

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW

In this issue:

The October Revolution and progress

—J. Batal, T. Davagsuren, P. Motta Lima

The Swedish youth and the Communists

—K. E. Johanson, U. Karlsson, W. Svensson

VOLUME 9, NO. 11

November 1966

35 CENTS



- J. BATAL**
T. DAVAGSUREN
P. MOTTA LIMA
- 3 October and progress**
- R. BELOUSOV**
B. DAMDIN
- 10 Theory and practice of building socialism**
THE PLAN AND THE MARKET IN THE
SOCIALIST ECONOMY
DARKHAN—SYMBOL OF INVIOABLE FRIENDSHIP
- J. LEDWOHN**
- 18 Monopolies and the working class**
FRG: THE WORKERS WANT A SHARE
IN MANAGEMENT
- W. NOVACKI**
F. STAUFENBIEL
H. KESSLER
I. NIVINS
- 25 Science and society**
ROLE OF SCIENCE IN BUILDING SOCIALISM
IN POLAND
INTERWEAVING OF THE TECHNOLOGICAL
REVOLUTION AND CULTURE IN THE GDR
CORRELATION BETWEEN THE TECHNOLOGICAL
REVOLUTION AND CULTURE IN WEST GERMANY
SOCIOLOGY AND SOCIAL REALITY
- S. CAMARA**
V. LUKIN
- 41 Problems of the national liberation
movement**
THE GUINEAN EXPERIENCE AND PROGRESSIVE
DEVELOPMENT IN AFRICA
SOME ASPECTS OF THE CLASS STRUCTURE IN
SOUTH AND SOUTHEAST ASIA
- D. LAKKAS**
A. LEVKOVSKY
- 54 Viewpoints on current problems**
MONOPOLY DRIVE TO WIN OVER THE
INTERMEDIATE CLASS FORCES
- K. E. JOHANSON**
U. KARLSSON
W. SVENSSON
J. GELLY
- 60 In the Communist and Workers' parties**
THE SWEDISH YOUTH AND THE COMMUNISTS
COMMUNISTS IN ACTION FOR THE
HAPPINESS OF CHILDREN
- H. ALLEG**
- 70 The war in Vietnam**
WHITHER MR. JOHNSON?
- G. OEHRMAN**
H. FAGAN
- 73 Our diary**
COMMUNIST ELECTORAL SUCCESS IN SWEDEN
CONFERENCE OF THE BRITISH LABOR PARTY
- 80 Heroes of the fight for freedom**
IN MEMORIAM

WORKERS OF ALL
COUNTRIES, UNITE!

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

Theoretical and
Information Journal
of Communist and
Workers' Parties

NOVEMBER, 1966
VOLUME 9
NUMBER 11

Authorized as Second
Class Mail, Post Office
Department, Ottawa and
for payment of postage
in cash. Printed in
Canada.
WORLD MARXIST REVIEW
is the North American
edition of the monthly
journal Problems of Peace
and Socialism published
in Prague. The North
American edition is
published by Progress
Books, 44 Stafford St.,
Toronto 3, Ontario,
Canada.
SUBSCRIPTION RATES:
\$3.50 a year. Single
copies 35 cents. Bundle
of five or more, 25 cents
per copy. Outside
Canada, add 15 cents
exchange.
PROBLEMS OF PEACE
AND SOCIALISM is also
published in French,
Russian, Bulgarian,
Czech, Dutch, German,
Greek, Hungarian,
Italian, Japanese,
Mongolian, Polish,
Rumanian, Spanish,
Swedish and Vietnamese.
Subscriptions to these
may be obtained through
Progress Books,
44 Stafford St., Toronto 3,
at \$3.50 a year.

Published by
PROGRESS BOOKS
44 Stafford St., Toronto 3
Ontario, Canada.



WMR

among our contributors

JOSEF LEDWOHN *Member of the Political Bureau, Communist Party of Germany*

SIKHE CAMARA *Public figure in Guinea*

KJELL E. JOHANSON *Chairman, League of Democratic Youth of Sweden*

URBAN KARLSSON *Member of the Executive Committee and
Secretary of the Board, Communist Party of Sweden*

WIDE SVENSSON *Swedish Economist*

JACQUELINE GELLY *Candidate Member of the Central Committee,
French Communist Party*

HENRI ALLEG *Algerian publicist*

ALVARO DELGADO *Member of the Central Committee, Communist Party of Colombia*

JUAN RODRIGUEZ *Member of the Central Committee,
Communist Party of Venezuela*

JOSE MANUEL FORTUNY *Guatemalan journalist*

October and progress

J. BATAL, T. DAVAGSUREN, P. MOTTA LIMA

THE WORD "PROGRESS" is probably one of the most widely used in the vocabulary of our time and understandably so, for ours is the century of rapid progress. Another word that has gained worldwide currency is "communism." Bourgeois theoreticians, it is true, have long since tried to separate these two concepts and even to oppose the one to the other not wanting to recognize that many of the progressive achievements of our day were made possible by the October Revolution which ushered in the era of man's advance to communism.

The October Revolution, the 49th anniversary of which is being celebrated by progressive people in all lands, was undoubtedly a powerful accelerator of social progress not only in Russia but throughout the world. All true friends of the Soviet Union take the occasion to extend their heartiest congratulations to the Soviet people and to wish them further success.

Under the impact of October the revolutionary process gained momentum: a worldwide working-class movement developed; new impetus was given to the struggle of the peoples in the then colonial countries, among them India, Egypt and other of the Arab countries, Africa and Latin America; relying on the experience of the October Revolution, the people of China completed their revolution in 1949 and joined the socialist world system thereby undertaking to enhance its might and unity; reliance on the October Revolution helped the people of the new democracies to win power and embark on socialist construction, inspired to great deeds the people of revolutionary Cuba which overthrew the domination of the exploiters in the immediate vicinity of the citadel of contemporary imperialism.

The October Revolution showed that society

can successfully develop without imperialists and capitalists. After October Marxism spread to all parts of the world; Communist parties arose in many countries, new contingents joined the ranks of the Communists. The Soviet Union blazed the trail. It was not easy going; not all projects were realized. There were failures. Some concepts had to be reconsidered. However, despite all the difficulties, the Soviet Union confidently advanced and its achievements were applauded by all progressive mankind. In the decades following October imperialism suffered a series of telling defeats under the blows of the peoples. Of worldwide historic significance was the victory over fascism to whose defeat the Soviet people made their invaluable contribution. This victory accelerated progress throughout the world. However, imperialism is still strong and dangerous. World imperialism is the arch enemy of social progress. The international working class, in alliance with all working people, is steadily stepping up its onslaught on imperialism. The conflict between the two worlds—the capitalist and the socialist—began in October is continuing with increased intensity.

In our days progress and socialism, ushered in by October, are indivisible. The masses in the capitalist and newly emergent countries are deeply interested in such major issues of progressive social development as: how does socialism improve the well-being of the man of labor; how does it ensure freedom and democracy for the individual (we shall return to this question later). Figures answer the first question.

Forty-nine years ago tsarist Russia produced less than three per cent of the world industrial product. Last year the Soviet Union's share had risen to nearly one-fifth.

Whereas in 1913 the United States produced eight times more industrial goods than Russia, in 1965 industrial output in the USSR was about two-thirds of the U.S. level. The changes in some industries are even more striking. Some 15-20 years ago there were hardly any industries in the USSR that were ahead of the United States. Today the Soviet Union leads in the production of iron ore, coke, coal, metal-cutting lathes, main-line thermal- and electric-power locomotives, tractors (in total capacity), harvesting combines, timber, cement, reinforced concrete structures, and woollen textiles. Rapid and comprehensive development of the productive forces—such is the result of the advantages of the new social system which has opened the road to progress to a one-time backward country. In the last 25 years per capita real income of factory and office workers has increased three-fold. Besides their basic wages which are steadily growing (the wages fund will increase by 40 per cent in the present five-year-plan period), Soviet working people receive an additional income of up to 35 per cent of their wages at the expense of public funds which includes a free health service, upkeep of children's institutions, sick benefits, etc. About 11,000 million roubles are spent annually on pensions. Approximately one-third of the country's population has moved into new apartments built by socialist society in the past seven years.

Together with the powerful economy built up in the past 49 years of Soviet power there grew and developed its architects—workers, peasants, intellectuals. Today the Soviet Union possesses highly skilled cadres of all kinds; the USSR accounts for a fourth of the world's scientific personnel. Nearly four times as many students are studying in the universities of the Soviet Union as in Britain, France, the FRG and Italy combined. Soviet higher educational institutions graduate four times as many engineers as is the case in the USA. To this list of progress should be added the achievements in harnessing nuclear energy and in outer space, not to mention other scientific and technological victories scored in recent years.

Today, when celebrating the anniversary of the October Revolution, it is only natural that Marxists should review the general trends of socialist progress set in motion in 1917 by the Russian proletariat and its Leninist party which relied on the international solidarity of the world proletariat. When the working class of Russia smashed the old social relations of capitalism and established their own power they had to start from scratch, having been

left with a legacy of backwardness and ruin.

The Communist Party of Russia showed the people the only sound and scientifically substantiated way to begin the building of the new society in those conditions—that of abolishing backwardness and promoting steady economic and cultural progress. A truly titanic effort that had no parallel in history was required on the part of the working class and their vanguard, the Communists, to lead the country along this road. All their successes are the gain of world socialism, a contribution to the treasure-house of historical experience accumulated in the struggle for man's happiness. Today this treasure-house is being greatly enriched with the experience acquired in building socialism in the other socialist countries.

Of exceptional historical importance is the experience of such traditionally industrially developed countries as the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and the German Democratic Republic. The other European socialist countries, essentially agrarian before the revolution, have become, under the leadership of the working class and its parties, industrial-agrarian countries. Advancing along the high-road of socialist progress they are blazing the trail to new forms and ways of smashing the old order and building the new society.

Important to understanding the process of the revolutionary transformation of capitalism into socialism is the experience gained by the world working-class movement in its struggle against capitalism, and which has been scientifically generalized by the fraternal Communist and Workers' parties.

Of fundamental importance is the experience of the Central Asian Soviet Republics which created their own working class and intelligentsia, a modern industry and a socialist agriculture, and a progressive culture. Before the revolution there was not a single higher educational institution in Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan. As for Kirghizia, Tadzhikistan and Turkmenia, they did not have any secondary specialized educational institutions, leave alone universities. At present the Soviet Republics of Central Asia boast 90 higher and 340 secondary specialized educational institutions with a student body of more than 740,000. This is four times the number of students in the whole of pre-revolutionary Russia.

The Mongolian People's Republic, which made the revolutionary leap from feudal to socialist relations, confirmed in practice Lenin's profound thesis advanced at the Second Congress of the Comintern in 1920: "... it would be a mistake to assume that the backward peoples must inevitably go through the capitalist stage of development."

The experience of the USSR and the other socialist countries proves that only a high level of the productive forces and of labor productivity can constitute the practical base of socialism and communism. Marxism-Leninism shows the inadmissibility of voluntarism, of ignoring the objective laws of economic and social development, and conclusively proves—and this is borne out by the experience of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries—that if we are guided by science we will all the sooner reach the threshold to an abundance of all the good things of life. It is this that attracts the masses all over the world to scientific socialism.

Every socialist country can and must make the greatest possible contribution to the international revolutionary movement by accomplishing its objectives in building the new society; this will be proof positive to the masses that socialism is in every respect superior to capitalism and to all preceding social formations.

The socialist world system, the international working class, the national-liberation movement, Communists throughout the world—one and all bear a great responsibility for human progress. In the unity of these powerful forces of our time lies the guarantee of social progress.

* * *

After political power has been won by the working people the building of the new socialist society calls for painstaking and constructive effort in the economy first of all. Needless to say, the enthusiasm of the people, inspired by the revolution, plays a tremendous role in building the new society. However, in recognizing the very great role of the subjective factor it would be wrong to affirm the primacy of the mind filled with quotations and aphorisms and not with knowledge, primacy of will allegedly capable of dictating its laws to the world. This would be idealism, pure and simple, a departure from the materialist world outlook and tantamount to disarming the working people ideologically. Social reforms carried out by command with total disregard for existing economic conditions can only end in economic and political disaster, can only discredit socialism.

The ideas of scientific socialism, the truth of which was confirmed by the October Revolution and the experience of the socialist countries, are spreading to the countries which have gained independence, are finding more and more adherents. This is a sign of the times. More and more people are beginning to realize that Marxism-Leninism is the most consistent scientific theory showing the way to social progress. The one-time technically

and economically backward countries which have taken the non-capitalist way are now building independent states, independent economies, are establishing and promoting relations of public ownership. Only given such constructive endeavor is social and national emancipation possible.

The socialist way, as Marx indicated in his criticism of non-scientific theories, does not at all mean some kind of “transitory stage” which will come to an end when people have emerged from universal misery and poverty and become “mature” for private ownership. This “maturity” is the concept of some bourgeois theoreticians who denigrate communism and seek to discredit the non-capitalist way. In reality, the non-capitalist way leads to the accumulation of social wealth, increasing the technical equipment of human labor and promoting the development of the social forms of property. Scientific communism would be a theory not of progress but of stagnation and regress if it did not underscore this.

* * *

The dialectical relationship between the destructive and constructive aspects of the socialist revolution is of fundamental importance for an understanding of the nature of socialist progress. To treat the former aspect as an absolute quantity to the detriment of the latter, to minimize the creative role of the socialist revolution, means renouncing Marxism-Leninism.

The defeat of unscientific views had a tremendous impact on the destiny of the Russian working-class movement. Russian Marxists assimilated and carried forward Marx's ideas on these points. Already in the last century Marx opposed attempts to make revolutionary theory a theory of universal destruction and stagnation. He stressed that levelling up was the main feature of those attempts, aimed at reducing all Europe to the position of a hawker of mouse-traps. At that time the spread of such concepts and notions in Russia and some West European countries, mainly in Spain and Italy, that is, countries where the labor movement was only just beginning, was linked with the activity of Bakunin's Socialist Democracy Alliance.

In a report published by decision of the Hague Congress of the International in 1873, Marx and Engels quoted various “revelations” and appeals of the Russian branch of the Alliance, known as Narodnaya Rasprava (People's Retaliation), which hoped to make the student youth, and not the classes and the class struggle, the main force of revolutionary renovation, saying: “Give up those universities, academies and schools . . . go among the

people. . . . Don't at the moment trouble about science in the name of which they would like to shackle you and make you helpless . . .

"We must rouse the people to revolt, not teach them . . .

"A complete loosening of people's life . . . of evil passions . . . Depredation alone will prove the vitality, passion and strength of the people . . . We have only one plan, a negative and invariable plan of ruthless destruction. We refuse outright to work out living conditions for the future as incompatible with our activity . . ."

Needless to say the October Revolution would not have triumphed had this point of view won the upper hand in the Russian revolutionary movement.

Marx and Engels scathingly criticized such plans and projects and the political line based on them, the disastrous attempt to impose on the revolutionary movement a program of "universal destruction of everything." They developed a grand program for the socialist revolution, which abolishes the exploitation of man by man and provides unlimited opportunities for social progress. Commenting on the Bakuninist program, the Marx and Engels report said: "In this case anarchy becomes universal destruction of everything . . . Here thought and science are emphatically forbidden to the youth as mundane occupations likely to arouse in it doubts as to all-destructive orthodoxy."

Actually this destructive nihilism which they tried to instil in the student youth was merely an indication of the ideological poverty of the movement, an expression of the utter poverty of its theory, which ignored the objective laws of social development. Typical of these "terrible revolutionaries," Marx and Engels wrote, was a "complete lack of ideas," which they attempted to make up for with "high-flown balderdash." They spoke "terrible phrases" and tried hard "to look like revolutionary giants in their own eyes." But what they were imperilling was the revolutionary movement, not reaction. The Marx and Engels report said: "The Alliance is at war, not with existing states, but with revolutionaries who refuse to stoop to the role of supers in the tragi-comedy they are staging . . . The Alliance threatens with death all the revolutionaries who are not at one with it. This is the only part of the program for universal destruction which they have begun to fulfil."

Reactionary ideas cloaked in pseudo-revolutionary talk did not merely complicate propaganda and organizing work among the

workers and peasants but caused telling damage to the unity of the revolutionary movement which, indeed, was what the "destroyers" were combating. Lenin, heading the Russian Marxists, completed the defeat of various unscientific concepts and achieved victory for Marxist ideas in the Russian revolutionary movement.

Since then Marxist views have been gaining ground in the international working-class movement, and the principle of solidarity based on proletarian internationalism has been an important weapon for the victories of the movement. Today it is exceedingly important for the working-class movement to realize the need for unity against imperialist reaction. The U.S. imperialist aggression has shown more than anything else the importance of unity in the mighty anti-imperialist front, and every attempt at upsetting this unity simply plays into the hands of the imperialists.

As we see it, the Russian Marxists defeated non-scientific views in the Russian revolutionary movement even before October 1917, with the result that these views played no appreciable part in the Russian socialist revolution. Completely identical political situations and ideological trends cannot occur at different historical periods. Given definite social conditions, however, concepts and political practices similar in some ways to the concepts which the founders of Marxism-Leninism exposed may occur. Relapses into views of this kind may become disastrous to the revolutionary and national-liberation movement and to the entire cause of socialism. And this is why such developments require the same kind of incisive, critical analysis as Marx, Engels and Lenin made in combating anarchism.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union, led by Lenin, was equipped with the ideas of Marx and Engels, who fought against "revolutionary" phrasemongering used merely as a camouflage for capitulation. Without these ideas its creative activity would have been impossible.

In the very first months of Soviet rule Lenin counterposed the "steady advance of the iron battalions of the proletariat" to the "hysterical impulses" of the ultra-Lefts. Communists in the Soviet Union, and later in a number of other socialist countries, did a vast amount of work to arouse and channel the immense store of social energy accumulated among the masses, an energy capable of furthering progress on the basis of socialism. The Communist and Workers' parties in the capitalist countries are correctly applying Marxist-Leninist principles and methods against Right and Left opportunism as they step up the fight for the

interests of the working people, for social progress and peace.

The October Revolution proclaimed that the fight for peace, against aggressive imperialism, is a major condition for creative effort and social progress. History has shattered the allegedly revolutionary theory which sees historical progress as an endless succession of wars. This theory is just another apology of "universal destruction of everything."

Despite the difficulties facing the Communist movement, the forces of progress have already grown to such an extent as to be able to safeguard peace by their struggle and to isolate the warmongers.

To attain this goal, the peoples must become the decisive factor in questions of war and peace. On November 8, 1917, Lenin said in submitting the Decree on Peace to the Second All-Russia Congress of Soviets: "Everywhere there are differences between the governments and the peoples, and we must therefore help the peoples to intervene in questions of war and peace." Almost fifty years have passed since these words were spoken. Today the imperialist aggressors are trying to push the world toward "universal destruction of everything." But today the peoples of the world have the strength to "intervene in questions of war and peace." To try to divide and weaken them means helping the imperialists.

Marx, Engels and Lenin had the discernment to see in the proletariat a force capable of effecting radical social changes. In present-day conditions, the main factor for historical progress is the working class which, aware of its political role, has formed Marxist-Leninist parties and is leading other sections of the working people. Even at the stage of the struggle for power the working class and its parties in the capitalist countries put forward a comprehensive and constructive program for carrying out radical socio-political changes, rapidly developing the productive forces after the victory of the revolution, raising the living standards of the working people on this basis and promoting every aspect of public life. This is the embodiment of a genuinely scientific theory of progress. And it firmly discards the non-scientific, illusory notions of progress held in the past.

In those countries where the working class is still in the making, the fact that among the working people, the peasants, the handicraftsmen, the intellectuals, there are forces striving to unite with the international working class and to fight with its support for a happy future, and who regard the aims and tasks of the world proletariat as akin to their own desire for social emancipation and national liber-

ation is highly important. This is a notable characteristic of modern social progress. The forces of progress are uniting and their ability to influence history is increasing. The experience of the October Revolution and of the development of the people's democracies shows that in the countries where the peasants made up the greater part of the population, they accomplished great things under the leadership of the working class and are continuing to do so. To break up the worker-peasant alliance in any one country or internationally means holding back progress.

In bringing to the fore the task of creating the new along revolutionary lines, Marxism, to which all idealist views are alien, proposes that for the entire stage of advance to communism labor should be organized in such a way as harmoniously to combine its moral and material incentives. It is precisely on this basis that the creative initiative of the masses can be effectively promoted and the labor productivity achieved under capitalism surpassed.

Material incentives for labor, combined with the enthusiasm of a people freed from exploitation, are a prime factor in developing production (technological progress, greater proficiency, higher productivity of individual and social labor). They lead to a stage at which all sources of social wealth will gush forth, creating the abundance needed for adopting the communist principle of distribution.

To regard poverty and want as inevitable companions of the working people and almost to exalt them as a blessing are crude misrepresentations of the object of socialist construction, allowing capitalism to exercise full control over progress in material culture, surrendering to capitalism without a fight. This, of course, is something the adherents of scientific socialism, who realize their responsibility for the cause of progress and the fortunes of the people, cannot allow. In the socialist countries the working people, led by Marxist-Leninists, devote enormous attention to developing the productive forces and improving relations of production, to advance production all the more rapidly and make it as effective as possible.

The international working class and the socialist world system—its greatest gain—are striving against all difficulties to help the still lagging great progressive movements of the peoples. They spare no effort to create favorable conditions for the victory of the peoples fighting against colonial slavery, for a free life. To divide these great forces of modern social progress means playing into the hands of reaction.

The working class, which provides leadership to the other sections of the working people, is the paramount factor for progress in the socialist countries. In these countries no progressive social changes have taken place nor can take place without the working class or against its organized will.

The political organization of the working class—its party—is the greatest force of the progressive development of socialist society promoting the advance towards abundance and the complete liberation of the working man from care about his daily bread, which after the abolition of exploitation is a prime condition for individual freedom. There is no getting away from this, and the laws of social development severely punish those who ignore them.

Marxist-Leninists see genuine democracy as the awakening of the initiative and activity of the working class and other working people, as a combination of political and economic power in the hands of the people. Labor is the principal sphere of human activity and it is first of all in the course of labor that social relations take shape and manifest themselves, and that socialist consciousness grows. Those who man the enterprises are the key force of the socio-economic life of society. For their workaday life furthers socialist collectivism and helps do away with administrative fiat and bureaucratic practices.

Lenin said that politics is concentrated economics and that a policy is particularly strong when based on a study of the economy and its pressing needs, and when it rallies the masses to meet the requirements of social development. Lenin never believed that political injunction can replace objective economic requirements, or that political decisions possess magic strength independent of the requirements of social development. To think so means completely ignoring Marxism-Leninism. The fact that today the ideas of scientific socialism have spread all over the world indicates something that is not of least importance, namely, that a radical change has come about in the people's view on politics, its possibilities, its connection with economics and its actual strength.

* * *

The socialist countries have opened the doors wide to scientific and technological progress, which in recent years has increasingly affected all aspects of production. They are determined to make more effective use than capitalism of the fruits of the contemporary technological revolution. This is an extremely important arena of struggle between socialism and capitalism. The latest advances of science

(nuclear physics, chemistry, biology, etc.) rapidly find application in production, revolutionizing the productive forces; the role played by science and technology in social progress is growing. Indeed, in this epoch of the scientific and technological revolution, socialist society cannot ignore science and its dictates.

What is of prime importance for the future of socialism is, of course, not the technological level as such, but people capable of creating new systems of machines and supervising them. Extensive introduction of new technology requires well educated, conscientious workers with high skills. Modern production processes call for efficiency in labor, and efficiency in labor is organically bound up with the general educational level of the people. The progress of the socialist society is unthinkable without the development of a democratic, humanist, truly popular culture.

Knowledge plays an enormous role in the development of socialist society. But, needless to say, the thinking of the masses cannot be revolutionized simply by memorizing quotations; this can be done by creating conditions in which, as Lenin said, the working people learn to make use of books, to imbibe knowledge day in and day out. In one of his last works Lenin associated the future of socialism in Russia with people "of whom you can be certain that they will not take a single word on faith, or utter a single word contrary to their conscience."

Progress increasingly depends on the growth of the conscious activity, on the development of every working man. For the creative activity of the masses throughout the world, including the people of the countries that have launched out on the non-capitalist path, to play a growing role in the march of history, it is essential to raise their cultural standards and deepen their consciousness. The experience of the October Socialist Revolution is in this respect extremely significant. Lenin stressed that the insufficiently high cultural level of the old Russia in no way obviated the need for the socialist revolution; on the contrary, this revolution was the precondition for the rapid cultural advance of the people. History has borne out this prediction. It is the steady advance of education and culture generally that enables the working people clearly to distinguish between pseudo-revolutionary phrasemongering, which can only lead civilization into an impasse, and scientifically substantiated genuine progress and revolutionary creative endeavor.

Time and again Lenin warned against vulgar nihilistic attitudes towards problems of culture, stressing the need for painstaking

work to bring culture to the masses. As far back as 1919 he urged: "We must take the whole of culture . . . the whole of science, technology, knowledge and art. Without these we shall be unable to build communist society."

This idea is striking ever deeper root in the minds of the working people of the developing countries, where the groundwork is being laid for raising the culture of the masses to a higher level. This, indeed, is one of the most important features of the contemporary national-liberation revolutions. The experience of the newly-free countries has already shown that the solution of urgent tasks of educational work accelerates social progress.

In the wholly or predominantly agrarian countries which have thrown off the yoke of colonial and imperialist dependence and are waging a struggle against the survivals of colonialism and neo-colonialism, increasing the effectiveness of man's labor on the land is a salient element of revolutionary constructive endeavor and social progress. To this end it is important to put agriculture on a more efficient footing, to introduce modern techniques and to promote cooperative effort, all of which presupposes recasting the cultural makeup of the peasant, overcoming the age-old backwardness and ignorance.

The fight for culture, to expose the insidious schemes of the exploiters to speculate on culture, to disseminate knowledge among the masses and to make the basic achievements of world science, technology and art accessible to them is an important aspect of progress. And its significance is steadily growing in our time of technological revolution, for only people with adequate grounding can master the new techniques and use technological progress in the interests of building the new society.

A deepening of democracy in public life is typical of the socialist countries. To the question of how socialism ensures freedom and democracy for the working people, which we touched upon above, the answer is provided by the measures taken to improve economic management, to stimulate the activity of the

working people in resolving political issues, and to enlist the masses in all areas of governmental activity.

The rapid growth of popular initiative and activity and the development of socialist democracy are an earnest of future victories of socialism. The socialist countries have shown through their own experience that social idolatry, such as the personality cult, is incompatible with continued progress. Marxism-Leninism has demonstrated through the example of the October Revolution, as well as the revolutions which led to the establishment of other socialist countries, that the perspectives of historical development are determined by the activity of the masses, that they depend on the consciousness of the people, on the assimilation by them of knowledge and culture. On November 8, 1917, Lenin said: "According to the bourgeois concept, there is strength when the people go blindly to the slaughter in obedience to the imperialist governments. The bourgeoisie admit a state to be strong only when it can, by the power of the government apparatus, hurl the people wherever the bourgeois rulers want them hurled. Our idea of strength is different. Our idea is that a state is strong when the people are politically conscious. It is strong when the people know everything, can form an opinion of everything and do everything consciously."

Developing the ideas of Marx concerning the socialist reconstruction of society, Lenin elaborated the theory of the politics, economics and culture of the period of building the new system. The socialist revolution creates the conditions for the flowering of economic, political, social and ideological life, which is the basis for the further, all-embracing development of socialist society towards a higher stage of progress—communism. Advancing towards this goal the Soviet people will, we are confident, carry out their grand plans. And this will be of signal importance for resolving the basic contradiction of our time, for the victory of socialism and communism over capitalism on a worldwide scale. Progress is bound to triumph over all the machinations of reaction.

The plan and the market in the socialist economy

REM BELOUSOV

In the process of building communism full use must be made of commodity-money relations in keeping with the new meaning acquired by these relations during the building of socialism.

