such margins to finance its enormous capital program."

Capitalist enterprises, whatever their size, have always put aside a part of their profits in order to expand their capacity. But before the period of highly developed monopolies, a large part of the industrial expansion had to be financed by new issues of capital. At present, another form of financing capital investment is used on a wider scale. Taking advantage of their almost complete control of the production and the market in a number of industries, the monopolies raise prices for their products much higher than their actual value. Their dominant position on the market enables big monopoly concerns to increase prices even when a part of their products cannot be sold. In the United States, for example, the price of steel went up at a time when the industry was working at little more than half of capacity. By inflating prices, the monopolies draw huge profits which not only compensate the losses caused by a slump because of the fall in demand but also provide the source of new capital investments. It should be noted at the same time that the policy of providing a big surplus for investment is not always reflected in an actual rise in price. In

a period of rapid technical change, for example in the chemical industry, the amassing of huge surpluses is carried out by maintaining or even slightly reducing prices, while immense savings in cost have been made through technical improvements. Thus the British Imperial Chemical Industries boasts that it has reduced prices in a period when all other prices were rising; but its profits have nonetheless been substantial, and it has been able to finance out of these profits several large extensions of its plant.

Accumulation is in fact more and more tending to be a monopoly of the monopolies, which thereby become stronger at a more rapid rate than in the past. This is the basis on which they have come more and more to dominate the state, and to use the state as an instrument for still further serving their interests. The Right-wing Labor leaders and theoreticians welcome the fact that the monopolies are doing well. They urge that dividends should be kept low, in order that as much as possible may be accumulated out of profits.

Such a policy directly serves the interests of the big monopolists. The larger the shareholder, the more consistently he acts in conformity with Marx's statement that capitalist production is merely production for capital. The monopolists want profits *as capital*, for the expansion of their enterprises and to secure more surplus value. And it is from this standpoint that the tax laws have been built up. It is true that there is heavy taxation on large incomes, by a surtax over and above the income tax rate. But profits which are not distributed are not taxed at the high rate. Therefore the monopolists retain these profits in their companies, and thus increase the value of their capital without paying surtax.

The monopolies use their profits also for expanding production and reducing the number of workers, that is to say, for the introduction of automation and other technical advances. To Right-wing Labor in Britain, these technical advances amounted to a new "industrial revolution" which would give capitalism a new lease of life. What the Labor "theoreticians" ignore is the fact that the application of automation and other new methods of production, *in capitalist society as contrasted with socialist society*, would reduce the number of workers employed and thus sharpen the capitalist contradictions. The extension of productive capacity always meant, therefore, an increase in productivity per worker and new difficulties in finding

markets for the products. The expansion of credit sales* to consumers was one of the devices used for a temporary solution of these difficulties. It was accompanied by an enormous growth of expenditure on advertising. As a result of this whole process, the number of workers engaged in direct production tended to fall, while the number engaged in advertising, selling and the financial apparatus, tended to rise. With the emergence of the crisis this feature has become even more marked in the United States economy. The *Federal Reserve Bulletin* shows that in the United States the number of workers employed in manufacturing, mining, agriculture and construction fell by two million between 1951 and 1958, from 26,677,000 to 24,676,000. During the same period the number of workers employed in trade, finance, transport, public utilities, and the apparatus of the Federal, State and local authorities rose by four million, from 27,723,000 to 31,699,000. In January 1958, when the index of U.S. manufacturing output was the same as in 1957, the number of workers employed in manufacturing was one million less than in 1957.

According to American economists, when the boom comes again, it will leave three million out of work. The existence of millions of unemployed has become a part of the American way of life.

Throughout the capitalist world the same process has been at work, increasing the parasitic nature of contemporary capitalism. In Britain the process has not gone so far as in the United States, but the reports of the British Productivity Council (a body set up under American inspiration) show the continuous reduction of the number of workers engaged in particular sections of industry. In total, both the number of workers employed in direct production and the number employed in distribution, finance, etc., have risen in the last ten years.

The Keynesian Remedies

Until the economic crisis developed in Britain in 1958, Right-wing Labor "theoreticians" were confident that it would never come. They spoke of "Keynesian remedies," of "built-in stabilizers," of state intervention to keep the economy going.

One of the alleged "built-in stabilizers" was the expanded social service system, which was supposed to increase the purchasing power

*Consumer credit did not play a large part in the British economy. In 1958 the total consumer credit outstanding averaged only £10 per head of the population, as against an estimated £70 per head in the United States.

of the working people. In fact, what has taken place has been an immense increase in indirect taxation, which falls mainly on the working people — from £340 million in 1938-39 to £1,763 million in 1952-53 and £2,191 million in 1958-59. Insurance contributions levied on the workers have also increased substantially, from £55 million in 1938-39 to £412 million in 1958-59.

Far from increasing the purchasing power of the working people, the extension of the social services has been made the excuse for taking considerable additional sums from them for payment of interest on the National Debt and to compensate for the growing military expenditure.

The form in which "Keynesian remedies" can be applied in Britain, according to the Labor Party, is for the state to make increased investments in the nationalized industries. This is the basic method of Right-wing Labor's policy to deal with a slump, as expounded in the policy document *Plan for Progress*. It is alleged that to increase investment in the nationalized industries will lead to a general revival also in privately-owned industry. However, in the nationalized coal-mining industry, for instance, because of the fall in demand from privately-owned industry, heavy stocks of coal that cannot be sold are leading to the closing down of pits and unemployment for miners.

It is true that to increase investment in the nationalized industries, like reduction of the rate of interest, taxation allowances for new investment, and so on, can have a certain influence on the economy. The point, however, is that none of these measures can solve the basic contradiction in capitalist society. But this contradiction does not exist for Right-wing Labor theory. So when the crisis actually appeared in 1958, it was said by Labor to be due to the "restrictionist" policy of the Tory Government; Labor, we are told, knows how to "manage" capitalism better than the Tories. (It should be noted that Labor's "expansionist" policy does not apply to the purchasing power of the working people, which, they say, should be kept down by some form of wage-freeze.)*

But reality is beginning to undermine all the illusions spread by Right-wing Labor leaders.

The accumulation of unsold stocks of coal in Europe, resulting from the developing economic crisis, leads to the rude shattering of the class peace idyll, as was clearly shown by the events in Borinage.**

The myth about the disappearance of capitalist competition has also been dispelled. The conflicts within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, between France and West Germany over coal and steel prices, between Britain and the Common Market countries over tariffs and quotas, between Britain and the United States over the refusal to place orders in Britain, and the refusal of a license to British Overseas Airways to fly from the United States to Japan — these and many similar facts show that the competitive struggle is not a thing of the past, but is now a struggle between giants in which their states are directly involved.

The "new nature" of capitalism which Crossland, Strachey and other British Labor "theoreticians" claim to have discovered is nothing but a myth. But it is a myth on the basis of which Right-wing Labor has built its policies of defense of the interests of British imperialism and alliance with international monopoly capital against the forces of socialism.

*Labor's "program for expansion" aims to "end Tory restrictions on production." It envisages higher productivity, more horse-power at the elbow of workers and big investments for increasing the competitive power of British industry. "... Labor is determined," proclaims its program, "to give top priority to the re-equipment and expansion of British industry." In a convincing way this article shows that Right-wing Labor's policy does not encroach upon the domination of monopoly capital in the British economy and is in accord with the striving of the monopolies for greater profits by means of raising productivity and increasing output.

[Unlike the Tories and Right-wing Labor, the British Communists are demanding an economic policy to meet the urgent needs of the people and to raise their purchasing power. The Communists are fighting against lay-offs, for higher wages, pensions and benefits, for a shorter week (40 hours in industry and 35 hours for miners). They have put forward a program of building houses, schools, hospitals, bridges and motor roads which would keep many industries running at full capacity. "To fight the slump," reads a statement of the Communist Party, "we must have a Government that will raise wages, pensions and benefits at once. The way to keep people at work is to help them buy more.

"The Tory Government is out to keep wages down. And the Labor Party in its program says that if there is to be restraint it must be restraint all round. We don't want wage restraint under either a Labor or a Tory government."—**Editor's note.**

A big strike of miners, supported by other sections of the people, took place in January-February 1959 in Borinage (Belgium). Its main objective was to prevent the closing down of coal-mines and mass dismissals as ordered by the European Coal and Steel Community. A detailed analysis of this strike is contained in Jean Terfve's letter "The Strike in Borinage," published in the April 1959 number of *World Marxist Review*.—Editor's note.**

The Anti-Monopoly Movement in Italy

Mauro Scoccimarro

TO ASSESS the new political situation in Italy we must examine the reasons for the changes taking place in it. These have their source in the worsened international economic situation and in the adverse consequences of the Common Market on Italy. Moreover, the situation in the country is characterized by chronic unemployment, the backwardness of entire regions and uneven development of the economy. The postwar boom in the capitalist world tended to conceal the negative aspects in our country, thus enabling the successive clerical governments to postpone the solving of pressing economic problems and the enactment of social reforms demanded by the people.

But when the world economic situation deteriorated, a slight slow-down in business activity in Italy (1958) brought these problems to the fore again. Moreover, new economic difficulties have arisen as a result of Italy's participation in the Common Market.

With the help of the clerical governments, the big monopolies managed to regain their economic and political power after the war. Now, however, they see that it has been shaken. That is why they are forcing the government to take more resolute measures to extend their domination, to shift the consequences of depression and European economic integration onto the working people and non-monopoly producers, and check the growing popular movement for the socio-economic reforms envisaged in the Constitution. *This explains the trend towards the fusing of the state and the monopolies, towards turning the state into their instrument. The threat to democratic liberties is growing, the reactionaries are stepping up their attempts to install an authoritarian regime designed to pave the way to the dictatorship of big monopoly capital. Hence the anti-monopoly struggle is now, more than ever before, the basic task of the working-class movement, of all democratic forces.*

The Monopolies and Their Policy

A correct anti-monopoly policy must take cognizance of the role and influence of the

monopolies on political and economic life.

An investigation has revealed that before 1954* 180 joint-stock companies owned some 70 per cent of the share capital; of this number 40 owned 40 per cent and controlled 66.5 per cent of the share capital — 1,480 billion lire, while 10 of the 40 companies — Centrale, STAT, Edison, Italiana Strade Meridionali, Montecatini, FIAT, Pirelli, SNIA-Viscosa, Eridania and Italcementi — controlled 109 companies with more than half of the share capital.

These figures indicate the degree of capitalist concentration in the basic industries (power, engineering, automobile, chemical, rubber, artificial fiber, sugar, cement, etc.). But this alone is not enough to ensure monopoly domination. The economy is controlled through cartels and consortiums handling supplies and sales such as ANIDEL (the National Electrical Association), the Association of Sugar Manufacturers, the Italian Cotton Institute, the National Hemp Consortium and others. For example, the companies accounting for three-fourths of the output of electric power have a monopoly of the electric power industry because of the domination of ANIDEL in this sphere. The Eridania and Italcementi firms produce 80 per cent of the sugar and dominate the industry through the consortium. The same can be observed in other industries.

Their dominant position in the different branches of industry enables the big companies to control and direct whole sectors of the economy. There are two reasons for this. Firstly, dominating in the manufacture and sale of certain goods, the big monopoly groups usually control the stocks and fix prices** and thus determine the production process of many non-monopoly enterprises. Secondly, the smaller output of the non-monopoly enterprises is dispersed among numerous small undertakings, which are incapable of influencing whole branches of production

*Many researches have been published of late showing the activity of individual companies. The findings confirm that after 1954 capitalist concentration continued to grow.

**These include electricity, chemical raw materials, fertilizers, fiber, sugar and other products.

and still less the powerful monopoly groups which dominate them.

According to official data, there are 5,000 small firms in the chemical industry. Their total economic potential is considerably less than that of Montecatini which produces 75 per cent of the sulphuric acid, ammonia and chemical fertilizers, 90 per cent of the synthetic dye-stuffs, almost all pharmaceutical goods, etc. The same is true of other industries: 36,000 textile firms depend on the groups which control the output of yarn, electricity and dye-stuffs; 6,000 leather enterprises depend on the Ledaga Association which supplies them with tannin; 70,000 food-producing firms are completely subordinated to the monopolies controlling the output of sugar, canned foods and other items.

A monopoly-type structure is also characteristic of Italian finance. Here, too, a high degree of concentration is combined with widely held share capital. This enables a group of monopolists with relatively small capital to control the majority of the shareholders. According to the data published by the Economic Committee of the Constituent Assembly, 0.015 per cent of shareholders in the companies investigated controlled 50 per cent of the capital. And if from the separate monopoly groups we turn to the relationships between the monopolies, we shall see that the *directors of the ten biggest companies sit on the boards of 109 companies*. The latter own over half the share capital and include the groups dominating in the main branches of the economy. Thus, the big financial houses and monopolies are interlocked. This lessens competition between the various groups and intensifies the monopoly character of the economic structure.

These facts show that monopoly domination does not necessarily presuppose the concentration of production in one firm. The decisive factor here is the opportunity to dictate market prices, enabling the monopolies to evade to some extent the law of the average rate of profit engendered by competition and to gain the maximum monopoly profit. This explains why the Italian economy, very backward in most branches, is dominated by the monopolies. This monopoly domination aggravates the ills and contradictions of the economic structure and causes great damage to the national economy.

The monopolies strive to keep output at a level most appropriate for maximum profit (this level is usually lower than their potential). This tendency is intensified when reduced cost of production, as a result of tech-

nical improvements, is not followed by lower prices for their goods. It is chiefly the monopolies who profit from higher productivity, whereas the non-monopoly cost of production remains high. This is felt particularly by the medium-sized and small enterprises whose development is, in the long run, retarded. On the other hand, high monopoly prices tend to reduce consumption. The monopolies, then, cramp the development of the non-monopoly enterprises. One example will suffice to show that this phenomenon really exists and that it represents a danger. In 1954 some 120 billion lire were spent on chemical fertilizers and insecticides; of this sum nearly 50 billion lire were pocketed by the Montecatini firm in the form of profits. The same can be said about FIAT which supplies the countryside with tractors. Although the big monopolies are growing stronger, agriculture remains backward with all the adverse consequences of this for the overall economic advance of the country.

The monopolies exert no less influence on the market. By fixing high prices they are changing the usual market conditions to the detriment of the weaker sectors of production, thus creating and sharpening the disproportions and contradictions in the economy (between industry and agriculture, between the developed and backward regions, etc.).

As a rule the monopolies react adversely to changes on the market; when demand increases they raise prices without increasing output, but when demand falls, they reduce output and not prices. In this way they upset the normal commodity circulation and, in the final analysis, do the reverse of what is needed to create more employment.

The operations of the monopolies are affecting the distribution of the national income. For instance, between 1948 and 1954 their annual profits rose by an average of 30 per cent, whereas the national income rose only 7 per cent a year. This shows that a big part of the income goes to monopoly capital which is upsetting the balance in the economy and retarding its general development. The growth of the monopolies is widening the gap between profits and wages. *The net profit of the monopolies is now four times more than the total income of the working people.*

They are adding greatly to their wealth also at the expense of the non-monopoly enterprises whose profits fail to reach even the average rate.

According to data published by the Association of Joint-Stock Companies in 1950, the

ten biggest companies mentioned above made nearly 12 per cent of the total profit, whereas the profits of 15,000 other companies amounted to only 3 per cent, which is considerably lower than the average rate of profit.*

As a consequence capitalist accumulation is restricted in growing measure to narrow sectors and is reduced to practically nothing in many branches where the productive forces show hardly any sign of development. This policy affects also the sphere of finance. The big monopolies spend vast sums on financing their own undertakings.** This self-financing diverts a large part of the savings and capital which could be used for financing the medium-sized and small enterprises. It was calculated that in 1954 the big companies spent over 400 billion lire for this purpose. They consumed 90 per cent of the national investment earmarked for private industry and used it for amassing maximum profit and not for the development of the national economy. FIAT, Montecatini, Pirelli, Edison and SNIA-Viscosa have exported billions of lire (in the form of capital) to the Middle East, South Africa and South America. And this is at a time when chronic unemployment is rampant in the country, when millions are without jobs, when backward regions are crying out for development and when masses of people live in abject poverty.

Nationalization and Democratic Control

The policy of the monopolies runs counter to the interests of the nation. Its consequences are extremely serious for the economy which is characterized by the interweaving of the highly developed forms of monopoly capitalism and a high degree of capitalist concentration with the most backward forms of pre-capitalist production. The monopolies aggravate the ills — chronic unemployment (two million people), part-time employment (another 2-3 million partially unemployed), the general economic backwardness, sharp disproportions in the development of different areas, low living standards, wages and consumption.

The growing power and the strict control exerted by the monopoly groups gravely affect not only the working-class but also the millions of small and middle producers in town

and countryside. These, sinking deeper into debt, find that their interests are sacrificed. Thus, the economic, social and political interests of the working class and of a large part of the middle sections in town and countryside are beginning to coincide; this provides the soil for their alliance in the struggle against the monopolies and for the democratic regeneration of our society. The object of this struggle is nationalization of the big monopoly enterprises so that the new management should be guided not by the private interests of monopoly profit but by the interests of the country as a whole.

But nationalization becomes a democratic, anti-monopoly reform only when the interests of the working people and the entire nation prevail in economic management. Without this we get merely a new form of reactionary capitalism, subordinated as before to the monopoly groups. Postwar experience shows that even if nationalization is carried out first as an anti-monopoly measure (as was the case in France when the Communists were in the government) later, when the conservative circles take over political and economic management, the nationalized industry becomes a tool of monopoly capital. That is why nationalization inevitably raises the question of having a say in the political and economic affairs of the country. This means a challenge to the political and economic power of the monopolies. Herein lies the basic element of anti-monopoly policy; people who ignore this fact may fall victim to illusions of a reformist and revisionist nature.

Nationalization also necessitates a certain correlation of forces and political conditions which make it possible to advance this slogan as an urgent measure. This, in turn, is a precondition and the primary demand for any effective political struggle. Until these conditions mature, nationalization will remain a propaganda slogan which, nevertheless, should be supported because combined with mass action it paves the way for its implementation.

In these circumstances the anti-monopoly struggle in the form of strikes, demonstrations and mass action by the workers, peasants and middle sections has not yet found political expression in a slogan which could unite all the participants in the struggle. At present such a slogan could be the demand for democratic control of the monopolies, with the immediate aim of restricting monopoly domination. Democratic control could become not only a propaganda slogan but

*In point of fact the difference is actually greater, since we speak here about the profits registered in the reports of the companies. The actual profits of the big companies are 5-6 times more, while the profits of the smaller companies are a fifth or a sixth of those stated.

**The undistributed profit is used for financing production. In this way the monopolies evade taxes, since the undistributed profits are retained and concealed by them. This sum is not recorded in the accounts.

also the slogan of effective political struggle. The slogans of nationalization and control reflect not two different policies, but one and the same policy at different stages of its development, corresponding to the different relationship of forces in the given political situation. They are, however, different: nationalization is a democratic reform which turns monopoly capital into state capitalism and, consequently, concentrates monopoly property in the hands of the bourgeois state, whereas control merely restricts the power of the monopolies. Nationalization is a more progressive and radical measure: it implies public control and goes even farther. Democratic control is a less progressive measure: it is not yet nationalization but a means providing political conditions for its implementation. Consequently, nationalization and democratic control supplement one another. They may interweave in practice, depending on the political situation. At a given moment we can demand the nationalization of one group of monopolies and the establishment of control over the others.

After the large-scale explanatory campaign conducted by the Communist Party the slogan of nationalization of the power industry has met with the support of other political and social forces. This is evident from the stand taken on this issue by the Radicals, Republicans, Social Democrats, Independent Democrats and Socialists. Support is forthcoming also in the Left wing of the Catholic movement. Hence, the political conditions for nationalization of the monopolies producing electric power may mature very quickly. And when they do, the nationalization of these monopolies will be placed on the agenda. Much less progress has been made in the struggle against the Montecatini firm (chemicals and mining). The demand for nationalization is supported at the moment by peasants, agricultural workers and part of the miners. Still, some important gains have been registered. For instance, the monopoly had to reduce prices on chemical fertilizers and medicines. This is a contribution to the struggle for establishing democratic control over this monopoly.

The question arises: what should be placed under public democratic control? The answer is: chiefly values, prices, profits and capital investments, i.e., channels through which monopolies secure maximum profit to the detriment of the economic development and national progress.

The people of Italy are anxious that

✓ output should not be curtailed, that factories should not be closed and workers dismissed for the purpose of safeguarding monopoly profits;

✓ that the cost of production at the non-monopoly enterprises should not be raised, because this retards the expansion of the productive forces; that technological progress should not be impeded, or prices increased, since this reduces the consumption;

✓ that high monopoly profits should not constitute such a large part of the national income to the detriment of non-monopoly industry doomed because of this to technical and economic backwardness;

✓ that the monopolies should stop self-financing, since they swallow up capital needed by non-monopolistic industry;

✓ that capital be invested in the interests of the national economy and not exported.

In general, the need for public democratic control arises from the contradiction between private monopoly and the vital interests of the country.

The ways and means of exercising control can vary: on the one hand, control necessitates vigilance and struggle by the people; on the other—the intervention of the public authorities. In Italy there is a control body—the Inter-Ministerial Committee for Prices. This committee is entitled to fix prices on some monopoly goods (fertilizers, cement, sugar, medicines, electricity). Set up immediately after the war for the purpose of ending the speculative practices of monopolies, it soon fell under their influence and became a bureaucratic body. At present, it does not exercise its main function although it engages in some activity. But it could have been reorganized on a democratic footing to supervise prices, values and capital investments. This committee should be directed not only by the government but also by Parliament, by the economic bodies and, of course, by the people. In this case it should effectively control the monopolies. Such are the technical aspects of the problem, indicating the practical possibility of control. But we are interested in the political aspect; we all understand that public democratic control can be more or less effective, depending on how it is stimulated and supported by the popular movement. On the other hand, any such public intervention may in itself become a factor contributing to mass action.

This connection between control over the monopolies and mass action is a real factor,

since the policy of the monopolies infringes upon the interests of the workers, peasants, urban middle sections and other strata. Although compelled to resist the oppression of the monopolies for various reasons they are, in the final analysis, fighting against the common enemy—the big monopoly bourgeoisie. When workers go into action against the senseless curtailment of industry and against dismissals, when peasants oppose the injustice of the tax system and the disparity between monopoly prices for manufactured goods (fertilizers, tractors, implements) and farm products, when the independent producers demand more credits and better terms of financing and oppose the domination of the monopolies; when consumers protest against inflated prices and the high cost of living—they are all upholding their own particular interests and putting forward their own demands, but they are motivated by a common desire: to restrict the power of the monopolies. This political element is inherent in all the struggles and demands. But this fact is not yet clearly understood by all people, and will not be understood so long as the classes and strata fight separately, advancing purely economic demands. We must overcome this and go over from the economic struggle for separate demands to a united political struggle for the common political objective. The slogan of *Democratic Control Over the Monopolies*, which expresses the general anti-mono-

poly demand, is in accord with these tasks. This slogan combines the particular demands with the common political aims, elevates the economic struggle to the level of political struggle and turns the objective identity of economic and social interests into the subjective identity of the political aims. Thus, in the course of mass action conditions are being created for a broad political alliance of all social forces opposed to the monopolies; the basis is being laid for the vitally important unity of the Left-democratic opposition.

Control over the monopolies assumes real political significance as an everyday struggle for the restriction of monopoly power (up to its abolition) in order to clear the way for new forms of economic organization. The question is how to advance the democratic forces and compel the conservative forces to retreat. In the course of this struggle ideological discrimination and anti-communist prejudices are disappearing. The struggle and experience of the people are gradually extending the identity of aims to other aspects of our political life. Still broader alliances will be built around the working class. This can lead to a new relationship of political and social forces, to a Left-democratic majority capable of directing the policy and economy of the country along new lines, towards the democratic and socialist regeneration of Italian society.

