

Workers of All Countries, Unite!

World Marxist Review

July 1960
Volume 3, No. 7
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

The Communists Are Stepping Up the Struggle for Peace	3
N. INOZEMTSEV: U.S. Foreign Policy: Trends and Perspectives	10
E. VERCELLINO: The Policy of Broad Alliances	18
F. FUERNBERG: Nationalization under Capitalism — Attitude of the Communists	25
J. LINDSAY: Lenin and Humanism	33
V. RUMIL: Ideology and Science	36

PAGES FROM HISTORY

M. THOREZ: The Seventh Congress of the Communist International	43
--	----

IN THE COMMUNIST AND WORKERS' PARTIES

The People of South Korea Will Fight to the End	51
H. OSTLER: National Conference of the Communist Party of New Zealand	53
F. NAUMANN, A. PETERSHEIM: "Jugendweihe"	54
F. MARGULIES: Automation and the Working Class	56
SHORT NOTICES	57
IMPORTANT DATES	59

EXCHANGE OF VIEWS

K. OSTROVITYANOV: How the State Makes Use of Economic Laws in Building Communism	61
F. STRANSKY: Economic Co-operation Between the Socialist Countries — a New Function of the Socialist State	64
SUNG E-FANG: The Role of the State of Dictatorship of the Proletariat in Changing the Production Relations	68
S. KUZINSKI: The Socialist State and the International Division of Labor	71
O. BOGOMOLOV: Background to the Co-ordination of the Economic Plans of the Socialist Countries	73
M. POHORILLE: Some Aspects of the Working of Democratic Centralism	76
L. RACHMUTH: The Basic Difference Between the Economic Role of the Socialist and the Capitalist State	78

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESSES AND CONFERENCES

K. BRUTENTS: A Forum of People's Solidarity	82
---	----

COMMUNICATIONS AND COMMENT

J. GARTNER: Injured Innocence	88
Against the Persecution of Democrats	
J. RAMIREZ: Lives of Political Prisoners in Danger!	91
Statement by the Eleventh Session of the General Council of the WFTU	92

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

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

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

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

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

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Theoretical Framework	5
3. Methodology	15
4. Data Collection	25
5. Results	35
6. Discussion	45
7. Conclusion	55
8. References	65
9. Appendix	75
10. Glossary	85
11. Index	95

The Communists Are Stepping Up The Struggle for Peace

(From Statements Issued by the Communist Parties)

BY torpedoing the Summit conference the aggressive militarist circles calculated, no doubt, to sow confusion in the ranks of the peace fighters. And the public was, indeed, disappointed and distressed by the Summit failure. But the peace supporters, full of faith in victory and in their cause, are more resolved than ever to bar the way to war.

After the collapse of the Summit, the Communist parties issued statements in which the international situation is assessed, the prospects of the fight for peace are examined and the tasks of the struggle outlined. These important documents testify to the cohesion and unity of the communist movement and show that the Communists are confident, as before, that peaceful co-existence is possible and are fully determined to bring the masses into action for peace and against imperialist reaction. Below we print excerpts from the statements issued by some of the Communist parties in the capitalist countries.

Bankruptcy of the Cold War Policy

The statement released by the National Secretariat of the Communist Party of the USA shows the bankruptcy of the cold war policy of the United States, a policy which threatens world peace.

For the first time since the cold war began 14 years ago, the statement said, its advocates, under pressure from the American people, had to take the defensive. There is universal criticism of a policy that led to the U-2 fiasco and brought the prestige of the United States to the lowest point in recent history. This policy exposed the President to ridicule and discredited the government in the eyes of the American people.

Responsibility for the summit failure, the statement continues, rests on the United States. On the pretext of national defense, the U.S. government claims the unilateral right to fly at will over the air space of any nation. On a similar pretext the United States

threatened war over Quemoy and Matsu, invaded Lebanon, stationed one million soldiers in 70 lands, encircled the world with 250 bases, overthrew the democratic government of Guatemala, now threatens to intervene in Cuba, and expended more than 40,000 American lives in a colonial war that killed one million Koreans to place in power its puppet tyrant Syngman Rhee who has now been ousted by a wrathful people.

The new "open-sky" doctrine comes perilously close to the lunacy of preventive war. This is the resumption of brinkmanship, at a more dangerous level than practised even by John Foster Dulles. These are the real reasons for the summit collapse. This collapse was not caused by the firm rebuff of Khrushchov who spoke with passion on behalf of an indignant country which had never been bulldozed, even by Hitler, and which will negotiate only in conditions of equality, without being threatened from positions of strength.

"The lesson to be drawn is that there can be no acceptable alternative to a firm foreign policy of peaceful coexistence. Cold war, in whatever shape or form, can provide no safe or dependable policy for the United States in the world of today." The longer it continues, the greater will be the danger to the security of the United States and even to its existence as a nation. National unity based on the bankrupt cold war policy is built on shifting sands and is, therefore, merely a fraud, a falsification. "Instead of a bipartisan cold war policy, our country needs a long-term peace policy that will be the basic guide of the government, no matter what Administration is in power."

Another important lesson to be drawn concerns the deplorable state to which the cold war has led democracy in the United States. "The Administration's fumbling and double-dealing on the U-2 spy flights has opened the eyes of many Americans to the almost autonomous power of the military, the CIA, and other semi-military agencies in

the government. The principle of civilian supremacy over the military, central to our tradition and form of government, is violated shamelessly — at a time when one mishap in the military sphere can unleash a dreadful war."

Instead of complaining about "closed societies" in other countries, the U.S. officials should look into the situation at Washington, where on the pretext of military necessity vital executive agencies are shut off by the dozen even from the gaze of Congress. The lords of Big Business, the top military brass, the bipartisan advocates of the cold war and the arms race are crippling democracy, undermining the republican form of government, and corrupting the morality of the country.

The cold-war advocates try to justify the arms race and provocative "open-sky" spying, whether by plane or satellite, on the ground that these are necessary to guard against a surprise attack. If this were true, why is the Soviet Union, admittedly superior in rockets and missiles, urging the abolition and destruction of these weapons by mutual agreement? How does it come about that the Soviet Union has always maintained the initiative in defending peace, as is generally recognized? Do Soviet planes invade our air space to pinpoint strategic and industrial targets for attack?

"The truth of the matter is that there is not a single individual, class or group in the Soviet Union or in any socialist country that can profit from war. For them armaments are a burden, using up valuable resources and skills that otherwise would be devoted to the vast development program of building communist society . . .

"The American people earnestly and eagerly looked forward to the Summit, with the fond hope that it would open at least a long period of relaxing tensions, and liberate them from the constant dread of nuclear corrosion and destruction. Now they confront a situation in which, as the President himself has said, an Administration that stands in the way of peace must be shoved aside by the people."

Every effort should be made to create an atmosphere favorable for the resumption of negotiations — at all levels — on peace and disarmament.

This can be done provided the people are vigilant and thrust aside the old McCarthyite

assertions about "treason," "softness to communism" and the red bogeys which are now used against those who criticize the official policy and demand that serious efforts be made for securing peace.

The people will have to be alert to the efforts of the Democratic Party leaders to make political hay out of the failures of the Eisenhower-Nixon Administration, without at the same time making definite and clear-cut commitments on a peace policy. The people remember that the Democratic top command participated in the bipartisan support of the cold war and the arms race, and even outdid the Republicans in demanding more arms.

"A mere change in Administration will mean nothing, unless the new President is committed by the utmost pressure of the people to follow through on a peace policy, without subterfuge. He will need a new strong and firm peace contingent in both Houses, similarly committed. All the people's strength must be mustered to defeat cold-war candidates and to elect honest advocates of peace, democracy and the people's needs."

These aims, the statement went on, can be achieved only by resolute efforts and action of the people in the course of which their voice in favor of peace would be heard. New marches, meetings, petitions and other actions for the banning of nuclear testing, for complete disarmament, honest negotiations and a new summit — only such mass action can bring positive results.

"During this crisis," the statement concluded, "the Communist Party has spoken out with the clearest voice in the land, rallying labor and the people, Negro and white, to the cause of peace, and has placed this sacred cause at the center of all its endeavors. Once more, we have shown that we have no interests separate from those of the American working people as a whole. Confident that the struggle for peace can be won, if labor and the people impose their united will upon the leaders of our country, our Party will work tirelessly and with self-sacrificing devotion toward this end."

Peaceful Coexistence Is Won by Mass Action

All the documents put out by the Communist parties concerning the Summit breakdown express confidence that the U.S. imperialists are powerless to halt the relaxation of tension which is a result of objective de-

velopment. But peaceful coexistence does not come by itself, it has to be fought for, and this fight will be successful provided the masses take part in it. This was stressed at a Central Committee meeting of the *French Communist Party*.

"Had the French and British leaders," the meeting said, "openly condemned the reckless and irresponsible policy of the USA marked by flights over the Soviet Union and had they energetically expressed the desire that the Soviet Union be given the necessary guarantees against these flights in future, they would have enabled Eisenhower correctly to understand his duty. Instead, in the guise of maintaining 'Atlantic' solidarity, General de Gaulle backed the American President. As a result, he bears a large measure of responsibility for torpedoing the conference. Thus, it has been demonstrated once again that France's foreign policy remains tied to that of the United States even in those aspects which create a grave threat to peace."

"De Gaulle's lining up with the American leaders in supporting Adenauer and his colleagues who are burning for revenge, the maintenance of U.S. bases on French soil and the scandalous allocation of bases for the West German army — which teems with former Nazis — in Cognac, Istres, Montpellier and Chaumont are fraught with serious danger to France and the cause of peace."

"De Gaulle's talk about the grandeur of the country and the place it should occupy in the world cannot make us forget about the submission of French policy to orders issued by the Atlantic bloc in which the U.S. imperialists dominate."

"The sole way to enable France to play a positive role in the fight for world peace is to give it an independent foreign policy in keeping with the national interests."

"This policy presupposes, of course, friendly relations with all nations, both big and small. It requires, in particular, steady improvement of Franco-Soviet relations, as envisaged in the joint communique issued after Khrushchov's visit to our country."

The Central Committee meeting warned that the reactionaries will try to make the most of the Summit crisis in order to divide the masses and to continue their onslaught on democracy. "The duty of all peace-loving French men and women led by the Socialist and Communist workers, the duty of all de-

mocrats is to rally in the fight for the same aims as in the past:

"To achieve a real relaxation of tension in the relations between countries. This means that an end must be put to provocations and to the violation of international rules and law."

"To take the way of complete and controlled disarmament and, first of all, to achieve the cessation of nuclear tests. This is the sole way to remove the threat of war."

"To eliminate the consequences of the Second World War in Europe and normalize the situation by signing a peace treaty with the two German states; to find a just and reasonable solution to the West Berlin problem, which would protect the interests of the German Democratic Republic."

"To work patiently for a new summit meeting and for a peaceful settlement of problems on which the security of nations and peace depend. These aims hold good for the present and can be realized."

"Far from worsening as a result of the recent events the conditions favoring the peace forces have objectively improved."

But, as Maurice Thorez said at the meeting, peaceful coexistence is won by action of the people. "Peaceful coexistence does not signify relinquishing the class struggle either on a world scale or inside the countries. Are not the relations between the imperialist and socialist camps a higher form of class struggle? The class struggle shows no signs of abating; it is not becoming less tense, persistent or necessary."

"And, similarly, there can be no conciliation between classes in the capitalist countries . . ."

"It would be wrong to think that relaxation of tension is automatically followed by a letup in the class struggle, by a respite in the struggle between the forces of peace and reaction . . ."

"We should be guided by two ideas. The first is that changes in reactionary policy can be brought about only by the active intervention of the masses who are fighting for a détente and peace and for their economic demands, freedom and against monopolies."

"The second idea which arises from the facts, is that the de Gaulle rule is not gaining in strength. The opposite can be asserted only on the basis of an erroneous and superficial analysis which ignores dialectics, seizes upon isolated facts while disregarding the

inter-relationship and the sum-total of all the phenomena. To say that de Gaulle's power is being consolidated means to have no perspective."

The Central Committee reminded the Communists that there was no more important, more urgent task than the fight for peace. It called upon them to work perseveringly and boldly for unity of the democratic forces and to bring these forces into action.

"The demands of the people for peace can overcome all obstacles," so reads the statement issued by the Political Committee of the *British Communist Party*.

Pointing out that Britain is brought into grave danger by the adventurous actions of the United States militarists, the statement calls on the people to work for "an independent British foreign policy in support of peace, end subservience to the U.S., finish with the NATO nuclear strategy, close down the U.S. bases in Britain, renounce the manufacture and use of nuclear weapons."

It is more than ever necessary now, the statement continues, to step up the fight for peace and peaceful negotiations.

John Gollan, General Secretary of the Party, pointed out that a change in Western policy and repudiation of the cold war depend on the strength of the labor movement and the peace movement. "There could be no greater contribution to this," he said, "than an independent British peace policy, breaking with American provocation, nuclear weapons and the cold war — thus clearing the way for Britain to take a stand against American wrecking and for genuine international negotiations."

Relaxation of Tension Will Continue

Adducing factual material to prove that the summit had been wrecked by the action of the enemies of peace over a long period, the leadership of the *Italian Communist Party* stated:

"In view of the irrefutable facts unmasking the U.S. rulers, how shameful and absurd is the campaign aimed at putting the blame at another's door, depicting the violation of Soviet sovereignty as a mere incident and thus persuading the public that it is the Soviet Union which is to blame for the summit failure. To adopt this stand means to pursue a policy of provocations, of subverting peace and preparing a new war, the policy pursued for so many years by the U.S. militarists and their yes-men . . .

"The attempt to take a 'third' way deserves condemnation. This way consists in artificially dividing the rightness and wrongness equally between the imperialist powers and the Soviet Union. Attempts of this kind are tantamount to applying the same yardstick to those who have consistently fought for peace for many years and those who resist the relaxation of international tension . . .

"The fact that the Social Democratic parties of Europe could not at the present moment take a firm stand for peace and unhesitatingly condemn the U.S. imperialists is fresh testimony of their inability to show the working class and the peoples of the West European countries the way to a new international order under which peace would rest on universal respect for the principles of peaceful coexistence. This is one of the chief reasons for the decline of the Social Democratic parties supporting imperialist policy. The same goes for the so-called democratic groups of the 'third force' who in this critical situation are searching for a third way, relinquishing the struggle against the real enemies of the détente.

"The 'third' way which the Italian Socialist leaders seek in face of the facts that wrecked the summit, is a futile way. It conflicts with reality and is not understood by the working people who have a high degree of political consciousness. This stand hinders the rallying of the masses in the fight for peace. He who is anxious to fight for peace need not necessarily adhere to the political camp of the socialist countries. But the genuine fighter for peace should see and expose imperialist provocations; he should keep his head clear and see to it that the people do not become the victims of lies with which the imperialists cover up their provocations. The mistake made by the Socialist leaders in deciding to drop out of the great movement for peace has led today to a position which confuses the working people and weakens their struggle.

"In the present situation, more complicated than before, it is essential to renew with still greater force the propaganda and struggle for a new trend in international politics. Those who over-simplified the situation, holding that the relaxation of tension had come by itself and was an accomplished fact, made a mistake. But equally mistaken are those who thought or think now that as long as imperialism and capitalism exist there can be no question of general acceptance of and respect for the principles of peaceful co-

existence, of creating a new climate in international relations and of making a new war impossible . . .

"The process of lessening international tension has an objective basis. It is engendered by the new correlation of forces in the world, the steady and striking progress made by the socialist countries, the national-liberation movements, the fight for peace in which the people of all lands can unite and co-operate. Some bourgeois leaders too, under pressure from their peoples and in their own interests, have had no choice but that of easing the tension. This factor should not be underestimated. It will acquire an ever-greater significance in future."

Stating that the summit breakdown led to a grave loss of American prestige and sapped the unity of the Western bloc, the statement went on: "The process of relaxation is bound to continue. Our thesis that war can be averted, that the socialist, democratic and other forces must develop and act consistently remains valid."

"A summit meeting continues to be the aim of all people longing for relaxation and peace. But for it to be successful, the right conditions should be created. This means above all that it is necessary to prevent the more aggressive imperialist groups from undertaking new provocations against peace. These groups must be isolated and condemned by public opinion . . .

"Thus, new vistas are opening up before the peace movement, before all the democratic forces and the mass organizations. The working class and its parties must be in the van of these actions. The Communists should call on the masses to express their solidarity with the Soviet Union, People's China and the other socialist countries in the fight against imperialism and for peace. We want the division of the world into opposing blocs to be overcome; but for this it is necessary to achieve success in easing the international tension, and the peaceful coexistence for which the socialist countries are fighting."

Lastly, the statement criticizes the anti-national foreign policy pursued by the Italian ruling circles.

The statement issued by the *Algerian Communist Party* exposes the culprits responsible for the summit breakdown and expresses determination to step up the fight for peace. The document states:

"The wrecking of the conference is, first, the consequence of the policy pursued by the U.S. imperialist leaders who on the eve of the summit sent a spy plane to the Soviet Union for aggressive purposes, sanctioned this provocative act and refused to condemn it, thereby creating an atmosphere of mistrust. In this situation a meeting of the heads of government would be deception of the people striving for peace."

"Second, it is the work of the two Atlantic partners of the United States, especially of de Gaulle who backed Eisenhower calculating to secure in exchange American support for his imperialist war against Algeria. The U.S. aggressive policy facilitates the foreign and democratic policy of the French colonialists."

"The Communist Party is convinced that it expresses the sentiment of the Algerian people when it declares its approval of the firm stand taken by the Soviet Union. Our people refuse to mix up the victim and the bandit, the Soviet Union and those responsible for the summit breakdown, those imperialist circles which ally themselves with the oppressors of our people and also oppress them. The Algerian people see that the gangster methods of the Americans are reminiscent of those used by de Gaulle in the struggle against the Provisional Government of the Algerian Republic: de Gaulle proclaims the right to self-determination but deprives it of all sense and, consequently, makes negotiations impossible."

"The Algerian people, the victim of a colonialist attack, stand today more resolutely than ever before for a détente, for peaceful coexistence and universal disarmament. They will work to attain these aims together with the world peace forces, continuing at the same time the struggle for their liberation."

A resolution adopted by the Secretariat of the National Council of the *Communist Party of India* expresses confidence that the people's struggle against imperialism and the cold war will soon make possible the holding of a new summit conference, this time with the active co-operation of the leading Asian and African states whose assistance can be of great significance for ensuring agreement and combating any other imperialist attempts to sabotage. The Communist Party appeals to all sections of Indian public opinion to join hands at this crucial time to work tirelessly for complete and general disarmament,

for the closing down of foreign military bases and renunciation of military pacts, for national independence for all peoples and for overcoming all obstacles in the way of a new summit with Afro-Asian participation and co-operation.

The Communist Party approves the foreign policy of peace pursued by the USSR, the policy which unites and cements all progressive forces, and hails the new Soviet disarmament proposals, proposals which have improved an international climate darkened by the summit failure. The Soviet proposals are a bold and courageous effort to meet halfway the suggestions and criticism of the Western powers; they have met with the support of peace-loving people everywhere.

These proposals are all the more timely and commendable since they come on the heels of the various provocative actions and statements of U.S. government leaders headed by President Eisenhower, Vice-President Nixon and Secretary of State Herter.

Sharpen the Vigilance of the People

Noting the activization of the militarist forces in connection with the summit failure, many Communist parties stressed the need for greater vigilance by the people. It was pointed out that vigilance is enhanced not by appeals but when the masses are drawn into the struggle against the enemies of peace.

A meeting of representatives of the Communist parties of Sweden, Norway, Finland and Denmark, held on May 28-29, put forward a program of action for these parties.

"The exposure of methods practised by the American militarists has deepened the crisis in NATO. Now more obvious than ever before is the danger involved for small countries like Denmark and Norway in being members of this bloc.

"The struggle for an international détente cannot be halted by the provocations of the American militarists. The struggle of the peoples and of the peace-loving governments for banning nuclear weapons, for disarmament and a new summit conference continues with ever-increasing force. The Nordic countries, too, are taking their place in the fight for peace. These countries are particularly alarmed at the rapid resurgence of West German militarism. . . .

"True, the small Nordic countries cannot determine world politics. But they can make an effective contribution to the lessening of tensions and to peaceful co-operation." These

countries have everything necessary for creating a neutral zone of disengagement in this part of Europe. "Such a zone would substantially reduce friction between the blocs of the Great Powers and could lead to a far-reaching neutralization of Europe in the future."

Exposing the intrigues of the military circles, the Central Committee of the *Communist Party of the Netherlands* called on the peace-loving and democratic people of Holland to step up the fight for peace. It was pointed out that the substitution of philosophizing and theorizing for concrete action plays into the hands of the warmongers, because the masses learn to distinguish the enemies of peace from the friends of peace only in the struggle for definite aims. We should work for the formation of a government that would declare that it will not wage war either for West Berlin or Western Irian, or anything else, and that Holland will leave the camp of war. Such a government would repudiate atomic armaments, station its armed forces only in its own country, refuse to allow foreign troops to be quartered on its territory, close down the U.S. atomic bases in Soesterberg and introduce a genuinely democratic regime which would enable the people to express their will for peace.

By indulging in talk about peace the imperialists seek to blunt the vigilance of the people and lull them in order to deliver a surprise blow. "Striving to carry out their plans the imperialists resort to the help of revisionists (with their center in Yugoslavia). They also count on the softness and inconsistency of individual Communists who are inclined at times to relinquish the struggle against imperialism. This, clearly, is a grave danger. . . .

"The danger of war is ever present. The less we are prepared the greater the danger of war, especially if we are not prepared politically and ideologically, and if the Communist parties and champions of peace do not engage in daily and uncompromising work among the masses to prevent war. We should fearlessly tear the hypocritical mask off the imperialists."

The Executive Committee of the *Communist Party of Argentina* pointed out in its appeal entitled "We must be vigilant in face of U.S. aggressive policy," that the people have no greater concern than that of maintaining and strengthening peace. U.S. imperialism, it said, uses the territory of other countries for

aggressive purposes. "These facts should make our people more watchful because the North American imperialists have set up bases in our country, too. Everybody knows that they have a base for U-2 planes in Ezeiza which, in the guise of 'meteorological research,' have been sent to our country as part of the 'Crow Flight' unit. This is the unit to which the U-2 plane shot down over Soviet territory belonged.

"It is also known that the U.S. imperialists . . . are gradually laying their hands on the best land along the bank of the River Parana where they are building ports and airfields, as well as on land near the border with Chile, Bolivia and Brazil, and are now penetrating into Argentine Patagonia. . . .

"This is the fruit of the foreign policy of the Frondizi government which, increasingly, is yielding to the demands of U.S. imperialists. Unless this policy is changed in good time it will lead to our country being brought into the camp of war headed by the USA. The Argentine people should not permit this because in the event that the militarists in Wall-Street, in the Pentagon and in the White House achieve their aim of turning the cold war into a "hot" war, our territory will automatically become the object of retaliatory blows."

The appeal ends with the following demands:

"Immediately close the air base in Ezeiza

as well as the other U.S. bases, both known and secret, on our territory.

"Stop the sale or lease of land to the U.S. monopolies or the monopolies of other countries, such as Coney, King Ranch, Standard Oil and others, especially land in the border regions. . . .

"Take Argentina out of the Organization of American States and annul the pacts and agreements signed in Bogota, Rio de Janeiro, Caracas, as well as the South Atlantic Pact and other agreements imposed by U.S. imperialism and which have clearly-stamped reactionary and aggressive aims.

"Support any initiative, both inside and outside UNO, aimed at terminating nuclear tests, destroying the stockpiles of atomic and thermo-nuclear weapons and carrying out complete and general disarmament.

"Develop diplomatic and commercial relations with all countries without exception, particularly with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries; recognize the Chinese People's Republic and the other socialist countries."

The political line of the Communist parties is clear and definite. In international questions, it is the fight for peace, rallying the masses against the intrigues of the imperialist warmongers. The Communists are continuing the campaign for disarmament and are working for the unity of all the democratic forces in order to make war impossible for all time.

U.S. Foreign Policy: Trends and Perspectives

N. Inozemtsev

Chance or Deliberate Policy?

THE eventful months of the recent period have seen a sharp struggle in the international arena.

wp

N. S. Khrushchov's visit to the United States a relatively short time back (September) resulted in considerably improved relations between the Soviet Union and the United States, the two powers heading the two differing state systems — the socialist and the capitalist. And the Soviet Premier's subsequent visits to India, Indonesia, Burma, Afghanistan and France were also fruitful for the cause of peace. Other things, too, were helping to reduce tension. Some progress, for example, was made at the Geneva talks on ending nuclear tests. These events were regarded by the world public as paving the way to the Summit on which the people's hopes were pinned.

Then came May, the month of the Summit. And on May 1, a day which has long been celebrated as the day of international proletarian solidarity and the festival of spring and peace, the U.S. imperialists sent an espionage aircraft over the Soviet Union; this spy plane penetrated 2,000 kilometers into Soviet territory and was brought down by a rocket. Thus an act of flagrant provocation was committed by the U.S. brass which gravely complicated the pre-Summit situation. The treachery and recklessness of the U.S. ruling circles were manifested also when the question arose of how this act should be defined and who should be held responsible for the gross violation of international law. Instead of apologizing in accordance with customary diplomatic practice, the President, the Secretary of State and other high-ranking officials declared cynically that spy flights over Soviet territory were the avowed policy of the U.S. government and would continue to be so. The Paris conference was thus torpedoed by the U.S. imperialists. This was followed in the leading country of the capitalist world by an outbreak of war hysteria and a campaign for bigger military allocations. The imperialist

propaganda, naturally, tried to shift the blame for wrecking the Summit onto the Soviet Union and to fan anti-communist psychosis.

This about turn in international affairs came as a surprise to many people in the West who, although not adepts at politics, sincerely desire peace. What had happened, they asked, in perplexity. How to reconcile recent developments with the numerous statements made by Eisenhower and other leaders responsible for the foreign policy of the Republican Administration who had said that all their thoughts were centered on ensuring the security of nations? Why was it that only a few months ago the U.S. Government had considered it expedient to extend an invitation to the Soviet Prime Minister and solemnly to declare that it wanted all outstanding issues to be settled by peaceful means? Yet in May it sabotaged the Summit and was now seizing on every occasion to aggravate relations and charge the international atmosphere. These questions are being asked far and wide, and the answer to them will furnish the reply to the most important question of all: what turn will developments take and what are the prospects for peace?

Only a scientific Marxist analysis of the fundamental processes in international life, an analysis that takes into account the class essence of U.S. foreign policy, can provide the correct reply.

All policy, pointed out V. I. Lenin, concerns the sphere of the relations between classes. And this holds good for foreign policy. Foreign policy is inseparable from domestic policy and, in the final analysis, is the concentrated expression of economics. U.S. foreign policy is determined by the economic interests of the ruling class — the monopoly bourgeoisie. And from this stems the reactionary and aggressive nature of this policy which aims at establishing the world domination of the American monopolies.

But the political struggle now being waged by the class forces in the country exerts an influence on the imperialist aggressive policy of the U.S. rulers. Nowadays the monopoly

bourgeoisie is frequently obliged to reckon with *the greater influence exerted by the masses*; this is a feature of our times. A report on "Ideology and Foreign Policy," prepared by the Harvard University International Research Center for the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee states that foreign relations in all countries are becoming increasingly interwoven with domestic policy. They have ceased to be the exclusive privilege of a small élite with a free hand to determine, apply and change the policy. More than ever before, says this report, foreign policy has to reckon with the hopes and the fears of the people.

Foreign policy, then, relates to the sphere of relations not only between the classes in this or that country, but also between countries and, in our days, between the two different socio-political systems. Like any other country the United States exists within a system of states. Hence, whether they want to or not, its rulers have to take into consideration both the alignment of forces in the capitalist world and the balance of power between the two world systems — the socialist and imperialist.

If this simple truth is disregarded, and if statesmen lose all sense of reality, this can only lead to a widening gap between the aims of foreign policy and the realization of these aims, between "the policy of design" and that of "action." That is exactly what happened with the notorious U.S. "from positions of strength" policy.

Crisis of the "Policy of Strength"

The main line of U.S. foreign policy in the postwar period pursued two closely allied objectives. The first was to buttress the capitalist system whose positions had been shaken by the defeat of fascism. This objective shaped the policy of spearheading the struggle against the Soviet Union and the forces of socialism, the national-liberation movement in the colonial and dependent countries, and the democratic movement in the capitalist countries including the United States. The second objective was to establish the domination of American monopoly capital in a capitalist world weakened by war. The United States should take upon itself the responsibility of the biggest shareholder in the corporation known as "the globe," was the way in which Welch of the powerful Standard Oil of New Jersey Corporation outlined these tasks. And, said Senator Vandenberg: "America must . . . be the world's . . . leadership — or the world won't have any."

Throughout the postwar years the "positions of strength" policy has been Washington's favorite foreign policy line. The U.S. rulers counted on "building up strength," primarily military strength, which would enable them, by means of "brinkmanship" and, under given circumstances, even by going to war, to achieve world hegemony.

The U.S. monopoly bourgeoisie, as the facts show, made grave miscalculations, both in posing the major aims of its foreign policy and in determining the methods by which these aims were to be achieved: they grossly overestimated their own strength and underrated that of the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies; they failed to grasp the potentialities of the national-liberation movement; and they refused to see the essence of the deep-going antagonisms between the United States and the other imperialist countries.

The "policy of strength" is spearheaded first and foremost against the Soviet Union, China and the other socialist countries. First "containment" and, later, "the rolling back of communism" were elaborated for specific application against these countries and were supported by war doctrines, of which the chief, "massive retaliation," envisaged a nuclear war against the socialist countries. *Anti-communism and struggle against the socialist states, comprised the main content of the "policy of strength."* And it was precisely here, in achieving its chief aim, that this policy met with its greatest fiasco.

In the first place it was a bankrupt policy from the *military standpoint*. The U.S. rulers proceeded from the assumption that American imperialism had three important advantages: a) a monopoly of atomic weapons — which the Pentagon strategy believed to be the "ultimate weapon"; b) a monopoly of the means of delivery — long-range bombers and a large number of aircraft carriers; c) "the invulnerability of the United States," which implied its remoteness from the possible major theatres of war and its highly ramified network of military bases on foreign territories.

But the Soviet Union quickly caught up with the United States in the production of atomic weapons, and was the first to make the H-bomb. As concerns the means of delivery, the USSR, having concentrated on rocketry, has left the United States far behind in this highly important field. The "traditional" American means of warfare — the Air Force and the Navy — lost their former significance, as did their military bases, and

the problem of ensuring the security of the United States had to be posed anew. U.S. invulnerability had become a thing of the past.

The launching of the first Soviet Sputniks by means of inter-continental ballistic missiles was regarded by a number of influential bourgeois politicians as a disaster for the American imperialists. As Chester Bowles, U.S. diplomatist, has written: "October 5, 1957, will be remembered in history. On that day* the Soviet Union, a country which most Westerners had dismissed as industrially and scientifically backward, shot an earth satellite the weight of a good-sized man into outer space . . . Before October 5 almost no one had questioned America's industrial, military and scientific superiority. Then suddenly there was a Sputnik, ringing the earth, and millions began to ask whether communism was not the winning side after all."

The Sputniks were followed by the Sun satellite, the rocket to the Moon and the spaceship. The Soviet Union's technological and scientific achievements were a solar plexus blow to the U.S. military, political and strategic system. "Massive retaliation" now made nonsense, and the plans to "contain" and "roll back" communism by means of war were obviously at odds with American imperialism's possibilities.

From the economic standpoint, too, the "positions of strength" policy proved ineffective. The United States proceeded from the premise that it would always enjoy considerable economic superiority over the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, and that this superiority would become overwhelming as a result of the economic blockade of the socialist countries and of their being forced to engage in a costly arms race.

By utilizing the advantages of socialism, however, the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies made a big leap forward in the economic field. Between 1952-1958 alone the average annual rate of growth of industrial output in the USSR was 11.4 per cent against 1.6 per cent in the United States. Late in the 'fifties the Soviet Union and the socialist system as a whole had reached a level of economic advance which made it possible to pose the question of outstripping the capitalist countries in world production, of surpassing the most advanced capitalist countries in productivity of labor and output per capita and of attaining the highest standard of living.

The decisions of the 21st Congress of the CPSU marked the beginning of a decisive stage in the economic competition between socialism and capitalism, a competition in which all the advantages, as it turned out, were on the side of the socialist world.

The ideological position, also, suffered not a little from the policy of strength. Anti-communism, upon which modern imperialist ideology and propaganda were built, had failed to yield the desired results.

More and more people are beginning to realize that platitudes about "moral leadership," the "security of the free world," and "the American way of life" conceal the reactionary and aggressive designs of the U.S. monopolies who are bent on exploiting not only Americans but all people. The greater the economic, political, scientific and technical successes won by the Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic and other socialist countries, the more effective were the results of their peace policy and the greater the attraction of socialist ideas. "... We delude ourselves," said Walter Lippmann, "if we do not realize that the main power of the Communist States lies not in their clandestine activity but in the force of their example, in the visible demonstration of what the Soviet Union has achieved in forty years, of what Red China has achieved in about ten years."

Such factors as the rapid growth of the national-liberation movement, the relatively lesser weight of the United States in the capitalist world and the imperialists' miscalculations in assessing the sentiments of the American people have deepened the "policy of strength" crisis.

The U.S. imperialists believed they could shore up the tottering edifice of colonialism and preserve the colonial periphery of the capitalist system. They believed they could prevent the peoples of the East from winning national independence, and could fill what they termed the "power vacuum" in the areas formerly dominated by the fascist states, or in the disintegrating British and French colonial empires.

But things did not work that way. None of the direct military adventures (and there have been a number since the war) in which the American colonialists engaged, has met with success. Nor have such forms of neo-colonialism as "economic aid," or the establishment of military blocs with the participation of Eastern countries, yielded the desired results. Most of the countries in South-East Asia, the Middle East and Africa have become inde-

*Actually the first Soviet Sputnik was launched on October 4, 1957.—Ed.

pendent. From being the object of imperialist policy some of these countries have become important independent factors in international life. Although remaining within the capitalist system, they oppose imperialism and, together with the socialist countries, are part of the *broad peace zone*.

American policy in Asia, said Professor H. Morgenthau, an American foreign affairs expert, has failed in all respects. "We set out to build a system of military alliances against the Soviet threat — and succeeded only in arousing opposition . . . in the very countries we hoped to include in these alliances," wrote C. Campbell, another expert on U.S. policy in the Middle East.

Neither did the growing uneven development of capitalism or the sharpening antagonisms in the imperialist camp facilitate the foreign policy aims of American imperialism. If we trace back the dynamics of the changes in the relation of forces in this camp, it will become apparent that the United States is no longer playing quite so prominent a role in capitalist economy; its share, which in the early postwar years comprised three-fifths of the total volume of the industrial output of the capitalist world, had fallen by the late 'fifties to less than half.

In the early postwar years the U.S. monopoly bourgeoisie dictated its policy to most of the other capitalist countries, including the "Marshallized" countries in Western Europe. By the end of the 'fifties the position had changed, although the United States continues to remain the leader of world imperialism. West European powers such as Britain and France, have re-established their positions, while the Federal Republic of Germany has not only made good the wartime devastation, but now ranks second in the capitalist world for industrial output.

Since the war, there has been a growing tendency towards an alliance of the imperialists of all countries headed by the finance oligarchy of the United States. This tendency has found expression in the military and political blocs such as NATO, SEATO and CENTO and is manifest in the fact that an imperialist camp, as such, has been formed. But at the same time another tendency has been operating, intensifying the antagonisms between the imperialist powers; it stems from the fact that the monopolists of the various countries pursue different economic interests. Powerful centrifugal forces are operating in the international imperialist alliance and sapping its very foundations.

When the U.S. imperialists proclaimed their "policy of strength," they did not doubt that they would build a reliable hinterland in the country. And with this aim in view they took a number of measures ranging from the anti-labor Taft-Hartley Act to the shameful thought-control laws, from the fanning of anti-communist hysteria to the setting up of a ramified system of political persecution of which McCarthyism was the embodiment.

But here, too, the U.S. rulers failed to achieve their purpose. In recent times imperialist foreign policy is being more and more criticized by broad sections of the American public. The cold war and the arms race, the disastrous economic and political consequences of the foreign policy gambles have given rise to growing dissatisfaction, and the idea of resolving outstanding international issues peacefully is gaining ground.

Businessmen like Cyrus Eaton, a leading member of the Cleveland finance group, the banker Warburg and Senator Humphrey have begun to speak out against a policy that is paving the way to another world war. Their attitude is exemplified in Cyrus Eaton's words to the effect that he doubted whether there was another man in the world more devoted to capitalism and democracy (naturally, he means bourgeoisie democracy — N.I.) than he was, but he believed the most certain way of destroying those two institutions was by America's going to war with Russia.

The campaign to end nuclear weapons tests has gained momentum in the United States and there is a growing desire for more East-West trade, and scientific and cultural co-operation.

This sentiment of the masses has had repercussions on what is usually regarded as an ordinary event in U.S. political life — the mid-term elections of 1958, at which the more aggressive and reactionary politicians of the Knowland type, who for a long time had been setting the tone in Congress, were defeated.

All this goes to show that by the late 'fifties the operation of a series of internal and external factors had created a situation indicative of the crisis of the "positions of strength" policy. The objective situation, the wave of demands for a change in policy, and the spread of the peace movement in all parts of the world forced the ruling circles of the USA on the defensive, in face of the socialist countries' powerful peace offensive.

Successes and Difficulties of Peaceful Coexistence

The "agonizing re-appraisal" which began under pressure brought to bear by the masses and the international situation found expression in some spokesmen of the ruling class beginning to appreciate the need for a foreign policy that would accord with the basic imperialist aims of the United States and at the same time take a realistic account of the balance of forces in the world.

Khrushchov's visit helped to create a climate in the relations between the USSR and the USA conducive to greater business co-operation. In November 1959 the U.N. General Assembly adopted a joint Soviet-American draft resolution on general and complete disarmament in which the other nations joined as co-sponsors. A U.N. resolution on the utilization of outer space was approved and an agreement was concluded for the utilization of the Antarctic for peaceful purposes. Negotiations were completed for scientific, technical and cultural exchanges between the Soviet Union and the USA during 1960-1961. In this situation the more far-sighted U.S. politicians were compelled to recognize the necessity for the peaceful coexistence of countries with differing social systems.