Program of the CPSU

ONE OF THE BASIC aspects of the economic reform now being implemented in the Soviet Union is the combination of centralized leadership and planning with the active role of the market and commodity-money relations. Instead of rigid regulation and tutelage over the enterprises, a flexible system of self-regulation is being created making it possible to gear production programs to consumer demand and to make the most rational use of resources. At the same time the problem arises of assuring that self-regulation at enterprise level is oriented on the interests of society as a whole. Hence in carrying out the reform it is necessary to have full clarity as regards the forms and methods needed to direct the lower links of the socialist production mechanism, and in particular as regards the role of the market in planned economic management.

Pursuing its Leninist policy of economic up-building, the CPSU has always sought to make full use of centralized management of the economy, which is one of the decisive advantages of socialism. The principle of centralized management stems not from the subjective desire of any group of people, but from objective necessity conditioned by the social ownership of the means of production. Consequently, the plan has always been and will continue to be a regulator of socialist production.

The system of planned management consists of a complex of measures providing for

the purposeful regulation of production and its organization in conformity with the objective economic laws. What is in question today is not the replacement of this system by a new mechanism, but its further improvement and extension through the inclusion of elements of self-regulation. This is fully in keeping with the tasks confronting the Soviet economy at the present stage.

The object of state planning is basically a dual one: ensuring the proper balance and optimal use of all production resources. Both tasks have their general economic and specifically production aspects. Many nationwide inter-branch and some internal proportions in the various industries can be regulated only on a national scale, in a centralized way. At the same time proportions bearing, for instance, on the range of consumer goods, types and sizes of rolled metal, diverse tools, the technical specifications of machines and other aspects of direct interest to the consumer, can be determined by the various branches of industry or even by individual enterprises.

Optimal planning is complicated by the fact that with the growth and consolidation of the economy the number of possible variants in both the production and the consumption spheres is multiplying rapidly. Who is to choose the best variant and on what criteria should the choice be based?

In the past nearly all questions of produc-

tion and capital construction were decided in a centralized way. Yet the most talented orchestra conductor cannot perform a symphony alone. But the planning bodies often relieved production executives of the need to decide even minor questions, forgetting their role as conductor and losing sight of the big problems involved in working out optimal plans. The emphasis on administrative methods in solving the countless problems arising in the enterprises was accompanied by the emergence of contradictions alien to the socialist mode of production.

In order to eliminate these contradictions it is proposed to draw a strict demarcation line between the functions of central bodies and those of the enterprises. Progressive structural changes in social production, inter-branch and inter-regional specialization, elaboration of scientific and technological problems, training specialists and skilled workers and the creation of state reserves are some of the problems which should be solved on a unified basis on the scale of the economy as a whole, while optimal utilization of production capacity and other resources in the enterprises and the establishment of rational links with supplier plants should be handled by the enterprise, drawing on the initiative of the working people.

Consistent observance of democratic centralism in planned management presupposes, then, two types of production regulation — centralized guidance, on the one hand, and on the other self-regulation at branch amalgamation and enterprise levels.

Both economic research and practical experience show that the best mechanism for the self-regulation of the enterprises is the market, commodity-money relations, organically integrated with cost accounting and material incentives.

Commodity-money relations, which are subordinated to the law of value, stimulate the growth of labor productivity and help to gear the production structure to consumer demand. In the process the socially necessary expenditures of labor for one or another purpose are objectively determined. No producer can afford to ignore these labor expenditure ratios. He who works better, more rationally, earns additional income. The uneconomical producer, on the contrary, at once comes under the material pressure of the market, for he cannot recoup production costs exceeding the socially necessary level.

Ever since its establishment the Soviet state has sought consistently to use the market mechanism to increase efficiency of production and to strengthen the economy. Landmarks in this respect were the New Economic

Policy of the early nineteen-twenties and the Party decisions of the thirties and in more recent years.

In the situation existing at the time, Lenin considered "stimulation of home trade properly regulated (directed) by the state" to be the link which had to be tackled with all resolve in order to lay a sound groundwork for transition to the next stage in socialist construction. True, there were times when the Soviet state assumed the functions of direct organizer of production and distribution of the basic items of output. The commodity integument of trade was either completely discarded (the policy of "war communism") or became so deformed that the economic content was distorted (obligatory deliveries of agricultural produce by the collective farmers in the thirties and forties). These departures from normal trade were due to extraordinary circumstances: the Civil War and the Second World War, the need to complete industrialization within a brief space of time, and the pressures of post-war rehabilitation. In all these periods it became necessary to redistribute accumulation in favor of the heavy and defense industries, to mobilize all material, labor and financial resources and to concentrate them on the decisive sectors. To accelerate building up the key branches, the law of value was often not observed. This tended to place the emphasis on administrative planning, highly centralized management, and restriction of commodity-money relations. But this did not remove the objective need to promote trade, to develop the market.

Social division of labor is, as we know, the cardinal factor in commodity production. The contradictions engendered by the dual character of labor, which Marx pointed to in his *Capital*, develop in the conditions of private property into a contradiction between the social and private character of the producer's labor. Under capitalism trade and highly-developed buyer-seller relationships are essential for solving these contradictions. Market relations become the regulator of production. Under capitalism there is no other way of translating concrete labor into abstract labor, or the labor of the individual worker into social labor.

Socialism radically changed both the goal and the conditions of social production and also the methods of regulating it. There is an unbroken connection between the initial and final stages of extended socialist reproduction. Yet, owing to the social division of labor, it retains its contradictory dual nature. True, the undivided domination of socialist ownership of the means of production creates an opportunity for resolving this contradic-

tion by means of a new mechanism—planning. In this sense socialist planning is the antipode of the market. But the historical nature of the development of planning should be borne in mind: it begins with lower forms and methods regulating only some sectors of social production and gradually assumes more mature and universal forms. The capitalist market has a history of centuries behind it, whereas socialist planning came into being less than half a century ago. It has not yet reached its acme. Needless to say, this in no way detracts from its role and significance in the contemporary system of management.

The voluntarist view that the plan can solve all problems without reckoning with economic laws was subjected to criticism and rejected as erroneous some time ago. But to this day not all people take a sober view of the real possibilities of planning, believing that it can embrace and directly regulate all economic intercourse and all the diverse economic relationships in the country.

The point is not only the complexity of the task. There are also a number of objective reasons why it is impossible precisely to foresee all the proportions in the economy, especially for long periods ahead. For one thing, scientific and technological discoveries are attended by an element of chance, and because of this it is difficult, and at times impossible, to tell exactly when new types of machines or consumer goods will make their appearance. Hence one must either plan the production or introduction of existing designs and technology (and this often retards technological progress), or leave these questions open for the time being. The situation is somewhat the same in prospecting for minerals. But perhaps the real conundrum for the planners is that posed by agriculture, which is heavily dependent on weather conditions. Harvest fluctuations tell on the rate of growth and ratios of social production generally. Finally, there is the elasticity of demand for consumer goods.

In all these areas more or less accurate prognostications are of course possible, but they are subject to adjustments in the course of the operation of the plan. Adjustments in turn call for corresponding changes in the production program, capital construction, trade, and in other sections of the plan. Even under the rigid system of planning which existed until recently the need for this was constantly felt. Although the programs were handed down to enterprises only after considerable delay they required constant correcting. Because they were too cumbersome and suffered from too many flaws the organizational impact of the plans was greatly im-

paired. Needless to say, these shortcomings were the "infantile ailments" of planning.

It may be that in the future, as the transition to communist production relations goes on, improvement of the scientific aspect of planning and mechanization and automation of the processing of information and computer operations will gradually lead to an effective and flexible system of regulating the reproduction process without the agency of the market. Economic information will flow through special communication channels from consumers and producers to centers forming an integrated directing body. Here the information will be processed by electronic machines to produce an economico-mathematical model of the state of the entire economy and its prospects, as well as a blueprint of the reciprocal links basic to the optimal ratios of social production and consumption. These links will be incorporated into a mathematical pattern and transmitted to the point of production. In this way production will be effectively regulated, while leaving a certain freedom for the amalgamations and enterprises to display initiative and, consequently, to regulate their own performance not under the impact of the market but on the basis of the impulses generated by the forward urge which will be an intrinsic feature of the free, creative labor of the members of communist society.

The transition to a system of this type is dependent on such objective factors as the maturity of society and the level of the productive forces, including the various branches of science and technology. This, of course, is a matter for the future. There is no doubt that much time will be needed to evolve methods and forms of overcoming the contradictions inherent in the dual character of labor which would make it possible effectively to harness all the production units of society to ensure the maximum satisfaction of its requirements by making better use of existing resources without recourse to trade and the market. But until another and better mechanism is created, commodity-money relations can be effectively used to make state guidance of the economy more flexible, to harmonize production with consumption.

The reasons for activating commodity-money relations at the present stage of building communism are many.

A new feature is the need, on the one hand, to invest huge sums in building the material and technological base of communism, and, on the other hand, to build up the considerable funds needed to raise living standards. This can be done only by increasing to the maximum labor productivity and the

returns from social production as a whole, by making rational use of every ruble. The old methods of planning are no longer adequate; the question now is not so much mobilization of resources as their optimal utilization.

Moreover, the technological revolution demands that producers effectively adjust their programs in keeping with scientific and technological progress. Here, too, the market comes to the aid of centralized planning inasmuch as promotion of wholesale trade in the objects and instruments of labor plus proper price formation and material incentives provide a powerful stimulus to keeping the production program in step with the times, while making it possible to supply without bureaucracy and red tape, the raw materials and equipment needed to turn out new types of machines. Enhancing the role of trade heightens the influence exerted by the consumer on production. So far this is one of the best ways of exercising control over quality and stimulating the output of technologically more advanced goods at lower cost.

Another important reason for greater emphasis on the role of commodity-money relations is the need to make production more sensitive to changes in market conditions when supply and demand tend to balance. In the past when the balance between the two was often disrupted (when funds for capital investments exceeded the material resources and the money incomes of the population grew faster than the quantity of goods available) everything on sale was easily sold. More recently, however, owing to the better balance between supply and demand, the unwieldiness of the former methods of management has made itself particularly felt. Mostly this has been the case in light industry, where the stocks of many items showed excessive growth. In heavy industry, where technical supplies and materials are provided through centralized channels, this phenomenon makes itself felt indirectly, primarily in slower launching of new output and insufficiently rapid improvement of quality, although here too there are no few indications of difficulty in marketing certain items.

At present many socialist countries, the Soviet Union included, are striving to make use of the market mechanism within the framework of state guidance of the economy. Seizing on this, some bourgeois writers have begun to talk about a "retreat" from economic planning, about a "return to private enterprise" and revival of the so-called free market. This, however, is wishful thinking.

That the interests of the state, the public,

the production collective and the individual worker should coincide is natural to the economic relationships under socialism and their commodity-money forms. Hence the market can be used as a factor facilitating self-regulation by the socialist enterprises. To produce goods not for the sake of the record but to make life better, to subordinate production to the requirements and interests of consumers, to make a thorough study of both social needs and the requirements of the population, and, on this basis, rapidly to readjust the output and to improve the quality of both the means of production and consumer goods—such is the purpose in utilizing commodity-money relations in a planned economy.

In order to understand the essence of the socialist market it is necessary to remember that it is an important complement to the plan, that market regulation of production is effected under the overall control of the socialist state. The following passage from a letter by Lenin to the engineer Krzhizhanovsky concerning the interaction of the New Economic Policy and centralized planning may be cited in this connection: ". . . The New Economic Policy does not change the unified state economic plan or transcend its bounds: it changes the approach to the realization of this plan."

As can be seen from this letter, even at a time when production was influenced through commodity-money relations not only by the socialist sector but also by small producers and even by capitalists, Lenin held that the New Economic Policy, directed though it was at stimulating trade and the market, should remain within the framework of the plan.

The leading role of the state in guiding the socialist economy is effected through direct and indirect influence on economic development, including the market. The production machinery and the accumulated capacity, are, as we know, the material base of social production. On this machinery depend the volume and proportions of the output. In the new conditions the central bodies remain in a position directly to influence the inter-branch structure of production capacity inasmuch as they have at their disposal a substantial share of the funds available for capital investment, long-term credits, material and financial reserves and also other methods of direct regulation of growth rates and ratios on a national scale.

The state indirectly influences social production through a system of economic levers—prices, profit, credit, premiums and other payments. These levers are highly specific instruments of planned management. On the one hand, they are active elements of either

the market mechanism or the system of cost accounting which links them with the material interests of the public. On the other hand, they are objective economic imperatives which the state takes into account in planning. Use of these levers enables the state bodies economically to regulate the functioning of working collectives, relying not so much on their authority and the law as on the material interest of the working communities themselves, and directing the latter so as to ensure conformity between the general economic and interbranch proportions and the needs of the whole of socialist society. In these circumstances the plan and the market constitute a dialectical unity based on the fundamental coincidence of the economic interests of all participants in socialist commodity production. Hence there are no grounds for counterposing the plan to the market as some economists tend to do. The plan and the market are interconnected and mutually conditioned economic categories. The dependence of the market on the plan is obvious, but at the same time a plan which does not take cognizance of market demand is a poor one. Development of commodity-money relations under socialism does not detract from the role of the plan; on the contrary, it enhances the efficacy of planning, for with the new approach plans rest on objective criteria, not on subjective wishes. This makes planning far more realistic and heightens its impact on the economic processes.

On the other hand, greater economic independence of the enterprises and the development of commodity-money relations in no way imply passive submission to the requirements of the market. The market should be organized and anticipated, in other words, planned. This is not a new approach. The Eleventh All-Russian Conference of the Communist Party held shortly after the establishment of Soviet power posed this task: "Proceeding from the existence of the market and reckoning with its laws, it is essential to master it and, by means of systematic considered economic measures based on precise assessment of the market processes, to undertake the regulation of the market and currency circulation." Forty-five years have passed since then. There is hardly any need to undertake the regulation of the market on the basis of a through study of its requirements, on the basis of planning.

After abolishing the economic basis of capitalist competition — private ownership of the means of production — the socialist system retained two interconnected and inter-

active factors of the market mechanism which play the decisive role in commodity-money relations. One of these is the connection between supply and demand, and the other, the level, structure and correlation of prices. But under socialism these factors are subject to the influence of the state plan.

The important thing is to balance supply and demand. In practice this means that the total volume of commodities offered should be realized and that the consumer should be able to buy everything he needs. In other words, there should be, first, equilibrium in terms of value between supply and demand, and, second, the structure of the goods offered should coincide with the structure of the demand. The first task is solved by the central planning bodies; solution of the second largely depends on the market. Needless to say, these tasks are two sides of the same medal. To separate them artificially is as unjustified as it would be to counterpose the plan and the market to each other. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries have a good deal of experience in planning the consumer market through drawing up balances of income and expenditure by the population. And elaboration of analogous balances for the capital goods market is the job of the day. Determination of the general correlation of supply and demand is a matter for the central planners. Market demand is, of course, taken into account, but there are substantial openings here for the state to influence the market.

Formerly it was up to the central planning bodies to balance the supply and demand structure. Practice has shown, however, that it is well-nigh impossible to do this through centralized channels. The structure of supply and demand, overall balance notwithstanding, often fell short of the mark because the physical nomenclature of the commodities produced did not coincide with the concrete requirements of the public. Since it is impossible for a single center to plan the vast assortment of goods turned out, it is now proposed to let the market play the decisive role. Direct contract relations between producers and consumers, between production and trade, is the best way to orientate the producer to turn out goods of types, sizes and quality required by the consumer. In other words, by watching the market the enterprises will be best able to ensure a balance between supply and demand.

Moreover, stable contract arrangements between producers and consumers provide a basis for realistic planning at enterprise level. As a result plans for both the various branches

and the economy as a whole will reflect the actually existing supply and demand.

An important feature of the operation of the market in the conditions of a planned economy is state control over the movement of prices. This control should be aimed at, first, ensuring equilibrium between the general levels of supply and demand as well as their structures, and, second, maintaining the structure and correlation of prices at a level making it advantageous for the enterprises to produce the range of goods needed by the public and also to improve their quality, a level, moreover, which would provide an incentive to consumers to give preference to newer lines of output.

If the monetary system functions normally, price formation acts as an important coordinating agent in balancing supply and demand. Economically unjustified changes in prices may upset the balance, with a corresponding effect on both producers and consumers. As we see it, however, disproportions on the market are by no means always caused by incorrect price levels and correlations. In this connection it will be of interest to examine the operation of the market mechanism when its principal components are not in proper relation to one another.

An excess of demand over supply has been a feature of our economy in recent years. This can happen in two cases. Firstly, when there is more money in the hands of consumers than there are commodities available. At times some specific need of the economy cannot be fully met at the existing level of production. For instance, although Soviet industry has in the last seven years increased the output of steel tubing 1.7-fold, taking first place in the world for volume of output of this item, there is still not enough piping available for oil and gas pipelines. Owing to the shortage the rate of growth of these branches of the fuel industry is retarded.

Can a balance be achieved between supply and demand in this case by increasing prices? Formally it can. With investments in building oil and gas pipelines remaining fixed, higher wholesale prices on pipes will reduce demand for them, but this does not essentially improve the situation. Clearly, equilibrium should be achieved not through the agency of the market and prices, but through centralized planning of proportions between branches, primarily by properly coordinating material and technical supplies with the volume of accumulation on the scale of the entire economy.

What usually happens, however, is excess of demand over supply in situations where the items in short supply can be replaced by

others, but for the consumer the technological use or operation of the substitute is less economical. Because of this there is greater demand for the original item. A disproportion seems to appear, although actually the shortage is due to violations of economically justified ratios between the prices of interchangeable items. This was the cause at one time of a shortage of gas and a surplus of coal in the Donbas; since the price of gas was lower than that of coal dust, the power stations switched to gas and there was an overstocking of coal dust at the pits.

Since prices are decisive in making interchangeable items of different quality equally advantageous to use, this problem can be solved through the mechanism of the market, which can effect a balance between supply and demand by stimulating the most effective utilization of substitutes.

In connection with the need for state control over prices the question arises: should the state fix prices as rigidly as hitherto?

As past years have shown, this is an extremely complex problem. The socialist countries are now searching for new ways of resolving it. In some countries (Hungary and Czechoslovakia) a more flexible system of prices is envisaged. The prices of the essential goods will continue to be fixed by the central bodies. For some goods there will be contract prices fluctuating within limits set by the state. Finally, a substantial part of the commodities will be sold at uncontrolled prices based on agreements between producers and consumers. The Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, for instance, stresses in its decision on economic reform that direct regulation of prices by the state should be limited to a minimum range of goods. But the stipulation of a necessary minimum in itself underscores the controlling role of the state in price formation.

From what has been said it will be clear that strengthening commodity-money relations in the conditions of the socialist economy makes for a fuller utilization of the advantages of the socialist mode of production and heightens the effectiveness of state plans. Public ownership of the means of production unites all producers and enables the socialist state not only to control the market, but also to stimulate with its aid technological progress, rational use of production resources and growth of returns from social production. This is confirmed by the initial showing of the enterprises which have gone over to the new system of planning and economic stimuli. For instance, during the first nine months of this year enterprises working in the new way

exceeded their plans, even though the targets were higher than previously, and increased the volume of marketed output by more than 11 per cent, their profit by over 20 per cent and labor productivity by 8 per cent as com-

pared with the same period last year.

In the final analysis the object in using the market mechanism in a planned economy is to ensure an all-round rise in the material well-being of all working people.

Darkhan — symbol of inviolable friendship

WHERE THE meandering Khara flows through the wind-swept steppes of Northern Mongolia the contours of modern buildings and industrial enterprises are rising above its banks. To me this is a source of particular joy, and not only because I am helping to build the new town of Darkhan, but also because I lived for years in these parts when the scene was one of unrelieved dreariness and desolation.

I recall the first shacks and the inn built here thirty-five years ago, inaugurating the first dirt road of which I was put in charge. In the '40s the track gave way to a motor highway, and in the '50s came the Moscow-Ulan Bator railway line, built with Soviet aid.

Then came the '60s and the age-old silence of the steppe, the world I had known for more than thirty years, was shattered by an invasion of trucks and masses of building equipment. In 1961 the foundation was laid at this small station of the future town of Darkhan which, upon completion, will be the country's biggest industrial and power complex. Its units include the Sharyn Gol open-cast mine, a thermal power station, building-materials enterprises, a cement works, a plant making silicate bricks and a grain elevator. Most of these have already been commissioned.

The importance of Darkhan for the national economy can hardly be overestimated. But no less significant is the fact that Darkhan is an international undertaking in a very real sense. It is being built with the help of the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia. In Mongolian the name "Darkhan" means "forge." And the name is symbolic, for it is here in the process of joint labor that lasting friendship between

our peoples is being forged, that the ideas of proletarian internationalism find vivid expression.

The Darkhan project derives chiefly from the rich coal deposits in the Sharyn Gol area. Before the coal could be tapped a railway branch-line and a power transmission line had to be installed.

The job of straddling the steppe with steel masts for the transmission line to Sharyn Gol and linking it by rail with Darkhan, a Herculean undertaking, was completed in 1963, ahead of schedule. This made it possible to start the open-cast mine earlier than planned.

The summer of 1964 was an exceptionally hot one, literally and figuratively, for the building workers. The grain elevator had to be completed in time to receive the grain of the new harvest. Working round the clock, the men finished the job on this automated storage installation with its 66-metre high tower months ahead of schedule.

Soviet specialists helped in training the personnel for the elevator.

The building-materials complex was completed in 1964. The complex also supplies prefabricated panels, structural steel, concrete and mortar, sawn timber and wooden panels, in a word, everything needed on construction sites all over the country.

Towards the end of 1965, the power station, built with Soviet aid, was completed. Two high-voltage transmission lines were built simultaneously, one supplying Sharyn Gol with power, the other Suhe Bator.

With the aid of Czechoslovak specialists construction is nearing completion on the Darkhan cement plant. Equipped with modern Czech machinery it will produce 200,000 tons

annually, fully meeting the needs of the country's building industry.

Poland has helped with a silicate brick plant, which has an annual output of 30 million bricks and 22,000 tons of lime.

Completion of the Darkhan project will be a big contribution to socialist construction in Mongolia.

Not far from the industrial complex work is under way on the Darkhan microdistrict. At a turning on the modern highway snaking its way across the steppe, a road sign indicates the approach to a housing site. Many families have already moved into the first group of modern apartments. In all, Darkhan's first microdistrict will have upwards of 10,000 residents.

The town will also have a seven-storey hotel and post and telegraph office with an automatic telephone exchange. It will boast a TV center, sports stadium, hippodrome, swimming pools, a modern shopping center, restaurants and various civic buildings. Four kindergartens and creches and two ten-year schools are presently under construction.

The Five-Year Development Plan (1966-1970) provides for further industrial construction. Bulgaria is helping with the building of

a factory for dressing hides and with equipping a vegetable and fruit-growing state farm. Hungary is helping to build a meat-packing plant. Soviet specialists are helping to build a knitwear factory, a poultry factory, a confectionery and a dairy.

The rapid industrialization presupposes training large numbers of skilled workers and technicians. During 1962-65 over 3,000 workers were trained for Darkhan. Many more are acquiring the necessary skills in the European socialist countries.

Mongolia's progress in building socialism has been greatly accelerated by the generous aid of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. The friendly cooperation of Mongolian, Soviet, Polish and Czechoslovak specialists in Darkhan proves that the fraternal relations between the peoples of the socialist countries are based on the principles of Marxism-Leninism, full equality, disinterested mutual aid and comradely support.

The new socialist town of Darkhan is a symbol of unbreakable friendship between the Mongolian people and the peoples of the other socialist countries.

B. DAMDIN

Federal Republic of Germany: the workers want a share in management

JOSEF LEDWOHN

THE FIGHT OF THE working people for a say in running the enterprises and the economy as a whole is an indispensable part of the class struggle in Federal Germany. The problem, however, is not a new one.

During the revolutionary years 1918-19 the workers submitted genuinely democratic demands for a share in running the economy. The point at issue then was for production councils in the enterprises, at province (*laender*) level and on the scale of the country as a whole. These demands were spearheaded against the dictatorial rule of big capitalists and their associations. Later, at the time of the Weimar Republic, the co-management idea was used to disguise reformist illusions concerning class harmony and peaceful evolution from capitalism into socialism. At that time the Communist Party took a resolute stand against these illusions, as it does today.

After the Second World War the demand for co-management acquired a much greater significance. Due to the general anti-capitalist trend in political life and the knowledge that the big capitalists had been responsible for fascism and for the war, the feeling was widespread that they should no longer hold undivided sway in the enterprises and in the economy. The first decree issued by the Allied Control Council of the four occupation powers invested the production councils with partial control over production, a say in personnel arrangements and in determining labor regulations. Similar rights were recorded in the constitutions of the provinces.

As the monopolies began to recover their power, these gains were abolished, primarily

with the aid of the law on the status of the enterprises. Only the law on co-management in the mining (coal and steel) industry provided for some, although utterly inadequate, concessions to the trade unions in this sphere.

Hence it follows that a share in management is something that has to be fought for, a matter of class confrontation involving the democratic rights of the working people in the enterprises and in the economy, and their influence on the country's economic policy. The task is not to secure a "share of responsibility" or "equal partnership" but to curb the power of the monopolies. In the course of this struggle the class consciousness of the workers is deepened and they gain a greater realization of the need to fight for radical democratic reforms.

In this respect we Communists proceed from the fact that in the Federal Republic, with its developed system of state-monopoly capitalism, the big monopolies and the machinery of state are closely intertwined. The entire economy is geared to the interests of a handful of tycoons lusting for profits and power.

On the basis of a powerful economic potential the German imperialists have created, within the NATO framework, another predatory army designed to reach their aggressive aim—the revision of borders in Europe. The revival of the rule of monopoly capitalism, the rapid development of its economic and military might and the dominant position of the handful of tycoons have deepened and continue to deepen the gulf between the democratic stipulations on the question of power

in the Basic Law (Constitution) of the FRG, in the provincial Constitutions and in the democratic constitutions of the communities and the actual state of affairs. This contradiction is becoming increasingly apparent in the political life of West Germany.

The monopolies and their government want to overcome this contradiction in their own way with a view to consolidating their rule. With this aim in view Erhard declared not long ago that the building of what is called the "established society" is the socio-political task of the CDU/CSU. In keeping with this aim the functions of parliament and the rights of the provinces and communities have already been curtailed. Invoking the laws designed for an "emergency situation," the government hopes to get control of the means with which to bring about absolute regimentation of all economic and public life. In this century the German bourgeoisie has already practised this on two occasions: during the First World War by means of a highly developed system of war economy and again during Hitler's Reich by means of the dictatorship and a strong economy based on compulsion.

The working class is aware of the threat to democratic rights emanating from the uncontrolled economic power of the concerns. Thus, Ludwig Rosenberg, Chairman of the Association of German Trade Unions (AGTU), said at a meeting in Dortmund last year that "...abuse of economic power not only can take place, it actually takes place today." The AGTU program emphasizes that the present situation is characterized by a restoration of the old property relations and of the old balance of forces, while the steady process of concentration has brought about an unheard of concentration of power with the result that the danger of abusing this power is growing all the time.

Proceeding from this assessment of developments in Federal Germany, the restoration of the power of the big concerns and the danger to democracy emanating therefrom, the trade unions have worked out a plan for democracy and for implementing the democratic clauses of the Constitution, namely, the right of the trade unions to have a say in the management of the enterprises, in the economy and in other spheres of public life.

Thus, two contrasting concepts stand out in the Federal Republic: the plan for building the "established society" based on state-monopoly rule advanced by the monopoly bourgeoisie, and the plan for workers' co-management drawn up by the trade unions. And while we Communists pay close attention to this demo-

cratic position of the unions, we have our own views on this question.