Crisis and the Working Class

E. Varga

THE cyclical economic crisis which broke out in 1957 and still continues in a number of capitalist countries has shattered the illusions of the bourgeois ideologists and revisionists concerning the possibility of a non-crisis capitalism in the postwar period. The crisis is a further confirmation of one of the basic tenets of Marxism, namely, that capitalist reproduction, by virtue of the inner laws of capitalism, is bound to give rise to periodic crises of overproduction. The sole exceptions were the years of the two world wars. And this is understandable, since there can be no overproduction when millions are diverted from useful labor to waging war, when millions more, instead of producing for civilian needs, are engaged in the manu-

facture of weapons which are destroyed on the battlefield, when cities are razed to the ground and when military and civilian consumption is far in excess of the constantly declining civilian production. World war signifies the using up of all stocks, housing shortages, shortages of furniture and clothing, and, very often, famine. And since the crisis is the decisive phase of the cycle, there can hardly be any question of cyclical development during a world war.

The illusions concerning a non-crisis capitalism derived from the circumstance that a gap of nearly 20 years lies between the last world economic crisis which preceded the Second World War and the current crisis; furthermore, the 13 years since the end of

the war have not seen a crisis of overproduction affecting the whole capitalist world, but only two intermediate crises confined essentially to the United States. The explanation is that the war consumed all the stocks and greatly exhausted the production capacities of the civilian industries. House-building was at a standstill during the war, and so vast was the destruction of dwelling space during the hostilities that even today, 14 years later, not all the damage has been made good. The two post-war "intermediate crises" in the United States, which were not observed in the other belligerent capitalist countries, are explained by the fact that the territory of the USA remained unscathed during the war, that it became a belligerent two years after the war had broken out, having at its disposal much unused production capacity.

Who Bears the Brunt of the Crisis?

Under capitalism crises of overproduction are inevitable. A new and important factor is that in the postwar years monopoly capital has been able—more so than in the past—to shift the burden of the crisis onto the working people of both the home countries and the underdeveloped countries. This was the result chiefly of the growth of state-monopoly capitalism, which made great strides in the inter-war years and especially after the Second World War. The strength of the financial oligarchy and of the state, both of which have merged into state-monopoly capitalism, made it possible to shift a substantial part of the burden onto the working masses.

In the era of pre-monopoly capitalism the capitalists themselves suffered, to a certain extent, from the crisis. In those days a drastic fall in prices, in the value of products, reduced the surplus capital to the socially required level, and, as Marx pointed out, restored for a brief period an equilibrium. For the capitalists this process was fraught with heavy losses and resulted in wholesale bankruptcy. Credit crises, which always accompany crises of overproduction, further aggravated the situation. The capitalist concerns which managed to weather the crisis also lost heavily owing to the fall in prices, curtailed production, and often because of the spoiling and destruction of surplus stocks.

State-monopoly capitalism has made it much easier for the monopolies to weather the crisis. This is explained by Government orders, chiefly military orders, which are maintained at the war-time level and sometimes even higher; by direct state aid to the monopoly enterprises affected by the crisis,

and by maintenance of high monopoly prices during the crisis.

As an example we can cite the United States. In the first half of 1958, the military orders that had been envisaged in the budget but not yet allocated to firms, were distributed among the monopolies. This raised the budget deficit to some \$13 billion. But the capitalists gained in a two-fold way: short-term loans were made available to the state at high interest, and they got their money back in the form of payments for highly profitable Government orders.

Here is an illustration of how the U.S. monopolies profit from this source. The government invited tenders for equipment for a power station. Two big monopolies—General Electric and the Westinghouse Electric Corporation — made identical bids of \$17.5 million. The bid of the British firm C. A. Parsons and Co. Ltd., was only 12 million. The Government, naturally, accepted the lowest tender—that of the British firm. But the two U.S. monopolies protested, claiming that the British could make a lower bid because of their lower labor costs. This prompted James B. Carey, president of the International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, to say that one million man-hours of labor would be involved in the production of the equipment; the labor costs of this particular contract would therefore be roughly about 3 million dollars. Consequently, even if the American monopolies did not pay a single penny for the labor, the difference between the American and British bids would still be in the region of 2.5 million dollars.*

This example testifies to the profits obtained by the American corporations from deliveries of aircraft, A-bombs, rockets, etc. — thanks to a monopoly of government orders and no competition on the part of foreign rivals. In his message to Congress, Eisenhower stated that the United States had aircraft which cost as much as if they were made of gold.

The importance of military deliveries for U.S. industry can be ascertained from the following figures: the cost of all industrial produce in 1959 amounted to about \$300 billion,** while military orders accounted for 40 billion. These figures, however, do not show sufficiently *the economic weight of the military deliveries*. Nowadays, with the feverish development of military equipment, armaments become outdated very quickly and are replaced by still more costly armaments. This

*The Times, March 20, 1959.

**Survey of Current Business, January 1959, p. 3.

means that also in peacetime the monopolies have a guaranteed vast and highly profitable market for the sale of arms. This ensures a definite minimum of production even during the crisis, and prevents it from falling as was the case during the crisis of 1929-33. Here, then, we have the economic basis for the cold war, which is incessantly fanned by the monopolies with a view to preventing a fall in the volume of military orders. By means of the cold war the monopolies make the people bear the burden of military expenditure.

Whenever a monopoly is affected by the crisis, it receives direct help from the government. The U.S. railways, especially those in the eastern part of the country, have long had a competitor in the shape of road transport, and during the crisis decreasing freight-loadings made them unprofitable. At this juncture Eisenhower cancelled the three per cent tax which had been collected from their gross receipts. As a result, the railways again became profitable and their shares quickly rose on the Stock Exchange.

Price-fixing is an important lever which, in conditions of the present crisis, enabled the monopolies to avoid the usual losses. The general level of prices, far from falling, went up. At the same time the purchasing power of all currencies continued to fall. Thus, that of the dollar fell to nearly half the prewar level.

According to the International Monetary Fund, the purchasing power of the basic currencies (taking 1952 as 100) was, at the end of 1958, as follows: Swiss franc—94.3, Canadian dollar—93.5, West German mark—92.6, Belgian franc—92.6, U.S. dollar—91.9, Italian lira—87.7, French franc—83.3, pound sterling—82. The depreciation of some other currencies, Chilean and South Korean, for example, was even more marked.

The fall in the purchasing power of the currencies of the imperialist states is explained by two main factors:

a) the extremely high military expenditure which deflects an enormous part of the output to non-productive purposes and leads to budget deficits which, in turn, result in inflation;

b) the high prices maintained or even increased by the monopolies during the crisis (as, for example, in the U.S. steel-smelting and aluminum industries).

Monopoly profit-seeking results in a considerable decline in the purchasing power of the currency and in price boosting. During

a crisis the monopolies seize on the difference between monopoly prices and "free prices."*

While prices of monopoly products remained at a high level (or even rose) during the crisis, prices of some commodities produced by non-monopoly enterprises or weaker monopolies fell considerably. Prices of food, non-ferrous metal ores, cotton, wool and other raw materials and goods sold on the world market by the underdeveloped countries declined catastrophically. In this way the capitalists of the imperialist countries, particularly those in Western Europe who import big quantities of raw materials, succeeded in shifting the burden of the crisis onto the working people in the underdeveloped countries where living standards are low. According to our estimates, West European monopoly capital amassed in 1958, on top of the usual profit and that obtained through unequal exchange, about one billion dollars as a result of the difference between the price of the exported manufactured goods and the imported raw materials. This explains why during the crisis years Britain managed to secure a more favorable dollar-pound exchange.

Who Profits by the Depreciation of Money?

The steady process of currency depreciation in the capitalist countries—typical of the postwar years—is an important lever in the hands of capital in its fight against the working class, enabling it to reduce real wages without resorting to frontal attacks by way of direct wage cuts. This compels the workers to play the role of the "attacking" side in the fight for higher wages, because with the fall in the value of money they are forced to do so. Although they are sometimes successful in this fight, they find themselves in a less advantageous position than the capitalists because their demand to bring wages into conformity with the depreciated money is, as a rule, put forward at a time when depreciation has become a fait accompli, when it has fallen to a lower level. Even under the more favorable conditions when the workers have a sliding wage scale (either established by agreement with the employer or introduced by the state), their demand for higher wages is offset by the depreciation.

The profound faith of U.S. capitalists in the blessings of moderate inflation can be

*Before World War II some countries (Germany and Poland, for example) published different indices for monopoly and free prices. Later the publication was discontinued because it revealed all too obviously the monopoly price machinations.

seen from the views of Sumner H. Slichter, professor of economics at Harvard University: "I regard 'creeping inflation' as a necessary cost of achieving maximum economic growth . . . I think that it's impossible to achieve the maximum growth of which we are capable without having some inflation. I wouldn't worry about a deficit of three billion dollars, or something of that sort."*

Thus the monopolies, on the one hand, force the workers to fight in defense of their real wages, and, on the other, claim that prices are soaring because of the high wages!

The fact that in the economic struggle between labor and capital the working class is, by virtue of the depreciation of money, placed in the position of an allegedly attacking side is of great *political* importance for the monopolies.

At a time when the imperialist states are preparing for war against the socialist countries, when they are continually waging war in the colonies that still remain in their grip and oppressing the semi-colonies, it does not always pay monopoly capital to wage a frontal attack on the working class at home. The constant depreciation enables the big bourgeoisie, particularly in the USA and Britain, to be on good terms with trade union leaders, and even to consent to certain wage increases in the knowledge that the inflation and the soaring prices will shortly reduce real wages.

A feature of the present situation is that the existence of the socialist world objectively provides the working class of the imperialist countries with definite political protection against the frontal attacks of capital. But instead of realizing and recognizing this, the Right-wing trade union leaders engage in slander against the socialist countries, particularly the Soviet Union. In the United States, for example, the organ of the AFL-CIO Executive headed by Mr. Meany systematically prints hostile and slanderous articles calling for war against the Soviet Union.

The corruption of the Right-wing leaders and manipulations with long-term collective agreements are a big *political* gain for the monopolies.

Will Unemployment Increase or Decrease?

The economic crisis has raised *unemployment* to the level which has long been the dream of the capitalists. For example, *The Economist*, mouthpiece of British monopoly capital, has in the postwar years published

dozens of articles claiming that Britain needs at least one million unemployed.

The *relatively* low unemployment in the imperialist countries both after the war and in the decade preceding it was the result not of any "improvement" of capitalism, but of the huge manpower losses during the war, and also of the fact that millions were diverted from the labor market and called to the army. Another reason was that for a certain period rehabilitation and stock replenishment made it easier to find jobs. But there can be no talk of any permanent improvement on the labor market. On the contrary, the *capitalist world is re-entering the period of chronic mass unemployment*.

Speaking in Parliament, Ian Macleod, British Minister of Labor and National Service, quoted the following percentages of unemployed in the main countries at the beginning of this year: * Canada 8.9, Italy 8.9, Denmark 8.3, Belgium 7.2, the USA 6.1, West Germany 5.6, and Britain 2.5.**

These figures, however, give a distorted picture because the percentages are taken not from the number of employed workers, but from the entire "working population," i.e., all who work, including civil servants, handicraftsmen, shop-keepers, and others. It is common knowledge also that bourgeois statistics tend to put the unemployment figures in the best light. In the United States, for example, the number of unemployed is established by questioning a relatively small cross-section of people (some tens of thousands). The percentages calculated for the particular group are then extended to the total number employed with the result that every mistake or every forgery is multiplied a thousand-fold. Some of the unemployed are described as people insufficiently "active" in looking for work and are no longer registered as belonging to this category. Moreover, anyone who has worked at least *one hour* a week is not classified as unemployed. It would not be an exaggeration to say that the number of fully unemployed in the United States at the beginning of this year was not 4.7 million (the official figure) but in the neighborhood of 8 million. We should also bear in mind the uneven unemployment in the different branches of industry. The number of unemployed is high in the old industries (mining, textile, etc.), while there is prac-

*The Times, March 19, 1959.

**The Minister proudly pointed to the relatively small percentage in Britain as against the other countries. But, according to official statistics, even this percentage stands for well-nigh 550,000 jobless.

*U.S. News & World Report, March 9, 1959, p. 106.

tically no unemployment in some of the new industries (electronics, rocket production, and so on).

It can be assumed that in the years to come unemployment will be considerably greater than it was in the immediate postwar years, and for the following reasons:

1) uneven development of technology rapidly reduces the socially-needed time for the production of goods;

2) growing unemployment enables the capitalists to dismiss older or inefficient workers and further intensify labor;

3) in the former belligerent countries considerable numbers of young workers will be eligible for work in the next 2-3 years;

4) compared with the immediate postwar period production will develop at a slower rate in the next decade in view of the fact that the possibilities for expanding the capitalist market occasioned by the consequences of the war have been exhausted (replacement of the fixed capital in the civilian industries which had not been renewed during the war; restoration of war-ravaged towns; replenishment of stocks).

The tendency for chronic mass unemployment to increase was particularly manifested in the United States which suffered infinitely less from the war than the other imperialist countries.

*The Number of Workers in the U.S.A.
(in millions) **

	In 1948	In 1958	Change
Manufacturing	15.3	15.5	up 1%
Farming	8.0	5.8	down 27%
Construction	2.2	2.6	up 22%
Mining	1.0	0.7	down 27%
Total	26.4	24.7	down 7%

Within a single decade the number of workers directly engaged in creating value and surplus value fell by seven per cent. Typical is the situation in the manufacturing industry. Factory employment rose only one per cent, whereas output rose 32 per cent. Since it is certain that output in this branch in the next decade will not register another 32 per cent increase, it is to be expected that the absolute number of industrial workers will, like that of miners and farmers in the past decade, show a decline.

At the same time the numbers employed in providing services are growing rapidly in the United States. Thus, while the number of industrial workers, in the past ten years,

has fallen by 1.7 million (seven per cent), the number employed in trade, finance, insurance and other services has risen from 16.2 million to 19.9 million, i.e., by more than 20 per cent. In the federal, state and local governments, i.e., in the state apparatus of the bourgeoisie, the number of employees rose in these years from 7.1 million to 10.5 million—by 48 per cent. A similar trend, although less pronounced, can be observed in all the imperialist countries.

In the United States the tendency for employment to decline has been evident in the past few years:

*Manufacturing Industry**

	Production index (1947-49=100, with seasonal fluctuations)	Number of workers (in millions)
December 1957	137	16.3
December 1958	144	15.7

In December 1958 there were nearly 700,000 (five per cent) fewer employed, but production went up five per cent! In the manufacturing industry higher productivity, intensification of labor, and replacement of the older workers have reduced manpower requirements by 10 per cent, with a rise in the production of surplus value.

Greater exploitation and high monopoly prices explain why, during the current economic crisis, monopoly profits declined only for a very brief period. According to the First National City Bank** the net profit amassed by 2,219 enterprises belonging to the leading corporations amounted (after taxes) to \$15,776,000,000 in 1957 and to \$13,928,000,000 in 1958. This attests to a relatively insignificant reduction—on the average not more than 12 per cent. We should also bear in mind that profits are distributed unevenly among the various industries.

Thus, during a crisis state-monopoly capitalism ensures monopoly capital sufficient and at times higher profits, and safeguards it against bankruptcy.*** The brunt of the crisis is borne almost entirely by factory and office workers, salaried officials, "little people," and by the population of the underdeveloped countries, particularly those with onesided economies.

*Survey of Current Business, January 1959, pp. 2 and 11.

**Business and Economic Conditions, March 1959, p. 29.

***During the last crisis in the United States over one thousand enterprises went bankrupt every month, but none of these was monopoly-owned. Even during the 1929-33 world crisis the government supported the monopolies whenever they were in danger.

*U.S. News & World Report, February 6, 1959, p. 95. The figures here are rounded off by the author.—Ed.

The Prospects

Basing ourselves on an analysis of the dynamics of the postwar cycle, we can outline the perspectives roughly as follows:

1) When the consequences of the Second World War have been overcome in the main, the cyclical movement inherent in the capitalist mode of production will, we believe, resume its normal course, accompanied, as the experience of a century shows, roughly every 6-8 years by a world economic crisis. This will be the case, of course, only if the warmongers are prevented from unleashing a third world war.

2) In the cycle which will follow the current crisis it is doubtful if there will be any great upsurge of world capitalist production similar to that which occurred in the first postwar cycle, because the specific war expansion of the world market will not obtain. This cycle will probably resemble the prewar rather than the postwar cycles.

3) It can be assumed that chronic mass unemployment typical of the epoch of the general crisis of capitalism will increase, since rapid technological progress will cause a much greater labor surplus compared with the needs of industry.

A new factor will be the volume of unemployment among office workers. The rapid

mechanization of office work — computers, business and adding machines capable of performing the work of hundreds of clerks — will make large numbers of "white-collar workers" redundant. This will help overcome the division of manual and mental workers deliberately maintained by capital, and organize them into one army opposing capital. This is highly essential because in the leading capitalist countries the number of mental workers is as high as that of manual workers.

4) The economic competition between socialism and capitalism will continue to develop in favor of the socialist camp. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries are granting the underdeveloped countries low-interest loans and technical aid, selling them means of production on favorable terms; they in turn are buying raw materials from these countries on terms more favorable than those offered by the imperialist monopolies. All this will help to end the economic dependence of the underdeveloped countries which have got rid of the *political* rule of imperialism.

5) The struggle between labor and capital will become more acute. Although chronic mass unemployment will make the struggle of the workers more difficult, their growing organization will allow them, provided they have correct leadership, to fight successfully on the economic and political fronts.

**In the Communist
and Workers' Parties**

Chronicles of Communist Construction

*(Some Facts and Figures in Connection with the June Plenary
Meeting of the C.C. of the CPSU)*

THE XXIst Congress of the CPSU defined the "broad introduction of new techniques, integrated mechanization and automation of production, specialization and coordination of all branches of the national economy" as the basic condition for the accomplishment of the Seven-Year Plan and the laying down of the economic base of communism. The Congress expressed the conviction that all-round communist construction would "give rise to a powerful wave of labor enthusiasm, to new forms of nationwide emulation for fulfilment and overfulfilment of the Seven-Year Plan, and would be marked by outstanding victories."

Responding With Deeds

The Congress ended on February 5, and four days later a miners' team led by Ivan Byelousov pledged to fulfil their plan in five years. On February 10, a similar pledge was made by Nikolai Mamai's team of miners.

The press shop workers at the Urals Engineering Works have also taken upon themselves the obligation to fulfil the plan in five years in which time the productivity of each press operator will go up by 40 per cent. Their challenge was taken up by the steelmen of the Kharkov Tractor Plant, who in their turn are competing with the Stalin-grad tractor-builders. The nationwide drive for the fulfilment of the plan ahead of schedule is sweeping the country.

Party meetings held soon after the Congress summarized the first results of the campaign for technological progress, and revealed new potentialities.

New Elements in the Pledges

Soon after the Party Congress new elements began to appear in the emulation pledges of the regions, towns and separate enterprises. The new trend in rationalization can be seen in the reconstruction of shops and plants as a whole, rather than of individual working places, and integrated mechanization in place of only selected mechanization. What are known as rationalization "funds" or "pools" were established at the enterprises. By the end of the year engineering and instrument-making plants undertook to put into production

570 new types of machines and instruments, to modernize no less than 400 types, and to install 150 additional continuous production and conveyor lines. Engineering workers in Sverdlovsk, Minsk, Kharkov and Riga responded with similar pledges. The appeals of the advanced enterprises in all industries now place the emphasis on technological innovation and modernization.

Millions of workers discussed these appeals and pledges. Pooling of experience helped to find the most efficient solutions to problems of technical reconstruction. Everything that hindered progress—inertness, extravagance and bureaucracy—was severely criticized. The decisive word of the Party was needed to raise the movement to a higher level, to give it clear direction and remove the obstacles from the path of technological progress.

Mass Preparation for the C.C. Meeting

On May 10 it was reported that the Central Committee of the Communist Party would convene, on June 24, a meeting to discuss the "ways and means of carrying out the decisions of the XXIst Congress concerning integrated mechanization in industry and construction, automation, continuous production lines (replacement of outdated equipment, dies and instruments, with a view to further expanding output, improving quality, and lowering production and building costs."

The publication of the date of the Meeting six weeks in advance enabled the Party organizations to make thorough preparations. The Party committees investigated problems of technological development. Thus, the Moscow City Committee discussed the role played by Party organizations in research institutes, mechanization and automation at enterprises of the radio-technical and instrument-making plants, modernization and specialization at engineering works. The Leningrad City Committee made a check on the fulfilment of obligations. The Stalino Regional Committee jointly with the T.U. Council examined the progress made in introducing integrated mechanization and automation. They were assisted by some 20,000 workers and technicians. The whole country participated in the preparations for the Central Committee Meeting.

Mass Initiative Yields Results

In the Vladimir Region the workers are planning to achieve two-thirds of the increased output by tapping internal resources only. The tractor builders are determined to increase the 1965 target by 50 per cent through a more rational utilization of capital investments and better use of the existing production capacities. The cotton industries intend to increase output substantially through the reconstruction and extension of the existing mills, which is cheaper and takes less time, rather than through building new ones. Other enterprises are following this example. On May 21, the Central Committee adopted a special resolution commending the initiative of the Vladimir Party Committee and Economic Council. In its recommendations the Central Committee stressed "the paramount importance of raising output through reconstruction and extension of the existing enterprises, which is cheaper and quicker, rather than through building new enterprises."

In subsequent resolutions the Central Committee commended the initiative of the workers of Sverdlovsk, who undertook to achieve the 1965 production level a year ahead of time without making any additional capital investments; and of the workers of the Tatar Autonomous Republic, who doubled their target for collecting scrap-metal. It stressed the decision of Moscow's engineering workers to boost the planned targets for output of specialized machine-tools and multiple units, automatic production lines, measuring instruments and gauges, for this will accelerate the re-equipment of the industry as a whole. It hailed the chemical and oil workers of the Gorky Economic Area who undertook to raise output without additional investments.

The workers of the Moscow Economic Area decided to achieve the 1965 production level in 1963 without additional capital expenditures. The workers of the Leningrad Economic Area hope to achieve the 1965 labor productivity level by 1964. The automobile and tractor workers of Byelorussia intend to fulfil their total plan a year ahead of schedule, and the plan for heavy trucks—18 months ahead. The engineering workers undertook to turn out 2.5 times more automatic production lines than envisaged by the plan. The steel workers, miners and builders of the Dnepropetrovsk Economic Area decided to achieve the 1965 production level in 1963 without additional investments.

The Central Committee has endorsed these decisions and has drawn the attention of the public to them.

Moving Faster Towards Communism

The Central Committee Meeting held in the Kremlin over June 24-29 was attended by Party,

government, executive, trade union and Komsomol workers, managers of big enterprises, construction projects and transport, heads of research institutes, leading designers and scientists, inventors and innovators.

After a thorough discussion in which 52 people spoke, the Meeting adopted a number of measures on technological development: "All branches of the national economy should pay special attention to the reconstruction of enterprises, modernization and replacement of outdated equipment, improvement of technology, specialization and coordination of industries." Emphasis is to be placed on "automation of technological processes, of shops and plants (rather than of separate operations), and priority should be given to those branches where it will produce the maximum economic effect."

Not only machines and problems of technology were discussed. Rather it was the people—creators of advanced techniques, builders of communist society—who were in the spotlight. The features of the new worker were evident from the speech of Valentina Gaganova, a weaver of the Vyshnevolochok Cotton Mill, who said: "We realize that the state cannot afford to allocate all the money we need for expansion and re-equipment . . . That is why our shops undertook to utilize the internal resources and to help the teams lagging behind to catch up with the advanced ones. I had asked to be assigned to a backward team, though I knew that I would be earning less money. I was sure that the team would make out well and we would all be earning more. In May our team fulfilled the assignment 118 per cent, and accomplished the half-year plan by June 6. Now all the members make an extra 5-6 rubles a day. Now we have agreed that if a worker fails to master our technically justified standards or produces less than 115 per cent of the planned quota, he will be considered inefficient. This is our aim today, and as soon as we have accomplished it, we shall advance further."

Speaking about Valentina Gaganova, Khrushchov said: ". . . We should think this over—a person who thinks in terms of capitalist concepts would never believe that a worker would voluntarily give up a better-paid job for a lower-paid job . . . The value and nobleness of her deed consist in the fact that it is not material interest that prompted her to take this step but lofty ideas, fidelity to the communist system."