Do these facts imply that American imperialism and its policy have changed? Is it that "economic humanism," as Henry Cabot Lodge affirms, has really triumphed as a system in the United States? Or is it, as American revisionists from Browder to Gates have declared, that U.S. capitalism, by virtue of its "exceptionalism," has been so "transformed" that it has become "peace-loving" and "democratic"? Of course not!

Because in the late 'fifties some changes occurred in the United States' attitude to certain international problems, this does not mean that American imperialism has changed its spots and has ceased to be imperialism. It has not become any more peace-loving, nor has there been any change in its attitude towards socialism as a system. U.S. foreign policy has throughout preserved its imperialist nature.

What has changed is not the nature of American imperialism or the basic aims of its foreign policy but the internal and external conditions under which U.S. policy is being implemented. All groups of the monopoly bourgeoisie, all its spokesmen in the Administration, Congress and the bourgeois parties have waged and continue to wage a fierce struggle against socialism and the national-

liberation and democratic movement. But capitalism has ceased to be the all-embracing world system it was, and the internal laws inherent in it can no longer determine the basic trends of social development. Against the forces of war and destruction are now aligned the more powerful forces of peace and construction, and of these the socialist world system is the chief one. Not only is it the mission of socialism to emancipate the working people from the yoke of capital, but, also, to rid mankind of the threat of wars which, in the past, were the concomitant of a society of antagonistic classes.

It should never be forgotten that as long as imperialism exists, the threat of war remains. Numerous representatives of the monopolies belong to the group advocating the "rolling back" of communism at all costs, even if this means resorting to war. Chief among these monopolies are privately-owned war-industry concerns, the big aviation, atomic, rocket and electronic, shipbuilding and oil companies. They seize on every opportunity to swell the war budget, increase war orders, return the world to the iciest times of the cold war. No little part in fanning war hysteria is played by the capitalists and politicians associated with state-owned war enterprises. The share of these enterprises in the U.S. economy is relatively large; late in the 'fifties the fixed capital of the armed forces was valued at 140 billion dollars. Influential military circles are closely linked with the war industry and the merging of the Pentagon brass with the finance oligarchy is an important link in this association.

It was the big monopolists, the reactionary politicians and the military representing the interlaced international finance capital owning war enterprises, who conceived and elaborated such programs as the aggressive Norstadt plan and the reports of the Gaither Committee and the special Rockefeller Foundation group, etc. These circles are endeavoring to present the peaceful efforts of the socialist countries in a wrong light and to scare the American people with the bogey of a "Soviet danger." A number of reports prepared during 1959-60 for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee stress that if the United States wants to survive it must, cost what it may, achieve equality with the "enormous" military potential of the USSR, restore the balance of military force and attain "nuclear stability." This task is placed as the central one in a report on the influence of military technology on strategy and foreign policy. The compilers of the report hold that to assume that a total nuclear war is out of the

question because it would bring enormous destruction to both sides, is to evade replying to the gravest military problem that has ever confronted the United States.

Among those advocating continuation of the "positions of strength" policy is a numerous and highly organized group consisting of leaders of both political parties, of spokesmen from the Right section of Congress and of a fairly large number of high-ranking Administration officials.

The reactionary trade union bosses are violently anti-communist and support the infamous "liberation" policy. They are utterly opposed to improving relations with the Soviet Union or to relaxing tensions, and are not far removed from the ultra Right-wing politicians. At a special conference on foreign policy held under their auspices they called for national unity in the name of the cold war.

Imperialist reaction wants the cold war to continue because it is a source of profits, enables it to suppress the democratic movement at home and to maintain its position as leader of the capitalist world under the slogan of combating the communist "danger," and of the unity of "Western civilization." By fanning up the cold war it hopes to prevent the peoples in the socialist countries from achieving a higher standard of living than under capitalism.

At the same time some of the U.S. bourgeoisie realize that if the imperialists unleash another war, this may well spell their destruction. This section now tends to believe that the U.S. government, proceeding first and foremost from its own interests and those of the capitalist system, should seek to solve international issues by peaceful means. The power of modern weapons, said Henry A. Kissinger in his *Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy* makes nonsense of a general nuclear war as a means of conducting policy, to say nothing, of course, of attacks born of despair. It goes without saying that the somewhat different attitudes taken by the U.S. ruling circles do not affect the class foundations of imperialist policy but concern only the tactics of struggle.

The forced recognition of the bankruptcy of the imperialist "positions of strength" policy on the one hand, and the embarrassment caused by the decisive achievements of the Soviet Union and the socialist countries, on the other; the fact that influential monopoly capital groups want to continue the arms race and at the same time fear the disastrous con-

sequences of another war; the aggravation of antagonisms at home and in the imperialist camp as a whole — these factors account for the contradictory nature of the concrete actions of U.S. foreign policy, for its zigzags and turns.

Recent events have shown that the advocates of the "positions of strength" are again in the saddle. The United States Government has embarked on the path of political gambles, as the shameful torpedoing of the Paris meeting proved.

This fact re-affirms the need for *the greatest vigilance by the peoples and nations fighting for peace*. They must be prepared to give a decisive rebuff to the aggressors, to wage a persistent struggle against the bellicose imperialists. The aggressors should not be left in the slightest doubt that if they attempt to unleash a new war they can expect sure retribution at the front and in the rear. It was with the express purpose of curbing the aggressive forces that the Soviet Government took the decision, should aircraft again violate the air space of the Soviet Union or the socialist countries, to strike at the bases from which they operate. This decision is in keeping with the interests of preserving peace, for it will dampen the ardor of any aggressors who make attempts on the security of the peoples.

What Now?

The advance of socialism, the success of the national-liberation movement and the peace movement have made for considerable progress in the struggle for an international détente. But it would be wrong to assume that the process of easing international tension is a straight line, that there are no zigzags.

The historical path is not as straight as the pavement of the Nevsky Prospect, said the Russian revolutionary Chernyshevsky. And this applies to problems of international relations and foreign policy. In practice the fight for peace, for ending the cold war and for solving outstanding issues by negotiation will have its ups and downs, its successes and failures.

Yet through the fog of numerous events, the conflict of international policies and lines and the contradictory nature of the actions stemming from these policies, the Marxists perceive the general line of development. In our epoch this is the line of the transition from capitalism to socialism. The steady growth of world socialism and the changed

balance of world forces which make possible the peaceful coexistence of states with differing systems and the elimination of war from the life of society — these factors are an objective historical law. *Experience has confirmed the profound truth of the conclusions drawn by the 20th and the 21st Congresses of the CPSU and approved by the international communist movement.*

Is the imperialist camp — first and foremost the United States which heads this camp — in a position to reverse the wheels of history, to impose its foreign policy on the peoples? The answer can only be in the negative. The crisis of the imperialist "from positions of strength" policy has not been evoked by subjective, attendant circumstances, but by objective irreversible factors.

What are the prospects of further changes in the balance of forces between socialism and capitalism? The entire postwar experience shows that this balance is steadily changing to the advantage of socialism, and, what is more, at an ever more rapid rate. In the near future the socialist world system will surpass the capitalist system in a decisive sphere of human activity — material production. The socialist countries are on the threshold of achieving further scientific and technological successes. And this will enhance the influence exerted by socialism on the deep-going processes taking place in capitalist society, and thus consolidate the forces of peace and progress. The material and moral factors on which international security depends will gain in strength.

What are the perspectives of the national-liberation movement and the relations between the United States and the economically underdeveloped countries? The peoples who have won their independence will not want to part with it for the benefit of the U.S. monopolies. The countries which are still colonies will hardly become reconciled to being slaves. Thus there is a sharp struggle ahead between U.S. imperialism, which now is the mainstay of the shameful colonial system, and the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

What will be the position of the United States in the imperialist camp? Uneven development is a law of capitalism and any plans to establish an "American world super-trust" are doomed to failure at the outset. The factors which in the late 'fifties contributed to the lessened role of the United States in the economy and policy of the capitalist world will continue to operate. Many American

bourgeois writers have been obliged to admit this. Ten years ago the United States was the industrial center of the world and the only important source of capital, states a report of the Economic and Industrial Research Corporation. In the 'sixties, it said, it would no longer be the sole, but only one of the several, producing powers; and in contrast to the past ten years, the next decade would see growing competition from both friends and enemies.

What will be the alignment of political forces at home in the United States? The class antagonisms between the monopoly bourgeoisie and the broad sections of the people will undoubtedly become more acute. The dangerous policy of hotting up the cold war has already greatly aggravated class relations in the country and brought new forces into being which are preventing realization of the imperialists' designs. Having wrecked the Summit, the aggressive and reactionary circles are endeavoring to capitalize on this by launching another anti-communist and anti-Soviet campaign. But no longer are their attempts yielding the desired results. What could be done with success in the early 'fifties in view of the imperialist intervention in Korea, or in the mid-'fifties in view of the counter-revolutionary putsch in Hungary, is no longer possible in the early 'sixties. The times have changed!

The cold-war advocates planned a rousing welcome for Eisenhower upon his inglorious return from Paris. In point of fact he was met with the indignation of many Americans whose interests had been set at naught by the Washington Administration. A meeting attended by nearly 18,000 people — the biggest since the war — was held in New York in support of disarmament and the ending of nuclear tests and against the intrigues of the enemies of peace.

Nor did the efforts of the reactionary leaders to prevent a deepening of the split in the ruling circles, and, under the guise of "national unity," to preserve the bipartisan foreign policy, meet with the desired results. The National Committee of the Democratic Party published a statement in which it condemned the Government's position on the spy-plane incident and pointed out that "the foreign policy of the Eisenhower-Nixon Administration is now in shambles." Differences are sharpening in the Republican Party too. As the election campaign gets under way, the differences will become more pronounced and foreign policy will, apparently, be the central issue in this year's elections.

There can be no doubt that the economic and political factors leading to an aggravation of the class struggle in the country will continue to operate with increasing force. The instability of the capitalist economy in the USA, the cyclical crises, the monopolies' offensive against the standard of living and the rights of the working people are bound to evoke the growing resistance of the working masses. According as the aggressive circles try to keep up the tensions, prevent disarmament and the prohibition of thermo-nuclear weapons, the gap between the top imperialists and the people on the major issue — that of war or peace — will widen.

Thus an analysis of the basic trends in international relations shows that increasingly favorable objective conditions for the struggle to eliminate war from the life of society will be created in the future. At the same time the contradictions on questions of foreign policy will grow, among both the ruling classes of the United States and those of other capitalist countries, and in the imperialist camp as a whole, and this too is important for the cause of peace. But objective possibilities, important though they are, cannot, in themselves, remove the threat of war. It is a fact that the classes doomed by history close their eyes to reality. As experience — re-affirmed by recent events — has shown, the imperialists are prepared to embark on any adventure, and even to go to the length of triggering off another war to achieve their reactionary aims. The imperialist rulers of the USA blindly persist in pursuing their aggressive policy. At the hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the spy-plane overflight, the Chairman asked the Secretary of State whether he thought they had learned anything, to which Herter replied, that it was not to have accidents. Was that, asked the Chairman, all that they had learned.

This fact and many others confirm the truth that under present conditions it is vitally important that *the desire for peace* should develop among the majority of the people into *an active will for peace*, into a political struggle to isolate the forces of aggression and reaction. "We know that all the peoples, including the American people, want peace," said N. S. Khrushchov, "but the desire alone for peace is not enough. The desire must be reinforced by vigorous action. It is more important now than ever before to enhance the vigilance of the peoples, to expose the intrigues of the aggressive forces, to see to it that the principles of peaceful coexistence

become the real basis of relations between states with differing social systems."

An active will for peace is the guarantee of success for the progressive forces. Recent events in Japan are an example of this. Decisive action by broad sections of the people who are seeking to frustrate the anti-national plans of the Kishi government — plans which have the sanction of the State Department — have forced the imperialists to call off the President's provocative visit to Japan.

Passivity is a bad ally for the peace movement. Only stubborn struggle by the peoples will direct international developments along the path of peace, and create such conditions for the imperialist bourgeoisie that it will have no way out but to concede to the working people's demands for a *détente*. By utilizing the contradictions among the ruling classes of the capitalist countries, the people can exert such pressure on the bourgeois governments, as will force them to agree to the peaceful coexistence of nations with differing social systems. With these aims in view the Communists are working for a broad and effective peace front, a front which will curb the advocates of cold and "hot" wars.

The Communist Party of the United States holds that one of its main tasks is to achieve national unity around a peace policy which would be the main guide for the government, irrespective of which party is in power. The Communists link up their efforts to defend peace with the struggle to win the social demands of the working people, to improve their standard of living, for the democratization of political life in the capitalist countries. "The fight for peace and the fight for democracy are inseparable," says a statement issued by the National Secretariat of the Communist Party of the USA. "The enemy of both are the same forces which are responsible for the cold war."

The way to peace without armaments and without wars is being paved by the foreign policy of the socialist countries — a policy which embodies the best features of the peoples who are building socialism and communism. This policy combines unshakeable firmness in defending the principles of peaceful coexistence with great flexibility in the methods and the means of waging the struggle for peace. The new Soviet disarmament proposals crystallize the demands of the peace fighters among whom are representatives of all social sections, all peoples and all countries; they take into account the wishes of some Western powers, France for example, on certain aspects of disarmament and international

control. This makes the plan an effective and concrete program for the people in their struggle for the triumph of peaceful coexistence everywhere. Realization of the first stage of the Soviet disarmament program envisaging the prohibition and destruction of all means of delivery of nuclear weapons and the closing of military bases on foreign territories would guarantee peace and make a

surprise attack practically impossible.

The international situation requires that all peoples should be conscious of the responsibility they bear for the destiny of peace. War in our epoch is not inevitable; but neither is peace inevitable. Only the combined efforts of the peace-loving peoples, their persistent and stubborn struggle, can bar the path to war and win world peace.

The Policy of Broad Alliances

Enrico Vercellino

THE proletariat must not regard the other classes and parties as 'one reactionary mass': on the contrary, it must take part in all political and social life, support the progressive classes and parties against the reactionary classes and parties, support every revolutionary movement against the present system, act as the defender of every oppressed nation or race, every persecuted religion, the rights of women, etc."*

The question of unity and broad alliances with the social sections and political forces whose economic and political interests coincide with or are similar to the interests of the working class is given prominence in the Appeal addressed by the 17 Communist Parties of the capitalist countries of Europe to all workers and democrats.

Experience has proved that the broader the non-proletarian masses upon which the working class can rely in the struggle for the national interests, the better it will be able to fulfil its leading role.

Why is it possible to say that the opportunities for forming class alliances are greater than ever? Why is it that these alliances can now be established on a broader scale than in the past? What kind of alliances have we in mind, and what problems do they pose before the Communist parties?

The big leap made by the USSR and the other socialist countries has profoundly changed the balance of forces in the international arena; anti-communism has been rebuffed, a certain easing of the tension has taken place and we are approaching conditions under which war can be banished from

the lives of people forever. Even some monopoly groups and the political circles associated with them have begun to come out in favor of a détente and more trade with the socialist countries. With modern means of warfare being what they are, the question of peaceful coexistence is of vital importance for hundreds of millions. More and more people are becoming aware of their responsibility in working for coexistence and this, undoubtedly, favors the forming of new and broader alliances. The cause of peace, as the wrecking of the summit conference by the American imperialists clearly demonstrated, is opposed by powerful and unscrupulous enemies who are using the détente to screen their aggressive activities and to befog public opinion. In light of this the need for unity acquires a growing importance, and persistent struggle should be waged to put an end to the "positions of strength" policy and to ensure peaceful coexistence.

Important internal factors in the capitalist countries enhance the need for and the possibility of establishing broad alliances.

Let us examine some of these factors.

The Political Struggle Is Widening

At first glance it would seem that the forms of political struggle in the capitalist countries have not changed substantially during the past few decades. Political parties, parliaments, trade unions, co-operatives, etc., function, the people enjoy the franchise and the right to strike. In the main there have been three trends in the bourgeoisie's tactics since the end of the nineteenth century — demagogic promises and concessions made under mass pressure; the appearance of "inter-class"

*V. I. Lenin, *Protest by Russian Social Democrats*.

parties, which makes it easier to influence and divide the working people; and overt and brutal forms of reactionary dictatorship, such as bonapartism and fascism, to which the ruling classes resort in time of danger. Actually, however, the forms of organization and methods of struggle have changed tremendously as a result of the growing class consciousness of the workers and under the impact of the higher forms of democracy in the socialist countries.

Elections, for instance, now play a greater role in political life. Formerly only a small part of the electorate went to the polls. And although at the turn of the century most adult males in Britain, France, Germany and other countries had the vote, not by a long way did all of them exercise this right. Before the First World War women were enfranchised in only two countries. Now most of the adult population in Austria, Italy, West Germany, Belgium, France and other countries* takes part in elections. And despite the fact that the ruling classes often rig the elections, the people are exerting greater pressure on political parties, parliaments and governments.

After the Second World War the bourgeoisie, alarmed by the advance of socialism, began to adapt themselves to the new situation and granted rights which they would never have granted under different circumstances. They had to perfect their methods of influencing the masses. The Church, Catholic parties and associations are adepts at this. In some countries they have formed new trade unions, re-organized the existing unions and mass organizations, enlarged their body of activists and their propaganda network and even study Marxism-Leninism so as to be in a better position to combat it; they engage in propaganda in the home, and in the factory and office.

At the same time the mass media — press, radio, TV, cinema, etc., from which the people cannot escape either at home, at work or during their leisure — have been vastly extended.**

*In Austria 4,350,000 people out of a population of about 7,000,000 went to the polls (1956); in Italy 30 million out of 50 million (1958); in Belgium 5,300,000 out of 9 million (1958); in West Germany 30 million out of some 52 million (1957), etc.

**In Britain, with a population of a little over 50 million, some 50 million copies of newspapers and magazines were being published daily in 1956 (i.e., one per person, including children), and there were more than ten million radio sets (i.e., one per family). In Brazil 1,372 newspapers were being published in 1957; in India—6,600 newspapers and periodicals. In Austria there were 150 newspapers and journals, 89 broadcasting stations, and about 1,790,000 radio sets.

Many bourgeois parties appreciate the need for a more flexible and subtle "mass" policy that would take account of the sentiment of the working people. They have tried to create for themselves a mass basis in order the better to feel the pulse of events and in a timely way to influence the people. This was how the Catholic, Radical and other mass "inter-class" parties, which poll from 30 to 50 per cent of the votes during elections, came into being. Now, directly or indirectly, practically every citizen is influenced by some party or public organization.

The fact that the bourgeoisie have had to extend the sphere of the people's political activity does not imply that the nature of the capitalist state or the character of bourgeois democracy have changed. But participation in political life rouses the masses to action, develops their political consciousness and gives them confidence in their strength. No longer can problems — first and foremost those of war or peace — which the bourgeoisie formerly solved without difficulty behind the people's backs, be solved without a brainwashing of public opinion. Thus, regardless of the will of the ruling class, even contrary to it, processes are taking place which facilitate the activity of the Communist parties.

The Communist parties are concentrating not only on winning over the unorganized, or those with no definite political views, but on winning the organized masses and those influenced by the other parties. Hence the Communist parties should have large numbers of activists and vigorous branches in close and constant contact with all sections of the population.

The Polarization of Forces and Anti-Monopoly Struggle

Only when it aims at rallying the people in the struggle for common interests can the work be really effective. This identity of interests grows under the impact of such an important objective factor as the degree of monopoly concentration.

In West Germany eight trusts and two big state-owned enterprises under monopoly control produce 95 per cent of the iron ore, 70 per cent of the coal and 94 per cent of the steel. In the USA over 50 per cent of the total production and the labor force are concentrated in 500 corporations. In Australia where the monopolists comprise less than one per cent of the population, they own nearly all the basic means of production. The postwar policy of the governments backed by the monopolies was far from being designed to for-

ward the social and democratic regeneration which became the order of the day after the defeat of fascism. And the so-called regulating measures adopted by governments on orders from the monopolies, while somewhat cushioning the manifestations of the economic crises, were, needless to say, powerless to change the essence of the economic cycle or to prevent the disastrous effects of the mad scramble for profits. The "regulating measures" had harmful repercussions so far as the people were concerned, because the burden of the military expenditure and of the support given to the monopolies by the state was foisted onto the workers. Whether business is good or bad, mass unemployment is chronic; a part of the production capacity is always idle.

As things are today it is not only the working class that suffers under the monopolies. The middle sections, the small and middle producers, also suffer. Tens of thousands of owners of small enterprises, squeezed out of business by the monopolies, face ruin. In many capitalist countries agriculture, too, is in a critical state and ruin stares the small and middle farmers in the face; the monopolies have a stranglehold on the handicraftsmen and on the owners of the small independent enterprises, while their greed for profit is bringing distress to what were once prosperous regions.

These processes are causing a further polarization of forces. At one pole we see the monopoly and reactionary forces; at the other, the majority of the people who are becoming more and more conscious of an identity of interests in the struggle against monopoly domination in the political and economic spheres and the monopoly-inspired adventurist foreign policy.

In these factors we see the objective possibilities for broader alliances. The identity of interests and aims of diverse and even essentially different political forces impel them towards united action or temporary co-operation.

When Lenin said that "capitalist society increases the people's need for association, for organization" he set the working class the task of influencing these associations and organizations. And it can now be confidently said that with the concentration of more and more capital in fewer and fewer hands, and with the polarization of forces and the growing political activity of the people, the need for unity has grown tenfold; and the classes, sections and groups opposed to the monopolies are becoming increasingly aware of this.

Social Changes Dictated by Life

The different sections of the people oppressed by the monopolies have many aims and interests in common, and their demands are more far-reaching than in previous years.

Thus the demands to safeguard and regenerate democracy, to strengthen the local government bodies and grant them autonomy, to hold genuinely free elections, to make the press independent of monopoly control, and to secure respect for parliament by the government — these have become matters of urgency in all the capitalist countries of Europe, and not only in Europe. In a number of countries the time is ripe for radical reforms in agriculture which would abolish the big latifundia and drastically restrict landed property; the time has come to nationalize the power and other key industries.

It is vitally important to solve the problems of unemployment, to strengthen the nationalized branches of the economy, to ensure democratic control over the monopolies, including the foreign monopolies, to nationalize the banks or control them; to abolish the food crisis; expand civilian industries, industrialize the backward regions, reduce prices and raise the standard of living, further the co-operative movement and reform public education, etc.

Let us take one of these problems — that of strengthening the municipal enterprises and seeing that they are run in a democratic way. This will illustrate how diverse forces can achieve unity in the struggle for common aims. It is becoming a common practice to place public utilities under municipal control; this has been done in a big way in Britain, Italy and the United States, where city transport, or a considerable part of it, and water, gas and electricity supply are owned by the municipalities.

Not everywhere do the municipal enterprises uphold the interests of the consumers, nor are they everywhere controlled by the people. The monopolies are trying to get their grip on these enterprises, too. But the Communist parties and the other democratic forces often succeed in frustrating their maneuvers and in securing a certain amount of democratic control over them.

In the course of the struggle to place certain monopoly-owned industries or local enterprises under the control of the municipalities, anti-monopoly associations are established which sometimes include all, or nearly all, the inhabitants. In Milan, for instance, the mass movement against the Edison Company's

manipulations of electricity charges embraced the majority of citizens, from workers to middle shopkeepers and medium employers, from handicraftsmen to members of the free professions. They demanded that the generation and distribution of electric power should be under municipal control and called for nationalization of the power monopolies.

Broad alliances of this kind are springing up in the struggle for the municipalization or nationalization of chemical factories whose owners, intent on superprofits, refuse to increase the output of chemical fertilizers, because this would mean that they would have to reduce prices. This is detrimental to the workers, who are threatened with dismissal, to the peasants, who are forced to buy fertilizers at high prices, and to all consumers of staple agricultural products.

Even if the struggle for the nationalization of one or another industry does not meet with success, it nevertheless helps to unite the democratic forces and expose the intrigues of the monopolies. In Canada, for instance, the persistent refusal of the Liberal government, acting in U.S. interests, to nationalize the gas pipe-line resulted in a mass protest movement. And although the pipe-line was not nationalized, the U.S. monopolies failed to get control of it. The defeat suffered by the Liberals at the 1957 elections was, in part, due to their support of the U.S. monopolies in this matter.

Municipalization measures, provided the people fight for them and provided no compromises are made with the oligarchy and trusts, can curb the monopolies and help forward the struggle for far-reaching social changes, the extension of democracy and socialist aims.

There is no doubt that nationalization, municipalization and other anti-monopoly, anti-imperialist and anti-militarist measures are in keeping with the general trend towards socialism. And this poses the question of utilizing economic forms of struggle for the advance of socialism. The policy pursued by the Communists in this respect is similar to the policy pursued by them in defending and extending democracy and in combating the reactionary and fascist methods of bourgeois dictatorships. By supporting nationalization, co-operatives and municipal control of local enterprises, the Communists show that they are for progressive forms of economic management, forms which, without being socialist are a step forward compared with private monopoly rule. These measures can be im-

plemented, safeguarded and developed only through struggle. Thus, both in the political and economic spheres, the Communists are working to get the people to take a more active part in management and politics. This promotes unity among the working people, deepens their class consciousness and develops their ability to take part in public life and prepares them for socialist changes.

The Alliance with the Middle Sections

Democratic reconstruction is in the interests of the entire people — the working class, the poor peasantry, and the so-called middle sections in town and countryside, i.e., the intermediate social groups such as the progressive intellectuals, the small and middle producers in agriculture and industry, the small shopkeepers and handicraftsmen, members of the free professions, etc. In many countries the middle sections comprise a big percentage of the population: 30 per cent, for example, in Australia. In Italy these sections account for about 29 per cent of the national income. The working class seeks an alliance with these sections in order to lead the majority of the people.

The Communist parties believe that the best way to establish such an alliance is to prove by their day-to-day work that they have the answers to the burning questions, that their actions uphold the interests and immediate demands of the broad sections of the people and, hence, of the middle sections. Their activity proves that the Communists can do things which conform to the interests of the masses and which are feasible under capitalism; that they can run local councils and finance bodies, agricultural and producer co-operatives better than others can; that they can draw up and submit practical proposals concerning the management of municipalized and semi-government enterprises, finances and taxes, concerning the national economy and trade, unemployment and social security measures. The Communist parties are working for a foreign policy of peace, they are exposing the cold-war men and their maneuvers, and demanding the abolition of foreign military bases; in a word, they are fighting for easing the tension, and for national independence.

This uphill work, which has won the sympathy of big sections of the people, enables the working class to gain experience in leading political and economic organizations and to give a rebuff to the monopolies. Deeds can convince the most biased people that if today the Communists prove to be good organ-

izers and able, earnest and sincere political leaders, tomorrow they will rise to the occasion in a government of a broad democratic alliance and the day after tomorrow in a socialist society.

Needless to say, to win confidence one must be able to get things done. In some countries the Communists favor the establishment of co-operatives uniting the small and medium peasants for the joint use of agricultural implements. Communist Party members play an important part in running the co-operatives in Mexico. There are some 6,000 co-operatives of this kind in France. Although they realize that under capitalism even progressive co-operatives cannot abolish the exploitation of the working people, the French Communists, nevertheless, support the co-operative movement, especially in the countryside. For, ensuring as they do, better working conditions for the peasants, the co-operatives, in addition — and this is important for the future — help the peasants to become accustomed to the idea of joint farming.

The co-operative movement receives the constant attention of the Italian Communist Party. After discussions on the middle sections (in connection with the Ninth Congress), and after summing up our experience, the members came to the conclusion that in order to combat the arbitrary rule of the monopolies and the government supporting them, the co-operatives should be amalgamated into broad associations which would be better able to nullify the machinations of the monopolies. Similar associations should be set up in industry, trade, building, the social service enterprises, handicraft production, etc.

Not only do these forms of union bring economic and financial benefits to the groups and people concerned, but they rally them in the anti-monopoly struggle, promote the growth of production, deepen class consciousness and enable the small and middle producers to get a better understanding of the effectiveness of the higher forms of economic organization obtaining under socialism. Co-operatives and their associations can be set up and developed now: they are as essential in the period of democratic regeneration as they are in the transition to socialism. These forms of economic organization and actions for socio-economic reforms show the middle sections that there is a way along which they can go together with the working class, convince them that in a socialist state they will be able to develop their initiative and give free rein to their abilities, which is something they cannot do under monopoly domination.

This is evident from the examples of Czechoslovakia, China, the German Democratic Republic and other socialist countries. With a population of over 17 million, the GDR had in 1958 about 250,000 small enterprises employing more than 800,000 handicraftsmen. They are always busy on orders and receive state credits on favorable terms for the purpose of expanding and modernizing their enterprises. The handicraftsmen and their families enjoy the same social security rights as the factory and office workers. All regulations or laws affecting handicraftsmen, shopkeepers or employers are discussed with them beforehand and the views of the chambers of handicraftsmen and the chambers of industry and trade — the organizations representing them — are taken into account.

The example of the socialist countries gives the middle sections a clear perspective and convinces them of the need for an alliance with the working class.

Forms of the Alliances

Alliances are formed, consolidated, developed or renewed (if they were temporary) in action and only in action. The feature of the present alliances is that they are open to sections which were not the traditional allies of the working class; these include non-monopoly capitalists and their political parties or groups. This is understandable, despite the fact that the basic class antagonisms continue to obtain. Often it is a case of partial or temporary alliance and co-operation. These alliances are, or can be, the result of joint action from below or of agreement reached at the top. In the course of the popular struggle these temporary alliances and agreements can gain in strength and become permanent.

In Brazil broad alliances are being formed in the fight to protect the national resources — coffee and oil — from the encroachments of North American capital. In Chile the National Committee for the Protection of Oil Resources from the U.S. monopolies embraces the parties of the Popular Action Front (which includes all the Left parties), the Radical, the Christian-Democratic and the National Popular parties and the United Trade Union Center, students and professional workers. This committee succeeded in getting the oil de-nationalization law annulled. All the democratic parties in Chile opposed the anti-communist law allegedly aimed at "safeguarding democracy," forced its repeal and are now jointly defending the electoral law which the reactionary forces propose to revise in an anti-democratic spirit.

In many capitalist countries municipal councils, on which various political parties are represented, adopted resolutions supporting the Summit conference, demanding prohibition of atomic weapons, disarmament and the establishment of atom-free zones. On these burning issues the majority of the population is united. In Belgium and other European countries working-class action against the disastrous effects of the Common Market was supported by shopkeepers, and small and middle producers.

The struggle against imperialist monopolies, such as the United Fruit Company, which violate labor legislation in Costa Rica, Honduras, Uruguay and other Latin American countries, is uniting political and trade union forces.

In the course of actions in Japan against the new Japan-U.S. "Security Treaty" and the Kishi government's reactionary policy, there has emerged a united national organization—the National Council, and over 2,000 local "united action committees" uniting people from all walks of life and members of various parties and mass organizations. The initiator of this movement was the working class, whose organization and activity have imparted prestige to the movement and helped to bring millions of people including the middle sections and the patriotic-minded sections of the bourgeoisie into it. This movement is educating the masses, enhancing the political consciousness of the people and their readiness to fight for democracy and the well-being of the country.

What conclusion can be drawn from the examples and experiences cited? The main thing is that all Communists and democrats have raised the issues in which the people are interested, waged a joint struggle and found the right solutions. That is how tangible results are achieved, and in their turn these results facilitate switching over to broader agreements and alliances, to better forms of united struggle.

Co-operation with the Catholics

It is not easy to establish contact with the Social Democratic and Catholic masses or the people influenced by other parties or ideological trends. But where these parties are big and influential, they are vulnerable through the masses behind them who are becoming more and more convinced that far-reaching social and political changes are urgently needed, and that the reformist doctrine and policy of their Party leadership run counter to progressive development. Symptomatic

in this respect is the fact that the influence of a number of Social Democratic parties — although they are still mass parties — has been on the wane during recent years; their membership has fallen considerably, they have lost many voters and they are being ousted from government.

Illustrative too are the processes taking place in the Catholic movement and its mass organizations, in the Christian-Democratic and Catholic parties. The persistent efforts of the Catholic Church to adapt itself to the times (and to scientific and technological development), and its contact with the various sections of the population have yielded no small results. But these efforts also make clear that the abstract and irrational theory of Catholicism has had to come down to earth, that it takes cognizance of scientific discoveries and achievements beginning with painless childbirth and ending with the splitting of the atom and space travel; in a word, it now recognizes everything that runs counter to Catholic doctrine, everything that the Church had rejected as long as it could.

At the same time, the Catholic masses cannot fail to see that Marxist theory and socialism which the Church attacks so vehemently are continuing to develop. The ideas of colonialism, anti-communism, the cold war, etc., are, although supported by the Church, suffering defeat after defeat. This is sharpening the antagonisms and, here and there, straining relations between the leadership of the Catholic parties and the rank and file. In view of this, our co-operation and alliance with the Catholic working people will benefit them.

In the report to the 13th Congress of the Communist Party of Belgium, the Central Committee pointed out that in the past few years considerable numbers of the Christian trade unionists had taken part in the actions against unemployment and pit and factory closures. Some of the reforms suggested by the Communists were supported not only by the Socialist Party of Belgium, but by many representatives of the Christian Party, although they had qualms in doing so, because of the pressure exerted by their leaders.

The anti-monopoly economic struggle frequently unites the sections concerned and even develops into a political struggle which influences relations between the parties and the outcome of elections. During the elections to the Autonomous Assembly in Sicily in 1959, the Right-wing Christian Democrats — who maintain connections with the big monopolies — were defeated, while the Left wing, supported by the democratic forces, gained

in strength and began to play a leading role in the regional government. This broad alliance led to a split in the Christian Democratic Party which, though it was only on a regional scale, had political repercussions throughout Italy. It is true that after repeated attempts the reactionary wing of the Christian Democrats in Sicily succeeded, with the help of the central government and the big monopolies, in recapturing the leadership of the regional government, but this in no way detracts from the political importance of the preceding struggle and the correctness of the policy of broad alliances. This shows that this policy should be pursued more resolutely, that efforts should be made to make the alliances stronger and more lasting, to see that they have greater support among the masses.

Significant, too, are the results of the alliance between the democratic forces in Valle d'Aosta, where two Communists and two Socialists are now in the regional government together with members of the Valle d'Aosta Union Party (an influential local Catholic organization), which at the last elections (1959) for the first time refused to enter into an alliance with the Christian Democratic Party. Similar examples could be cited in other countries. All attest to the same thing: that, given a correct approach, not only can partial successes be achieved, but the clerical and conservative groups can be prevented from putting over the corporate-paternalist policy and the policy of partial reforms with the aim of taking the edge off the antagonisms in the Catholic movement. These examples help the working people to see more clearly the irreconcilable nature of the contradictions between the policy pursued by the ruling groups inside the Catholic parties and the economic struggle waged by the Catholic masses.

That is why, without renouncing their ideological concepts, and continuing to combat the exponents of bourgeois theories, reformists, revisionists and leaders of the reactionary-clerical circles, the Communists readily enter into friendly discussion with the Christian Democrats and members of other parties. They take part in joint actions, without hurting religious feelings, and, needless to say, without making any conditions of an ideological or political nature as a prelude to discussion and co-operation. In this way the Communists are convincing the Catholic workers not only that the monopolies and the political forces behind them are their main enemies, but that the socialist system is compatible with their religious convictions and

also that the Catholic masses can, and should, help in building a socialist society. Socialism does not rule out the co-operation of people with differing political and religious views.

The Communist approach to the Catholic masses is only one of the many examples of the way in which Party members patiently seek to draw closer to possible allies.

Experience Inspires Confidence

Opportunism and sectarianism are obstacles to unity and broad alliances. Opportunism and reformism are most frequently expressed in unprincipled adaptation to the situation, to the laws and regulations, to the established procedures in parliaments, municipalities and other institutions of the bourgeois state; in the rejection of struggle; in being prepared for unity with anyone; in being ready to agree with any position; in being ready to make any compromise; in loss of perspective and denial of the leading role of the working class and the Communist Party.

Although opportunism and sectarianism appear to be at opposite ends of the pole, passivity and a wait-and-see attitude are features they both have in common. With its unbelief in the possibility of new and broader alliances, sectarianism paralyzes the will for unity. That is why it is regarded as a serious and, in some Communist parties, as the main obstacle to broad alliances. Sectarianism magnifies the difficulties and underrates the possibilities of struggle in parliament, municipalities, co-operatives, mass organizations, state and municipal enterprises, etc. As far as united action and alliances are concerned, sectarianism fails to distinguish between bourgeois ideology pure and simple and its impact on the working people; between the leaders of other parties and their membership and the working people influenced by these parties.

Overcoming sectarian and opportunist ideas, the Communist parties call on their members to give precedence to everything that unites the working people, to begin their talks with the day-to-day problems agitating the people, and not with the more difficult, say, ideological problems. This does not mean that the Communist parties do not help their allies to arrive at definite political and theoretical conclusions on the basis of the facts, experience and the working people's struggle.

The results of the joint action achieved in different countries show that unity and alliance in the struggle for peace, democracy and socialism have always benefited the allies

and friends of the Communists and have been for the good of the nation. The Communists pledge openly and sincerely to carry out joint actions and they honor these pledges. And that is why alliances have never been regarded as an auxiliary means, they are not trickery and cunning, as the enemies of unity and broad alliances would have us believe. These gentry would like to expose these alliances as a maneuver, as illusory unity. They would also like the matter to remain the subject of theoretical discussion. But they will be disappointed, for the need for unity and broad alliances is firmly recognized by the Communists and it will not remain just in their book of good intentions, the result of theoretical research. Unity and broad alliances are developing, and this is in line with the leading role of the vanguard of the working class. The Communist parties are extending their

contacts with the various sections of the population through greater activity among the workers, strengthening working-class unity, deepening the political consciousness of the working class as the leader of the nationwide struggle.

The monopolies and the political forces supporting them are not taking this quietly. They resort to slander and all other means in the endeavor to split the working class and the people generally. Division is their favorite and most dangerous weapon. And mere calls for unity will not blunt this weapon, what is needed is the iron will for unity, daily and hourly work to rally the masses.

The Communists have accumulated a rich store of instructive experience of joint action and this makes them confident that still greater success will be won in the future.