COMMUNIST PROPOSALS ON THE DEMOCRATIZATION OF THE STATE AND SOCIETY IN THE FRG

Proceeding from Lenin's idea that the socialist revolution of necessity implies a fight for consistent democratic reforms, and from the new opportunities that have arisen thanks to the existence of a powerful socialist camp, the Communist Party, especially at its Congress in 1963, worked out a strategy of the struggle for changing social relations. (Policy Statement of the Communist Party of Germany, "Safeguard Peace, Defend Democratic Rights, and Win Social Security.")

The statement shows that the movement now unfolding to safeguard peace and uphold Constitutional rights sets itself more far-reaching democratic and national aims; from their own experience the people will realize that the contradiction between the vital interests of the nation and the drive of the monopolies for profits and power is an irreconcilable contradiction and hence a peaceful and democratic system must be established, under which monopoly domination will be ruled out. The 1963 Policy Statement says: "The Communist Party maintains that this new democratic system should carry out far-reaching social changes which would basically undermine the big monopolies and their power.

"This system should carry out the social reforms which the overwhelming majority of the people have demanded since 1945, which are proclaimed in the program of the trade unions and recorded in the Constitutions of some of the provinces (*laender*). The big industrial concerns, banks and insurance companies will be nationalized and brought under democratic management and control. In keeping with the demands of the trade unions of factory and office workers, their production councils and unions will enjoy the right to have a say in the management of production and in the economy."

Thus, in accordance with its line towards democratization of the state and society, the Communist Party supports the demands of the trade unions for co-management.

For a better understanding of the points of close contact between our policy and the basic demands of the unions, the concrete proposals advanced by our Party must be explained in greater detail.

In our political strategy we proceed from the Marxist-Leninist concept that leading the working people towards a revolutionary

change in social relations makes it imperative for us consistently to pose democratic tasks based on the concrete situation. In this sense we regard the fight for the democratization of society in the Federal Republic as an inalienable part of the fight for socialism.

As regards the nature of the state, our Party stands for a democratic system under which the principle of the sovereignty of the people would be realized, thus enabling the people themselves to resolve issues of vital importance. What is needed is that the parliaments, in keeping with the Constitutions, should fully exercise their rights, that deputies be responsible to the parliaments and to their electors, and the governments—to the parliaments.

The meeting of the Central Committee held in 1964 offered the working class and its organizations a program of struggle for the democratization of the state, envisaging observance of the basic rights of citizens, rejection of any attempt to abolish them through emergency laws, extension of democracy also in the social and economic spheres; complete realization of the Constitutional rights of the Bundestag, the *laender* and communal parliaments; extension of the rights of the *laender* and democratic communal self-government and guaranteed finances for them through a financial reform which would allocate the state revenue between federation, *laender* and commune correspondingly by one-third; abolition of all electoral clauses running counter to the principle of equality established in the Constitution, for instance, the five per cent clause, and the introduction of proportional representation; abolition of the influence of monopoly capital on the parties and Parliament by banning all employer and trust lobbying, by publishing the sources of financing the parties and by ruling out any monopoly domination over the press; participation by the trade unions and democratic public opinion in the control and management of radio and television, and a democratic school reform.

The establishment of genuine legality in the FRG necessitates abolition of the system of political justice established during the cold war and which persecutes people for their opinions. Anti-communism as a state doctrine is a decisive obstacle in the way of constitutional democratic practice in state life and as such must be eradicated.

Democratization of state and public life in Federal Germany calls for radical socio-economic reforms. Unless the trade unions enjoy democratic rights in the enterprises and in the economy, unless monopoly rule based on arbitrary practices is curbed, this development

of state and democratic life is impossible. The Communist Party is in agreement with the many trade unionists who say that without economic democracy political democracy remains a fiction. The source of the political reaction in the FRG is the restoration of the power of big capitalist concerns. And this is at variance with the Fundamental Law which prohibits abuse of economic power.

Economic and social reforms are also urgently demanded by the revolution in science and technology. The restored power of the concerns and the basic changes currently taking place in the productive forces increasingly affect the conditions of the working class. Concern is growing among the workers. The basic feature of the workers' conditions always stressed by Marx—"social insecurity," fear of the morrow, worry about the job—again makes itself felt despite the years of the boom. The new developments in the expansion of the productive forces—automation, atomic energy, cybernetics and chemical processes—strongly react on the social position of the workers, impelling them to think anew. Something like a million workers are made redundant every year by automation, rationalization and expansion of large-scale production. The spectre of chronic unemployment such as that in the USA threatens the workers in Federal Germany. The Seventh Congress of the AGTU held last May in West Berlin stressed that the central problem arising from the technological development was job security. While large-scale unemployment has not yet made itself felt because of the boom, "redeployment" either at enterprise level or in a particular branch of industry has severely hit hundreds of thousands. This is yet another reason why the demand for the right to a say in management is meeting with growing support among the working people.

In the working-class movement the Party's view is that in keeping with the demands formulated in the AGTU program the workers' organizations should draw up a plan of action for the nationalization of the big industrial-military complex, the atomic energy industry, mining, the electric power industry and the big banks. This nationalization of the key sectors of industry along with the enterprises already owned by the state and those under public management could be a solid foundation for a democratically run economy. In this case the cooperatives and trade union banks could also play a positive role.

The CPG suggests that the unions in the state-owned enterprises should act now to secure the right to co-management and to transform these enterprises into technologic-

ally progressive and socially exemplary ones. Their model labor conditions and social amenities could be a living example of what an economy placed under democratic management and control could do for the people. The state-owned enterprises could thus become a new stimulus accelerating the struggle for the nationalization of all the trusts.

These are some of the main ideas formulated by the Communist Party for the democratization of the economy and which are now being discussed among the working class.

TRADE UNION DEMANDS FOR CO-MANAGEMENT

The Seventh AGTU Congress renewed and specified the demands for co-management. In this report Ludwig Rosenberg stressed the connection between the demand for trade union participation in management and the basic idea of the Federal Constitution, according to which the Republic must be a "democratic and social law-abiding state." Everybody knows that this is a far cry from reality. At the Congress Rosenberg pointed to this contradiction and insisted that class privilege and profit should no longer be the main feature of society in Federal Germany. For the FRG really to become a socially just and democratic state, it is essential that the trade unions should have a say in managing the enterprise and the economy.

Rosenberg, then, sees the fight for the right to co-management as a democratic and constitutional task. We Communists fully agree with this, since neither the Fundamental Law nor the *laender* constitutions contain even a hint that power in society should be wielded by a handful of multi-millionaires. On the basis of this Constitutional task the right to co-management is correctly defined as the democratic alternative to emergency legislation. It will be recalled that the AGTU Congress, by a clear majority, opposed the emergency laws and unanimously supported the fight for co-management as an essential step towards a social and democratic law-abiding state.

A whole series of proposals on the question of co-management were generalized in a concept formulated in an unanimously adopted decision of the AGTU, a decision which will become the basis of the trade union attitude on the issue of shared management. The decision emphasizes that the demand of the trade unions for "an equal share to be enjoyed by wage workers in decision-making in all spheres of the social structure" is determined by the conviction that generally speaking "a truly democratic system is possible only when the

working people not only take part in management as citizens through Parliament, government and administration, but in addition exert a determining and immediate influence on the economy" (Ludwig Rosenberg's report to the Seventh AGTU Congress, minutes).

This influence must be exerted at the place of work, in the enterprise, on a national scale and in the European institutions. This far-reaching demand, the direct opposite of monopoly rule, should be understood as a genuinely democratic demand.

In particular, the criticism is made that the law on the status of the enterprise, against which the trade unions vigorously protested in 1952, denies the right of co-management. Hence the Seventh Congress of the AGTU demanded that the law should be redrafted in order to invest the production councils and trade union representatives in the enterprises with effective rights. This is made particularly needful by the scientific and technological advance, and especially in order to safeguard the interests of the workers already at the stage of planning. It is a matter of determining investments and production programs, labor organization and the personnel of the enterprise. The AGTU decision to secure a new formulation of the law enables the unions to involve millions of workers directly in the fight for democracy in the enterprises.

Another section of the decision urges that the workers should have a greater share in management. The 1951 law on co-management in the mining industry is defined as a step toward "equality of labor and capital." This shows that there is still much confusion and even illusions in the unions concerning the fight for democracy in industry. Still, we hold that the demand to extend this law to all Big Business associations is both correct and necessary. As regards broader participation in management, we see this as the right of the unions to be represented on the advisory councils on a par with the employers and to appoint a manager of labor to the boards of the enterprises.

This situation now exists in the steel and mining industries. It should be noted that the practise of "broader participation in management" is correctly criticized because not infrequently it is exercised with complete disregard for the workers and their unions and, moreover, by means of a legislation geared to the interests of the employers. Thus, the labor managers and the unions were at variance in the course of the movements for higher wages.

The AGTU demands that the Law of 1951 should be extended to all the big enterprises falling under the following categories: 1)

employing over three thousand workers, 2) an overall balance of DM75 million, and 3) an annual turnover of DM150 million. If two of these conditions obtain in an enterprise, the regulations operative in the above-mentioned industries should be applied in keeping with the demands of the unions. These, of course, are not some kind of rigid conditions, but the views of the unions on the degree to which the large-scale enterprises should be subordinate to the principle of broader participation in management.

The union catering to the workers in the chemical, paper and ceramics industry demands in addition that the status of the bigger enterprises (giant concerns) should be so modified that at the general meeting of shareholders and managers there should be an opportunity of "equal representation for wage and salaried workers." This should be made a rule in enterprises employing over twenty thousand people. The union holds that this demand should be applied to at least 50 enterprises, among them the successors to the IG Farben Industrie.

The decision of the AGTU Congress pays special attention to the demand for a say in management at levels higher than the enterprise. It is suggested that a more far-sighted economic policy be pursued, although it is believed, and with every justification, that without trade union participation in management this will not meet the interests of the working people. Another demand is that adequate bodies be set up in which the unions should have equal representation, although neither the form of these bodies nor their particular functions are specified.

In the opinion of the CPG, these bodies could be economic boards in the *laender* and a Federal economic council on the national scale. They should enjoy not only the right to obtain information and the right to a consultative vote but also the right to display their own legislative initiative and thus be able to submit the workers' demands directly to Parliament.

The AGTU Congress stated that the public will be broadly informed as to the significance of co-management, and decided to ensure trade union preparedness for coping with this task.

THE TRADE UNION VIEWPOINT

While on the whole there is an agreement among the trade unions with regard to the demands for co-management, their views on its essence and aims differ; this reflects the growing class consciousness and greater understanding of the nature of state-monopoly

capitalism, on the one hand, and on the other the growth of reformist illusions and of the ideas of social partnership.

The basic aim of the unions in their fight for co-management is to restrict abuses of power by the big concerns and to secure more vigorous action on behalf of the economic and political interests of the workers. Their struggle is thus spearheaded directly against monopoly capitalism. Gefeller, chairman of the trade union of the workers employed in the chemical, paper and ceramics industries, at this year's congress criticized the economic policy pursued by Erhard and the big monopolies, saying among other things that the "... administration, acting on behalf of capital, determines the place of the individual in society." Development — when visualized through the prism of the Constitution — has led to the establishment of an "anonymous power" and the "dominant role of big capital in relation to those who are economically dependent on it."

Highly indicative is the view expressed by H. Lang, of the metal-workers' union, who wrote in an article: "The demand for broader participation in management advanced by wage and salaried workers and their trade unions is based on the fact that as a result of the scientific and technological revolution industry and capital are concentrated to an enormous degree in the hands of a few. The rapidly growing concentration leads to a situation where issues affecting the life of the nation are decided by an ever smaller upper crust of the finance oligarchy. Closely linked with this is the further widening of the gap between ownership of the means of production and the right to control them. Increasingly, management of the concerns is exercised not by the big capitalists who are no longer in a position to acquire the know-how needed in such vast enterprises but by administrators acting on their behalf. The scientific and technological revolution shows even more vividly how unnecessary monopoly capital is in the process of production" (Tatsachen, No. 35-36, 1966, Duisburg).

Statements of this kind show a growing understanding of the class structure and the relationship of forces in the FRG. The supporters of these partially Marxist analyses and demands stress the need for co-management as a militant slogan directed against the monopolies.

Fighting actively for a say in management, trade unionists are beginning to realize the real issues associated with it in the steel and coal industries. The laws on co-management in these branches have remained on paper,

unions being denied the right to influence the economic policy while the work of the labor managers and advisory councils has not been greatly stimulated by corresponding activity on the part of the workers.

At the same time the unions often cherish illusions concerning the significance and efficacy of the right to co-management. In an article last spring in *Mitteilungen des wirtschaftswissenschaftlichen Institutes des DGB* (Reports of the AGTU Economic Institute) Dr. Gerhard Leminsky wrote: "... The new possibilities" secure for the unions "an influence transcending the framework of the labor market." This signifies, he went on, "a greater measure of responsibility" and he concluded by saying that the unions have been "... incorporated into the modern system." This, as we see, is a preview of the idea of social partnership between unions and employers.

In this way, clearly, harmful ideas are being introduced into the trade unions and the working class. However, these ideas of class harmony have no great prospects in view of the stark reality in the FRG. Growing exploitation and the unyielding position of the monopolists refute over and over again the ideas concerning identity of interests between capital and labor.

The ideological clash between the two trends on the issue of co-management, however, often takes place only in depth, without surfacing, thus hindering the unions from displaying greater vigor in the fight for co-management.

MONOPOLY v. CO-MANAGEMENT

The importance of the fight is indicated by the reaction of the monopolists, of their press and the Government. Erhard is categorically opposed to any broadening of co-management. The unions have come up against an unprecedented campaign of slander on the part of the monopolies. The latter want to discredit the demands of the unions and to intimidate the workers. They themselves reveal all the falsehood of so-called social partnership and, willy-nilly, reveal their anti-labor and anti-democratic physiognomy.

For example, Fertsch-Roever, chairman of the association of independent industrialists, declared: "We now know that when a demand for co-management is advanced it is not the question of our personal destiny. Should this demand be realized, it would imperil the economic and political system which is the foundation of free enterprise. And we now know that we must fight if we want to survive, that the question confronting German industrialists is 'to be or not to be'."

The employers' associations have formed a common front against co-management. The unions are systematically subjected to slander: they, it is alleged, want to wreck "economic stability" and destroy "peace in the country," and build up a "giant trade union cartel." In this way the demand for co-management advanced by the unions is depicted as something heretical in the eyes of the public.

THE PERSPECTIVES

The trade unions characterize the violent attacks of the monopolies and their press as slanderous and as further proof of the need for union participation in management as a means of breaking the power of the monopolies based on the "I'm-boss-here" principle.

In this conflict with the monopolies the Communist Party fully sides with the unions and supports their demand for a share in management. It opposes all the concepts to the effect that co-management is a kind of social partnership and should lead to class harmony and reconciliation of class interests. The debate now under way, however, tends to prove the contrary, namely, that the class struggle is becoming more acute in the course of the movement for broader democratic rights. This deepens class consciousness and reinforces the determination of the working class to achieve its aims despite the resistance of the monopolies.

It goes without saying that co-management is not yet socialization or a substitute for socialism; it is simply an indispensable measure which can be effected even with the economy of the Federal Republic retaining its capitalist character. But it could lead to substantial changes, to the possibility, for one, of curbing monopoly rule. It is this democratic measure which at the given stage of the class struggle against state-monopoly capitalism could be the basic factor in the matter of rallying the workers.

We in Federal Germany are confronted with the task of securing an end to the policy of aggression, of replacing it with a sane policy taking cognizance of the real state of affairs in our world. The influence exerted by the unions on the enterprises, on the economy and on the Government could be decisive in furthering this. The policy formulated by the Seventh AGTU Congress, i.e., rejection of the emergency laws, new proposals for securing the right to co-management, the demand that the FRG should display initiative on disarmament and resolutely reject the idea of possessing atomic weapons, a realistic approach to the policy of the working class on the German question and the posing of numerous pressing

tasks in the fight for social demands, shows that the unions in the Federal Republic constitute an important democratic factor. Even if there are different views concerning the ways and aims of democratic development, the demand for broad participation in management is decisive for the first breakthrough along the pathway of progress to be effected by rallying all the forces of the working class.

Concerning the further perspective of democratic development in the FRG, much will depend on the extent to which the Communists achieve unity of action with trade unionists and Social Democrats. A comparison of the democratic tasks set forth at the beginning of this article with union demands for co-management shows a broad convergence of views on many points. As an alternative to the economic policy of the monopolies and their Government, the Central Committee of the Communist Party has published a number of proposals concerning a democratic program entitled "For a stable and peaceful economy on behalf of the people," which expresses even more clearly the striving of the working people for co-management.

There is a growing desire to draw closer to the unions and their anti-monopoly, democratic demands also in the Social Democratic Party. Many Social Democrats now feel that the policy of community with the CDU/CSU can but harm the working class and the SDPG itself.

New opportunities are opening up in West Germany for the advance of the working-class movement. The Communist Party is using the lessons taught the workers by the revival of monopoly rule, by the resurgence of militarism, for the purpose of deepening class consciousness.

An impetus to a more mature class thinking, to a turn towards Marxism is provided by the scientific and technological development which sharpens to the extreme the contradiction between the social character of production and private appropriation, and shows that monopoly capitalism is incompatible with the interests of the people. This growing awareness, it should be said, is retarded by ceaseless anti-communist propaganda.

However, the formation of an anti-monopoly and anti-imperialist front in the FRG is a logical process and it is taking place in the specific conditions brought about by the existence of the two Germanys. A movement for socialist solutions is growing in the FRG, the working people see for themselves the success of socialist construction in the GDR, and political discussions converge on socialist

ways and means of resolving the current social problems. Anti-communism and pressure from the state still have an impact on the working-class movement; however, owing to the existence of the GDR the ruling circles are compelled to pursue a prudent policy, carefully avoiding any major conflict with the working people. But the desire of the concern owners to secure maximum profits, the striving towards an "established society" and the plan for a revision of frontiers in Europe all breed conflict with the population.

The ruling circles have not been able to gain any considerable support among the working class for their hopes of establishing a new dictatorship. On the contrary, mistrust of the government and its designs is growing. In the measure that the growing cooperation between Communists and Social Democrats serves as the basis of united action, the unions are becoming strongholds of popular resistance to social reaction, to the aggressive policy of the government, to the dictatorship based on emergency laws. For this there are pre-requisites in the decisions of the AGTU and in the union branches.

It is particularly significant for the advance of the democratic movement that new relationships between the trade unions and the intellectuals have been taking shape in recent years. Many prominent intellectuals regard the unions as the decisive democratic and humanist force in society. Hundreds of professional workers and university lecturers have declared their solidarity with the trade unions in the struggle against the emergency laws. Together with the trade unionists they have reaffirmed in appeals and at public meetings their common will to safeguard democracy and peace. These beginnings of an alliance between the working class and intellectuals are bound to have their impact on the Social Democrats, bound to bring them closer to the democratic forces in the Federal Republic. The fight of the trade unions for the democratic right to co-management will attract increasingly broader masses of working people.

A meeting of our Central Committee held in November last year pointed out that the demand for co-management submitted by the trade unions had ushered in a new phase of the class struggle in Federal Germany. The fight for co-management offers the working class and the peace-loving forces a possibility gradually to win positions in the economy and in the state, positions to which they are entitled by their place in society. Therefore the demand for co-management is an important aspect of the fight against the big mono-

polies, against the Government, the militarists and their aggressive policy of revenge.

Political development reveals ever more clearly that the demand for a share in man-

agement must become the central militant platform of the workers. The fight for this demand will be the key task of the working class and decisive for the entire development in Federal Germany.

SCIENCE AND SOCIETY

The role of science in building socialism in Poland

WITOLD NOVACKI

IN POLAND, as in the other socialist countries, experience has shown that science and socialism are twins. Socialist society could not develop without the application of science in all areas of endeavor; without science it could not demonstrate its superiority or win in the economic competition with capitalism. And conversely, science enjoys more favorable conditions under socialism than is the case under capitalism.

Here we propose to dwell chiefly on the role played by research in building socialism in Poland. Needless to say, it is impossible to discuss in detail all the aspects of this complex question in a single article. We shall, therefore, confine ourselves to a brief description of the present "potential" and organizational structure of scientific work, with particular emphasis on its bearing on practical economics and the life of society in general, and to a few of the basic problems posed in the past 20 years or so. Some of these problems, incidentally, still await a satisfactory solution.

ORGANIZATION OF RESEARCH

Poland has three groups of research organizations — those under the Academy of Sciences, the higher schools, and the research departments organizationally linked with industry or other branches of the economy and coming under the various ministries or other central bodies.

Although all three engage in a wide range of

investigation, there is rather strict specialization among them.

The *centers under the Academy* engage mainly in general theoretical research of decisive importance for all branches of science and scientific trends which indirectly influence applied research, ensuring its sound development.

The Academy centers also conduct applied research connected with their general theoretical research, engaging in projects relating to the introduction of scientific findings, in design and in elaborating technological processes. This combination of applied and basic research is, economically, the most expedient method in the present circumstances. As a rule, however, as soon as the project is well on its way it is handed over to the departmental institutes for completion. A case in point is a major research institute working on electronic computers which was first established under the Academy and then transferred together with its entire personnel and equipment to economic bodies. The same happened in the sphere of applied research on electronic semi-conductor elements and their production and in a number of other cases.

Another function of the Academy is that of initiating major collective research projects involving the cooperation of many, sometimes even remote, branches of science.

At present the Academy system includes 21 research institutes and 58 other independent organizations and laboratories. These centers are staffed by 487 professors and assistant pro-

fessors and 2,160 graduate students and instructors, besides a large number of other researchers, technicians and administrative personnel.

The members of the Academy, of whom there are 284 (96 full members, 124 corresponding members, 1 honorary and 63 foreign members), are outstanding men in their respective fields. Organizationally the Academy is divided into six sections — social sciences, biological sciences, physico-mathematical, chemical, geological and geographical sciences, technical, agriculture and forestry, and medical — which have a total of 76 committees on the various sciences. The committees consist of members of the Academy, other research workers representing all levels, and also representatives of economic organizations and practical workers. The Academy is, of course, the most competent and authoritative scientific body in the country and acts as joint adviser to the government on scientific matters.

Research conducted by the *higher schools* is naturally closely linked with their curricular activity. It is spread more evenly over the entire area of science than the research work of the Academy, though it does not go as deep. For one thing, research on regional and local problems is concentrated in the universities and colleges.

Poland has 74 institutes of higher learning with a total of 270 departments, (exclusive of evening and correspondence studies), and 2,607 chairs with numerous laboratories and big research institutes. These are staffed by 3,425 professors and assistant professors; the number of graduate students and instructors runs to over 14,000.

Departmental institutes which are connected with various branches of the economy and subordinated to economic bodies cooperate with factory laboratories, research and designing bureaus and directly with production enterprises. The basic function of these institutes is to handle matters directly connected with the development of particular branches of the economy. Among these are general theoretical problems (and their percentage in the total number of research undertakings is steadily increasing), but attention is concentrated mainly on applied research. Advisory functions relating to current production problems, designing, etc., which once predominated in these institutes, are being transferred to the factory laboratories and research bureaus.

Poland now has 107 institutes of this kind manned by 1,639 professors and assistant professors, 8,766 graduate students and instructors, 2,766 research and technical workers with a higher education and about 11,000 with secondary education.

THE ORIGINS OF THE PRESENT SYSTEM

The present organizational set-up and our scientific potential are the result of the rapid development of science during the 22 years of people's rule.

Before the Second World War research facilities were confined to the higher schools, of which there then were considerably fewer than now. The few research institutes existing apart from the universities were small. During the Second World War and the Hitler occupation Polish science suffered heavily. In some branches over 40 per cent and in others more than 50 per cent of the researchers lost their lives. Of the 603 university laboratories that existed in 1939 only three remained intact, and 357 were completely destroyed. Enormous losses were suffered also by scientific libraries: in Warsaw 76 per cent of their book stocks was lost, in Poznan 68 per cent, in Lublin 30 per cent and in Cracow, which suffered less than other cities, 14 per cent. Of the research equipment little remained.

Rehabilitation was undertaken in 1944 in the liberated areas and almost at the same time work was begun to expand the country's scientific facilities. Progress was rapid thanks to the enthusiastic efforts of the scientists and the big investments of money and materials on the part of the Government. Despite the devastation and the pressing needs in other areas of public life, these investments soon exceeded the total expenditure on science in old Poland between the two world wars.

In the early period the rehabilitation and development of science proceeded mainly along lines of the old, prewar pattern. But soon, owing to the new needs and above all in connection with the turn to socialism, new tasks came to the fore necessitating a complete reorganization.

In the course of this work new and difficult organizational and scientific problems arose, many of which have not yet been solved. Let us dwell on some of them.

FROM DRIFT TO PLANNING

The striving to gear research to the country's needs is one of finest traditions of Polish scientists. This tradition can be traced to the fight against national subjugation from 1795 to 1918. Although Poland at that time had few institutions of higher learning, not to speak of government research centers outside the universities, scientists, working in professional associations or singly, concentrated mainly on problems relating to the national culture and its defense against the oppressors. The same applied to the inter-war period when Poland was an independent capitalist state, though coordination of research with the requirements of the country notably weakened.

The situation after the Second World War provided new stimuli to linking scientific work with practical requirements. Postwar rehabilitation, development of the war-ravaged western and northern regions which were reunited with Poland as a result of the war, the socialist industrialization, reconstruction and development of agriculture after the land reform—all posed before our researchers interesting

problems. The once widening gap between science and social practice was rapidly bridged.

At first things tended to drift, but soon a pressing need for planning research on a national scale asserted itself. Later it became essential also to plan the training of personnel and the further development of research.

This was the first big issue to confront Polish science as the country began the building of socialism. It was not a simple problem, for to solve it many preconceived notions and fears held by scientific workers had to be overcome. Mistakes were made in tackling it, mainly because we tried mechanically to apply the methods of economic planning to science. Now, however, the question has been solved in the main, though there still are details that require elaboration. The main thing is that the idea of planning scientific development has prevailed. A particularly important role in this connection was played by the First Congress of Scientists held in 1951 which led to the founding of the Academy of Sciences.

WORK ON CONCRETE CURRENT PROBLEMS

The entry of science into planned participation in the building of socialism first found expression in the fact that research organizations, often even those specializing in highly abstract fields, began to extend concrete services to the economy. The Institute of Mathematics, for instance, worked on problems such as optimal distribution of electric power stations and high-tension transmission lines; the functioning of railway junctions; analysis of transport problems, and a number of complex anthropometric problems of importance to industry. These were, of course, "side-lines" for the institute, but the use of its facilities for the purpose was fully justified.

Nearly all research institutions included in their plans projects aimed at solving the problems arising in the various branches of the economy and in enterprises.

Perhaps the most advanced form of this type of activity is the economic expertise under the Academy and other scientific bodies, often at the request of the government. As a rule this is done in the case of problems requiring the cooperation of researchers in a number of branches. In some cases special research organizations are set up. Problems of this type have included the geographical subdivision of the country, development of the Upper Silesia industrial area, waterways, water conservation and combating water pollution, anthropological surveys (important, in particular, for the footwear and clothing industries), social changes in areas undergoing rapid industrialization, and school reform.

THEORETICAL RESEARCH

Both the big economic research projects organized by the Academy and the services rendered to industry by various institutes, higher

schools and other research organizations are of great importance in building socialism.

But even more important is basic research providing the theoretical groundwork for all research and direct scientific aid to industry. Neglect of this area would have an adverse effect, indirect perhaps but nonetheless telling, on the solution of the new practical problems (in production, for instance) which are constantly springing up, and thus retard both production and social development.

At one time some people tended to be carried away by the "striving to combine science and practice," to underestimate and even to ignore basic research, preferring to concentrate on practical tasks such as solving concrete current problems for industry, etc. A certain role was played of course by the pressure of current, day-to-day needs. Fortunately, however, this tendency was a passing phenomenon and was never on a very wide scale. Today the importance of basic research from both the economic and cultural standpoints is correctly understood everywhere.