The Meeting was implacable toward shortcomings, backwardness, inertness and bureaucracy. Its participants visited a special exhibition of outdated equipment still being produced by some of the plants. The Meeting enhanced the role of public control over the implementation of decisions. It noted that "control from below is most effective."

tive in helping to reveal in good time and eliminate shortcomings."

The Meeting adopted a message urging all working people to master advanced technology and raise productivity in order to strengthen the economic might of the country and satisfy to the full the growing material and spiritual needs of the people.

The C.C. Meeting had scarcely opened its pro-

ceedings when reports started coming in from the enterprises on the fulfilment of the six-month plans and on the technological re-equipment. Far-reaching plans for integrated mechanization, automation, modernization and re-equipment are being drawn up everywhere.

These measures enjoy the active support of the people, for they are aimed at raising the economy to a higher stage.

Poland's Agricultural Program

THE decisions of the June Meeting of the Central Committee of the United Workers' Party and of the Meeting of the Board of the United Peasants' Party constitute a grand program for agricultural development for 1959-65. They elaborate on the Resolutions of the Third Congress of the United Workers' Party and center on the two main problems:

- ✓ How to achieve a 30 per cent growth of agricultural output in the next seven years; and
- ✓ How should production be developed to effect socialist changes in the countryside?

Sweeping changes have taken place in Polish agriculture during the 15 years of people's government. The grave consequences of its age-old backwardness, complicated by the domination of landlords during the inter-war period and by the heavy war damage, have been eliminated. Under the 1944-45 land reform over six million hectares of land were handed over to the former farm laborers and poor peasants. Millions of "surplus hands" found jobs in the towns thanks to socialist industrialization. Supply and marketing co-operatives, which have made considerable headway, now have a membership of over three million. Credit co-operatives, co-operative savings banks, and milk, fruit and vegetable-marketing co-operatives are all functioning successfully. There are 1,950 producer co-operatives with over 230,000 hectares of land. Four hundred thousand workers are employed on the state farms which cultivate 2,195,000 hectares of land.

Higher output testifies to the successes gained. The per capita output of agricultural produce has gone up by 40 per cent as compared with the prewar period. In the 1954-1958 period alone the gross agricultural output rose by 25 per cent, and that of marketable goods—35 per cent. State assistance was the decisive factor: the volume of deliveries was reduced; purchasing prices for some products were raised; more means of production and construction materials were sent to the countryside; more state credits and allocations for agricultural development were assigned.

These measures stimulated the initiative of the peasants and encouraged them to increase the

output. In the last few years the peasants have invested much more themselves.

But notwithstanding all that, the rate of agricultural development is still insufficient. The average grain crop yield (although 27 per cent higher than the prewar) is still relatively low—1.45 tons per hectare. Cattle herds are also increasing slowly. Shortage of fodder is being felt more and more because of the growing number of horses (Poland has more horses than any other country in Europe).

Further advancement is hindered by numerous difficulties of which the main are technological and social backwardness (small peasant farming). What is needed to overcome these difficulties and achieve a higher rate of growth in the next few years is an adequate material and technological base, and encouragement of the peasants' initiative.

The June Meeting decided that the allocations should be used to finance mechanization, improvement projects and construction.

The tractor fleet will be increased from 58,000 units in 1958 to 135,000 in 1965, and will be completely re-equipped. The number of trailer and mounted attachments and other equipment will increase accordingly. It is intended to replace some 300,000 horses by machines. The fodder saved will be used to raise the cattle population,

As a result of the mechanization the peasants will be freed from the most labor-consuming operations and labor will be more efficiently used. More intensive agronomic methods will be introduced. Thousands of young peasants will learn new trades.

Large-scale improvement projects will be launched. Of the 20 million hectares of cultivated lands and pastures, 10.5 million require artificial irrigation and drainage. When the projects are carried out in 1965 they will ensure the output of an additional 1.1 million tons of grain and eight million tons of hay.

The Directives of the Third Party Congress provide that by 1965 housing to the extent of 1.2 million rooms should be built in the villages. Apart from this a large number of farm buildings, including sheds for the increasing livestock population are to be constructed.

To cope with this program it is planned to develop the tractor-building and agricultural machinery industries; and to construct special plants for the manufacture of improvement equipment. It is also envisaged that an adequate number of specialists will be trained.

Obviously, with small peasant farming prevailing in the village the peasants are unable to buy agricultural machinery and tractors, or to use them efficiently. The same is true of extensive improvement and large-scale construction. The purchase of machinery by the well-to-do peasants (either individually or in groups) would only stress social inequality and create conditions for the exploitation of the poor peasants. That is why the employment of modern machinery and improved methods of farming can only be effected on the basis of collective ownership of the basic means of production. To advance agriculture we need a mass economic organization for the peasants through which they could jointly employ their own means of production and make use of assistance rendered by the state. Such an organization already exists in the Polish village, where it has long-standing traditions and deep roots. It is the so-called agricultural group. There are such groups in 18,000 (of the total number of 40,000) villages with a membership of about 500,000. The groups organize the joint use of machinery, conduct seed selection, collective contracting, and disseminate progressive farming methods.

The United Workers' and the United Peasants' parties are of the view that the groups should purchase the tractors and machines. The state must create the conditions for such purchases; it should allocate funds which, together with the resources of the peasants and the incomes of the groups, will enable the latter to buy the machinery they need.

The intention behind this measure is to transfer to the groups the difference between state purchasing prices and the prices for obligatory deliveries. Thus a fund for agricultural development will be set up, which will be controlled by the groups. The machinery acquired will form the collective non-distributable property of the group, but all peasants will be equally entitled to use it. The fund will be used chiefly for the purchase of machines and tractors.

Preference in the purchase of tractors and other machines will be given to villages with well-organized groups enjoying mass support and having experienced people trained to run a collective economy. Villages without agricultural groups but with activists who could use machinery effectively will be able to organize such groups. Priorities will be granted to groups which, jointly with other

peasants, are able to make a 15-20 per cent down payment from their own savings. Shortage of labor power will also be considered in granting priorities.

The Agricultural Development Fund may also be partly used to finance improvements and, in certain instances, the production of building materials and the construction of food processing enterprises. However, here too, the groups will be required to cover at least 15-20 per cent of the costs from their own means.

A firm material base will enable the agricultural groups to display broad initiative in solving their basic production problems. They will engage in contracting, supplying their members with fertilizers, seed and pedigree stock, in maintaining improvement installations, etc. The groups will disseminate agricultural know-how, conduct experimental work, and popularize advanced experience. The State Land Fund will also grant land to them for collective use.

The decisions of the two parties emphasize that the development of agricultural groups will be accompanied by the growth of producer co-operatives and the strengthening of the socialist sector in agriculture. The fact that the machines purchased with the aid of the fund are collectively owned and help to increase the incomes derived from the joint labor of the group members will stimulate the development of these groups along socialist lines. The collectively-owned property and allocation of commonly-owned means for common needs will help to overcome age-old habits and prejudices. Collective improvement work, reclamation of new lands, and joint exploitation of the State Fund lands will stimulate this process. The groups will be a sort of school, training rural cadres of a new type.

The development of the groups, the strengthening of the existing producer co-operatives and the setting up of new ones will create the conditions for achieving higher output and re-organizing the countryside along socialist lines.

The producer co-operatives will be granted means from the Agricultural Development Fund in proportion to the volume of their state deliveries. At the same time the state will continue to aid them with credits, priority delivery of machines and fertilizers, etc. The co-operatives will enjoy lower taxation, a 25 per cent discount in payments for the services of state machine and tractor stations, favorable terms for construction of farm buildings, free services of experts, and so on.

All this will strengthen the co-operatives and help them evolve into model socialist farms. The example of the most efficient co-operatives and of successful agricultural groups will convince the peasant masses that producer co-operatives are

the best and shortest way to higher living standards and higher output, that they guarantee the abolition of exploitation and social inequality,

which are inevitable in conditions of private property and private land ownership.

Mieczyslaw JAGIELSKI

Resisting Anti-Democratic Forces

THE situation in Mexico is tense owing to recent developments. The railwaymen's strike with its restricted economic demands was used by the government as an excuse for anti-labor and anti-democratic measures which have evoked profound indignation among the masses. The Communist Party has called on the people to fight for democracy.

The Mateos Administration, states the appeal of the Party, is pursuing the anti-popular, pro-imperialist policy of its predecessors—the governments of Miguel Aleman and Ruiz Cortines. It is openly violating the Constitution and trampling on constitutional guarantees and rights.

The unlawful arrest of some eight thousand railwaymen, trade union leaders and public figures (the office of the Public Prosecutor reluctantly admitted a figure of 3,600); confinement in army barracks and camps; gross violation of periods of imprisonment and searches in private homes without legal warrant; raiding of the premises of democratic parties (the office of the Central Committee of the Communist Party was seized by the police); transfer of the management of the affairs of the railwaymen's union to trade union bureaucrats within a few hours after the arrest of Demetrio Valejo and of the other leaders; repeated violations of the right to strike; banning of demonstrations, rallies and even meetings in private homes; annulment of the labor agreement with ten thousand railwaymen and, finally, the confiscation of *La Voz de Mexico*, the Communist Party organ, the seizure of the printshop, and arrest of the workers—all this is evidence of a flagrant transgression of constitutional guarantees and civil liberties, of unprecedented reprisals against the working class and the democratic forces.

McCarthyism manifests itself in a statement made by a high-ranking official at the Public Prosecutor's Office: "The Communist Party of Mexico has been outlawed, since it has failed to register, as required by the law, with the Ministry of the Interior as a national political party." However, nothing can stop the Communist Party from waging a political struggle in the interests of the working-class—not even such statements nor the denial of the Party's rights to existence, a denial which is derived by the ruling classes from the anti-constitutional and anti-democratic electoral law. The Communist Party functions as a legal party under the Constitution, and it is not

within the powers of the Prosecutor to repeal the Constitution. Neither arbitrary action, nor unlawful regulations or reprisals can put a stop to the political activity of the Party. In upholding the legality and other constitutional rights of the Communist Party the people have thereby maintained their own democratic liberties; they will not permit the abrogation of these rights, since it would mean the infringement of constitutional rights in general.

The people are aware that reprisals, anti-Soviet provocations and anti-communist outbursts came in the wake of the Acapulco meeting of President Mateos with Eisenhower as if in payment for the humiliating U.S. loans.

Our people know from their own experience what North American interference means; open aggression, economic intervention, or systematic political pressure through the U.S. Embassy and secret police agents supported by official circles. The reactionaries want an open dictatorship, forgetting, however, that Latin American dictatorships have discredited themselves, are opposed by the people, and are being overthrown one after another.

No matter what the government does to conceal the growing opposition to its policies, the truth will out. Mass action (in the last 18 months) of telegraph and telephone workers, railwaymen, oil workers, teachers, students and peasants testifies to the growth of the militant spirit among large sections of the people, to the inexhaustible capacity of the workers and their faith in their strength. The masses are fighting for better conditions and democratic rights. They are fighting not because of a "red conspiracy to overthrow the present government," but because they suffer from hunger and misery, from a policy which puts the trade unions under the control of the state and imposes upon them treacherous leaders.

The Communist Party appeals to the nation, to all working people, all democrats and patriots, to put an end to the reprisals and the infringements of constitutional rights and liberties, for this is the concern not only of the Communists, but of all workers, democrats and other patriots. Only a joint struggle in defense of the Constitution will ensure the abandonment of the treacherous pro-imperialist policy, and the preservation of democratic rights. Resolute united action by all Mexicans will frustrate the reactionary onslaught.

The Communist Party urges the workers and the entire people to win freedom for hundreds

of political prisoners, including Demetrio Valejo and other leaders and members of the railwaymen's union, for the members of the Communist and Worker-Peasant parties. The trials of the railwaymen and revolutionary leaders should be turned into a big fight for the Constitution, for democratic and trade union liberties.

We urge all working men, democrats and other patriots to put an end to all persecution and restriction of political parties; to fight for the return to the Party Central Committee of its premises unlawfully seized by the police; to demand the withdrawal of the army and the police from the premises of the railwaymen's union, and the

restoration of democratic rules in that organization; to fight for the reinstatement of the dismissed railwaymen; to demand respect for collective labor agreements and the satisfaction of the workers' demands; to work for solidarity with the railwaymen; to render material and moral support to hundreds of political prisoners and their families; to demand the repeal of the "Public Order Act" which runs counter to the constitutional rights of the citizens.

The appeal was signed by the Political Commission of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, and was distributed throughout the country.

Nationwide Discussions

THE constant need to extend the role of the working people in the management of the state and of the national economy flows from the very essence of the socialist system. As owners of the means of production and masters of the country, they are vitally concerned with economic progress. Their direct or indirect participation in the work of the state bodies helps the latter in the exercise of their economic and organizational functions.

Nationwide discussions are now a common occurrence in Czechoslovakia, and they are a method of guidance for the country. They center around problems of socialist construction put forward by the Communist Party, such as the directives for the Five-Year Plans, agricultural development, organization of economic management, the structure of the state apparatus, etc.

This practice was adopted first in 1954 when the bills on the national committees were submitted to the country for discussion. An important feature of the discussions was the vital concern of the working people for the strengthening of the state. It was manifest in the numerous suggestions on the submitted bills, as well as in the proposals for increasing the efficiency of the local government bodies. Altogether some 63,000 meetings were held, attended by 2,735,000 people who made 279,000 suggestions, of which 56,000 dealt directly with the bills; 121,000 dealt with the work of the national committees, and 101,000 with other questions. These suggestions helped to improve the bills and to stimulate the activities of the national committees.

The local Party organizations bear great responsibility for holding the discussions and acting on valuable suggestions. The broader the democratic rights the greater the role of the Party in ensuring the national interests.

Considerable experience has been gained since the first nationwide discussion. Following the 1956

Party Conference, which considered broader mass participation in state management, such discussions have been a regular practice. In the latter half of 1957 the Central Committee circulated for discussion a letter on socialist construction. What was at issue was how to raise the efficiency of management of industry and construction. Some 500,000 suggestions were made, i.e., almost twice as many as during the first discussion.

In summing up the results the Central Committee stressed the role of the discussion in stimulating initiative. The Party bodies were to see to the implementation of suggestions. They were instructed to give replies to criticisms and to make use of the experience in future work. It is interesting to note here that Party bodies discussed even unacceptable proposals, though they were few, that revealed a lack of understanding on the part of their authors. This was done to explain to the people why such suggestions had to be rejected.

Good experience was gained from setting up commissions, under Party bodies, for the examination of the suggestions made. In the Prague Region, for example, some 800 representatives from Party and public organizations, the state and economic bodies worked on such commissions. The essential point in this discussion was that it was not an isolated campaign, but a complex measure which furthered the initiative of the masses and strengthened the Party's ties with them. Wherever this spirit prevailed the discussion served to improve all Party work.

The Central Committee assigned groups of workers to help local organizations. The same was done by regional and district committees. The Ostrava Regional Committee allocated 72 representatives who attended 700 meetings and helped in examining the suggestions.

Every new discussion is better organized than the preceding one because of the growing consci-

ousness and activity of the masses. At the same time Party organizations benefit much from this experience. This is corroborated by the discussion of the C.C. letter, submitted in November 1958, on raising the living standards of the people. The Party asked advice on concrete matters: a wage system reform which would ensure higher real wages; the building of 1.2 million flats by 1970, children's allowances, etc.

The workers linked the discussion of these questions with production pledges. The Gottwald Nova Hut Plant concentrated on increasing productivity, economizing on means and materials. The workers also found additional resources to build 80 more flats. The Jan Sverma Engineering Plant in Brno fulfilled the monthly plan 111 per cent through implementation of the proposals submitted during the discussion. This plant provided a typical example of how the C.C. letter was discussed. As soon as the letter was published the Party committee drew up a discussion plan. Both Communists and non-Party workers participated. The visual aids commission and the editorial boards of the wall newspapers prepared materials illustrating the points in the letter by facts from factory life. A special seminar was held for the factory propagandists who later organized 800 talks. The letter was also discussed at 29 Party branch meetings and at a general meeting, to which non-Party people were invited too. In the course of the discussion an organizational committee for a housing co-operative was set up. A long-term plan for housing construction was drawn up. The workers decided to compile a waiting list for apartments; those at the top of the list would have to participate in decorating the first group of apartments. Seventy-one proposals were of national concern; they were submitted directly to the Central Committee. Some 500 had a bearing on the affairs of the plant and the city. The plant Party committee organized monthly check-ups on their implementation.

These are typical examples. The fact that the vast masses of workers make suggestions, discuss them and take part in carrying them out illustrates the broad character of socialist democracy, of real participation in state management. In the Karlovy Vary Region the C.C. letter was discussed by 150,000 people, i.e., by half the population, and in the Jihlava Region—by 153,000. In most districts of Prague half of the speakers were non-Party people.

All in all, the C.C. letter was discussed by four million people. Over 12,000 resolutions from factory, co-operative, school and national committee meetings approved the measures proposed in the letter and contained pledges to overfulfil plans, raise productivity and lower production costs.

In summing up the results the Central Committee meeting adopted a number of decisions affecting price reductions on consumer goods as from March 8. The people will benefit to the extent of 2.3 billion crowns within a year. Five hundred million crowns have been allocated for children's allowances to families with three or more children, and 300 million for the reorganization of the social insurance system. Thus, the working people will benefit (in addition to higher wages and allowances) by some three billion crowns annually.

The campaign has revealed that the prestige of the Party is high. The working people have seen for themselves how attentively their proposals are studied.

The discussion of the materials for the congress of agricultural co-operatives proved very useful. Agricultural output is lagging behind industrial growth. There is only one way to ensure swift development, and that is large-scale production on socialist lines. The Central Committee has carefully studied the desires of the peasants, their experience and suggestions. Special attention was drawn to the work of the advanced co-operatives. The Central Committee then submitted its own proposals on the further development of agriculture.

The discussions were attended by over 500,000 members of co-operatives and about 150,000 individual farmers and agricultural workers. The peasants not only made suggestions but also drew practical conclusions. Depending on the local conditions a number of measures have been worked out, such as improvement of meadows and fields, regulation of crop rotation, better utilization of fertilizers, expansion of areas under industrial crops and corn, reclamation of virgin lands, etc.

The experience of the advanced co-operatives which have started long-term planning has shown that a constant rise in living standards is ensured only through larger non-distributable funds. It would be safe to say that it was the nationwide discussion that helped the peasants to realize this economic tendency. Thus, 343 co-operatives of the Liberec Region have decided to raise the share allocated to the non-distributable funds from 5-7 to 8-14 per cent. A number of advanced co-operatives, realizing that the tilling of individual plots retarded collective work, have decided to cultivate them jointly or to incorporate them in the crop area of the co-operative.

All this did not come about all at once, but was the result of extensive explanatory work conducted by the Party organizations. The peasants are less experienced than the industrial workers in solving cardinal problems, so time was needed before they were able to assess the local tasks from the angle of national requirements. There were instances where co-operatives adopted deci-

sions that were too general or ineffective. But since the regional and district committees displayed great concern for the discussions and reacted immediately to all the suggestions, the co-operatives which had adopted a formal approach to the issues discussed, re-examined them and rectified their mistakes.

Hundreds of capable Party workers were assigned by the regional and district committees to help the co-operatives; many of them settled there permanently. Representatives of the factories taking patronage over separate co-operatives, as well as workers residing in villages also took part in discussing questions of agricultural development.

Apart from conducting nationwide discussions of bills and draft decrees, the Party enlists the masses in the drawing up of perspective and annual economic plans. Work on this year's plan revealed the broad scale of this measure, too. Last autumn, by decision of the Party, the Government and the Trade Unions, the industries checked up on the economic efficiency of the enterprises; in connection with the plan for the following year hidden resources were disclosed and measures for higher productivity were worked out.

All enterprises set up commissions of advanced workers and technicians to study the moderniza-

tion of equipment and the technological processes, and to draw the entire personnel into the preparation of suggestions to be submitted to the leading bodies. Special groups were organized to tackle specific problems. The plan was discussed by technological and economic conferences and production meetings. In this way practically all the workers took part in working out the 1959 targets. The result was that the government target was surpassed by five billion crowns.

Nationwide discussions instil in the working people the feeling of responsibility for the country's economic development. The political experience gained by the masses is of cardinal importance. It is the result of their practical participation in the accomplishment of the tasks of socialist construction, for it is only "in the crucible of the struggle" that they realize how closely the interests of the individual are interwoven with those of society. They come to know that joint efforts in developing the national economy are of benefit not only to society, but to each individual as well. These discussions strengthen socialist democracy, the moral and political unity of the people.

O. CERNIK

*Secretary, Central Committee,
Communist Party of Czechoslovakia*

The Growing Role of the Party in Industry

AT our 26th National Congress there was increased representation from the key industries of Britain, notably engineering and coal mining. This was a sign of the progress being made in building Party branches in industry.

Although today there are nearly four hundred Communist Party branches organized in factories and other places of work, the reasons for this form of organization are not yet clear to all. Among political parties in Britain, the Communist Party alone has such basic units. Some of our newer members find it hard to explain to non-party workers why there has to be a Party branch based on a place of work, and what is its job. But in the branches which carry out all-round activity and are able to increase their membership, the workers see with their own eyes how important it is that a factory should have a Communist organization.

During recent months there have been a large number of actions, both local and national, in defense of full employment, including meetings, demonstrations, mass lobbying of Parliament as well as strikes. Whenever lay-offs are threatened the Communists try to rally the workers. In factory after factory they lead the fight against unemployment and short-time working.

The Communists always defend shop conditions and trade union working agreements. They work for 100 per cent trade unionism, for shop organization, and for effective unity of all trades and of different unions. In some of the factories they have inspired the workers to take effective action, including strike action to protect their elected workshop leaders when they are under attack from the management.

The best factory branches make continuous efforts to explain the historical role the working class has to play, and to enhance the political thinking of the workers.

Selling our socialist literature and *Daily Worker*, distributing leaflets, holding meetings at factory gates—such are the most popular forms of work. Some of our branches have produced and sold factory pamphlets dealing with immediate struggles for better conditions within a factory and linking them with the fight for socialism and the role of the Communist Party. These pamphlets have proved very popular with the workers.

The Communists enjoy the support of their fellow-workers. They are elected to important positions of trust and responsibility in the trade union movement, and often head the work of the Shop Stewards Committees. Yet, some believe that only

a small, highly efficient Communist Party is needed—a sort of a “ginger group.” This underestimates the need for a mass political party of the working class, and much has yet to be done to change these ideas.

In view of this, importance is attached to the popularization of our program “The British Road to Socialism.” Some of our best factory branches sold several hundred copies of the program, and followed this up with invitation meetings and educational discussion, at which non-party workers were present.

As the economic and political situation develops, more and more workers are learning from their experience that our analysis of capitalism is correct. The better understanding of our positions and the rejection of Right-wing social-democratic ideas will inevitably have their influence on the official policy and leadership of the TUC and the Labor Party. At the same time this can find its reflection in the local trade union and Labor movement, and in the town and county councils.

There are many areas where a change in the general policy of only one big factory can decisively affect local political life. An example of this influence occurred when a large factory wanted to fire thousands of workers in a reorganization scheme. Due to the effective action of the factory

branch the threat was resisted by the workers of this factory and others. Town meetings and demonstrations were held, the local council and the Member of Parliament were compelled to act, and the management had to abandon their plans. In some cases industrial workers ally themselves for common struggle to cover groups of firms in a given combine or even in a whole industry like aircraft or motors.

In the forthcoming General Election, factory anti-Tory committees will be set up in many of the bigger enterprises. Their task will be not only to mobilize support for the appropriate candidates, but to influence the policy of these candidates in a progressive direction, in line with the demands of the working class.

At our 26th National Congress it was emphasized that we must reach new heights in our Party building campaign, especially in the factories. The rapid development of the work of our factory branches and the setting up of many hundreds more are vitally necessary for strengthening the contact between the Party and masses, and achieving united action of the working class.

Frank FOSTER
Secretary, West Middlesex
District Party Committee

The Source of Our Confidence

FOR the past two years Jordan—a small country with a population of about one-and-a-half million—has been in the grip of terror. Political, trade union and other forms of public activity are proscribed. About a thousand Communists have been jailed and anyone suspected of being associated with Communists is subjected to harassment. Anyone found with Party literature in his possession is liable to a prison sentence of fifteen years.