Nationalization Under Capitalism

— Attitude of the Communists —

Friedl Fuernberg

A Bit of History

STATE-OWNED enterprises have existed for a long time in a number of the capitalist countries of Europe; in some of them they actually date from feudal times. The circumstances under which they came into being have been many and varied. To increase their source of income the feudal lords set up enterprises which, they saw to it, became monopolies under the law. The best known and most widespread were the salt and tobacco monopolies that are still to be found in many countries, having developed from primitive manufactories into large-scale modern enterprises. This specific type of state-owned enterprise has only an indirect bearing on the problem of nationalization in capitalist society with which we shall deal later.

Arsenals, armaments factories, the Post Office, some shipbuilding, mining enterprises and railways are other examples of state ownership that obtained before monopoly capitalism took its present form. Some of these enterprises were purchased from private

owners, while others were built by the government. In some countries, for example, the government built railways because private capitalists were reluctant to make the expenditure this would involve. The government acted as a kind of collective capitalist, financing and building railways which subsequently, directly or indirectly, became a constant source of profit for the capitalists.

The development of monopoly capitalism went hand-in-hand with the gradually increasing intervention of the capitalist state in economic affairs; this intervention was most pronounced during wars and at times of economic crisis. "The objective conditions," wrote V. I. Lenin, "show that the war had accelerated the development of capitalism, which advanced from capitalism to imperialism, from monopoly to coalescence with the state machinery."* Many new state-owned enterprises appeared in the European countries during the First World War and in the

V. I. Lenin, *Report on the Current Situation* delivered at the April Conference of the RSDLP (Bolsheviks) on May 7 (April 24), 1917.

postwar period — power stations, nitrate works and shipyards in Germany, for example. When Hitler was preparing for the Second World War, many iron and steel, aluminum, aircraft and automobile works, as well as synthetic fuel and rubber and other plants were built in the Reich. State-capitalism also appeared in Great Britain. The grid system has been government property since 1926 and the London passenger transport service since 1933. In France the number of government-owned enterprises grew rapidly in the thirties and by the time of the Second World War this country had dozens of enterprises of a state-monopoly nature, including many of the railway companies, a number of the road-transport and shipping companies and several war-industry factories.

At this time the taking over by the state of some branches of the capitalist economy was an emergency measure, planned and carried out to serve the big bourgeoisie and was one in which the working class did not participate.

A Spurious Socialism

When the capitalist State first began to take over industrial enterprises Marxists subjected the process to a thorough examination. As we know, Engels ridiculed the spurious Socialists who described the state-owned enterprises of his day (salt and tobacco monopolies, railways, the Post Office, etc.) as socialist enterprises or rudiments of socialism.*

Nevertheless, already in the early days of the labor movement misunderstanding arose when, deliberate or otherwise, "nationalization" was equated with "socialism." However, before World War I, this did not become a problem for serious discussion nor a bone of contention in the Socialist workers' movement. The situation changed during the First World War when the leaders of most of the

European Socialist parties openly sided with the bourgeoisie of their countries. They now hastened to declare that the intervention of the capitalist state in economic affairs was, "in principle, a socialist measure." "Theories" of this kind were short-lived — like the state regulation measures, they were designed for times of war and were aimed at reconciling the working class to the economic regulations. These "theories" made no impact on the masses inasmuch as the allegedly "socialist" measures of the capitalist state obviously entailed coercion and hardship for the working people.

It was only after the First World War, when a revolutionary situation arose in a number of capitalist countries in Europe, and socialism had become the urgent task of the working class, that for the first time the equating of nationalization with socialism had important political implications. With a view to preventing the working class from taking over state power, the Social Democratic leaders promised in 1918-19 to achieve socialism rapidly and without revolutionary struggle by nationalizing large-scale industry. That, they declared, was the Western, peaceful way to socialism, one which differed radically from the Eastern, revolutionary way.

In Germany the Social Democrats hung out posters proclaiming in huge letters that "Socialization is under way," that nationalization is a decisive step towards socialism. In a book entitled *The Road to Socialism* the Austrian Socialist leader Otto Bauer spoke of nationalization through taxation of capital. A special parliamentary commission was even set up in Austria to study the problem of nationalizing big industry. This ballyhoo was designed merely to mislead the workers. Considerable numbers of the working people believed the Social Democratic leaders when they said that socialism could be achieved through nationalization, without revolutionary struggle. This was because the socialist workers had for years associated the nationalization of big industry with their idea of socialism: Marxism had always called for taking over the means of production.

In point of fact in 1918-19 the socialist leaders had no intention whatever of nationalizing industry to any appreciable extent. And the bourgeoisie had nothing against these leaders promising "socialization." What is more, it wanted to fall back on these promises with the idea of preventing the working class in the industrially advanced European

*". . . of late," wrote Engels in *Anti-Duehring*, "since Bismarck went in for state-ownership of industrial establishments, a kind of spurious socialism has arisen, degenerating now and then, into something of flunkeyism, that without more ado declares all state ownership, even of the Bismarckian sort, to be socialistic. Certainly, if the taking over by the state of the tobacco industry is socialistic, then Napoleon and Metternich must be numbered among the founders of socialism. If the Belgian Government, for quite ordinary political and financial reasons, itself constructed its chief railway lines; if Bismarck, not under any economic compulsion, took over for the state the chief Prussian lines, simply to be the better able to have them in hand in case of war, to bring up the railway employees as voting cattle for the government, and especially to create for himself a new source of income independent of parliamentary votes—this was, in no sense, a socialistic measure, directly or indirectly, consciously or unconsciously. Otherwise the Royal Maritime Company, the Royal porcelain manufacture, and even the regimental tailor of the army would also be socialistic institutions (or even, as was seriously proposed by a sly dog in Frederick William III's reign, the taking over by the state of the brothels).

countries from following the example of the Great October Revolution.

At that time the young Communist parties and the Left groups in the Socialist parties were exposing the class essence of the declarations of the Right-wing Social Democratic leaders to the effect that the way to socialism without proletarian revolution lay through nationalization. They called the working class to revolutionary struggle to overthrow capitalism, believing this to be an essential condition for the nationalization of industry and the building of socialism. Developments have proved they were right.

A New Situation Gives Rise to New Problems

In 1945 when the Second World War ended the question of nationalization again came to the fore in the capitalist countries of Europe. Things had changed considerably since 1918-19, hence the problem took on a different character, one that was new in many respects.

During the Hitler dictatorship German imperialism had in one way or another subordinated most of the European capitalist countries; the movement for national independence in these countries took the form of struggle against the domination of German monopoly capital. In a number of European countries capitalism was threatened with disaster. After the trials and hardships of the war and fascism, the people began to act not only against the German monopolists but also against those who had collaborated with them. This time, it was clear, it would not be enough for the bourgeoisie simply to flirt with the slogan of "socialization" to maintain and consolidate its power.

The working class had been in the van of the anti-fascist liberation movement in the European countries. Social and national demands were merging. The defeat of German imperialism was ensured, above all, by the valiant struggle waged by the Soviet people. The idea of socialism as a social system, one which would bring the people well-being and peace, won millions of new adherents. The defeat suffered by German monopoly capital, which for many years had been predominant in most of the countries of capitalist Europe, was a telling blow to European imperialism as a whole.

In this new situation the Communist parties in some of the Western European countries became the driving force behind nationalization. They fought for the nationalization of the industry owned by the German monop-

oly capitalists and the big bourgeois collaborators associated with them. The Communists demanded the nationalization of enterprises and industries that were specially needed for the rapid rehabilitation of the shattered economy. They demanded, too, that the enterprises taken over by the state during the war should remain nationalized. These demands were of a national character and were indissolubly linked with the tasks of securing the independence of the countries. Since the German imperialists were to blame for unleashing the war, it was justly believed that to deprive the German monopoly capitalists and the groups of national capitalists associated with them of power, would also be a guarantee of peace. For this reason the Communist slogans had the backing not only of the working class, but of all sections of the working people and of some representatives of the bourgeoisie.

It goes without saying that the demand for nationalization was a highly important one in the struggle against the domination of capitalism generally. At the same time the Communist parties rejected the view that nationalization of some industries would automatically lead to socialism, a view which the Social Democratic leaders were again thrusting to the fore in the labor movement with the aim of hindering the proletariat fighting for state power.

The democratic, anti-monopoly movement of the peoples headed by the working class led to the nationalization of a number of industries in many European countries. Carried out under pressure of the working class and as the result of the greatly enhanced prestige of socialism, this was a new development. In the countries which subsequently took the road to socialism, it undermined capitalist rule, facilitated the transfer of power to the working class, and became a cornerstone for the socialization of industry.

In some capitalist countries, France and Austria, for example, partial nationalization weakened the position of the monopolies for a time and posed new problems before the bourgeoisie and the working class.

Another situation arose in the capitalist countries where it was in the interests of certain circles of the big bourgeoisie to nationalize some industries and where nationalization was necessitated by economic considerations. In Britain, for instance, where nationalization was carried through on the ini-

tiative of the Labor Party, it was from the very outset aimed chiefly at strengthening the economic and political power of monopoly capital. This was not what the British working class had expected when it called for nationalization of private enterprises. Once again it had been misled by the Right-wing reformist leaders and the bourgeois politicians who used the state sector to intensify the exploitation of the working people.

In the interests of the big bourgeoisie the governments of some Western European countries assumed the role of "collective employer," setting up heavy-industry enterprises and buying up the shares of economically and financially derelict private companies.

Carried out as they were for various reasons and in varying political situations, the partial nationalization and other measures for the taking over by the state of some sectors of the private capital economy resulted in a quite considerable degree of state capitalist ownership in France, Britain, Austria, Italy and other countries. In many European countries the state owns the railways, the power stations, the mines, iron and steel, machine-building, chemical, aluminum, shipbuilding, automobile and munition works, atomic plants, oil refineries and gas works, some big banks, insurance companies, etc.

About 20 per cent of British industry is nationalized. In France some 650 state-owned and mixed enterprises produce about 13 per cent of the gross national product; in all, French nationalized industry accounts for approximately 20 per cent of the industrial capacity. The state-owned enterprises in West Germany account for most of the electric power generated, for more than 70 per cent of the aluminum produced, 30 per cent of the shipbuilding, 36.2 per cent of the iron ore, 18.8 per cent of the coke and 17.6 per cent of the oil. In Austria 98 per cent of the iron and steel production, 98 per cent of the coal, 90 per cent of rolled metal goods, 94 per cent of the non-ferrous metals, 91 per cent of oil extraction and refining, 46 per cent of electro-engineering, 31 per cent of the machine-building plants and the works turning out structural steel, a considerable part of the chemical industry, etc., have been nationalized. At a rough estimate, about 25 to 30 per cent of the enterprises in Italy are either owned by the state or mixed.

A sharp class struggle, which assumed varying forms and dimensions, depending on

the conditions obtaining in the particular countries, immediately developed around state ownership. The struggle was waged for participation in the management of the nationalized industries, for the right to have a say in their development. With the active help and direct intervention of the American imperialists, the Western European bourgeoisie has consolidated its domination. And in countries where nationalization was carried out under working-class pressure and with the participation of the Communists, the bourgeoisie soon succeeded in bringing the nationalized enterprises into the system of state-monopoly capitalism.

In one way or another the nationalized industries now serve the interests of monopoly capital. They are the channel through which the surplus value created by the workers employed in the state-owned enterprises is re-distributed in favor of the monopolies. While the nationalized industries are charged high prices by the private companies for the goods purchased from them, they supply the monopolies with cheap semi-manufactures and raw materials, electric power and fuel. Prices for the goods produced by the state-owned enterprises are rising much more slowly than those charged by the private companies. The general price index in France, for example, rose 25-fold between 1938-1956, whereas the electric power charges went up, on the average, ninefold. In Austria some capitalists are making superprofits from the difference between the price for the iron and steel manufactured by the state-owned enterprises and the goods made from these metals. According to the Austrian Institute of Economic Research they are netting superprofits at a rate of 175 million schillings per year from the purchase of sectional steel produced by the state-owned enterprises.

The managers of the nationalized industries employ capitalist methods and are closely associated with the monopolies. Most were already capitalists and others soon became capitalists. Their posts give them considerable economic power which they wield to further the interests of the bourgeoisie and to feather their own nests. Developments have thus reaffirmed that nationalization and socialism cannot be simply equated, that without the capture of political power by the working class the transition to a socialist society is impossible. In a

situation in which the monopolies' economic and political rule is undivided, the nationalized industries are merely one of the forms of state-monopoly capitalism which, according to Lenin, "... is recognized by the state and controlled by it for the benefit of the bourgeoisie and in opposition to the interest of the proletariat".*

Experience shows that the economic and social conditions have now matured for waging a struggle for *democratic nationalization* that would correspond to the interests of broad sections of the people and undermine the positions of the monopolies; a struggle to remove the state-owned industry from the grip of monopoly capital and convert it into the bulwark of a popular movement against the financial oligarchy. The outcome of this struggle will depend on the balance of class forces in each country, on the extent to which the working people realize the need for far-reaching democratic changes, and on the ability of the working class to rally against the monopolies the peasants, the urban petty bourgeoisie, and some groups of the non-monopoly bourgeoisie, that is, all the sections of the people objectively interested in undermining, or restricting the influence of monopoly capital.

In these conditions, the nationalized industries, although subordinate to the monopolies, are a *potential threat* to them, a dangerous precedent which the working people can make use of in the anti-monopoly struggle.

That is one of the reasons why, as soon as it had consolidated its position, monopoly capital in a number of Western European countries — first and foremost Austria and West Germany — sought to abolish nationalization and return the state-owned undertakings to private ownership. Another reason is that the monopolies find it profitable to get their hands on highly productive state-owned enterprises equipped with the latest machinery. Their efforts, however, have come up against considerable resistance, not only from the working class, but also from other strata of the population. In light of the foregoing, the humbug of "people's shares" should be regarded not only as an attempt to create the semblance of working class participation in joint stock capitalist ownership, but as an effort by the monopoly

bourgeoisie to get wider circles of the people economically interested in denationalization. It should be emphasized that in their nature the "people's shares" in no way differ from the other shares issued by capitalist companies. The term "people's shares" has been used to camouflage the process of handing back to private owners enterprises which were, or are, the property of the state.

The working class is resolutely opposed to denationalization in any form, although the state-owned enterprises are part of the capitalist system. Its attitude is to be explained by the immediate and the long-term tasks of its struggle.

Some of the reasons are rooted in its day-to-day economic struggle. In the eyes of the people the political forces and organizations officially responsible for the nationalized enterprises are constantly on the search for votes. The policy documents of many parties, whether they are Social Democratic or bourgeois, not only recognize the importance of labor for society as a whole, but contain numerous far-reaching promises. But there is a yawning gap between the promises and their fulfilment, and the workers in the nationalized enterprises, like the proletariat as a whole, are aware of this. There is, nevertheless, a difference between the conditions of the workers in the privately-owned enterprises and those in the state-owned enterprises, and this is an important factor in the working-class struggle. In a number of European capitalist countries the state sector includes important branches of the capitalist economy which comprise the nerve of modern industry. Strikes in the nationalized industries could paralyze the country's economic life. Furthermore the workers in the state-owned enterprises do not enter the lists against individual capitalists but against the state, i.e., the whole ruling bourgeois class. For these and other economic and political reasons it is often difficult — in any event hazardous — for the management of nationalized industries to infringe the existing social legislation. It cannot always reduce wages below the prevailing level.

Those in the managerial apparatus of the nationalized enterprises are always trying to feather their own nests. In the effort to enrich themselves they are more ready than the managers of the ordinary capitalist enterprises to make concessions to the workers. It is also extremely difficult — and this is important — to carry out wholesale dismis-

*V. I. Lenin, *Report on the Tactics of the RCP* (B) delivered at the Third Congress of the Communist International.

sals in the nationalized industries, inasmuch as this becomes a political matter.

The workers try to make the most of their position in the state-owned enterprises, fighting for better working conditions, security, wages and social services. Amongst other things the working class demands that the nationalized industries, which formally belong to society, should have their own price-policy, one that would differ from the policy of monopolies, and that they should have honest managements. These demands are inseparable from the political struggle to curb monopoly capital. We know that in bourgeois society capitalist exploitation restricts the results of the struggle. Nevertheless a certain measure of success can be achieved—this will create difficulties for monopoly capital and strengthen the position of the working class—and further, it is important that the working people have a good idea of what these restrictions really imply.

The somewhat better conditions in which the workers in the nationalized industries wage their struggle are an advantage for the whole working class. Their successes and their demands are an example for the working people in the other sectors.

The working class upholds nationalization for more profound reasons. As we know, the opponents of socialism are doing their best to show that only private enterprise can guarantee normal economic development. Time and again we have seen attempts to undermine the nationalized industries and corrupt their managers with the object of making ideological and economic capital out of the failure of state-owned enterprises in the interests of the capitalist system and for the purpose of denationalizing them. Sometimes the capitalists have succeeded. But in many countries, and in several instances, this has involved considerable expense and, often, great risk, because the nationalized enterprises include many important ones.

Nationalized enterprises have been running without private owners for a number of years now and many of them are giving a relatively good account of themselves in the spheres of production and labor productivity. In France, for example, rail transport improved as a result of nationalization. The freight turnover of the railways owned by the SNCF was, in 1956, 60 per cent up on the 1938 figure. Considerable achievements in the manufacture and sale of automobiles have been recorded by the nationalized

Renault Works. In Britain from 1948 to 1957 productivity rose by 20 per cent in the nationalized coal industry and in transport. The enterprises taken over by the state have also made considerable technological advance. Austrian steel plants, for example, have envolved the "L.D." method.* Thus once again (and this time under capitalist conditions) have the reactionary cock-and-bull stories intended for the backward sections of the people (that things would not work without private owners) been disproved.

Needless to say, the working class is not blind to the fact that under capitalism the nationalized industries are owned by the "collective capitalist" — the bourgeois state. But this does not alter the fact that, given a favorable alignment of class forces, nationalization can strike a blow at the political positions of capitalism.

And, finally, another important factor should be taken into account in determining the working-class attitude to nationalization under capitalism. Nationalization is the highest stage of public ownership under capitalism, and is its most antagonistic form. On the one hand it is used by the monopoly bourgeoisie to consolidate the economic and political power of the monopolies and defend the capitalist system. On the other, nationalization under capitalism creates the material base for socialism and drags capitalism, as Lenin aptly put it, "into some sort of a new social order, a transitional one from complete free competition to complete socialization."** Hence the more nationalization there is under capitalism the easier it will be, eventually, to turn capitalist industry into a socialist industry, because "socialism is the next step forward from state-capitalist monopoly."*** That is why we say that nationalization under capitalism helps to strengthen the position of the working class at the present time and will facilitate the transition to socialism in the future.

Nationalization of the Monopolies Is an Imperative Need of the Times

State-owned enterprises play a definite role in the economy of a number of European capitalist countries, its importance depending

*The "L.D." method is a new way of obtaining steel from pig-iron by the application of oxygen blasting. This method was worked out in Linz and Donawitz, centres of the Austrian metallurgical industry.

**V. I. Lenin. *Imperialism, the Highest State of Capitalism*.

***V. I. Lenin. *The Impending Catastrophe and How to Combat It*.

upon the extent to which nationalization has been carried out. Because the working class in its class interests wants to have as much say as possible in shaping economic policy (even though the economy in question is a capitalist one), it cannot be indifferent to the economic problems connected with the nationalized enterprises. Not only does it want to have a voice in solving all problems of this nature, it is anxious to see the nationalization extended. Nationalization is imperative, especially in view of the struggle of the working people to restrict the power of the monopolies and to democratize economic and political life in the capitalist countries.

In the Appeal adopted at the Rome meeting of the Communist parties of the capitalist countries of Europe it is stated: "The struggle for democracy demands today a fight to limit the power of the monopolies, and restrict their domination over economic life and political institutions." To achieve this aim the Appeal advances the following measures: "nationalization of some monopoly sectors of industry, democratization of the agencies running the public sectors of the economy."

The Communist parties want a further nationalization of key industries and important enterprises. In contrast with 1945-1946, the call for nationalization is now no longer limited to the property owned by the German monopoly capitalists and the collaborators, but concerns all "monopoly sectors of industry." As in the past, the Communist parties do not hold the view that nationalization automatically leads to socialism. They repudiate the revisionist view expressed, for example, in the program of the Communist League of Yugoslavia — which says that capitalist nationalization marks the beginning of the gradual transition to socialism. Such theories pursue the same aim now as they did in the past, namely, the aim of keeping the working class from fighting for political power.

As the Appeal of the Communist parties notes, nationalization of the monopoly sectors of industry does not abolish the exploitation of man by man, that is, it does not lead to socialism. This is an important conclusion, not only because it questions the view that transition to socialism is possible without the capture of political power by the working people under the leadership of the working class, but because it emphasizes that democratic nationalization of the monopoly

sectors can win support from all sections of the working people regardless of whether they are socialists or not. In the present situation this is an important factor. The U.S. monopolies are trying to get a grip on key sections of Western European industry. Through the European Economic Community and the European Free Trade Association, the Western European imperialist powers dominate over the economy of small countries. Having recovered its strength, German monopoly capital has far-reaching plans in this direction, and is particularly dangerous in its aggressiveness. Nationalization of the monopoly sectors makes it easier to safeguard the economic and political independence of the weaker countries. Thus in many capitalist countries of Europe the national interests coincide with the fight for nationalization of the monopoly industry.

Rapid technical advance and growth of automation call imperatively for the nationalization of large-scale industry now; it becomes absurd, from the point of view of society, that this industry should be privately owned. It is easier to bring this home to broad sections of the people today, even if they are not yet conscious of the advantage of socialism and the need to replace the capitalist system by the socialist system. At the same time automation leads to a still greater concentration of capital and enormously increases the power of big industry — power which, in the hands of a tiny group of monopolies with aggressive aims, is a growing danger to mankind. This power must be wrested from the monopoly bourgeoisie; in any event everything must be done to weaken it.

The Communist parties in the capitalist countries are fighting to counteract the effects of the economic crises which doom the people to unemployment and hardship. From the conclusions drawn by Marxism-Leninism, conclusions which experience has confirmed, the Communist parties know that the greed of the monopolies for profit intensifies the danger of economic crises. For this reason they call on all sections of the working people to demand nationalization of the monopoly sectors of industry and thus ensure for themselves a say as to how the economy should be run. In popularizing the demand for this kind of nationalization the Communists are of the opinion that it will generate a powerful movement when mono-

poly capital again plunges the capitalist countries into an economic crisis.

The remarkable progress of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries in the scientific, economic and cultural fields cannot be gainsaid by the adversaries of socialism. Yet it is common knowledge that in the Soviet Union industry has been nationalized and is run in a planned way. Even now when the economic situation is favorable, the success of the Soviet Union is affecting the thinking of people in the capitalist countries. The enemies of nationalization are finding it harder than ever to think up convincing arguments in favor of private ownership of big industry.

Formerly, when the revolutionary tide was flowing, the Right-wing Social Democrats tried to divert the working people from the fight for socialism, and to impress upon them that the peaceful road to a socialist society lay through partial nationalization. Later, at the height of the cold war, when reaction managed to blacken socialism in the eyes of the backward sections of the people, monopoly capital sought to put spokes in the wheel of nationalization, calling it a socialist measure. Nowadays propagandist tricks of this kind recoil on the monopoly bourgeoisie. People are no longer scared by the bogey of socialism. We are approaching a time when even the people who had doubts about socialism are, thanks to the achievements of the Soviet Union, beginning to believe in the possibility of and the need for socialism. The greater the Soviet Union's success in the competition between the two systems, the greater will be the desire of the masses in the capitalist countries for socialism.

When the Communists say that nationalization under capitalism does not mean that capitalism will gradually change into socialist society, they do not for a moment lose sight of the fact that the movement for democratic nationalization is, in growing measure, merging with the struggle for socialism. The fight for nationalization, like any other mass democratic movement, is

spearheaded against the reactionary monopoly bourgeoisie, and weakens the main forces of capitalism. It helps the working class to find flexible forms of alliance with the masses and helps the working people to become conscious of the need for socialist transformations. It is no accident that the leaders of the Socialist parties have begun to change their standpoint on nationalization. The Right wing proclaims its opposition to nationalization. It has even agreed to proposals of the "people's shares" kind, which are aimed at returning the nationalized enterprises to private ownership. This is a sign that nationalization is becoming an ever greater danger to monopoly capital. But the Right-wing Socialist leaders are encountering resistance in their own ranks. The breach in the Socialist parties on this question is widening. And everything goes to show that this contradiction will become still sharper.

The Communists have no desire to impose socialism on the people. We want the working people to believe in the need for socialism on the basis of their own experience and as a result of our explanatory work; we want them to understand that to achieve socialism the people must take over power under the leadership of the working class. That is the way forward to socialism, and the Rome Appeal states in this connection:

"The perspective of democratic development shows the way forward to socialism. We live at a time when socialism has demonstrated its superiority in all spheres of economic, political and social life. We live at a time when, with the development of co-existence and of peaceful competition, more and more millions of men of differing social background can be won more easily for the great ideals of socialism. The Communists are fully confident that in the conditions thus created the majority of the people in each of our countries will find ways and means to unite in order to bring about the socialist transformation of society — a transformation whose fulfilment requires the exercise of political power by the working class and by other strata of working people."

Lenin and Humanism

(Notes of a Writer)

Jack Lindsay

1.

LENIN had many facets to his character; but it seems to me that when one thinks of him, what comes spontaneously into one's mind is his moral personality, his extraordinarily clear and pellucid intellect which went to the core of a situation and which at the same time was always guided by an unshakeable love of man. This fusion of love and clarity gives the peculiar warmth, simplicity, directness, and charm to Lenin at every phase and moment of his life. It constitutes his pervasive humanism.

The comments which follow are prompted by the thought of Lenin's humanism, his profound love of man. It is again what makes of Lenin such an effective touchstone for what is genuine and what is false in humanist professions. Set against the ardent unity of theory and practice in his life, in all his thinking and action, any position in which fine words are used to cover up base or inadequate practices is instantly revealed for what it is. And it is here that Lenin has so great a significance for our world today where in many quarters terms like Freedom, Democracy, and Humanism have been used so speciously that all meaning has been taken out of them.

Marxism honors and studies the achievements of humanist thought and struggle from the earliest days onwards. By humanism here we may roughly say that we mean all that in human culture which has grasped reality and grappled with it, which has seen men in their real place in the universe and extended the sense of human unity, which has helped men to deepen their grip on the processes of nature and to become more human. Marxism thus does not separate the struggle in science and production to know and master nature from the struggle in art to define human reality and enrich our sense of concrete relationships. Nor does it separate the struggle in art and science from the struggle in life itself to break through all obstructing factors into a fuller sense of brotherhood and to

find social forms for actualizing that fuller sense.

Benedetto Croce, who in his earlier years learned something from Marxism, tried to define and write history "as the story of liberty." But in practice—in his *History of the Kingdom of Naples*—this worked out as the dismissal of all historical and socio-economic factors and the concentration alone on moral issues, those issues in turn being narrowly reduced to bourgeois needs and rationalizations. By attempting to define absolute (non-historical, non-class) values in morals as the sole determining factor in history he landed himself in an extreme relativism, and thus rejected the real, historical moral values.

In the Leninist sense there is a real meaning in the view of history "as the story of liberty" — of the struggle for an ever-deepened sense of human unity and fraternity, for the social and political forms at every phase of history which are the most advanced ones possible, the ones most able to express and consolidate the struggle forward. In this Leninist sense there is nothing abstract about the idea of liberty, and so, though moral issues play an essential part in the whole picture, they are not abstracted from that totality as ideal motive forces. They are seen as relative in the sense that they do not determine the situation, that they are bound up with the phase of social development, and that they express only an imperfect movement towards freedom and fraternity. But they are also seen as "absolute" in the sense that they embody permanent aspirations and needs of men; and we might claim that every step forward in history, by expanding the socio-economic nexus that binds men together, increases the possibilities of freedom and fraternity, and thus strengthens the "absolute" elements at the expense of the relative (those that subordinate freedom and fraternity to class needs of exploitation and oppression). As Engels put it, "Communism . . . is a question of humanity and not of the workers alone." With the ending of class

exploitation and with the public ownership of means of production, the "absolute" elements come right to the top.

These positions seem to be present in the thought of Marx and Lenin alike; but while there is a more extended philosophical analysis of them in Marx, they become more concrete in Lenin because the possibility of socialism, of a fully human system and morality, is now in the forefront of things and is in 1917 actualized. Then the general idea is brought down to earth by Lenin with an ever increased fulness and directness; and what is involved in the working-out of an "absolute" or human morality (from which class limitations have been removed) becomes ever clearer. More, in Lenin himself the values of this "absolute" morality are splendidly incarnated, with the remarkable fusion of clarity and love. Lenin thus reveals the climax of the struggle away from class limitations in morality and the actual development and personality of the new kind of man in whom the old divisions and imperfections have fallen away.

The bourgeois efforts to distort the Leninist position take two forms. They jeer on the one hand at the "absolute" element and describe it as a utopian dream set far in the future which is used to straitjacket the present; or on the other hand they try to twist the whole Leninist position into some kind of Machiavellism, in which "whatever" helps the cause is good, however bad the means may be. Both forms of attack fail altogether to grasp Leninist morality and its implications. It is true that, short of a world-communist society, the class struggle remains in one form or another and the use of force (including social and political forms born of class society such as the state, police, army, etc.) cannot be eliminated.

For the first time in history, a socialist society has a clear aim before it and has a fully humanist critique to bring to bear on the various phases it passes through on the way to communism. There is no parallel for this in any stage of the society of exploiters, for all such stages have been and are rent by a violent contradiction between the human aspiration and the facts of division and exploitation. Socialist men, with the concrete aim of communism, are able to accept the survivals of "force" in their situation because they understand their purpose, their relative nature, their historical origins, and are able to see them in a perspective which ends with their elimination. The old type of contradic-

tion therefore falls away, and a new type of movement forward, that of socialist development with its own laws, is created. The abstract opposition between the communist future and the socialist present which the bourgeois critics try to conjure up exists only in their own minds; for in socialist reality the dialectical relation of future and present—of communism and the socialist phase on the way to communism—is warmly understood, and the future is in fact realized as something ceaselessly and concretely becoming the present in an extending and deepening series of satisfactions and achievements.

Similarly, the attempt to reduce the Leninist position to Machiavellism falls to the ground when it is examined. True, all that helps the proletarian cause, the cause of the common people, is good—because it deepens the sense of human unity and helps forward the day of its actualization. But that is not at all the same as saying that one can defy all principles of human behavior on the plea that one is trying to help socialism. That would be to introduce the bourgeois division of means and ends into the very process that ends it. It is by this inverting of the proposition that the bourgeois critics of Marxism try to blackguard its morality and confuse the struggle into freedom and fraternity. They invoke their abstractions in order to impede the moral development of men, not to facilitate it.

2.

But because Marxist ethics offer the possibility of overcoming the old contradictions which made class ethics a mixture of absolute abstractions and relative apologies for class practices, it does not follow that this overcoming occurs overnight in a single decision of the will or that a complex struggle is not necessary for the full working-out of the possibilities. Such a painless transformation would be contrary to all the principles of Leninism, with its stress on the omnipresence of struggle. Society as a whole and every individual in it must go through a long process of change before the old contradictions in their immense ramifications are fully destroyed. But what is present from the first moment of socialism is the new perspective and the open struggle between the old and the new ethical bases.

In a sense, however paradoxical it may be, bourgeois critics are paying a tribute to the higher level of socialist morality when they point a finger of denunciation at any particu-

lar dereliction in a socialist society from that society's norm of humanity, from its new concept of the unity of theory and practice. Bourgeois critics rarely indeed think it any argument against Christian morality that in the centuries when that morality was the sole one professed, there were an endless series of massacres and insensate cruelties in the name of humanity and love; for the insuperable contradiction between profession and practice is lodged at the heart of the system. But socialist morality by its very nature presupposes an unceasing fight to bring theory and practice closer together; and so any weaknesses or fallings-away from this high standard seem more immoral than similar failures in a society with antagonistic classes.

We should welcome this scrutiny, which implies the recognition of the higher moral laws of socialist society. We should indeed do everything we can to set before people in the class-half of the world the uncompromising moral claims of the socialist half. Peaceful coexistence implies competition between the two halves in the sphere of material production. And while it is not our purpose to draw any superficial analogies, we think, nevertheless, that socialism can challenge capitalism, and is indeed challenging it, in the spheres of morality and humanism. In fact in some respects the latter kind of analogy can be of conclusive value in convincing people of the higher level of socialism.

In the last couple of years, with the many dramatic developments in the world of science, practically everyone recognizes that the Soviet Union is in several crucial respects ahead of the class-world and that this superiority is bound to increase. No propagandist for capitalism now bases his case on deriding the Soviet economic claims. Rather, one and all admit that in a comparatively short time the boasted material advantages of the class-half of the world are going to be outdone by the socialist half. For this reason the propaganda is more and more directed to moral issues, in an effort to convince the working class and the middle class of the capitalist countries that they are morally better-off than they would be under socialism, when they would be "dragooned" and would lose their "freedom." It follows then that everything which can show up these claims for what they are, and can make people realize the real moral issues of our age, the real moral basis of a socialist society, weak-

ens the grip of capitalist conditioning on millions of people and makes a decisive contribution to progress.

At no phase of socialist development in the Soviet Union or elsewhere has there been a lack of Leninist fervor in the construction of the new society—no matter what confused or incorrect measures may at moments have been taken. The latter are the incidental setbacks in a movement which seen as a whole cannot but be motivated by Leninist principles and attitudes. But what we need is a continual reaffirmation and working-out of Marxist ethics and their implications, here, there and everywhere, at the top of our voices; and this involves, for the class-half of the world, more than a mere denunciation of exploitation. It means a thorough analysis of all that is involved by the reduction of people to things, to means, in a class world. It means a remorseless analysis of the contradictions in the ethics of the class world, but also an honest and detailed analysis of any of our own shortcomings, our failures to live up to the full demands of Leninist morality. By such means the youth of the capitalist countries in particular, keen to find satisfying moral standards but driven into anarchistic attitudes by their sense of the hypocrisy of the world around them, can be won for the struggle for peace and progress as they can be won by no other means.

3.

Lenin never had illusions; and no one ever had a simpler and more consistent faith in people than he had. The Lenin who matters to us in the struggle for people's minds and hearts is the real Lenin, unidealized and exactly as he was—the Lenin that we find in Krupskaya's and Gorky's reminiscences as well as in his own writings. A man with an enormous sense of urgency and yet with as great a patience, never asking of men more than was possible, yet never asking less than the best of which they were capable. His inflexible purpose was balanced by a smiling interest in all things human, a deep-going tolerance and sympathy, which at the same time never for a moment blurred his sharp resistance to all that made for capitalist exploitation and degradation.

Lenin's moral personality thus plays a big part in the struggle for a communist morality pervading life in all its aspects; but it is not a "special thing," of concern only to the advanced political fighter. It is precisely the universally human element in Lenin which

makes him so consistent and tireless a fighter, and which gives him an appeal to anyone, however little politically-developed, who is at all awake to the problems of human destiny.

It seems to me that in the phase of world history we confront, the question of Leninist humanism is of primary importance, and that every effort should be made to elucidate it, to develop it. The lack of any such humanist

positions in the Social Democratic or Labor parties is one of the main reasons for their impotence, for their continued dominance by bourgeois ideas and methods. To win the peoples of the world, and especially the youth, to a peaceful progress to socialism we need a consistent and bold exposition of our Leninist humanism.

Ideology and Science

(Apropos of Revisionist Counterposing of Science and Partisanship)

Vladimir Ruml

THE problem of the relationship and inter-relations between science and ideology, far from being an academic matter, is one of the most important problems of our times. Science, now in a phase of rapid development, is penetrating more and more deeply into the life of our generation; utilization of atomic energy, automation and the breakthrough into outer space — all are accompanied by important social consequences, and for this reason merit ideological study. Simultaneously, unprecedented social changes and mass movements are taking place in the world. The social sciences, and in the first place sociology and political economy, are called upon to generalize these processes in order to facilitate and accelerate the victory of the new, progressive trends. It is not the philosophers in the quiet of their studies but living development that links science and the ideological struggle with the future of humanity and civilization.

1. Ideology and Social Being

"... If geometrical axioms affected human interests *attempts would certainly* be made to refute them."* Citing this saying of the British materialist philosopher, Thomas Hobbes, Lenin stressed that in a class society ideological struggle, no matter how abstract it may appear at first glance, cannot but reflect the clash of contradictory, often uncompromising, interests of classes and groups of people. For this reason as long as classes exist all the complaints about ideological struggle and the calls to relinquish it are either hypocrisy or naive, pious wishes.

Each social class recognizes itself in its ideology and from this recognition come its

historical tasks; through this ideology it strives to influence all other classes and social sections, representing (either with or without grounds) its own class interests as those of society as a whole. It is in this materialist understanding of the origin and purport of social ideas that we find the basic distinction between the Marxist approach to ideology and the bourgeois views on the subject, views which frown upon any association of ideas with social being.

The concepts "ideology" and "social thinking" do not mean quite the same thing. Social thinking includes all the forms in which life is reflected in the human mind (political and juridical ideas, religion and ethics, science, the arts and philosophy), whereas ideology is the sum total of views expressing the vital interests of a particular class.

The ideological element obtains, in varying degree, in all forms of social thinking, but in none of these forms (with the exception perhaps of politics) can social thinking be equated exclusively with ideology. For this reason social thinking and ideology should neither be identified nor counterposed. This conclusion is important also for a correct understanding of partisanship in science.

Unlike the social sciences, natural science by virtue of its academic character and range of problems is not directly associated with political activity, although there is an indirect link between them. Natural science is linked with the ideological and political class struggle usually through philosophy, through a common world outlook, or by taking part in the struggle of the materialist and idealist camps in philosophy. The specific character of natural science does not, consequently, preclude its very great importance in deter-

*V. I. Lenin, *Marxism and Revisionism*.

mining world outlook. The ideological significance of Copernicus' heliocentric theory in the struggle against the idealism of the mediaeval scholastics is universally known; Darwin's discovery of the laws of evolution remains to this day the subject of a bitter ideological struggle. The theory of I. P. Pavlov, who purged psychology of idealism, still engages the idealists.

Some ideologies correctly mirror objective requirements of the material world, others distort them. Thus, the ideology of the French bourgeoisie of the 18th century on the eve of the revolution of 1789 was a fairly true reflection of the requirements of social progress. Its supreme achievement was eighteenth-century materialism and atheism.