Thus, not only recent years, but the whole period since the Second World War and the birth of People's Poland have been marked by progress in basic research. Mathematics is an example. Up to 1939 it was one of the leading branches of science in Poland; in point of fact the Polish school of mathematics had a worldwide reputation. However, alongside the high level and notable achievements in some areas of mathematics there were serious gaps in others. The founders and the leading figures of the Polish school of mathematics, conscious of this one-sidedness, realized that to build up a really sound mathematical center in the country it was necessary to concentrate the efforts of the small number of available mathematicians on a few comparatively narrow fields. In the beginning these were the theory of numbers and mathematical logic; later functional analysis and topology were added. It is in these last two areas that Polish mathematicians have gained world recognition. At the same time the progress was unsatisfactory in mathematical analysis, which is basic to the development of many areas of physics and technology, and the calculus of probabilities, which is of extremely great theoretical and practical importance. Although more than 50 per cent of our mathematicians lost their lives during the war, our school of mathematics not only regained its old positions but is developing successfully along new lines. These include primarily mathematical analysis, differential geometry, algebra, mathematical statistics and a number of applications of mathematics to the natural sciences, technology and the economy.

The same can be said of many other areas. In physics the past few years have witnessed good progress in basic research relating to the theory of fields, physics of solids and physics of elementary particles. Particularly positive results have been obtained in nuclear physics,

which is accorded special attention by the government, as can be seen if only from the appointment of a government commissioner for the peaceful use of nuclear energy. Thanks to basic research it has become possible to carry out a large number of applied research projects in this new field and to apply the findings.

A big achievement is the progress made in the basic technical sciences, above all in theoretical and applied mechanics, acoustics, electro-acoustics, electrical technology, electronics, chemistry of metals and metallurgy. Many new lines have been launched in basic biological research (including medicine, agricultural science and forestry) and also in the social sciences.

CONCENTRATION OF FORCES AND MEANS

It is of course impossible to keep up an equally high pace in all areas of basic research.

There are two reasons for this. First, not all of these areas are equally important from the social standpoint (i.e., from the standpoint of their usefulness to the economy and the needs of cultural development); second, in view of Poland's size and resources it has limited means to draw on, not to speak of the limited number of qualified personnel available. This is of no small importance since nowadays creative research in practically all spheres is becoming more and more costly.

Because of this we must concentrate our forces and means on a few selected areas, reconciling ourselves to more modest effort in others. In some respects the situation is reminiscent of that in which our mathematicians found themselves between the two world wars.

The need to concentrate forces and means is now generally recognized. Yet the choice of the areas on which to place the emphasis is still a complex problem which is being warmly debated.

The latest and so far most thorough attempt to choose areas of concentration is the Academy's draft for basic research in 1966-70. Originally the draft listed 56 lines of research covering 185 problems. Subsequently, however, it was cut down to the following 15 areas (52 problems): 1) physics of solids; 2) nuclear and high-energy physics and physics of elementary particles; 3) electronics; 4) technological cybernetics; 5) basic research (theoretical and experimental) in chemical catalysis; 6) chemistry and physical chemistry of polymers; 7) nuclear chemistry; 8) biochemistry and biophysics; 9) productivity of ecological systems; 10) soil as the basic factor in the growth and development of plants; 11) the properties of agricultural crops and their relation to the environment; 12) basic research in forestry; 13) research on the nervous system; 14) molecular pathophysiology, and 15) problems relating to the growth of the economy, management and planning.

In setting our sights on these areas we were guided by the needs of the national economy

and the desire to create favorable conditions for spheres of science new to our country and whose development calls for closer coordination and specialization on a national scale. The plan includes 11 problems in the physics of solids, an area which, though of great importance for industry and the economy as a whole, has hitherto progressed far too slowly and received insufficient funds. Problems relating to nuclear physics, high energy physics and the physics of elementary particles as well as nuclear chemistry are also included. Special attention is paid to technological cybernetics, for the progress to date in automation makes it possible to pass on to the next stage of basic research and experimentation aimed at evolving and introducing systems capable of performing more complex tasks.

The draft also lists three problems in the sphere of catalysis, for not less than half of our chemical output is obtained through catalytic processes. The practical significance of these problems is, therefore, considerable, but in order to ensure proper development of this industry it is essential to expand the facilities for basic research and thus pave the way to further technological advance. For the same reason we included in the plan seven problems of the chemistry and physical chemistry of polymers.

In the sphere of biology two problems are underscored: biosynthesis of proteins combined with research on nucleic acids and genetic information, and the productivity of ecological systems, the theoretical and practical significance of which is so great as to warrant the announcement of an international biological program on the subject for 1965-70.

Agricultural science is represented by four comprehensive projects within the framework of three lines of investigation: soil research, the properties of agricultural crops, and forestry research.

In the social sciences the emphasis is on the economic, sociological and juridical branches, the object of which should be the solution of the main problems relating to the structure and development of the national economy and improvement of management and planning methods.

In order not to disperse forces we did not include in the draft many basic areas of research of considerable theoretical and practical importance. For instance, mathematics, theoretical physics, geographical sciences and astronomy were left out. But since in these fields there already exists a reliable organizational basis and the lines of work have been clearly defined, the various schools pursuing these lines can themselves create conditions favoring coordination of research on a national scale.

Selection of the principal lines of research will continue in the process of drawing up a long-range science program for 1966-85. This work is already under way.

INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC COOPERATION

For our science and culture to develop, close ties with the science and culture of the rest of the world are essential. Understandably, we have the closest contacts with the scientific world of the socialist countries. These contacts cover both scientific and technological cooperation in the framework of the Council for Mutual Economic Aid and direct cooperation between the higher educational establishments and Academies of the fraternal countries.

Our Academy is linked with its counterparts and specialized (agricultural and medical) academies of the socialist countries by 16 bilateral agreements. These cover exchange of researchers, information and publications, arrangements for practical work in each other's institutes, and coordinated joint research projects. Especially lively are our contacts with the Academies of the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, GDR and Hungary.

The Academies in the socialist countries engage in *multilateral cooperation*. The object is to promote international division of labor and specialization in research, to accelerate research work and to heighten its effectiveness, and also to enable the smaller countries to take part in the costlier types of research. Multilateral cooperation now extends to 12 basic problems.

Cooperation in the agricultural sciences is developing particularly fruitfully. On the Polish side 27 research institutes working on 39 problems are taking part in this work.

The achievements notwithstanding, scientific cooperation among the socialist countries has not yet developed to the extent it might have, and it is still short of meeting the requirements. Because of this we support every initiative aimed at extending and improving both multilateral and bilateral cooperation. We would like to expand research cooperation also with the capitalist countries, for there is no doubt that such cooperation would pave the way to econo-

mic and political contacts and promote peaceful coexistence.

RECIPROCAL ACTION

In conclusion I should like to dwell on one question relating to the part played by science in building socialism in Poland — a question to which both scientific and economic circles are devoting special attention.

Formerly the part played by science in economic development consisted mainly in solving problems arising in the process of economic endeavor along already established lines. Planning in science was largely a derivative of economic planning. The economy placed "orders" with researchers (not necessarily only for "troubleshooting services" or expertise, but also for developing certain branches of science, for instance, polymer chemistry in connection with the expansion of the production of plastics).

In the broad sense, this system of "orders" will, of course, be retained. But the fact is that scientists, like economic executives, are striving towards a situation when researchers not only fulfil "orders" placed by the national economy, but themselves point out new possibilities and perspectives and thus exert a steadily growing reciprocal influence on the economy. This initiative should be exercised not only on the basis of past achievements (discoveries and inventions), but also on the basis of an analysis of the prospects of scientific advance. Consequently, economic planning should to some extent become a function of scientific planning, and the plans in both areas should be reciprocally interactive.

This idea underlies, in particular, also the work to draw up a long-range plan of scientific development for 1966-85 mentioned above. There is no doubt that this period will see a further growth of the contribution made by science to the building of socialism in the Polish People's Republic.

Interweaving of the technological revolution and culture in the GDR

FRED STAUFENBIEL

MATTERS RELATING to culture and its development have always featured in the policy of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany. The task during the past twenty years of democratic and socialist development has been to draw the historical lessons of the two world wars and of fascist rule, to utilize these lessons in the life of the people, and especially for educational purposes. To put Germany on the road to peace and democracy and to follow a policy of friendship and peaceful cooperation with all countries, it was essential to defeat fascism and imperialism physically as well as spiritually.

This was the situation that confronted the united party of the working class in the German Democratic Republic, and in coping with it, the Party developed its policy of renewing the humanist culture, disseminating it among the working people, and simultaneously began building a socialist culture.

This complicated process was facilitated by the new socialist mode of production, by the orientation on the scientific and technological revolution, by the new socialist system of education and by the transition to planning and guiding all the complex processes of social development.

To complete the socialist construction of society and to ensure scientific guidance of the economy and greater productivity it is essential to secure a steady growth of the socialist outlook, a higher educational standard and methodically transform the social environment in keeping with the needs of socialism.

During the years of anti-fascist struggle and afterwards, when we set out to develop socialist democracy, we gradually evolved the concept of our socialist culture. Our success in implementing this concept has been such that today we are entitled to speak about a new situation in the educational and cultural life of our people. The democratic school reform, followed by the establishment of a socialist educational system, and the ramified network of people's colleges and industrial academies have radically changed things in the sphere of edu-

cation. The young generation is afforded an education in the humanities, natural sciences and technology, and adults have manifold opportunities of continuing their education and improving professional skills. At present over 650,000 working people are receiving a higher education in 700 industrial academies without giving up their jobs. Roughly one in every four working people has been taking a course of study during the last three years.

Education in its fullest sense is now within reach of our people. Our intelligentsia, a sizable proportion of which is of working-class or peasant origin, shares the class interests of the workers and peasants.

The attitude of the working people to the arts, and the attitude of artists to the problems of the working people have changed considerably. The humanist literature of the world and the current socialist literature of our country and other countries have a wide readership. Names like Johannes Becher, Bertolt Brecht, Anna Seghers, Arnold Zweig and other authors are household words. Since 1958 the bookshop sales of their writings are as follows: Brecht 1,060,000; Becher 855,000; Seghers 805,000; Ludwig Renn 754,000; Willi Bredel 527,000 and Arnold Zweig 431,000. Segher's *Seventh Cross*, has been re-issued over fifty times since 1952, in a total of 850,000 copies.

Many gifted writers have risen from the ranks of the people, winning a large reading public in a short time. We may cite here as revealing examples Herbert Jobst's trilogy—*The Foundling*, *The Ward* and *The Tramp*—brought out in more than 40,000 copies, *Christa*, *The Story of a Love* and *Hanusch*, the trilogy by Jurii Brezan, a noted Wendish* author, published in upwards of 500,000 copies, or Erwin Strittmatter's *Tinko*, *The Miracle Worker* and *Ole Bienkopp*—over 850,000 copies. Typical of the literary career of these writers is that they are among those who, to quote Brecht's words about Strittmatter, "have risen

*The Wends are a Slavic people living in the GDR.

with, and not from the proletariat" and who would "presumably never have become writers" had it not been for the new socialist system of education and culture in the GDR.

The one-time separation of the working people from the arts—a legacy of the capitalist past—has been ended, not completely, it is true, but to a very considerable extent.

As we see, big things have been done, especially the overcoming of anti-communism and other manifestations of reactionary bourgeois ideology, assimilating and carrying forward the humanist heritage of culture, forming a socialist intelligentsia, and spreading Marxist-Leninist ideas, education and art among the people. The next task is to provide the ethical, ideological, cultural and social conditions needed for further development.

To promote and disseminate the humanist culture of the world among one's own people is a condition for cultural progress. This Leninist idea of the cultural revolution under socialism is a valuable guideline for our work.

Last year the Institute of Social Sciences made a survey of the cultural standards of workers employed in the electronics, electrical and mechanical engineering, and iron and steel industries. This survey, which was part of the cultural and sociological research program of the Institute, revealed that 15 per cent of the working-class families have personal libraries of over 100 books each, 31 per cent from 30 to 100 books, 32 per cent from 10 to 30, 15 per cent 10 and only 6 per cent no books at all.

Asked the kind of book they had found particularly interesting, 1,750 workers named 1,532 books, among them 469 different titles. These titles were distributed as follows:

TABLE 1

	Total Numer of books	Identical titles
Socialist German literature	520	106
Soviet literature	336	70
Critical-realist and classical German literature	108	50
World classics (without the above categories)	335	85
Crime and adventure stories	124	82
Reportage and travel	62	35
Scientific and technological books	40	28
Others	7	

Literary interest has become more varied and has tended to focus on the world classics and the present-day works of socialist realism, as the table shows. Obviously, this trend indicates a growing need for us to engage in an exacting analysis of the spiritual problems of the day. The capacity of art and literature to influence the mind and, for that matter, the social behavior of people in a humanist and democratic sense is now much greater.

We have succeeded in developing an essentially new attitude to culture on the part of the working class and cooperative farmers. This development, we found, is due to an appreciable rise in the educational level of the working people.

Cultural levels in socialist society are determined by something more than a classical humanist education. Nor is it confined to an ability for aesthetic perception divorced from labor. To fulfil the tasks with which we are confronted, we must see the cultural level of our working people as a compound of scientific, technological, philosophical and ideological knowledge, practical skills, a capacity for aesthetic perception and creativity. We need then, a combination of knowledge, skill, and spiritual links between people, coupled with the ability to use all one's knowledge and skill for the good of the community.

* * *

On the twentieth anniversary of the Socialist Unity Party the Institute of Social Sciences held a forum on "The Interplay of the Technological and Cultural Revolution in the Comprehensive Socialist Construction in the GDR." The purpose was not so much to sum up the progress as to make what had been done and brought to fruition under Party guidance the starting point for new theoretical and practical questing.

Discussion centered on the conclusions to be drawn from the focal problem of the technological revolution, the problem of controlling the forces brought into being by society; this we see as a condition for making a humanist use of man's growing technological domination over nature.

In our socialist conditions, we see the unity of the scientific and technological and the cultural revolutions, as part of a contribution to solving one of the basic problems of cultural progress and which is bound to favor our efforts to safeguard peace and settle the national question of Germany.

In building socialism we are creating the social conditions for the unity of the technological revolution and the all-round development of humanist culture. But their utilization will be no spontaneous process. To achieve this unity, we must first of all eliminate lack of interest in and emotional detachment from the process of building up culture as part of one's work. This can be done by encouraging initiative, by bringing people into the work of guiding production and the social processes, and by fostering development of the individual in line with the objectives of the socialist community.

This difficult problem, which in terms of cultural policy is of fundamental importance, can be solved on the basis of developed socialist relations of production and a corresponding system of economic management, by judiciously directing and stimulating a number of processes, namely:

(a) making better and more extensive use

of the fruits of human labor to improve everyday life, in consonance with the basic economic law of socialism;

(b) maintaining, by economic and ideological means, harmony between the social needs and the basic personal interests in all important areas of life, primarily labor;

(c) steadily encouraging the working people to study the natural and social sciences, and to immerse themselves in ideology, ethics, and aesthetics;

(d) shaping the objective, particularly the labor, environment from the cultural point of view and establishing unity between the highest level of scientific and technological achievement and aesthetic perfection as the hallmarks of the products of the industry;

(e) shaping the social environment in urban development and communal construction generally according to the new socio-economic and cultural needs of the socialist way of life;

(f) purposefully furthering and guiding the arts on the lines of socialist realism, and popularizing the progressive legacy of all times and of all nations as part of sustained cultural development, according to the needs of our socialist society.

These are processes which, in the course of completing the building of socialism, have their effect on social consciousness, cultural standards and social attitudes of the working people, making productive activity for the community a need or acting as a spur to it.

Forecasts of our cultural development should therefore make it possible, in keeping with the actual relationship between labor, education, cultural standard and way of life, to specify in scientific terms the nature of the man of the rising socialist society and the pattern of his requirements.

Due to changes in the character of labor, the relationship between spiritual and physical activity also changes in favor of mental work. With many people this change is accompanied both by more intense mental processes and a more complete education.

The principal method of raising cultural standards appears to consist in combining professional specialized and general education, which is associated with the increased need to assert oneself in labor with all one's knowledge and ability. Wherever greater spiritual demands on labor are combined with a higher standard of general training and with the development of socialist relationships in the collective, this fosters personal participation in the most diverse phenomena of cultural life.

The sociological investigations I have mentioned and other studies of a similar nature in the chemical industry have shown that a necessarily rising standard of training in the natural sciences and in technology does not lead to a decline in aesthetic needs. While better training in these fields does not spontaneously give rise to higher and more extensive artistic requirements, it makes for a higher capacity to perceive complicated ideological and emotional

problems and spiritual values. This increased capacity is enhanced through ideological and ethical training. Hence the main reasons for elevating cultural standards should be sought in a special set of circumstances, namely, the utilization of science as a productive force, collective work on rationalizing production, personal participation in guiding the social processes, the growth of spiritual requirements, and steady work by the Party, trade unions and government bodies in the areas of education and cultural advancement.

The new place of the people in the production process under socialism does not lead to restriction of initiative, it requires a much greater use of their personal qualities. Responsibility of the individual for his work, and the new technology call to a much greater extent than ever for mental alertness, ability to make independent decisions, sense of duty, careful observation, sound responses, and so on. Use is made not only of habits of work and experience, but also of the moral, political and mental qualities of the individual. This is to say that under socialism the industrial worker must put in everything—his personal qualities, his education and his culture—at work and in planning, and managing industry.

There are a number of other factors. Production is being conducted on a scientific basis, and this means that the producer's knowledge and skill acquire a hitherto unknown dynamic quality. No worker can make do all his life with the education gained at school.

In socialist society the producer must evolve a new attitude to the objective changes in the nature of his work. He must understand these changes and strive all the time to improve his skill. He is bound to be assigned one-sided tasks and to experience certain elements of monotony. The important thing, however, is for him to realize the need for these stages and to have the will to undergo the necessary training if he is to help surmount difficulties. This requires readiness for joint planning and leadership of technological and economic progress. For in the course of *joint work* the individual can become master of the complex technological and economic processes.

This explains the new development in the way of life of the politically active industrial workers, namely, that they go in for *serious study*. In our society the attitude of the individual to education changes to the extent that he sees this not only as a social necessity but as something that he himself needs.

For the reasons enumerated here and for a number of others, the humanism of our life has become the source of new cultural requirements. Literary works showing how people react in solving particular problems of the social revolution in our country meet with a fairly wide response. This is an indication, not only of the new quality of our artistic effort, but of the importance citizens of our republic attach, from the standpoint of their own lives, to the problems posed by the arts. Ole Bien-

kopp in Strittmatter's novel of the same name, Hannes Ball in Neutsch's *The Trace of Stones* or Meternagel in Christa Wolf's *Divided Heaven*, or the characters in Kant's *The Conference Hall*, Knappe's *My Nameless Country*, Seghers' *The Strength of the Weak*, or Selbmann's *The Sons of Wolves* are not merely literary characters but interesting images of people building socialism in the GDR. They reveal the urge of the individual man in the making for greater control of the social forces with all their contradictions and conflicts. One of the new themes if our art is to show how this struggle moulds people, how the socialist community, in addition to furthering this struggle, "demands" outright that each takes part in it, and how far this provides the individual in socialist society with greater freedom. And while these new "aesthetic provinces" (Johannes Becher) are only just emerging and are far from having revealed themselves in full, the best works of this kind are already seen by our people as fitting testimonials to our socialist cultural life.

The educational and sociological survey I mentioned previously also showed that while there is basic harmony between personal and social interests, a combination of physical and mental labor requiring ever higher skills makes for satisfaction with one's work.

TABLE 2

Nature of Work	Sentiment about one's work (per cent)					
	Quite satisfied		Satisfied		Dissatisfied	
	a ¹	b ²	a ¹	b ²	a ¹	b ²
Overall results	63	56	32.6	42	4.4	2
1. Combination of physical and mental labor	69	55	28	45	3	0
2. Mainly physical labor using simple tools	53	50	38	48	9	2
3. Work on the assembly line	57	—	41	—	2	—
4. Work in transport and storage	65	—	30.5	—	4.5	—
5. Managerial work	73	—	25	—	2	—
6. Mainly control and supervision of instruments and appliances	—	58	—	39	—	3

a¹—metal-working industry.

b²—chemical industry.

The relatively widespread satisfaction with one's work should under no circumstances be identified with an uncritical attitude. The survey showed that demands for improving the production milieu are frequent. Listed according to importance they should be as follows:

- (1) Providing a proper working environment.
- (2) Scientific quality of technology.
- (3) Managerial activity.
- (4) Wages and bonuses.
- (5) Regulation of working time.

The fact that most suggestions concern a high-standard working environment reflects a certain harmony between the objective and subjective need for greater self-assertion on the job. Clearly the time is ripe for a work-place milieu and environment in keeping with standards expected under socialism. The foremost work teams show considerable initiative in this field. They strive to coordinate the plan for "technology" with the plan for "working conditions" and to shape the working environment with due regard to scientific knowledge as a component of all-round rationalization.

On the other hand, it was also proved that work-day relationships exert a very big influence on the emotional state of the workers. It appears that a cheerful mood at the work place is not merely a psychological quantity; it is largely determined by the man's self-assertion at work, by the general atmosphere of the working environment and by the ethical standard of management.

Socialist production needs workers who can think independently, workers with scientific training and who are keen to get things done. In other words, it needs all-round workers. This objective social necessity becomes a subjective requirement of the working people to the extent that the more important social prerequisites for the unity of the technological and the cultural revolutions are created methodically, through the cooperation of large sections of the working people.

To promote the technological revolution and socialist democracy, we need, first of all, to raise the educational standard of the working class and all other groups of the population. Thus the interplay of the technological and the cultural revolutions, as a fundamental process in completing the building of socialism, has become the focus of scientifically based ideological and political leadership in the cultural field.

Correlation between technological revolution and culture in West Germany

HORST KESSLER

THE TECHNOLOGICAL REVOLUTION and its realization in the interests of the working people also affects our national struggle against state-monopoly capital in West Germany. The ideologists of monopoly capital maintain that the improvement in living standards won by the working class is "proof" that the big social problems of the "industrial society" have been solved and that the irreconcilable contradictions between the working class and the bourgeoisie have disappeared. But the recent wage clashes and the renewed onslaught by the employers on living standards prove the contrary, that the contradictions between the ruling monopoly bourgeoisie and the working class have not disappeared, despite the modifications in exploitation.

The struggle is, of course, waged in different forms. It is linked with the demand for proper educational leisure and cultural facilities and the right to participate in industrial management. The trade unions, as the main champions of these demands, have to grapple with the basic contradictions in the sphere of education and culture, an outcrop of the class contradictions and seen more clearly owing to the technological revolution. State-monopoly capital's interference in cultural life is resulting in a specific form of relative impoverishment of the working people, which, in conditions of the technological revolution, is becoming a crucial socio-political problem.

The technological revolution has created new possibilities for cultural communication besides television and radio: modern methods of book production and production of gramophone records, mechanization and automation in book distribution and storage, thus providing new means for satisfying some of the cultural needs of the people. However, since these means are an integral part of the political re-

gime in the Federal Republic, they cannot be put to the best use.

The need to raise the educational level, made essential by the revolution in technology, is at variance with reality in West Germany. Although science and technology have made it possible to bring the cultural treasures of civilization within reach of all, this is offset by the relatively growing cultural impoverishment of the working people. The big monopolies in the "culture industry" are interested in maximum profit by catering to needs they have fashioned. Hence a certain standardization in cultural interests. Take literature, for example.

The findings of West German sociologists provide the following picture: the so-called serious literature, meaning the works of all times and all countries, from Goethe to Aragon, from Shakespeare to Sholokhov and also the new West German literature from Boell to Grass, attracts a bare 6.7 per cent of the reading public. The remainder, approximately 93 per cent, have no idea what belles-lettres is. Their reading matter is the pulp books and journals which in numbers of titles and editions exceed all others.

In view of this, the fight for cultural reforms and against the reactionary influence exerted on public opinion and the propagation of anti-humanist ideas becomes an important part of the social and political struggle of the working class.

* * *

Both as regards the content and the form of the trade union struggle, socio-political and cultural demands are being considered more and more in their practical context. What is more, in the economic competition and political struggle between socialism and capitalism more importance is attached to the question as to which of the two social systems will be

able not only to carry out more effectively the technological revolution in the economic and social spheres, but also to resolve the cultural problems associated with it in the interests of the working people.

This point is being widely debated in West Germany. In the series, *Models of a New World*, Robert Jungk and Hans-Joseph Mundt show how different scientists picture the future. Despite the different viewpoints and concepts expressed, they all want a democratization of existing conditions and the preservation of peace.

The views expressed in the said works take as their premise peaceful coexistence. Thus, the publisher Hans-Joseph Mundt writes: "All efforts made after August 6, 1945, towards establishing the future forms of human coexistence are an act of pure self-preservation. Ever since the atom bomb was dropped on Hiroshima . . . the possibility of war can no longer enter into the calculations in the interplay of forces."

The obvious dissatisfaction with the status quo in social relations has prompted the idea of the models for social reform. Reconciliation with reality in the sense of the apologetic slogan "no experiments" is clearly rejected. Most of the authors see the future as a general democratization of the social structure on the basis of an "ideal" capitalism. They consider that the vast technological possibilities of the second half of the 20th century should be used for the good of man, and not against him. Thus, present concepts are objectively working against state-monopoly capital in the Federal Republic.

In itself, the ideological attitude determining these models of the new world is, undoubtedly, a conflicting one. But it is the search for a democratic alternative to the imperialist regime, for a world with different social relations, that determines the main orientation. True, one cannot overlook the fact that the approach is a distorted and unrealistic one when it comes to the practical issues under socialism. In the final analysis, however, the search for a "third way" is prompted by an assessment of the balance of world forces which fails to take fully into account the conditions of reality.

The draft plans leave out of account capitalist production relations and proceed from the assumption that the technological revolution will automatically change the social structure of modern capitalism, and that it is possible to solve social and cultural problems merely through research, planning and the management of social processes. Consequently, in most cases the authors say nothing about militant actions against the existing political system. Theirs is an abstract humanist concept. But it is bound to remain an utopia or, seeing that it lacks any humanist content, partly to integrate with the state monopoly regime and its machinery of power. They are afraid, as yet, of reaching political agreement with the social

forces capable of effecting real changes through the class struggle for a genuinely democratic alternative. Their concepts as such do not give sufficient impetus to the development of the democratic forces. In other words, the "thinking for the people" would have to be reinforced by cooperation with the working-class forces who can secure a democratic alternative in West Germany.

Still standing in the way to the realization of these drafts, which promote the interests of the working class, are the purely theoretical schemes which reject the need to "put these drafts into practice." (Robert Jungk, *Models of a New World*.)

* * *

The idea of reforms and planning in culture has captured the minds not only of progressive bourgeois-democratic circles. The reactionaries, too, are beginning to cultivate their idea of planning in the cultural sphere.

One of the main arguments of the opponents of socialism was against planning and guiding the cultural processes. Lately, however, the slogan of the apologists of state-monopoly capital, "planning violates and undermines human freedom," has been relegated to the background also in the cultural sphere. The technological revolution makes it essential still under capitalism to regulate cultural processes to a certain extent. That is why even some of the ideologists of monopoly capital are taking issue with the pessimistic trend in bourgeois philosophy which regards technological advance as the prime cause for the decline of culture. Prominent today are views that predict the "automation-conditioned cultural advance" and groundlessly equate technological and social progress.

These theoretical concepts are supplemented with appeals to develop a constructive "cultural policy for the industrial age" and to plan the spiritual-cultural processes in the interests of the monopoly bourgeoisie.

What has brought about this change in thinking?

Firstly, the attempts made by some imperialist spokesmen to deny the revolutionary character of the technological advance have come to nought. The significance of its social and cultural consequences are too apparent to be minimized.