But despite the terror our Party is carrying on the struggle in which it enjoys the sympathy of the population. If one asks, how is it that the Communists are able to fight in such conditions, the answer is: the source of strength of our Party lies in its close contact with the masses.

Big sections of the urban and rural population have faith in the Party, respect it, regard it as their own party, and render it financial and moral support. The Party, for its part, misses no opportunity to strengthen its ties with the working people. In a letter to the regional organizations and to all Party members, the Central Committee urged them to find new ways and means of strengthening contact with the masses and to study the questions agitating the various sections of the population. The letter was closely studied by the

organizations, so that now there is much that is new in our work.

The Party organizations in the Nablousse Region, where terror is particularly rampant, use the trials of Communists to their advantage. The local branches turn to the workers, peasants and intellectuals, explaining to them the reasons for the arrest and persecution of Party members, and urge them to attend the court sessions. Not infrequently these sessions are turned into patriotic demonstrations. The fearless speeches made by the Communists in court arouse the admiration of the working people, and the latter, on their return home or to their place of work, pass on their impressions of the courage and staunchness of the men in the dock. The courts often conduct the trials behind closed doors in order to prevent the people from hearing the voice of the Communists.

The Amman Regional Party Committee has appealed to friends of the political prisoners to visit them on days when visits are allowed, when large crowds gather outside the prisons. The Party organizations use this method to conduct large-scale campaigns for the release of political prisoners.

The Party organization in the Irbid Region puts out a local paper, which is widely read. This is particularly important in view of the fact that, because of the strict surveillance on the railroads and highways, the national Party paper often arrives late. A local paper is also circulated in Jerusalem. The regional committees are at the same time working to increase the circulation of the national paper, especially among the peasants. During harvesting when the peasants are working in the fields, Communists read the paper to small groups, with the result that in a few days many people know its content. Highly appreciative of the paper, which reflects their interests, the peas-

ants say: "This is the party that helps us. But the others, what do they do?"

Notwithstanding the terror and growing difficulties the editorial board of the national paper manages to put out miniature cartoons of a topical nature. These, which have been well received, are distributed among the people or posted on the walls. Often people say: "The Communists are not afraid. These cartoons are a slap in the face for the government traitors."

Our party is sparing no efforts to achieve closer contact with the masses. The Central Committee fosters every initiative, no matter where it comes from, provided it helps to strengthen this contact.

Magid TALALE

Short Notices

Colombia

IN DEFENSE OF SMALL TRADERS

A FEATURE of the anti-imperialist and strike movements in Latin America is the active participation in them of office employees, handicraftsmen, shopkeepers and other middle sections. Fighting in their defense and for the unity of the patriotic forces, the Communist parties of the Latin American countries are giving the lie to reactionary slanders to the effect that the working class is harming the economic position of the middle sections by fighting only for its own narrow interests. A leaflet recently distributed by the North Santander Party Committee in Cucuta, urging solidarity with operators of street stalls, is an example showing how the Communists defend the middle sections.

The leaflet recalls that the local municipal council adopted a motion condemning the thousands of poor families, victims of speculation and the housing shortage, who took possession of vacant land in San Luis. "Today the council which expresses the class interests of a handful of big traders who mercilessly plunder the people," the leaflet reads, "seeks to deny the street stall operators the right to earn a living for their families by forbidding them to trade in the most remunerative part of the city."

"By this decision the council has not only violated the article of the Constitution which proclaims that the right to work is a social obligation safeguarded by the government, it has doomed to unemployment and misery thousands of people who have no other means of earning their bread

and butter but their modest trade. Acting on behalf of a handful of big traders who are trying to oust the stall operators whom they regard as rivals, and thus to make bigger profits and raise prices, the municipal council has betrayed the people who elected it 'in the period of stagnation', and has become an instrument of corruption."

The Party committee has urged all trade unions, citizens' councils and all democrats to put an end to the offensive against the people—an offensive launched by the latifundists and the big traders through their agents in the municipal council—to protest emphatically against the decision of the council and align themselves with the stall operators in defense of their right to work.

Reunion

THE FOUNDING CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

DURING the past eighteen months independent Communist parties, based on the former federations of the French Communist Party, have been formed in the French overseas departments of Martinique and Guadeloupe. Not long ago, the Founding Congress of the Communist Party was held on Réunion.

This island—situated in the Indian Ocean, some 490 miles east of Madagascar—has been a French colony since the mid-XVIIth century. Its population, chiefly Creoles, are fighting against colonial oppression.

Until recently the local Communists belonged to an affiliated federation of the French Communist Party. After the war they fought to achieve Department status for the island, and the democratic liberties proclaimed by the French Constitution. This status was granted in 1946, when the Communists were represented in the French government, and this somewhat improved the position

of the population. But with the removal of the Communists, department status became a screen for colonial oppression and exploitation.

The Communists are now demanding that the Creoles be granted home rule in union with France, having in mind a genuine union and not a de Gaulle type of community. The Party Congress proclaimed this as one of the basic slogans of the struggle.

It reviewed the economic position of the island where the market is controlled by big French companies jointly with twenty native bourgeois families. The economy is of a pronounced colonial character (sugar-cane is the only crop cultivated by the monopolies). Of the 300,000 inhabitants, 40,000 are out of work. Low wages, chronic malnutrition and hunger result in disease and an enormous mortality rate. The average life span is 25 years; over 40 per cent of the young people are unfit for military service because of poor physique; the infantile mortality rate is 160 per 1,000 live births.

The formation of an independent Party will enable the Communists to uphold the interests of the people more effectively. This, however, does not mean cessation or weakening of the contact between Réunion and the French Communists. The Congress emphasized that "the struggle waged by the Communists in France and in Réunion against one and the same imperialism imperatively demand that the Réunion Communist Party should reinforce its solidarity with the French Communist Party, and discuss with it questions affecting the two parties."

Tunisia

NATIONAL ASSEMBLY ELECTION SOON

IN July 1957, the Constituent Assembly in Tunisia unanimously abolished the monarchy and proclaimed a republic, but not until June 1 this year did the imperative demand of the Communist Party and other democratic organizations to adopt a constitution meet with success.

The Political Bureau of the Party has issued a statement expressing satisfaction at the adoption of the Constitution, which signified the realization of cherished national aspirations — sovereignty, universal and direct suffrage by secret ballot, and the basic democratic freedoms: freedom in the practice of religion, of speech, the press, assembly, etc.

The national movement, however, has always demanded that the government should be responsible to Parliament. But the Constituent Assembly has adopted a presidential system, under which

executive power is vested in the President who defines "the general policy of the state," and acts as supreme commander of the armed forces. He also has legislative powers and is empowered to proclaim emergency measures, which concentrates too much power in the hands of one man. During the period between elections to the National Assembly he is not subject to any control.

Despite these and some other shortcomings, the Constitution provides for certain democratic guarantees. In large measure it now depends on the people whether the liberties and democratic rights formally recognized by the Constitution are fully observed, whether the Constitution becomes a means for attaining the basic aims of the working people.

The Political Bureau calls on the Communists and all democrats to make the best use of the right to vote in order to elect genuine representatives of the people to the National Assembly. The Communist Party will make determined efforts to achieve the further democratization of the country.

In connection with the elections to be held this autumn the Party has officially requested the government to state whether it has taken measures to ensure that every elector will be able to exercise his right to vote freely, without any direct or indirect pressure, and that candidates will be able, without hindrance, to express and uphold their viewpoints and programs without obstacles to holding meetings and publishing statements.

Ceylon

THE COMMUNIST PARTY REVIEWS THE POLITICAL SITUATION

THE reactionaries who act under the slogan of "combating communism" are demanding that all who favor the program approved by the people during the 1956 general election (nationalization of foreign capital, land reform, co-operative development, extension of democratic rights, nationalization of schools and a uniform education system, etc.) should be removed from the government. Supported by the Prime Minister they have achieved a measure of success. A cabinet crisis has developed and a tense situation prevails in the country.

A resolution adopted by the Central Committee of the Communist Party stresses that the attack launched by all the Right-wing ministers, far from being the internal affair of the government or the National Front coalition, is part of the offensive launched by U.S. imperialism and the internal reactionaries. After the victory won in the last general election the people have become more

conscious of their strength; the mass organizations have grown, and the class struggle is spreading from the towns to the countryside. Both foreign and native capitalists are alarmed at the growing trade union and strike movements. But since the progressive forces lack unity and display sectarianism, the reactionaries have gained the upper hand.

Their victory, however, is a temporary one; moreover, it is a Pyrrhic victory. The National Front coalition which the people put into power in 1956 has disintegrated. The government has lost its absolute majority in Parliament, and seeks to continue with the help of appointed cabinet members; it no longer has the support of the progressive forces, including the working class and the Communist Party.

The Communist Party did its best to rally the progressive forces against the reactionary offensive. Had the other democratic forces joined this struggle, the offensive could have been halted. Today the task is to rally all democrats into a

united front headed by the working class; this is the only way to frustrate the reactionary efforts and lead to the formation of a government which would carry out a progressive policy. Therefore the Communist Party calls on all the democratic forces to co-operate on the national and local plane; it suggests that a general minimum program should be adopted and a nationwide campaign started for a united democratic front.

The formation of this front calls for intensified ideological and practical struggle against sectarianism in the progressive movement, against the "go it alone" policy which disrupts the democratic forces and helps the reactionaries. It is essential to combat their anti-communist policy of undermining the progressive movement. The shaky position of the government and the possibility of an early general election imperatively dictate the need for a united front. Only in this way will it be possible to thwart the reactionary designs, to continue the democratic development which began in 1956.

The National Bourgeoisie and the Liberation Movement

A seminar on the national bourgeoisie and the liberation movements in Asia, Africa and Latin America was held late in May in the Leipzig Institute of World History. Contributions to the discussion were made by Marxist theorists: Abdel Kader El Ouahrani (Algeria); P. Alberdi (Argentina); Idris Cox (Britain); V. Teitelboim (Chile); H. Jourdain (France); L. Berg, W. Markow and R. Schulz (German Democratic Republic); M. Lukman (Indonesia); Kia-Nouri and Eskandari (Iran); I. Uesugi (Japan); Jahija Hammudeh (Jordan); Joussef Khattar El-Helou (Lebanon); Hadi Mes-souak (Morocco); Modilim Achufus (Nigeria); Walid Samman (Syrian region of the UAR); Mohamed Harmel (Tunisia); G. Levinson and A. Rumyantsev (USSR). Written contributions were received from L. Gruppi and E. Ragioneri (Italy).

The seminar was opened by Dr. Markow, Director of the Institute. A. Rumyantsev, speaking on behalf of the Editorial Board of WORLD MARXIST REVIEW, dwelt on some of the theoretical aspects of the problem under discussion and, in particular, on the term "national bourgeoisie."

All speakers stressed that the seminar was the first collective effort to study this important and complex problem; they agreed that it would be useful to continue the discussion in the Journal.

In publishing the contributions (abridged), the Editorial Board invites readers to join in the further elaboration of the problem.

The National Bourgeoisie, Their Nature and Policy

Kia-Nouri

THE role of the national bourgeoisie occupies an important place among the problems of the liberation movement. It is common knowledge that the bourgeoisie of the imperialist countries have lost their former revolutionary spirit and have become a reactionary force. The situation is different in the colonies and semi-colonial countries where, under certain conditions, part of the bourgeoisie joins the liberation movement.

First of all I would like to pose the question— which sections of the bourgeoisie of the colonial and dependent countries can be described as national, and what are their characteristics and role in the anti-imperialist struggle? Up to now we have not been sufficiently clear about this. There is the view that only the industrial bourgeoisie should be considered national. In this connection

reference is made to the thesis formulated by the Sixth Congress of the Comintern. This thesis said that a part of the bourgeoisie in the colonial and dependent countries, first of all the trading bourgeoisie, serves the direct interests of imperialism. This part is equated with the feudalists and high-ranking officials—stooges of imperialism—while the remainder of the bourgeoisie, including the industrial, are called national. On these grounds some comrades hold that the entire industrial bourgeoisie of the colonies and dependent countries and also that part which has become a monopoly bourgeoisie, can be characterized as national.

Let us recall what Mao Tse-tung said about the Chinese bourgeoisie. Speaking of the middle bourgeoisie, he pointed out that they "personify the capitalist relations of production in China." "The

middle bourgeoisie are the so-called national bourgeoisie. Their political platform is: formation of a state dominated by one class—the national bourgeoisie.” In another work he said: “The bourgeoisie are divided into the big comprador bourgeoisie and the national bourgeoisie. The former are a class subservient to the capitalists of the imperialist countries and nurtured by them; they are linked by thousands of threads to the feudal forces in the countryside.” And further: “The national bourgeoisie of China are basically the middle bourgeoisie.”

In our opinion Mao Tse-tung's definition is the most precise. However, it reflects mainly the peculiarities of China and leaves open a number of questions concerning other countries. I have in mind the large industrial enterprises built by national capital; enterprises with mixed capital—imperialist and national (they can be found in our country); all kinds of banks; the differences between the comprador bourgeoisie and the Right-wing national bourgeoisie, etc.

Thus our task is to show clearly what part of the bourgeoisie is national. We shall try to expound our views on this question in detail.

Private capital develops along the following channels: trade, industry, credit and banking, etc. In view of the backward national industry a major part of the capital in the colonies and dependent countries is invested in trade.

Only a small part of the trading bourgeoisie is pro-imperialist. Within its ranks, however, there are differences depending on which of the imperialists of different countries one or another group collaborates with. Imperialist rivalry for markets affects the position of these groups. When this rivalry sharpens, various groups of the pro-imperialist trading bourgeoisie also come into conflict with each other.

The majority of the trading bourgeoisie consist of middle and small traders who either have no direct links at all with imperialism or have only slight ties. Anti-imperialist and anti-feudal sentiments among this part of the trading bourgeoisie became manifest insofar as the penetration of imperialist capital and the feudal survivals retard the progress of national industry and the expansion of the home market.

Also anti-imperialist at times is that part of the middle and small bourgeoisie which trades in foreign goods, since it suffers from the pressure of imperialist and comprador capital and obtains considerably less profit than the big trading bourgeoisie.

As to the industrial bourgeoisie, we should remember that in the colonial and dependent countries industrial capital appeared much later than trading capital. This industrial capital is concentrated in light industry and in mining, in handi-

crafts, construction work, etc. Generally speaking, mainly small and middle capital is employed in the national industry of these countries. And this is understandable. The weakness of private capital, explained by tenacious feudal survivals and the domination of imperialist capital, hinders the expansion of the enterprises of national industry, most of which are small and medium-sized.

That part of the industrial bourgeoisie which fuses its capital with imperialist capital by taking part in mixed enterprises, is, to a considerable degree, dependent on imperialism, becoming its agent and receiving its support in exchange.

Numerically this part of the industrial bourgeoisie is small. Large sections of the industrial bourgeoisie—owners of medium-sized and small enterprises, cottage industries, small construction organizations and farms—suffer heavily from imperialist pressure. They are restricted by feudal survivals, the narrow home market and by the competition of foreign goods, as well as by the enterprises dependent on foreign capital. That is why the majority of the industrial bourgeoisie in the colonies and semi-colonies, chiefly the middle and small sections, are anti-imperialist and anti-feudal.

On the whole, the national bourgeoisie comprise the above-mentioned sections of middle and small capitalists (both in industry and trade). They also include those big capitalists whose main capital is employed in national industry.

In view of the fact that the capital of the national bourgeoisie is invested in national industry, they are interested in bringing the home market under their control. The domination of imperialism in the economy retards the growth of their profits. The national bourgeoisie are interested in the industrialization of the country, they are opposed to feudal survivals which cramp the development of the national industry. Their anti-feudal sentiments are also explained by the fact that a considerable part of the income that could be invested in the economy, thus increasing their profits, goes to a small group of parasitic feudal landlords. The national bourgeoisie also oppose the comprador bourgeoisie because the latter flood the market with foreign goods and by their competition impede the growth of the weak national capital. These factors determine the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal and anti-comprador character of the national bourgeoisie, and their opposition to the state apparatus run by the landlords and compradors.

But the primary concern of the national bourgeoisie, just as of any other bourgeoisie, is how to increase profits. Being objectively progressive at a certain period, they take part in the liberation struggle; but because of their dual nature they tend to vacillate and come to terms with imper-

ialism. Consequently, they cannot be a consistent champion of the bourgeois democratic revolution.

In addition to the national bourgeoisie, there are in the colonies and dependent countries the so-called comprador bourgeoisie. Economically, they depend on the imperialist monopolies. The seizure of the sources of raw material, and the exploitation of the working people by the imperialists are in the interests of the comprador bourgeoisie; they are interested in maintaining the domination of the imperialist monopolies in the economy and in the home market, and in increasing foreign capital investments.

Socially, the comprador bourgeoisie are closely linked with foreign capital and the local feudalists. This section consists of the big commercial middlemen (conducting foreign trade jointly with foreign firms), bankers, usurers and a part of the big industrial bourgeoisie which owns enterprises or shares in them jointly with foreign monopolies.

The comprador bourgeoisie are agents of the imperialist monopolies and uphold the policy of the imperialists on whom they depend. They are opposed to any national-liberation movement aimed at abolishing or restricting the influence of imperialism. They oppose the development of national industry if it is detrimental to the interests of imperialism.

In certain conditions one or another part of the comprador bourgeoisie can, for a short time and on a limited scale, join the anti-imperialist movement. In Iran, for example, the comprador bourgeoisie who are linked with American imperialism came out against British imperialism during the struggle for oil nationalization, when American imperialism was attempting to wrest from British imperialism a part of Iranian oil. But scarcely had the American and British monopolies reached agreement when the comprador bourgeoisie betrayed the patriotic movement and deserted to the open enemies of the people.

In the dependent countries ruled by the big landlords and capitalists—allies of imperialism—the national bourgeoisie seek to take power into their own hands. Inasmuch as they are not in a position to achieve this by themselves they appeal to the oppressed masses. The national bourgeoisie are lavish with promises. But when they come to power they forget them.

This bourgeoisie, however, begins to vacillate in the face of a strong mass movement, when the working class shows signs of winning over the bulk of the people, without whom the bourgeoisie cannot come to power or retain it. To further this vacillation, the imperialists try to buy them over with various kinds of sops. Under these conditions the national bourgeoisie face an alternative: either co-operate with the working class and share power with it, or come to terms

with the imperialists and their agents—landlords and the comprador bourgeoisie—and form a government with the latter.

The attitude of different sections of the national bourgeoisie is not the same in these conditions. Their Left-wing, the minority, as a rule co-operates with the working class. The Right wing, also a minority, collaborates with the enemies of the people and betrays the national movement. The center, the majority, wavers, taking one path or the other. Its attitude depends in large measure on the relation of forces between the Right and Left wings.

At times the national bourgeoisie co-operate with the working class and accept its leadership in the liberation movement and in the united front. In these conditions the Right wing becomes isolated. Such was the case in China and some other countries where the movement was led by the working class. Of particular importance for winning over the majority of the national bourgeoisie to the revolution is the timely overcoming of sectarianism and Left-wing deviation in the political organizations of the working class.

The dual nature of the national bourgeoisie is most clearly expressed in their approach to the agrarian problem. On the one hand, they regard the feudal survivals as an obstacle to their political and economic domination. In order to win power they need the backing of the peasants—the absolute majority of the people. This means that the national bourgeoisie must, in turn, support the peasants' demands or, at least, pretend to do so. Herein lies, so to speak, their anti-feudalism. On the other hand, the national bourgeoisie cannot support all the demands of the peasants who want land and means of production without compensation. They cannot agree to confiscation of the big estates for the simple reason that this runs counter to the "sacred" principle of private property. In this instance part of their capital invested in land would also be confiscated. The national bourgeoisie do not agree to the division of the land, since this would deprive them of a source of profitable investment for part of their capital. And, finally, the national bourgeoisie, especially their Right wing, are not inclined to settle accounts with the landlords and feudalists in a revolutionary way; they seek a middle way which would enable them to wrest only political power from the feudalists, while leaving them part of their property. All this means that the national bourgeoisie as a whole cannot have a consistent program for solving the agrarian problem.

The national bourgeoisie are also inconsistent in the matter of granting democratic liberties to the people. They favor these liberties when power is held by the big landowners and the comprador bourgeoisie, calculating that it will enable them

to head the masses and come to power in a legal way.

It would be wrong, however, to think that the national bourgeoisie use only legal means of struggle. Not infrequently they resort to other measures as was the case in the past in Egypt and Iraq. In one way or another, the bourgeoisie advocate democratic liberties to the extent they need this for seizing power. Thus the democracy of the national bourgeoisie is superficial, one-sided and inconsistent. The moment they win political power their attitude to democratic liberties changes.

One should not forget that in some cases the national bourgeoisie prefer to exercise their dictatorship by giving it a semblance of democracy. This happens when the working-class party is weak, and they can grant democratic liberties without jeopardizing their power. But the moment the growth of political consciousness among the people becomes dangerous to their rule, their attitude changes, and they resort to non-democratic methods, up to and including abolition of all liberties.

Here, too, the position of various sections of the national bourgeoisie is not the same. Their Left wing favors a more profound and lasting democracy; the center—the absolute majority—vacillates, and the Right wing is inclined to use anti-democratic methods.

In the past few years the national bourgeoisie in most countries of the East have adhered to the principle of "positive neutrality." However, the standpoints of various sections do not coincide. The policy pursued by, say, Tunisia differs from that of Indonesia. The Tunisian government has permitted the construction of American and French military bases aimed against the socialist camp. It does not recognize the Chinese People's Republic. Indonesia's stand on these questions is quite different, and accords with the interests of preserving peace.

On the whole, the bulk of the national bourgeoisie in the colonies and dependent countries favors a policy of positive neutrality aimed at maintaining peace and non-participation in imperialist blocs. It is against the imperialist military bases and for an independent foreign policy on the Bandung principles, on friendship and economic and cultural co-operation with the socialist countries. This foreign policy is positive and enjoys the support of the progressive forces. But in a number of countries, as for example in Tunisia, and recently in some of the Arab, African and Latin American countries, the ruling Right-wing sections of the national bourgeoisie have pursued a different policy, which is not conducive to eliminating the influence of imperialism and runs counter to the interests of liberating the colonial and semi-colonial peoples from the yoke of imperialism.

Despite their weaknesses, the national bourgeoisie—on the whole an anti-imperialist and anti-feudal force—can join the united anti-imperialist front. This front, consisting of the workers, peasants, urban petty bourgeoisie, intellectuals and national bourgeoisie, in fact all who oppose imperialism, can become one of the main factors in the struggle against imperialism and its agents—the landlords and the big comprador bourgeoisie. But this front in itself does not as yet ensure the success of the struggle. This is possible only when the front pursues the correct policy of rallying the masses and guiding them correctly.

Thus, three main conditions are essential for victory over the enemy: the participation of the masses in the anti-imperialist struggle, the unity of all the anti-imperialist forces organized in a united front, and correct revolutionary guidance of this front.

Two forces lay claim to lead the united front—the national bourgeoisie and the working class. The peasantry, urban petty bourgeoisie and the intellectuals are usually guided by one or other of these main forces. The national bourgeoisie do everything to retain leadership, to isolate the working class and to win the other forces to their side.

The national bourgeoisie are not devoted to the cause of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. They are concerned mainly with their narrow class interests, striving to keep the revolution within the framework of these interests. That is why, when confronted with such tasks as the elimination of imperialist influence, feudal survivals and feudal political institutions, the solution of the agrarian problem and the winning of democratic liberties, they begin to vacillate, may abandon the revolution, hinder the liberation movement and lead it to defeat. The liberation movement will be victorious provided it is headed by the class which is interested in carrying through the revolution to the end and which has all that is required for it to become a leader of the revolution. Only the working class can be such a force, and it, together with its vanguard, is always striving to win leadership of the revolution within the framework of the united national front.

The working class is anxious to preserve the unity of the anti-imperialist forces and its leadership of them in the liberation struggle. For this purpose it must, above all, ensure its own unity. When necessary, the working class must, within the framework of the general strategic tasks, concretize the correctly chosen revolutionary slogans, and, having rallied all its forces, lead the people in the struggle for the realization of these slogans. Any mistake in assessing the relationship of the forces led by the national bourgeoisie on the one hand, and the forces led by the working

class, on the other, can be an obstacle in the way of the movement.