An ideology that distorts reality can arise spontaneously, without conscious effort, in a way that prevents discerning its falseness. Religious ideology, for instance, usually appears spontaneously. But, of course, the reactionary ideology of the Vatican theologians of our times deliberately misrepresents reality, tries to make the facts and scientific discoveries fit into religious dogmas. Idealist and agnostic philosophy distorts the true relationship between being and thinking. But the founders of the great idealist systems of the past, men like Plato and Hegel, sincerely believed in the correctness of their idealist world outlook; although distorting reality their philosophical systems, nevertheless, had a rational kernel (for instance, dialectics) and made a positive contribution to science. The founders of the modern idealist philosophical systems (particularly the American pragmatists) are for the most part deliberately adjusting their theories to what suits the bourgeoisie. They justify the activity of the reactionary classes, doing so either by directly defending the reactionary social system or by way of indirect apologetics. Direct apologetics deny the contradictions of the given society and portray it as an ideal social structure; indirect apologetics, while admitting the contradictions, regard them as a manifestation of human nature.

When the subjective interests of a class come into conflict with the basic trend of development, this class, viewing reality through the prism of its mercenary interests, cannot have true knowledge, and its ideology gives a reactionary, distorted picture of the world. But if the subjective interests of a class are in harmony with the objective laws of social development, then the reflection of reality in the consciousness of the class is relatively true and its ideology is progressive.

The Marxist-Leninist teaching on society sums up the experience of the class struggle of the proletariat and theoretically substantiates its historical mission as the liberator of humanity from the chains of private property and exploitation. Truth is measured by practice, and practice confirms the communist teaching; hence it is true. But with the passage of time practice refutes the bourgeois philosophical, sociological, economic and juridical theories. Hence the guide to the truth of an ideology is whether it is confirmed or refuted by historical development, whether it has a place in real life or is real only in the minds of its creatures and has been refuted a hundred times by life.

Marxism recognizes the decisive role of the mode of production in social life generally and in relation to ideology in particular. Seizing upon this vulgarizers of various hues drew the conclusion that Marxism reduces the spiritual, scientific and ideological interests of people solely to their economic needs. This has been the favorite theme of those who strive to refute Marxism, who have accused it of oversimplification, of denying the inner logic of science, etc. But these charges, whatever truth they may have in relation to vulgar "economic determinism," have absolutely nothing to do with the Marxist theory of historical materialism. According to the materialist conception of history, the economic factor plays, *ultimately*, the determining role in the historical process. Ideology and science grow on the soil of definite historical conditions — this thesis was first formulated by Hegel. Marx and Engels went farther and established that the determining factor in history is the production and reproduction of material life. The founders of scientific socialism stressed that whenever a definite scientific theory appears, it acquires its own inner logic and develops accordingly, being influenced by other factors, in the first place by classes and the class struggle. "Here economy creates nothing absolutely new (*a novo*), but it determines the way in which the existing material of thought is altered and further developed, and that too for the most part indirectly . . ." wrote Engels concerning the relationship between economy and ideology.

Marxism signifies a revolution in thinking and, at the same time, the logical continuation of the entire preceding history of social thinking. It organically combines science and partisanship in its approach to social life; thanks to its close contact with reality it is in a state of constant development, being enriched by

*F. Engels to Conrad Schmidt, London, October 27, 1890.

the practical experience of the revolutionary struggle and the experience gained in building the new society.

2. The "Sociology of Knowledge"

By placing the relationship between science and ideology in the forefront of the ideological struggle the bourgeois theorists seek above all to discredit Marxist ideology. They demagogically set science against ideology, concentrating their fire on scientific communism, and allege that objective cognition of social phenomena and processes is utterly impossible since it is bound to be distorted in the interests of the different classes. Proceeding from this they sneer at Marxism as a mere utopia, at Marxist prevision as religious prophesy, and at the teaching on socialist revolution, the proletarian dictatorship and the building of a classless communist society as a social myth. Arnold Toynbee, for example, has described Marxism as a variety of religion adjusted to modern conditions (cf. A. Toynbee, *The World and the West*. London, 1953); Raymond Aaron calls it the "opium of the intellectuals" because it is supposed to intoxicate its adherents with pipe-dreams of social justice (c. R. Aron, *L'Opium des Intellectuels*. Paris, 1955). These onslaughts are launched on the pretext of defending science from ideology with a view to inculcating bourgeois objectivism among the intellectuals and to debunking Marxism in the eyes of the masses, to convincing them that social justice is both groundless and unattainable. In point of fact, it is not the ideals of communism, under whose banner one-third of mankind is rallied, that are groundless and unattainable, but the hopes of the reactionary bourgeois ideologists to prolong the life of the dying capitalist system by means of their pseudo-scientific doctrines.

This counterposing of science and ideology is seen at its fullest in the so-called "sociology of knowledge" of the German philosopher Karl Mannheim. Mannheim's *Ideologie und Utopie* (Ideology and Utopia) and *Wissenssoziologie* (Sociology of Knowledge), in which he lauds agnosticism and relativism in sociology, have been translated into many languages and are revered as the gospel not only for the overt apologists of capitalism but also for latter-day reformists and revisionists for whom it is the fount of anti-Marxist "wisdom," as can be seen, for example, from a reading of W. Weidlé's article "On the Concept of Ideology" (cf. *Le Contrat Social*, March 1959).

Mannheim's "sociology of knowledge" fully reflects the decadent features of the bourgeois world outlook in the epoch of imperialism: lack of faith in human reason, pessimism and bellicose anti-Marxism. According to Mannheim science is objective by virtue of its non-partisanship, while ideology, being partisan, is always subjective. Looking upon ideology as a deliberate or, at best, unconscious mystification of social relations, Mannheim describes it as an illusion, as self-justification for the class and the substantiation of its activity. If the content of science consists, in his view, of laws, theories and hypotheses based on objective facts, the content of ideology boils down to doctrines, prophecies and myths supposed to justify the subjective, selfish interests of the given class, or social group. From the standpoint of the "sociology of knowledge" the ideological concepts of all classes are socially conditioned, all are equal and at the same time all are "false," precisely because they reflect the existing social relations in the "distorting mirror" of their own interests which are contrary to those of the other classes and society as a whole; nor is Marxism, Mannheim claims, an exception in this respect.

In granting that ideology is conditioned by social factors, Mannheim, in essence, tries to turn against Marxism the Marxist teaching on the determining role of social being in relation to social thinking. To perform this trick he juggles with notions and resorts to obvious distortion: vulgar economic determinism is substituted for the materialist conception of history. If we grant that ideology is conditioned by economic factors, then it cannot be true — such is the sleight of hand conclusion reached by Mannheim. But the question of the origin of ideas is far from being identical with the question of whether they are true. An historical explanation of the origin of a particular social theory is a long way from telling us whether it is correct or not. The soundness of a theory is verified by social practice.

Turning his back on practice as an objective yardstick in analysing the content of ideology and ignoring history in assessing the different ideologies, Mannheim seeks in vain for a social group which, thanks to its station in society, could, by virtue of its impartiality, claim the role of eternal bearer of objective truth. He avers, it is true, that this group is the intelligentsia. But what else could be expected from a bourgeois intellectual for whom scientific work — the generation of ideas — is an independent process. The intellectuals

in capitalist society are not a homogeneous social group; their status in society differs widely, they express the interests of different classes and, consequently, their own interests are contradictory.

For the "sociologists of knowledge" the basic difference between modern bourgeois social doctrine and Marxism is that the former is a non-partisan, impartial science which sensibly refrains from drawing political conclusions, whereas Marxism is a biased ideological interpretation of reality adapted to arbitrary aims. But in point of fact, the basic difference between bourgeois ideology and Marxism has absolutely nothing to do with this.

For capitalist social teaching is forced to conceal its partisanship because it is the ideology of the exploiting class, the tiny minority, whose mercenary interests clash with the interests of the oppressed majority of society, whereas *Marxism openly admits its partisanship because it represents the ideology of the working class whose interests coincide with the aspirations of all mankind.*

Moreover, the ideology of modern monopoly capital being the ideology of a reactionary class cannot truly reflect social reality because this reality dooms capitalism to perdition, whereas *the ideology of the working class whose interests coincide with the objective needs of social development necessitates a true reflection of reality in its revolutionary development.*

And the ideology of the monopoly bourgeoisie, a class which has no future, naturally cannot foresee the trend of social development, whereas *the Marxist ideology of the working class, a class called upon to reconstruct society along just, communist lines, contains of necessity prevision of the logical march of history.*

Bourgeois ideology, consequently, is doubly false and fraudulent because in addition to distorting social relationships it tries to conceal its partisan, class character. But *Marxism—the ideology of the working class and socialist society—is consistently objective; it gives a true picture of social reality and at the same time does not conceal its partisanship.*

3. The "Liberation" of Science from Ideology —a Myth of the Revisionists

The unity and oneness of Marxist ideology have for over half a century been the subject of bitter revisionist attacks. And this is not surprising. Objectively, revisionism seeks to

inculcate bourgeois ideology in the communist and working-class movement in the guise of "perfecting" and "supplementing" Marxism. In this sense revisionism can be described as ideological piracy: capitalist ideology dressed up in a pseudo-Marxist toga tries by deception to penetrate the minds of the working people in the same way as the pirates lulled the vigilance of their victims by flying false flags from their masts. Since Marxism is a harmonious and consistent teaching, the revisionists, in order to distort it, seek imaginary contradictions between its component parts and demagogically counterpose one to another, suggesting to "delete" here, to "add" there. But each time it appears that it is the fundamental principles of Marxism that are deleted, the principles that constitute its revolutionary essence, while the "adding" is merely an excerpt from bourgeois ideology.

It will be no exaggeration to say that all the revisionist attacks on Marxism in the guise of its alleged incompatibility with science drew their arguments from the Mannheim concept. That is why a Marxist critique of the "sociology of knowledge" is valid and timely also in relation to the revisionist myth about "liberating" science from ideology.

The counterposing of science to ideology is comprehensively "substantiated" in a long article by the Yugoslav philosopher M. Markovic headed "Science and Ideology" (cf. *Nasa stvarnost*, Nos. 7-8, 1959). The author starts by saying that up till now "the concepts 'science' and 'ideology' have lacked clarity." If we are to believe this author, then neither Marx, Engels, Lenin nor any other Marxist had the slightest idea of the relationship between science and ideology. Apparently, it has been left to Markovic to bring clarity into the matter. It hardly needs saying that Markovic's "positive" contribution does not go beyond sheer banality. Setting science against ideology he sees the difference between them in that "science establishes and explains what has been, what is and what will be," whereas "ideology expresses what should be, what is desirable in the interests of the working class." This formulation as well as the subsequent reasoning coincide, almost word for word, with the views of the Austrian Social Democrat Karl Czernetz. Markovic goes on to say that Marxism far from being a scientific generalization of the objective tendencies of social development is "a reflection of the emotions and interests of restricted social groups."

On this (more than shaky) ground Markovic warns the Communist parties not to med-

dle in science, philosophy and the arts. Preaching the opportunist principle of the "neutrality" of a political Party in scientific and cultural life, he declares that science is the bailiwick of the scientists. But this revisionist claim is an anti-Marxist positivist slogan drawn from the arsenal of bourgeois ideology. In point of fact, cognition is always associated with social practice. The role of the latter in cognition is not exhausted by the fact that practice is the yardstick of truth. Practice is also a stimulus to cognition and its ultimate goal. It is a link connecting the separate rungs of cognition. The means at the disposal of scientific cognition are in themselves insufficient to determine its scientific truth; for this we need the backing of propositions verified by practice. And in this respect it is essential to bear in mind the peculiarities of the revolutionary working-class Party. *It is in its activity that the unity of theory and practice is realized.* The Party views every social phenomenon in its relationship to others, basing itself on the common aspirations of the people, on the interests of the struggle for communism. In this interaction of theory and practice the former is cleansed of subjective elements, and the latter of the fortuitous. This explains why the work of the Communist parties is a constant source of inspiration for Marxist theoreticians.

In demagogic arguments about the "particular interests" of an imaginary "ruling privileged minority" in the socialist countries, in the sallies against the Party leadership of these countries for "meddling" in science, literature and the arts, Markovic evades the basic point: *that which has been objectively established by Marxist-Leninist social science is at one with the vital interests of the working class.* And it is these vital interests of the working class and of all working people (and not transient or current considerations as Markovic would have us believe) that guide the Communists in their work. There is not, nor can there be, any inner contradiction between science and ideology in Marxism. Communist ideology and Marxist social science are not autonomous and certainly not opposing, contradictory spheres of spiritual activity, as Markovic believes, but a monolithic unity. The Marxist social doctrine, the theory of scientific communism, is the ideology of the politically conscious vanguard of the working class. The real contradiction exists not between partisanship and science in Marxism-Leninism but between those who uphold and develop this science in the interests of

the working people and those who, like Markovic, are trying to revise Marxism and, in the long run, so to distort it that it would abjure the interests of the working class and champion those of the bourgeoisie.

There is no need to go far for examples to see that the revisionist myth of "liberating" science from ideology brings grist to the ideological mill of the bourgeoisie. Markovic's article is replete with them. Counterposing science to ideology, he logically arrives at the following conclusion: "In Russia in 1917, for example, the Bolshevik revolution would not have been carried out had not Lenin declared that it would be a success. Hence we sometimes see things taking place which, in the strict scientific sense, seem impossible . . . Examples that come to mind are Communards storming heavens, the Russian revolution of 1905, the Hungarian and Bavarian revolutions in 1919, the establishment of collective farms and machine and tractor stations in some countries of the socialist camp."

We have deliberately reproduced the foregoing quotation because it clearly shows how modern revisionism identifies the active creative role of ideas in social life with voluntarism, how it claims that the socialist revolution is well nigh "impossible" but sometimes, surprisingly enough, it happens. By making deductions of this kind the revisionists betray not only their theoretical bankruptcy but also their political opportunism.

Throughout his article Markovic blames the Marxist-Leninists because where socialist society is concerned Marxist ideology "is an idealization of reality; its content consists of political slogans which do not correctly reflect the actual relationship and do not correspond to real practice." The obvious aim of these groundless charges is to smear the home and foreign policy of the socialist countries, and to insinuate that science and culture in these countries are in a state of decline.

Towards the end of the article Markovic, with an air of injured innocence, queries: ". . . if the point at issue is simply to distinguish between the scientific and the ideological aspects in Marxism, is it possible to discover the evil with which this is fraught?" The author, evidently, seeks both to smear Marxism as the ideology of the working class and to build up a reputation for himself as a creative Marxist. No one will deny that this article will add to the weight of the worthy "sociologist of knowledge" in the eyes of bourgeois philosophers and sociologists, but who will now believe Markovic's claims, that he is a Marxist?

Markovic's pernicious attacks on Marxism from the standpoint of the bourgeois "sociology of knowledge" impelled B. Zihlerl, member of the C.C. of the League of Communists, to forget for the time being to be "neutral" in philosophy, and to criticize him, though moderately, in the Party press (cf. the weekly *Komunist*, December 24, 1959). Characterizing Markovic's article as "somewhat problematic speculations on the borderlines between the sphere of action of scientists and that of ideologists," Zihlerl pronounced his views to be incorrect, as running counter both to the facts and to Marxism. The press polemic which this sparked off demonstrated once again how widespread are petty-bourgeois views among Yugoslav philosophers. This, of course, is understandable, for any retreat from Marxist ideology, as Lenin warned, ends in acceptance of bourgeois ideology. Markovic, far from admitting his errors, argued that Yugoslav philosophers should be more "flexible" in relation to bourgeois philosophy, sociology and political economy, and all in the name of "creative Marxism" (cf. *Komunist*, February 18, 1960). It is worth noting that a confused article by R. Ratkovic under the heading "Ideology and Social Science," obviously sponsored by the C.C. of the League of Communists in order to dissociate themselves from Markovic's views, far from explaining the essence of the problem, made the confusion more confounded. Siding with Markovic in his attacks on what he describes as a "bureaucratic distortion" of Marxism in the USSR, Ratkovic repeats, in a more cautious way, the false Markovic concept and regards unity of science and ideology in Marxism as a potential possibility in the distant future; in the sphere of social relations, science and partisanship, says Ratkovic, never merge, "close though they may come to one another" (*Socijalism*, No. 1, 1960). Thus the Ratkovic article shows once again that the question of the relationship of science and ideology cannot be resolved from the standpoint of revisionism which uses it only as a means to discredit Marxism-Leninism.

4. Some Remarks on the Debate in Czechoslovakia

A lively debate on the relationship between science and ideology was held in Czechoslovakia during 1956-59. For Marxists, exchanges of views are regarded as an exceedingly fruitful method of resolving scientific problems. It should be noted, however, that the debate in question arose not so much out of real problems associated with the cultural

revolution, but was imposed on us by some philosophers who in the press and in lectures expressed incorrect views. The mistakes for the most part took the form of positivist distortions of Marxism and were made under the influence of neo-positivism, which is in vogue in the capitalist West, and sometimes of neo-Hegelianism.

The essence of these mistakes lay in a metaphysical counterposing of science to ideology with the subsequent politically harmful demand for "freeing science from ideology." Without taking the pains to make a thorough study of the viewpoint of the founders of Marxism on science and ideology, some philosophers attempted to transfer the assessment by Marx and Engels of the ideology of the Young Hegelians and other idealists, contained in their *German Ideology*, to the concept of ideology in general. Marx and Engels were quoted at random and the quotations were counterposed to the concept of ideology in the works of Lenin. Such an arbitrary interpretation of Marx and Engels, however, is absolutely wrong, because there is no contradiction between the views of Marx, Engels and Lenin on the role of ideology in social life. Neither Marx and Engels, nor Lenin ever doubted that the working class had its own ideology and that the theory of scientific communism was the scientific expression of this ideology.

Taking as their starting point the correct and basically sound idea that various mathematical and statistical models can be used for the scientific cognition of social processes, some philosophers rendered absolute the role of these essentially subsidiary means of studying objective reality. Attaching a specific significance to these models, they saw in them not the means and instruments of cognition, but its aim. They attached a universal and anti-historical character to these models, objectively counterposing this method to the dialectical materialist method of social research. But it is clear that these models, no matter how great their cognitive significance, are products of the human mind, and it is impossible, without falling into idealism, to substitute scientific research and investigation into the real processes of life by the study of models which in the final count are but the reflection of this reality in the mind.

Other philosophers argued against theory on the pretext of the "struggle against unclear abstractions." The desire to come closer to life is certainly correct, for insufficient knowledge of the facts of social life is one of the sources that breeds dogmatism. But an

incoherent conglomeration of facts cannot be classified as science; science begins only when the facts are gathered into a definite, objectively-substantiated system. For this the facts should be studied in their inter-relation; the important facts should be distinguished from the insignificant ones; the facts should be generalized. And this cannot be done without appropriate scientific concepts that reflect the objective laws of reality. Scientific concepts are a generalization of human practice. Scientific abstractions, particularly philosophical ones, provided they are correct, are instruments not of distortion but of profound understanding of reality.

A one-sided scholasticism is as incompatible with materialist dialectics as vulgar historicism. Where there is no understanding of the dialectical unity of concrete knowledge and its correct theoretical generalization, there is not, nor can there be, a consistent Marxist approach to the study of reality in its revolutionary development. The struggle for the creative development of Marxism has always been a struggle both against logical schematism (for example, against Bogdanov, Bukharin, Lukacs and others) and the positivist neglect of the importance of concepts. Inevitably, these distortions of Marxism in theory are accompanied by slipping into opportunism in politics.

The Central Committee of the Czechoslovak Communist Party helped the philosophers, reminding them of the need for a Party ap-

proach to theoretical problems, and explained the political meaning of the mistakes and delusions of some of them concerning the relationship between science and ideology and on a number of other questions. At a seminar held in October 1958, V. Koucky, Secretary of the Central Committee, showed that the attempts by the revisionists to draw a line between "Marxism as a pure science" and "Marxism as the sum total of ideological aspirations, as a political instrument," were aimed at "severing Marxism from life and turning it into an academic discipline." This, obviously, could but isolate Marxism from the practice of the communist and working-class movement and result in the loss of its revolutionary content. At the same time the revisionist slogan "free science from ideology," current among some of our intellectuals, testifies to their high-handed arrogance in relation to the working class the defence of whose interests leads, allegedly, to distorting the scientific content of Marxism (cf *Nova Mysl*, No. 12, 1958).

The resolution adopted by the Central Committee last summer acted as a stimulus to the ideological workers, revealed the sources of the mistakes made by some of them during the debate on science and ideology, and brought theoretical research in philosophy closer to the ideological work of the Party, to the practical needs of socialist construction.

Among Our Contributors

FRIEDL FUERNBERG: member of the Political Bureau, Secretary of the Communist Party of Austria.

JACK LINDSAY: British writer.

VLADIMIR RUMIL: scientific worker, Czechoslovakia.

NIKOLAI INOZEMTSEV: Soviet scientific worker.

Pages from History

The Seventh Congress of the Communist International

Maurice Thorez

TWENTY-FIVE years have passed since the Seventh Congress of the Communist International was held in Moscow (from July 25 to August 20, 1935). Yet neither the intervening years, nor the profound difference between the past and the present periods have detracted from the value of the conclusions arrived at by the Congress for the international communist movement, above all those concerning the unity of the workers and the democratic forces in the struggle against reaction and war.

The main report on "The Fascist Offensive and the Tasks of the Communist International in the Fight for the Unity of the Working Class Against Fascism" was delivered by Georgi Dimitrov who not long before had put up a heroic stand in Leipzig against the Goebbelses and the Goerings, and the barbarism of nazism. The Congress also heard reports by Comrade Ercoli (Palmiro Togliatti) on "The Preparations for Imperialist War and the Tasks of the Communist International," by Comrade Wilhelm Pieck on the work of the Executive Committee of the Communist International and by Comrade Manuilski on "The Results of Socialist Construction in the USSR." Applause greeted Comrade Manuilski's words to the effect that the success of socialist construction in the Soviet Union was, after the October Revolution, the second great victory of the international working class over capitalism and marked an important change in the balance of forces to the advantage of socialism.

The Seventh Congress of the Comintern has gone down in history as the Congress of struggle for a united working-class front and a people's front against fascism and war. In view of the political experience in the capitalist countries during the preceding years, most of the discussion centered around this question.

This was the experience of the armed struggle waged by the Austrian workers in Febru-

ary 1934 and by the miners in Asturias in October of the same year, during the course of which Socialist workers stood side by side with the Communists, having gone over from the policy of class collaboration to class struggle in its sharpest form. This was the experience of work in the Soviet regions of China with their population of 100 million, experience of the battles fought by the glorious Chinese People's Army against the reactionary Kuomintang, the betrayer of the national interests. In two countries—Germany and France—events took a decisive turn.

The working class and democratic movement was defeated in Germany. In 1933 Hitler came to power, due to the weakness of the working class which had been disorganized, paralyzed and isolated by the split in the working-class movement and could exert no appreciable influence on the middle sections who had succumbed to the political leadership of the big bourgeoisie.

Responsibility for this defeat lay primarily at the door of the Social Democratic leaders. Their policy of class collaboration had led them to reject the proposals made by the Communists for a united anti-fascist front. There were sectarian mistakes too in the work of the Communist Party of Germany; the Party was, it must be admitted, too late in appealing to the working people to defend democratic liberties; and these errors hindered the mobilization of the masses against fascism.

In France, on the contrary, checked as it was by the joint actions of the working people united in a broad people's front, fascism met with defeat after defeat.

The Experience of the French Proletariat

On February 6, 1934, eighteen months before the Congress, the fascist leaders in Paris launched their gangs in an attack against the Chamber of Deputies with the intention of accomplishing a coup d'état. The working class reacted promptly and effectively. Al-

ready on February 6, the Party issued the call for counter-action and on February 9 the proletariat responded by going into the streets where for five hours it fought the police. On that day numerous Socialist workers fought alongside their Communist brothers.

The courageous battle waged by the working people of Paris set an example to the workers and democratic forces throughout the country and ensured the success of a huge anti-fascist strike on February 12 in which the Socialists took part together with the Communists.

To what did the Communist Party owe its prestige among the working people? First of all to the attention it paid to the immediate demands and vital interests of the working people, to its efforts to give the answer to the questions posed by everyday life and to find a solution to the problems. The sectarian Barbé-Célor group, which regarded the fight for partial demands as a "traversed" path, was unmasked and expelled from the Party.

The Communist Party worked indefatigably to unite the working class. In the 12 years between 1923 and 1935 it made twenty-six proposals to the Socialist Party for joint action. Little by little—as the result especially of the international anti-war and anti-fascist congresses convened during 1932-33 at the call of Henri Barbusse and Romain Rolland first in Amsterdam and subsequently in the Salle Pleyel in Paris—the first contacts were established. When in February 1934 the Socialist workers fought against fascism at the side of the Communist workers, it became clear that an official pact between the two parties was necessary. The united front had become, to use Leon Blum's expression, "inevitable." And on July 27, 1934, a joint-action pact was signed.

Thus it was that in 1934 the French Socialists and Communists were able to fight together against the reactionary policy of the Doumergue Cabinet. The situation in France was different from that in Germany where the Social Democrats, in line with their slogan of "the lesser evil," were opposing the Communists and supporting the Bruening government which was reducing wages, whittling away at the political rights of the working class and helping forward the fascization of the Weimar Republic.

The joint-action pact made it possible to exert a more effective influence on the middle

sections. Strong in its unity, the proletariat won allies and drew them into a broad democratic bloc against fascism.

In October 1934 the Central Committee of the French Communist Party advanced the people's front slogan and drew up a people's front program. The Communists made repeated appeals to the Left parties, including the bourgeois Radical Party, to defend democratic liberties against the gangs of rebels, to take action against the rich and the profiteers, to fight on behalf of the working people and the unemployed, and to uphold the economic interests of the people oppressed by the "two hundred families."

A few days before the opening of the Seventh Congress, that is, on July 14, 1935, a huge demonstration in Paris of the Left forces attended by half a million people acclaimed the people's front with its slogan of bread, peace and freedom.

Georgi Dimitrov drew the attention of the delegates to this experience of the French Communist Party. Referring to the tasks confronting the united front and the people's front, he said in his closing speech: "We have not invented this task. It has been prompted by the experience of the world working-class movement itself, above all, by the experience of the proletariat of France. The service of the French Communist Party is that it grasped the need of the hour, that it paid no heed to the sectarians who tried to hold the Party back and hamper the realization of the united front of struggle against fascism, but acted boldly and in a Bolshevik fashion, and by its joint action pact with the Socialist Party prepared the united front of the proletariat as the basis for the anti-fascist People's Front now in the making. By this action, which accords with the vital interests of all the working people, the French workers, both Communists and Socialists, have once more advanced the French labor movement to first place, to a *leading position* in capitalist Europe, and have shown that they are worthy successors of the Communards, worthy inheritors of the glorious legacy of the Paris Commune."

Fascism is the Chief Enemy

Georgi Dimitrov's report to the Seventh Congress is exceptionally rich in content.

Its chief merit lies in its thorough analysis of the class nature of fascism, and it gives a classical definition of fascism: "Fascism in power is the open terrorist dictatorship of the most reactionary, most chauvinistic and most imperialist elements of finance capital."

Thus Dimitrov refuted the erroneous views current among Social Democratic circles, according to which fascism is a "supra-class power, or the power of the petty bourgeoisie or lumpenproletariat." Fascism had the mask of social demagoguery torn from it, was exposed as the vicious enemy of the working people and a weapon of capital.

In fighting the fascist dictatorship the Communists were defending bourgeois democratic liberties. When, instead of being confronted with the choice between bourgeois democracy and socialist democracy, the proletariat has to choose between bourgeois democracy or fascism there must be no hesitation. The proletariat must see that fascism is a dangerous and retrogressive step compared with bourgeois democracy and should safeguard every vestige of democratic liberties; and where the parliamentary system has been abolished it is logical that the working class should demand the convocation of the people's constituent assembly in order to mobilize the masses for the fight against reaction.

Fascism (especially German national socialism, its most barbaric variety) is the shock force of international counter-revolution and was denounced at the Seventh Congress as the chief instigator of imperialist war and the initiator of the crusade against the Soviet Union. "Fascism," the Congress declared, "is war." It spoke of Hitler Germany in Europe and militarist Japan in Asia as the centers in which were concentrated the forces striving to start aggression. Hence fascism is the *chief enemy* against which the actions of the working class and the friends of peace should be spearheaded.

The Congress elucidated in a new way the perspectives before the working people in the anti-war struggle. Though it maintained its view that wars were inevitable as long as capitalism existed, it was resolutely opposed to waiting fatalistically for the carnage. The Congress pointed out that, compared with 1914, the possibilities for waging an effective struggle against imperialist war had grown considerably thanks to the emergence of the Soviet State, the faithful guardian of peace, to the growth of the international working-class movement and to the strengthening of the anti-imperialist forces generally.

Far-reaching changes have taken place in the past twenty-five years. The changed balance of forces since the Second World War enables us to assert today that war is no longer inevitable, although the soil for military

adventure is always present in the capitalist system. A struggle can and must be waged not only to stave off war for a period, but to abolish it forever.

The United Working-Class Front and the People's Anti-Fascist Front

A united working-class front, Dimitrov emphasized, was needed to defend the proletariat and its gains, the working people and their elementary rights, to uphold the peace and the freedom of the peoples. To build this front was the main and immediate task. Its solution was made possible by the changes which had taken place in the working class and the Social Democratic parties under the impact of the unfortunate events in Germany, Austria and other countries; a Left trend, one more inclined to establish unity, had developed among the Socialist workers.

The Seventh Congress called on the Communist parties to apply the united front tactics in a new way. The masses should be brought into motion not only by criticism of capitalism and by inviting them to join in the fight for the ultimate aim, the dictatorship of the proletariat, but by pointing out to them each time what they must do in a given situation and mobilizing them around a platform of partial demands, of defense of the immediate economic and political interests of the working people.

The united front is struggle. And the Congress showed clearly that the important thing in the united front tactics was not the formal conclusion of pacts and agreements between the party leaders, but joint action by workers of differing views. The Congress regarded the local committees elected in the factories, in the working-class districts and in the villages as the most reliable parts of the united front machinery. The setting up of these bodies would make it possible to extend and strengthen the united front, enable it to become firmly entrenched among the masses.

But this should in no way diminish the importance of united action pacts, or of the contact commissions which are a weapon in the working people's struggle. Simultaneously with joint action the Congress was strongly in favor of negotiations and short- or long-term agreements between the Communist and Social Democratic parties, the reformist trade unions and the other organizations of the working people.

The Communist International itself set an example when it announced its readiness to negotiate with the Second International. Al-

ready in October 1934 Marcel Cachin and I had a talk with Vandervelde and Friedrich Adler and during the civil war in Spain there were numerous talks with de Brouckere. None of these, unfortunately, produced much result.

The Congress emphasized that the establishment of unity in the trade unions on the basis of the class struggle was a task of paramount importance. It condemned the sectarian mistakes including the underestimation of the activities in the reformist trade unions. The Communists set no conditions for the realization of trade union unity in each country and on an international scale: they simply wanted the united trade unions to defend the economic interests of the working class in the fight against capital. The Communists said they were prepared (as had already been done in France) to dissolve the Communist fractions in the trade unions if this measure would promote unification.

The Congress went further. Believing that the Communist parties now had a strong core, were monolithic in their unity, and tempered in struggle, it boldly posed the question of political unity, of uniting the workers in a single party. The Communists acted as the genuine champions of working-class unity in advancing as an indispensable condition for the formation of such a party, the demand for complete independence from the bourgeoisie and an end to the bloc between Social Democracy and the bourgeoisie with all the consequences ensuing therefrom. The Communists' persistent effort to consolidate the united front were intended to create the conditions for the formation of a single party.

But the establishment of a united working-class front was not the only aim at that stage: it was hoped to make yet another step forward, to unite the proletariat with the peasantry, the urban petty bourgeoisie and the intellectuals in the struggle against the finance oligarchy, for the defense of the demands advanced by those strata of the population whose interests do not run counter to those of the proletariat. In the fight against fascism and war the working class had to extend its policy of alliances to social groups who supported neither the dictatorship of the proletariat nor socialist democracy, but stood for the traditional democratic rights.

In this way a wide anti-fascist people's front could have been built which, in certain cases, could have led, thanks to mass action, to the formation of a government of struggle against fascism and reaction, relying on the

co-operation of the revolutionary vanguard and other anti-fascist parties in the interests of the working people as a whole.

The establishment of a people's front and the assumption by it of the leading role do not imply the victory of socialism. The Communists in France and other capitalist countries were sure that their people would carry out greater changes than those set down in the program of the people's front government. They were sure that the working class would fulfil its historical mission: the revolutionary transition from capitalist society to a society in which there would be no exploitation of man by man. But at that time there was no talk of this. The problem then was to block the way to fascist barbarity and another terrible war; to implement a policy in accord with the interests of the people, the will and aspirations of the masses in town and countryside, the hopes of the small trading bourgeoisie and the democratic sections of the bourgeoisie.

If the people's front did not signify the triumph of socialism it was, nevertheless, an important part of the Communists' policy. It was not a matter of tactics to meet the occasion, still less was it a pre-election maneuver. It was the practical application of Marxist-Leninist theory on the alliance between the working class and the middle sections of the people in the fight against big capital. Did not Lenin teach the Communist parties to combine firmness and intransigence on fundamental issues with flexible tactics, with efforts to reach agreement with the Social Democratic parties and some of the bourgeois groupings in the struggle against monopoly domination and reaction?

Thanks to the united front and the people's front policy the working class was more and more becoming an active force exerting a decisive influence on the march of events. It would not rest content with struggle in the form of propaganda against capitalism; it would deal telling blows to the policy of the capitalists, seek to paralyze the bourgeoisie's offensive against the working people and frustrate its attempts to establish a fascist regime.

In these conditions the Communist parties would cease to be a militant *opposition* inside the working class, vis-à-vis the Socialist parties and the powerful reformist trade unions; they could take the destiny of the working class into their hands. Dimitrov appealed to the Communists to pay careful attention to all the needs of the people, to combine revo-

lutionary realism with heroism, to become a decisive factor in the political life of each country.

The Communists and the Nation

Insisting on the unification of all democratic forces and organizations in the fight against reaction, the Seventh Congress of the Comintern stressed the need for an ideological struggle against fascism, and for the exposure of demagoguery which, with terror and violence, was its favorite weapon.

Dimitrov showed that the fascists "are rummaging through the entire *history* of every nation so as to be able to pose as the heirs and continuators of all that was exalted and heroic in its past. . . ." He denounced this gross falsification of historical and political truth by an anti-national party representing the interests of the most reactionary sections of the bourgeoisie and of decaying monopoly capital.

Guided as they were by the great principle that "we are concerned with every important question, not only of the present and the future, but also of the past of our own people," each party had to link up its struggle with the revolutionary traditions of its people. The Communists are the irreconcilable opponents of bourgeois nationalism. But they are not supporters of national nihilism. The socialist revolution leads to the salvation and the development of the nation.

In its fight against fascism the French Communist Party was always true to the national traditions. In the name of the working class we resolutely defended the heritage of the Encyclopaedists of the 18th century, and the legacy of the Jacobins and the Great French Revolution. Whereas the fascists in the "Fiery Cross" nominated as their head a descendant of a Coblenz emigré, a traitor to France, we took pride in our country's past, in the age-old struggle against enslavement and oppression. The national Party Conference of June 1934 orientated the French Communists along this path. In the demonstration of July 14, 1935, the tricolor was to be seen alongside the red flag and the strains of the Marseillaise, the song of 1792 and 1793, alternated with those of the Internationale.

The Continuity of the General Line and New Tactical Positions

The ideas expounded at the Seventh Congress were not new to the Communist International. They were, in fact, the fundamental principles upon which the activities of the

Communist parties were based and which had been enunciated time and again by Lenin.

The principles of the united front tactics were clearly set forth by Lenin in the summer of 1921 at the Third Congress of the Communist International. That Congress coined the slogan: "To the Masses! Establish a United Front!" The resolution enjoined the Communist parties to take an active part in the day-to-day economic struggle of the working people. On Lenin's insistence, late in 1922 the Fourth Congress of the Comintern again pointed out that persevering work among the masses on the basis of a united front was a fundamental task of the Communist parties.

Thus since the early years of the Third International the establishment of unity had been regarded as a task of paramount importance.

Lenin also taught that a working-class party should serve as a forum for the people. And that was why among the fundamental tasks of the Communist International defined by the Second Congress, was that of "inspiring and leading in the footsteps of the revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat, its Communist Party, not only the whole proletariat or the overwhelming majority of it, but the entire mass of the working people and those exploited by capital . . . of wrenching this overwhelming majority of the population in the capitalist countries out of their state of dependence on the bourgeoisie," inspiring in them confidence in the leading role of the working class.

The Congress noted that the majority of the working people could not, under capitalism, acquire a genuinely socialist consciousness, but emphasized that only if the Communist Party became linked "indissolubly" not only "with the entire life of its class," but "with the whole mass of the exploited," could it work effectively.

Eight years later the program adopted by the Sixth Congress of the Communist International expressly recalled that everything must be done to win over the urban petty bourgeoisie to the side of the proletariat.

True to the behests of Lenin, the Communist International laid special emphasis on the need for an alliance between the peasantry and the working class. "Communist work in rural districts is acquiring paramount importance in the present period. . . . To refuse to do this work . . . is tantamount to renouncing the proletarian revolution"—this was stated at the Second Congress of the Comintern. The Theses on the agrarian ques-

tion adopted by this Congress pointed out that a wide gap separated the agricultural proletariat, the semi-proletariat in the countryside, the small tenants and the small proprietors from the landowners and the capitalists and that they must be won over to the side of the working class.

The proletarian state, the Second Congress emphasized, must give land to the peasants, and not take it away, and it warned against haste in carrying out collectivization: "The proletarian state power must pass to collective agriculture only with extreme caution and gradually, by the force of example, without coercion of the middle peasant."

That was the stand in 1920. The program of the Communist International in 1928 reiterated that the proletariat must win over "the exploited and toiling sections in the countryside."

The policy charted by the Communist International contributed to reinforcing and consolidating the world revolutionary working-class movement.