Various factors compel the men of West German finance capital to go over, in the interests of the monopolies and of preserving the balance of forces advantageous to them, to long-term planning of the spiritual and cultural process and using it as a means of state-monopoly regulation. Among the most important of these factors are: utilization of science as a direct productive force and consequently as a prime means of obtaining maximum profits and of retaining competitive capacity; the growing demand for clerical workers, technicians and skilled factory workers, and also for skilled personnel in the services, in the administration and in public institutions in various spheres;

the great importance attached to the mass media, specifically the cinema, television, the glossy magazines and periodicals and, especially, utilization of works of art to influence the people spiritually.

These processes have acquired such scope and significance for monopoly capital that objectively they require state regulation, especially when moulding public opinion.

If it is to adapt itself to the new conditions and if it is to retain its power the imperialist state has no choice but to elaborate a concept of scientific development, a system of higher and public education and also of ideological warfare against the people and all the democratic forces.

Secondly, the men of the monopolies realize that although state-monopoly capital has been able to resolve some of the economic problems of the technological revolution, the same cannot be said as regards its cultural problems. Taking into account the existence of the socialist camp and the growing struggle of the democratic forces, the rulers can no longer afford to ignore the cultural demands of the people. The technological revolution helps to transform the movement of the working class for cultural reforms into an integral part of their political and social struggle.

As a result of automation and the growing need to maneuver with labor power, a comprehensive education is vital to stabilizing the social status of the individual. Today the reproduction of labor power implies both the need constantly to raise the educational level of factory and office workers and the growing demand, owing to increased physical and nervous strain, for more and better organized leisure, holidays, etc.

Thirdly, the theory of cultural pessimism and the cultural crisis proved ineffective to counteract the progressive forces.

More to the liking of the monopolies are those trends in bourgeois philosophy seemingly capable of sustaining the kind of "public consciousness" required by the Christian Democratic Union's concept of "established society," i.e., of passing off the class interests of finance capital as a matter of "public consciousness."

If we examine the situation from this aspect we see that certain trends in the contemporary bourgeois theory of society and culture have for some years now been concerned with elaborating a kind of optimistic view of the future. However, their demand that cultural processes should be planned, signifies, in the final analysis, a still more subtle manipulation of the individual in the process of reproduction, in public life and also in his leisure time; it signifies his complete involvement in the state and economic system of monopoly capital.

This circumstance merits the special attention of democratic and humanist scientists, for the ruling circles will not miss the opportunity to use every scientific achievement in their own interests and against the working people.

Unlike socialist planning and regulation of cultural processes the characteristic thing about state-monopoly planning is its anti-democratism. To this day the working people of West Germany, and specifically the working class, are barred from having a say in decision-making, for example, in respect to the organization of the educational system, and particularly its form and content.

The CDU program on the "established society" is a striking example of how planning in some spheres of society, including planning in research and education, contains, even in the initial stage, the concept of "unification" and "formalization" of all working-class organizations and aims ultimately to abolish all democratic rights. The underlying idea of Erhard's "established society" is that all groups and interests in this society should be subordinate to the "general public aims," i.e., to the aggressive aims of West German imperialism.

Wolfgang Abendroth, one of the authors of *Models of a New World*, aptly described the character of capitalist planning as follows: "Planning is done not in the interests of the whole of society, or for some 'common good' . . . but exclusively in the interests of expanding the power of closely associated employers' groups of organized capital, and, consequently, in the interests of profit making . . ."

As we see, state monopoly planning and its influence on culture are essentially spearheaded against the genuine cultural interests of the working people. It wants forcibly to combine the "two cultures," bourgeois and proletarian, into one, to serve imperialism, in other words, to take the working people under its spiritual tutelage.

The trend towards concentration in publishing, in television and in the film industry is indicative of state-monopoly regulation in culture. Concerns like Bertelsmann-Guetersloh have a monopoly of many branches of the cultural industry. Consequently, the mass production of books, pop records and films is geared to yield maximum profits and to shape the public mind.

When the mind has long been doctored with anti-communism, the cultural industry finds itself meeting the cultural and spiritual needs conditioned by the imperialist ideology. To this should be added the so-called public opinion, meaning the state doctrine of anti-communism and revanchism in all its clerical, philosophical and literary variants.

Thus, as a consequence of demand and supply, of deformed and standardized "cultural" needs, and the manipulation of taste, a kind of ideological vicious circle has taken shape which most of West Germany's citizens find hard to see through let alone break through.

A new situation has arisen also in the balance of forces in the cultural field. The cultural machinery of the state no longer reigns supreme; similar instruments of power are now in private hands. In other words, the cooperation between the monopolies and the state in

the economic and political spheres is now extended to the cultural sphere.

Taking into account these trends, the working class and its allies can counteract the state monopoly regulation of culture only by stepping up the fight for cultural reforms, for trade union participation in cultural planning.

* * *

The fight for democracy and for participation in the management of cultural affairs is right in the center of the conflict with the monopolies. This conflict is not confined to winning new educational opportunities. It is a question of restricting the dominant positions of the monopolies in culture and of the reactionary forces in the machinery of state and in the various public institutions. There are numerous institutions in West Germany presently in the hands of the monopolies but which, according to their original statutes, could quite easily be used to ensure the democratic interests of the working people. By acting jointly with the progressive intelligentsia, the trade unions would be able to offset the cultural concepts designed to justify monopoly rule with their own concepts which meet the working people's demand for a progressive science, education and culture. What is more, the West German trade unions have the necessary material means to counteract the cheap and trivial output of the culture industry, and through their own publishing houses to make progressive literature and art accessible to the working class, to make democratic writers and artists less dependent on the monopolies by placing orders with them and by encouraging them in every way.

The development of a democratic and socialist culture in the GDR acts as a stimulus to the struggle for progressive culture in West Germany.

In the conditions of the technological revolution the matter of the cultural pursuits of the working class and the working people generally is no longer just a matter of "Sunday," or free time and leisure. It is a vitally important issue for the working people and one which must be tackled right now.

In the circumstances an alliance between the working class and the intelligentsia acquires decisive importance not only in the sphere of economics and science but also in institutions moulding public opinion, for the number of intellectuals working in these places is growing.

To retain their monopoly over the public mind, the government and also the concerns operating in the cultural sphere are forced to use the services of growing numbers of working-class intellectuals whose objective interests are at variance with those of their job-givers. This is state-monopoly capital's tender spot. The growing political consciousness of the intellectuals and their closer contact with the working class can help considerably to resolve the issue whether the working class of West Germany will be able to restrict the omnipotence of political capital in the cultural sphere.

Progressive intellectuals realize that the pressing task is systematically to expose the manipulation of the mind, a manipulation designed to enslave the individual spiritually. Here is the journal *Kuerbiskern* apropos of this: "The intelligentsia should purposefully support the trade unions, primarily in the form of political and social investigations from which concrete conclusions could be deduced. At the same time, it would be advisable systematically to investigate certain spheres of the trivial, commonplace culture supplied through the mass media which would give an idea of how the leisure of the working people is organized in capitalist conditions.

"... The market of 'best-sellers,' of cheap films and literature should be examined from the standpoint of its socio-political impact and the findings made known to all public organizations. The 'democratic stiltification of thinking' should not only be laid bare to the core, but exposed as an intolerable loss of humanness, a loss which is entered in the balance sheets of the concerns as profits. This, too, should be brought home to the interested organizations."

In conditions when the transition to state-monopoly capital has been completed it is necessary, more than ever before, to fight to curb the power of the state and the monopolies. The contradictions engendered by the development of state-monopoly capital create favorable conditions also for waging a consistent struggle for cultural reforms.

The fight of the revolutionary forces in West Germany would gain fresh momentum were the working class to advance, as they have done in the political and economic spheres, a comprehensive democratic cultural program, a program spearheaded against the harmful culture of the ruling class.

Sociology and social reality

(Notes on the Sixth World Sociology Congress)

THE SIXTH WORLD Sociology Congress, held in France last September, was in a dual sense an event of considerable interest to the international working class movement. In the first place the revolutionary changes now taking place would be inconceivable without progress made in the social sciences, without the keen interest displayed by the progressive forces everywhere in this important branch of knowledge. Moreover sociology has developed techniques and methods of investigating social phenomena which are of immense practical value particularly for the socialist countries: mathematical modelling of social processes, statistical estimate of various social parameters — the dynamics of employment, of working time and leisure, growth of the general educational level, correlation of supply and demand in trade, etc.

Secondly, the Congress was in a way a contest between the sociological views of the two worlds — of capitalism and socialism. In order to win this contest with the capitalist world it is essential to know thoroughly the arguments of its theoreticians and to counter these with our Marxist theory. This is one aspect of the fight to win the intellectuals to the side of the working class.

The debate highlighted significant aspects of the state of affairs in the sphere of ideology. Noteworthy was the tendency toward a certain shift to the left on the part of a sizeable number of the non-Marxist intellectuals, who are becoming increasingly aware of the threat to civilization presented by contemporary imperialism. The exchange of views at the Congress was therefore something in the nature of a fight for the minds and hearts of those non-Marxist intellectuals who, critical of capitalism, are earnestly searching for objective truth.

At the same time one sensed a definite ideological confusion among the more serious-minded sociologists who are no longer content to act as unthinking apologists of capitalism and who seem anxious to draw the right conclusions from the social reality of our time. This is expressed chiefly in the absence of any integral sociological concept, in a tendency towards eclectic reformist thinking of a frankly

utopian and semi-utopian kind, in attempts to confine sociology to narrow, specialized, purely professional research divorced from a study of the general course of social progress.

Discerning deep-going antagonisms in capitalism, these sociologists, by virtue of their class and historically determined limitations, do not accept the Marxist view of how these antagonisms can be resolved and seek to disprove it and, in doing so fall into the traps laid for them by the anti-Marxists.

These complex and contradictory features of the modern bourgeois sociology, its inherent weaknesses and at the same time its claims to scientific objectivity were epitomized in the thesis on what is described as "de-ideologization" of sociology. The thesis itself reflected a reluctant recognition of defeat in the ideological contest with Marxism, the utopian hopes cherished by men who really believe that their thinking is not influenced by the monopoly "thought factories" serving the Pentagon, and the noisy charges levelled against Marxism that it is not scientific because it is "steeped" in ideology.

The sociologists from the socialist countries, who were to the fore at this congress compared with previous world forums of this kind, subjected these views to well-grounded criticism. Incidentally, the role played by the Marxist scholars from the socialist countries was acknowledged by most delegates as a feature of the Congress.

In our time even the most hardened supporters of capitalism fall back on science in view of the futility of relying solely on the blind forces of the market and on the ability of the strong man to hack his way to success in the conditions of free enterprise.

The Congress worked in two sections which examined two main groups of problems: unity and diversity in sociology and the sociology of international relations. Most of the current problems of sociology came under these two headings. A wide range of other problems was discussed at the plenary meetings, working groups, section meetings, in committee, etc.

The agenda contained items such as comparison of features of social life in the various

countries, mass culture and its significance, the fight for peace and peaceful coexistence, mathematical models of social processes, the sociology of scientific cognition, modern man, the sociology of religion, of the family, social mobility in society, the sociology of medicine, of politics, etc.

The sociological and ideological aspects of the scientific and technological revolution were discussed in less detail, perhaps because more attention will be devoted to these questions at future sociology congresses. Next year, for example, a special congress on industrial sociology is planned.

Although the proceedings generally speaking took place in an atmosphere of scientific debate, with the occasional anti-Communist sallies meeting, by common accord, a fitting rebuff, echoes of the old ideological arguments of the cold war were heard, and also some arguments that had little in common with science; the latter, it should be said, were condemned by the majority of the participants.

For example, an American delegate argued that social conflicts are, by virtue of their nature, unknowable, because it is impossible, so the argument ran, to establish their true cause and origin and to ascertain who is responsible for them. This abstract reasoning was then applied to the war in Vietnam, where the American military are committing a crime against humanity. This argument, however, was strongly criticized and rejected by most of the members of the working group in which it was raised. Moreover a substantial section of the Congress went on record condemning U.S. aggression against the people of Vietnam.

In view of the role played nowadays by the modelling of social processes (modelling is becoming a universal method of scientific study both in the natural sciences and in the social sciences), a special working group studied this problem. On the whole its work was fruitful and the exchange of views on concrete questions associated with the technology of social research and the structure of social models was undoubtedly useful. However, here too one heard the hoary cold war argument that under socialism modelling in sociology is impossible in view of the voluntarist type of solution in the socialist countries, a solution which does not permit of mathematical analysis. The Marxists countered these erroneous interpretations of the nature of socialism with facts showing that the economic reforms in the socialist countries are aimed at the most effective and scientific utilization of the laws of planned development. On the contrary, it is precisely where the blind forces of the market dominate that all kinds of cataclysms can occur which cannot be assessed with any degree of accuracy even with the help of the very latest computers and methods of theoretical probability.

On the whole it can be said that the conditions for the application of models and precise qualitative calculations are far more favorable

in a socialist society where the calculations can be conducted on the scale of the entire system, on a state and even inter-state scale. In the conditions of capitalism any scientific prognostication is liable to be a voice in the wilderness, for so long as capitalism exists no one can force on the monopolies a prognosis that is not to their liking.

IDEOLOGY AND SOCIOLOGY

If in the matter of concrete experimental or mathematical research the techniques used by non-Marxist and Marxist sociologists may coincide, the general theory of sociology, of course, remains a class one, and it cannot but be influenced by the ideology of one or another class, cannot but serve its interests.

To claim the opposite is either sheer utopianism or downright hypocrisy. The inter-relation between sociology as a social science and ideology as a theoretical expression of class interests is an objective fact.

One of the main issues at the Congress was that of the relationship of ideology to sociology, the influence of ideology on sociology, the relationships of the various sociological concepts and schools in countries with differing social structures.

A sociologist can recognize the link, minimize or even deny it, but it exists. Marxists readily grant the linkage and place their sociological studies in the service of the working class. Sociology achieves results in socialist society precisely because it is a component, an element of the overall concept of Marxist-Leninist science.

In their papers and during the debate, Marxist sociologists made the point that dependence of sociology on ideology does not make sociology unscientific. Everything depends on the particular ideology guiding the sociology. If the former is scientific, as in the case of working-class ideology, then the sociology, too, will be scientific.

For years bourgeois theoreticians have been doing their best to confuse the matter of the scientific nature of Marxist-Leninist ideology, alleging that Marxism, being a class ideology is *ipso facto* unscientific. The point is that it is precisely the class — the working-class — basis of Marxism-Leninism that makes it scientific.

The scientific nature and class content of Marxism-Leninism are thus closely integrated. Both stem from the historical fact that the proletariat is a class free from class limitations and class egoism. Being the exponent of historical necessity, the working class seeks to perceive objective truth as profoundly as possible, without laying claim to having found the absolute, ultimate truth, but probing deeper and deeper into objective truths relative to the given historical conditions.

Profound cognition of the social reality is essential to the working class for its struggle and its constructive endeavor, for the aim of

the working class is neither to destroy the productive forces or culture nor physically to annihilate its class adversaries. Only one destructive element enters into its revolutionary constructive activity — it abolishes the social relations based on exploitation the inhumanity of which was demonstrated by progressive thinkers long before the advent of Marxism.

Having assimilated all that is best of civilization and having substantiated the materialist conception of history, Marxism serves human progress precisely as the science and the class ideology of the vanguard of progress — the working class. In the course of the Congress scientists from the socialist countries subjected to thoroughly grounded criticism the "de-ideologization" of the social sciences.

During the final plenary session Raymond Aron argued that sociology should be neither an empirical nor an ideological science, should not be bureaucratic. Had this been simply a criticism of empiricism on the one hand and of speculation on the other, the Aron thesis would of course have had a rational element. But implying as it did a call to divorce sociology from ideology, it merely confused the issue.

This would seem to be a case of reluctance to see that social research and sociological prescriptions carry real weight only when they are linked with society and serve definite social institutions. This of course does not mean that the moment he descends from his ivory tower the sociologist loses his objectivity and sees the world in a distorted light. Here much depends on his personal integrity as a scientist, on his courage and selflessness.

Marx, as we know, castigated sociologists who, for careerist considerations, distorted the true state of affairs. Referring to Malthus he wrote: "... a man who seeks to *adapt* science to a viewpoint derived not from science itself (however much the latter might err) but from *without*, to a viewpoint dictated by interests alien, extrinsic to science — such a man I call 'despicable'."

The Sixth World Sociology Congress showed that sociological research, provided it is conducted by progressive people, can be most useful in the matter of safeguarding peace and promoting the advance of civilization.

I. NIVINS

The Guinean experience and progressive development in Africa

SIKHE CAMARA

FOR THREE LONG centuries Africa was ruthlessly trampled underfoot, humiliated and degraded; it tasted the bitter experience of slavery which carried off two hundred millions of its sons. This terrible period, which left its imprint on the continent, was followed by another, the period of brutal colonization ushered in by the General Act of the notorious Berlin conference. Under this Act Africa was divided, like booty, between different states whose only "right" to the continent was their power and capital, and who shamelessly claimed that theirs was a "spiritual mission."

Our fathers and also our generation became the victims of a well organized system of human degradation. It was only fear of a sudden explosion of anger and collapse of the entire system that impelled the colonialists, under powerful pressure, gradually to loosen their stranglehold on the colonies. But they did this in such a way as to preserve in a number of cases the stability of the colonial system they had established and the inviolability of their selfish interests.

For Africa and its people the road to Calvary continued. The men who over the years had organized the resettlement of its peoples, destroyed its social structure, occupied its territory, who, in a word, systematically despoiled the continent, have not changed. Resorting to more veiled forms, acting more subtly, and therefore all the more dangerous, they repeat or try to repeat the things done in the past. This new system of indirect domination, which is more effective and more in keeping with the period of de-colonialization, is known as neo-colonialism.

The neo-colonialist does not resemble the master of the past; but he is still all-powerful, is still the owner of capital which he wants to preserve and augment. It is hard to believe that he could become a loyal partner wholly

absorbed in "spiritual activity." He knows that his capital is a most effective weapon, one that can often destroy a man's will and conscience, his honor and dignity, and pave the way to the loathsome and egotistical domination of capital.

Foreign rule, irrespective of its nature or when established, irrespective of whether direct or indirect, always followed one basic pattern: to poison the minds of people, blunt their conscience and will, erode everything human in them, destroy their active forces and render them incapable of safeguarding their freedom and dignity.

Any domination of one people by another brings with it imbalance in the social relations between master and slave, for might takes the place of right, and the civilization of the colonial power, its religion and system of education are imposed in every form, sometimes even by force, the purpose being to shape the psychology and way of thinking of the subjugated people in the colonialist image.

Books, the school and the Church, ethics and even philosophy, the press and the radio — all are in the service of the machinery of state of the ruling country for the purpose of justifying its domination, of proving that its culture is the highest of all, while the culture and traditions of the oppressed people, even where acknowledged, are not viable.

The effects of this propaganda will disappear — and even then not immediately — only after the oppressed peoples have paid the price of misery, prison, blood and death for their political sovereignty, only after they have achieved economic independence, after their psychology has changed as a result of tireless and painstaking work.

Even when a country has gained independence, whether through the peaceful transfer of power or after a violent struggle, this problem still remains, for the colonialists never leave a country of their own free will, despite all the talk about the past having been a "period of historical fraternal cooperation" —

*The author of this article, a member of the Democratic Party of Guinea, is presently Ambassador of the Republic of Guinea to the USSR.

and that in the future relations will be in the nature of a "community" or "an association of language" where the main role will be played, needless to say, by the language of the former or present colonial power.

Having won political freedom it is then necessary to mobilize all our forces to combat this evil, this poison whose pernicious effect is all too evident. The task now is to found African nations on economic and social structures elaborated, adopted and built by us, in the interests of our peoples whom, since they have entrusted their fate to us, we serve loyally; we must find effective means for abolishing economic and military domination and overcoming the dangerous consequences and survivals of the colonial era in the sphere of education and in the consciousness of people.

There are two very different ways of doing this.

The first is to replace the former colonial administration with local leaders, to accept readymade decrees on independence, a flag and a national anthem, to continue to celebrate as before the national holidays of the former colonial power and other anniversaries when we had to laud the empire, colonization and the French Union. In short, everything remains the same actually — the regime and the political structure based on the ideology of the bourgeois revolution of 1789, on the ideology of the "liberal" European nations of the 19th century. What it amounts to is the mechanical transfer of the political traditions of our former masters onto our soil, to a purely formal system of democratic institutions, and all that is needed in the circumstances is that the semblance of legal representation of the people and of public freedom be ensured. The only innovation in Africa has been the establishment in some countries of the one-party system, secured by decree or law, by the constitution or even by party congress decision. However, the experience of the neo-colonial regimes has shown that this kind of decision, made, as often as not, arbitrarily, does not enjoy the support of the people.

Naturally, in the economic sphere, too, everything remains the same; the only thing that changes is the color of the bourgeoisie: it changes from white to black, it becomes even more insolent and brazen, more demanding and inhuman. The main features of this structures are: exploitation, sovereignty for a chosen few and not for the people, profit rule, subordination of the interests of the nation to a handful of individuals, monstrous inequality between citizens, in other words, dictatorship of the individual or oligarchy in power.

In order to ensure its existence this regime has to conclude military agreements with the former colonial power, thus enabling it to preserve its domination, has to allow the use of its territory for military bases which, if need be, would protect the said regime, to encourage and certainly not prevent infiltration by foreign capital and an alien ideology whose task is to

blunt the conscience and the will of the population who have been deprived of their national culture since the entire educational system in the schools and universities is patterned exclusively on the principles established by the former colonialists.

The neo-colonialist governments have to observe the conditions dictated by the ex-colonialists if they want to receive the subsidies doled out to them and which are designed to keep the venal ruling groups in tow. Furthermore, the ex-colonialists can always, if they choose, replace one ruling clique by other, more loyal and more corrupt, groups.

This path which rejects the struggle, the need to tackle difficulties, is the easiest and, at the same time, the most profitable one as far as the selfish personal interests of the new African bourgeoisie are concerned. But this easy way, while it might suit those who have lost all sense of dignity and honor, is not acceptable to those who have dedicated themselves to the service of society.

The second path is the natural continuation of yesterday's struggle, of resistance to the abuses of colonialism and is the direct outcome of the victory of the people. This path opens wide vistas for economic and social reforms in the newly free countries where the ideas of social revolution integrate with uncompromising struggle in defense of the homeland.

* * *

The national and social revolution is a reality in the Republic of Guinea for, unlike many other countries where political independence is purely formal (and this is true even of some of those countries which profess "African socialism"), Guinea pursues an uncompromising anti-imperialist and anti-colonial policy.

In 1958 Guinea refused to adhere to the French community and became an independent republic. It also refused to join the satellite organizations which are African in form only, their prime function being to preserve the domination and prestige of France and also of international capital in Africa. The Republic of Guinea, which unswervingly follows a policy of non-alignment, is a passionate champion of anti-imperialist African unity.

Those who seem surprised at the Government's bold policy and who are concerned about the Republic's future should remember that its political system is wholly and entirely a democratic one. The strength of our people lies in their unity around the Democratic Party of Guinea (DPG) which includes, owing to historical conditions and as a result of the fight for national liberation, different sections of the working people of town and country: peasants, handicraftsmen, factory and office workers, small businessmen, merchants and intellectuals. In his book *The Guinean Experience and African Unity*, President Sekou Toure writes: "From the very moment the Democratic Party was founded, our wish was that it should not resemble the political parties in the European

sense. Our party remained a broad movement for the liberation of Africa, whose mission it is to unite all Africans of good will around an anti-colonial and progressive platform. Thus plantation owners, merchants, chiefs and their subordinates, men and women, Muslims, Catholics, Protestants and those 'without religion can find a place in the party provided they accept its program."

In due course the structure of the Party was evolved. It continues, in the conditions of freedom, to be a broad national front uniting large masses of anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist citizens. A whole generation of courageous and admirable people have grown up in its ranks.

The DPG is a mass party. It is the fighting weapon of the people, and as such must be incisive, sharp and effective. Not a single one of its members can boast of enjoying any privileges, excepting the privilege of sharing the duties and responsibility that go with membership. It is this that ensures for the Party its leading role.

In all its activity the DPG is guided by the principles of democratic centralism. Its top officials are elected democratically and by direct vote. The program of the Party, i.e., all important affairs concerning the country and the people, are likewise discussed democratically. Besides these fundamental principles underlying the internal organization of the Party and enhancing its authority, mention should also be made of such factors as discipline which is voluntarily accepted by the rank and file and leaders alike, respect for criticism and self-criticism, and the indisputable authority enjoyed by the national leadership.

The atmosphere of people's "dictatorship" established by the people themselves, unfetters the thoughts and energy of the individual and completely wins him over to the new regime. It is this that makes possible the true emancipation of the individual and the people generally, i.e., the intellectual and spiritual rebirth of factory worker and office employee, trade union functionary and intellectual, peasant, women and youth. This, in turn, multiplies their strength and the possibility to serve the new society.

After state independence had been won the Party and the Government took a series of measures to lay the foundation for an independent economy. These included a state monopoly of foreign trade, creation of an independent monetary system and national bank, nationalization of the electric power and transport companies, of real estate societies, foreign banks, insurance companies, diamond mine corporations and the property of concessionaires in the goldfields.

In the sphere of agriculture cooperation was organized and encouraged in every way in keeping with the resolutions of the Sixth Congress of the Democratic Party held in 1962. Other measures in this sphere included establishment of state-owned farms, nursery gardens and special centers to modernize agriculture.

The economic measures of 1962 and 1963, which made for a certain liberalization in trade and were designed to improve supplies and meet the needs of the urban and rural population, engendered a profit-greedy and reactionary commercial bourgeoisie which sought to deprive the people of their freedom, their rights and the political power lawfully instituted by them. This "new class"* began to speculate in goods and foodstuffs, to build sumptuous mansions for themselves and, ultimately, encouraged by their apparent success, tried to take possession of Party and state bodies. This was more than the people could tolerate. The popular reaction to these elements expressed itself in the 12-point program of reforms adopted on November 8, 1964. This was followed by a series of decrees which likewise reflected the sentiment of the people.

The new decrees declared currency speculation and black marketing in goods illegal and punishable by law. They proclaimed the formation of one national and several regional commissions to investigate how merchants, politicians and government officials had acquired their property after September 28, 1958. These commissions were empowered to confiscate movable and immovable property in favor of the nation if the said property was acquired unlawfully. The decrees also prohibited the sale of goods outside the stipulated areas. Racism, tribal enmity and subversion were declared punishable by law.

The decrees spoke of a trade reform, of the restoration of the state monopoly of foreign trade and of restricting the number of private merchants. They specified that the latter would have to give guarantees of their solvency, their professional ability and moral integrity.

Housing regulations and control on rents were introduced. Persons granted loans for building houses were obliged to move into them; they were not allowed to use them as a source of profit-making. Members of the government and administration were prohibited from engaging in any activity that brought with it an additional income.

Reforms were introduced also in the Party. In particular, branches were formed in enterprises and in offices. Furthermore, it was decided strictly to limit membership.

These measures were aimed at remedying the situation in all spheres of life, penalizing the enemies of the nation and making it possible for every honest citizen to occupy his rightful place.

It soon became clear that the struggle would be waged along a wide front since it was a question of a frontal attack on the selfish and anti-national interests of certain people accustomed to "getting rich" quickly, and who openly connived with the imperialists against the interests of national security. Hence, when the law of November 8, 1964 went into effect the

*It would be more correct to call them bourgeois elements since they are small in number and have no future.

and that in the future relations will be in the nature of a "community" or "an association of language" where the main role will be played, needless to say, by the language of the former or present colonial power.

Having won political freedom it is then necessary to mobilize all our forces to combat this evil, this poison whose pernicious effect is all too evident. The task now is to found African nations on economic and social structures elaborated, adopted and built by us, in the interests of our peoples whom, since they have entrusted their fate to us, we serve loyally; we must find effective means for abolishing economic and military domination and overcoming the dangerous consequences and survivals of the colonial era in the sphere of education and in the consciousness of people.

There are two very different ways of doing this.