The basis of the relationship between the working class and the national bourgeoisie is unity and struggle. The workers make every effort to draw the national bourgeoisie into the united front, and especially their majority — the middle sections and the Left wing. Under certain conditions, the Right wing also joins the united front. But in doing so, it seeks to adapt this front to its conciliatory policy and to isolate the working class. In case of failure, it endeavors to split the anti-imperialist forces so as to prevent the working class from establishing its hegemony. In so doing it does not scruple to use any means even up to betrayal of the revolution.

The working class, therefore, cannot base its policy on preserving the united front with the above-mentioned sections of the bourgeoisie. While co-operating with the national bourgeoisie, the working-class party combats their conciliatory and reactionary tendencies, and tries to isolate their Right wing from the other anti-imperialist forces. It is when the revolutionary movement is on the upsurge and the masses are taking an ever more active part in the struggle that the working class can ensure the necessary conditions for its leadership.

The role of the national bourgeoisie in the anti-imperialist and democratic revolution consists mainly in the fact that they can, under certain conditions, head a considerable part of the anti-imperialist forces and especially the petty-bourgeois sections of town and countryside. That is why a correct understanding of the role of the national bourgeoisie as a whole and of their various sections is of great significance for the working class and its party. Understanding of this role will help them rally and efficiently guide all the anti-imperialist forces at every stage of the revolutionary struggle.

An incorrect assessment of the role of the national bourgeoisie and of the part they play in the popular movements sometimes leads to mistakes either of a Right-opportunist or Left-sectarian character. Left-sectarianism is manifest when the working-class leaders overestimate the conciliatory character and underestimate the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal character of the national bourgeois-

sie. An incorrect assessment detracts from the role of the united front with this bourgeoisie. As a result, the working class is unable to persuade the masses of the correctness of its policy, to isolate the bourgeoisie from the masses of the working people and, consequently, to create the conditions for its own leadership. Such a policy separates the proletariat from the main anti-imperialist forces. Such Left-wing sectarian mistakes were made by our People's Party between 1949 and 1953, during the struggle for oil nationalization. They caused serious harm to the liberation struggle.

The Right-opportunist deviation means overestimating the revolutionary and underrating the conciliatory tendency of the national bourgeoisie. This is expressed in attempts to retain unity at all costs and in overlooking the weak sides of the national bourgeoisie. This deviation usually appears when the national bourgeoisie, unable by themselves to resist the pressure of the reactionary forces, tend to co-operate with the working class. An opportunist policy results in the leadership of the anti-imperialist forces going to the bourgeoisie, while the working class becomes their appendage, and trails in their wake. This policy ends in failure of the movement since the working class is unable to mobilize the working people in a timely way for the revolutionary struggle. Such a deviation in the policy of the working-class parties always results in leadership of this struggle being assumed by the most opportunist section of the national bourgeoisie, which is quite capable of entering into a compromise with the enemy and betraying the revolution.

These two deviations in the policy of the working-class parties in the colonies and dependent countries may appear at any time, and for objective reasons such as: the peculiarities of these countries, the quantitative and qualitative weakness and inexperience of the working class, the contradictory nature of the national bourgeoisie and the influence of nationalist ideology on considerable sections of the people and even part of the working class. Mistakes can be avoided only if the working-class party is alert to these dangers, if it diligently studies the experience of the other fraternal parties and profoundly analyzes its own revolutionary experiences and those of its country.

Study the Particulars of Each Country

Idris Cox

THE experiences of the past decade have shown that the role of the national bourgeoisie in the liberation struggle is now more important than ever before, and that big changes have taken place in the relation of class forces engaged in the struggle against imperialism.

In Britain there is a growing recognition that the abolition of imperialism depends on the unity of the British workers with the national-liberation struggle, and that the struggle against imperialism is a united fight against the common enemy. That is why clarity on this issue is also essential for the advance of the revolutionary movement in Britain.

Comrade Kia-Nouri was critical of some inaccuracies in the resolution of the Sixth Congress of the Comintern on the role of the national bourgeoisie. But even if this resolution was 100 per cent correct in relation to the situation existing in 1928 it would still be inadequate as a guide in the present situation.

In his speech Comrade Kia-Nouri made a serious attempt to work out a more thorough analysis of the various sections and trends in the national bourgeoisie. While recognizing the factors which make for differentiation he endeavored at the same time to bring out the common features among the national bourgeoisie in the various countries. He, however, does not fully take into account the differences in the political factors existing in the Asian countries in contrast to the Arab countries, and in the African countries in contrast to both Asian and Arab countries.

At the Sixth Congress of the Comintern in 1928 the perspective was that the colonies would achieve political independence only after the working class (in alliance with the peasants, petty bourgeoisie, and progressive sections of the national bourgeoisie) was in the leadership of the national-liberation movement. In practice it has been revealed since the Second World War that political independence has been achieved in India, Indonesia, Ghana and other countries under the leadership of the national bourgeoisie. This new possibility arose mainly due to the growth of the socialist world and the rapid advance of the national-liberation movement on a world scale.

We must take into account the distinction between political independence and economic liberation. While India, Indonesia and Ghana have rid themselves of direct political domination by foreign imperialism, the economic position of imperialism is as strong as ever. Both Nehru and Sukarno

have emphasized that the struggle for economic liberation is even sharper than the fight for political independence.

Nor can we ignore the impact of socialist economic aid on the development of the newly independent countries. For it is quite clear that the availability of socialist economic aid to assist in the transformation of backward colonial economies has an important bearing on class relations in the national-liberation movement. Another important aspect is the impetus which the newly independent nations give to the fight for independence in the remaining colonies. This is seen in the effect of Indian independence on the Asian and Arab countries, and of Ghana independence throughout the African continent.

In my view Comrade Kia-Nouri is correct in his criticism of the Sixth Congress Resolution, which places the whole of the colonial trading bourgeoisie in the imperialist camp.

It would be useful for us to draw some lessons from the experience of the victorious Chinese Revolution, including the more precise definition of the terms "comprador" and "national bourgeoisie." The Chinese comrades use the term "national bourgeoisie" to denote all those whose interests are based on the growth of the national economy, and the term "comprador" to denote the agents of foreign imperialism whose activity is against the interests of the national economy.

Now I would like to come to more specific aspects of the problem in Asia. I am not competent to deal with Asia as a whole but in Britain we have given some attention to the situation in India. I think it is clear that India won its political independence in 1947 under the leadership of the national bourgeoisie as a whole, including the big bourgeoisie. True, the main force was the pressure of the workers and peasants, but it was the national bourgeoisie which came to political power — as distinct from China where the leadership of the workers in close alliance with the peasants merged the national revolution into a socialist revolution.

India was also different from Indonesia where the victorious national bourgeoisie framed its own constitution. In India the new constitution came into being as a result of an agreement with the British imperialists — though this was forced upon them by the struggle of the Indian people as a whole. The result of this agreement was the partition of India, and the maintenance of close ties with the Commonwealth.

In this situation it is not surprising that no serious efforts were made to embark upon large-scale land reform, or to raise living standards. The first Five-Year Plan demonstrated the backward pattern of India's economy. The clash of interest within the ranks of the national bourgeoisie came with the second Five-Year Plan, with its concentration on heavy industry and expansion of the state sector of production. It is largely due to generous Soviet economic aid that this plan was developed in its first stages, and then the British imperialists, frightened of the political consequences, also extended aid to assist in the development of India's heavy steel industry.

Despite this, the second Five-Year Plan has been faced with a serious crisis during the past year. This has arisen because of the drop in the prices of primary goods on the world market, the reduction of India's sterling balances in Britain and its inability to provide from its own resources the necessary capital investment. The second Five-Year Plan has now been modified at the dictation of a financial consortium of the United States, Britain and Canada, whose price for assistance is the slowing down of production in heavy industry and the expansion of the private sector of production.

Nowadays political independence is won not only under the leadership of the national bourgeoisie. In Malaya, the struggle for independence was led during and after the war by the Liberation Army whose main leadership was that of the Communist Party of Malaya. In the military struggle against British imperialism since 1948 the main class forces were the workers and peasants. When British imperialism was forced in 1957 to concede a limited measure of political independence it was not the national bourgeoisie which achieved political power but mainly the feudal and comprador elements. This is revealed in the fact that Prince Abdul Rahman became the first Premier, and that each of the nine federated states is headed by a sultan. In many respects the national bourgeoisie is strongly opposed to the present government. This is evident from the opposition to Malaya being drawn into the war plans of SEATO, and to the restrictions on the growth of the national economy.

The situation is different in the Arab countries of the Middle East. In Egypt it was the big bourgeoisie which took over the leadership of the struggle in the national revolution in 1952, bringing into its fold the middle and small bourgeoisie as a secondary force, though greater in number. In the sharper struggle against imperialism the big bourgeoisie had to turn to the socialist countries for economic aid, and this became a power-

ful factor after 1952 in resisting the pressure of imperialism.

In Egypt not only is the national bourgeoisie a strong force, but there are elements of a monopoly bourgeoisie. It would be extremely useful to make a deeper analysis of the role of the national bourgeoisie in Egypt, for it seems to me that the dominant role is exercised by the monopoly bourgeoisie, and that Nasser is a spokesman of the interests of the Misr monopoly group which has its grip on almost the whole of Egyptian economy and is seeking to extend its domination over Syria's cotton trade, and including the Central Bank of Syria.

In Syria the national bourgeoisie is protesting against the penetration of Egyptian capital in Syria's economy. There seems to be little doubt that the Egyptian monopoly bourgeoisie was hoping to bring Iraq under its domination.

In Africa—South of the Sahara—there are specific features in the liberation struggle. In West Africa (where there is no permanent European bourgeois settlement) the liberation struggle is led by the African national bourgeoisie. But in other African territories under British rule the liberation struggle is led by the African workers and peasants, with big influence being exercised by petty-bourgeois elements and the national intelligentsia in the leadership of the struggle.

The national bourgeoisie in West Africa is not only engaged in trading, but includes prosperous cocoa farmers, contractors, and those engaged in transport and even in gold mines. But the national bourgeoisie occupies a unique position in the sense that it tends to co-operate with imperialism on internal affairs, but allies itself with the anti-imperialist movement in other parts of Africa. Though Ghana won its political independence in 1957 the economic domination of imperialism in it is as strong as ever. Nigeria is due to achieve political independence in 1960, but there also the economic domination of imperialism is as strong as ever. Even within Nigeria the relation of class forces differs from one region to the other. In the East the national movement is headed by the national bourgeoisie, in the West the comprador elements have a strong position, and in the North there are reactionary tribal rulers and other feudal elements.

In West Africa the agrarian problem is entirely different from that which exists anywhere in Asia, including the Arab countries of the Middle East. There is no private ownership of the land and no class of big landowners. The land is held in common by tribal communities and has not been alienated to European private ownership, except by consent. It would be incorrect therefore to apply to West Africa the same

political objectives in regard to the land problem as exist in the Asian countries.

The outstanding feature in West Africa is that in face of the rising mass movement British imperialism has been forced to make concessions towards political independence, but it will strongly resist the economic liberation of these countries. The national bourgeoisie has accepted the terms of political independence in agreement with British imperialism, and there is no indication that it will lead to a strong fight for economic liberation. These countries in West Africa will win their economic liberation only to the extent that the working class comes forward into the leadership of the national movement, and to the extent they enter into closer relations with the socialist world.

In the countries of East and Central Africa the situation is quite different. European settler rule, particularly in Kenya, Southern Rhodesia and Northern Rhodesia, has retarded the growth of an African national bourgeoisie. It is the European settlers who constitute the bourgeoisie, though there is a smaller proportion of Asian traders who can be regarded as the lower sections of the bourgeoisie. Due to the absence of a national bourgeoisie the liberation movement in Kenya is led by workers and peasants together with the petty bourgeoisie and the national intelligentsia. This is also the case in Northern Rhodesia, Southern Rhodesia, Nyasaland, Tanganyika and in Uganda. The main aim of British imperialism in these countries is to create an African bourgeoisie which they hope will co-operate with imperialism.

Also in South Africa the domination of European settlers (both British and Afrikaans) has

retarded the growth of a national bourgeoisie. The national movement is led by workers, small African farmers and peasants and the African intelligentsia, who have the co-operation of European petty-bourgeois elements.

While I am in general agreement with the endeavors to outline the common features of the national bourgeoisie in the various countries, I feel that the following should be singled out:

First, while the national bourgeoisie expresses itself as a strong positive force in the struggle for political independence, it is important to emphasize that it is only to the extent that the workers and peasants led by the Communist Party come into the leadership that it will be possible to achieve economic liberation. At the same time the liberation movement can achieve its objective only if the working class is able to unite the peasants, petty bourgeoisie and progressive elements of the national bourgeoisie in a National Front to achieve complete freedom and independence.

Secondly, we need to give more study to the impact of socialist economic aid on the struggle for national liberation. Socialist economic aid can serve to strengthen the resistance of the progressive wing of the national bourgeoisie against imperialist economic domination, but it can also frighten the more reactionary wing of the national bourgeoisie due to their fear of being committed to the socialist camp.

Third, we need a more specific analysis of the situation in each country. There are striking contrasts in each particular situation and all the specific features need to be taken into account.

The Working Class and the National Bourgeoisie

Hadi Messouak

THE liberation movement of the colonial peoples is a striking manifestation of the general crisis of capitalism. Alongside the growing economic and political might of the socialist camp it is one of the decisive factors of our times, a factor which has tipped the scales in favor of democracy and socialism.

In the colonial and semi-colonial countries the liberation movement is supported by all progressive forces and often by the entire nation with the exception of the feudal elements whose destiny is linked with that of the colonialists. Not infrequently, the middle and petty bourgeoisie play a leading part in this movement. In a number of countries, such as China and Viet Nam, the libera-

tion movement was led by the proletariat and its party which brought it to victory over imperialism. The bourgeois revolution in these countries grew into a socialist revolution. In other colonial countries the national bourgeoisie — big, middle or petty, depending on the economic and social development—now head the liberation movement with all the consequences arising therefrom.

The economic and political situation in Morocco helps us better to understand the place and political role of the national bourgeoisie in this country. It merits special consideration because it has many features in common with the situation in other colonial and dependent countries.

The character of our economy has not changed materially since the winning of independence. Morocco has always been an economically backward country, an agrarian and raw material appendage to Western European and, above all, French capital. The basic branches (the power industry, banks, credit, shipping, a large part of industry and foreign trade) are still under foreign control. Foreign monopolies exert pressure on the economy and, consequently, on the government.

Deliverance from economic dependence on foreign capital, withdrawal of foreign troops and liquidation of military bases, solidarity with the Algerian people and active support of their liberation struggle, territorial integrity through the reunification of all lands occupied by France and Spain and, lastly, establishment of a constitutional monarchy—these are the five points of the general political program of the national movement. The Communist Party insists on an immediate agrarian reform and on granting the working class the right to uphold its vital economic and political interests.

The struggle for independence from imperialism, i.e., for the completion of the national revolution, necessitates an alliance of all the progressive forces of the nation, including the national bourgeoisie. To develop correctly, this alliance should be headed by the proletariat and its Party. The proletariat must always challenge the bourgeoisie's claim to the leading role in this movement. It can achieve hegemony by its active participation in the liberation movement, entering into alliance with the bourgeoisie and keeping a watchful eye on them. We must have clarity in our assessment of the various sections of the bourgeoisie, their revolutionary role and the tendencies engendered by the economic development of the country.

The economic weakness of the Moroccan bourgeoisie is explained by the fact that nearly all the capital invested in industry belongs to foreigners. The big, middle and petty bourgeoisie together own only 10 per cent of the investments. In agriculture foreigners possess some 2.8 million acres out of the 20 million acres suitable for cultivation. There are very few large estates, 20 families of Moroccan feudal landlords and capitalists alone owning more than one billion francs each (\$2,000,000). As a rule, the wealth is owned by several members of the same family.

The young Moroccan bourgeoisie, inexperienced in running a capitalist economy, prefer to invest capital in trade and real estate, where profits are fairly high and entail no great risk. True, some of the national bourgeoisie have of late invested capital in the food, building and textile industries. But their role is insignificant and cannot be compared with that of the Indian bourgeoisie. Suffice

it to say that Morocco produces barely 20 per cent of the textiles sold to the population.

In Morocco, as in most of the other recently freed countries, private national capital is hardly represented in the banking and credit institutions. As for the extraction of minerals, the main wealth of the country, 50 per cent of all investments in the mining industry have been made by the state, the other 50 by foreign capital. The share of private Moroccan capital is negligible.

For 20 years we have witnessed the emergence and growth of a rural bourgeoisie who, possessing considerable capital, have invested it in land and run their farms by capitalist methods, following the example of foreign settlers. At present, several hundred of them own some 940,000 acres of fertile land.

The trading bourgeoisie are numerous. They are represented, on the one hand, by a handful of big merchants engaged in imports and exports. On the other hand, they include a large number of shopkeepers. The interests of some of the big merchants coincide with those of foreign industrial capitalists (nearly all French). But on the whole this section of the bourgeoisie is in conflict with the big foreign firms which control a big part of Morocco's foreign trade, excluding the import of such consumer goods as fabrics and tea. The small trading bourgeoisie, the thousands of shopkeepers, are almost wholly dependent on the purchasing power of the people and the state of national industry and agriculture. They are in a bad way because, since the proclamation of independence, Morocco has been experiencing economic difficulties and the purchasing power of the people has been falling steadily. Consequently they are becoming increasingly aware that their destiny is linked with the working people, with the progressive forces of our country.

In the past, the big national bourgeoisie supported the national movement because, objectively, it upheld their interests against the domination of foreign capital in industry, trade and transport. But even then they did not break completely with imperialism, for they gained from co-operation with it in a number of spheres.

After winning independence we witnessed the emergence of the comprador bourgeoisie who enrich themselves by speculation in licenses and also through sitting on the boards of companies founded by foreign capital. The fact that some of the big bourgeoisie are on company boards indicates their intention to uphold colonial privileges to the detriment of the nation. It is precisely this insignificant part of the bourgeoisie that hampers the national movement and, at times, openly opposes it. Their spokesmen are opposed to economic independence for Morocco and seek to keep it as an agrarian and raw mater-

ial appendage to France in order to ensure high prices for their farm produce on the French market. This is the only section of the big bourgeoisie which demands that our country immediately and unconditionally join the Common Market. But this tendency on the part of the emerging comprador bourgeoisie is resisted by the other sections of the big bourgeoisie.

In my opinion, the claim that in all colonies and semi-colonial countries a large part of the bourgeoisie enters into an alliance with imperialism and feudalism against the people is a doubtful one. This bourgeoisie is found only in relatively developed countries. In Morocco, their role is negligible. It seems to me therefore that any application of this thesis to countries such as Morocco would give a false orientation to the working-class movement in these countries. And this would be detrimental to the national-liberation movement, since in this case the working-class movement would be directed not so much against the monopoly bourgeoisie of the imperialist powers as against the national bourgeoisie.

The big bourgeoisie do not limit themselves to foreign trade and participation in the mixed enterprises. They also have a considerable interest in industry, internal trade, transport, processing farm produce, etc. They stand for industrialization of the country, for economic independence, and they support the national movement insofar as it does not run counter to their interests. True, the big bourgeoisie are still weak economically and waver in policy, because they are subjected to strong pressure by imperialism. Fearing the popular movement they are even prepared to make concessions to imperialism, though they do not defend it openly. The main feature of this bourgeoisie is their hostility to agrarian reform.

The middle national bourgeoisie include middle traders, officials and intellectuals. They repose their hopes in national independence and in a subsequent improvement of their material position. But their illusions were dispelled when they encountered the growing economic difficulties created by the imperialists in all spheres and, particularly, in the economy. At present the middle bourgeoisie support the national movement and take an active part in it. Their spokesmen head this movement and direct it along the path of establishing bourgeois democracy and free enterprise, cultivating mistrust in relation to the working-class movement. This bourgeoisie want to use the liberation movement for their own aims. Whenever the masses call for an end to all exploitation this bourgeoisie falls back on anti-democratic legislation.

On the whole, this part of the bourgeoisie has its eye on political and economic power the moment the country is completely liberated from

imperialism and feudalism. The struggle of the middle bourgeoisie for power explains their stand which is anti-imperialist in foreign policy, progressive from the standpoint of the national economy, but at the same time contains anti-working class and anti-communist tendencies.

Prior to the emergence of the proletariat and its becoming aware of its class aims, the petty bourgeoisie not only constituted the majority of the national movement but were also the most active and radical participants in it. Even when the proletariat became an independent factor in the liberation movement, the petty bourgeoisie continued to play an active part in the national revolution. To this day they are among the more progressive forces of the country, determined to prosecute the struggle for independence to the end. Although their top sections are not always ready to make sacrifices for the sake of independence, the majority unite with the proletariat and regard the working-class movement as their natural ally. Anti-communist tendencies among this section are not very pronounced.

The working class actively participates in the anti-imperialist struggle and seeks to head it. The basic question facing it and its Party in their attitude toward one or another section of the bourgeoisie in the colonies is whether this particular section is opposed to imperialism or not. The reply to this question determines the attitude of the proletariat.

Since the chief task is the abolition of imperialist influence we should build the broadest possible front led by the proletariat, the most revolutionary and consistent class. Alliance with the main mass of the bourgeoisie, and in particular with their top sections, is essential in the anti-imperialist struggle. The choosing of allies presupposes "the separation of friends from enemies," support of friends and crushing of enemies. Consequently, in the struggle against imperialism the proletariat of the colonial countries must combat all the allies of imperialism, the chief of whom are the feudalists. These allies may also include certain sections of the bourgeoisie who profit from colonial exploitation.

The proletariat seeks to overcome the vacillation of the national bourgeoisie, neutralize their reactionary tendencies and utilize their national tendencies. But we should not overlook the class aims pursued by the bourgeoisie in the joint struggle—they try to accomplish the national revolution for their own benefit. Fear that the revolutionary movement may go beyond their aims impels them to put a brake even on the bourgeois revolution. This was why individual sections of the bourgeoisie in some of the colonial and semi-colonial countries betrayed their own revolution. This was the case last year in Moroc-

co when some elements of the national bourgeoisie upheld the interests of the colonialists, despite the fact that these interests ran counter to their own. The reason for this behavior was the fear that the proletariat and the progressive forces might begin to realize their own aims and demand nationalization of the enterprises.

The proletariat and its Party should always see to it that their participation in the joint anti-imperialist struggle does not further bourgeois policy and ideology. In our work we try to evade opportunism and sectarianism in relation to the national bourgeoisie. In other words, we try not to exaggerate or belittle their revolutionary role. Every revolutionary stage is characterized by its specific political situation, aims and alliances. In their attitude toward the different sections of the bourgeoisie the working class must take cognizance of the economic, political and social conditions of the country. In most colonial and dependent countries there are strong, if not dominant, feudal survivals. That is why mistakes of a sectarian nature are especially dangerous. As a rule, all investments in these countries have been made by foreigners; there are no powerful big bourgeoisie who betray the national movement. True, this movement is very often misled by the petty bourgeoisie. But to renounce an alliance with the petty bourgeoisie is tantamount to splitting the anti-feudal and anti-imperialist front which consists of various progressive forces, to throwing the petty bourgeoisie and some sections of the middle bourgeoisie into the arms of the imperialists and thus to become isolated.

There are, however, countries with a relatively developed capitalism, where the interests of a considerable part of the bourgeoisie coincide with those of the imperialists. Most dangerous here are mistakes of an opportunist character. By making such mistakes the working-class movement plays into the hands of the bourgeoisie, enables them to deceive the masses and to exploit the mass movement in their own interests at a time when conditions have matured for the working

class to head this movement and lead it under the guidance of its vanguard—the Communist Party.

It should be said that the national-liberation movements in a number of colonial and dependent countries often underestimate the help accorded them by the working class of the metropolitan and other capitalist countries. For example, working-class action in France against the Riff War in 1925 or against the war in Indo-China testifies to the great help that the proletariat of a colonial power can render the oppressed nation fighting for liberation.