The situation created on the eve of the Seventh Congress by the fascist offensive and the sharpening of the social contradictions in Europe and throughout the world generally emphasized the need for unity. To establish a united working-class front and a people's front was now the cardinal task. A new approach had to be made to the Social Democrats and to the reformist trade unions; new tactics corresponding to the needs of the day had to be worked out.

Having defined the new line and pointing to the need to orientate on the masses, the Seventh Congress criticized the sectarian mistakes of the past. In many countries the Communists had been insufficiently flexible in pursuing the united action policy; they had not been able to establish close contact with the Socialist workers and their local organizations; posing the slogan of "Soviet Power" in a general way, they did not place the emphasis on the struggle for democratic rights and liberties; they were unable to rally the masses for the fight for partial demands. They concentrated their fire against the Social Democrats and did not at once recognize fascism as the chief enemy.

In a number of countries the Communists did not go beyond simple theoretical recognition of the need to work among the petty-bourgeois strata in town and countryside with the object of winning them over to their side. They left broad sections of the peasants and their organizations outside the orbit of

their influence. Where the Marxist party underrated the needs and interests of the middle sections, these latter fell easy prey to fascist demagoguery.

Another weakness of the communist movement to which the Seventh Congress drew attention was its tendency mechanically to apply the experience of the Communist party of a given country in the work of a Communist party of another country. Not always were the features of the movement in the various countries, the level of political preparedness, or the degree of revolutionary maturity, taken into account. The living creative study of problems was replaced by cut-and-dried schemes and stereotyped practices.

The Congress cautioned against the threat of Right-wing opportunism, which was particularly dangerous when upheavals in the capitalist world were imminent.

The Political Results of the Seventh Congress

The Seventh Congress of the Comintern thus placed the perspectives of struggle and victory before the international working-class movement. By advancing the slogan of unity of all workers and democrats, the Congress showed the millions of working people who had experienced the bitterness of defeat under the blows of fascism, and the millions who were trying to avoid the same fate, the practical way out of the situation, how they could effectively bar the way to reactionary dictatorships.

Citing the example of the struggle waged by the French proletariat, the Congress showed that a united working-class front developing into a people's anti-fascist front, would make it possible not only to bar the way to fascism, but to take the offensive against it. The delegates had good grounds for believing that the anti-fascist movement in France and the armed battles in Austria and Spain were the guarantee that, after the German experience, attempts to install a fascist regime in other countries would come up against the strong resistance of the working people.

The Seventh Congress regarded itself as the Congress of the future victories of the working class, as the Congress that was paving the way to these victories. And that, as we know, is exactly what it was.

In the subsequent months implementation of the line it charted resulted in important successes.

The people's front policy pursued by the Communists in Spain ensured the victory of the democratic forces over the reactionary bloc at the elections in February 1936. A government relying on the people's front was formed and the conditions were created to bar the way to fascism.

And then the domestic and international reactionaries hatched a plot against the Republic in order, cost what it may, to throttle Spanish democracy. In July 1936 the Spanish fascists and the Italian and German interventionists went over to the offensive. During this time of trial the heroic struggle waged by the working class and democrats of Spain showed the strength of popular unity. The intervention by the fascist powers could not have broken them had not the French, British and American imperialists, under the pretext of "non-intervention" and with the help of the Right-wing Socialist leaders, contributed to the temporary defeat of the Spanish people. It was only by combining their efforts that the capitalist ruling classes were able to win a victory over the popular front in Spain.

In France the Communist Party's correct policy enabled the People's Front established in 1934-35 to score outstanding successes in 1936. On the one hand, the working class averted the fascist threat by ensuring an impressive electoral victory for the People's Front and, thanks to unity, upset the plans of the fascist rebels. On the other hand, it won its main economic demands and secured the satisfaction of the demands advanced by its allies, the peasants, artisans, shopkeepers, and intellectuals. Working-class unity was concretely expressed in the establishment of a single trade union body, the CGT, which became an important factor in the national life.

The Communist parties in a number of other countries also, and not without success, fought fascism, pursuing the united front policy enunciated at the Seventh Congress of the Comintern.

On the initiative of the Communist Party, a national anti-Japanese front was established in China in 1937. Under the leadership of Mao Tse-tung the Communist Party of China united the national and democratic forces in the war against the invaders and proved itself the genuine defender of the country's interests, winning the love of the masses and becoming the recognized leader of the nation. And today, in unity and co-operation with its allies of the democratic front, it is building socialism.

The International and the National Parties

In the years following the Seventh Congress the Communist parties in the different countries gave proof of their political maturity. They learned to establish durable contacts with the masses, to find their bearings swiftly and independently in complex situations, and to keep a cool head at times of crises. Their cadres became tempered.

The tempering of the cadres of the Communist parties in the capitalist countries was noted by the Seventh Congress which drew the corresponding organizational conclusions.

The Congress made some fundamental changes in the methods employed by the Communist International in guiding its sections. It resolved that in view of the specific conditions obtaining in each particular country, and to avoid direct intervention in the internal organizational matters of the Communist parties, the Executive Committee should in future concentrate on elaborating fundamental political and tactical lines of world significance. The executive guidance was transferred from the international center to the national sections.

Fifteen years previously the Rules adopted by the Second Congress of the Communist International empowered the Executive Committee to issue instructions which were obligatory on all the parties and organizations affiliated to the Communist International. It had the powers of a genuine leading body. The situation had changed by 1935:

"We would not be real revolutionaries," said Dimitrov at the Congress, "if we did not learn from our own experience and the experience of the masses. We want our parties in the capitalist countries to come out and act as *real political parties of the working class*, to become in actual fact *a political factor* in the life of their countries. . . . We want the Communists of each country promptly to draw and apply *all the lessons* that can be drawn from their own experience as the revolutionary vanguard of the proletariat. We want them *as quickly as possible to learn how to sail on the turbulent waters of the class struggle.*"

And Dimitrov urged the Communist cadres in the various countries to display initiative and boldness, to think for themselves and to improve their methods of work in the spirit of the Seventh Congress. The new wine, he said, should not be spoiled by pouring it into old bottles.

How far this confidence in the national cadres was justified may be judged by the

activities of the Communist parties during the Second World War.

The Communist parties of the countries which participated in the war against the fascist invaders were the inspirers and organizers of the battles fought by the masses for national independence. In the many hard years of trial they marched with their people, heroically defending their interests and stopping at no sacrifice. The activities of the Communists everywhere bore witness to the correctness of the party's political line, to its clear-cut program for the liberation of the people and their future life. In every country they fought in the spirit of the Seventh Congress for the establishment of a people's front uniting all patriotic forces.

In the axis countries the Communist parties also remained faithful to their cause.

The changing situation made it daily more and more obvious that it was impossible to guide the communist movement in the different countries from one center such as the Communist International, even though great freedom of action had been granted to the national parties by the Seventh Congress. In solving their problems the national Communist parties, tempered in battle, no longer needed to depend on the rulings of a higher-level body, a body which worked out the political and tactical lines. That was precisely why the

Executive Committee resolved to dissolve the Communist International.

This decision was prompted by the considerations which in 1935 led the delegates to the Seventh Congress to give the matured and strengthened Communist parties the maximum initiative and independence in the management of their affairs.

Marcel Cachin said at this Congress:

"I must mention here the great help that our French proletariat has derived from its affiliation to the Communist International. . . . We have absolute confidence in it. . . . It is a confidence founded on the accumulated experience of the fifteen years that have passed since our entry into the Communist International."

Having worked out the new tactical lines corresponding to the needs of the time, and having advanced the issue of the united front and the people's front, the Seventh Congress of the Comintern once again rendered "great help" to the proletariat of the capitalist countries. This Congress occupies a prominent place in the annals of the Communist International which, despite the errors made, effectively helped to mobilize the working people for the defense of economic and political interests and contributed to the growth of the international communist movement.

**In the Communist
and Workers' Parties**

The People of South Korea Will Fight to the End

THE demonstrations that flared up in South Korea after the rigged presidential elections spread all over the country and developed into a popular uprising against the colonial regime of the U.S. imperialists and the Syngman Rhee clique. The puppet government fell and its overseas bosses were forced to maneuver and to engage in subterfuge in an attempt to deceive the people and calm them.

But the eruption of popular wrath was not accidental—the election swindle was simply the spark that ignited the long-maturing indignation. The 15 years' sway of the U.S. imperialists and the Rhee clique has reduced the country to a state of decay. Industry and agriculture are in a state of ruin; unemployment is rife; some three million peasants are left without food; medium and small producers are going bankrupt en masse; Rhee and Co. trampled on democratic rights and liberties.

The way to genuine regeneration of the country is clearly pointed out in the appeal of the Central Committee of the Korean Party of Labor to the South Koreans published on April 21. It reads:

"Representatives of the political parties and public organizations of South and North Korea should meet in order to find a way out of the present situation; all issues should be resolved by the Koreans themselves. They should take steps to solve the pressing problems. The way out is to meet and discuss the urgent questions.

"The experience of the past 15 years has shown that South Korea cannot exist in isolation from the North, and that its population will not be able to resolve the issues unless the South and the North negotiate.

"As long as South Korea is occupied by the U.S. imperialists, and without South-North talks, there can be no solution to the serious political crisis and economic stagnation, no matter who comes to power there."

The appeal points to the progress made by North Korea, to the vast national resources which could be used for the rapid rehabilitation of the South Korean economy and for raising the standard of living.

"It is our hope that the fruits of the work of the people of North Korea will, without delay, be

placed at the disposal of the people of South Korea.

"Work should be provided for the unemployed in South Korea. As is the case in North Korea, all workers should have an eight-hour day, state social insurance, paid holidays, and a general improvement in conditions.

"Large-scale irrigation is necessary in the countryside, and agricultural machinery and chemical fertilizers should be supplied so that the lot of the hunger-stricken peasants can be improved. All children of school age should have the benefits of free education. Students in technical schools and higher educational establishments should be provided with government grants.

"In order to develop the national economy it is necessary to provide manufacturers and traders with conditions for normal activity.

"Government measures are needed to end contagious and endemic diseases; a State Public Health system should be introduced.

"The population of South Korea should be provided with all the conditions needed for a normal life. We are anxious to see this done as quickly as possible.

"The tragic position of the people can no longer be tolerated. Let us come together at the earliest for talks around the table.

"The U.S. troops must go, and the Korean question should be settled peacefully, through the democratic expression of the will of all Koreans.

"The question cannot be decided through war. A fratricidal war is what the enemies of our nation are longing for.

"We have always upheld peace and we are working persistently for the peaceful unification of the motherland. The clamor raised by the U.S. imperialists and the Rhee clique about 'the danger of an invasion' is designed for the purpose of diverting the indignation and hatred of the people of South Korea.

"Everybody knows that the U.S. imperialists and the Rhee clique have turned down all our proposals for maintaining peace in Korea and for the peaceful solution of the Korean question, that it is they who are instigating 'a crusade to the North.'

"As long as the U.S. aggressive troops occupy South Korea, peace cannot be maintained in the country, nor can there be a peaceful solution of the Korean question. The United States must be held responsible for the situation in South Korea before the peoples of Korea and the people of the world; it should immediately withdraw its troops from South Korea. We call on the people of the world to condemn and brand with shame the crimes perpetrated by the U.S. imperialists in South Korea.

"It is necessary to reduce the strength of the South and North Korean armies to the minimum, to let the men go home to peaceful labor. This will remove the burden of military expenditure from the South Korean population.

"Peaceful reunification of our motherland should be achieved without foreign interference, in keeping with the free expression of the will of all Koreans through universal elections in both South and North Korea.

"All who cherish the national honor must rally in the sacred fight for the realization of this great cause!

"Now is not the time to discuss the past or to argue about political differences. We shall not ask you about the past, but shall consult with you and march hand in hand with all who want a peaceful reunification of the motherland."

In connection with the 15th anniversary of the liberation of Korea by the Soviet Army, which will be observed next month, the Central Committee of the Party of Labor has published an address to all Koreans. This document assesses the developments in South Korea and expresses confidence that the people's movement will win further success. "Thanks to their struggle, the people of South Korea have won a big victory. This, however, is only the first victory. . . . The U.S. imperialists still occupy the country and maintain their puppet administration. The landlords and the compradore bourgeoisie — the aggressive mainstay of U.S. imperialism — have not suffered a single blow. . . .

The U.S. imperialists forcibly suppress the people who are demanding freedom and democracy, and, at the same time, are continuing their insidious intrigues with a view to deceiving and calming the people."

The U.S. imperialists, the document continues, have replaced the members of the puppet government by their stooges who, together with Rhee, conducted treacherous activities, and who now talk about "reforms." But the "caretaker" government is only a "new edition" of Rhee's puppet rule. The U.S. imperialists and their stooges are trying to restore Washington's shattered prestige in South Korea and to preserve their colonial domination.

No vile intrigue, however, will help the U.S. imperialists to preserve the rotten colonial regime. The political and economic crisis in South Korea is deepening. People of different social strata are becoming more and more dissatisfied with the U.S. imperialists and their accomplices. The growing antagonism between the different sections of the South Korean population, on the one hand, and the U.S. imperialists and their associates — the clique of traitors — on the other, can be resolved only by ending the occupation of South Korea and abolishing colonial rule. As long as the occupation and colonial rule continue, the people of South Korea will carry on the struggle and extend it.

The situation is ripening when it will become possible peacefully to unite the country, and thus realize the dream of all Koreans.

The Central Committee calls on all South Korean patriots to fight for the withdrawal of the U.S. troops and the abolition of the corrupt reactionary regime, for normal life, for democratic rights, for contacts between North and South, for a conference of representatives of the political parties and public organizations of North and South Korea with a view to ending the national division, for a peaceful re-unification of the country through establishing a single government after holding free nationwide elections without foreign interference.

National Conference of the Communist Party of New Zealand

THE triennial National Conference of the Communist Party of New Zealand, held in April, showed that the Party, after rebutting all the attacks of the revisionists who suffered complete ideological and organizational defeat at the 1957 Congress, has rallied to the call "Out to the People With Our Policy." As a result, the Party which had up till 1957, in the postwar years of capitalist boom and cold war propaganda, to fight a defensive battle, was now on the offensive winning more members and extending its influence.

This new feeling of growth, symbolized by the presence of fraternal delegates from the Communist parties of Australia and Great Britain and, for the first time, a representative from the Communist party of a socialist country — China — created great enthusiasm at the Conference.

The successes, since our Party is still small, were naturally also not large in scope, but they were seen to be quite significant. The question of bringing the Communist Party forward as the real leader of the working class in a country where for nearly fifty years the Labor Party has had the support of the workers, was the central question discussed at the Conference. Vic Wilcox, the General Secretary, who delivered the report of the National Committee, showed the degradation of the Labor Party. Compare the Labor Party of those times, he said, when it still spoke about a socialist future, with the Labor Party of today, a Party with a skeleton organization, relying for a working base on the affiliation fees — grudgingly given — of the unions, a Party that has had to stop its national paper, *The Standard*, because of lack of support. Its central approach was and is the obtaining of concessions from capitalism, not the changing of the system, which leads to perpetuating the privileged position of the employing class. The hold of social democracy on the working class and its allies has rested and still rests on capitalist ability to give concessions to the exploited to keep them quiet. But today social democracy is in a state of world crisis and decline. This is logical and must occur with the decline of the capitalist system.

The Conference called for a more direct and vigorous criticism of the Labor government and its policy. At the same time the Party must be sure that the workers understand what it says. The main thing was that the Party should shed every vestige of being a ginger group pushing the Labor Party forward and submerging itself. It should explain that both under the National Party and under the Labor Party the workers had had a bad deal,

while big business had always been protected. The time has come to work towards open mass protests against Labor policy on international and internal issues, led and organized by the workers' organizations.

The Party must put up the maximum number of candidates in the November 1960 elections and must work hard to convince the people that a vote for a Communist candidate was not a vote wasted, even if a Communist was not elected. In constituencies where the Party was not putting up a candidate, it should advise the workers to vote Labor, explaining to them why it was necessary to do so, until such time as the Communist Party was strong enough to contest every constituency.

The Conference pointed out that in the Party's work there had been a weakness in not sufficiently combining the struggle for immediate issues with socialist propaganda. This had led to the Party being seen by the workers too often as a Party of immediate action, mentioning socialism only in a general way. Members had to realize that it was not possible to get socialism without a mass movement and without struggle, and that in order to develop the mass movement the Party had to teach the workers about the issues of socialism.

The program put before the Conference was fully endorsed. This program of an all-out fight of the democratic forces against monopoly shows the way to a socialist future of the country. The report pointed out that peaceful coexistence did not automatically guarantee a peaceful path to socialism. The degree and methods of the revolutionary struggle within each particular country will be determined by the alignment of class forces, but as a revolutionary Party it would be foolish for the Communist Party to expect the capitalist class to wait until it is too weak to act. The menace of a new fascism is still before the country, and the fight will still be bitter. The capitalists will endeavor to increase their exploitation of the workers, small farmers and all outside the realm of monopoly. They will also endeavor to destroy or at least weaken the Communist Party.

The ruling classes never cease their attacks against the Party. By way of illustration the delegates were shown a tiny transistor radio transmitter which the secret police had concealed in the ceiling of the Conference hall, but which had been detected. Another transmitter was again concealed in the ceiling by the secret police and was again discovered before the Conference began its second day.

The correctness of the Moscow Declaration of the 12 Parties had been fully confirmed: the major imperialist powers, particularly the USA, were still interfering in the affairs of small nations and a section of the imperialists were still looking for wars, and were held back only by the growing awareness of the people and the overall strengthening of the world peace forces. Hence followed the need to be always on the alert, and to step up the fight for peace.

The report detailed the results in the Party recruiting campaign from May Day 1959 till Easter

1960. The target of a 25 per cent membership increase had been exceeded. The target for a circulation increase of *The People's Voice* and the Party theoretical organ had been doubled. The Conference decided to change the name of the Party's theoretical organ from *Labor Review* to *Communist Review*.

The Conference was an inspiring and outstanding success. All documents were unanimously adopted. The outgoing leadership was re-elected to the leading committee.

H. OSTLER

"Jugendweihe"

THE approximate translation of this word is youth initiation ceremony* which has become firmly established in the public life of the German Democratic Republic, and is an important aspect of Party work in educating the young generation. "Jugendweihe" tradition is deeply rooted in the German working-class movement. Civic confirmation appeared at the end of the last century in protest against clerical domination in educational bodies and against the militarist education of the youth. The advanced workers formed unions of atheists which acquainted the youth with natural science and with Marxist ideas, and taught them to be staunch in the struggle against the enemies of the working people.

As a young man Wilhelm Pieck, President of the Republic, took an active part in organizing this movement. In 1912 he founded a youth club in the Steglitz district of Berlin, organized workers' holidays in connection with school leaving and youth initiation.

Recalling the first ceremonies, Walter Ulbricht said in his concluding speech at the Fifth Congress of the Socialist Unity Party: "Ethics was for us the main subject in civic confirmation. We took part in the struggle against clerical reaction, against capitalist amorality; and the working class, the Marxist teaching, educated us in the spirit of the supreme ethical principle — solidarity of the working class and friendship of the peoples."

The ceremony is now held in March and April each year. It is universal and voluntary in character. This year over 88 per cent of all boys and girls were initiated, in the presence of some three million parents and guests.

The aim of the initiation is to impart to the young people special knowledge, and to broaden their outlook in order to prepare them for the

ranks of the conscious and active builders of socialist society.

From September to the end of April young men and women attend special classes. The subjects acquaint them with the laws of nature and society, the significance of the 10 principles of socialist ethics elaborated at the Fifth Congress of the Socialist Unity Party. The students are advised on the choice of a trade, rules of behavior, the role of the GDR. Talks are given by public and political leaders, scientists and workers. The youngsters discuss questions of socialist construction in the Republic. Talks on subjects like "The Success of Soviet Astronautics" or "Atoms for Peace in the German Democratic Republic" induce the young people to make a deeper study of natural science and technology.

At seminars dealing with the subjects "Brothers, Look at the Red Banner" (the first line of an old workers' song) and "On Genuine Revolutionary Heroism" veteran workers tell about the struggle waged by the working class of Germany against imperialism and militarism. Visits are arranged to the former concentration camp in Buchenwald, to the Dimitrov Museum in Leipzig, and to the Socialists' Monument in Friedrichsfelde, Berlin.

Talks with workers and peasants, heroes of labor, help to educate the youngsters in the spirit of love of work, respect for the will of the collective, to improve the work of the schools and the youth organizations, to extend the polytechnical know-how. The value of this work can be seen, for example, in a letter sent by an ex-pupil to his tutor, Hero of Labor Hans Garbe: "You told me that in the event of my being successful, I should not forget that I grew up in a worker's family. I promise you never to forget this. You have given me very much, and I thank you. For me you will be an example. I suppose I would have finished school with a 'satisfactory' mark. But after hearing you I decided that I could do better, and I succeeded in getting good marks. Since then I have been more active in the Free German Youth. . . ."

*This ceremony arose as a protest against Confirmation, catholic and protestant ritual of admitting juveniles to the believers' community. The confirmation is designed to influence the minds of children and thus educate the younger generation in the spirit of religious obedience.

The studies supply a deeper understanding of science, socialist ethics, arts and literature, help mold the outlook of the youngsters, enrich their knowledge and add to their moral qualities. They help to develop well-educated young men and women, people proud of their Democratic Republic and who are fighting for peace, international friendship and socialism.

Youth initiation is not a matter of one party or organization, it has become the common cause of all the citizens of our Republic. The Christian Democratic Union, the Liberal Democratic Party, the National Democratic Party and the Peasant Democratic Party have supported the Socialist Unity Party's initiative and agreed with the aims and purpose of civic confirmation.

The working class exerts its influence on this event. On the initiative of the workers, groups are being formed in the factories, machine and tractor stations and agricultural co-operatives, which jointly with the trade unions, women's and youth organizations, explain the significance of civic confirmation.

The Socialist Unity Party pays close attention to socialist education of the youth, to preparing civic confirmation. Party members are obliged to support all measures in connection with the youth initiation.

Education of the youth in the spirit of socialism, naturally, is not to the liking of the reactionaries. The leading church bodies instigated by the militarist-clerical forces in West Germany, are attacking the civic confirmation, trying to turn religious people against the policy of the Party and government.

The constant attacks against socialist education by the Catholic and Evangelical clergy account for the revisionist tendencies that have appeared in the youth initiation movement. Some people who had no clear idea about the socialist content of civic confirmation, tried to place the program of studies and of celebrations on an ideologically neutral footing. They claimed that the program of the study-

groups was too polemical. Combating these views our Party explained that the chief aim of the study-groups and civic confirmation is to equip the youth with the ideas of scientific socialism.

Equally unsuccessful were the attempts to change the traditional name of the ceremony to "a youth festival" and to replace the book *Universe—Earth—Man* which provides a scientific, materialist explanation of nature and society (the youth initiation committees present this book to all participants) with a book lacking in ideological guidance. Unstable elements tried to make the youth initiation "acceptable" and "liberal."

The Party vigorously rejected these revisionist views and upheld the progressive character of the movement and its revolutionary traditions.

Nor was the movement free from sectarian errors. Some former members of the atheists' unions who failed to grasp the new character of youth initiation under worker-peasant rule, maintained that only the children of atheists should be admitted to the ceremony. The Party said that all boys and girls should take part in the celebration for which purpose it was necessary to carry out painstaking explanatory work in order to show the importance of civic confirmation. These sectarian tendencies have been overcome. Even religious people and people of petty-bourgeois origin take an active part in preparing and carrying out civic confirmation.

Reactionary priests, speculating on the antagonism between science and religion, argue that religious confirmation and youth initiation are incompatible. They forbid young people to attend the ceremony, putting forward the alternative: "either youth initiation or religious confirmation." But the spread of the movement in the past six years shows that the people have no time for these reactionary views. *Die Welt*, the influential bourgeois paper, has had to admit that youth initiation has become very popular in the German Democratic Republic.

Friedrich NAUMANN
Alfred PETERSHEIM

Automation and the Working Class

(Theoretical Conference in the Communist Party of Austria)

ABOUT two years ago the leadership of the Communist Party assigned a group of members — engineers and technicians — to study automation in Austria. This work even attracted the attention of people far removed from the Party. The organ of the Trade Union Amalgamation also published an article on automation. Last autumn the Austrian Trades Union Congress adopted a unanimous resolution on automation which had been drawn up by the progressive Trade Union Unity group.

After this preparatory work the Political Bureau of the Communist Party decided to hold a widely-representative conference to determine the Party's attitude to automation.

Although the Central Committee sponsored the conference, it did not organize a preliminary discussion of the theses so as not to predetermine the conference findings. The published materials reflected the views of a group of Party members — engineers and technicians — and were not binding on the speakers.

In the debate, which was lively and interesting, 27 people spoke: workers, engineers, factory council members and Party leaders.

Below are the main questions debated.

It was generally recognized that under capitalism automation brought with it the loss of jobs and of social gains of the workers, because growth of output was not accompanied by an appropriate growth of purchasing power. Speakers stressed the need for appropriate preventive measures, to fight for higher wages, reduction of working hours, lower age limit for pensions, etc.

On the other hand, mention was made of the danger of the country lagging behind technologically: scientific research is in a bad way in Austria; patents and cartel arrangements increase the dependence of the enterprises on foreign countries, above all West Germany; the training of technical personnel is unsatisfactory. Can we be indifferent to all this? Can we simply regard this as a consequence of capitalism, and only busy ourselves with jobs and wages?

The report and contributions revealed the consequences of technological progress in the capitalist and the socialist countries. That which under capitalism gives rise to fear and which spells danger to the workers, under socialism promises a splendid future. The Communists should be more active in explaining to the workers the superiority of socialism, a superiority which becomes in-

creasingly obvious with the development of technology, and in particular with the spread of automation.

Automation intensifies capitalist contradictions, including class antagonisms, but for the people employed at automated factories the changes in their conditions make it difficult to become conscious of their class position. This helps to spread reformist illusions. Exploitation grows with technological progress, but its outward manifestations change: "convenient" work places are substituted for arduous physical labor; dirty overalls are replaced by white ones; the growing percentage of clerical workers in the overall labor force gives the manual worker the perspective of "advancing" to the category of white-collar workers. Intensity of labor is, as before, measured by the sweat of the worker, despite the fact that under capitalism automation adds to nerve strain and causes greater exhaustion. These things should be borne in mind in conducting our political work.

Speakers said that although automation was not very advanced as yet in Austria, we as Marxists should be in a position to foresee the march of events. The Party, it was stressed, should tackle all aspects of the process, it was absolutely insufficient to limit ourselves only to trade union demands. On the one hand, we should make constructive proposals on the problems of today and, on the other, show the limits of the possibilities under the existing system.

If we want to apply to our conditions the ideas of the Appeal adopted at the meeting of 17 Parties in Rome, if we want to fight "to restrict the power of the monopolies," we cannot simply adopt a negative attitude or be indifferent to the problems arising from Austria's lagging in technological development.

Participation by the working people in allocating capital investments, the development of research, the training of technical personnel — these questions are of the greatest interest to workers and intellectuals.

Whether the monopolies will be curbed and the conditions created for the working class to influence the economy, thus bringing about the possibility of the country's democratic and independent development, can be decided only through persistent class struggle and not through "social partnership" and reformism. Automation and technical progress are important problems in which we should display initiative. The development of working-class unity and the success of the struggle to take Austria

along the road to socialism depend in no small measure on whether the Communists will be able, and if so to what extent, to influence the solution of these problems.

The conference stressed that the youth were closely interested in problems of technology. But only the Communists could show them the picture of a future technological progress free from social barriers and from educational privilege, the world of ingenious machines, willingly obedient to man, delivering him from monotonous work and opening

up the possibilities for interesting and creative activity. In this way the romanticism of the socialist revolution can be enriched by the romanticism of the technological revolution.

The conference fulfilled a useful function. It was decided to continue to pay close attention to automation. A commission will sum up the results of the conference and prepare a detailed document to be discussed and adopted as a Party directive on automation.

Fred MARGULIES

Short Notices

Hungary

AN INTERESTING DISCUSSION

SOME time ago a letter written by a young peasant woman, relayed over the radio, told that friends had persuaded her husband to leave for the city which was the only place, they said, where he could get on in life. But the wife wanted to join the co-operative and thought that interesting work could be done in the village too.

The question was posed sharply and aroused considerable comment. Some 400 replies were received, about half of which said that the youth had good chances in the village. Other letters lauded urban life (these were mainly from the villages where the co-operatives were either weak or non-existent).

Controversy centered around three questions:

Some held that work in the town provided better conditions than work in the countryside. Many co-operative members objected to this in a very convincing way. For example, B. Sandorné, a 20-year-old member of the Oroshaza co-operative, argued not in a general way but with figures. The average monthly wage of a factory worker is 1,500 forints. A co-operative member can easily make 500 workday units a year. Last year the cash payment per workday unit averaged 40 forints; that is, a co-operater can get 20,000 a year, or more than 1,660 monthly.

A 16-year-old girl wrote that her parents, who had a tiny plot of land, had held out for a long time before joining the co-operative. Now that they have joined, they live better and earn more than many town workers. Some criticisms and suggestions were also made on this question. For example, some said that the co-operatives should make advance payments every month.

Another question was the nature of the work in town and in the countryside. Some argued that in the towns one could become skilled, whereas farm work was unskilled.

An interesting reply came from the village of

Szeghalom. Before 1945 even a thresher was unknown there. Now the machine and tractor station has many types of tractors, all of them operated by young peasants who have had special training. The village of today cannot be imagined without radio and TV sets, combines and tractors. Trades new to the villages have appeared — fitters, electricians, motor drivers. Many combine work with study in agricultural colleges. The number of rural intellectuals has grown, and those who graduate from secondary and higher school willingly return to jobs in the villages.

And, lastly, the cultural level of the countryside was discussed. Now there are over 2,500 houses of culture in the villages. The co-operatives annually allocate two per cent of their funds for cultural purposes. A letter from Szentetornya described the local house of culture which has a library, a billiards hall, a TV set.

This extensive material was summed up in an article in the journal *Partelet* (Party Life). The article showed that the eagerness of some young men and women to leave the countryside for the towns was largely due to shortcomings in educational work and to inability to make use of the opportunities which obtain in the countryside now covered by co-operatives. What is needed is not evasion of the questions agitating the rural youth, but explanations about the perspectives of socialism in the countryside in order to win them over for the job of technologically reconstructing the village along socialist lines.

Indonesia

PARTY PROPOSALS ON ECONOMIC QUESTIONS

IN VIEW of the deteriorating economic position of the country, the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Indonesia has issued a statement which recalls that when the government introduced a monetary reform last year, the Party warned that the measures

would adversely affect the economy, unless the state sector and the private sector were expanded by loosening the economic grip of the foreign monopolies and unless relations were developed with countries ready to help Indonesia.

The government, instead of heeding the warning, adopted some harmful measures such as raising taxes, direct and indirect, cutting expenditure on government enterprises and institutions, etc.

The Party declares that the current price policy is incorrect. The rise in prices, while wages and salaries remain unchanged, has caused anxiety among the people. It is not enough to announce price ceilings and introduce police control to enforce prices. The government should see to it that the market has sufficient stocks of goods. The state-ment criticizes the government for raising transport fares and the charges for other basic services, and points to the inadmissibility of the state corporation chasing after superprofits.

Taxes should not be the main source of government revenue. Rather the government should rely more on the earnings of the formerly Dutch-owned enterprises. These enterprises should be completely nationalized.

The new line mentioned in Sukarno's Political Manifesto which has been supported by many parties — that of transforming the colonial economy into a national economy — has not yet been implemented.

The Party insists that the government should raise wages and salaries according to the level of prices, lower taxes, discontinue the policy of the state enterprises in chasing after superprofits, distribute the lands of the insurgents and landlords who collaborated with them among the landless and poor peasants, solve land disputes in favor of the peasants and improve the distribution of goods among the population. All foreign currency earnings should be placed at the disposal of the government. The enterprises of the national bourgeoisie should be aided.

In order to develop the national economy, the statement stresses, it is necessary to rely on the support of the people as a whole, and the democratic rights of the people should be extended.

Canada

MASS PAMPHLETS ON CURRENT QUESTIONS

DISARMAMENT IS PEACE is the title of a political tract written by Tim Buck, General Secretary of the Communist Party, and widely distributed throughout the country. Other tracts published earlier were *The Turning Point in History* (about the Soviet seven-year plan), *Socialism and You*, etc.

The Party has had ten years' experience in publishing such tracts on topical questions. Tracts like *Jobs, Jobs, Jobs; Where Is the CCF Going?* (the Canadian Commonwealth Federation is the party of social democracy), *On Korea* and others enjoyed popularity in the past. Many are in the nature of topical pamphlets written in popular language. The tract is a vest-pocket pamphlet numbering around 20 to 25 pages; it costs five cents. The regular procedure is for branches to purchase tracts in the desired quantity for sale to branch members; members distribute them (mostly free of charge) to people with whom they are in contact. Tracts are also mailed to Members of Parliament, city and town councillors, trade union, co-operative and community leaders, and to the leaders and rank and file of the social democratic and other parties.

Steps have now been taken to improve the distribution, the setting and the style of the tracts, to introduce in them topical, hard-hitting cartoons.

Uruguay

THE PARTY ON THE RADIO

THE Communist Party, availing itself of its legal opportunities, has concluded an agreement on daily broadcasts in the capital. Given on Sunday mornings the broadcasts last for half an hour. They have become popular and are known as Sunday Talks of the Communist Party. The Party organizations in Rivera, Fray Bentos, Minas, Mercedes, Rocha, Maldonado and Carmelo also broadcast several times a week.

The character of the talks depends on their length. The week-day talks in the capital are in the nature of a summary of the Party's views on the questions of the day. On Sundays they are more varied. The talks are given by Party leaders, activists and journalists. Rank-and-file citizens are often invited to express their views on particular issues. At times the talks are wholly devoted to questions of interest to a particular group, to workers of a particular trade, etc. Such was the nature of the recent broadcasts dealing with the economic demands of the meat-packing workers. Talks on trade union unity, International Women's Day, students and their fight for academic rights had a large number of listeners.

In the provinces the broadcasts usually consist of a brief opening talk, a commentary on social issues, in particular the struggle for economic demands, and political information. Editorials from the Communist daily are also read. The speeches delivered at public meetings held by the Party are usually relayed.

The broadcasts start and end with the Internationale.

Important Dates

THE People's (Tudeh) Party of Iran has celebrated its fortieth anniversary. June 22, 1920, saw the opening of the Founding Congress of the Iranian Communist Party, which adopted the Program and Rules and elected the leadership of the Party. The Congress sent greetings to Lenin and to the Executive Committee of the Comintern.

In 1921 the Party was forced to go underground, but even in the difficult conditions of persecution it consolidated its organizations in Teheran, Tabriz, Meshhed and other towns. Communist workers established a number of trade unions, cultural and educational societies, and published Party literature. At this time the Party played an important part in developing the mass movement for the annulment of the unequal treaty (1919) with Britain, for recognition of the young Soviet republic and for a friendship treaty (1921) with it.

The persecution of the Communists was intensified in 1925 when Reza Shah came to power. In 1931 the Majlis passed a law making communist activity a punishable act. In 1936 the Party was subjected to further attacks. A framed trial of 53 Communists was staged. The accused were brutally treated, and all received severe sentences.

In 1941 when the Reza Shah regime was overthrown some democratic liberties were restored for a time. The released Communists formed the People's (Tudeh) Party which became the worthy continuator of the revolutionary traditions of the Communist Party.

Throughout the Second World War the Party fought against the pro-fascist elements in Iran, for democratic reforms, for better conditions for the people. The suppression of the democratic movement in Iranian Azerbaijan and Kurdistan (at the end of 1946 — beginning of 1947) was followed by a reign of terror. Many Party organizations were destroyed.

After the overthrow of the Mossadeq government the country found itself in the grip of black reaction. In 1955 over 700 Party activists were arrested in Teheran and subjected to monstrous brutalities. Arrest and execution of Party members continue to this day.

Despite the persecutions the Party is at its post, fighting for a united national front and exposing the intrigues of the U.S. imperialists and the ruling clique which has placed the country under the heel of the foreign monopolies.

The People's Party has united with the Azerbaijan Democratic Party. The declaration issued by the two Central Committees stressed the need to restore at the earliest the unity of the working-class party and to ensure the political and organi-

zational unity of the workers of all nationalities in the common struggle against colonialism and reaction.

The political line of the Party is expressed in the C.C. appeal to all freedom-loving Iranians, published March last. The appeal reads in part: "The blood-thirsty, anti-national and dictatorial regime of the Shah and his clique should be overthrown by the Iranian people who have glorious traditions in fighting for emancipation; a regime should be established which would rely on all classes and sections standing for the independence and freedom of our country. This aim, and the subsequent political and economic independence of the country, as well as the deliverance of the people from the yoke of colonialism and reaction, can be achieved only through the co-operation of all patriots, all anti-imperialist and progressive sections, that is, the social strata fighting for independence and progress — workers, peasants, intellectuals, handicraftsmen and the national bourgeoisie — irrespective of political views, class interests and social status, and only by uniting in a national front under a single banner for the benefit of the country as a whole and in the name of its genuine liberation. . . .

"The People's Party regards as its sacred duty to exert every effort to build this national unity which is the basic guarantee of victory over colonialism and reaction."

This year the *Mardom* (The People), the central organ of the Party, has re-appeared.

* * *

July 17 marks the thirtieth anniversary of the Communist Party of Colombia. On this day thirty years ago a mass meeting was held in Bogota following the decision of the Central Committee of the Revolutionary Socialist Party to found the Communist Party of Colombia. The decision formulated the tasks of the Party in the struggle against the policy of subordinating the country to the North American monopolies, for an anti-feudal and anti-imperialist revolution.

The Communists actively fought for democratic political life and later against the threat of a fascist coup which became particularly ominous after Hitler's advent to power in Germany. After the Second World War the Party successfully overcame the Right-opportunist and revisionist dangers which appeared in its ranks under the impact of Browderism.

The years since 1950 have been a most difficult time for the Party. Reactionary dictatorships followed one after another. Although the Party had to go deep underground, it did not cease its fight

against the offensive on the democratic rights of the working people, against the attempts to turn Colombia into a supplier of cannon fodder for the criminal gamble of U.S. imperialism in Korea. The Communists took an active part in the peasants' armed struggle for land. At that time Comrades Angel Maria Cano, Aurelio Rodriguez, Elcias Molina, José Gonzalo Sanchez, Eutiquio Timote Tique, Julio Rincon, Carlos Gutierrez, Manuel Marulanda Velez, all Central Committee members, died at their posts.