The first is to replace the former colonial administration with local leaders, to accept readymade decrees on independence, a flag and a national anthem, to continue to celebrate as before the national holidays of the former colonial power and other anniversaries when we had to laud the empire, colonization and the French Union. In short, everything remains the same actually — the regime and the political structure based on the ideology of the bourgeois revolution of 1789, on the ideology of the "liberal" European nations of the 19th century. What it amounts to is the mechanical transfer of the political traditions of our former masters onto our soil, to a purely formal system of democratic institutions, and all that is needed in the circumstances is that the semblance of legal representation of the people and of public freedom be ensured. The only innovation in Africa has been the establishment in some countries of the one-party system, secured by decree or law, by the constitution or even by party congress decision. However, the experience of the neo-colonial regimes has shown that this kind of decision, made, as often as not, arbitrarily, does not enjoy the support of the people.

Naturally, in the economic sphere, too, everything remains the same; the only thing that changes is the color of the bourgeoisie: it changes from white to black, it becomes even more insolent and brazen, more demanding and inhuman. The main features of this structures are: exploitation, sovereignty for a chosen few and not for the people, profit rule, subordination of the interests of the nation to a handful of individuals, monstrous inequality between citizens, in other words, dictatorship of the individual or oligarchy in power.

In order to ensure its existence this regime has to conclude military agreements with the former colonial power, thus enabling it to preserve its domination, has to allow the use of its territory for military bases which, if need be, would protect the said regime, to encourage and certainly not prevent infiltration by foreign capital and an alien ideology whose task is to

blunt the conscience and the will of the population who have been deprived of their national culture since the entire educational system in the schools and universities is patterned exclusively on the principles established by the former colonialists.

The neo-colonialist governments have to observe the conditions dictated by the ex-colonialists if they want to receive the subsidies doled out to them and which are designed to keep the venal ruling groups in tow. Furthermore, the ex-colonialists can always, if they choose, replace one ruling clique by other, more loyal and more corrupt, groups.

This path which rejects the struggle, the need to tackle difficulties, is the easiest and, at the same time, the most profitable one as far as the selfish personal interests of the new African bourgeoisie are concerned. But this easy way, while it might suit those who have lost all sense of dignity and honor, is not acceptable to those who have dedicated themselves to the service of society.

The second path is the natural continuation of yesterday's struggle, of resistance to the abuses of colonialism and is the direct outcome of the victory of the people. This path opens wide vistas for economic and social reforms in the newly free countries where the ideas of social revolution integrate with uncompromising struggle in defense of the homeland.

* * *

The national and social revolution is a reality in the Republic of Guinea for, unlike many other countries where political independence is purely formal (and this is true even of some of those countries which profess "African socialism"), Guinea pursues an uncompromising anti-imperialist and anti-colonial policy.

In 1958 Guinea refused to adhere to the French community and became an independent republic. It also refused to join the satellite organizations which are African in form only, their prime function being to preserve the domination and prestige of France and also of international capital in Africa. The Republic of Guinea, which unswervingly follows a policy of non-alignment, is a passionate champion of anti-imperialist African unity.

Those who seem surprised at the Government's bold policy and who are concerned about the Republic's future should remember that its political system is wholly and entirely a democratic one. The strength of our people lies in their unity around the Democratic Party of Guinea (DPG) which includes, owing to historical conditions and as a result of the fight for national liberation, different sections of the working people of town and country: peasants, handicraftsmen, factory and office workers, small businessmen, merchants and intellectuals. In his book *The Guinean Experience and African Unity*, President Sekou Toure writes: "From the very moment the Democratic Party was founded, our wish was that it should not resemble the political parties in the European

sense. Our party remained a broad movement for the liberation of Africa, whose mission it is to unite all Africans of good will around an anti-colonial and progressive platform. Thus plantation owners, merchants, chiefs and their subordinates, men and women, Muslims, Catholics, Protestants and those 'without religion can find a place in the party provided they accept its program."

In due course the structure of the Party was evolved. It continues, in the conditions of freedom, to be a broad national front uniting large masses of anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist citizens. A whole generation of courageous and admirable people have grown up in its ranks.

The DPG is a mass party. It is the fighting weapon of the people, and as such must be incisive, sharp and effective. Not a single one of its members can boast of enjoying any privileges, excepting the privilege of sharing the duties and responsibility that go with membership. It is this that ensures for the Party its leading role.

In all its activity the DPG is guided by the principles of democratic centralism. Its top officials are elected democratically and by direct vote. The program of the Party, i.e., all important affairs concerning the country and the people, are likewise discussed democratically. Besides these fundamental principles underlying the internal organization of the Party and enhancing its authority, mention should also be made of such factors as discipline which is voluntarily accepted by the rank and file and leaders alike, respect for criticism and self-criticism, and the indisputable authority enjoyed by the national leadership.

The atmosphere of people's "dictatorship" established by the people themselves, unfetters the thoughts and energy of the individual and completely wins him over to the new regime. It is this that makes possible the true emancipation of the individual and the people generally, i.e., the intellectual and spiritual rebirth of factory worker and office employee, trade union functionary and intellectual, peasant, women and youth. This, in turn, multiplies their strength and the possibility to serve the new society.

After state independence had been won the Party and the Government took a series of measures to lay the foundation for an independent economy. These included a state monopoly of foreign trade, creation of an independent monetary system and national bank, nationalization of the electric power and transport companies, of real estate societies, foreign banks, insurance companies, diamond mine corporations and the property of concessionaires in the goldfields.

In the sphere of agriculture cooperation was organized and encouraged in every way in keeping with the resolutions of the Sixth Congress of the Democratic Party held in 1962. Other measures in this sphere included establishment of state-owned farms, nursery gardens and special centers to modernize agriculture.

The economic measures of 1962 and 1963, which made for a certain liberalization in trade and were designed to improve supplies and meet the needs of the urban and rural population, engendered a profit-greedy and reactionary commercial bourgeoisie which sought to deprive the people of their freedom, their rights and the political power lawfully instituted by them. This "new class"* began to speculate in goods and foodstuffs, to build sumptuous mansions for themselves and, ultimately, encouraged by their apparent success, tried to take possession of Party and state bodies. This was more than the people could tolerate. The popular reaction to these elements expressed itself in the 12-point program of reforms adopted on November 8, 1964. This was followed by a series of decrees which likewise reflected the sentiment of the people.

The new decrees declared currency speculation and black marketing in goods illegal and punishable by law. They proclaimed the formation of one national and several regional commissions to investigate how merchants, politicians and government officials had acquired their property after September 28, 1958. These commissions were empowered to confiscate movable and immovable property in favor of the nation if the said property was acquired unlawfully. The decrees also prohibited the sale of goods outside the stipulated areas. Racism, tribal enmity and subversion were declared punishable by law.

The decrees spoke of a trade reform, of the restoration of the state monopoly of foreign trade and of restricting the number of private merchants. They specified that the latter would have to give guarantees of their solvency, their professional ability and moral integrity.

Housing regulations and control on rents were introduced. Persons granted loans for building houses were obliged to move into them; they were not allowed to use them as a source of profit-making. Members of the government and administration were prohibited from engaging in any activity that brought with it an additional income.

Reforms were introduced also in the Party. In particular, branches were formed in enterprises and in offices. Furthermore, it was decided strictly to limit membership.

These measures were aimed at remedying the situation in all spheres of life, penalizing the enemies of the nation and making it possible for every honest citizen to occupy his rightful place.

It soon became clear that the struggle would be waged along a wide front since it was a question of a frontal attack on the selfish and anti-national interests of certain people accustomed to "getting rich" quickly, and who openly connived with the imperialists against the interests of national security. Hence, when the law of November 8, 1964 went into effect the

*It would be more correct to call them bourgeois elements since they are small in number and have no future.

counter-revolutionaries again became active, lavishly backed by international capital. They felt particularly sure of themselves this time, believing that they had rallied to their side all the discontented: big and small merchants, racists, big property owners, dishonest civil servants, all overt and covert enemies of the Party who had suffered as a result of the new revolutionary measures.

A dangerous and aggressive opposition emerged. However, thanks to the vigilance of the leadership of the Democratic Party and of the people the enemies of the revolution were caught this time as well and the plans of their imperialist masters were foiled.

The latest plot was nipped in the bud but the Party, whose lofty and difficult mission it is to give leadership to the country, knows that every success must be consolidated and developed. The Party fully realizes that the revolution cannot satisfy all sections of the population, that in satisfying the people's desire for social reforms it inevitably infringes on the privileges and interests of those aligning themselves with the counter-revolution. Hence the need for radical and timely measures to defend and preserve the revolutionary regime against these people.

International imperialism, too, has no love for the regimes in the African countries which no longer submit to its will and which have dared to oppose it with a social structure based on the popular and democratic forces. It therefore encourages, finances and even arms counter-revolutionaries, hatches plots and coups on our continent. The most recent victim of the intrigues of the imperialists and their lackeys have been the fraternal people of Ghana where the revolutionary regime of the People's Convention Party was treacherously overthrown and a reactionary military dictatorship installed.

The imperialists have repeatedly resorted to all kinds of stratagems, woven all kinds of plots in our Republic as well to overthrow the regime established by the people. And they are continuing to do so.

That is why our Party, taking into account the experience of independent development in the past eight years, decided on a number of revolutionary measures during 1966 aimed at reinforcing the regime in the country.

Notable among these were the decisions taken last July by the National Council of the Revolution providing for concrete measures to defend our revolution, and, in particular, to organize civil defense brigades and a people's militia, and to increase the army personnel in the so-called border Federations so as to prevent any attempt to stage a coup from the outside. Defense of the country is the concern of the entire people. Hence, every Party branch, every village, town and residential block is called upon to fulfil this lofty duty together with the People's Army which has always participated in revolutionary actions

under the leadership of the Party. It is therefore planned to take the following measures in the near future:

1. To prepare the population for defense;
2. To equip them accordingly;
3. To carry out universal military training with a view to preparing the population for self-defense in case of necessity.

The army in Guinea is not a separate unit isolated from the rest of society and is, therefore, a reliable sentinel of the people's future and the Republic's sovereignty. The DPG constantly sees to it that the army's morale and efficiency are on a high level.

These measures follow from the lessons of the coup in Ghana and are designed to wipe out the counter-revolution and to eliminate international imperialism's positions in our country.

We are confident of ultimate victory in the fight we are waging in defense of our Republic and our revolution.

* * *

The above picture of the Republic, of its people and the Party should enable the reader better to understand Guinean reality. The experience of the development of the national and social revolution in Guinea, which is progressive despite certain frustrations and breakdowns, makes it possible to affirm that the Republic of Guinea is advancing along the non-capitalist way. We said "no" to capitalism and its system of oppression; the goal that has attracted and rallied us to the struggle is material and spiritual well-being for the entire people.

"Our path is the non-capitalist path of development," said President Sekou Toure. "It was that way before and will remain that way, for it is the only way to safeguard society and to liberate its members from the oppression of injustice which characterizes the relations of exploitation.

"We unequivocally declare our belief in the inevitable socialization of world society. Our experience is an absolutely new one in socialist development in the conditions of a peasant country."

The experience of Guinea permits us, we think, to make some general remarks concerning the political and socio-economic structure in some countries of Africa which we propose calling a regime of non-capitalist democracy.

Under such a regime the constitution guarantees democratic liberties, the equality of all before the law, freedom of conscience, freedom of speech and the press, freedom of assembly and universal and free elections by secret ballot. It is clear that in the conditions of a people's dictatorship where these democratic liberties serve the supreme interests of society they acquire an entirely different meaning from that in the constitutions of the countries which have sacrificed the national interest. Under the dictatorship of the people it is

the people themselves who watch over their democratic liberties, who participate in the social and political life of their country not only when they go to the polls but also through constant control of their deputies and direct participation in the work of various commissions, meetings and assemblies.

Besides political rights the constitutions of the countries of non-capitalist democracy ensure also social rights: the right to work (and at the same time the obligation to work), to leisure, to education. To restore the equilibrium unjustly upset in the past, the new regime must grant privileges to the formerly disinherited social strata and recognize the paramount importance of the working people.

Practice has shown that to establish such a regime and place it on a solid footing, and to ensure constant development in all spheres, a party is needed that would unite all the forces that fought for the overthrow of imperialism and its allies in the country. The existence of such a party would mean that national unity has been achieved in the country and that it is acknowledged by all.

In the new countries the system of rival parties is hardly desirable, and even harmful, since in most of the regions of Tropical Africa class differentiation is not the decisive factor in social life. During the colonial period all sections of the population of the continent suffered the same deprivations, persecution, inequality and injustice, in a word, all found themselves in the same position. Even if some social classes did emerge in some of the countries they are of minor importance, and the contradictions between them are far from the stage when clashes break out spontaneously and become inevitable.

As for antagonisms of an ethnical, local or religious character, they were deliberately cultivated and fanned by the colonialists so as afterwards to act as arbiters and impose their rule, directly or indirectly. The imperialists had hoped that many of the countries would fall apart because of purely international antagonisms one or two months after gaining independence.

As far as Guinea is concerned it was in the colonial period that it had to contend with difficulties of this kind. Thus, there were conflicts of an ethnical and regional nature in Conakry in June 1958, that is, four months before the proclamation of national independence. Credit for this goes to the Democratic Party which has performed truly prodigious work in moulding the national and political consciousness of the people and achieving political and national unity.

The unity of our forces and their concerted action are an historical necessity. United and indivisible power stems from the people and is exercised by the people and their representatives in the supreme bodies of the national party, in the National Assembly and in the

regional and local councils. The people elect their representatives and also control their activity. They can recall them at any time and revoke their mandates. The government and the National Assembly consist, in effect, of representatives of the national party. The same is true of the head of state even though the Constitution stipulates that he is appointed by the National Assembly. In most cases the head of state is the general secretary of the national party. This does not release him from participating actively in the work of the Political Bureau and congresses of the party. It is the job of the latter to chart the guidelines for the country's development.

The opponents of the new African democracy criticize our elections, in particular the election of candidates by an overwhelming majority of votes or unanimously. But this unanimity is easily explained: opponents of the regime, where such exist, are lost in the masses of its ardent and convinced adherents who are ready to make any sacrifice for its sake. As for the high percentage of votes polled by candidates (85-99 per cent), it should be noted that the decision to vote for, or against, the given candidate had actually been made by the voter long before election day at party or trade union meetings, at meetings of women's, youth and other mass organizations in towns and villages, in enterprises and offices, in regions and districts, where the merits of the candidate are discussed in an atmosphere of free criticism the violation of which is punishable by law. It is therefore not surprising that voting is virtually unanimous. The thing that distinguishes this practically complete unanimity from the partial unanimity in the "classic" democracies or what they have evolved into with time, is that in the African non-capitalist democracies there is no sharp differentiation of classes, no political groups with distinctly different interests, no exclusive professional corporations, no political unions based on ethnical or religious principle.

In Guinea all outwardly different interests were, in view of the circumstances and historical necessity mentioned earlier, reduced to a common denominator in the supreme interests of society. We have no election struggle in the accepted sense. But we have lively debates in parliament and at party meetings on vital national issues, during which lags in carrying out the economic plan, bureaucratic red tape and other shortcomings are sharply criticized.

The economy in the countries of non-capitalist democracy consists of two basic sectors: the social sector where state and cooperative property prevail, and the private sector, the size and content of which depend on local conditions.

The all-important thing is that there should be effective, frank and positive cooperation between the two sectors, that there should be no antagonisms between them, the main criterion being the interests of the people. Nobody need

be uneasy about the reforms of the economic structure; even representatives of foreign private capital, operating in the country in keeping with its laws, realize that everything that is being done in Guinea today is being done in the interests of achieving economic independence and improving the well-being of the people.

The budget, tax system and finances in general are subordinate to the needs of the economy. Loans, for example, play a secondary role. The budget is made up mainly of taxes, the greater part of its revenue coming from industrial and other enterprises. Receipts from the enterprises constitute a substantial part and are collected either directly, in the form of deductions, or in the form of turnover tax.

In the sphere of consumption the social fund has priority over individual income. It includes substantial benefits in the shape of social insurance and welfare, paid vacations, health service and school equipment, in a word, everything that raises the standard of living as a whole.

This system corresponds to the needs of the developing countries, for the important thing at present for the peoples who have been disinherited by history is to build strong and viable states where the crying injustice of the past will be rectified and where the people will live in conditions of social justice.

* * *

After gaining national independence and economic freedom or in the process of the struggle to achieve these objectives one of the main tasks still facing the entire continent is to achieve African unity.

Under pressure of the peoples the colonial powers granted independence to the African countries hoping that they would be able to keep them divided for some time to come. They tried to oppose the states that were formerly part of the French colonial empire to the states formerly part of the British empire. They tried to impress upon the Africans that it was more important for them to maintain their relations with the former colonial powers than to restore the historical and cultural community of the African peoples.

But these wily schemes and plans came to nought. "French" Guinea concluded its first alliance with "British" Ghana, and the "French" and "British" Cameroons merged into one federation.

African unity is the true way to resolving the complex problems facing us in the political and economic spheres. It is the most reliable means for consolidating the political independence of the African states, for abolishing the foreign military bases on their territories, for putting an end to the attempt of the colonialists to impose their rule on us in the new conditions and involve us in military blocs. Lastly, it is a most reliable means for uniting all our forces and rendering joint aid in every possible way to the fraternal peoples of Africa

still living under the colonial yoke of Britain, France, Portugal, Spain, and to the peoples of South Africa and Southern Rhodesia living under racist regimes.

The Organization of African Unity, established in Addis Ababa in May 1963 by the heads of African states, was undoubtedly a timely act unprecedented in the history of the continent. However, to proclaim community of aims is to solve only part of the problem. What is far more difficult is to achieve the aims set, especially when different viewpoints exist. The Organization of African Unity has accomplished much to date, notably in the political sphere. Needless to say, it could have accomplished even more were it not for the intrigues of the imperialists who are acting hand in glove with the native reactionaries now again rearing their heads on our continent.

It is clear that political unity will facilitate the economic unification of our continent, and, conversely, that it will be very hard for each African people acting separately to achieve economic freedom, to create a modern industry and to modernize agriculture. The point is that many of these countries have not got the necessary capital. Their home market is too restricted and cannot absorb the output of large enterprises. Unless they unite and act jointly they will not be able to achieve equality in their relations with the industrially developed capitalist states which buy our raw materials and our agricultural products for a song and in exchange sell us their manufactured goods at prohibitive prices.

Some African countries are jointly building big industrial projects. Despite the difficulties encountered this is a promising undertaking for, in our view, the formation of a broad economic union — generally known as the African Common Market — would be, if not a cure-all, at least a big step towards creating an independent African economy. It would therefore be in the best interests of the independent African states to establish, as soon as possible, joint transport companies, jointly to begin industrialization and to pursue a joint planned economic policy in respect to third states on the basis of equality and mutual benefit.

There is an African saying to the effect that anyone who starts a fight must be ready to take the blows. But in any fight one must be able to repel and deliver blows to the enemy and sidestep them should the enemy prove to be the stronger of the two. In the event of the fight being drawn out you stand a chance of emerging victor.

Our fight is very much like the encounter between David and Goliath. At present we are weaker than our enemy, imperialism, because it, by bestraddling our continent, was able to prevent its development in all spheres of life for a long, long time.

But if we succeed in achieving unity, in building up from scratch and developing as one whole our economic, cultural and social heritage, imperialism will never be able, no matter

in what guise it acts, to entrench itself on our continent.

The difficulties which our young states have to grapple with are titanic. Experience has shown that if they are to overcome them, if they are to put an end to the economic and

cultural backwardness, our countries must resolutely take the non-capitalist way which will put an end to the consequences of colonialism and make possible rapid economic, social and cultural development thanks to the aid rendered by the powerful socialist world.

Some aspects of class structure in South and Southeast Asia

VLADIMIR LUKIN

THE DEVELOPMENTS of recent years in the vast and densely populated area usually referred to as South and Southeast Asia have made that area one of the nodal political points of the world. Revolutionary actions and counter-revolutionary coups, deep-going internal political conflicts and naked imperialist intervention all show that the countries of Southeast Asia have entered upon a decisive phase in their development. Most of these countries gained national independence some twenty years ago. Since then they have established themselves in the international arena as politically independent states striving for economic liberation and hence in conflict with the fundamental interests of the imperialist powers. The various classes, social strata and political groupings in these countries have accumulated experience of an order fundamentally different from the old colonial experience. Moreover, changes of no small importance have taken place in their social and political alignments. A new generation is coming to the fore as custodian of the legacy of the national liberation revolution. The fact that U.S. imperialism has unleashed war precisely in this area in an effort to bend the people of Vietnam to its will is an indication of the significance of South and Southeast Asia and underscores the need for a profound study of every aspect of the highly complex and in many respects unique Asian set-up. It is particularly important to examine the class structure and the social background of the political squalls of the past two decades.

I.

On the eve of gaining political independence,

most of the countries of South and Southeast Asia were disintegrating agrarian feudal societies. More than 70 per cent of the population of the area consists of small *peasant* cultivators. In most of the countries pre-capitalist survivals are to this day a brake on rural development.

In contrast to the big landlords and planters the plight of the millions of peasants with little or no land of their own is appalling. Because of the chronic land hunger, a concomitant of which was extremely slow growth of industry, the landless peasants had no opportunity whatever of finding work outside their villages. This, in turn, produced a veritable army of "superfluous" peasants and relative overpopulation, problems necessitating urgent and radical measures.

The parcelling of land into tiny strips has retarded technical progress in agriculture, dooming it to stagnation and inefficiency.

The most exploited section of the rural population is the agricultural proletariat — landless farm laborers and peasant cultivators whose plots are too tiny to provide even the barest subsistence and who therefore rely on seasonal work on the plantations and on the big farms.

The most numerous rural group (averaging 60-75 per cent of the agricultural population) are the small peasants and tenant farmers with more or less established rights. The conditions in which most of these people live differ little from the pauperized agricultural proletariat. None of the traditional features of the South Asian peasantry — extreme poverty, insecurity, and narrow outlook due to age-old oppression and lack of opportunity to obtain any education—has been erased in the past twenty years.

Things are further complicated by the tenacity of countless communal and caste prejudices, especially in the outlying areas.

However, the numerous survivals of pre-capitalist relations notwithstanding, class differentiation of a new kind is gradually gaining pace in the countryside. This is most clearly evident in India.

But on the whole in India, as in most other parts of South and Southeast Asia, this differentiation is still in the initial phases. As a rule there is little difference between peasant farms as regards technical equipment and employment of hired labor; not even in India has agricultural capitalism reached the point where the traditional agrarian structure begins to undergo extensive change. By and large the difference between the poor and the more well-to-do peasants is merely a matter of the size of the holding and, of course, the quantities of prime necessities available for consumption.

The past 10-15 years have witnessed substantial changes in the social structure in the South Asian village, due mainly to the agrarian reforms carried out in most of the countries. Even though agrarian legislation and the rate of its enforcement differ from country to country, its impact on social development in the countryside, and on society generally, is in many respects identical.

For one thing, the reforms have curtailed the economic power and political influence of the privileged and traditional parasitic elements among the landlord class. The economic position and legal status of some sections of the peasant proprietors have improved. Yet the basic problem facing the peasants — the problem of land — has not been solved in their interests.* The conditions of the masses of peasants with little or no land have hardly changed, and if the rapid population growth is taken into account, have actually deteriorated.

The Asian peasants began to emerge from their age-old downtrodden condition and to take a conscious part in public life during the decisive battles against colonial rule. For them genuine independence and final liberation from the feudal yoke, land hunger and poverty are essentially one and the same thing, which explains why they regard the fight for land as a direct continuation of the national revolution. At the same time the relatively little advanced class differentiation and the lack of any real possibility of improving their status through individual farming (mainly because of the paucity of resources available even to the better-off peasants and the extreme difficulty of enlarging their plots) compel the bulk of the peasants to search for a non-traditional, anti-individualist way out. This is one reason why the social psychology of the South Asian peasantry differs essentially from the views, habits, instincts and impulses of the "classical" petty

bourgeoisie. In the "split personality" of the South and Southeast Asian poor peasant the proprietor aspect is not only heavily outweighed by the worker aspect, but in the light of the socio-economic, historical and demographic factors involved its prospects are dim. It is important to bear this in mind when examining the specific features of the various forms of Asian peasant utopian socialism and comparing it with the traditional *petty-bourgeois* socialism.

Progressive and backward ideas interweave in the minds of the South Asian peasants and form a most fantastic pattern. For instance, while many socio-economic factors make them more inclined to accept collectivism than their counterparts in, say, Western Europe, their collective consciousness clings tenaciously to the more negative aspects of religious thinking, to caste and communal survivals often resulting in weird illusions concerning "eternal" equality, brotherhood and justice, coupled with a narrow outlook and group egoism. This retards the maturing of class consciousness and creates the danger of the negative aspects of peasant psychology being used in the interests of the privileged strata.

Needless to say, the danger of empirical "peasant socialism" being used by reactionaries and political adventurers is less wherever there is a well-organized and united working-class movement capable of providing the political leadership and exerting decisive ideological influence.

II.

The working class appeared in South and Southeast Asia comparatively recently, when the objective requirements of the colonial economy impelled the imperialists to develop mining and allied industries, some branches of light industry and the necessary elements of a modern infrastructure. As a rule the imperialists regarded the colonial working class merely as an ancillary factor essential to economic plunder. Hence the deformed structure of the South Asian industrial proletariat. Its common feature is association mostly with extracting, processing and transporting raw materials, and with some branches of light industry and the food-processing industries. Only recently has there been an appreciable growth of the more modern sections of the industrial working class.

A feature of these countries is the high degree of concentration of factory workers in small islands set in the ocean of a peasant economy. The working-class movement is thus hemmed in within narrow geographic bounds, a fact that greatly hampers contact with the population of remote areas.

Moreover, the South Asian working class is heterogeneous as regards national composition. As is known, in India and Indonesia scores of different languages and dialects are spoken. Formerly this circumstance did not make itself felt very much, since the various nationalities

*Burma with its interesting and unique record of agrarian reform is an exception. For a more detailed examination of this question see the article by A. Levkovsky in No. 7, 1966

and tribes lived in compact groups separated from one another. But with the development of capitalism an eroding of the traditional communal and caste demarcation lines set in as the new social forces impelled large numbers of landless peasants speaking different languages to migrate to the towns in search of employment. Plantations, mines and factories became concentrations of people of diverse nationalities with different customs and religious beliefs.

Another feature of the South and Southeast Asian industrial proletariat is its economic, social and psychological link with the countryside. The link has been preserved to this day due to the fact that the worker who does not earn enough to support his family in the city is compelled to leave it in the village on a tiny strip of land from which it obtains a meagre but essential additional income. Many second and even third-generation proletarians are thus closely connected with the villages and through them with their community and caste.

On the other hand, industrialization has been accompanied by a substantial growth of the working class as a result of the influx from the countryside. And while this development is progressive, inevitable and desirable from the broad historical standpoint, it has had a direct effect on the structure of the industrial proletariat. The core of the latter, the Bombay and Calcutta textile workers, the oil workers in Yenangyang, dockers in Colombo and Singapore, with their fairly high level of political consciousness, organization and political activity and their revolutionary traditions—found itself temporarily engulfed in a mass of young first-generation proletarians who brought with them the ballast of ignorance, caste, national and local prejudices, religious illusions and lack of organization characteristic of the social environment in which they were brought up.

The features of the industrial core of the South Asian working class are, then, relative youth, strong links with the countryside, a to-and-fro migration, unskilled labor and weak organization. But no less important is the low percentage of this core in the overall urban population occupying the same or roughly the same place in the general property and social set-up.

Generally speaking, factory workers account for three to six per cent of the population of the region, which is not much, especially when compared to the numbers of diverse other categories of the *dispossessed urban strata*, who constitute a specific and important social force in the Asian cities.

The bulk of the urban semi-proletariat consists of workers employed in small workshops, and handicraftsmen. In most of the countries this social group is considerably more numerous than the factory workers.