Lastly, the big, middle and even the petty bourgeoisie in some of the semi-colonial countries often try to oust the working class from the political arena. This takes different forms: from the demand to ban the Communist Party to the demand to dissolve it as a preliminary condition for its merger with the bourgeois parties into a single political organization. The persecution of the Communists and the prohibition of the Communist Party are often effected through the dissolution of all political parties, the setting up of a National Front on a bureaucratic basis and the banning, for a certain period, of all political activity. The Communist Party would commit an inexcusable error were it to yield to the pressure of the bourgeoisie and become reconciled to the role of appendage instead of remaining an independent force capable of heading the working masses and the entire nation, and leading them to struggle for national and social liberation. To leave a free field to the political maneuvers of the national bourgeoisie, even if they are playing a positive role on the international plane, would be an opportunist mistake, the consequences of which could be fatal for the working-class movement. The Communist parties in the colonies and dependent countries should be in the forefront of the fighters for democratic liberties. An alliance with the bourgeoisie presupposes combating their anti-democratic tendencies whenever and wherever they appear.

Some Experiences of Relations With the Bourgeoisie

V. Teitelboim

THE colonies and dependent countries have many features in common. But there are also differences. The main thing, in our opinion, is what is common and this we would define as the existence of imperialism and feudal survivals. The common features have forms and nuances which are as diverse as life. Comrade Cox drew our attention to this aspect when he spoke about the situation in some of the African and Asian countries. In Latin America it sometimes happens that in one country a leader of the national bourgeoisie (the head of the government) betrays the national interests, while in another — he upholds them.

There are, for example, differences between Cuba, Venezuela and Mexico. But these countries also have something in common, something that can be theoretically generalized after a thorough study of the situation in these countries. These generalizations, made from the standpoint of Marxism, should not, of course, become a Procrustean bed to which we would adapt reality, distorting it in order to make it fit our concepts.

I am not competent to speak about all of the Latin American countries. But it is obvious that in speaking even about one of them we should not lose sight of the peculiarities of the entire continent which, against the background of the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal struggle, differ from those of Iran, India, the Arab and other countries that won political independence only after the war or are still fighting for it.

Profoundly symptomatic events, not yet sufficiently examined by us, are developing on the Latin American continent. There are plenty of examples. In the past few years the Bolivian peasants and miners have repeatedly defeated government troops sent to the aid of the "tin barons." A few months ago the people of Cuba defeated the Batista troops who had been armed to the teeth by North American imperialism. And while it would be wrong to regard these two events as being exceptional, we cannot, of course, draw sweeping conclusions from them.

Despite their common features, the Latin American countries have very many differences. In work such as ours, after defining the common features, attention should be devoted mainly to the specific features of the individual countries, being careful, naturally, to avoid any conclusions as to

the "isolation" or "exceptionalism" of any of these countries.

In 1938 the Popular Front of Chile—an alliance of the national bourgeoisie with the proletariat, petty bourgeoisie and peasantry—won a victory in the presidential election. This was an important event in the history of relations between the national bourgeoisie and the working class of Chile. The Front came to power thanks to its program of bourgeois-democratic revolution, but this program was carried out chiefly in the interests of the bourgeoisie, while the vital demands of the workers remained on paper.

The 1929-33 crisis shook the capitalist world and ruined many of the dependent countries. An uprising broke out in our country, and in 1932 we established short-lived Soviets which corresponded neither to the particular stage nor to the period experienced by Chile. We rectified this mistake the following year. But only in 1936, in connection with the conclusions drawn by the Seventh Congress of the Communist International and the victory of the Popular Front in France and Spain, did we realize that the national bourgeoisie could play a part in the liberation struggle. This correct idea made possible the victory of our Popular Front.

At that time we did not fight resolutely for the hegemony of the proletariat and made a Right deviation, agreeing to a six-months respite in the countryside: we refrained from organizing trade unions among the agricultural workers in order "not to create difficulties for the government."

The leading position of the national bourgeoisie in the liberation front ended in 1947 when, with the opening of the cold war, the new President, resorting to outright treachery, outlawed the Communist Party and began to pursue an anti-working class policy.

This sharp turn and the isolation of the Communist Party set in because the working class lacked unity, there was no alliance with the peasantry, and our relations with the Socialist Party were bad.

In the first part of the 10-year period of illegal existence, some Party members tended to break all relations with the national bourgeoisie. This tendency, however, was strongly rebuffed. Our task then was to restore the trade union and

political unity of the working class, and extend it to the peasantry, the middle and petty bourgeoisie, but this time under the leadership of the working class. First of all we had to solve some preliminary tasks. In 1952 we established a united trade union center and began to build the political unity of the people, including the peasantry.

For this purpose a Popular Action Front was created. The Front's candidate was only 30,000 votes short of winning the Presidential election in September 1958. The election campaign demonstrated the great achievements of our Party. The basic gain was that, for the first time, the peasant masses joined with the working class. While the Front also attracted the petty bourgeoisie, only a small part of the middle bourgeoisie followed it, and this was a shortcoming in our work. Our policy of enlisting the national bourgeoisie in the movement was not supported by our chief ally, the Socialist Party, which opposed unity with them. And although our course veered not 180 degrees to the left but only 20 or 30, it sufficed to alarm the bourgeoisie. As a result, only a small part of them voted for the Popular Front candidate.

Social progress in the world today is being accelerated under the impact of socialist ideas, the growing influence of the Communist parties, the consolidating worker-peasant unity, and especially because of the rapid advance of the socialist world. The economic competition between the socialist and capitalist countries and the superiority which the socialist system will soon achieve gives grounds for believing that the agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution in the colonies and dependent countries will develop rapidly. Moreover, in the dependent countries, where capitalism has reached a definite level, we should bear in mind the idea of uninterrupted revolution, of a subsequent transition to socialism.

This is true also of Chile where in the past twenty years industry and urban life have taken the lead over agriculture and rural life. At present there are nearly 7,000 industrial enterprises, not counting those with less than five workers (about 60,000 small enterprises and workshops employ 194,000 people). Some 4,860 enterprises (five to twenty workers each) employ a total of 46,000, while 1,931 enterprises (twenty to 200 workers each) have a total of 96,250. Whereas in 1940 the share of industry in the national income was less than that of agriculture, it now holds the leading place. Only 39 per cent of the population live in the countryside. Whereas in 1929, out of every 100 meters of cotton fabrics sold ninety-four were imported, now only two meters are imported. Then, out of every 100 kg of iron used, 85 kg were imported, whereas now we import only 18 kg. As we see, the national bourgeoisie are

dominant in the output of manufactured goods. Both the bourgeoisie and the proletariat are strong, they have rich political experience and an eventful history.

Today the national bourgeoisie are in conflict with the latifundists and with North American imperialism which seeks to gain control of manufacturing industry through mixed enterprises, supply of machinery, raw materials and spare parts. They are also in conflict with the proletariat who are demanding higher wages and better conditions. The national bourgeoisie have developed largely at the expense of the steady impoverishment of the working class. From November 1958 to March 1959 inflation developed rapidly, and there is every reason to believe that this year the cost of living will rise 50 per cent. Unemployment is growing. Government policy favors the foreign monopolies and the big bourgeoisie. At present Chile's economic policy is virtually directed by the International Monetary Fund.

The basic, ever-sharpening contradiction is that between imperialism and the country as a whole. In addition to power stations, telephone, etc., the imperialists have seized the main raw material deposits — niter, copper and iron. Imperialism is contributing to the rise of a new section of the bourgeoisie, the so-called comprador bourgeoisie which consists mainly of traders and bankers.

Industrial and agricultural workers comprise, together with their families, about one million: 40 percent of the population.

One hundred and sixty-three enterprises with more than 200 workers each, employ 102,487, or 23 per cent of the labor force. Twelve of these produce 17.2 per cent of Chile's industrial output and account for 54.7 per cent of all capital investments in national industry. In 1932 there were 49 tobacco factories and 18 breweries, today there is only one tobacco factory and one brewery.

The big bourgeoisie encourage the penetration of North American imperialism; together with it they exploit the working class, oppress thousands of small and middle employers and tradesmen and oust from the market the weaker competitors, including the middle bourgeoisie. The pro-imperialist policy of the big bourgeoisie has resulted in a fall in production since 1955. Imperialism is now trying to penetrate into the state sector. In alliance with the big bourgeoisie it has gained control of a steel company, penetrated into the national enterprise generating electricity and is seeking to lay hands on the oil.

To some extent, capitalist forms are also developing in the countryside. But the share of the rural bourgeoisie is as yet smaller than that of the feudal elements.

Two forces are competing for the support of the vacillating national bourgeoisie: imperialism jointly with the latifundists and the big bourgeoisie, on the one hand, and the popular movement led by the working class, on the other. Future developments will depend in large measure on whose side they take. Hence, a clear-cut and correct stand on this question is of paramount importance for our work.

As the working class develops and the influence of the Communist Party grows, the bourgeoisie begin to search for an agreement with imperialism. Chile is an example in this respect. The Popular Front program was in accord with the nationalist, anti-imperialist and anti-feudal stand of that part of the bourgeoisie who had co-operated with the working class so long as they felt that their own leading role in the movement was not threatened. When in April 1947 the Communist Party contested the elections as the strongest party in the country, President Gonzales Videla declared that he would not allow "communism to come to power even by democratic means." Videla defected to the imperialist camp, betraying all principles of bourgeois democracy.

Another problem: our policy of joint action with the national bourgeoisie gives rise to one of the basic contradictions with our important political ally, the Socialist Party, which holds that the national bourgeoisie as a whole are now reactionary and that therefore we can no longer act jointly with them on any issue. This attitude is typical of petty-bourgeois extremism. Strangely enough this attitude does not prevent the Socialists from supporting the national bourgeoisie in the other Latin American countries, and, on a broader plane, international revisionism.

I should mention that some people distort the term "national bourgeoisie," including in it all the bourgeoisie of Chilean origin, even if they are pro-imperialist. As I see it, there is here some confusion in nomenclature. Different names are applied to the pro-imperialist bourgeoisie. For instance, the term "comprador" bourgeoisie—a term that is clear in China and other countries—is not clear to our people. It would be useful therefore, to make uniform a terminology which in my country at any rate causes confusion and is not understood.

We know too that in Latin America he who was yesterday a member of the national bourgeoisie may today turn into an out-and-out pro-imperialist. His position is a wavering, unstable one. It often happens that one and the same political party in Chile includes representatives of the big bourgeoisie, linked with North American monopolies, and of the petty and middle bourgeoisie. In building the Popular Front, the Communist Party, while making a distinction between the three sections

of the bourgeoisie represented in the Radical Party, relied on their Left wing in order to win over the center, and combated their Right wing.

The problem of the national bourgeoisie has many aspects. The strengthening of the anti-imperialist struggle and the enlistment in it of the national bourgeoisie depends in large measure on the working class and its Party. It is equally clear that the national bourgeoisie cannot lead the liberation movement, especially in our time when socialism is winning over imperialism.

Our Party has made a long study of the role of the national bourgeoisie. In his report to the Tenth Party Congress, Galo Gonzales said: "It is true that at certain periods the bourgeoisie have betrayed and may again betray the working people. But this does not mean that in all circumstances we reject joint action with them." And further: "The relations between the working class and the bourgeoisie in countries such as ours sometimes deteriorate and sometimes improve. At one period their interests conflict sharply, at another the antagonisms between them are subordinated to the basic antagonism—between the majority of the nation, on the one hand, and the imperialists and latifundists, on the other."

"The guarantee that the popular program will be carried out, that the democratic coalition of all strata, ranging from the working class to the national bourgeoisie, will bring positive results," said the report, "lies in the working class, guided and directed by its vanguard, becoming the leading force, in its close alliance with the peasantry and other strata, and also in a coalition forming a government in which the working class will play the leading role."

In his report to the Eleventh Party Congress Corvalan said: "The unity of the working class and its alliance with the peasantry, mutual understanding between the Communists and Socialists, strengthening the Popular Front as an independent movement with a clear anti-imperialist and anti-feudal program, and rallying the masses in town and countryside—these are the essential conditions for unity between the forces represented by this Front and between those who make up the so-called center in the fight for common objectives."

Such, briefly, is our stand and our experience in this matter. A hurricane of unprecedented velocity, having reached Latin America, is sweeping away everything that has outlived itself, clearing the way for new forces, awakening to struggle the masses of the people in town and countryside, and all other patriots, and forcing the imperialists, reactionaries and their agents to retreat. Proof of this can be seen in Venezuela, Cuba and other countries, in the tremendous upsurge of the popular struggle throughout Latin America.

This struggle, nevertheless, is not an easy one; it has its ups and downs, its offensives and retreats. The conditions in which the peoples are waging their everyday struggle are complex and tend to change. Fortunately, we have the experience gained

by the Communist parties. This experience helps us correctly to apply Marxism-Leninism in the specific conditions of each country. The present exchange of views is a step forward in this respect, and will, we believe, yield good results.

The National Bourgeoisie of Tunisia Before Coming to Power and After

Mohamed Harmel

DESPITE the fact that the national bourgeoisie in colonial and semi-colonial countries have much in common, there are also rather considerable distinctions between the bourgeoisie of the different countries, depending on their peculiarities and on the stage of the revolution experienced by those countries. So in order to arrive at the correct generalizations it is necessary to take into account the specific conditions of each country. The bourgeoisie should be considered not in isolation but in their relationship to the other classes and strata both in the country and abroad.

Tunisia is one of the countries which have only recently won independence and in which the national bourgeoisie are in power. It offers a good example for studying the role of the national bourgeoisie in the liberation movement before and after their rise to power.

Before Tunisia was granted independence, the French colonialists directly controlled its economy, thereby greatly retarding both the rise of the national bourgeoisie and the country's economic advance.

According to 1955 statistics, of the 290 industrial and commercial enterprises employing upwards of 50 workers, only 33 belonged to Tunisians. These were chiefly food industry and transport enterprises. Scarcely any textile mills were owned by Tunisians. These figures testify to the financial and economic weakness of the native bourgeoisie. The proximity of the metropolitan country and French domination resulted in the fact that the role of commercial middleman between the two countries was played chiefly by the French. Even the agents of French firms in Tunisia were Frenchmen. It is true that in Tunisia there is a small group of local trading capitalists who export Tunisian goods to France and import French goods. Their close links with the French market give them pronounced comprador features despite the fact that they, too, have had their differences with the imperialists who restricted their activities. This is confirmed by the fact that this section of the bourgeoisie took part in the national-liberation movement and

now, in some cases, is prepared to trade with the socialist countries.

Agriculture is also dominated by French capitalists who own 750,000 hectares of the most fertile land.

The national bourgeoisie in Tunisia are primarily the middle bourgeoisie, mostly engaged in agriculture and trade. It should be noted that the capital invested in industrial enterprises was accumulated through agriculture and trade. This section of the bourgeoisie led and continues to lead the national-liberation movement. During the independence struggle they played a progressive role. Having proclaimed the common aims of the struggle, they inspired the masses, including the workers, to follow them. In some cases they sought the support of the trade unions, trying at the same time to prevent the unions from becoming independent bodies. They often vacillated, retreated and were ready to compromise with the imperialists, but the balance of forces on the world arena and the pressure of the masses impelled them to overcome these vacillations.

It is obvious that the winning of independence does not mean that the national bourgeoisie have exhausted their possibilities as a revolutionary force. The desire of the bourgeoisie to consolidate their power confronts them with the necessity of continuing the struggle against feudalism and imperialism. As soon as independence was won, the Tunisian bourgeoisie abolished the monarchy and expropriated some of the property belonging to the collaborators and the French capitalists. With popular support, some of the sections of the national economy were nationalized. Many of the medium-sized enterprises that had belonged to the French now passed into the hands of Tunisian capitalists. In addition, a number of medium-sized enterprises were built with the help of government subsidies. These measures reinforced the political and economic positions of the national bourgeoisie.

However, having come to power, the national bourgeoisie find themselves confronted with new contradictions which, without help, they are unable

to solve. The defects of the bourgeoisie both in home and foreign policy are making themselves felt more and more, and their influence is beginning to decline.

In the economic sphere the process of social differentiation, which had been retarded during the colonial period, is becoming more pronounced. The heterogeneous composition of the bourgeoisie is becoming more obvious. The section which collaborated with the colonialists has lost its economic power. However, the middle bourgeoisie are gaining ground through the state apparatus. Then there is the group of the *nouveau riche*. Among these there is a liking for foreign trade operations which promise quick returns and high profits. Recent statistics show a considerable rise in such export-import operations conducted by Tunisians. These then, are the conditions favoring the emergence of a new comprador bourgeoisie.

In the political sphere the national bourgeoisie since coming to power have displayed two tendencies. The first, more progressive and to some extent meeting the interests of the working people, consists in upholding economic planning. The second, the prevailing tendency, is expressed in the desire to compromise with the imperialists. The differences in views between the various sections of the bourgeoisie are still there and, as time goes on, they will become more pronounced as regards questions of state development, because these differences reflect the objective interests and demands of certain sections of the national bourgeoisie.

Despite the fact that the national bourgeoisie tend to compromise with the imperialists, one should not underestimate the contradictions between them and the imperialists, or belittle the role of the masses who are now in a position to persuade the bourgeoisie, or at least elements of them, to change their policy. Tunisian economists maintain that the economy is now in the throes of a crisis and that neither American aid, nor the aid of the "Common Market" countries can overcome this crisis.

Tunisia's foreign trade has preserved many of its original features. It is chiefly carried on with France (71 per cent of the imports and 62 per cent of the exports). The national bourgeoisie aim at enriching themselves and at consolidating their positions. With a population of less than four million people Tunisia has 300,000 unemployed, and the average annual income per inhabitant is about 46,000 francs. The masses naturally are eager to improve their conditions and will not put up with empty promises. The bourgeoisie who are now in power cannot afford to ignore the demands of the masses. My view is that popular pressure, primarily that of the working class and the poor peasants, will play the decisive role. In any case

the bourgeoisie will only change their policy under mass pressure, and this will be accompanied by the sapping of their leadership and the growth of the role of the working class and its Party.

The vacillations of the bourgeoisie upon coming to power revealed the dual character of their policy. But with the march of time they will be forced increasingly to take a definite stand and defend either the interests of the people as a whole or of the privileged sections. And faced with this choice, their reactionary tendencies and their negative attitude to the masses are being manifested. The trade union movement which they led and encouraged before winning liberation is now becoming a nuisance to them. They have done everything to turn the unions into an appendage of the state. The national bourgeoisie are opposed to satisfying the workers' demands. As a result, wages have not been increased since 1955.

Their agrarian policy is even more illuminating. It should be pointed out that the feudal survivals are gradually disappearing and the feudalists are turning more and more to capitalist methods of exploitation. Large areas of fertile land await cultivation but the question is: to whom will the government grant the land? At first the government offered it for sale. But this measure only added to the concentration of land in the hands of the big landowners. There are signs that the government is beginning to change its policy in the direction of consolidating the rich farmers at the expense of the poor and landless peasants.

The reactionary features of the national bourgeoisie are also manifest in the attitude of the Bourghiba government to democratic freedoms. Despite a degree of democracy for appearances' sake, the bourgeoisie, since the winning of independence, have sought to restrict basic freedoms. They have established a monopoly for their party which in turn has been reorganized on bureaucratic principles to preclude the dissemination of ideas emanating from below.

That the bourgeoisie, on their ascent to power, so easily entered into a compromise with the imperialists and attacked the democratic rights of the working people, is explained by the fact that they took advantage of their leading position in the national-liberation movement, of the weakness of the working class and the opportunism of the trade union leaders.

The working class of Tunisia is not strong numerically and it is widely dispersed. Suffice it to say that of the quarter of a million workers, including farm laborers, only 35,000 work in enterprises employing more than 50. In the course of the liberation struggle the working class was strong enough to establish, while remaining an independent force, an alliance with the national bourgeoisie. However,

it was not strong enough to avoid falling under bourgeois influence. At present the working class is becoming conscious of its own interests and of the true aims of the national bourgeoisie. Experience has shown that the proletariat is a considerable force especially when it is allied with the peasants. The working class has its own militant traditions which our Party is cultivating. Fully aware of the importance of the alliance with the bourgeoisie and making every effort to avoid sectarian mistakes, we are combating the influence of bourgeois ideology on the working class, conducting educational work which will help to enhance the role of the working class in the national and democratic movement. But sectarianism is not the only danger that threatens the Communist and Workers' parties. For a small Party such as ours opportunism may well become a real danger. To prevent it from weakening our ranks we must not allow ourselves to be hypnotized by the progressive role which the national bourgeoisie played in the liberation movement. We must look ahead to the future, not to the past.

The working class can and must enter into an alliance, even though temporary, unstable and partial, with certain elements of the national bourgeoisie on matters pertaining to the development of the country. At the same time the working class cannot fail to see the reactionary features of the bourgeoisie. One should avoid hasty judgments about one or another member of the national bourgeoisie, and in policy should be guided by an objective estimate of the real position and perspectives of development both of the national bourgeoisie as a whole and of the sections comprising it.

This work, let it be said, is exacting. Only by conducting a persistent and flexible policy of alliance and struggle with the bourgeoisie will we be able to exercise the leadership of the working class in the national liberation movement. Despite the relative weakness of the working-class movement the opportunities are at hand for enhancing in the near future the role of the working class and the poor peasants in the struggle for the tasks of the national and democratic revolution.

The Bourgeoisie of the Syrian Region of the U.A.R.

Walid Samman

NOTING the common features peculiar to the national bourgeoisie of different countries, the comrades have stressed the need to take cognizance of the specific conditions of each country. This fully applies to Syria.

The political and economic conditions in our country were not conducive to the emergence of a strong comprador bourgeoisie. In view of the powerful movement for national independence, this bourgeoisie could not consolidate their positions and take political leadership into their hands. Leadership of the liberation struggle was seized by the national bourgeoisie.

The economic history of Syria shows that the national bourgeoisie have made considerable efforts to industrialize the country. A number of industries, namely, textile, sugar, leather, soap and matches were set up, providing jobs for tens of thousands of people.

After winning independence in 1946 Syria adopted a series of measures in the sphere of tariffs. The Bank of Syria was nationalized as were the tramways, power stations and railway companies owned by French, British and Belgian capital. The Syrian pound was separated from the French franc.

The national bourgeois governments, despite some ministers who were noted for their subservience to imperialism, had to maneuver and resist

the pressure of the imperialist powers which sought to impose upon them military pacts, bilateral agreements and loans. Even the military dictatorships were unable to involve Syria in any pact or agreement with the imperialists. One of the main reasons for the fall of the dictator Zaim was that he had signed an agreement with the Trans-Arabian Pipeline Co. The anti-imperialist attitude of the national bourgeoisie was explained by the growing resistance of the people to the policy endangering national independence and also by the class interests of the bourgeoisie.

Syria's industrialization proceeded rapidly from 1954 until the unification with Egypt. Industrial development held out good prospects, especially after the signing in 1957 of the Soviet-Syrian agreement on economic co-operation. The standard of living of the Syrian workers became the highest in the Middle East, the political and cultural level of the people was also rising. But the national bourgeoisie refused to effect the agrarian reform which envisaged the distribution of land among the peasants. This is explained in large measure by the fact that a part of the national bourgeoisie still have substantial interests in the countryside.

After the formation of their first government in 1936 the national bourgeoisie began immediately to restrict democratic liberties. They used the

police and gendarmerie to suppress strikes and peasant actions.

After 1943 they tried to regain the confidence of the people. They changed the electoral system and permitted the Communist Party to contest the elections. This, however, did not prevent them from falsifying the results of the 1947 elections and removing the progressive deputies from Parliament. Taking advantage of the U.N. resolution on Palestine (1947), the bourgeois government launched a campaign against the Communist Party. Party members were arrested and their premises destroyed; progressive activity was prohibited. This led, eventually, to military dictatorship (1949-54), superseded later by a democratic regime.

From 1954 until the unification with Egypt, Syria was ruled by coalition governments of the national bourgeoisie and the BAAS (the Socialist Party of Arab Regeneration). Although these governments included spokesmen of the Right wing of the national bourgeoisie and even of the comprador bourgeoisie, Syria pursued during those years a foreign policy of positive neutrality and renunciation of military pacts. In 1956, after the exposure of the plots engineered by the imperialists and native reactionaries, after the Anglo-French-Israel aggression against Egypt, this policy assumed a clearly anti-imperialist character.