On May 10, 1957, when the people overthrew the Rojas Pinilla dictatorship, the Party regained its legal status; it at once began active work among the masses, began to extend its ranks and raise the ideological level of its members.

The Eighth Congress of the Party in 1958 paid special attention to the struggle for working-class unity, for a democratic front of national liberation. The Congress condemned the government policy of yielding to the U.S. monopolies, and the policy of restricting democratic liberties.

Even today, under legal conditions, the Party is forced to combat the unceasing outrages of the reactionaries inspired by the imperialists and, directly, by the FBI mission "investigating the communist danger." The succession of anti-communist

crusades has been accompanied by terrorist acts against Party leaders. Comrade Jacobo Friaz, outstanding peasant leader and member of the Central Committee, was treacherously assassinated last January. A few months later an attempt was made on the life of another C.C. member, Comrade Juan de la Cruz Varela.

The Party warmly hailed the victory of the people's revolution in Cuba, regarding it as an example to be followed by all the Latin American peoples fighting for national independence.

The thirtieth anniversary of the Party is being celebrated in an atmosphere of growing strike struggles. The elections to the House of Representatives, to the Department assemblies and municipalities resulted in a big success for the Party's policy of broad alliances. The Communists actively support the "regeneration of liberalism" movement with its program of democratic reforms, including the demand that the Communist Party be allowed to nominate candidates during elections.

A meeting of the Central Committee held in April outlined measures to consolidate the Party organizationally and strengthen its ties with the masses. The goal has been set of securing a 100 per cent increase in membership and in the circulation of the Party paper *Voz de la Democracia*.

Exchange of Views

The Economic Role of the State Under Socialism

A seminar on the economic role of the State under socialism was held in April in Prague under the joint auspices of the Editorial Office of Problems of Peace and Socialism and the Institute of Economics of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences.

Contributions were made by: H. Mara (Albania); K. Dobrev and S. Angelov (Bulgaria); J. Friss (Hungary); W. Berger, K. Polak, A. Lange and W. Kunz (German Democratic Republic); F. Baruch (Holland); Sung E-fang and Yui Chuang-yuan (Chinese People's Republic); S. Kuzinski and M. Pohorille (Poland); R. Moldovan and I. Rachmuth (Rumania); K. Ostrovityanov, O. Bogomolov and A. Loshchakov (USSR); V. Manousek, F. Stransky, Z. Pucek and L. Dvorak (Czechoslovakia).

The seminar was opened by V. Kaigl (the Institute of Economics) who made a short introductory speech.

The speeches (abridged) are printed below.

How the State Makes Use of Economic Laws in Building Communism

K. Ostrovityanov

A DECISIVE advantage of the socialist over the capitalist system is the planned guidance of the national economy based on a knowledge of economic laws. The economic laws of socialism express the essential nature of economic processes and their inner causal link which exists in socialist production relations independently of man's will. With the socialization of the means of production, wrote Engels, the laws of man's social action, "hitherto confronting him as laws of nature alien to him and dominating him, will then be used with full understanding, and so mastered by him."*

Prof. Ostrovityanov then dwelt on the origin and nature of the economic laws of socialism and stressed that under socialism, as in any other social formation, the economy (the basis) determines the political ideas and the institutions corresponding to them (the superstructure). He criticized the bourgeois economists who claim that socialist economy, lacking any laws of its own, is determined by government policy.

Lenin, in the discussion on the role of the trade unions, said: "All democracy, like every political superstructure in general (which is inevitable until classes have been abolished, until classless society

has been created), in the last analysis serves production, in the last analysis is determined by the production relations prevailing in the given society."**

In socialist society, however, the political superstructure exerts a considerable reciprocal influence on the economy and acquires a new quality compared with the role of the superstructure in the preceding social formations.

This is so because the economic laws of socialism, as laws known and consciously used by society, operate through the economic policy of the socialist state. The policy of the Communist Party and the state is the concentrated expression of the progressive tendencies in economic development and reflects the basic interests of the people with the result that they take an active part in carrying it out.

Socialist ownership of the means of production, the moral and political unity of the Soviet people enable our state to bring into play all factors (economic, political and ideological) for attaining the aim of communist construction. Such a concentra-

*F. Engels, *Anti-Duehring*.

**V. I. Lenin, *Once Again on the Trade Unions, the Present Situation and the Mistakes of Comrades Trotsky and Bukharin*, January 1921.

tion of effort and factors is unthinkable in bourgeois society which is beset by antagonistic contradictions.

Hence the special role played by the socialist state in economic development, a role fundamentally different from that of the bourgeois state. The former, owning the basic means of production, plans and guides social development on the basis of the known economic laws of socialism.

But economic laws make themselves felt also when their requirements are not fully met or when they are simply ignored. In this case there arise partial disproportions, contradictions and difficulties in the economy, signaling for the socialist state the need to bring its economic policy into harmony with the objective laws.

The December (1956) and February (1957) meetings of the Central Committee of the CPSU noted that in drawing up economic plans the planning bodies tended to overlook the real demands for materials and finance, unduly to enlarge the construction assignments thereby causing unnecessary strain in the fulfilling of plans, dispersing funds and lowering the effectiveness of capital investment. The elimination of many defects of this kind in the current seven-year plan has improved socialist planning.

Turning to the operation of economic laws under socialism, Prof. Ostrovityanov showed that the leading role in the system of these laws is played by the basic economic law which expresses the essence and the main driving force of socialist production.

In contrast to capitalism, the main driving force of which is pursuit of surplus-value through expanded reproduction of the relations of exploitation, under socialism the driving force is the desire to secure the maximum satisfaction of the constantly growing needs and the all-round development of all members of society by steadily expanding and improving production on the basis of new techniques.

The non-antagonistic contradiction of socialist society (its motive force) between the level of production and the growing needs of the people is solved by the steady growth and perfecting of production. This in turn satisfies the needs and leads to increased demand which calls for a further expansion of production and new technology. In this way the contradiction between production and consumption, which arises in the course of communist construction, is solved in a planned way and the operation of the basic economic law is assured.

The basic law is closely related to the other economic laws. It operates both directly and through the other laws of socialism. Each economic law is in a state of interaction with the basic law and with other laws of socialism. To utilize these laws properly it is essential to take into account the par-

ticular economic and political conditions, both internal and external.

The basic economic law is interwoven first and foremost with the law of planned (proportional) development. From the requirements of the basic law follows the need for a steady rise in living standards, which in turn calls for continuous and rapid growth of production. And these requirements should be reflected in economic plans. Socialist planning is based on the utilization of all the economic laws; it embraces all branches of the national economy, science and culture, and it is an essential aspect of the economic and organizing functions of the state.

Centralized management of the national economy will be developed and perfected even at the higher phase of communism when the state will have withered away. This function will be then exercised by the public authority. Lenin wrote: "The administrative apparatus in the proper, narrow sense of the term, the apparatus of the old state, is destined to wither away, and an apparatus of the type of the Supreme Economic Council is destined to grow, develop and strengthen, taking over the entire chief activity of organized society."^{*}

In contrast to the imbalance, which is a permanent feature under capitalism, under socialism we see planning which, in Lenin's words, signifies conscious proportional development. And this is combined with free rein to the initiative of the masses, which brings to light more and more resources for overfulfilling the plans.

In the current period of the comprehensive building of communist society the masses, increasingly, are drawn into the job of management. The Leninist principle of democratic centralism in planning is being developed. In the Soviet Union this was manifest in the reorganization of planning and management of industry and building.

As regards the collective farms the central planning bodies fix for each region, territory and republic only basic production indices and targets and those for sale of farm products to the state. Guided by these assignments, the collective farms determine, at their own discretion, the crop acreage, the productivity of animal husbandry and the particular types of livestock.

In all this the socialist state uses the system of balances. It fixes the proportions, as expressed in physical and monetary terms, determines the resources and distributes them according to branches and type of output, draws a balance-sheet between resources and the demand for them, discovers the bottlenecks and takes measures to eliminate them, and discloses untapped resources for raising production and consumption.

An important means of ensuring sound planning

^{*}V. I. Lenin, *Speech Delivered at the First Congress of the Supreme Economic Council*, May 26, 1918.

and management is the large-scale application of mathematical methods and computers in economic investigations. Given a Marxist-Leninist approach, this can produce a tremendous economic effect.

To ensure a continuous and rapid rise in socialist production and well-being, the socialist state should make proper use of the law of the priority growth of means of production compared with consumer goods.

This law presupposes that the organic composition of capital grows together with changes in its technical structure. Many bourgeois economists deny this law. And their views are echoed by some economists in the socialist countries. The argument of the opponents of this law is that technological progress presupposes not only decreasing expenditure of living labor but also a decrease in the amount of capital invested in production. This argument, however, is untenable.

"... The value of raw material," said Marx, "... forms an ever-growing component of the value of the commodity-product in proportion to the development of the productivity of labor, not only because it passes wholly into this latter value, but also because in every aliquot part of the aggregate product the portion representing depreciation of machinery and the portion formed by the newly added labor — both continually decrease."*

Thus, a rise in the organic composition of capital leads to an absolute lowering of the expenditure of both living and congealed labor per unit of output, with the share of living labor falling more rapidly than that of congealed labor.

The law of the priority growth of means of production has always been consciously utilized by the Communist Party and the Soviet state in their economic policy. In the period from 1913 to 1953 gross industrial output rose 36-fold with output of means of production increasing 83-fold. In Department I we also see a steady rise in the output of means of production for departmental use. In the course of socialist construction the correlation of the rates of growth in the two Departments constantly changes. During the first five-year plan this correlation reflected the peculiarities of the industrialization and the restricted possibilities of increasing the output of consumer goods. Economic development in the ensuing years made it possible to bring the rates of growth closer. After the war, when restoring the economy and paving the way for its further advance, we were again faced with the need to develop Department I more rapidly than Department II. In recent years, however, thanks to the immense growth of industrial capacity and the output of agricultural raw materials, these rates have again drawn nearer.

But no matter how the correlation changed Department I has always expanded more quickly than

Department II thereby creating conditions for a fuller satisfaction of the rising demand.

The advocates of a narrow consumer approach to the basic economic law of socialism reduce the matter of steadily raising the material and cultural standards of the people to the greatest possible output of consumer goods. This is a short-sighted policy which is bound to result in wasting basic funds and in making extended reproduction impossible.

If we trace the operation of the basic economic law and see how the Soviet state has used it throughout its existence we shall see that the main trend in economic development has been priority growth of the means of production plus a steady rise in well-being (with the exception of the Civil War years and the period of the Second World War). During those years the lowering of the level of well-being was restrained thanks to the series of measures taken by the government.

In the postwar years, as in the preceding periods, the socialist state has worked to ensure a steady rise in living standards on the solid basis of rising output, new technology and higher productivity of labor. The current seven-year plan envisages an 80 per cent increase in overall industrial output and a 70 per cent increase in agricultural output; labor productivity in industry is scheduled to rise by about 50 per cent per worker; on the collective farms it will be doubled, and the national income will rise by 62-65 per cent. Real incomes of factory and office workers will increase by 40 per cent, those of collective farmers by not less than 40 per cent. The monthly wages of the lower-paid categories will rise to 500-600 rubles.

The requirements of the basic economic law are also met through the conscious utilization by the state of the law of distribution according to work done. Lenin pointed out that tens of millions of people could be won for communism "not by relying directly on enthusiasm, but with the aid of the enthusiasm engendered by the great revolution, and on the basis of personal interest, personal incentive and business principles. . . ."

Distribution according to the work performed provides a material incentive for the workers to increase production and thus creates conditions for a fuller satisfaction of their growing needs. It also fosters a communist attitude towards labor, socialist emulation and the movement to set up communist labor teams — the latter being a higher type of socialist emulation with the motto: "Study, work and live in a communist way."

All this shows that in Soviet society labor is becoming the prime necessity for more and more people, and this is an important condition for giving effect to the communist principle: "From each

*K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. 3.

*V. I. Lenin, *Articles and Speeches on Anniversaries of the October Revolution*.

according to his ability, to each according to his needs."

Utilization of the law of distribution according to work done is accompanied in the process of building communism by a systematic increase in the public funds set aside for the satisfaction of the needs of the people. In effect, this can be described as communist distribution.

The current period of comprehensive communist construction calls for a more consistent utilization of this law also on the collective farms. Distribution of incomes in cash and kind according to workday units was at one time a progressive method, an incentive to increased production. At present, however, the negative features of this distribution have become more pronounced. The reason is that the payment for the workday unit cannot be determined until the end of the season. This creates uncertainty in the morrow and lowers the material incentive of members in raising productivity. A series of government measures have resulted in a rise in overall agricultural production and in money incomes. Many of the farms have accumulated funds for payment of work done in terms of money; this has enabled them to make advance payments for workday units. Many have gone over to a system of guaranteed payments for work done, and some have abolished the workday units and payments in kind.

The workday units are no longer an objective criterion of the labor expended because in collective farms the number of workday units assessed for the same quantity of labor varies. Furthermore, it is evaluated variously on different collective farms.

After the sale to the collective farms of the machinery held by the machine and tractor stations and with the intake by the farms of the large army of machine operators the need for payment in terms of money became more urgent. The grading of work and elaborating the grading system are urgent matters. Payment in terms of money helps to bring the collective farms closer to the state farms, helps to elevate the co-operative collective farm property to the level of public property owned by the people as a whole. In collective-farm production utilization of the law of distribution according to work done paves the way for changing over to the communist principle of distribution. As the collective-farm income grows an increasing share of it goes for satisfying communal needs, for building dwellings, kindergartens, boarding-schools, hospitals, clubs and holiday homes.

Now that the problems of the transition to communism are being tackled both in theory and practice the question of the future fate of commodity-money relations is of particular interest.

Marx and Engels, it will be recalled, foresaw that at the higher phase of communism, with

changeover to communist ownership, the creation of abundance, the conversion of labor into life's prime necessity and the free distribution of products according to needs, commodity-money relations would no longer be needed and social labor would be assessed directly in working time without value and its forms.

But in order to pave the way for the withering away of commodity production and circulation at the higher phase of communism we should now develop and make full use of the law of value and the commodity-money categories associated with it. This is necessitated chiefly by the inner needs of communist construction.

The present stage of establishing the material basis of communism necessitates the strictest economy in all spheres and rational use of materials, labor and financial resources. From the standpoint of accomplishing the main economic task of the USSR a gain in time is one of the vital issues in the competition with capitalism.

The vast growth of capital investment in the socialist countries poses the problem of its effectiveness and of introducing modern technology, which cannot be solved without the law of value. The reorganization of industrial management was designed to secure the rational deployment of resources, lower production costs, greater profitability of enterprises and increased accumulation.

We should tackle these tasks by improving cost accounting, adding to the incentives, introducing modern technology and making use of all resources in compiling and fulfilling plans.

The same applies to agriculture. Increasing agricultural output with the minimum expenditure raises the question of introducing cost accounting on the collective farms. The sale of machinery to the collective farms, the establishment of a single system of procurements in the shape of purchasing agricultural products, the changeover to uniform prices differentiated according to zones, and the practice of collective farms evaluating the work done in terms of money — all this is conducive to extending the turnover between town and countryside, raising the interest of the collective farmer in increasing output and paves the way for cost accounting on the collective farms and for improving them.

An important role in satisfying the growing demands of the population is played by expanding trade through which the ever-increasing mass of consumer goods is distributed. This of the greatest significance because in this way a ramified network of trade establishments is being created which, at the higher phase of communism, can be used for the direct and free distribution of products according to need.

In determining the destiny of commodity-money relations we should take account of both internal

and external conditions. The history of commodity-money relations knows of instances and whole periods when foreign relations played the dominant role. In his article "On the Significance of Gold at Present and After the Complete Victory of Socialism" Lenin connected the abolition of gold money with the victory of socialism on a world scale. In the socialist world system the growing division of labor, specialization and co-ordination of production and the rapid expansion of trade between the socialist countries necessitate better commodity-money relations. The socialist countries are also developing trade and commodity-money relations with the capitalist world.

In addition to estimating the work done in terms of money, its evaluation in terms of time acquires a growing importance. Naturally in present conditions attempts to estimate the expenditure of labor in terms of time, namely in man-hours, cannot lead to the abolition of commodity-money relations. The question of value and of commodity-money relations is not only one of calculation — it is also a socio-economic problem linked with the forms of ownership and the character of labor determined by these forms and embracing relations in a given socialist country and between the socialist countries, and also between the socialist and the capitalist countries. It is quite possible that the two methods of estimating the work done will be used and will supplement each other at certain stages of the transition to communism.

The development of commodity-money relations in the USSR and in the other socialist countries in no way attests to the advantages of the so-called market economy of the West, i.e., capitalist economy, as bourgeois economists and the revisionists claim.

The anarcho-syndicalist concept of socialist economy as the sum total of dispersed enterprises run by individual groups of producers, an economy in

which the law of value works blindly through demand and supply wholly contradicts the nature of socialist planned economy based on public ownership of the means of production. The idea of the law of value as a regulator of production and circulation under socialism (an idea expressed by economists in a number of socialist countries) is groundless. It is disproved by the experience of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. This idea denies the main advantage of socialism over capitalism — centralized planning — and signifies free rein for the market and anarchy of production.

We should use the law of value and the commodity-money categories associated with it as levers for the planned management of the national economy. The price policy, based on this law, should proceed from the socially necessary expenditure of labor. Orientation on expenditure of labor at individual enterprises weakens the stimulating effect of the law of value with regard to lessening labor consumption per unit of output, and impedes the lowering of production costs and the raising of profitability.

Taking into account the operation of the law of value does not mean that prices always coincide with value. The state, by means of an appropriate price policy, uses part of the income created by some branches to produce a rapid rise in other branches. It uses prices to stimulate the production of particular goods and to regulate the demand for them. But planned deviations of prices from value are reasonable within definite limits. As a rule, prices should be higher than production costs.

In their advance to socialism and communism, said Prof. Ostrovityanov, the socialist countries are guided by the objective laws of social development which are skilfully utilized by the socialist state under the leadership of the Communist Party.

Economic Co-operation Between the Socialist Countries: a New Function of the Socialist State

F. Stransky

THE rapid development of economic relations between the socialist countries is part and parcel of the process of strengthening the socialist system. In this we see a new external function of the socialist state which can be described as the organization of economic co-operation and mutual aid.

This new function of the state is organically linked with its internal, economic and organizing function. Experience shows that the perfecting of

planned management in individual socialist countries furthers the planned economic co-operation between them. This co-operation embraces more and more spheres of economic activity and shapes the economic relations for a longer period. Any improvement in this planned co-operation leads in turn to improvement in the economic and organizing function of the state in each country.

To deny that organizing economic co-operation and mutual aid is one of the main functions of the

socialist state would be equivalent to introducing spontaneity into the relations between the socialist countries and thus retard their economic progress. This, incidentally, is what the present-day revisionists want. By denying, both in practice and in "theory," the economic and organizing function of the socialist state, they find themselves, willy-nilly, denying its new external function. Thus the economic relations between the socialist countries are deprived of their class essence. This is a departure from the revolutionary standpoint. As long ago as the early years of the existence of the Soviet state Lenin said: "At present we exert the main influence on the international revolution by our economic policy."* And today this thesis becomes topical.

Turning to the specific peculiarities of the socialist international division of labor, Stransky devoted special attention to the *planned* character.

Along with socialization of the basic means of production and the rapid development of new production relations, the state in the new socialist countries has taken upon itself centralized planned management of the economy. Since the level of the planning in these countries at the outset was comparatively low (short-term plans), it could not embrace the entire process of extended socialist reproduction. This explains why the economic cooperation was first carried out in simple forms. Subsequently, there arose the need for co-ordinated planning.

We can note two stages in the development of the division of labor between the socialist countries. At first they concluded agreements on reciprocal commodity deliveries; agreements of this kind were later concluded for a longer period. The second stage was characterized by the co-ordination of their economic plans. This does not mean, however, that a planned division of labor was lacking at the first stage; planning was exercised but it was "primitive" compared with the present and future forms and methods of planned socialist division of labor. If, however, we compare this "primitive" form with the division of labor in the capitalist system we shall see that it was infinitely more progressive. Long-term agreements are concluded even now when the division of labor is effected through the co-ordination of plans within the framework of the Council for Mutual Economic Aid.

Let us consider the co-ordination of economic plans by the European socialist countries — members of the Council for Mutual Economic Aid. The conference of the Communist and Workers' parties of the member-countries in 1958 defined two basic

trends of plan co-ordination up to 1965: 1. *assuring adequate resources of raw materials, fuel and electric power*, 2. *wide-scale specialization and co-ordination in the manufacturing industry, mainly in machine-building*.

If one of the chief aims of the socialist division of labor is to achieve the proportions needed for extended socialist reproduction within the socialist system, then one of the most important of these is the correlation between the growth of the manufacturing industry and that of the raw material and power resources, given a generally high rate of economic growth. The socialist world system includes countries with either a complex economy or with all the resources needed for building such an economy (the Soviet Union and China) and countries with a non-complex economy (the other socialist states). The first two countries can solve the problem of correlation between raw materials and the manufacturing industry themselves, whereas others can solve it only through the division of labor.

The reasons for the inadequate development of raw material and power industries compared with the development of manufacturing industry can be divided into several groups. First there are reasons of a "natural character": a small territory, which practically rules out the possibility of building a complex raw-material base and makes for a more or less one-sided character, considerable density of population which complicates the building of a raw-material base according to the potentialities of the manufacturing industry; unfavorable conditions for the extraction of the basic raw materials (geological peculiarities, poorness of ores, etc.).

The problem of raw materials affects first of all the European socialist countries. It is being solved by way of co-ordinating plans: through reciprocal deliveries of raw materials in short supply, on the one hand, and by importing raw materials from the Soviet Union and the Asian socialist countries, on the other.

Reciprocal delivery of raw materials in short supply is carried out on the principle of maximum effectiveness, i.e., by utilizing favorable natural and economic conditions. But some difficulties are encountered here. Countries with favorable natural conditions for extracting raw materials are not always in a position to finance the necessary capital construction.

The socialist countries have found the solution to such problems by combining the general interests of the socialist camp as a whole with the particular interests of each country, by combining the natural prerequisites with the economic conditions with a view to mutual benefit. Czechoslovakia, for

*V. I. Lenin, *Speech Delivered at the Closing of the Tenth Conference of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks)*, May 28, 1921.

instance, has concluded or plans to conclude a series of agreements for building aggregates and enterprises: in Poland for extracting coal and sulphur; in Rumania for the production of newsprint and for the construction of a power plant; for extracting potassium and manufacturing potash fertilizers in the German Democratic Republic; in Albania for mining iron and nickel ores; in Bulgaria for extracting copper pyrites and smelting copper, etc. Agreements of this kind are being concluded between other countries; they are advantageous to the parties and to the socialist camp as a whole.

Economic co-operation and mutual aid in extending the raw material, fuel and power base, the planned building up of the prerequisites needed for the expansion of the productive forces and the socialist allocation of the productive forces associated with it, leading to the gradual economic levelling up of the countries — all are closely linked with centralized planned management in each country.

I shall turn now to the second problem which engaged the attention of the conference of the Council's member-countries in 1958, i.e., *specialization in the manufacturing industry, mainly in machine building*. Socialist industrialization has brought about in a comparatively brief period substantial changes in the economic structure of the countries. Machine building and metal-processing have become (or will soon become in a number of countries) the leading branch. In Bulgaria, for example, they account for 14 per cent of total industrial output, in Hungary 24 per cent, in the German Democratic Republic 30 per cent, in Poland 19 per cent, in Rumania 22 per cent and in Czechoslovakia 30 per cent. Machinery and industrial plant are now a basic item of export from the European socialist countries. This poses the problem of specialization which makes it possible to avoid duplication and to achieve maximum mass production and a high level of mechanization and automation. Specialization paves the way for overcoming the contradictions between the rationally determined range of goods with a view to extending mass production in each country on the one hand, and enlarging the range of goods for better satisfying the growing demand of each country, on the other.

The growing division of labor enables the economy of each socialist country to go beyond the national boundaries and affords ample opportunity for planned expansion of the productive forces which, under capitalism, depended on the ups and downs of the market. Long-term planning can count on a stable and constantly developing market, which is something the capitalist world has

never known. The Soviet Union is a major importer of the machines produced in the European socialist countries.

It should be said that during the past eighteen months the level of the planned socialist international division of labor has risen substantially. This question is being tackled by the planning organs and other government bodies in the socialist countries.

The work of co-ordinating the national-economic plans up to 1965 has paved the way for perfecting the division of labor in the direction of extending long-term planning. That is why preparations for co-ordinating the long-term economic plans of the member-countries of the Council are now underway. These long-term plans will be the basis for co-ordinating production plans and goods exchange and will raise the division of labor between the socialist countries to a higher plane.

This work envisages a much greater role for science because the economic development scheduled to take place between now and 1975 will be spurred on by the rapid advance of technology and science. In the culminating years of the long-term plans the productive forces will achieve a level far higher than the present, or the future level in the highly-developed capitalist countries. Consequently, direct comparisons with the leading capitalist countries will no longer be valid; we shall have to use the method of scientific analysis, hypotheses, technical and economic considerations and research.

The building of a complex mechanism combining the economies of the socialist countries will lead to a further rapid development of the external function of the state. No socialist country will be in a position to draw up its own long-term plan unless all the socialist countries jointly have solved a number of basic economic and technological problems, and unless they engage in extensive joint preparations.

Mention should be made of yet another feature of the socialist division of labor, one which distinguishes it from the capitalist division of labor. This is the economic levelling of the socialist countries, the elimination of the economic distinctions inherited from capitalism. In this respect capitalism was found wanting. It will not be out of place to quote here from the book *An International Economy*, by Gunnar Myrdal, the well-known bourgeois economist. "The greatest failure of international integration in the non-Soviet world," he said, "is . . . the stagnation or slow development of the underdeveloped countries and the widening gap between the industrially advanced and the backward countries."*

*G. Myrdal, *An International Economy*. New York, 1956, p. 145.

The growth of the socialist world system, the division of labor between the countries of this system and unswerving adherence to socialist internationalism as the leading principle in their relations make it possible to eliminate their one-sided development. In the postwar years the one-sided agrarian character of some countries has in the main been overcome; substantial changes have taken place in their economic structure; the share of industry in the national income has increased everywhere, the working class has grown numerically, labor productivity has risen, etc. So that when we speak about the economic levelling of the socialist countries we should not forget that the distinctions in their economic levels are not the same as they were when the socialist world system first took shape.

Still, the problem exists. There are variations between the socialist countries, for instance, in income per head of population, in the amount of accumulation and personal consumption, in the volume of per capita industrial output, in the level of labor productivity, the intensity of agriculture, etc. It would be naive to expect that distinctions which took shape over hundreds of years could be eliminated in the space of a few years. It would also be wrong to think that the problem of economic levelling will disappear of its own volition.

This process, planned and organized, is a particular feature of the socialist international division of labor. This signifies that long-term plans should envisage the effect on the basic factors which, in the aggregate, determine the rate of economic development and provide favorable con-

ditions for the economic advance of the as yet backward countries. Uncoordinated influence on these factors cannot ensure the differentiated rates of economic development needed for gradual economic levelling.

Gradual economic levelling is an important factor in strengthening the political and economic unity of the socialist countries; this is a process of their organic unification. The gradual elimination of the distinctions on the economic level is, therefore, the common goal of all the socialist countries, a major task of the division of labor between them.

Dwelling on the forms of economic co-operation and mutual aid between the socialist countries, which have played a big part in overcoming the economic backwardness of some of them, Stransky went on to say that these forms (scientific and technological co-operation, credit, etc.) are bound to develop as the economic potential of the socialist world system grows and the division of labor is perfected. Differences in the economic level will be reduced in a planned way, and it can be anticipated that the more pronounced of these will be eliminated while working on the long-term plans.

Speaking about the economic contact between socialist and capitalist countries, Stransky stressed that the economic development of the socialist countries in no way leads to autarchy, to any weakening of their economic co-operation with the capitalist countries. On the contrary, experience shows that the greater the economic potential and market capacity of the socialist world, the greater the possibilities that open up for economic contact between the two world systems.

The Role of the State of Dictatorship of the Proletariat in Changing the Production Relations

Sung E-fang

THE countries of the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union have registered brilliant successes in building socialism and communism. The socialist camp is now stronger than the imperialist camp. One of the reasons for these remarkable achievements is that the working class in the socialist countries has made full use of the machinery of state in the course of the revolution and of construction.

The basic question of proletarian revolution is the seizure of power. Without power the proletariat cannot change the capitalist production relations and build a socialist society. During the transitional

period from capitalism to communism the following functions are characteristic of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

First, it overcomes the resistance and subversive activity of all the reactionary classes and forces in the country. Lenin wrote: "... during the transition from capitalism to communism suppression is still necessary; but it is now the suppression of the exploiting minority by the exploited majority."*

Second, protection against subversion and possible aggression on the part of external enemies.

*V. I. Lenin, *The State and Revolution*, Chapter 5.

As long as imperialism armed to the teeth exists the external functions of the state must be strengthened. Third, organizing and guiding the economic and cultural life of society and ensuring a rapid economic, cultural and educational development.

The state of the dictatorship of the proletariat has played an important role in the socialist revolution and in building socialism in our country. After the establishment of people's-democratic rule the resistance of all the reactionary classes was crushed, and we continued to suppress and exterminate the counter-revolutionaries. The Chinese People's Republic has waged a resolute struggle against imperialism, chiefly U.S. imperialism.

Sung E-fang then spoke about the struggle waged against U.S. aggression and pointed out that the external function of the state should be further increased for the purpose of liberating Taiwan and achieving the complete unification of the country, protecting it from imperialist aggression and crushing this aggression, and also for safeguarding world peace. The function of organizing and guiding the economic and cultural life of society has developed in a big way. The state plays an important role not only in building the socialist economy, completing socialist reconstruction, but also in organizing a balanced development of the socialist economy; it plays an important role in organizing production and in meeting the everyday needs of the people.

The state of the dictatorship of the proletariat transforms the non-socialist production relations into socialist relations of production and, upon completing socialist reconstruction, continues to regulate and improve these relations. Sung E-fang described the process of the abolition of capitalism in China, the expropriation of the big bourgeoisie and the reconstruction of private industry and trade. This, he said, was accompanied by a bitter class struggle.

The state had to change the production relations also in the private sector of agriculture and in the cottage industry into socialist production relations, and it did so not by expropriating the small producers, but by educating them, persuading them to take the way of co-operation. This process, too, was attended by a sharp struggle. In the countryside we have poor peasants, lower sections of the middle peasants and upper sections of the middle peasants — the latter wealthy middle peasants. When the agrarian reform was carried out the poor peasants and the lower sections of the middle peasants clashed with the wealthy middle peasants. And when the reform was completed, the struggle continued on a new basis and evolved into the fight between the capitalist and socialist ways of development in the countryside. The state supported the poor peasants and lower sections of

the middle peasants politically and economically. As for the small minority of wealthy middle peasants who displayed capitalist tendencies, it conducted educational work among them and waged the necessary struggle against these tendencies. In this way we completed the co-operation fairly quickly.

The completion of socialist reconstruction and the consolidation of new, socialist relations of production furthered the development of the productive forces. But the changing of the production relations does not stop at this. The class struggle still continues, and it is necessary to use the state to foster the new, progressive relations of production and eliminate the old backward ones. Communism or revolutionary socialism, wrote Marx, "*is the declaration of the permanence of the revolution, the class dictatorship of the proletariat as the necessary transit point to the abolition of class distinctions generally, to the abolition of all the relations of production on which they rest, to the abolition of all the social relations that correspond to these relations of production, to the revolutionizing of all the ideas that result from these social relations.*"*

After the socialist reconstruction of property it is necessary, in compliance with the needs of the growth of the productive forces, to effect further changes in the collectively-owned property, steadily raise the level of its socialization and change over to public ownership, i.e., ownership by the entire people. As for public ownership we should further regulate and perfect it and pass on from socialist public ownership to communist public ownership. In 1958, in the third year after completing, in the main, the agricultural co-operation, the movement to form people's communes developed with the result that the higher-type agricultural co-operatives developed into people's communes. At the present stage the property of the people's commune is still collectively-owned property, but it has the following features: first, it is large-scale property and, second, it is more socialized. The collectively-owned property of the production team (corresponding to the former producer co-operative of a higher type) is the basic form of property, while the property owned by the commune is partial. It is necessary to add, step by step, to the property owned by the people's commune. The share of the property owned by the people's commune will steadily rise and eventually become the basic form of property, while that of the production-team will be partial. Later, the collectively-owned property of the people's communes will become public property and a uniform public property will emerge. As yet, however, this will still be

*K. Marx, *The Class struggle in France 1848-1850*.

socialist property. Later, after a considerable rise in the level of the productive forces and the consciousness of the people, the need for the further transition from socialist to communist public ownership will arise.

The process of raising the level of the collectively-owned property in our country will be accompanied by class struggle. Sung E-fang then dwelt on the struggle (rather acute at one time) between the poor peasants and the lower sections of the middle peasants on the one hand, and the wealthy middle peasants on the other. This struggle, however, bears the nature of a contradiction among the people.

The relationships between people in the sphere of production are an important aspect of the production relations. Under one and the same form of ownership these relations can be different and are subject to change.

In the past years a series of reforms has been effected in China in the publicly-owned enterprises, in government offices and in the administrative system; changes have also been introduced in the rules and regulations, in labor relations, in management methods, etc. Centralized leadership has fused with administration in the localities. Enterprises have been vested with greater powers in the matter of management and utilization of funds and resources. The principle of democratic centralism prevails in all enterprises; managers are responsible to the Party committees; leading cadres perform physical labor and the workers have a say in management; irrational rules and regulations have been annulled; leading cadres, workers, engineers and technicians co-operate in production. In government offices, too, we have a system whereby leading cadres participate in manual labor and perform work in the lower organizations, and we insist on all leading cadres treating others as equals. In the countryside we have established numerous "experimental plots" and have fostered good traditions: "cadres should eat, live and work with the masses," etc. All this has improved relations in the sphere of production, has added to the enthusiasm and has enhanced the consciousness of factory and office workers in building socialism.

It is also necessary constantly to regulate and improve socialist relations in the sphere of distribution. When Engels spoke about distribution in a socialist society he stressed that "the method of distribution essentially depends on *how much* there is to distribute, and that this must surely change with the progress of production and social organization, so that the method of distribution may also change."^{*} In implementing the principle of dis-

tribution according to work done we proceed from the level reached by the productive forces at the present stage of the socialist construction. But the system and forms of distribution are always changing. In the past two years our economy has made such a big leap and the consciousness of the workers had risen to such a degree that, on their initiative, piece-work was abolished in many branches of industry. At present the time system predominates, while the piece-work and the bonus system are secondary. The collectively-owned farms have switched to a system of income distribution which combines wage payment with free supply, with the emphasis on the former. But socialist society, in which goods are distributed according to work done, is not the ideal society for us. Our lofty ideal is communist society in which goods will be distributed according to need. As Lenin wrote "in the first phase of communist society (usually called socialism) 'bourgeois right' is not abolished in its entirety, but only in part, only in proportion to the economic revolution so far attained, i.e., only in respect of the means of production. 'Bourgeois right' recognizes them as the private property of individuals. Socialism converts them into *common* property. To *that extent* — and to that extent alone — 'bourgeois right' disappears.

"However, it continues to exist as far as its other part is concerned; it continues to exist in the capacity of regulator (determining factor) in the distribution of products and the allocation of labor among the members of society."

". . . Bourgeois right in regard to the distribution of articles of *consumption* inevitably presupposes the existence of the *bourgeois state*, for right is nothing without an apparatus capable of *enforcing* the observance of the standards of right.

"It follows that under communism there remains for a time not only bourgeois right, but even the bourgeois state — without the bourgeoisie!"^{*} In the measure that we advance to communism we shall have to create the material and spiritual conditions for the gradual elimination of the survivals of bourgeois right. We should educate the masses in a communist spirit and foster an attitude towards labor without remuneration. ". . . We shall work," Lenin said, "to exorcise the accursed rule: 'each for himself and one God for all,' to exorcise the habit of regarding labor solely as a compulsion, and as just only when it is paid for at a definite rate. We shall work to inculcate in the minds, in habits and in the everyday life of the masses the rule: 'all for each and each for all,' the principle: 'from each according to this ability, to each

^{*}F. Engels, *Letter to Conrad Schmidt*, August 5, 1890.

^{*}V. I. Lenin, *The State and Revolution*, Chapter 5.

according to his needs,' so that gradually, but steadily we reach the stage of communist discipline and communist labor.'**

In summing up, Sung E-fang criticized the Yugoslav revisionists and laid bare the treacherous es-

sence of their attitude to the state, ownership production relations and other questions.

*V. I. Lenin, *From the First Subbotnik on the Moscow-Kazan Railway to the All-Russian May Day Subbotnik*, May, 1920.

The Socialist State and the International Division of Labor

S. Kuzinski

THE state in the socialist countries is carrying out a new and hitherto unknown function, that of developing the international division of labor. This function differs fundamentally from the role played by the capitalist state in international exchange.

For the past century and a half the "scientific grounds" for the capitalist division of labor between the big industrial powers and the economically backward countries have remained unchanged. These grounds are the theory of comparative costs according to which both the country exporting the finished manufactures and the agrarian country supplying the raw materials for industry, profit from the exchange of their products.

Although this theory deals not only with the division of labor between industrial and agrarian countries but also with the exchange between industrial countries (and here it has some rational elements), it can only be regarded, especially in the stage of imperialism, as apologetics for the exploitation of the underdeveloped countries. For it is common knowledge that the absolutely higher cost of production of raw materials and agricultural produce in an agrarian country which is forced to import manufactures, particularly machinery and plant, dooms her for decades to the blind alley of low labor productivity, to a slow growth of industry and often to an absolute decline in output per head of the population and prevents her from accumulating any significant quantity of capital. This happens even when the goods are exchanged in keeping with world prices.

What is more, the big monopolies not infrequently seize the key positions in the exports of the underdeveloped countries. Naked colonialism, semi-colonialism and a more or less concealed political dependence — these are the inevitable manifestations of the desire of monopoly capital to bring the underdeveloped countries under its sway.