The second large semi-proletarian group are the coolies and day laborers subsisting on chance earnings. This group, common to the

underdeveloped countries, does not lend itself to any precise statistical estimate by virtue of its nature. What is clear, however, is that its numbers run to tens of millions. Materially these people are no better off, and some are even worse off, than the unskilled factory workers. But for their social characteristics (low degree of organization, spontaneous militancy without stable ideological criteria) they are closer to the semi-proletarian handicraftsmen than to the factory workers.

The third group which perhaps should be included in the semi-proletariat consists of workers employed in trade and in services, the minor government employees, etc.

Although since the winning of political independence notable social changes have taken place among the South Asian urban working masses, the vital fact is that the relationship between the factory workers and their "pre-capitalist" environment remains unaltered. Numerically, it is true, the industrial proletariat has grown considerably (in India, for instance, from 6-7 million to 8-9 million). But the growth has not caused any far-reaching changes in the overall structure of society. On the other hand, the changes in the countryside have resulted in an exodus of the rural population to the towns. Consequently, the rate of urbanization is greater than that of industrialization, signifying a rapid swelling of the masses of "potential proletarians" who, while no longer having means of production of their own and still without a place in modern production are compelled to seek their livelihood either in the traditional handicrafts or in various kinds of casual occupations.

Objectively speaking the specific social features of the South Asian proletariat and its much smaller proportions compared with the predominantly rural population provides an opening for its penetration by people of peasant psychology and views.

Like the peasant, the proletarian in this area is revolutionary in sentiment; he wants a quick and radical change in his conditions. And no wonder, for even in India, where until recently economic development proceeded more systematically and effectively and where the national income has risen by half as much again since independence, the wages have remained at the miserable prewar level. In some countries the conditions of the proletariat have worsened in the past twenty years.

The proletarian knows that single-handed he cannot improve his lot. Moreover, the prejudices which hinder the growth of class consciousness in the villages do not have the same grip on people in the towns. Similarly, there is a greater gravitation towards united action and organization. And indeed the past 20 years have witnessed a substantial growth of class consciousness and class solidarity. Nevertheless it is patent that the degree of organization of the proletariat in South and Southeast Asia is still inadequate.

Among the many social and political reasons for this, three stand out. *First*, the majority of the South Asian proletariat, and the entire so-called "pre-proletariat," is not united by production as such, and this is a big obstacle to the growth of trade unions. *Second*, working class solidarity is retarded by the absence of trade union unity at all levels. As a rule, in the enterprise, in each branch of industry and nationally there are rival unions. The fight of the Communist parties and other democratic forces for trade union unity has yet to be crowned with decisive success. The *third* important reason for the organizational weakness of the working class is the low educational level of some of its contingents.

From this stems the danger that in many Asian countries socialist views seen through the prism of the social psychology of the poorer strata in the towns can assume, and often does, forms that have little in common with genuine socialism. In particular, the spontaneous outbreaks to get things changed at once can, under certain conditions, result in the extreme vulgarization of socialism, in thinking that the level of economic and social development and generally speaking all objective preconditions are irrelevant to its achievement. In this sense there are objective openings for this kind of instinctive "anti-historism" by one or another group of ultra-radical intellectuals who may be well acquainted with the destructive aspects of the social revolution but who have hardly any real concept of its constructive role.

On the other hand, the influence of socialist ideas among the proletariat is growing in the context of the victorious national liberation revolution. Nationalism is felt in this part of the world, impinging on the thinking of the most diverse social strata, including a substantial part of the working class. In the course of the fight for independence the reactionaries worked hard to inculcate in the working masses a concept of nationalism in which legitimate national pride and dignity are associated with religion and caste, with communal and chauvinist prejudices. In these circumstances the possibility is not excluded that the necessary and natural adaptation of the basic universal principles of the socialist outlook to the conditions of a given country or district may under certain conditions degenerate into a "national" socialism not only in the sense of negating its international character but in the sense of opportunist reconciliation with outdated social, political and religious institutions. (Adaptation to "truly national" backwardness can take a variety of forms, including the "revolutionary" destruction of all genuine cultural achievements, both national and international.)

III.

In order to arrive at an understanding of the present-day social processes in South and

Southeast Asia it is important to appreciate the place occupied in economic, political and ideological life by the *national bourgeoisie* and associated groups.

In most of the countries this class took shape extremely slowly. The main obstacle to bringing even the wealthiest of the local people into the sphere of production or commercial and financial operations was foreign imperialism, whose representatives from the very beginning of their rule monopolized these areas.

So much for the general picture. Now let us look at it in greater detail.

In India, and to some extent in Ceylon, national capital made greater headway before independence than in the neighboring countries. The abolition of colonial rule opened up new sources of accumulation arising from the protectionist measures taken by the state and from certain curbs on the foreign monopolies. As a result, the big commercial, banking and industrial bourgeoisie took shape as a class and gained strength in these countries in recent years. Moreover, in India, the first of the newly-emerged countries of Asia and Africa to gain independence, a tendency asserted itself towards the formation of local monopolies whose economic power is growing rapidly.

Not only is the bourgeoisie growing economically, it is also striking deeper roots in political and ideological life. In India it no longer confines itself to maintaining pressure groups in the leadership of the ruling Congress party. Anticipating the possible defeat of the Right wing of this party, the financial and industrial tycoons are, increasingly, staking on the Swatantra Party, founded in 1959 by Rajagopalachari, Masani, Ranga and other champions of "free enterprise."

By now the South Asian big bourgeoisie has almost completely overcome the anti-imperialist "passions" of its earlier years. Most of its members seem to have concluded that, all in all, an alliance with foreign monopolies is the only reliable device in the fight for economic power and political hegemony in their countries, the only safeguard against the pressure of the anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist classes. On their part the monopolies of the developed capitalist countries, and above all the U.S. imperialists, take advantage of the greater opportunities for "business partnership" in order to strengthen and expand their positions in this part of the world, to penetrate every pore of Asian society and thereby create a material foundation for political influence. This is particularly manifest in the Philippines, Thailand and India.

The big capitalists, however, are only the top crust of the national bourgeoisie, influential in India, not unimportant in Ceylon and the Philippines, but not carrying much weight in most of the other countries. For the area as a whole the small trader, small employer and proprietor of a handicrafts workshop is still the typical figure. As a matter of fact, this

social category has grown since independence.

The small provincial merchants and manufacturers are a political factor to reckon with, especially in India and Ceylon. They form the core of the leading "center" parties in these countries—the Congress and Sri Lanka Freedom parties. This lays a definite imprint on many aspects of the activity of the Indian and Ceylon governments, and especially in the striving to promote small-scale and handicraft production, to curb monopoly trends and to develop the state sector. The constant conflicts between the Right and Left wings of these parties are echoes of the deep-seated contradictions between the different sections of the national bourgeoisie.

The small bourgeoisie wants a strong state capable of safeguarding it against the competition of the big foreign and local capitalists. It is not opposed to the state sector since the latter affects industries in which it is not interested. From the standpoint of material and cultural standards it approximates to the urban factory and office workers and shares many of their hopes and aspirations. At the same time it is highly susceptible to the negative aspects of nationalistic ideology; the very mode of production of the small bourgeoisie largely accounts for its conservatism. The rapid twentieth century socio-economic progress alarms it, for it often does not visualize any place for itself in the society of the future. Hence the amplitude of its possible orientations, ranging from militant anti-imperialism (and anti-capitalism), to "anti-Westernism," which is ideologically tantamount to rejection in principle of any creative application to their countries of the achievements of European civilization, idealization of economic and cultural backwardness, and politically tantamount to association with the dark forces of communal, caste and chauvinist fanaticism.

In many other South and Southeast Asian countries the petty-bourgeoisie is the predominant component of the national bourgeoisie; in India or Ceylon, however, its political influence is much less. The reason for this is that here from time immemorial small-scale trade, money-lending and in some cases handicrafts have been in the hands of minority nationalities—Chinese in Indonesia, Thailand and the Philippines, Indians in Burma, and Chinese and Indians in Malaysia.

Unless the social nature of the Sino-Indian national minority is taken into account it will be impossible fully to understand the specific features of the national liberation movement in South and Southeast Asia — the complex interweaving of national and social aspects in the liberation struggle. On the one hand, the element of national strife has tended to narrow the scope of the anti-imperialist front, but on the other hand the social content of the anti-imperialist revolution has been markedly broadened and in a number of countries assumed a clearly anti-capitalist character. Be that as it

may, the fact that a substantial part of the bourgeoisie of this region is not a home-grown *national* bourgeoisie has ever since independence been a big obstacle in the way of its becoming the leading force in society.

IV.

The fact is, then, that in a number of South and Southeast Asian countries the bourgeoisie, while it exerts an influence on the life of society in one way or another, is not strong enough to establish its own monopoly control over governmental authority.

On the other hand, the proletariat as a whole, as regards numbers, organization and class consciousness, has not yet reached the stage when it could independently head the progressive forces and unite them around its own program.

This state of affairs stemming from centuries of backwardness and from the deeply agrarian nature of Asian society is of course a transient condition which is bound to come to an end with industrialization. But it is a fact of life today and will remain so for some time. Hence the importance of correctly assessing its socio-political consequences and perspectives.

A feature of the present state of affairs in some newly-emerged Asian countries is that intermediate strata and groups which in "normal" circumstances tend to gravitate to one or another of the main classes, i.e., to abide by the collective will of the particular class, acquire a measure of social autonomy and become the leading political force.

What have we in mind when we speak of the "non-proletarian democratic sections of the population"?

Experience shows that the *peasantry* is a factor of the utmost importance in political, social and cultural life at the time of the national liberation revolution. In all of the countries of the area under discussion the peasants are one of the most powerful revolutionary forces. Its spirit, interests and way of life permeate the whole society, and it exerts a big influence on the outlook of all parties and on the policy of all governments. Yet this is an *indirect* influence. "The political influence of the parcellized peasantry is, in the final analysis, expressed . . . in the fact that the executive authority subordinates the whole of society to itself"—this profound observation of Marx, an observation which has been borne out by the situation in all Asian countries, highlights, apart from everything else, the mechanism of peasant influence on socio-political processes.

An important group in the non-proletarian democratic strata of the population is the national *intelligentsia*. This is not surprising for the intelligentsia is the first to awaken to the need for change and to an understanding of the nature of the changes needed by society. The experience of the national liberation struggle in many of these countries is that it is

precisely this group that often plays the leading role in the revolutionary process and continues to head it over a long period, gradually bringing into motion the urban lower strata, part of the national bourgeoisie and, eventually, the peasantry.

In South and Southeast Asia the intelligentsia is relatively large in number, and influential. Long the custodian of the cultural, language and ethical traditions of its people, it preserved these traditions from erosion by colonialism. Its significance has increased still more since independence. Particularly noteworthy in this respect is India, whose intelligentsia, as the U.S. historian Edward Shields has noted, is unique among the intellectuals of the newly-emerged countries as regards numbers, professional differentiation and the high standard of its achievements.

The socio-political positions of this intelligentsia are varied, but there are some common features typical of most of its members. Perhaps the salient thing in the outlook of the educated stratum is concern for the future. Realization of the need for more rapid economic progress impels most intellectuals to advocate giving the state the dominant role in the sphere of finance and general guidance of national affairs, in other words, centralized planning. And since this can hardly be done without nationalizing the basic industries, their striving towards progress logically leads the majority of the intellectuals to recognition of the non-capitalist way as the most expedient path of development.

But so far gravitation towards socialism has not united the intelligentsia of most of the countries around a common program of struggle for its realization. In the process of the crystallization of the political views and ideology of this section of the population three basic trends can be clearly discerned. During the fight for national independence part of the intelligentsia saw in the Marxist-Leninist outlook the most consistent and comprehensive embodiment of their social, political and ethical aspirations. Among another section, mostly those who received their education in Western Europe and North America, many became placemen of imperialism in their countries. A third and sizable group concentrated almost exclusively on the fight for national liberation and did not concern themselves with the complex socio-economic and ideological problems, which at the time seemed to be of too abstract an order. Socially this group was to a greater extent than the others an integral part of the middle sections, consisting as it did of people educated locally and closely associated with the local milieu, religion and customs (for example, schoolteachers, local medical practitioners, the lower Buddhist, Hindu and Moslem clergy). This group became the main advocate of diverse concepts of Asian nationalism. To assume that the utopianism, the striving to impart to the intra-national social relations a

"family character," and the idealization of the pre-colonial past intrinsic to these outlooks (which exerted a powerful influence on the national bourgeoisie, the peasantry and a large segment of the working class) was the result solely of theoretical blundering would be oversimplification. Actually such views mirror many of the objective social relationships existing in these countries; they are the reflections in the minds of some intellectuals of the underdeveloped social structures of their countries, of the preponderance of the peasant and petty-bourgeois masses who exert enormous social and psychological pressure on all the other strata and classes.

The point is that the adherents of this trend based their conclusions solely on the social relationships existing in their particular country or region and largely disregarded the experience and perspectives of civilization as a whole. Nationalism had a dual effect on them. It delivered them from a feeling of spiritual enslavement and it gave them the sense of being equal members of the human race. Herein lies the progressive significance of nationalism. But at the same time it delayed their ideological contact (and organizational links) with the progressive forces beyond the boundaries of their own countries, thereby engendering a kind of national sectarianism.

This narrowness, fraught with dangerous consequences, will be overcome the sooner and the illusions inherent in narrow nationalism dispelled the more active the support rendered by progressives throughout the world to the peoples of the developing countries, and the more effective their mutual solidarity in the face of the aggressive policy of imperialism.

After gaining political independence the question of the social functions of the *machinery of state* acquired significance. And as the positions of the state in economic life are strengthened the importance of this issue grows. While in India the bourgeoisie on the whole exerts the predominant influence on the machinery of state (though to say so is but an approximation to the complex, and at times contradictory reality), in many other countries things are different. In some, owing to the above-mentioned peculiarities of class structure, a specific situation has developed in which the intelligentsia and middle strata—the core of the machinery of state—have acquired considerable scope for social maneuvering. A situation has emerged which confirms Marx's thesis that the bureaucracy is capable not only of serving one or another dominant class but under certain conditions may become an instrument paving the way to the domination of a particular class. Which class will depend on the complex interplay of internal and external forces.

The experience of the past 20 years gives grounds for saying that in a number of countries part of the top layer of the inflated state administration has systematically used its power to promote narrow group interests.

In the initial phase the bureaucracy in the administration resorted mainly to the old capitalist way of becoming rich. This was the phase of "bureaucratic primitive accumulation." Experience has shown, however, that lining one's pockets by "extra-governmental" means is soon followed by the use of government posts for personal and group purposes. Frequently abuse of office, squandermania and corruption become so widespread as to cause serious difficulties in the functioning of the state sector, discrediting it in the eyes of the people and eventually leading to grave economic dislocation and political conflicts.

As the "bureaucratic bourgeoisie" gains strength economically it steps up its ideological struggle. Its members soon realize that it is not in their interests to wreck the state sector. But what they are determined not to allow is any kind of control from below, on the part of the working people and their organizations, over state property at all levels, from separate enterprises to the state sector as a whole. They, too, are "for socialism" understood as uncontrolled state domination over the economic, political and spiritual life of their countries. According to this concept the sole function of the working masses is to make sacrifices at the altar of economic development. Any other understanding of their role is met with brutal repressions. "Socialism is the state," the apologists of the "bureaucratic bourgeoisie" loudly proclaim, when what they really mean is: "We are the state." Marx and Engels called this kind of distortion of socialism (especially widespread in economically backward countries with a legacy of autocratic, totalitarian traditions and analogous methods of combating them) "only a form in which the odiousness of private property is manifested."

* * *

The specific features of the class structure in South and Southeast Asia powerfully affect the ideological and political climate in this part of the world. The growing popularity of socialist ideas in this area is an irreversible objective process deeply rooted in the internal socio-economic conditions. The spreading of socialism on a world scale acts as a powerful catalyst accelerating this process. Consequently, the consistent champions of progress enjoy ample objective opportunity to rally, unite and educate broad sections of the working class, the peasantry, the non-proletarian urban strata, the intellectuals and the petty bourgeoisie.

At the same time, modern Asian society is objective soil for the spread of views often similar in form but essentially diametrically opposed to some of the basic universal principles of scientific socialism. The most wide-

spread, dangerous and tenacious of these are the peasant-utopian and bureaucratic distortions of socialism.

Events of recent years have shown the grave consequences of a situation when the vanguard of the national liberation and anti-imperialist revolution proves incapable of counterposing to the spontaneous sentiment of the petty-bourgeois, peasant masses a considered, flexible and enlightened policy, a policy aimed at harnessing the vast moral driving force inevitably engendered by the revolution in order to accelerate to the maximum the development of the productive forces of society, to make accessible to its members the genuine achievements of civilization and thereby overcome the heavy burden of the old autocratic and totalitarian traditions. Inability to advance a policy of this kind is fraught with danger to the basic gains of the revolution, for an underdeveloped social environment can deform its fundamental features with amazing speed. Progressive nationalism could turn into arrogant chauvinistic self-deception; anti-imperialism, into contempt for all that civilized man is justly proud of; preparedness for determined, uncompromising struggle for freedom, into irresponsible and reckless denunciation at the slightest suspicion of nonconformism; the revolutionary power of the most advanced groups of the people, into a mediaeval tyranny headed by a power-hungry despot. Present-day Asia offers classical examples of the two types of retreat from revolution — the sanguinary counter-revolutionary (usually imilitary) coup and internal degeneration. It is hard to say which is the greater evil.

But though the possibility exists, such ideological views need not necessarily become widespread. This is only one of the trends, one of the dangers encountered on the way to progress. The successful development of industry, the substantial social changes South and Southeast Asia have witnessed in the past twenty years, and, in particular, the growth of the numbers, class consciousness and militancy of the working class help to create increasingly favorable conditions for overcoming this danger. The outcome of the battle for genuine progress will be determined by the concrete social, political, historical and ideological factors operating in each country, and primarily by the conscious, determined struggle waged by the progressive forces against the negative phenomena associated with the vast preponderance of the peasant and petty-bourgeois masses, by the education of these masses in the spirit of truly progressive, scientific convictions. The grand battle for socialism is bound to end in victory alike in Asia and in the other parts of the world.

Monopoly drive to win over intermediate class forces

(Right-wing extremism and neo-fascism)

DIMITRIS LAKKAS, ALEXEI LEVKOVSKY

THAT FASCISM SPELLS WAR is an axiom for many peoples. Millions of men and women have learned this from bitter experience. Indeed, this is one of the main reasons why West European neo-fascism has failed to build a mass base for itself despite lavish aid from the monopolies.

Reverse the axiom and we have a thesis which is acquiring an increasingly ominous connotation today: *war* (needless to say, imperialist, unjust war) *spells fascism*. By means of war imperialism is resurrecting fascism, its methods and its form of government. Unable to unleash a world war because their hands are tied by the powerful forces of the socialist camp, the working-class movement and the revolutionary processes in the "third world," the imperialists are falling back on the theory and practice of "local wars," of which an important concomitant — not only a by-product — is the emergence of diverse neo-fascist, militarist organizations and groups. For example, the earlier war in Vietnam and later in Algeria gave rise to the OAS whose pernicious impact made itself felt in the political life of France.

Similar processes are now under way on a still larger scale and in still more sinister forms as a result of the U.S. aggression in Vietnam. In the United States itself a significant differentiation is taking place. Reactionary organizations of all descriptions have ganged up in the camp of the war hawks. Peace marches and war marches are being held in U.S. cities. Indicative in this respect was the clash outside the New York Stock Exchange in April this year, between some stock market clerks and youth demonstrators protesting against the war in Vietnam on which the big corporations are battenning. The civic courage

of the opponents of aggression and the reckless frenzy of the supporters of war collide on the streets of American cities. Protests on college campuses against militarism and the Vietnam war play an important part in awakening the public. But neither can we close our eyes to the half a million signatures collected by Right-wing student organizations in support of the war. Clearly a substantial segment of the student youth is still influenced by Right extremism.

The U.S. rulers are increasingly resorting to anti-democratic devices as they inflame militarist passions and seek to suppress discontent at home. For it is becoming more difficult to escalate the war without encroaching on democratic institutions. Hence the signs of patently totalitarian aspirations in evidence in the USA. Many observers saw one such sign in President Johnson's July speech following the bombing of the environs of Hanoi and Haiphong in which he said that "there is only one (man) that has been chosen by the Americans to decide." *The New York Times* commented on this editorially: "The power to decide what is right and what is wrong, what should or should not be done, President Johnson plainly stated in Omaha, is his alone. The fate of the United States, and much else besides, therefore rests in his hands."

Take another example—the four-day sitting in August of the Un-American Activities Committee, at which another attempt was made to muzzle the opponents of the aggression in Vietnam and to press for a bill providing for a penalty of twenty years in prison and a \$20,000 fine for those taking action against the war. Yet anti-militarist sentiment asserted itself even at these hearings as the spokesmen of a

number of democratic and anti-war organizations condemned this self-appointed drumhead court. Fifty arrests were made but even this could not silence the protest. The committee nevertheless approved the bill, once again showing that the supporters of democracy and social progress in the USA have a long and difficult battle ahead.

This is typical not only of the USA. In Europe the West German monopolies are intensively cultivating war hysteria and revanchism, creating a serious threat to world peace. The affinity and interaction of militarism, revanchism, anti-communism and neo-fascism is most glaringly evident in West Germany. Besides the "Union of Exiles" with its 2.5 million members thirsting for revenge, a special "territorial reserve" has been created in that country. The Bonn politicians are hoping to put through emergency laws in order to create an all-embracing system of military-political control. No wonder that in this climate we read about neo-fascist elements making headway, about a new Nazi party — the National Democratic Party. The growth of the neo-fascist canker was evident already in the September 1965 general election when this party polled about two per cent of the vote, and especially in the municipal elections in Bavaria and Schleswig-Holstein when the percentage went up to three, and in some cities to as much as eight to ten. Besides this party, West Germany has more than one hundred fascist organizations with tens of thousands of members.

The monopoly bourgeoisie uses a variety of means and methods to retain power. Not to see or to underestimate the arsenal at the disposal of the financial oligarchy would be inexcusable. It would be equally dangerous to assume that this arsenal no longer contains such weapons as Right extremism and neo-fascism. In Spain and Portugal the Franco and Salazar regimes are still in the saddle, and in Greece for nearly 20 years now a struggle has been going on between pro-fascist governments and the people. In the USA there are reactionary currents which are acquiring one or another shade of brown. Survivals of fascism are becoming more active in Austria and Italy.

Consequently, the struggle against imperialist reaction implies combating both the survivals of the "old" fascism and its modern successors who are trying to raise their heads. The object of this article is to focus attention on some aspects of the machinations of the main class enemy of the working people, to examine some of the more general changes in Right-wing extremism and neo-fascism, especially as regards their attitude to the intermediate class forces, rather than to go into the "national" features of the neo-fascist trends in various countries.

THE EMERGENCE OF FASCISM AND ITS MASS BASE

Between the two world wars fascism emerged as a response of the monopoly bour-

geoisie to the maturing of a revolutionary situation, which, as a rule, was associated with deep-going economic perturbations. The havoc played by the economic crisis, the economic, political and ideological chaos caused by this crisis, unemployment affecting millions of workers and the ruin of millions of the small bourgeoisie constituted the objective situation in which fascism began its drive for power in the 20's and 30's in the interests and with the active support of the monopolies.

The experience of recent years shows, however, that situations highly dangerous for the monopoly rulers may develop even when there is no perceptible economic decline. Nowadays the monopolies encourage pro-fascist and kindred trends not as a response to a mature revolutionary situation but in response to aggravation of class struggle during a boom. The object is to prevent the growth of democratic movements at their very inception. Moreover, the monopolies have become "wiser." But in a rapidly changing world, with the forces of socialism growing, with many new countries entering the historical arena, and with far-reaching changes taking place in state-monopoly capitalism, the *overall context* in which the extreme reaction operates is not what it used to be. The same applies to the social forces it regards as its potential mass base. What is this base?

We know from experience that *some sections* of the petty bourgeoisie, the core of the intermediate class forces (economically, politically and ideologically), may in certain circumstances provide the initial mass following of fascism. But this class is also changing, and what is more, unevenly in the various countries, and this makes itself felt in the forms and even the nature of the extreme Right movements.

The monopoly capitalists, while oppressing all the intermediate class forces, use a variety of devices to make these strata dependent on them, especially in the economic sphere. But although the forms and the methods used by monopoly to exploit the various strata of these forces (peasantry, urban handicraftsmen and shopkeepers, professional people, students and the new middle sections) differ and, moreover, change with time, the objective *base for anti-monopoly sentiment and action* on the part of these class forces is widening and growing stronger. Yet they remain disunited, the aims of the struggle are often seen in a distorted light, and there is a tendency to fight capital by capitalist methods.

The German petty bourgeoisie after the First World War, when the urban section predominated in it, was perhaps among the first to feel (but not to understand) the pressures of finance-capitalist competition. Monopoly capital penetrated into small-scale production, trade and the services. It squeezed out many small shopkeepers (through the competition offered by department stores, for instance) or fleeced them through the agency of retail

prices, credit, etc. Hence the invective against "plutocratic capital," "debt slavery" and the chain stores, and even the anti-capitalist slogans with which the Hitlerites and others of that ilk sought to win over the small bourgeoisie and some groups of working people (especially ideologically).

Today not only the general situation but also the *structure* of the intermediate strata has changed.* In France, for instance, Pierre Poujade, founder of a handicraftsmen's and shopkeepers' union, failed to see this, and, as a result, did not remain long on the political scene. At present new strata are taking, or have taken, first place in the structure of the intermediate class forces in the western capitalist countries under the impact of the technological revolution. The U.S. sociologist Wright Mills aptly concluded his study *White Collar, the American Middle Classes* (1951) with the following passage: "In the meantime, on the political market-place of American society, the new middle classes are up for sale; whoever seems respectable enough, strong enough, can probably have them. So far, nobody has made a serious bid." Besides Wright Mills, many other writers have noted the emergence of this new middle stratum and the inevitability of a political struggle to win it. Indeed, the class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat to win this section has gained in intensity throughout the 50's and 60's. The deep-going changes in the structure of the intermediate strata compels finance capital to change its tactics, since it is no longer able to hold a substantial part of these strata under its influence by the old methods. The content and forms of the class actions of the intermediate forces likewise change, as do the forms of struggle to win them over. Therefore it is now practically impossible to envisage a return to the old fascism or the old popular front.

The experience of revolutionary struggle shows that the movement of the non-proletarian or semi-proletarian masses *towards* the positions of the working class, towards realization of the need for a radical reconstruction of society, towards the ideas of scientific socialism, takes different forms (ideological forms included). But history has also shown that there is an objective danger stemming in the final analysis from the duality of the social status of the intermediate class forces, from the fact that they retain elements of petty-bourgeois or bourgeois outlook—the danger of some sections of the non-proletarian or semi-proletarian forces rejecting genuinely revolutionary activity, of this activity being distorted and even turned into its opposite. The monopolies exert every effort to wean the intermediate forces away from the revolution (or to prevent them from coming to it), in particular by means of diverse forms of right extremism.

Experience has also shown that the danger

*For a more detailed examination of this question see article "The Class Allies of the Proletariat," *World Marxist Review*, No. 9, 1965.

of a specific kind of pro-fascism or elements of such pro-fascism exists in some cases in those countries of the "third world" in which reaction is represented by other class forces than the monopoly capitalists. There are fascist organizations in a number of Latin American countries, in India there is the extremist pro-fascist Rashtriya Sewak Sangh party and the Jan Sangh group associated with it, and in the Arab East there is the Moslem Brotherhood. An examination of such Right extremist movements of the fascist type, however, is not the object of the present article.

HOW THE MONOPOLIES NURTURE FASCISM

The rise of fascism and its "success" in the West were inseparable from the interests and the policy of the monopoly bourgeoisie and its state. The process starts with financial coteries (usually the newer and more rapacious) feeding small parties and groups of the fascist type; then, as the political situation grows more acute, the leading fascist organization comes to the fore.