By the end of 1957 the progressive movement had made big headway. An important part in this was played by the Communist Party. Fraternal relations between the army and the people had a beneficial effect on the movements in other countries. The Parliamentary Front relied on the support of the masses. However, the imperialists continued their policy of plotting against Syria. The reactionaries at home and abroad did everything to destroy the democratic system.

The question arises: why did the Syrian bourgeoisie agree to unite with Egypt in the way in which it was done?

Some facts should be recalled in order to answer this question. Immediately after the fall of dictator Chichakli the imperialists, the comprador and big bourgeoisie and the direct agents of imperialism as, for example, the fascist National-Socialist Party, tried to seize power and establish control over the army. But these designs were foiled by the army, above all by the patriotic officers who had played a big part in overthrowing the Chichakli dictatorship, and also by the democratic forces. After this the imperialist agents in the National-Socialist Party assassinated Colonel Malki, noted for his democratic and anti-imperialist views. But far from bringing the desired results, this act of murder fanned the hatred of the army for the imperialists and their hirelings and brought it closer to the anti-imperialist forces. The comprador and big bourgeoisie were isolated and their activities

all put paralyzed. But they did not regard themselves as defeated. They made further attempts to destroy the democratic system. A part of the national bourgeoisie, which had co-operated with the democratic forces in general and especially in the Parliamentary Front and which had formed the government together with the BAAS, became weary of the relentless pressure of the imperialists, their plots and intrigues and tried to find a way out. It was in these circumstances that the question of unification with Egypt arose.

During the discussion of this question some sections of the national bourgeoisie made certain reservations concerning different aspects of the unification: the economy, democratic liberties, etc. The spokesmen of these sections in the government, who signed the official declaration on unification, insisted that these reservations should be written into the protocol of the last session of the Syrian Cabinet, which approved the unification principles proposed by Egypt. The majority of the national bourgeoisie believed that a big state would ensure stability and put an end to imperialist political and economic pressure. They believed that the Syrian bourgeoisie would rule their country and be able to sell their goods on the Egyptian market.

The comprador and big bourgeoisie calculated on striking a blow at their main adversaries—the army, the Communist Party and the democratic forces. Guided by these considerations they, together with the reactionary circles of the national bourgeoisie, consented to the unification. A few words should be said here about the role played by the BAAS leadership. Being in the government, this Party managed to enlist some of the trade union leaders and posed as an exponent of Arab nationalism and unity.

After the fall of dictator Chichakli, the democratic movement had been on the upsurge, and the Communist Party wielded considerable influence. The working people fought to strengthen friendship and co-operation with the Soviet Union; they saw for themselves that this country was their best friend and that without it they would not be able to retain their independence and resist imperialist pressure. In these circumstances the BAAS did not dare come out openly with anti-communist and anti-Soviet slogans. But, forced to co-operate with the democratic forces and to participate in the anti-imperialist campaigns together with the Communist Party, it used every opportunity to advance its slogan: "Neither with the East, nor with the West." The purpose of this slogan was to persuade the public that there was no difference between the Soviet Union and the United States and that the Arabs should not show preference for either. However, when Eisenhower proclaimed his doctrine of "aid" to the Middle

East, the BAAS hastened to declare that it should not be rejected, that its positive points should be studied. But when the people turned down the Eisenhower doctrine and denounced it as a new form of colonialism intended to replace Anglo-French imperialism by American imperialism, this party kept silent. Many examples could be given showing that the attitude of the BAAS often coincided, directly or indirectly, with the imperialist plans.

Before unification was placed on the agenda, the Foreign Minister, a leader of the BAAS, said in addressing a meeting in November 1957 in Damascus: "The history of this part of the world will, in some three months, witness the birth of a great Arab state." The BAAS leaders dissolved their party before the official declaration on unification. They accepted without reservations the conditions of unification and did everything to prevent the other parties and political leaders from expressing their views on it. The BAAS leaders did not conceal the fact that they intended to rule the country alone, without any rivals, since all the parties would be dissolved, Communist influence rendered ineffective and the army purged of patriotic officers. Shortly after the unification, they began to serve the reactionary circles of the Egyptian bourgeoisie and became their instrument in the struggle against the Communists, democrats and all honest-minded people.

The national bourgeoisie who had hoped to gain much from the unification became disillusioned. They found themselves confronted with a fairly strong Egyptian bourgeoisie thirsting to establish their domination over all the Arab countries.

In the space of several months after the founding of the United Arab Republic, the Misr and Cairo banks opened twelve branches in the main towns of Syria. More than half the annual loans granted to cotton and grain growers came from these banks. The Egyptian bourgeoisie seized the oil refinery in Homs, the construction of which began early in 1957, that is, more than a year before the unification. Despite the protests of local industrialists, Egyptian textiles, furniture, footwear, soap and matches began to flood the Syrian market. Many laws and decrees have been adopted, which infringe the interests of the Syrian bourgeoisie. Some of these laws restricted the area planted to cotton and specified the varieties to be sown. The Syrian bourgeoisie suspect that the Egyptian cotton growers want to end the growing of cotton in Syria and to replace it with grain crops. As a result, industrialization was checked, many small factories were closed and workers dismissed; large enterprises, especially textile mills, were threatened and housing construction discontinued. Capital flowed from Syria. The agrarian reform, designed to deceive the peasants and to turn them from

the democratic movement, restricted land-ownership only partially. A considerable part of the countryside remained unaffected by the law. Thus disillusion spread also among the peasants.

Last February, when the UAR government decided to establish an industrial bank in Syria with a capital of 12 million Syrian pounds, the Misr and Cairo banks and other Egyptian capitalists bought up some 30 per cent of the shares. However, during the election of the administrative council for the Bank, the Syrians got together and elected only their own countrymen.

None of the leaders of the Syrian bourgeoisie supported the anti-communist and anti-Soviet campaign and the campaign against Iraq. Wherever the reactionary circles of the Egyptian bourgeoisie attempt to establish their domination they encounter strong resistance on the part of the Syrian people.

The Egyptian comprador bourgeoisie have extended their activity by setting up mixed foreign and Egyptian concerns. Egyptian companies are now getting direct financial aid from the U.S. imperialists. Quite recently the American Export-Import Bank signed an agreement with an Egyptian company concerning the output of phosphates, granting it a loan in the amount of \$5,000,000 for the purchase of machinery and equipment in the United States.

A part of the Egyptian national bourgeoisie regards the actions of the comprador bourgeoisie as a threat to its interests and seeks ways and means of defending its rights. It realizes, just as does the national bourgeoisie of Syria, that most of the profits accruing from the new market, including the Syrian market, go to the small group of the bourgeoisie who control the economy of the country.

The comprador bourgeoisie, the directors of the Misr and Cairo banks pose as adherents of Arab nationalism and unity. In this way they intend to fulfil their plans for expansion. All who refuse to go with them are denounced as enemies of Arab unity and nationalism, as Communists, separatists, agents of imperialism and Zionism.

A propaganda campaign accompanied by pressure and intimidation is conducted with all means available. Its object is to impose on the people the so-called National Union. By denying the existence of classes, some people want to persuade the masses that the National Union will end all conflicts and misunderstandings between master and worker, between exploiter and exploited.

Such, briefly, is the situation in our country. The Syrian Communists are working to build a democratic and anti-imperialist front. They, as their political platform shows, have set themselves the task of "strengthening the independence of the

UAR, of exposing the imperialist plots against the Arab liberation movement in general, of supporting Arab unity on the basis of complete

liberation from imperialism, on the basis of democracy." This is a genuinely patriotic position corresponding to the national interests.

A Correct Party Policy Guarantees a Strong United Front

M. Lukman

DISCUSSION of problems concerning the national bourgeoisie, problems which decide the course of the revolution in the colonial and semi-colonial countries, is of great significance. A comprehensive understanding of the role of the national bourgeoisie can assist the working class to rally the anti-imperialist forces in the common struggle for national liberation.

Our experience shows that inadequate understanding of this problem has caused no little harm to the Indonesian revolution. On the other hand a correct understanding of this problem has led to progress in establishing an anti-imperialist national front.

In the period 1945-48 we made mistakes of two kinds. First, we exaggerated the role of the national bourgeoisie and forgot its dual character. The result of this mistake was that our Party lost its independence when uniting with the national bourgeoisie and tailed behind them, thus surrendering the leadership of the revolution. When there were indications that the national bourgeoisie were about to compromise with the imperialists, our Party made another mistake—it completely lost sight of their revolutionary potentialities. This wrong attitude resulted in pushing the national bourgeoisie further towards closer unity with the imperialists, towards breaking their united front with the working class.

Generally speaking, the Indonesian national bourgeoisie are weak. Not only foreign trade, but to a great extent also home trade, not to mention industry, have been in the hands of foreign capitalists. It was only after winning independence that the national bourgeoisie, by virtue of their key positions in the government, began to make headway in the sphere of foreign trade.

While the weakness of the national bourgeoisie provides no material basis for sharp contradictions between the working class and the national bourgeoisie in general, there is fertile soil for the rise of compradors.

The fact that the majority of the working class is employed in imperialist enterprises, not in enterprises owned by the national bourgeoisie, facili-

tates to a certain extent the establishment of a united national front.

At the same time because of lack of capital the national bourgeoisie are unable to put up a strong resistance to the imperialists and, what is more, since their existence depends to a great extent on the imperialists, they can easily be bribed by the latter.

It is also necessary to mention a group of the bourgeoisie which can be classified among the compradors. Although they are not yet economically linked with the imperialists, they nevertheless are carrying out policies that are to the advantage of the imperialists. They agree with the pumping of raw materials out of the country, with the exploitation of the working class by the imperialists, and with their monopoly position both in the economy and on the home market. The compradors are opposed to any obstacles being placed in the way of imperialist investment.

The wavering and double-pronged character of the national bourgeoisie is, in our opinion, explained by the fact that, on the one hand, they are oppressed by the imperialists, and on the other, they themselves exploit the working people. Their weak economic position, which naturally results in their weak political position, adds still more to their wavering attitude. Still, we are of the opinion that the vacillation inherent in the national bourgeoisie is not fatal. Provided there are strong progressive forces, plus a Party program which takes into account the interests of the national bourgeoisie, a correct style of work, and the possibility of directing well-aimed blows at the imperialists and their stooges at home, the national bourgeoisie can remain, or at least can be forced to remain for a long period, in the united front of anti-imperialist and anti-feudal struggle.

In this connection it will not be amiss to mention some of our experiences. There was a period (after the White terror of 1948) when the positions of our Party were very weak, when it was isolated and when the national bourgeoisie did not even reckon with it. Confronted with this situation, our Party exerted every effort to increase its strength and extend its ranks. In addition, it pursued with

greater persistency the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal policy, and paid more heed to the interests of the national bourgeoisie. Success in increasing its membership enabled the Party to establish closer contact with the masses and to strike heavier blows at the reactionary forces.

The growing strength of our Party has enabled it, in conjunction with other parties representing the national bourgeoisie, to put up stronger resistance to the measures of the reactionary Masjumi-ISP* government. As a result, we were able to deprive the reactionary Masjumi-ISP parties of their leading position in the government, and the INP,** the main representative of the national bourgeoisie which until then had played only a secondary role became, with the support of our Party, the leading party in the government.

But after our Party had considerably increased its strength and influence among the masses the national bourgeoisie began to fear its further growth. From this we can draw the following conclusion: it is characteristic of the national bourgeoisie in its co-operation with the progressive forces that, on the one hand, it is willing to use the strength of our Party but, on the other hand, it attempts to restrict it.

Despite this, our Party continues to favor co-operation with the national bourgeoisie in the united national front, inasmuch as there are strong antagonisms between the latter and the imperialists, and inasmuch as Indonesia has not yet achieved full national independence.

We, in Indonesia, usually call the national bourgeoisie "middle-of-the-road forces." We divide these forces into three categories—the Left group, the center group and the Right group. We make this classification in order to define our attitude towards each category and towards the forces as a whole.

The center group, which is usually a strong group, serves as a sort of a link between the Left and the Right groups but gives preference to whichever is the stronger group. Therefore in order to be able to draw all the middle-of-the-road forces into the united national front, we should render

particular assistance to the Left group whose policy reflects to a certain extent the aspirations of the mass of the middle-of-the-road forces, mainly the petty bourgeoisie.

Our attitude towards the Right group of the national bourgeoisie differs from our attitude to the comprador bourgeoisie. Since this group still belongs to the national bourgeoisie we, while criticizing it, do not go beyond certain limits, bearing in mind the interests of preserving the unity of the national front.

Our Party is still facing difficulties in establishing a united national front, that is, in establishing unity between the progressive forces and the middle-of-the-road forces. One of the reasons for this is that the bourgeoisie, having taken over the reins of government and enjoying the support of the progressive forces, are unable to ensure the economic development demanded by the working people unless they take progressive steps against the survivals of feudal and imperialist economic domination, and unless they develop economic relations with the socialist countries.

But if we are skilful enough in handling the national elements as a revolutionary factor in the struggle for emancipation, we shall certainly be able to find issues which could bring together the progressive forces and the forces of the national bourgeoisie. The growth of the progressive forces, consistent implementation of our Party program, which takes into account the interests of the national bourgeoisie, a correct style of work and success in the struggle against reactionary forces—this will enable us to create the real conditions for preserving the united front of the national bourgeoisie and the working class.

We will fight untiringly for this goal because the possibility of establishing a strong united front with the national bourgeoisie before the working class comes to power means that conditions will be created for the continuation of this front after the victory of the national revolution for the sake of the political, economic and cultural advances of our people.

(This exchange of views will be concluded in our next issue.)

*Indonesian Socialist Party.

**Indonesian National Party.

When the Masses Participate in Running the State

WHEN socialist society was still in its infancy, and the foundations of the new system were being laid, Lenin urged that the people should learn the art of running the state so that "millions and tens of millions of working people should advance from a simple form of activity to activity at a higher level." This concept destroyed the harmful bourgeois prejudice that state administration was the concern only of the privileged, an idea that had been dinned into the workers for years. Lenin taught that, having come to power, the working class should elaborate "forms that would enable all the working people easily to adapt themselves to the job of running the state and creating a state system. . . ."

The new phase in the development of Soviet society, which is now in the stage of all-round construction of communism, calls for still greater political activity on the part of the people. In view of this the nationwide discussions in the Soviet Union, now a regular feature of public life, have fully justified themselves. In these discussions the Party has found one of the forms which, as Lenin taught, enables all the working people easily to *adapt themselves to the job of running the state* ensuring thereby the participation of the entire population in solving the nation's problems.

In this connection the recently published symposiums devoted to the public discussion of major economic and political problems are of considerable interest.*

The five volumes under review cover only part of the more important statements made in the three public discussions held in 1958 and early this year.

The first of these was the discussion on the further development of the collective-farm system and the reorganization of the machine and tractor stations. It took place in response to the call of the February (1958) meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party.

In submitting for discussion the plan to change the pattern of technical service to the collective farms in the new conditions, the Central Commit-

tee appealed to the people to join actively in the discussion in order "to find the best way of solving this problem." Party and government bodies were instructed "carefully to study and generalize the suggestions made by the people in order to ascertain the best and most advantageous ways of reorganizing the production and technical servicing of the collective farms with a view to further developing the collective-farm system and creating an abundance of agricultural products."

As a result of the discussion of Khrushchov's report, the Supreme Soviet of the USSR adopted in March 1958 a law on the reorganization of the machine and tractor stations and the handing over of the tractors and other agricultural machinery to the collective farms.

The discussion on bringing the school closer to life and the development of public education was a stimulating experience. More than 13 million people attended the meetings on this subject in the towns and villages of the Russian Federation; in the Ukraine the overall attendance was in the neighborhood of 10 million. In addition to the meetings the plan was discussed at home, and during work intervals. Its key idea, that of combining education with productive labor, met with warm approval. An idea long cherished by thinking people, it is now for the first time being translated into reality on a countrywide scale, being an example of an advance dictated by the march of time.

The symposium on this subject includes seven thousand full or abbreviated letters and suggestions on this subject sent to *Pravda* between November 16 and December 15, 1958.

Particularly lively was the discussion of the theses on the control figures for economic development, which preceded the XXIst Congress of the CPSU. These meetings were attended by over 70 million people, and contributions were made by a total of 4,672,000 comrades who tabled criticisms, amendments, and suggestions. In addition, the central and local Party and government bodies, newspapers and magazines, and radio and TV stations received upwards of 650,000 letters and articles.

Pravda received more than 15,000 contributions in the form of articles and letters, and these make up the contents of three of the volumes. The social status of their authors is interesting. Not all, un-

*Nationwide Discussion on the Further Development of the Collective-Farm System and the Reorganization of the Machine and Tractor Stations. Moscow 1958, 408 pp.

Nationwide Discussion on Bringing the School Closer to Life and the Further Development of Public Education. Moscow, 1958, 288 pp.

Pre-Congress Discussion of the Theses of Comrade Khrushchov's Report on the "Control Figures for the Economic Development of the USSR for 1959-65." Moscow, 1959, Vols. 1-3 (576 pp., 751 pp., 471 pp.).

fortunately, gave their profession or trade, but of the 1,277 who did more than 50 per cent (670) were: workers (246), engineers (248), and scientists (176). Agricultural workers (134), Party, government and trade union functionaries (129), executives (102), and others, including pensioners, also contributed.

These facts show that democratic principles are not only proclaimed but operate in socialist society, for they reflect an important feature of genuine democracy—the initiative of millions of people manifested in their active participation in discussing vital questions of state administration, economic and cultural development.

In summing up the results of the discussion Khrushchov, speaking at the Party Congress, said that it “has yielded extremely rich material which will help to give precision to a number of projects of the seven-year plan and to work out subsequent long-term plans.”

On reading the suggestions and amendments contained in these three volumes one gets the impression that they could have been made only by people who feel themselves to be the *masters of their country*, who regard the building of communism as their vital concern. A person insufficiently acquainted with Soviet life may ask why is it that the people feel that they are the masters? And as if in reply, Sorin Toma, chief editor of the Rumanian newspaper *Scinteia*, depicts in an article the historical path traversed by the Soviet people: “. . . The hungry, bloody years of the Civil War. . . . The immense efforts to transform peasant Russia into a great industrial power. . . . Heroic labor on the projects of the five-year plans with the country encircled by an armed capitalist world. . . . The conflagration of the Hitler invasion, the siege of Leningrad, the countless graves of beloved sons. . . . The epic of Stalingrad, and the great liberation offensive in the West—victory after victory. . . . The difficult but heroic years of rehabilitation and the subsequent years of bold transformations and magnificent achievements crowned with the launching of the Sputniks.”

Such is the origin of the right of the Soviet people to be the masters of their country.

We can conclude from a study of the symposiums that public discussions as a form of participation by the people in the solution of major political and economic questions are acquiring growing importance in Soviet life. These discussions should not be confused with the referendums in capitalist countries by means of which the bourgeoisie mold public opinion to suit their purposes. The people who take part in such referendums have no opportunity of discussing the substance of any question. The rulers ask them merely to say “yes” or “no,” and in requesting this they resort to economic pressure, to brainwashing, and even to intimidation and terror. There are many examples of this kind

of western “democracy.” We shall cite one of the more recent ones—the de Gaulle referendum in France (September 1958), which signified a new stage in the offensive of monopoly capital. By means of this referendum the monopolists sought to give legal semblance to a regime of arbitrary rule and to place it upon a constitutional basis. All methods of pressure were brought into play to achieve this, including raids on the premises of the Communist and democratic organizations. The same object was pursued by demagogic propaganda in the press, radio, TV and cinema.

There are instances, too, when the referendum questions are not of real importance. Such referendums are intended to create a *semblance of participation* by the people in the solution of state problems.

The public discussions, which in the Soviet Union have become a form of continuous contact between the Party and the people, are *business-like* discussions of measures of national importance. What stands out from a study of the materials is that the people who made the proposals and submitted amendments approached the problems, both big and small, from the *standpoint of the interests of the state*. For instance, during the discussion on the Theses of Khrushchov’s report to the Congress, proposals were advanced which dealt with major economic problems and which were subsequently embodied in the final version of the Seven-Year Plan prepared by the State Planning Committee.

Noteworthy suggestions were made by the regularly functioning production conference at the Kuznetsk Iron and Steel Works. This conference is comprised of representatives of the management, the Party and trade union committees, workers and technicians. It pointed to the disparity in the plant between the contemplated 17 per cent increase in steel output and the planned growth of rolling shop capacities, which could raise rolled steel output by 42 per cent.

A planning miscalculation of this kind could not, in itself, affect the direct interests of the workers nor their wages. An easier plan moreover could, in a sense, facilitate the work of the enterprise. But the *interests of the state* would naturally suffer and the production conference, pointing to the disparity, suggested that a converter shop be built to make full use of the rolled steel capacity.

The State Planning Committee examined and accepted this proposal. So the Kuznetsk plant will build a converter shop and a large oxygen shop. Realization of this proposal will give the country an additional 1,200,000 tons of steel a year.

An important proposal was made in the Krasnoyarsk Territory concerning the development in the next seven years of the Angara-Pit iron-ore basin,

the rich deposits of which could be used by the West-Siberian Iron and Steel Works now under construction. These ores can be mined by the open-cast system, the most economical method. Cost per ton of raw ore will be lower than the cost of the ore in neighboring Khakassia, Kemerovo Region and Altai Territory. The pig-iron smelted from Angara-Pit ore will be the cheapest in the country.

Among the interesting suggestions put forward in the Kazakh SSR, was the one for solving Central Kazakhstan's water supply problem by building the 450-kilometer-long Irtysh-Karaganda Canal.

We have mentioned only three of the thousands of proposals made during the discussion. Local bodies have already carried out many of them, or will do so in the near future. These proposals concern in the main the organization and technology of production in the enterprises, better utilization of machinery, more economical use of raw materials, and so on. All of them, as the XXIst Congress noted, "express the concern of the people to see our country develop its economy and culture, and that the life of our people should progress from good to better."

It was this concern that prompted I. Ivlenkov, a joiner from the Chuvash Autonomous Republic, to suggest that the seven-year plan should provide for building furniture factories in localities which had plenty of timber. He also suggested that the wood needed by the furniture industry should not be used for fuel. Rasulov, Aliev, and Ilyesov, collective-farm shepherds in Tajikistan, were concerned for the interests of the state when they suggested that the seven-year plan should provide for more watering of the Tajik pasture lands. "Unless this is done," they write, "we can't talk seriously about improving animal husbandry."

A number of important amendments were made in respect to the engineering, metallurgical, fuel, chemical, light and food industries, land cultivation, livestock-breeding and other branches of the national economy.

Professor Antonio Pesenti of the University of Parma, member of the Central Committee of the Italian Communist Party, was fully justified in writing of the Soviet Union's seven-year plan: "This plan is the result of the democratic participation of the people in drawing it up, the result of all its aspects being closely studied and discussed by Party, trade union, economic, scientific and other bodies."

The constructive nature of the public discussion was not its only significant feature. The discussion was accompanied by a considerable growth of *labor enthusiasm* and initiative. The grand program for the all-round construction of communism has engendered a splendid drive by young workers for communist labor teams. This movement started in the Moscow-Sortirovochnaya Depot of the Moscow-Ryazan Railway where, forty years ago, the first "Communist Saturday," which Lenin called the "Great Beginning," took place. It has spread with lightning speed. Its members are filled with the desire to study in their spare time; they want the knowledge they acquire to benefit not only themselves, but first of all, to help them in their work. The pledges made by the members of the communist labor teams are permeated with the desire of each to become both at work and at home a model of the new, Soviet man.

A writer once said that it was easier to decipher the hieroglyphs of four thousand years ago than to distinguish the spiritual features of the man who will be living forty years from now. This is either a meaningless phrase or a delusion. The features of the future man, the man of the communist society, are already taking shape; his qualities are clearly discernible in the pledges of the communist labor teams.

"What magician will change the amazing figures of the seven-year plan into reality?" wrote Nikolai Tikhonov, the Soviet poet, during the discussion. "That magician will be the labor of our people, diligent, intelligent labor, labor that is constantly being improved and which in turn is *improving man* (our italics—I.L.), labor that moves the heart and guides the mind."