The main stimulus in the struggle waged by the peoples of the underdeveloped countries for independence is above all their national-economic in-

terest. And a big role in this struggle is played by the new international relations that have taken shape between the socialist countries.

The experience of the international division of labor within the socialist world system is, relatively, not too great. But its basic aims, principles and trends have already taken shape.

The basic aim is to raise the economic level of the socialist camp as a whole to that of the highly developed capitalist countries. This means that the socialist countries aim at increasing their national income to the maximum, while simultaneously evening up their general economic level.

Preservation of the sovereignty and equality of the countries taking part in the co-operation, co-ordination and international exchange is a cardinal principle of the international socialist division of labor. For the first time in history the international division of labor ceases to be the arena of struggle between the strong and the weak, or of the struggle for markets as is the case under capitalism. Under socialism the division of labor becomes a source of the growing strength and independence of the participating countries. This is perfectly clear, particularly where the small socialist countries are concerned. Countries like the Soviet Union and People's China have both adequate resources and an internal demand which suffice for large-scale industrial expansion; so that for them the division of labor with other countries is relatively less important. But other socialist countries have been able to attain their level of economic growth solely by relying on co-operation and division of labor between the other countries of the socialist camp.

The first stage of industrialization in the European People's Democracies, both in those that were economically backward and in those of medium development, was characterized by increased imports of capital equipment from the USSR; this was decisive for their development. By the end of the period 1954-56 certain tendencies towards autarchy set in — some of them were engaged in par-

allel production of similar items on a relatively small scale though they lacked the necessary power and raw material resources.

For this reason the decisions adopted by the Council for Mutual Economic Aid in December 1955 and May 1956 to co-ordinate plans for the iron and steel, machine-building, coal, oil, gas, chemical and textile industries, were of the greatest importance. The meeting of representatives of the Communist and Workers' parties of the Council member-countries in May 1958 and the session of the Council in June of the same year examined the main problems of co-ordinating the plans for the basic industries up to 1965.

Close co-ordination in the chemical and steel industries was announced at the 10th session of the Council in December 1958. The agreement provided for specialization and co-ordination in the manufacture of plastics, synthetic fibres, synthetic rubber, mineral fertilizers, and also in equipment for the chemical industry. It also envisaged commissioning rolling mills and production of various kinds of rolled metal.

This line of developing and deepening the international division of labor does not signify an automatic exchange of goods or that any of the socialist countries will enclose itself within the narrow frame of the national market. Nor does it imply that foreign trade is understood as trade in surpluses which remain after home requirements have been satisfied. What it means is that composite aims are consciously set, and that the international division of labor is based on a scientific analysis of the natural conditions and possibilities for the most advantageous distribution of branches of industry in the socialist countries.

This, then, is the principal role of the state in the socialist countries in developing the international division of labor.

The presence of natural raw materials plays a big part in determining the allocation of industries to particular countries. The division of labor in this sphere is based not simply on the development of raw materials production needed by the given country and other countries. Cost of extraction and transportation should be taken into account. The sources of cheap raw materials and power are not always found in the proximity of the processing centers. The relatively low cost of working rich or geologically better situated sources of raw materials can be greatly increased by long-distance transportation. And, conversely, a situation may arise when it is more profitable to bring raw materials from more remote areas. *Hence to ascertain the degree to which it is necessary to process the raw materials on the spot is an important common task of the socialist countries.*

As for overall industrial development, the interweaving of the various branches makes it more rational to establish a definite complex in one area. These complexes are in the nature of either a combine, i.e., a group of enterprises manufacturing a variety of products from the same raw material, or a set of enterprises making a single product during the entire production cycle. In agriculture, too, provided the conditions conducive to specialization obtain, the production of all farm products should be properly co-ordinated.

Linking up independent industries in this way yields a supplementary economic effect, whereas the establishment of some kind of "industrial monocultures" would be a harmful utopia. Hence the development of economic areas and countries as complexes should be the guiding principle in distributing the productive forces in the socialist world.

A constantly growing division of labor in the production of a range of articles from a single raw material leads to a situation in which from the general trunk of production branches spread out, which, in growing measure, are engaged in processing the original raw material. For these branches the transportation costs of the raw or semi-finished materials are of no great significance, primary importance being attached to the optimal output. It follows, then, that the development of a country or an area as a complex does not imply the manufacture of all or most kinds of products. This way of posing the question would be in conflict with profitability and with the need to concentrate on improving quality.

Another important problem of the international socialist division of labor is to find a structure of capital investments suitable for all the partner countries. Each country should utilize its manpower and natural resources to the utmost in order to achieve maximum output with the minimum expenditure of capital.

With a view to evening up the specialization, the countries possessing natural raw materials are building the corresponding processing industries. This principle is being implemented on a large scale. Poland, for example, is specializing in manufacturing equipment for processing coal, the Soviet Union and Rumania in oil equipment, the German Democratic Republic in various kinds of chemical equipment, Hungary in equipment for the aluminum industry, etc. With the same aim in view the countries importing raw materials are investing capital in the extraction of these materials in the exporting country. The GDR, for example, has granted a long-term credit, on favorable conditions, to Poland for the development of lignite extraction in Turow. Czechoslovakia has

granted Poland a similar credit for a big sulphur mine in Tarnobrzeg, and is taking part in erecting iron-ore dressing enterprises in the Soviet Union, etc.

The further search for forms of evening up investments can be conducted along the lines of more thoroughly specifying the profiles of the manufacturing industry from the standpoint of its ability to consume the materials. If, for example, the cost of the materials in relation to the total cost of output in the machine-building industry averages about 20 per cent, in the manufacture of precision instruments it is less than one per cent, and in railway car-building and in ship-building it reaches 80 per cent. A high rate of consumption of steel, the production of which requires considerable capital outlay, reduces the effectiveness of investments in the iron and steel and machine-building

industries. Clearly, it would be advisable for those countries which do not have a solid metallurgical base to concentrate on those branches of the metal-processing industry which consume less materials and which call for highly skilled workers.

The economists of the socialist countries are faced with the task of further elaborating methods of comparing production costs, the effectiveness of the investments and of the international specialization of production. Turning to the forms of co-operation and mutual aid practised by the socialist countries, Kuzinski said that the socialist international division of labor, supported by the planned economy of its partners, shows how to resolve the urgent problems of the world of today, which is something capitalism has never been able to do.

Background to the Co-ordination of the Economic Plans of the Socialist Countries

O. Bogomolov

SOcialist planning has acquired an important international aspect. This is because the need for planned economic development is making itself felt more and more imperatively in the socialist world system as a whole. On the international scale, of course, the law of planned proportional economic development begins to operate after the individual countries have acquired experience in the sphere of planning. Time is also needed to develop and consolidate the economic ties of the socialist states, to determine the definite proportions of the division of labor between them as part of extended socialist reproduction in each country.

The requirements of the law of planned, proportional economic development are consciously implemented throughout the socialist world system through the voluntary co-ordination of national economic plans. "Co-ordination of national economic plans," Khrushchov said at the 21st Congress of the CPSU, "is the form in which the productive efforts of the socialist countries are pooled at the current stage." The transition to direct co-ordination of the production plans of inter-related industries in a number of countries, initiated in 1955-56, marked the beginning of a higher stage of co-operation, substantially extended its scale and made it more effective.

As pointed out by Lenin, the trend "towards the creation of a single world economy regulated by

the proletariat of all nations as one whole and according to a common plan,"* becomes pronounced in our day. Not only theoretical conclusions but also the practical experience of economic co-operation and mutual aid in the socialist camp testify that this trend will, in the long run, develop in all its fullness.

At the same time, experience shows that the obliteration of statehood distinctions and the fusing of the nations into a single economic entity will be preceded by a long period of buttressing the national statehood and sovereignty of the socialist countries. At present the socialist camp has no supra-national body directing the economic development of each country according to a single plan. Unrestricted sovereignty in solving internal economic problems, particularly economic planning, will long be the best guarantee that each of the socialist countries will make the best of its potential and ability. Hence it is premature as yet to speak about a single long-term plan for the system as a whole, to which the economy of each country would be subordinated.

All the general economic problems of the day can be resolved by way of co-ordinating the plans. This form of co-operation of the fraternal countries ensures a harmonious combining of their common interests, consisting of utilizing the advantages of the planned development of the socialist world system

*V. I. Lenin, *Preliminary Draft of Theses on the National and Colonial Questions*.

as a whole, with the national interests and needs of each. This co-ordination of plans is a striking example of the consistent implementation of the great Leninist principles of socialist internationalism.

* * *

The division of labor, particularly its higher forms—specialization and co-ordination—is instrumental in bringing about a swift rise in production and well-being in all the socialist countries, and yields a valuable gain in time in the peaceful competition between the two systems. Hence, furthering the international socialist division of labor occupies an important place in the long-term economic planning of the socialist countries.

Planning on an international scale is essentially different from planning in the individual countries. One should not fail to see the peculiarities of the economic laws of socialism on the scale of the world system. For example, it would be theoretically incorrect to say that all the internal proportions of the economic development of the countries acquire an international character, and should, therefore, be observed in the socialist camp as a whole in the same degree as they are observed in the particular country. The international contacts established in the process of deepening the international division of labor, are not of an all-embracing character. In this they differ from the interaction of the component parts of the national economy of the individual socialist country.

Within the framework of the world system it is essential above all to co-ordinate the inter-related industries of a number of countries and to establish the proportions requisite to the socialist world economy: for example, between the levels of economic development of the countries, their mutual payments, etc.

International specialization of production always goes hand in hand with the setting up of an optimal national-economic complex in each country. It follows, then, that many economic proportions arise mainly under the influence of national conditions and have an internal significance. These include, for example, the relationship between the growth of income of the population and the growth of retail trade, between certain industries, etc. It is clear that there is no need for international co-ordination of national-economic plans in order correctly to establish such proportions.

At the same time there are proportions which require consistent implementation of the international socialist division of labor. A problem vital to the entire socialist system is to balance the development of the raw materials and the power industries, on the one hand, and of manufacturing industry, on the other. Not every country enjoys

conditions enabling her to produce all kinds of goods. At the same time the socialist camp as a whole has enormous resources which enable it to produce increasing quantities of all the essential raw materials.

Co-ordination of the development plans for the raw materials industry shows the importance of ensuring a correct balance between capital investments in these industries and in manufacturing industry within the framework of the socialist camp. The solution of this problem is not an easy matter.

Extraction of raw materials usually calls for considerable investment. Expenditure is recouped much more slowly than in the manufacturing industry. Hence those socialist countries with a relatively lower economic level find it difficult to make this investment even though they have the necessary raw material resources. On the other hand other socialist countries which are in a position to make the necessary investment lack the necessary mineral resources.

This contradiction is being overcome by way of jointly financing the raw-materials industry—a method now being practised on a growing scale. This means that all the countries have a fair share in developing raw materials extraction for the common needs, while those possessing the raw materials no longer need to make all the costly investment.

In order to develop and strengthen the economic base for the socialist world it is essential to ensure proportion between the growth of the production of machines in the particular country and the growing demand in all of them for machinery. The purpose of international specialization and co-ordination in this branch is to satisfy the joint demand in the countries for particular types of machines by organizing mass production of them in one or several countries, wherever it is found most profitable.

Evening up the general front of communist construction and achieving the fullest possible economic harmony between the individual countries are important demands of the law of planned, proportional development in the socialist world system. The way in which the less industrially developed socialist countries catch up with the advanced ones is not a spontaneous automatic process. It is a process that is ensured by the vast organizing work carried out by the Communist and Workers' parties to mobilize all the internal resources and production potential of the hitherto economically backward countries, and their maximum co-operation with all other socialist countries.

The objective economic proportions on which the international socialist division of labor and the strengthening of the economic base of the socialist world depend are not something immutable. They are influenced by many factors and change accordingly. Decisive among these factors is the impact of the socialist and communist reconstruction of public life in separate countries, plus the advance of technology. To a certain extent they depend also on the changes in the volume and structure of trade between the capitalist and socialist countries. In co-ordinating their plans the socialist countries endeavor to take cognizance of the structural changes in the economy of the socialist world, to ensure the utmost progressive proportions in its development.

* * *

This co-ordination of national-economic plans in the socialist countries is something new and, as is always the case when launching on the new, the necessary experience is still lacking. And yet some of the main questions which this co-ordination should answer, are already clear. In our view they can be listed as follows:

1) Consistent international specialization in the socialist camp presupposes *multilateral* co-ordination of economic plans. This, of course, does not rule out bilateral agreement on production planning. But it should be said that the international socialist division of labor is inconceivable without multilateral co-ordination of plans.

2) In order to determine the correlation of this international division of labor it is necessary to draw up and co-ordinate *long-term* economic plans for the individual countries. By its very nature, the building of large enterprises and of branches of industries, internationally specialized and co-ordinated, i.e., linked with those in other countries in the matter of marketing output and obtaining raw materials, necessitates long-term agreed plans. If after the lapse of a number of years these enterprises or industries should be threatened by the refusal of their customers to purchase the output or if difficulties are encountered in getting raw materials, the result will be heavy losses. But the absence of a clear-cut long-term plan presupposes adherence to the established but often insufficient rational proportions of the division of labor.

The member-countries are now charting the main aims and ways of their economic development for the next 10-15 years. The drawing up of these plans and their co-ordination are extremely important in the matter of establishing a really progressive system of international division of labor in the socialist camp. It is now possible to begin to draw up and carry out, along planned lines,

far-reaching measures for reconstructing the economy on the vast territory of the socialist camp. As a result, many of the national problems of building the material and technological base of socialism and communism will be resolved in the most effective way.

3) Co-ordination of the long-term plans, signifying an unprecedented extension of the sphere and importance of planning, calls for *better planning and more responsibility for fulfilling the plans*. The question of scientific planning, of strict discipline in carrying out the plans is being put in a new way. Indeed, if the plans of a number of countries are co-ordinated and interdependent, non-fulfilment by one will inevitably adversely affect the others. This makes it still more incumbent on the member-countries to perfect their economic planning, to raise the degree of technological and economic soundness of the planned indices. The elimination from the plans of unnecessary strain and provision of definite stocks making it easier for the state to maneuver with its resources, facilitate rhythm and uninterrupted work. This aspect of planning received special attention, for example, when drawing up the Soviet seven-year plan for 1959-65.

4) Successful co-ordination of the national-economic plans also depends on how *fully and comprehensively the common requirements of the socialist countries and the laws of development of world socialism as a whole are taken into account*. Time has shown the need for an overall examination of the economies of all the member-countries. This enables each to get a correct idea of the trends and features of the economic development of the socialist system as a whole.

5) Greater co-ordination of the economic development of the socialist countries makes necessary a still *greater unification of the basic methodological principles of planning and statistical assessment; it presupposes, in addition, comparative indices of the national plans*. This problem, which arose, as we know, in the process of the development of the capitalist world economy, cannot be fully resolved under capitalism. The basic processes in the development of the international socialist division of labor should be fully and correctly expressed in the language of figures. A basis for this is provided by unified methodological assessment and planning relying on the solid foundation of Marxist-Leninist economic science. There are still definite national differences and shadings in assessing and planning such indices as, say, the national income, the overall output of industry and agriculture, the volume of investments in the national economy and its various branches, production costs, labor productivity, the demand for the

various kinds of raw materials, for fuel, equipment, etc. Also, the systems of price formation and the methods of establishing rates of exchange differ greatly as yet in the socialist countries, which poses the extremely difficult problem of comparing costs.

Undoubtedly, the above-mentioned factors complicate the co-ordination of plans. That is why the socialist countries are making joint efforts to unify methods of planning and statistics.

Unity of content and comparative indices are important for perfecting the balance method of co-ordinating the national-economic plans.

The comradely co-ordination of the plans of the socialist countries is striking testimony to the potentialities and advantages of the new social system. Socialism has demonstrated its ability to unite the peoples and to plan their activity for the common good.

Some Aspects of the Working of Democratic Centralism

M. Pohorille

THE changes that have taken place in the past few years in the methods of planning and economic management in the socialist countries are, undoubtedly, an important step towards perfecting the mechanism of the socialist economy. It should be stressed that the basic trend of the changes is common to all the countries of the socialist camp. The trend can be seen in centralized planning combined with the greatest possible development of initiative from below and the independence of the enterprises and the local authorities, in bringing the economic management closer to production, in democratic control and participation of the masses in running the economy.

Experience teaches that planning and economic management should be flexible. But the most important thing is strictly to abide by the basic principle of socialist planning—democratic centralism. By way of illustration I shall mention Poland.

During the six-year plan period this principle was distorted: the entire accent was placed on centralism, and the initiative of enterprises and of the local bodies was restricted. When correcting these distortions, our Party encountered the resistance of bureaucratic elements, on the one hand, and, on the other, it found itself under fire from the anti-socialist forces who wanted to undermine the economic role of the state and the Party.

Those who favored extreme decentralization, an obviously revisionist concept, claimed that the amassing of maximum profits by the socialist enterprises would lead automatically to all kinds of social blessings. They advocated neutral planning, one fully adjusted to the "consumer's preference" expressed in the demand on the market. These concepts, obviously, were unacceptable. For the crux of the matter lay neither in recognizing nor in belittling the significance of profitability

or of catering exclusively to consumer taste but in either a Marxist or a syndicalist understanding of the character of the socialist economy.

At the Ninth Plenary Session of the Central Committee of the United Workers' Party in May 1957, Comrade Gomulka defined the attitude of the Party in the matter of reorganizing economic management. He said: "Views have been expressed, true, they are cloudy and not very precise, to the effect that the enterprises should become the joint property of individual collectives which will manage them through the medium of workers' councils. Any man capable of thinking a little in terms of economic categories, will immediately reject this concept for the following reasons: if every enterprise were to become the group or co-operative property of the workers, then all the laws governing the capitalist economy would be given free rein but with worse consequences. . . . Consequently the Party should say clearly and resolutely to the authors of these and similar concepts: stop muddling your own heads and stop muddling the heads of the workers."

Article 1 of the draft rules of the state-owned enterprise published in 1957 says that the state-owned enterprise is the basic economic unit of socialist public ownership.

The socialist system, at bedrock of which lies common ownership of the means of production, not only ensures central planning, it links this planning with local planning, with planning in industrial associations and in the enterprises resulting in the general system of planned economic activity. It cannot be said, however, that up till now long-term planning has been quite the success it should be at all levels in our country. That is why the drafting of the seven-year plan by the

district councils should be regarded as an important achievement.

The business-like, creative discussion of these plans before the Third Congress of the Party activated the masses and gave birth to a movement which became known as the movement of public initiative. The work done by this movement enabled us in 1958 to make additional capital investments of more than 1,000 million zloty; in 1959 the figure was in excess of 1,500 million. We now have a system of centralized and decentralized investment. The decentralized investment has many advantages, because it helps to solve problems which cannot be settled under the system of annual planning of centralized investments. The scale and the nature of the decentralized investment are liable to be changed, and at times substantially so. According to the 1959 plan the local councils had at their disposal 15,000 million zloty for local investment, i.e., about a quarter of the total capital investment.

With a view to scientific planning, we have begun research in the sphere of demand and the tendencies of its development in accordance with the growth of income. We are gradually extending our research to the budgets of the workers' families and rural consumption. Our scientists have elaborated physiological norms of diet which have helped us in drawing up a long-term plan for agricultural development. Still we lack many data necessary for a correct assessment of the situation, for example, many price indices, reliable figures pertaining to the incomes of the rural population, etc.

Pohorille then spoke about establishing a single, unified, internally non-contradictory system of planned directives and economic incentives which in the maximum degree would help strengthen discipline and develop the initiative of the workers in carrying out the plans. He pointed to two erroneous approaches to the problem of incentives. The first is to treat the whole system of incentives as a temporary, artificial means devised with a view to increasing the economic activity of the enterprises. This view is basically wrong because the system of incentives is not something external, it should be organically linked with the operation of the economic laws of socialism.

It is equally erroneous to say that an absolutely perfect system of economic incentives can be created which would free the managerial bodies from the need to interfere in the carrying out of the plan, and which would forever remove the possibility of contradictions arising between group interests (separate enterprises) and the interests of society. This view leads to a wrong theoretical concept according to which the functioning of the

enterprises depends solely on prices, profits, etc. This concept is at variance with the Marxist teaching on the socialist state, the tremendous organizing role of which it underestimates.

On the question of strengthening the discipline of planning—the guarantee of the correct functioning of the new system of economic management—the speaker said that at present cases of non-fulfilment of plans made it necessary to extend the system of administrative orders, to make wider use of sanctions, and to reinforce control. The task, however, is not to return to the issuing of vast numbers of directives, but to strengthen the independence of the socialist enterprises and discipline, to complete the movement for normalizing the situation in the national economy, a movement begun in 1957, particularly on such questions as prices, wages, supply quotas for the enterprises, co-ordination and specialization. The condition for the successful fulfilment of this task is the growing participation of the working people in economic management and, above all, the greater part played by the workers in running the enterprises in which they work and in which they are personally interested. This is not a new problem. The Party has tackled it—with varying success—ever since the first days of people's power in Poland. Immediately after the liberation, factory councils were formed which, jointly with government representatives, set the factories working and established control over the public property. Subsequently trade union committees were set up and had definite rights of control over the work of the enterprise. During the six-year plan extensive powers of control were vested in the Party organizations. Thus, there appeared a kind of triangle—the Party committee, the administration and the trade union committee.

The main task was to rally the masses for the fulfilment of the current production plans. This, undoubtedly, was instrumental in achieving good production results. Later, however, such forms of rallying the masses as production meetings, socialist emulation, factory bulletins, etc., proved insufficient. Bureaucratic distortions of the methods of economic management, insufficient control and decline in activity of the workers' collectives meant that valuable initiative and justified criticism by the workers did not meet with the necessary support and failed to yield the anticipated results. Even the socialist emulation, a movement which originated among the workers, was increasingly subjected to formalist distortions.

And so it was that in 1956 the Seventh Plenum of the Central Committee adopted a decision on extending socialist democracy in the enterprises. Workers' councils were formed in the factories in 1956-57. When this was done the revisionists

began to spread all kinds of syndicalist views to the effect that the councils should be entitled to decide the production program, questions affecting wages, prices, etc. It should be stressed, however, that these views did not meet with any great support among the working class. The Party defeated these revisionist concepts and intensified its work in the enterprises, and also in the workers' councils.

Without a doubt the workers' councils helped in a way to improve the work of the enterprises. But at the same time some negative features came to the fore, testifying to the need to revise the concept of workers' self-government which, in essence, fulfilled two functions—managerial and educational. Without the Party and the trade unions the workers' councils alone could not, naturally, perform these functions. Consequently the Party put forward a new concept of workers' self-government which was approved by the Fourth Congress of the trade unions. Workers' Self-Government Conferences were established, which included the workers' council, the trade union committee and the Party committee. The Conference co-ordinates the work and ensures the co-operation of all the workers' organizations participating in the self-government. Each organization retains its specific methods of work.

For the workers' self-government to function successfully the leading role of the Party in it should be strengthened. The establishment of the workers' self-government bodies, and the enhanced independence of the enterprises, have enabled the Party organizations to influence in a big way the entire production work of the enterprises. The necessity for independently solving the economic

and social issues, of holding consultations with non-Party workers and forestalling possible conflicts—all this has enabled the Party committees to improve their work and has activated the Party members. The factory Party organizations have new possibilities for exercising political control over the administration and the work of the enterprise, and at the same time, thanks to the workers' self-government bodies, they have wider opportunities for maintaining contact with the non-Party workers, foremen and engineers and for influencing them politically.

The workers' self-government operates along two main lines. First, its committees take part in drawing up the plans and other measures aimed at making fuller use of the resources and achieving better results. They also take care of working conditions, and decide on the distribution and utilization of the factory fund. The participation of Party and non-Party activists in the life of the factory, the close link between management and workers and the guaranteed right of the workers' self-government to decide the basic issues arising in the factory—all signify considerable extension of democracy in industry.

The second task of workers' self-government, one that is closely linked with the first, is to verify fulfilment of the production program and all the work of the factory.

Creatively applying the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the socialist state as the main instrument in the struggle of the masses for socialism and communism, the Communist and Workers' parties are strengthening the ties between the state and the people and, thanks to this, are winning more economic and political successes.

The Basic Difference Between the Economic Role of the Socialist and the Capitalist State

L. Rachmuth

THE need to make an examination of the fundamental difference between the economic role of the state in the socialist countries and its economic role in the capitalist countries can be explained by the fact that the economic success of the socialist countries would have been impossible without the organizing function of the state and the reinforcing of its economic role, and also because the bourgeois and revisionist economists in their apologetics for imperialism and in extolling "neo-capitalism," as well as the myth of the

welfare state make great play of the economic influences exerted by state-monopoly capitalism. The struggle against bourgeois and revisionist pseudo-theories is, therefore, extremely important from the standpoint of the interests of the international working-class movement. Hence the need for a thorough and profound examination of the new developments in postwar state-monopoly capitalism.

In our day the economic role played by the state under capitalism can be examined only in

its specific form of state-monopoly capitalism.* The economic policy of the imperialist governments, which is at the service of monopoly capital, is largely inspired by the economic doctrine of John M. Keynes. Keynes, as we know, adhered to the concept, a false one, that the capitalist state, by its intervention in the economy, could cure capitalism of its ills, abolish economic crises, ensure full employment and endow capitalism with eternal life.

After the war the Keynes concept became the economic gospel of the imperialist governments who steered their economic policy according to the main Keynesian "prescriptions." Shortly after the war, it was officially recognized that the state would bear the main responsibility for maintaining a high level of business activity.

Subsequently, state-monopoly capitalism underwent further development both in its national and in its international forms — the latter linked, for example, with the Western European "integration." In this feature of super-monopoly we see, partly, the initial realization of a new form of state-monopoly capitalism. But, leaving aside this and other forms, we shall dwell on one aspect only, and examine those forms associated with state consumption (or the state market) and the sources from which this consumption is financed (taxation and the national debt).

Taking their cue from the Keynesian concepts, the imperialist governments and bourgeois economists see in state expenditure the sovereign remedy for the economic ills. An American text-book on political economy suggests that whenever the government spends *enough* money, for example, spending it at the level of World War II, it will be able to restore full employment no matter how serious the depression may be.** This is in line with the central Keynesian idea that state expenditure should be so organized that the result (goods or services) should not form part of either industrial or personal consumption.

Up till now it has been the practice of imperialist governments to increase that part of the budget expenditure which we could term non-productive spending and to reduce expenditure for public needs (housing, etc.)

The tabular data below are taken from official U.S. sources.

*We leave out of account here the special role of state capitalism in the underdeveloped countries, which is spear-headed against imperialism and colonialism, tries to accelerate the economic development of the former colonies and thus carry forward their political independence. Because of the specific conditions in which it operates state capitalism here plays a progressive role.

**M. H. Umbreit, F. F. Hunt, V. V. Kinter, *Economics, An Introduction to Principles and Problems*, McGraw Hill, New York, 1957, Third Edition.

SOME BASIC GROUPS OF U.S. BUDGET EXPENDITURE

	1939		1955	
	\$ million	percentage budget expenditures	\$ million	percentage budget expenditures
Military expenditure	1,077	12.20	41,900	65.5
Social expenditure	3,823	43	1,935	3
House-building	154	1.74	367	0.57
Total budget expenditure	8,858		63,968	

The general trend of development has not changed since 1955. As the table shows, military appropriations absorb the bulk of the budget expenditure. This, of course, is not the only kind of non-productive expenditure, but it is the kind preferred by the big war-industry trusts because it promises vast profits.

In 1939 military expenditure accounted for 1.18 per cent of the national product of the United States; in 1954 and 1955 it stood at 12 per cent. But between 1939 and 1954 the national product had grown approximately fourfold. The percentage of military expenditure showed an almost 10-fold rise, and the share of general government spending (including expenditure by the state administrations and municipalities, and military expenditure) in the national product rose from 20.1 per cent in 1939 to 27.1 in 1954, i.e., approximately 35 per cent.

Non-productive expenditure is financed from taxation and the national debt. About three-quarters of the Federal budget revenue derives from income tax, most of which is paid by the working population, the remainder by the corporations. The other quarter derives from various tariffs, including customs duty.

If we leave aside the latter source, there remain (first) the income tax paid by the working population and (second) the corporation income tax. The economic effect of the two sources differs. Appropriation of part of the income of the working population in the shape of taxes lowers their purchasing power and raises that of the state. The general volume of demand and supply remains unchanged. But a structural change takes place, the share of production and the sale of means of production rises, while consumer-goods selling declines.

It is worth noting the dislocations caused by switching production and demand from Department II to Department I of social production. As long as Department I included means of production proper, their output always depended on output in Department II; but since we now get products such as armaments which are useless from the economic standpoint, Department I begins, increas-

ingly, to be less dependent on the second. This explains the tendency in the United States and in the main European capitalist countries for the gulf between Departments I and II to become wider, resulting from the lag in consumer-goods production. Income paid by the working population is a source for financing non-productive Government expenditure and, simultaneously, is one of the main reasons for the worsened conditions of the proletariat in the postwar; this, in turn, is of decisive significance for deepening the antagonistic contradiction between production and consumption in the capitalist world.

Appropriation in the form of taxation of part of the monopoly profits has a different economic effect. Income tax paid by the working population lowers their purchasing power, whereas the income tax paid by capitalists is a means of utilizing part of the idle capital for continuing capitalist reproduction. A similar role—utilization of a considerable portion of the total idle capital for profitable application—is played by the national debt. Whenever crisis symptoms set in, the imperialist governments increase their expenditure (and not only non-productive), float government loans and appropriate, in the form of the national debt, an extra part of the surplus value in the shape of spare money capital. State indebtedness makes for greater demand, thus adding to the profits of the monopolies.

Can the same effect be obtained by lowering the income tax paid by the working population? Such a step would, undoubtedly, make for increased consumer demand, but government demand would decline in the measure that the tax is lowered; thus the overall demand would remain constant.

The capitalist state, irrespective of whether or not it reduces income tax, resorts to loans with a view to raising the aggregate demand; in doing so it adds all the time to the national debt. In the United States the Federal Government debt has swollen to almost \$285,000 million. In 1939 the interest paid on the national debt was in the neighborhood of \$950 million, by 1956 it had risen to \$7,000 million, and by 1961 it will be in the vicinity of \$10,000 million, i.e., almost 12 per cent of the total Federal budget.

In these conditions it is clear why the income tax paid by the working population is constantly rising—it is the main source of the interest paid on the national debt and the source of payment for the debt itself, i.e., if we take it for granted that it will ever be redeemed.

It follows then, that the economic role of the imperialist state in the postwar has been one of organizing and developing the system of government expenditure, particularly non-productive

spending, at the expense of public and other spending, and in utilizing for this purpose two levers; taxation and the national debt.

One result has been a significant deformation of the postwar economic cycle. Growth of production capacities has raced far ahead of the purchasing power of the population. The postwar imperialist economy (especially in the United States) has been characterized by practically chronic overproduction caused by the vast accumulation of capital and the shrinking purchasing power of the masses. According to some bourgeois economists, a quarter or more of the U.S. production capacity is not being used. Without this overproduction it would have been impossible annually to destroy the growing part of the national product in the shape of non-productive government expenditure.

Non-productive government expenditure is materialized in the form of material "benefits" which can be used neither in the sphere of production nor in the sphere of consumption. Thus, from the material standpoint, they represent a deduction from the national income; but the labor expended on their production has created new values in the form of money, which is a potential right to a share of the national wealth. Part of the money profits of the monopolies within the framework of the national product grows in the degree to which there is a disproportion between profits and socially-useful material benefits.

What happens, then, to idle capital engendered by the growing non-productive government expenditure, and to which is added the interest on the national debt, which is also paid by the government? Some of it, naturally, goes to increase the export of capital, while the other part is swallowed by the national debt or is converted into direct capital investment for the production, on an extended scale, of the same socially-useless "benefits."

This means that the system of non-productive expenditure enforces, by virtue of its dialectics, a constant increase in this expenditure and, it follows, a bigger national debt and higher income tax on the population. And because this further restricts the purchasing power of the main groups of working people, extra capital flows more and more from Department II to Department I of social reproduction. Ultimately the purchasing power of the masses will be so restricted that the entire Keynesian edifice of non-productive expenditure will collapse with a bang, bringing much suffering to the working class and working people generally. This system of state intervention in the economy accentuates all the contradictions of capitalism and brings nearer its inevitable end.

Whereas the capitalist state acts as a brake on the productive forces, the socialist state, on the

contrary, contributes to their rapid development. Socialism does not come of its own volition, it is the result of the organized activity of the working people. And the state under socialism differs from the state under capitalism in that the former fulfils an economic-organizing function.

Rachmuth criticized the views of the Yugoslav revisionists who deny the economic-organizing function of the socialist state; reformist views, too, were criticized by him.

The bourgeois economist Buckingham, said Rachmuth, has defined socialism as the incarnation of four principles: 1) common ownership; 2) relative equality; 3) participation by the workers in deciding economic matters; 4) economic planning. To this definition the supporters of this liberal socialism add the marketing system.

Even the mention of common ownership and economic planning has been deleted from the latest Social Democratic program. The demand for relative "equality" is retained precisely because of its relative nature. Other equally loose demands such as justice, freedom and solidarity, have been added.

The point dear to the hearts of the compilers of these programs is the marketing system which is to be the basis of economic activity under their "socialism." Some economists, while admitting common ownership and recognizing a definite role for the state under socialism, cannot imagine the socialist economy other than as an imitation of a competitive economy. According to them, the state should fix, by means of some kind of pseudo-competition, prices, interests and wages similar to those which would be formed under free competition. The point of departure for all these concepts is the apologetic, discredited idea of vulgar political economy that market fluctuations and competition create a constant equilibrium both on the commodity market and on the labor market. They claim, in effect, that no organization of the economy is possible other than that based on essential elements of capitalism. This theory is closely linked with the concept according to which the transition from capitalism to socialism takes place imperceptibly, through the appearance of "elements of socialism" in capitalism.

In reality this is far from being the case. For the first time in history socialist ownership of the means of production makes conscious guidance of the economy both possible and necessary, and this presupposes scientific study of its structure, trends and objective laws. The Marxist analysis of the economy during the transition from capitalism to socialism, as well as an examination of socialist society, reveals definite economic needs which just cannot be satisfied by a simple satis-

faction of demand. These objective requirements and tendencies of socialist society find their synthesis ultimately in the basic economic law of socialism. This purpose is served by socialist industrialization, by the socialist reconstruction of agriculture, by the development of backward areas and by a number of other steps all of which in the aggregate add up to the economic policy of the socialist state.

Generally speaking it is difficult to understand how anyone can regard as rational a system which, in essence, rules out the conscious, common sense element in favor of a fluctuating, uncontrolled mechanism.

Some disproportions and discrepancies are, of course, possible under socialism. But the socialist state has the means with which to put them right. In order to restore equilibrium between demand and supply for a particular article, an equilibrium upset, say, by increased demand, output of the item can be increased or it can be imported, or goods similar to those in short supply can be produced or imported in greater quantities. Lastly, measures can be taken to stimulate savings bank deposits, internal loans can be floated, etc. In a word, the possibilities are numerous.

But the best solution should not be chosen mechanically. It can be found only by studying the specific conditions. Under socialism it is not enough to establish just any kind of "equilibrium." A simple manipulation of prices is not a solution which takes account of all the conditions and all the possibilities. What is needed is a deep analysis of various economic relationships, an analysis which should not be restricted merely to the surface aspect of demand, supply and prices.

Through their economic bodies the socialist governments establish the proportions of the national economy, organize production and distribution. Therein lies one of the essential aspects of the economic-organizing functions of the state under socialism.

True, the problem of the fundamental difference of the economic role of the socialist state is not exhausted by what has been said above. But what can be said is this: the main source of the difference between the economic role of the two kinds of state should be sought in their nature—on the one hand it is the state of the monopoly bourgeoisie, and on the other, the state of the working people.

While the economic role played by the capitalist state leads to the impoverishment of the working people, the main sense and chief result of the economic activity of the state under socialism is a steady rise in the material and cultural level of society as a whole.

(To be concluded)

International Congresses and Conferences

A Forum of People's Solidarity

DELEGATES of the peoples of Asia and Africa met in Conakry in April for the Second Solidarity Conference. Five years separate this conference from Bandung and less than two and a half years from the First Solidarity Conference in Cairo. Although this is only a brief interval even in the life of an individual, it has witnessed striking changes in the life of hundreds of millions in the East. With the proclamation of Malaya's independence in 1957 the last Asian country had attained statehood. In Africa the liberation movement is forging ahead. At the time of the Bandung conference there were only four independent African states (excluding the Union of South Africa). Today, there are eleven, and by the end of the year this number will have risen to fourteen; thus, over two-thirds of the 230 million population of Africa will be free. Highly significant is the fact that the conference was held in Conakry, the capital of independent Guinea — a French colony at the time of the Cairo Conference. Every time the Conference went into session the delegates passed by the Freedom obelisk in the center of the city. Eighteen months ago the square contained a monument to a French Governor-General; it is a sign of the times that this monument has been relegated to the lumber-room of the Ethnographic Museum.

And yet the delegates showed no intention of resting on their laurels. To disclose the sources of the success, to formulate new tasks and the ways of performing them and to give new impetus to the patriotic movement — these were the questions discussed by the conference.

A Powerful Anti-Imperialist Force

The attention of the delegates was centered around the problem of strengthening Afro-Asian solidarity. And this was natural! For the experience of the liberation struggle teaches that Afro-Asian solidarity is a powerful anti-imperialist force.

In the post-Bandung period the fraternal bonds linking the Afro-Asian peoples have become stronger, and their struggle has merged into a single stream. And this, it should be said, is one of the chief reasons for the defeat suffered by the colonialists. Afro-Asian unity in the anti-imperialist struggle and the support accorded this struggle by the socialist countries and the other democratic

forces create favorable conditions for the liberation movement of the oppressed peoples. Today, the struggle for national freedom is, as a rule, no longer a single combat between the oppressor and the oppressed. One of the delegates described Asia and Africa as one "big house." And imperialist overlordship of any room in this house is intolerable to all its inmates. That is why the struggle waged by the people of Algeria and by the Bantu people is close to the hearts of the peoples of Asia, just as the struggle waged by the Indonesians for the liberation of Western Irian or by the Koreans for the unification of their country is close to the hearts of the African peoples. The freedom fighters now have powerful backing in the world. *This means that any people, no matter how small, or where they live, can wage a successful struggle against the colonialists.* It is true, of course, that the success of the liberation struggle depends chiefly on the internal, national forces. The valor displayed by the Iraqi patriots in 1958 ensured the victory of the revolution. But it was the support of the Afro-Asian and socialist nations that safeguarded the revolution from imperialist intervention.