During the discussion of the vital political and economic problems, our people, as the real masters, studied them deeply and were solving them with a view to expediting the building of communism. The words of the great Lenin, pronounced when the young Soviet Republic was being built, come to mind: "... At present it is difficult to conceive with any degree of precision the wealth of energy latent in the working masses . . . and which will be released under socialism."

These powerful energies, now released, are playing an increasingly important part in solving matters of national importance. That is one of the chief conclusions to be drawn from the materials of the symposiums.

I. L.

Illusions and Reality

IN his book* J. R. Campbell, a leading member of the British Communist Party, examines the illusions of British "twentieth century socialism": full employment, large-firm benevolence, state-shareholding, managed capitalism and wage restraint. These illusions are the blinkers which the Labor Party leaders calculate will prevent the rank and file from discerning the capitalist exploitation wrapped up in Labor's General Election Program.

The author does not confine himself to showing how far removed from socialism the latest statements of the Labor Party leaders are. He traces present reformist policies back to their bourgeois ideological roots and theoretical authors, J. M. Keynes, P. F. Drucker and A. A. Berle. Campbell correctly assesses this "twentieth century socialism" as the "crude, unsophisticated and stupid importation of capitalist ideas into the movement, which can only confuse its vision and weaken its will, and render it not only unfit to bring about a social transformation but even to defend the everyday interests of the working class" (p. 65). Labor Party members, he writes, should combat this kind of socialism. He crosses swords with C. A. R. Crosland, one of the architects of the new Labor Party policy, who tries to develop "a more subtle theory of the post-capitalist society."

Crosland's characterization of present-day capitalism as "post-capitalist society" falsifies reality by projecting the idea that Britain has entered a new phase of development. According to Labor Party theoreticians, the state in Britain has become all-powerful and impartial and administers economic, political and social affairs in the interests of worker and capitalist alike.

The Croslands argue that governments and political parties now have at their disposal the new economic theory elaborated by Keynes and his followers which enables them to devise policies to control the capitalist economic cycle in the interests of all the people, end mass unemployment and other social evils. These Keynesian theories, they claim, are not only superior to all previous bourgeois theories but have outdated Marx as well. These "new" theories, says Campbell, "are illusions which are always prevalent in periods of comparative prosperity in capitalist society: . . . this prosperity in recent years has had little to do with specific government policies; and . . . what we have been living through has been a prolonged boom due to postwar circumstances that are now beginning to pass away" (p. 6).

While the British working class did manage to improve its position as compared to the period

prior to the Second World War, these improvements do not add up to a new social order or "new mixed economy" as claimed by the Labor leaders. The wage increases and the improved social services won by the working class after the victory in the anti-fascist war are already under heavy attack by monopoly.

Taxes collected from the British workers exceed by £600 million the cost of all the social services. At the same time the profits of monopoly rose and taxes on the rich declined. In 1952 the profits of all companies after taxes stood at £1,493 million. In 1957 they were £2,885 million, an increase of £1,392 million. On the other hand, the state collected £982 million in taxes from all companies in 1952. But in 1957 the amount had dropped by £57 million to £925 million. These figures do not bear out the claim of an alleged "new society," rather they testify to more streamlined profit-taking on the part of the monopolists.

The author refutes the Keynesian theory of regulated economy which is upheld by Strachey in his *Contemporary Capitalism*. He also denounces another borrowed Keynesian theory, propagated in the Labor Party document *Industry and Society*, that large capitalist firms tend to "socialize themselves." That is, they tend to think more in terms of acting responsibly in the public interest and less in terms of extracting maximum profits. Instead of concrete facts *Industry and Society* quotes apologists for American big business—Peter Drucker and A. A. Berle—as authorities in support of this alleged process of "socialization." This alleged process of "self-socialization" rests on the very character of capitalist production. Just as modern production methods have converted production into an exceedingly complex process, modern methods of financing tend to increase the complexity of the capitalization process of large-scale industry, trade and commerce. The capital resources of the big capitalists find more diversified fields of investment. On the other hand, the resources of many capitalist investors, as well as the savings of thousands of individuals, go to make up the huge amounts of capital (in the form of share capital) required to build up a modern enterprise. Consequently the capitalization (and management) of large-scale industry, trade and commerce tends to become more and more impersonal with the advance of monopoly.

The complexity of the labor process, management, capitalization and distribution of the product under monopoly capitalism feeds the illusion that the social character of capitalist production relations is changing spontaneously into production relations of a socialist character.

*J. R. Campbell, *Some Economic Illusions in the Labor Movement*, London, Lawrence & Wishart, 1959, 68 pp.

Campbell points out that this illusion has been eagerly seized upon by the monopolists as a counter-weight to the opposition of the masses and small owners to monopoly.

Modern capitalism has set about perfecting the methods of extracting profits just as it has intensified the labor process. These methods are factory modernization, time study, job classification, automation, paternalism and price-fixing. Profit figures, already quoted and showing that corporation profits in Britain stand at an all-time high, give the lie to the claim of the reformists that the modern capitalists are more interested in the welfare of the community as a whole than in making profits.

One of the crucial points in the reformist theory of the "self-socialization" process is the so-called "revolution" in management. This "new" management personnel, according to Labor theorists, consists of salary earners interested in production for production's sake. They are community-conscious and eager to co-operate with the government and local bodies. These theorists claim that "the influence of private ownership in the large firm, as far as management of production and growth are concerned, is small. Their managements are professional, autonomous bodies, self-appointed and self-perpetuating . . ."

Campbell adduces ample evidence to disprove this naive theory. He gives examples to show how the big shareholders gain control over a firm and even several firms through the proxy vote and pressure on other shareholders. And when the need arises to remove individuals from directorships and management this control is exercised by the large shareholders. This is common practice in the business world and operates with particular smoothness in large enterprises. And these "autonomous managers," once they have won top positions in industry, quickly amass large fortunes in shares, through bonuses, outright gifts from the firms, part payment of salaries in shares, and thus become big capitalists.

Much space is devoted to such key points of the Labor Party Program as state ownership of shares and managed capitalism. An analysis of this program shows that the state will buy shares in capitalist enterprises not in order eventually to own or control industries but rather to become a partner with capital in profit-taking in production and speculation on the stock market.

Campbell reveals the contradictory nature of the various schemes by which the Labor leaders propose to secure shares for the state. There is to be a capital gains tax. But *Industry and Society* says "it would be fatal to tax capital gains too much." Another scheme is to buy shares with the surplus from the National Superannuation Fund. This would be accomplished by levying larger

pension contributions than are needed to meet annual requirements. Taxes also levied on industry are invariably passed on to the consumers in the price structure. Thus the pension fund surplus to buy industrial shares will be raised at the expense of the workers.

The essential ingredient for success in managing the economy of present-day Britain, according to the Labor policy statement *Plan for Progress*, is "a partnership between state and both sides of industry." This three-way partnership between a Labor administered state, the working class and monopoly capital, to be freely entered into and maintained, should bring benefits to all concerned, in this case constantly expanding material gains for all the partners. This would call for constantly expanding capitalist production, free from capitalist slump and boom.

To accomplish this "ambitious" plan the Labor planners have developed a program to secure economic expansion on the basis of increased capital accumulation; it shows how a Labor government would deal with a slump should this occur while it was in office; and how to prevent a boom from spiralling into higher prices. In short, how to control the cycle of capitalist reproduction in the best Keynesian manner.

These "controls" are envisaged in *Plan for Progress* as being exercised through wage restraint; tying wages to national production levels; the voluntary passing on by monopoly of cheaper production costs in the form of lower consumer prices; and regulation of the capital investment program through a system of construction and raw materials priorities for separate industries.

Plan for Progress advocates an increase in the rate of capital investment in industry from the 15 per cent of national income invested in 1956 to 18 and 20 per cent. How is this capital accumulation to be secured? Apparently, says Campbell, it is not going to be secured through a "drastic curtailment of military expenditure" because that is not proposed. This could be done by heavy taxes on the wealthy. But the proposed additional tax on the the wealthy is the capital gains tax and the rate suggested in this respect is not sufficient to meet the aim of the Labor theorists. So the only conclusion is that working-class consumption is to be cut. And here there are definite proposals by the Labor leaders to increase workers' payments into the National Superannuation Fund. A worker earning £15 a week will pay into the Fund £14 6s. a year—the equivalent of a week's wages.

In their planning, the Labor theorists blithely ignore the basis of capitalist exploitation of the working class, and dismiss the basic fact that monopoly capital takes to itself the product of the collective labor of the working people by virtue

of its ownership and control of the means of production. And, further, because of its ownership of the product of social labor, monopoly is able nowadays to engage in price-fixing based on the "principle" of "all the traffic will bear." Because of failure to take into account the predatory nature of monopoly capital, Labor's plans for managing the British economy make no provision for the effective control of monopoly's power or for curbing its exploiting tendencies.

But while avoiding controls on monopoly, *Plan for Progress* does guarantee to the capitalist owners of industry a fixed rate of exploitation which will produce a continuing rise of absolute profit as long as overall productivity rises. It does this through its concrete proposal to tie wages to the overall rate of production, which can only condemn the workers to a fixed low wage in relation to profits.

The author shows convincingly that the plans of the Right Labor leaders to banish unemployment and other ills of capitalism will not succeed in their purpose because they fail to tackle the

fundamental contradictions of capitalist society in the Britain of today. Rather the plans are based on implementing on a state level the moth-eaten bourgeois theories of the partnership of capital and labor. In lucid terms Campbell explodes the hoary myths associated with the concept of this unequal "partnership" which gives blood, sweat and tears to the working people and high profits and luxurious living to the capitalists.

He calls for working-class unity, an end to anti-communism in the labor movement and to Labor Party hostility to the socialist world. He says: "It is essential that all socialist-minded workers should recognize that every move forward in the socialist world will give a powerful stimulus to the advance of the common people in Britain." The way forward for the working people in Britain is proven by experience, declares Campbell, to be the bold challenging policy which brings the most positive day-to-day results, while strengthening and inspiring the workers to press ahead to their goal—the socialist society.

A. DEWHURST

Reviews in Brief

J. M. BUDISH. *People's Capitalism. Stock Ownership and Production.* New York, International Publishers, 1958, 64 pp.

THE U.S. monopolists have been searching since the early 1930's for a new, sufficiently deceptive label for monopoly capitalism. In this quest they have experimented with such labels as the "American System," the "American Way of Life," the "Free Enterprise System," the "Individual Enterprise System," and others. At last another label has appeared—"People's Capitalism"—which is being publicized on a truly American scale.

But no matter what guise monopoly capital assumes, the facts point to an intensive process of monopolization, and not to the democratization, of capital. American monopolists, the author writes, have built up the greatest concentration of economic power in the hands of a tiny but powerful class of super-capitalists who comprise less than one-fifth of one per cent of the total adult population of the United States. The lavishly-supported employee stock-ownership plans (the booklet shows that only slightly over six per cent of all adult Americans owned any shares in 1956) are merely schemes designed to persuade the workers that the monopoly enterprises are owned by them. This propaganda about "people's capitalism" is good business for the monopolists, helping them to attract the money of the "little man," to undermine the collective bargaining power of employees, impair their capacity to maintain gains won in former struggles, to weaken the resistance of customers to the prices of goods and charges for services; it also saps the positions of the trade unions and the strength of the labor movement. Such is the economic and political background of this U.S. monopoly move.

The author draws a comparison between U.S. and Soviet economic growth. He uses the data collected by a U.S. Congressional Committee which studied this question. Although the Committee tries to discredit Soviet official statistics, it nevertheless has to admit that the rate of economic growth of the USSR has by far exceeded that of the USA.

The author describes the interdependence of capitalist production and the anarchy that reigns within it despite the attempts at regulation of both production and circulation; he also makes a point of the periodic crises in the U.S. economy during the past century. Characterizing the economy over the recent years, Budish concludes that since 1947 private enterprises have not been able to sell more than 75 per cent of the potential output of goods.

This conclusion is of great importance in understanding the prospects of the U.S. economy.

J. MARINELLO. *Ocho notas sobre Anibal Ponce. (Eight Essays on Anibal Ponce.)* Buenos Aires, Cuadernos de cultura, 1958, 72 pp.

LAST year books and articles were published in Latin American countries in connection with the twentieth anniversary of the death of Anibal Ponce, an outstanding Marxist sociologist and psychologist of Argentina, who towards the end of his life (at the age of 40) joined the Communist Party. Another prominent representative of the Latin American intellectuals, Juan Marinello, one of the leaders of Cuba's Popular Socialist Party, who knew Ponce, is the author of the book in question.

Together with critical articles on progressive figures of Argentina, Ponce wrote on psychology from the standpoint of dialectical materialism. His work is closely associated with José Ingenieros, an outstanding sociologist and cultural worker, who hailed the October Revolution. Before he became a Marxist, Ponce had been a positivist but later he adopted a critical attitude towards his teacher Ingenieros, also a positivist. In his writings Ponce upheld the idea that progress in culture is closely associated with the proletariat's victory over capitalism. Until power is in the hands of the working class, he wrote, there will be neither secure freedom, nor full support of culture and real respect for human rights. In his later years Ponce wrote commentaries on the *Communist Manifesto*, on Fourier and Barbusse, and the books *From Erasmus to Romain Rolland*, *Experiences of Modern Spain*, *Bourgeois Humanism and Proletarian Humanism*.

Ponce combined his scientific studies with the struggle for peace and democracy. He led the Argentine peace movement and headed the Latin American Anti-War Congress held in 1933, when oil magnates made Bolivians and Paraguayans shed their blood in the war for Chaco. Anibal Ponce organized the League of Intellectuals, Artists, Journalists and Writers, which actively defended culture from the fascist onslaught. *Dialectica*, the journal edited by him, contributed to the spread of Marxism on the Latin American continent.

This work reveals a profound understanding by prominent Latin American intellectuals of the truth that without Marxism-Leninism they would not be able to make substantial progress in science and culture, that mental labor should be supplemented with revolutionary activity. Far from affecting their scientific work, practice helps to enrich it. An example is provided by the life and work of Anibal Ponce.

Monopoltheorie—Monopolpraxis. Kritische Beitrage zur Theorie und Praxis der Monopole in Westdeutschland. (Monopoly Theory and Practice. Critical Essays on Monopoly Theory and Practice in Western Germany.) Berlin, Wirtschaft, 1958, 150 pp.

IF the monopolies were defended openly, it would be an easy matter to criticize them. But the thing is that the theoretical propositions of the neo-Liberals and Social Democrats now current in West Germany are declared "anti-monopoly." These theorists indulge in a sham criticism of the monopolies and call for a perfect state-monopoly policy and for reforms that would "restrain" the monopolies. The task is, therefore, to disclose the true class essence of their arguments. This is done through the critical articles on the theory and practice of the West German monopolies, which comprise the symposium under review (contributors are H. Riedel, R. Stollberg, J. Bondi and A. Borgmeier).

The adherents of neo-Liberalism declare that the very existence of monopolies is a mistake. Outwardly they oppose the power of monopolies and suggest reforms aimed at overcoming "the disappointing, mistaken development of the commodity and money economy," a term they use to designate monopoly rule. However, an impartial analysis of the measures advanced by the neo-Liberals shows that they aim at strengthening the monopoly power. They go to the length of regarding measures directed against the working class and the trade unions as "anti-monopoly."

This book also criticizes the Social-Democratic concept of monopoly. The Right Social Democrats claim that the Marxist theory of concentration and centralization of capital is no longer valid, since small enterprises can coexist and compete with the monopolies, provided the latter are restricted by effective "anti-monopoly legislation." They reduce the question of monopolies to that of cartels and regard the state as a body responsible for public order and independent of the monopo-

lies. But the law on cartels adopted by the West German Bundestag in 1957 testifies to the restricted nature of the "anti-monopoly" legislation, which serves the monopoly interests. By and large, the book contains an interesting analysis of the current neo-Liberal and Social-Democratic theories used by West German monopoly capital to maintain and consolidate its rule.

M. GILL. *Nuestros buenos vecinos. (Our Good Neighbors.)* Mexico. Talleres Graficos Dimas Garcia Cruz, 1958, 377 pp.

THIS book has aroused considerable interest among readers, the reason being that it contains much new material and documentation exposing the policy of the United States—the "good neighbor—in relation to Mexico.

It reviews the main events in U.S.-Mexican relations over the past century. This enables the author to refute those who believe that in recent decades U.S. imperialism has changed "for the better." Quite the contrary, he says, American imperialism is today even more aggressive than in the days of Theodore Roosevelt.

The author shows that U.S. imperialism has robbed the Mexicans of almost half their territory, and stresses the despicable role played by U.S. diplomats in plundering the people of Mexico and meddling in their affairs.

At the end of the last century the United States began an extensive economic penetration of Mexico with the aim of creating a "paradise" for the American dollar. Whereas at the beginning of this century U.S. capital investments in Mexico were negligible, by 1956 they exceeded 10.5 billion pesos. The book shows that these investments, far from assisting industrialization, have impeded it. Twenty-five big enterprises, representing the U.S. trusts and amassing huge profits, constitute a peculiar "super-state" retarding the economic development of Mexico.

No Halfway House

AN article published in *Le Peuple* by the Belgian Socialist Senator Victor Larocque and reprinted in the Socialist International bulletin for May contains some interesting points and admissions on matters of world politics.

The author correctly rejects the thesis that "the power of armaments makes war an impossibility," and argues that if "the accumulated armaments are not to be put to use, is it not absurd to produce new ones?" Larocque points out that the dilemma—either coexistence or a war fraught with fearful consequences—stands out more sharply than ever before. He also draws the logical conclusion that "the great effort to be made in the coming years is, surely, to find a plan of balance where the living standards and customs of the peoples of East and West can meet."

These concepts are worthy of attention, being a reflection of the process of lessening international tension now under way, and which is evident from such facts as the Khrushchov-Ollenhauer meeting, Khrushchov's talks with West German Social-Democratic journalists, the meeting between the CPSU delegation and Labor leaders in Britain, etc.

This process derives not only from the complex of factors that have led to the Geneva meeting and which facilitate an easing of international tension, but also from the better understanding by the masses that the cold war goes hand-in-hand with the large-scale offensive now under way in Western Europe against democratic gains. Certainly, Larocque is correct when he disagrees with the arguments designed to prove that peaceful coexistence of the two camps is impossible because of "incompatible conceptions" or "atheistic materialism." But what is a surprise is that the author, after drawing these conclusions, stops halfway.

Let us leave aside the ideological differences that divide us from Larocque. The Communists have always maintained—and their view is shared by growing numbers—that such differences should not be an obstacle to mutual understanding on the defense of peace and the vital interests of the working class.

Larocque assesses the policies of the two systems—capitalism and socialism—as being positions-of-

strength policies. But everybody knows that it wasn't the Communists who evolved the "calculated risk" or "brinkmanship" policies, and certainly it is not the socialist countries that are building military bases far from their borders. The socialist countries reject the "positions of strength" policy. And when the author asserts that Khrushchov is banking on "universal extension of communism," we would remind him that the Communists do not place their hopes on "the export of revolution." Their confidence derives from the nature of capitalism, from the understanding that the inner contradictions of capitalism are insoluble. And these views are founded on a solid scientific basis.

Larocque's bias against the communist attitude will hardly help in realizing the idea of coexistence which he justly propounds.

The present international situation is such that it necessitates not only posing correct aims—which the author does in part—but seeing the forces capable of realizing these aims. Another decisive step, which should be taken if one really wishes to preserve peace, is to get rid of anti-communist prejudices. Then the alliance of the Left forces—of all the Left forces—will be able to repel those who hinder both the lessening of international tension and democratic and social progress.

We Communists are all in favor of sincere discussions with the Socialists, of contact with all sections of the working-class movement. We know that many Socialists, too, favor contact with the Communists.

So why stop halfway? Why, for example, shouldn't representatives of the different trends in the working-class movement meet for an exchange of views on such a cardinal question as defense of peace, or joint Socialist-Communist action for easing the tension in Europe? There are any number of pressing problems on which we could try to find a common language. Surely meetings and contacts will redound to the benefit of Socialists and Communists alike, to the whole working class.

So why wait?

Rome, June

Giorgio MARTINI

Free Farjallah Helou!

(Letter from Beirut)

DEAR Friends,
On the evening of June 25, the agents of the special police and of the Second Bureau of the Syrian region of the United Arab Republic arrested Comrade Farjallah Helou, Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Lebanon. Helou, an ardent fighter against imperialism, a man who has devoted over thirty years of his life to the cause of Arab liberation, was arrested on the street in Damascus.

Although no charge has been laid against Helou he was taken to a secret place of confinement and, according to reports received in Beirut, is subjected to torture day and night. His life, clearly, is in danger.

These reports, based on reliable sources and published in the Lebanese press, have evoked anxiety and indignation among the people who deeply respect this popular leader and patriot. A mass

campaign for the immediate release of Comrade is now under way in Lebanon.

We appeal to the Communist and Workers' parties of the world, to all public organizations, to all institutions and associations upholding the rights of the people, peace and democracy, to the Commission for the Rights of Man, to the Secretariat of the United Nations Organization, to all who cherish peace and freedom, to raise their voices and demand together with us that the torture now imperilling the life of Farjallah Helou should cease immediately, that he be released.

Resolute joint action by all the forces of peace, democracy and progress will save the life of Farjallah Helou and help to set him free!

Beirut, July 4, 1959

*On behalf of the Central Committee
of the Communist Party of Lebanon,
Nicolas CHAOUI*

NEW BOOKS

Below are listed a few of the many interesting Marxist works that have been published recently. The list will be continued in forthcoming issues of the magazine.

(Titles of works in other languages are given in English)

- The Struggle of the Korean Party of Labor for People's Rule and Its Consolidation.* A symposium. Pyongyang, 1958, 117 pp.
- Problems of Party Work.* Moscow Gospolitizdat, 1959, 567 pp.
- Dialectical Materialism and Contemporary Natural Sciences.* Bucharest, Ed. Politica, 1959, 276 pp.
- N. Dushkov. *Concerning Truth in Anglo-American Philosophy.* Sofia, Science and Art, 1959, 154 pp.
- Studies of Gramsci's Legacy. Materials of the Rome Conference Held on January 11-13, 1958.* Rome, Ed. Reuniti, 1959, 592 pp.
- History of the Resistance Movement.* South Viet Nam and the Southern Part of Central Viet Nam in 1945-46. Hanoi, Van Su Dia, 1958, 164 pp.
- M. Cachin. *Marcel Cachin Speaks to You.* Paris, 1959, 224 pp.
- E. Collotti. *German Social-Democracy.* Novara, Einaudi, 1959, 186 pp.
- The Communist Party of Chile. Documents of the XIth Congress.* Santiago, 1959, 143 pp.
- The Counter-revolution in Hungary in 1956. Researches.* Budapest, Kossuth Konyvkiado, 1958, 308 pp.
- Business Activity, Crisis, War. The International Economic Conference in Humboldt University in Berlin, October 1-4, 1958.* Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1959, 332 pp.
- E. Nabel. *The Specific Development of German Imperialism.* Warsaw, Polskie Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1959, 398 pp.
- Proletarian Internationalism—the Communist Party's Banner in Battle.* Symposium on Party History. Moscow, The Higher Party School and the Academy of Social Science, 1959, 364 pp.
- G. Szenasi. *On Guard for Legality.* Budapest, Kossuth Konyvkiado, 1958, 254 pp.
- The Fortieth Anniversary of the December 13 Fighting, 1918-58.* Bucharest, Inst. de istorie a partidului de pe linga CC al PMR, 1958, 144 pp.
- Social Democracy in an Impasse.* Paris, 1959, 208 pp. ("Recherches internationales", No. 11.)
- G. Tsonkov. *The General and the Specific in Socialist Revolution.* Sofia, the Bulgarian Communist Party Publishing House, 1959, 176 pp.
- V. Chkhikvadze and S. Zivs. *Against Present-Day Reformism and Revisionism on the State.* Moscow, Gospolitizdat, 1959, 167 pp.

3
a
.
8

o-
n-
.
ty
s-

Editions of the Journal

"PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM"



EDITIONS IN ENGLISH
(World Marxist Review):
Central Books Ltd.,
37 Grays Inn Road,
London, W.C. 1., England

Progress Books,
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 rozšírování tisku,
Praha 6, Sadova 3
Czechoslovakia

CHINESE EDITION:
Guozi 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,
Vorosmartyer 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.