The imperialists are conscious of the danger which Afro-Asian unity in the struggle for national independence holds for them. In the days when they lorded it over the countries of Asia and Africa they completely isolated them economically, politically and culturally. Even now trade between the African countries accounts for a bare 10-12 per cent of Africa's overall foreign trade turnover. Until recently one had to travel from Accra to Casablanca either through Paris or Rome, i.e., the traveller had to cover not 3,000 but 7,000 kilometers. Post and telegraph communication was conducted in the same way.

Keeping the Afro-Asian countries disunited and sowing discord has always been the tried method of the colonialists. The imperialists also play on territorial and border disputes. It will be recalled that the colonialists charted the map of Asia and Africa with scant regard to economic, ethnographic or linguistic factors. For instance, some of the borders in West, Equatorial and East Africa merely divide the zones of domination by the imperialist powers. The Indo-Pakistani frontier was deliberately drawn with a view to spoiling relations between neighbors.

For the same disruptive purpose the imperialists make the most of anti-communism. By pointing to differences in the socio-economic systems and ideologies of the Asian People's Democracies and the other countries of Asia and Africa, imperialist propaganda seeks to demonstrate that solidarity between them is "impossible." Attempts of this kind were laid bare at the conference. "Our movement," said John K. Kale, a delegate from Uganda, "should be built on our unifying common denominator of anti-imperialism as its foundation-stone. A different political, social and economic set-up in the Afro-Asian world is not incompatible with our solidarity." The same view was expressed by delegates from Guinea, Tunisia, Pakistan, Lebanon and other countries. Certainly, it would be absurd to belittle the profound difference between the social systems of People's China and, say, India. But the two countries are vitally interested in combating colonialism and in overcoming the aftermath of colonial and semi-colonial dependence. And it is these questions and not the path chosen by this or that country that are fundamental to the solidarity movement.

Alarmed by the rapid growth of the African Liberation movement the imperialists are making every effort to set Asian and African peoples against each other using, for instance, the question of Asian immigrants in Africa. They intimidate Africans with false talk about a future "Asian supremacy" in order, as one of the delegates observed, to get the Africans to become reconciled to their slavery.

To allow the imperialists to sow discord in the ranks of the freedom fighters would be tantamount to depriving the Afro-Asian peoples of a powerful weapon which they need just as much today as they did yesterday. As long as oppressed and exploited nations continue to exist and as long as a single square foot of Asian and African territory continues to be held by the colonialists and part of the wealth to be appropriated by them, the struggle will go on. Most of the delegates who spoke at the conference called for a rebuff to the splitting intrigues of the colonialists and for reinforcing Afro-Asian anti-imperialist unity. For instance, A. Diallo, Secretary-General of the Conference of the African People, and Taieb Sah-Bani from Tunisia, warned that any rivalry between Afro-Asian countries and any attempts by one or another country to bring egoistical interests to the forefront and to impose its influence and doctrines on others would irretrievably prejudice anti-imperialist solidarity. The thoughts of the delegates were expressed by President Sékou Touré of Guinea, who said: "We must watch with infinite vigilance the splitting methods that are used to sap Afro-Asian solidarity of its positive

content which, in fact, is the best guarantee of our common interests, the sure foundation on which to realize our unanimous aspirations."

The New Tasks of the Struggle

Modern colonialism has many forms. The imperialists are trying by force to preserve the colonial order in Algeria and Oman, in Uganda and the Union of South Africa, in Goa and in Western Irian. Elsewhere they grant political independence but with stipulations that enable them to retain the dominant position and to install docile governments. In those areas where they are forced to concede more, the imperialists bank on their economic grip in the former colonies and on the capitalist international division of labor in order to retain these countries as their agrarian and raw material appendages. Moreover, they enter into collusion with part of the national bourgeoisie, using promises, intimidation and anti-communism to wrest concessions on, and renunciation of, some points advanced in the national program. At times the colonialists are more interested in developments taking this course than in installing patently puppet governments which, isolated from the people, are often powerless when confronted by the democratic movement.

This is done in the guise of "democratic" declarations, solemn statements on "complete renunciation" of colonialism. The Algerian tragedy and the "appeasements" in the British colonies show that the colonialists' actions lay bare the mendacity of these declarations and Western policy in the East. When the press reports say the police in Uganda were ordered to shoot at the demonstrators and not "over their heads," this shows the worth of the words of Macmillan who in Moscow last year assured his audience that colonialism "was dead." *Colonialism, wherever it can still do this, crushes and kills, as in the past.* But, because it can do so more and more rarely, methods of indirect domination have come to the fore. Political independence alone does not abolish this "invisible" colonialism. *Although the troops and officials have withdrawn from most of Asia and a large part of Africa, colonialism still clings to its positions.*

The national-liberation struggle in Asia and partly in Africa is entering a new phase. "We Afro-Asian peoples," reads the economic resolution, "cannot regard our struggle for independence as completed unless we abolish economic inequality and build up a sound and independent economy. Only economic independence will enable the Afro-Asian peoples successfully to resist the imperialist intrigues . . . The conference therefore declares that the struggle for full economic independence is today the cardinal task of the countries of Africa

and Asia which have won political independence."

The economy of the Afro-Asian countries is crippled by their colonial past. Together with Latin America they account for two-thirds of the population of the capitalist world and only for about ten per cent of its industrial output. Is it a normal state of affairs that the annual budget of independent India comprises seven-tenths of the annual budget of New York City? About 75 per cent of the population in the Afro-Asian countries is illiterate. These figures show the price paid for the "grandeur" and "prosperity" of capitalist Europe and the United States.

The imperialists, it was stressed, continue to exploit the former colonies through the unequal exchange of goods, thereby draining away the sources of accumulation. In 1957 and 1958 the Afro-Asian countries lost over \$10,000 million from this unequal exchange, a sum greatly in excess of the total loans granted to them. The foreign monopolies, too, sap the economy of these countries with the help of investments. Paradoxical, but true. H. D. Malaviya, a delegate from India, said that from 1946 to 1958 the net influx into the USA from foreign investments amounted to \$7,600 million, with half the investments concentrated in the underdeveloped countries.

Building up a national economy in the Afro-Asian countries would be a heavier blow to imperialism than the loss of direct political domination over the colonies. Such a development would sap the economic foundations of colonialism. This explains why the imperialists, taking advantage of their economic positions, fiercely oppose the independent economic development of the Afro-Asian countries. The colonialists try to undermine the state sector in these countries, which is an instrument for developing national economy. In the guise of concern for national capital, they stand for "unrestricted freedom" for private enterprise. Since the national bourgeoisie in the Afro-Asian countries is weak and unable to compete with Western monopolies, this means in practice unlimited scope of action for these monopolies.

The conference denounced "all neo-colonialist devices and methods aimed at preserving colonial and imperialist oppression in any form." It warned against the dangers to the underdeveloped countries in the Common Market, the International Development Association and the Dillon Plan for co-ordinating the economic expansion of the NATO countries.

It was stressed that economic independence could be achieved and the delegates were urged to redouble efforts in this direction. The days of mandates and protectorates, viceroys and governors, have gone forever; soon the last hour of

foreign monopolies operating on Asian and African soil will strike. The conference resolutions outline a program for building the national economy in the newly-liberated countries. It envisages agrarian reform and, in particular, industrialization, which, as the conference defined, "is the key to economic progress and the prerequisite for economic independence." Confirming the resolutions adopted in 1957 in Cairo, the conference noted "the positive significance of the nationalization of foreign banks, insurance companies and enterprises" and reaffirmed "the sacred right of all nations freely to dispose of their national resources." Afro-Asian peoples were urged to promote solidarity in the fight for economic independence.

The conference expressed appreciation of the aid rendered by the socialist countries, aid which imperialist propaganda tries to vilify. In recent times the bourgeois press has given currency to the thesis that the socialist countries cannot be sincere in helping Afro-Asian countries where the national bourgeoisie is in power. *But in extending aid the socialist countries are guided by the desire to help the oppressed peoples* who, having got rid of the political domination of the colonialists, are now striving to throw off the economic yoke. The conference demonstrated once again that attempts to cast aspersions on the co-operation between the socialist and economically underdeveloped countries are doomed to failure. It was pointed out in the resolution that as against the colonialist nature of the "aid" received from the imperialist powers, the aid rendered by the socialist countries "helps our industrialization, helps us to make the utmost use of our resources on terms of equality, mutual benefit and friendly relations without any discrimination or meddling in our internal affairs, and has no strings attached that are incompatible with our national interests and dignity."

Africa Is in the Vanguard

African problems occupied a prominent place in the work of the conference. The voice of nearly all Africa was heard in Conakry. A delegate from Guinea was followed by a delegate from Ghana, a Moroccan by a Tunisian, a Kenya delegate by a Somali, a delegate from Angola by a delegate from Mauritania. Some of them expressed the point of view of their peoples for the first time. This was a striking manifestation of the spread of the anti-imperialist struggle, of the maturity of the solidarity movement. The African continent has awakened from its slumber. Today *its people, in the vanguard of the national-liberation struggle, are destroying the last pillars of colonial slavery.* The Permanent Secretariat of the Solidarity Council had every reason to declare, in characterizing the

present stage of the anti-imperialist struggle, that "its salient feature is the rising tide of the liberation movement on the great African continent."

Quickly though freedom marches, its advance is still too slow for those who are oppressed. It was not surprising therefore that the question: how to get rid of the colonialists as quickly as possible, occupied the minds of the delegates. That liberation is inevitable and that it is not far distant nobody doubted, even the delegates from the Portuguese colonies, where the colonial ways of the past century remain almost intact. The gist of all the resolutions on Africa can be expressed as follows: "Colonialists, Get Out *Immediately!*" Standing ovations were accorded more than once to the speakers who proclaimed this demand.

Present-day Africa is a maze of acute contradictions between the imperialists and the oppressed peoples. A colonial war is raging in Algeria. Practically the whole of the French peacetime army has been thrown against the Algerian freedom fighters. Yet the colonialists are now farther from victory than they were six years ago when the uprising broke out. *The war in Algeria is not a local event, as imperialist propaganda claims; it affects the destiny of colonialism throughout Africa.* The valiant resistance of the Algerian patriots is a factor that impels the French (and not only the French) colonialists to make concessions in other areas. The Conakry conference was unanimous in saying that the struggle waged by the people of Algeria was the cause of all the nations of Africa and Asia. It unmasked the U.S. imperialists who, despite the appeal addressed by the Tunisian Conference of the African Peoples to Eisenhower and the U.S. Congress, continue to support the French colonialists.

The racists are still on the rampage in South Africa. Denouncing the barbaric actions of the Verwoerd government, the participants in the conference, for instance, a Zanzibar delegate, stressed that the responsibility for these actions rests with the Western powers for having encouraged the South African racists; it was only recently that these powers have begun to dissociate themselves from the latter. The conference urged the Afro-Asian countries to sever diplomatic relations with the Union of South Africa, to boycott its goods, and resolved to hold an Independence Day for South Africa.

The "Dark Continent" is the cherished goal of the imperialist trusts. Especially active in Africa are the U.S. and West German monopolies. During the past four years the continent has been visited by Eisenhower, Nixon, Rockefeller and Mr. Black, president of the International Bank, and by many

more U.S. leaders and businessmen. About 200 American corporations are conducting business on the continent. The U.S. Information Service carries on propaganda activities in 13 countries. Nor are the West German monopolies losing any time. Speculating on the fact that Federal Germany has no colonies and posing as the enemies of colonialism, they aim at penetrating into places where the other Western powers are finding it hard to penetrate. Objectively they are an instrument of world imperialism; but they always place their own interests first. According to the *London Times*, a West German delegation had made its presence felt during the proclamation of the independence of the Cameroons; it had, according to the paper, stepped ahead of the representatives of the other Western powers. The designs of the West German monopolists were disclosed by a *Die Welt* correspondent who visited the Cameroons. The people of the Cameroons, he informed his readers, "dream" of the days when they were a German colony, and they said to him "when are you (the Germans—Ed.) coming back?"

Monopoly penetration is fraught with especial danger to Africa in view of the Continent's low level (lower than in Asia) of socio-economic development. With the exception of a few areas Africa has practically no national industry or capital; there is a sharply expressed monoculture and a negligible number of native technical and administrative personnel. In these conditions the young independent countries are forced to wage a difficult struggle for existence and to prove their viability, despite the imperialist propaganda and sabotage. That is why the people of Africa are watching developments in Guinea which, with the aid of the socialist countries, defeated the economic blockade organized by the French colonialists and has strengthened its economy. The mention of Guinea's three-year plan drew repeated applause.

Africans, both those free and those still unfree, are anxious about the future development of their countries. They have no desire to follow the path of the capitalist West. Hatred of colonialism, which is justly considered here as an abominable product of capitalism, the weakness and in some countries the non-existence of a national bourgeoisie, the predominance in many areas of tribalism and its traditions, which are incompatible with capitalist relations, the role played by the intellectuals in the liberation movement, most of whom are eager to work hard for their people, and, last but not least, the instructive example of the progress of the socialist countries—these factors produce a negative attitude towards capitalism and stimulate the persistent search for other ways of social development. That is why the Africans

speak quite often about a non-capitalist way of development. Even people who are far from Marxism hold that much can be learned from the experience of the socialist countries. Will the African countries be able to develop without experiencing the negative features of capitalist development? The answer depends in large measure on those heading the liberation struggle, on whether they find a constructive solution to their particular problems.

The new, "restless" Africa, as the *Daily Herald* calls it, is a continent of boundless energy. The cause of Africa is a matter of concern for progressive mankind.

The Conference and International Problems

The degree of maturity reached by the Afro-Asian solidarity movement can be gauged by the fact that the conference discussed other issues in addition to the problems facing the national-liberation struggle. It took a clear stand on current international matters. With the spread of the anti-imperialist struggle the Afro-Asian peoples are becoming conscious that they are called upon to play a notable role in shaping the destiny of the world. Together with this, interconnection between the international situation and the national-liberation movement stands out more clearly.

The conference confirmed the adherence of most of the Afro-Asian countries to a policy of positive neutrality. This is a comparatively new trend in international relations. It set in after the war and differs essentially from the traditional neutrality. True, some interpret this trend as one of keeping aloof from the two world camps, as maneuvering between them and playing on their contradictions. This view is being imposed (and not always without success) on some circles in the Afro-Asian countries. But as the Conakry conference revealed, the Afro-Asian peoples have a different understanding of positive neutrality. While it presupposes steering clear of military alliances, this policy in no way signifies an impartial, neutral stand on the controversial issues between the two camps. The neutral countries of Asia and Africa have (and express) their own views on the questions of peace and war, disarmament, colonialism and self-determination, and their attitude is objectively anti-imperialist. "A genuine policy of positive neutrality," said Nakhle Moutrane, a delegate from Lebanon, "must of necessity signify a tireless struggle against imperialism in all forms of its domination . . ."

The conference passed a special resolution warmly supporting the ideas of peaceful coexistence and general disarmament. The peoples of Asia and Africa, too, have no desire to see a

nuclear war, and recognize the historical necessity of peaceful coexistence. In view of the grand tasks of national regeneration that confront them, they have a vested interest in peace and in easing international tension which the imperialists exploit in the interests of colonialist policy, counselling the Eastern countries to abandon neutrality and entangling them in military blocs where their national independence is restricted.

Peaceful coexistence does not signify the termination or slackening of the national-liberation struggle. Nor does it signify preserving the existing order in the imperialist world—exploitation of the working people, colonialism and enslavement of the small nations which, of course, is the sense the imperialists would like to impart to coexistence. But the progressive forces, including the fighters for national independence, will never agree with this. *There can be no conciliation between the oppressors and the oppressed, between the colonialists and the subject peoples. Under peaceful coexistence these peoples are fully justified in rising against their oppressors.* The national-liberation struggle reinforces peaceful coexistence, because it is directed against colonialism which engenders a constant threat to peace. It will be recalled that the two world wars began as wars for the redivision of colonies, that most of the armed conflicts of the past 15 years have been colonial wars.

The Soviet proposals for general and complete disarmament have met with approval in the Afro-Asian countries. This was expressed at the conference held by Rameshwari Nehru (India). The people in Asia and Africa regretfully see the fantastic sums so sorely needed by the newly-liberated countries to speed up their economic progress being squandered on the armaments drive. Ten per cent of the world's annual military expenditure would suffice to erect 40 plants of the size of the Bhilai iron and steel complex. The peoples of Asia and Africa, then, are especially interested in disarmament. Disarmament is quite possible in present conditions and would signify a big contribution to peace. True, the imperialists are not against giving a twist to the disarmament slogan to the detriment of the Afro-Asian peoples. They would like to use it in order to disarm the fighters for national independence. The French colonialists, for instance, would like to see disarmament begin with the Algerian National-Liberation Army. The imperialists are like the bandit who, with a revolver concealed in his pocket, suggests to the man with a stick that he should throw it away, that he should "disarm." Is it the Afro-Asian countries that have A- and H-bombs, supersonic bombers and missile-firing submarines? Is it their aircraft that intrudes into the air space of other countries? Africa is the only continent

over which a poisonous atomic cloud has mushroomed this year, but are the Africans to blame for this?

Those who are armed must disarm, in the first place the powers possessing the bulk of the armaments. Incidentally, the imperialists are well aware that disarmament will weaken their military machine which is often used against colonial peoples. This, naturally, makes them more reluctant to agree to disarmament. As regards the fighters for national liberation they would readily turn their arms into ploughshares, but, on the one condition: that the colonialists who have forced them to take to arms withdraw from Asia and Africa and cease to encroach on the rights of the peoples of the East.

Supporting the idea of disarmament, the conference simultaneously denounced the aggressive blocs and bilateral military agreements, for instance, the Japan-U.S. "security pact." It demanded the withdrawal of foreign troops from Asia and Africa and the closing of military bases. It passed condemnation on the French colonialists for converting the Sahara into an atomic proving ground. It also demanded that People's China and Mongolia be given their rightful place in the United Nations.

The policy of positive neutrality leads to the extension of the peace zone. The socialist countries stand foursquare for the freedom and equality of nations, for peace and disarmament, do not seek any privileges or unilateral advantages in their relations with the Afro-Asian countries. Their aim is to unite with them in the struggle against war and colonialism, in the offensive on poverty, oppression and backwardness. The socialist countries, as is known, have suggested that the big Asian powers should participate in a summit meeting. They welcome the enhanced role of the Afro-Asian countries in international affairs and are convinced that in the years to come the voice of the freedom-loving peoples of Africa and Asia will have a still greater significance for peace and progress.

* * *

The Conakry conference, a forum of anti-imperialist solidarity of the Afro-Asian peoples, demonstrated their resolve to wage the struggle against colonialism to a victorious end. It testified to the growing isolation of the imperialist powers. The resolutions adopted by the conference call on the millions of patriots to prosecute the national-liberation struggle with renewed vigor.

K. BRUTENTS

Injured Innocence

THE leaders of the Communist League of Yugoslavia, it appears, are again complaining of being treated unfairly. They have been offended by the recent criticism of their views in the Communist press, where Yugoslav foreign policy and Tito's May 17 statement on the Summit conference were assessed. How did the Yugoslav revisionists react?

To put it briefly, they rejected the criticism out of hand. The Belgrade *Komunist*, for example, defined it as a "gross distortion of the spirit and the aims of Yugoslav policy," while Tito himself, speaking in Subotica at the end of May, denounced it as lying propaganda.

As we see, a positive assertion. But that has not made it any more convincing. We would seek in vain for a reply in the Subotica speech on the substance of the criticism. Tito was unable to bring forward a single fact to disprove the assessment. And this is no accident—these facts are simply non-existent. That is why Tito confined himself to the unsubstantiated declarations typical of the Yugoslav Communist League leaders — "Yugoslavia was profoundly principled in her foreign policy," for that reason she was being attacked in an attempt to "bring her to her knees," but "we are used to that sort of thing," etc.

Thus, the Yugoslav leaders have again adopted an attitude of injured innocence. It is most decidedly out of place, however, because they have no reason to complain that the criticism is unjust.

What, indeed, did the Communist press say about Tito's May 17 statement? He had, it said, side-stepped the real reasons for the break-up of the Summit conference and equated the Soviet Union's stand with that of the USA, thereby helping the American ruling circles to befog the world public. And no matter how they try, the Yugoslav leaders will not be able to prove that the criticism is unfounded,

Let us recall the facts. The people of the world placed great hopes in the Summit meeting. And because the U.S. Government torpedoed the talks, these hopes were not realized. That was why it was so important for Washington to conceal the real reasons for the break-down. Caught red-handed, they were unable to deny that an American aircraft had violated the Soviet border. But they did try to depict this as a "minor incident"

which should not be allowed to disrupt the talks. Their propaganda machine worked full speed to shift the blame for the break-down onto the Soviet Government.

What attitude did the President of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia adopt? While, he said, the acts of the U.S. Government were deserving of censure, they should not be "made the cause of a feud," and "in the situation that has been created, one should not look for prestige." Whereas all over the world broad sections of the public, including many bourgeois leaders, hold the U.S. Government responsible for the collapse, Tito eschewed passing such judgment. On the contrary, he cast aspersions on the Soviet Government's stand. And no matter how the Yugoslav press now tries to justify Tito's statement, there can be no doubt that it supports the position of the U.S. ruling circles and their attempts to misinform the public. As the Cuban newspaper *Noticias de Hoi* justly put it, "by belittling the significance of the spy-plane incident, Tito tried to help Eisenhower out of an awkward situation." Such are the facts.

The Yugoslav newspapers make believe that they cannot understand why the attitude of their leaders is being criticized by the Communist press. It is difficult, writes G. Altmann, author of a recent article in the *Komunist*, to fathom the motives behind these "attacks," for Tito's statement was "the first effort made outside the Summit to save it at a critical moment." But there is little point in his pretending to be such a simpleton. The reasons for criticizing Tito's statement are crystal-clear: concern for the interests of peace and socialism.

The statement could only be ignored if these interests were renounced; especially as the standpoint it sets forth is no chance one. The whole Yugoslav press is writing in the same spirit. From issue to issue, *Borba*, *Politika* and other newspapers carry tendentious comments, lifted from the imperialist press, on the failure of the Summit. These comments aim at "proving" that a radical turn has taken place in Soviet foreign policy, that the Soviet Government is acting "from positions of strength," and so public opinion, which earlier condemned U.S. policy, now places the responsibility for the failure on the Soviet Union. M. Ra-

doicic, *Politika's* correspondent, is doing his best to make a good job of this, shamelessly ascribing to the American man in the street the false assertions of the imperialists. While space is not stinted for the slanderous inventions of the reactionary press, *Borba* and *Politika* are uncommunicative when it comes to reporting the actions of the progressive forces condemning the policy of the American monopolies. Hence it is not surprising that the Yugoslav newspapers ignored the statements issued by the Communist and Workers' parties which give a Marxist-Leninist assessment of the international situation.

The Yugoslav press resorted to a new maneuver in trying to hush up the U.S. Government's responsibility for its shameful deeds. *Borba* and the other newspapers assure their readers that the reasons for the collapse of the Paris conference are unimportant, and hence no search should be made for the guilty party, as that would not be "constructive." They had not a word of censure for those members of the Security Council who refused to condemn the aggressive policy of the U.S. Government. Moreover, the toothless resolution which the supporters and allies of the United States managed to get through at the Security Council was presented by the Yugoslav press as a positive event.

That is the stand the Yugoslav politicians have taken on the collapse of the Summit. And it is in vain that they say there are no grounds for criticizing their attitude. And if further evidence is needed to corroborate the correctness of this criticism it is supplied by Tito himself. In his Subotica speech he again equated U.S. policy with that of the Soviet Union, saying that "the Great Powers were not countries one could fully trust," that "they have no right to play with the destiny of mankind." A truly astonishing statement! At a time when the people everywhere are pinning their hopes of peace and security on Soviet policy, Tito is trying to instil mistrust of that policy.

"... Our principled stand on foreign policy has built up our prestige in many friendly countries," he boasted. But among what social forces Yugoslav foreign policy had won prestige he preferred not to say. And that is a pity. For had the Yugoslav President dwelt on the subject in a little more detail he might, perhaps, have furnished a reply to the following question: Why has his attitude won the obvious approval of certain avowed opponents of peace? The West German radio, for example, which is under the control of a "Peacemaker" like Adenauer, proclaimed Tito's statement to be an example "which world public opinion would do well to follow." Praise of this kind ought to make Yugoslavia's leaders ponder seri-

ously on how they erred against the interests of the working class, peace and socialism.

What Tito's well-wishers in Bonn particularly liked about his statement was that it gave the U.S. version of the events leading to the breakdown in, as the radio commentator put it, "a more elegant" way. And indeed, the Yugoslav leaders did not risk defending this version outright, but tried to make their attitude appear objective and unbiased—the usual method of the opportunists. As Lenin said: "An opportunist, by his very nature, will always evade formulating an issue clearly and decisively, he will always seek a middle course, he will always wriggle like a snake between two mutually exclusive points of view and try to 'agree' with both and to reduce his differences of opinion to petty amendments, doubts, good and pious suggestions, and so on and so forth."* The Yugoslav revisionists are following this "golden rule" of opportunist tactics. They wriggle between two mutually exclusive points of view and, while appearing to condemn the aggressive acts of the American imperialists, their reservations make nonsense of the censure. But it is precisely this justification of imperialist policy cloaked in hypocritical assurances of fidelity to peace and socialism that so suits the U.S. monopolists.

The Yugoslav leaders profess to be the most consistent champions of the principles of coexistence. What is more, they assure us they have creatively developed these principles to suit the peculiarities of the present situation. In point of fact the doctrine of "active coexistence" invented by them is no development, but an opportunist distortion of the Leninist idea of peaceful coexistence of states with differing social systems. The words of one of the characters in Shakespeare's *Merchant of Venice* can be aptly applied to the Yugoslav theoreticians' confused thinking on "active coexistence":

"his reasons are as two grains of wheat hid in two bushels of chaff: you shall seek all day ere you find them, and when you have them, they are not worth the search." And truly the "grains" hidden in the verbal chaff around the theory of "active coexistence" are not worth the search, for they are rotten. The whole essence of this pseudo-theory boils down to glossing over the fundamental fact that capitalism and socialism are diametrically opposed systems, to substituting the division of the world into blocs for the fundamental contradiction of social development and thereby to justifying Yugoslavia's self-isolation from the socialist camp and the policy of maneuvering between the two camps.

*V. I. Lenin, *One Step Forward, Two Steps Back*.

Persistently reiterating that they are against blocs, the Yugoslav leaders do their best to confuse the question of the alignment of world forces. They fail to see, or to be more correct, refuse to see that aggressive blocs of the NATO kind—if we speak of the essence and not of the form—are not simply alliances of countries, but military and political unions of the monopoly bourgeoisie. It is not the national interests of the member-states that lie at the basis of these blocs, but the narrow-class mercenary interests of the imperialists bent on world domination and confidently expecting not only to hold back mankind's advance towards socialism but to recover the lost positions by force of arms. The existing aggressive blocs are further confirmation of Lenin's proposition that "capital places the protection of its union of the capitalists of all countries against the working people above the interests of its country, its people and whatever you will."*

How can the socialist camp, which is not a military and political bloc, but a community of peace-loving socialist states, a logical and essential stage in the development of world socialism, be placed on the same plane as the alliances of the bourgeoisie? It is between socialism and imperialism, and not between two blocs, unions of states, that the struggle is being waged in the international arena. A policy of "steering clear of blocs" signifies, in fact, an attempt to adopt a neutral position—not in the struggle between the blocs, but between the two social systems.

To justify their attitude, the Yugoslav leaders usually point to the neutrality of capitalist states and countries which have recently cast off their colonial fetters. Why is it, they ask, that the Communist and Workers' parties criticize Yugoslavia's policy of non-participation in blocs, yet look with favor on the neutrality of these countries? The Yugoslav leaders are trying to discover a contradiction here. But it is absurd to put the question in this way. We are speaking about absolutely different things. There can be no doubt that the neutral policy pursued by the non-socialist countries which refuse to join the imperialist military blocs is a positive policy. But the Yugoslav leaders do not regard Yugoslavia as a non-socialist country. They are Communists, they assert, and are fighting for the triumph of socialism. Why, then, do they think the criteria applied to the policy of states led by the bourgeoisie should be applied to that of Yugoslavia? If, as they profess, their aim is to secure the victory of socialism, they cannot be neutral in the fight between socialism and imperialism.

*V. I. Lenin, *Foreign Policy Report at a Joint Meeting of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee and the Moscow Soviet*, May 14, 1918.

For Lenin support by the working class of any country for the revolutionary struggle waged by the workers in other countries was part and parcel of proletarian internationalism. Neutrality in the fight between the two social systems signifies repudiation of this support. The attitude of the Yugoslav leaders—which is directed against the solidarity of the socialist countries — does not further the international proletariat's struggle for socialism; on the contrary, whether these leaders like it or not, it plays into the hands of the imperialists. This is all the more true because their speeches on international affairs frequently run counter to their declarations of neutrality. Yugoslavia, as we know, is a signatory to the Balkan Pact.

It is difficult to believe that these obvious truths—elementary for every Marxist—are beyond the grasp and comprehension of the Yugoslav leaders. For they are not among those who know not what they do. The reason is to be sought elsewhere. Briefly, the heart of the matter is this—the leaders of the CLY are slipping from the class positions. Having isolated themselves from the socialist countries and the international communist movement, they have taken to flirting with the imperialist bourgeoisie. And the quagmire of opportunism and conciliation is sucking them down into the depths.

In his day Lenin castigated the German reformist trade union leader Karl Legien and his ilk; "they talk in a way that will not offend" capitalism, he said. The contemporary Yugoslav Legiens are true to these traditions of their spiritual predecessors. They are talking in a way that will not offend the American monopolies.

The CLY leaders prefer not to say why they are so polite and so tactful when the aggressive adventures of American reaction come into question. They take umbrage when told that it is not for nothing that the American monopolies are helping Yugoslavia. And the Yugoslav leaders often ask: have not the Soviet Union and other socialist countries requested credits from the capitalist countries? That is so, but analogies of this kind can delude no one. It is common knowledge that the generosity which the capitalist nations so often displays towards Yugoslavia has never been extended to the countries of the socialist camp. There is, furthermore, a difference between credits granted in the usual course of commercial relations with the capitalist world, and the USA's systematic and often free aid to Yugoslavia. But even this is not the main thing. It is not for accepting aid that the Yugoslav leaders are being criticized, but because to obtain it they are renouncing principles. More than once has dollar "aid" to Yugoslavia strangely "coincided" in time with

statements made by the Belgrade leaders in support of the political actions of the United States. Many people have been struck by the fact that the latest U.S. credit to Yugoslavia came late last May.

Speaking on February 9, 1948, in Serbia, Tito said: "Do not imagine, comrades, that the American reactionaries are giving us dollars for the sake of our beautiful eyes . . . They have their own reasons for giving us money." And that is true. President Tito spoke well on that occasion! But ten years later he said: "We are reproached for praising the Americans, and for not praising those in the East. I should very much like to know, when have we praised anybody without reason? . . . But if someone does well by Yugoslavia, why should we rail at him? No, what we say is that we are grateful for it."

What has changed in these ten years? American imperialism, which, as Tito said in 1948, did not

part with its dollars for the sake of anyone's beautiful eyes, has not changed. So there is only one conclusion to be drawn—it is the position of the leaders of the Communist League of Yugoslavia that has changed—and very much so. And the change, let us add, is not for the better.

The Yugoslav leaders have no reason for taking offense. They have only themselves to blame for having again come under the fire of criticism. When the clouds of the cold war, which were just about to disperse, again darkened the world, the international communist movement was united and resolved in its determination to uphold the cause of peace and socialism. Once again the Yugoslav leaders have refused to march in the ranks of international communism. That is their affair. But that being so, let them not strike an attitude of injured innocence.

J. GARTNER

Against the Persecution of Democrats

LIVES OF POLITICAL PRISONERS IN DANGER!

ABOUT 2,000 political and trade union leaders are behind prison bars in Paraguay. Many are in the Pikuiba, "180th Kilometer," Ingavi, Bahia Negra and other concentration camps in the Chaco region.

In Asuncion, the capital, hundreds of prisoners are held in the municipal quarries at Tacumbu, in the women's prison, and in police stations. Refined methods of torture are used by the investigation police headed by Juan Erasmo Candia, an assistant of dictator Stroessner. Hundreds of political prisoners, roped together, are forced to slave in the quarries for 14 to 16 hours a day; they are often beaten, and to intimidate them overseers use a wire whip. For sustenance they get a plate of beans and a liter of water to drink—in up to 40°C of heat. No visits are allowed and no mail or parcels of clothing or food. Many are very ill, and some have become mentally unbalanced. Antonio Maidana, Secretary of the Communist Party of Paraguay, is held in unbelievable conditions. Together with 16 other prisoners, among whom are the economist Alfredo Al-

corta and the teacher Julio Rojas, Maidana is held in the No. 3 police district, Asuncion, in a tiny filthy cell. Maidana, whose health has been impaired, and his comrades often suffer from throat and nose bleeding, and heart attacks brought on by the extreme heat, but they are given no medical treatment.

A short time back they were joined by Doctor Carlos Luis Casablanca whose health gives cause for concern, having been seriously undermined by the torture to which he has been subjected. This barbaric treatment is by way of reprisals against the political prisoners. The authorities seize on any pretext to destroy them physically.

The solidary movement with the political prisoners and the fight for their liberation is gaining momentum in Paraguay. This movement is linked with the struggle waged by the workers, peasants, students and other sections for bread, freedom, national sovereignty, for ending the state of siege, and for a general amnesty.

Jose RAMIREZ

STATEMENT BY THE ELEVENTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL OF THE WFTU

SINCE 1953 there has been a reign of terror in Iran. A big strike last summer involving 30,000 brickworkers in Teheran and the powerful student demonstrations in the capital last January, were drowned in blood by the armed forces and American imperialism.

On May 4, the Iranian Government ordered the execution in Tabriz, the provincial capital of Iranian Azerbaijan, of five patriots: Javadi Forougi, Hassan Zehtab, Kosrow Azeri, Ali Azim Zadeh and Ayoub Kalantari. Moreover sentences varying from ten years' imprisonment to forced labor for life were passed on seventeen patriots and workers, including one woman. They were condemned by a military tribunal which met behind closed doors in a hasty session and which showed scant regard for judicial procedure.

Scared by the popular demonstrations in Turkey, the Iranian government ordered a further wave of arrests of Iranian patriots of whom four, Balou-rian, Yaassafi, Chariat and Gassemlou have been condemned to death.

The General Council of the World Federation of Trade Unions expresses its profound solidarity with the workers and the people of Iran, and protests against the repressive measures of the Iranian government; it demands that the sentences be repealed, that an end be put to the reign of terror and the imprisoned patriots released.

It calls upon all trade union organizations and upon all workers, whatever their views and party affiliation, to give the utmost support to the people of Iran in their just struggle.

NEW BOOKS

(Books are printed in the language of the country of publication;
the titles here are given in English)

- L. N. Pazhitnov. *At the Fountainhead of the Revolution in Philosophy*. "Economic and philosophical Monographs of 1844" by Karl Marx. Moscow, Sotsekgiz, 1960, 170 pp.
- P. Secchia. *Capitalism and the Working Class in the Center of the Italian Wool Industry*. Rome, Editori Riuniti, 1960, 403 pp.
- V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works. Second Ed. Vol. I*. Bucharest, Editura politica, 1960, 630 pp.
- V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works. Vol. 6-10*. Buenos Aires, Editorial Cartago, 1959-1960.
- L. Sève. *The Difference*. Two Essays: Lenin as a Communist Philosopher. On *The Sum-Total and the Remainder* by Henry Lefebvre. Paris, Editions Sociales, 1960, 222 pp.
- Essays on Sociology*. Paris, 1960, 208 pp. "Recherches internationales," N. 17.
- Facts and Figures about the USSR for 1959*. Concise Statistical Handbook. Moscow, Gosstatizdat, 1960, 302 pp.
- History of Albania*. Vol. I. Tirane, Universiteti shteteror i Tiranes, 1959, 543 pp.
- D. Nemes. *The Liberation of Hungary*. The Development of Hungary after the Liberation, Second Revised Ed. Budapest, Kossuth konyvkiado, 1960, 330 pp.
- Modern State-Monopoly Capitalism*. Collected Articles. Moscow, the Publishing House of the Higher Party School and the Academy of Social Science, 1960, 275 pp.
- H. Fagan. *Nationalization*. London, Lawrence and Wishart, 1960, 64 pp.
- E. Fischer. *On the Necessity of the Arts*. Dresden, Verlag der Kunst, 1959, 205 pp.
- B. Rattinger and others. *People's Power and Elections*. Prague, Statni nakladatelstvi politicke literatury, 1960, 86 pp.
- G. Willard. *The Phoney War and the Vichy Betrayal. September 1939-June 1941*. From the History of the French Communist Party. Paris, Editions Sociales, 1960, 176 pp.
- A. Petrushov. *Postwar Agrarian Relations in the West European Countries*. Moscow, Sotsekgiz, 1959, 308 pp.
- Z. Rotocki. *The Revival of the Armed Forces in the Federal Republic of Germany*. Poznan, Instytut Zachodni, 1959, 283 pp.
- C. Amort. *To the Help of the Czechoslovak People*. Documents on Czechoslovak-Soviet Friendship, 1938-1945. Prague, Nakladatelstvi Ceskoslovenske akademie ved, 1960, 519 pp; Appendix, 62 pp; 4 maps.
- A. Gramsci. *Under the Mole Tower, 1916-1920*. Torino, Einaudi, 1960, 508 pp.
- The Working Class and Peasant Movement in Poland. 1914-1923*. Warsaw, Ksiazka i Wiedza, 1960, 555 pp.
- N. S. Khrushchov. *A World Without Arms Is a World without Wars*. Vol. 1 and 2. Vol. 1. January-July 1959, 512 pp; Vol. 2. August-December 1959, 440 pp.

[illegible]

VIETNAMESE EDITION:
S'ò' xuất nhập khẩu sách bao 32,
Hai Ba Trưng, Hà-nội