The contemporary American counterparts of the German monopolists are copying some of the methods of the latter in nurturing neo-fascism (the Dallas group). The Right wing of U.S. reaction derives the lion's share of its financial means from the richest men in the country. According to data for the early 60's its funds came from the "wellsprings of 70 foundations (almost all of them tax exempt), 113 business firms and corporations (most of which can deduct contributions to 'religious' or 'educational' organizations), 25 public utility companies," etc. A later survey based on official data shows that the receipts of Right-wing organizations have been going up from year to year, mounting by 17 per cent in 1963 alone. Prominent among the Big Business groups cited as backers of these organizations are the Milliken, Pew, Hunt, Crail, Frawley, Gray and Simes monopoly interests.

The U.S. tycoons are by and large following the old pattern of encouraging fascism by lavish spending for the purpose and giving publicity to reactionary ideas and leaders through the mass media. U.S. observers estimate that the country has nearly 1,000 Right-wing organizations, some of which, such as the John Birch Society, are directly supported by the monopolies. The Birch group came into being in 1961, and by the beginning of this year its membership was put at 100,000.

The extremist propagandists are seeking to capitalize precisely on the duality of the intermediate class forces. The condition of anti-communism and pseudo-anti-capitalism served up is designed to turn the uninformed against all progressives, persuade them that fighting communism means combating "plutocratic capital." With the same aim in view, these propagandists have created the cult of the "home-town boy" who gave his life fighting

the Communists. For the Nazis this "man of the people" was Horst Wessel. His American counterpart is John Birch.

THE PRESENT-DAY CAPITALIST STATE AND NEO-FASCISM

As can be seen from the example of prewar Italy and Germany the state machine plays an important role in fostering fascism. Wars and the growth of state-monopoly capitalism bring in their train an enormously swollen state apparatus, spur the growth of militarism and of a huge caste of privileged bureaucratic officialdom, including the officer corps. As a result of the shocks sustained by the capitalist state (such as the military defeat of Germany), this bureaucratic stratum closely linked with the monopolies has become more aware of its specific interests and hence more consolidated as a caste. The modern bureaucratic-militarist upper crust is capable of quick decisions and violent actions of every imaginable kind. It has produced its own "autonomous" organizations functioning in the imperialist countries and beyond their borders. There now are hundreds of ex-servicemen's, officers' and even SS-men's associations, not to speak of the fascist dregs serving as mercenaries in foreign legions and making up punitive detachments in many parts of the world, in particular in Africa.

Fascism after advent to power is not what it was before. Once in the saddle, it combines the reactionary extremist movement with the power of the monopoly-controlled state first of all in order to suppress by force and violence the organizations of the working class, to destroy the workers's movement and to annihilate its active members, and then to stifle all other progressive forces and all institutions with even a tinge of democracy, regardless of their origin. The result is the fascist-type capitalist state.

But not always are the monopolies, the top layer of the propertied classes, able to dominate the thinking and the movements of substantial sections of the middle strata (primarily the petty bourgeoisie) by means of Right-wing extremism and in this way achieve their two principal aims: to divide the working people and weaken them, in particular by setting the various contingents of workers against one another, and to change the character, forms and methods of the bourgeois state by establishing a fascist dictatorship which would absorb the Right extremist movement itself as one of its components. The finance oligarchy is interested in sustaining this movement only insofar as it facilitates the achievement of one or both of these aims.

The two aims were more closely interwoven in prewar fascism than today, although already then they did not coincide in time in some countries. Today the gap between the two is more pronounced. It is also more clearly evident that the monopolies do not always stand

in need of broad neo-fascist movements in order to carry out the reactionary reconstruction of the machinery of state. While Big Business is more interested than ever in strengthening, expanding and centralizing the administrative machinery and walling it off from the people, the reactionary trend in the superstructural institutions of state-monopoly capitalism finds its driving force mainly in actions undertaken *from the top*. There is a sharp growth of bureaucratic centralism and of coercive state organizations such as the army, intelligence services and police. In the United States, for instance, some 4,200,000 men are in the armed forces, including more than 3,000,000 in the army.

The monopolies would like to put an end to any control by parliament over the basic areas of state administration, and to achieve this they are prepared to violate the constitution, as happened in Greece, where the Royal court, the finance oligarchy and their foreign imperialist backers are using the state machine to prolong their rule.

The neo-fascists in Greece reposed hopes in the palace coup of July 15, 1965. Now that the government installed by the Court is generally recognized to be in a hopeless impasse, they are again stepping up their subversion. The danger of a fascist government being set up is being discussed not only in Greece but abroad. The U.S. newspaperman Sulzberger, for instance, recently commented on this possibility, citing an interview with the Greek King. At the same time the Rights are talking about the need for a broad "national front" (the people call it the "black front") to check the democratic movement and prevent the middle strata from joining it. Hence the basic demands for the democratization of the country which the Eighth Plenary Meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Greece put forward remain valid to this day. These demands are: "Purge of the machinery of state of fascist elements, disband the rural terrorist gangs (TEA), the reactionary officers' organization (IDEA) and the intelligence service (KIP), and the repeal of all anti-democratic emergency measures, restoration of trade union and general democratic rights, freedom for political prisoners, repatriation of political emigrants and a general amnesty. A proportional representation system should be introduced."

The reactionary, anti-democratic nature and structure of the capitalist state, the specific interests of the bureaucratic officialdom, and, most important, monopoly interests are giving rise to openly pro-fascist trends *within the state machine itself*. This is the principal source of the *rise and spread of neo-fascism* in a number of Western countries. It is not fortuitous that the most unscrupulous and uncontrolled state bodies (the CIA in the United States) are the biggest incubators and disseminators of the neo-fascist virus. This is a new departure in the functioning of the state apparatus.

The super-parasitism of the machinery of the monopoly-dominated state is evident, for one thing, in the fact that it sets up special army units of a fascist type (similar to the sinister German SS). At the same time the "traditional" aspect of the fascist ulcer should not be forgotten; the recurring discovery of secret arms stores and the combat training of bands of cutthroats in various countries are reminders that it still exists. Symptomatic, too, is the appearance of books such as *Seven Days in May* which envisages the possibility of fascist coups being engineered in the USA with special army formations playing the decisive role.

RIGHT EXTREMISM IN THE CITADEL OF IMPERIALISM

Right extremism in the USA made itself ominously felt during the last Presidential election. According to US researchers Arnold Forster and Benjamin R. Epstein, in the early 60's some 20 per cent of the U.S. electorate sympathized with the extremists, 25 to 30 per cent took a more or less conscious stand against them, and 50-55 per cent constituted the undecided center. In the course of the struggle to win over the waverers a specific kind of differentiation of forces and ideological trends is taking place. The above-mentioned authors, for instance, although they are opposed to Communist views, nevertheless entitled their book "Danger on the Right," and called for resistance to this danger. Quite another position is taken by Burnham, a former admirer of Trotsky, who declares that the liberal "is always looking for the enemy on the Right, whereas in reality all the major challenges which now bear crucially on our survival come from the Left." Discussing such opinions a prominent member of the British Labor Party correctly noted the "ominous resemblances between the German anti-liberal crusade of the twenties, and the American anti-liberal crusade of the sixties . . ."

By the time of the 1964 Presidential election, the U.S. Rights had succeeded in seizing control of the Republican Party, making the takeover clear at the party's San Francisco convention. Even in a newspaper so remote from radicalism as the *New York Herald Tribune* articles appeared under headlines such as "Hitlerism Is Reborn." That Goldwaterism is a variety of neo-fascism was recognized, although with different connotations, by many writers in the Western press.

The danger of Goldwater's confused and contradictory demagoguery consisted in the fact that he helped the extremists to win over some sections of the petty bourgeoisie and other middle strata. These strata, as James Reston wrote in *The New York Times*, longed for the return of the "good old days." They took at face value the sham attacks made against the ward bosses, the big trade unions and big business,

against the corruption rife in the Eastern part of the country, against "collectivism" and the power of "East-coast money," and believed in the sincerity of the exhortations to return to the simple virtues of the early settlers and small-town dwellers.

The top men of U.S. finance capital decided to make the elections a test of the strength of Right-wing extremism. Having repudiated the "radical" policy of John F. Kennedy and sized up the potential of the extreme Right organizations, the ruling elite preferred to give their support at this stage to Johnson, who sought to cover up the ominous shift to the Right by refurbishing some of the policies of his predecessor ("the great society"). Although Goldwaterism was heavily defeated, it nevertheless underscored the growing danger of Right extremism. The threat presented to all the democratic and progressive forces of U.S. society by reaction's "second echelon" has increased rather than diminished.

The seeds of neo-fascism in present-day USA are producing shoots in the soil of racism (incidentally, fascism of this type is dominant in South Africa).

In July 1966 Joseph Alsop, a man of the Right in U.S. journalism, reluctantly conceded that "we are threatened with a crisis of race-hatred." Strangely, however, he placed responsibility for this at the door of the champions of civil rights and the human dignity of the Negro people. The real sources of the crisis of race-hatred were revealed by the dramatic events of August, this time not in the "conservative" South, but in the industrialized and traditionally "liberal" North, where some 12 million Negroes have had to settle. Subjected to harsh exploitation in monopoly-owned enterprises and suffering from unemployment and social discrimination, the Negro working people have been crowded in ghettos notorious for unsanitary conditions, high rents and housing unfit for human habitation.

In August this year Negroes marched through sections of Chicago inhabited by whites to demand an end to discrimination in housing, abolition of the ghettos and the right to live in any residential neighborhood. The reactionaries, stampeding the white population with the "threat" of "black power," launched a virulent racist campaign. Confused by propaganda, part of the white population, especially the youth, attacked the Negroes and organized countermarches. There were calls to stage a "white revolution" and to establish "white power," symbolized by the swastika. The U.S. press commented that "it was the first time in years that any significant number of middle class Americans has publicly displayed support for Nazi views on race."

The American Nazi Party went into action in Chicago. Its Fuehrer, Rockwell, resorted to purely fascist demagoguery, claiming that it was the rich who loved Negroes because they did not have to live as their neighbors. This was

followed by the argument that the Negroes themselves were to blame for their plight. This invective was crowned by a mixture of anti-Semitism and anti-communism: "The money for race-mixing comes from Jews . . . The Communists are behind the race-mixing." In the meantime, the more "respectable" leaders are trying to build up and consolidate their main forces. For instance, in August 1966 agreement was reached, with Goldwater's blessing, on joint action by the four leading ultra-conservative organizations.

The U.S. Communists have arrived, in the draft of their new Party program, at the disquieting conclusion, based on an analysis of the situation in the country, that the USA is going through a crisis of democracy expressed in activation of the ultra-right who are out to institute an "American version of fascism."

FOR A BROAD ANTI-MONOPOLY FRONT OF ALL PROGRESSIVES

The political organizations of the working class, and primarily the Communist parties, call for the building of broad alliances of the democratic and patriotic forces in order first to restrict and then to abolish the power of the finance oligarchy.

"The working class, peasantry, intellectuals and the petty and middle urban bourgeoisie are vitally interested in the abolition of monopoly domination," the Statement of the 1960 meeting of Communist and Workers' parties declares. "Hence there are favorable conditions for rallying these forces."

"Communists hold that this unity can be achieved on the basis of the struggle for peace, national independence, the protection and extension of democracy, nationalization of the key branches of the economy and democratization of their management, the use of the entire economy for peaceful purposes in order to satisfy the needs of the population, implementation of radical agrarian reform, improvement of the living conditions of the working people, protection of the interests of the peasantry and the small and middle urban bourgeoisie against the tyranny of the monopolies."

The Communists are not only making a thorough study of the *changing* character of the

class allies of the proletariat but also analysing the essence of these changes (in the economic, sociological and ideological spheres) and drawing the corresponding political conclusions.

The vast majority of the Western Communist parties attach enormous importance to *economic* problems and *economic organizations* as concrete rallying points for the joint struggle of the most diverse sections of the population to curb the monopolies and to extend democracy. The defense and extension of *democratic freedoms and institutions* occupies an increasingly prominent place in the joint actions of the basic sections of the working population and their parties.

The communique of a conference of representatives of the West European Communist parties held in May 1966 noted that the development of the social and political struggle "provides favorable opportunities for building up a broad mass movement uniting the working class with the other anti-monopoly forces. This conference holds that this alliance can be expanded further with a view to winning reforms necessary for restricting the political and economic power of the monopolies, for effecting a genuine democratization of public life and paving the way to socialism."

Their ordeal during the first half of this century demonstrated to the basic sections of the intermediate strata in most capitalist countries the vital importance of democracy and of democratic ways of solving social problems. Not only has the progressive potential of these strata increased but its impact is making itself felt more and more in a number of countries. This is due in no small measure to their closer contact with the proletariat and to the actions undertaken together with it.

It would be a mistake, and even dangerous, to assume that there are countries in the West where Right extremism (in any shape or form) will never again present a threat to the gains of the proletariat and other sections of the working people; a threat to the future of the nation. We cannot allow ourselves to sit back and comfort ourselves with the thought that "it won't happen again." Joint action and unity of all working people and strata are the best guarantee that all the schemes emanating from the monopoly bourgeoisie for resurrecting neo-fascism and increasing the danger of war will be frustrated.

The Swedish youth and the communists

K. E. JOHANSON, U. KARLSSON, W. SVENSSON

THE YOUNG GENERATION AND POLITICS

IN SWEDEN as elsewhere young people play an important role in the working class movement. The nearly 50 years' history of the Communist Party offers convincing evidence of the valuable contribution made by the youth. It was thanks largely to the young people from the ranks of Social Democracy that the new Social Democratic Left Party (subsequently renamed the Communist Party) was founded, and it was the youth who formed its backbone.

In the first years of its existence our Party was naturally closely linked with the young generation, its political aims and aspirations. The political activity of the Youth League — its participation in cultural and educational work as well as in the movement for building community centers and activating the trade unions — helped at the same time to organize youth rallies and prepare a base for drawing young people into the revolutionary movement.

After the Party split in 1929 the political work of the youth was confined chiefly to fulfilling various Party assignments. In the middle thirties, with the development of the anti-fascist movement, work among the youth was revived, but during the first years of the Second World War the Party's ties with the younger generation were again limited to a very narrow range of questions.

In 1943-44 it was decided to extend work among the youth with a view to uniting the entire democratic youth for the achievement of socialist objectives. The general upsurge that followed the victory of the democratic forces in the Second World War was accompanied by success for the Youth League, which began to concern itself with questions of direct interest to young people. Communist Party membership rose sharply, many young people joining its ranks.

In Sweden as in many other West European countries the postwar changes affected all areas of public life. A consequence of this was that the youth began to be less interested in politics generally and in the Communist Party in particular. We tried various methods of work

in an effort to extend the Party's influence among the youth, but with little success.

In the early fifties a new youth organization — the Democratic Youth League — was formed with the aim of uniting broad sections of the youth to fight for their rights. In 1958 the Communist Youth League and the Democratic Youth League were officially merged to form a new organization called the League of Democratic Youth.

The Communist Party has always stimulated political activity among the youth. The idea of solidarity with movements for social and national liberation has elicited an enthusiastic response among young people, and the Party, together with other forces, is working to develop and deepen that solidarity.

The present article is the result of a study made by a group of Party functionaries of some general aspects of the youth problem. The theses advanced here are not the conclusive findings of scientific research. They are more in the nature of reflections, discussion points and a few general appraisals.

1. ATTITUDE TO POLITICAL WORK. THREE MAIN YOUTH GROUPS

In examining the problem of "youth and politics" one cannot speak of the youth in general. A basic factor is the *attitude* of young people to politics, their participation or non-participation in political actions. From this standpoint the Swedish youth may be divided into three basic groups:

- a) the socially and politically active;
- b) socially well adjusted but not belonging to political parties or associations;
- c) socially maladjusted.

Of course it is impossible to draw any definite line of distinction between these three groups. The above division is merely a guide to the general direction work among the youth should take if we wish to enlist them as active fighters for the Communist cause.

a) Active Youth

It can be assumed that the socially and

politically most active section of the youth are members of youth associations. True, not all are active in the traditional sense of the word, nevertheless membership in such associations is a perfectly objective criterion and one of the most accurate for ascertaining the degree of political activity of the youth and their participation in social life.

Sweden has approximately 1.5 million young people between the ages of 12 and 24. The five youth associations directly affiliated to the parties represented in the Riksdag have a total membership of 187,000, including 159,300 between the ages of 12 and 25.

The membership of the different political associations of the youth is shown in the table below.

Organization	Number of members	
	Total	Between 12 and 25 years of age
Center Youth League	72,000	61,200
Right Youth League	30,800	25,500
League of Democratic Youth	8,750	6,900
People's Party Youth League	17,250	13,000
Social Democratic Youth League	58,500	52,700
	187,300	159,300

Another political youth organization is the Christian Democratic Youth; it supports the conservative clerical Christian Democratic Union, which, though not represented in the Riksdag, polled about 70,000 votes in the 1964 parliamentary elections.

Politically-minded young people traditionally gravitated to the political parties or to the youth organizations more or less closely linked with the latter. But since there is a substantial difference between the programs and activity of the various parties it is not enough to speak of the political activity of the youth generally. One must take into account the character of that activity, its ideological complexion. For example, the youth league of the Right Party represents the conservative view. This party wants to preserve society in its present form, and in some respects even to turn it back. Its members can (at any rate at certain periods) be described as Right extremists, and on many issues are more reactionary than the conservative Rights. The People's Party youth league is an organization of liberal-minded, free-thinking young people and is purely bourgeois in character. The youth league of the Center Party is primarily an association of rural youth which, however, has latterly begun to win considerable influence in the cities and towns. It undoubtedly owes its relatively large membership to its preoccupation not so much with urgent political issues as with the promotion of entertainment. The name of the Social Democratic Youth League

speaks for itself. The purpose of the League of Democratic Youth is to educate its members in the spirit of socialism.

Besides those belonging to these traditional associations, a large section of the youth, primarily the radical and to some extent the liberal, participate in other movements and organizations such as the campaign against the Bomb, local and national committees against the policy of apartheid in South Africa, the Committee Against Neo-nazism and Race Prejudice, the Anti-Fascist Society, the Great Thursday Committee, various committees of the movement against the war in Vietnam, etc. It is impossible to say exactly how many young people are involved in these organizations. One measure of the political activity of the youth is its direct participation in various political actions—in the struggle of wage earners for better conditions, in mass actions for democratic rights, in the student movement, etc.

b) Youth not Belonging to Political Organizations

There is a considerably larger section of the Swedish youth whom we consider insufficiently active politically. These are young people who hold down jobs, are members of trade unions, pay their dues regularly, exercise their right to vote, follow debates on general questions, but who take no active part in public life.

However, in most cases the inactivity of this action of the youth is not absolute but relative. While they avoid politics, they are keenly interested in the work of organizations which are not obviously political in character.

This is borne out by the result of a study made in 1960 in the town of Linköping at the request of the local municipal authority. Altogether 555 young men and girls between the ages of 15 and 24 chosen at random (out of a total of 8,550 young people of this age in Linköping at the time) were interviewed.

Among those polled were 56 young men undergoing military training; their replies were not taken into account. The remaining 499 replied to the question as to their participation in various associations as follows: 21 (4.2 per cent) belonged to political associations, while 123 (24.6 per cent) belonged to sports associations; 15 (3 per cent) to voluntary defense organizations, 44 (8.8 per cent) to religious societies, 22 (4.4 per cent) to temperance societies, 18 (3.6 per cent) to Boy Scout organizations, and 17 (3.4 per cent) to school societies.

The study showed that half of the youth polled belonged to at least one society. Of those belonging to various societies 63 per cent were boys and 34 per cent girls. Most members of these societies were school-pupils and students of both sexes; in the 18-25 age group the percentage of membership in societies was 72 for boys and 73 for girls, the biggest number belonging to the Central Sport Society, which is true for all of Sweden.

That the insufficient activity of the youth is

relative can be seen also in the fact that young people who do not belong to any society, when asked whether they didn't think they ought to join some association, replied in the affirmative. The poll taken in Linköping shows that very many youngsters are anxious to engage in some form of public activity.

The existing political organizations seek to draw the youth into active participation in the fight for various political demands. But these efforts are frequently frustrated by the passive attitude of the young people even as regards issues directly affecting their own interests. The reason for this passivity may be twofold: in the first place, many young people believe that the leaders of the existing organizations take no account of the interests and wishes of the youth and, secondly, they feel that there are more important problems in the world in need of solution.

The first consideration applies mainly to political issues, the second, to ideological problems. The young people believe that in most cases the former should be settled automatically. Since society has certain obligations toward its members, and especially toward the youth, it should not be too difficult, the young people believe, to solve its problems. As for the problems of war and peace, the Bomb and the abolition of hunger in the developing countries, the youth who are uniting around these issues maintain that greater effort must be exerted to find some solution if the threat of total and swift annihilation of all the achievements of civilization is to be averted.

As we have said, a large section of the Swedish youth displays a keen interest in the activities of organizations and committees such as those against the war in Vietnam, against the Bomb, the policy in South Africa, the Anti-Fascist Society, etc. The young people who rally around the issues, essentially political, championed by these organizations as a rule represent a wide range of views and opinions. This is understandable inasmuch as these organizations are of a general nature reflecting the interests of different classes and groups. It is noteworthy, however, that a large part of the young people who take an interest in these organizations do not belong to any political party. They avoid work in party organizations, with the result that some of them fail to orientate correctly when a stand has to be taken on one or another political issue. A paradoxical situation arises. On the one hand, the youth is involved in such vital political issues as the fight for peace, general disarmament, banning of nuclear weapons, support of the newly emerging countries, the liberation struggle of the colonial peoples, etc. On the other hand, they disdain politics, declaring their desire to take up the above questions outside of politics. This can only be explained by the fact that these young people do not expect to find a response to their ideas and aspirations in the existing political parties. Why is this so? What can the progressive movement do to

attract this unquestionably active youth which would be a valuable acquisition to the movement working for social change?

c) Socially Maladjusted Youth

The press often displays a greater interest in the maladjusted than in any other group of young people. This is understandable, since they stand apart from the rest of the youth. Many of these young people descend to skid row, ending up as dipsomaniacs or jailbirds.

We would like to emphasize, however, that this group of youth in Sweden, as indeed in most countries, is extremely small, a fact which is of decisive significance for the present analysis. According to an official report on juvenile delinquency in Sweden, for example, only one-half of one per cent of the youth commit crimes. In Stockholm 2-3 per cent of the youth appear in court on various charges. These are the official data. The results of studies made by experts coincide on the whole with these figures. For example, in an article entitled "The Youth in a Squirrel Cage," John Takman writes that "no more than three per cent of all Stockholm youth aged between 15 and 18 are registered in the police records and courts for larceny, drunkenness and other violations of the law."

2. INFLUENCE OF THE ENVIRONMENT

"No one becomes what he is, good or bad, without the decisive influence of the environment," writes John Takman in his book *Juvenile Psychiatry*. "With few exceptions, all young people are moulded by their environment and education during infancy, pre-school and school age." This is correct. It applies to all young people irrespective of social origin, sex or education (within certain limits, of course). Environment is the decisive factor in the moulding of a young person; it determines to a large extent whether he will be politically active or passive. It is precisely for this reason that we must examine the role of this factor more closely. We shall examine four main influences: 1) family; 2) friends; 3) school, and 4) workmates.

a) Family

The family lays the decisive imprint on the child in its formative years. We must proceed from this generally accepted premise in all our practical work to win over the youth. At the same time, it should be borne in mind that the development of the child (intellectual and emotional, physical and mental) passes through a number of particularly vital periods when the influence of various ideas and events is decisive.

The experience of psychology shows that the first of these periods occur at a relatively early age (approximately at the age of three and at the beginning of the school age). At this time

the influence of factors outside the family are limited. Here the role of the parents and other members of the family is predominant, they have no equal "competitors." In the second of the above phases, however, which coincides with the child's entry into a new world beyond the threshold of the family, the picture changes somewhat. The child absorbs new impressions remote from those to which he has been accustomed at home, and new adults with their own views and opinions enter his life.

The principal changes, however, occur at the third stage, the turning point at which the youth is ready to cross the rubicon into adult life.

At this time the dominant role of the family ends. Young people begin to free themselves from parental influence, to search for new social ties. The group of friends and companions consisting of young people who think and act more or less alike now takes the place of the parents. This exposes the youth to new influences, new interests may appear and traits acquired in the family may undergo a change.

The new environment may deepen the impressions obtained in the family; on the other hand, under the impact of various events young people may be impelled to revise views acquired in their childhood years at home, or use them as a basis for evolving a new outlook.

All this makes it incumbent on us to devote more attention to the problem of the family environment and social background. For example, in the traditionally bourgeois family we find many humanist ideas, a sense of civic responsibility and appreciation of art and literature inculcated from childhood. These elements can subsequently provide excellent soil for the acceptance of socialist ideas. It is important for the socialist section of the working class movement to take this into account so as not to lose the opportunity of winning supporters of socialism from an environment remote from the working class.

b) *The Group*

As we have already pointed out, one of the new elements of the environment of the youth is the company they keep. With the advent of companions the authority of parents and school begins to recede.

Further development now depends on where the company goes—to the youth community center, the youth society or the cafe. This may perhaps be a matter of chance. But if the interest of the youth group is aroused by some political organization the latter can play a large part in solving the problems of the adolescents belonging to the group.

Bertil Soederling in his booklet *The Child at the Adolescent Age* maintains that young people in their teens have little desire to participate in political or religious organizations, folk dance ensembles, etc. They do not want to be "herded" into anything. They want to be free to dispose of their time as they see fit.

Soederling's opinion is confirmed by long-term observation of youth community centers and societies. Nevertheless it is possible to stimulate the interest in something concrete—for instance, one can help them to organize a band to listen to good jazz, attend performances of plays and films, arrange table tennis tournaments, debates on the origin of life, etc.

Many people take a purely negative attitude to youth groups, and this of course excludes all possibility of influencing them. We cannot afford to take this attitude. In reality all these groups represent a specific form of adjustment to the adult world, and just as there are individuals who are well adjusted or ill-adjusted to society so there are healthy groups and anti-social groups.

c) *School Age*

With the raising of the school-leaving age and the democratization of the educational system, which has changed the social composition of college and university students, the influence of the school has considerably grown. Moreover, in recent years there has been a marked increase in the political activity among students, chiefly due to the students' councils. A certain political radicalism is penetrating this sphere which influences the outlook of many young people. Unfortunately, it does not yet affect fundamental political and economic problems. The school gives the young people knowledge and broadens their horizons which in itself contributes to the spread of socialist views and the development of qualitatively higher social relationships. Nevertheless, the present school system leaves a great deal to be desired. Some subjects are taught from a purely bourgeois standpoint. Textbooks are so compiled as to justify the existing social order. From the very first year in school nearly all the children are obliged to attend Bible classes where they are imbued with preconceived values and standards.

d) *Workmates*

Perhaps the biggest influence on the political education of the youth is exerted by the working community. Workers' solidarity conditioned by class relations unites them, imbues them with valuable qualities essential for political and trade union struggle against big capital. It is here that the popularity of the movement in the enterprises has its roots: successful struggle benefits all workers. With economic progress, an increasing proportion of the population is involved in production in the form of non-manual labor. This applies primarily to the younger generation. At present the percentage of non-manual workers in the labor force in the Stockholm district is considerably higher than that of manual workers.

For the Communists the growing number of non-manual workers means that the working-class movement must search for new ways

and means of developing the socialist outlook and strengthening the solidarity of the various social groups. As an environment, the enterprise is becoming increasingly complex for the younger employees. This makes it all the more imperative to establish contact with the youth before they leave school, try to interest them in the working-class movement and help to mould a socially mature outlook on life even before they join the labor force.

3. RANGE OF INTERESTS OF THE YOUTH

In speaking of the youth and politics it is essential to take into account not only their social background and political attitude but many other factors as well—age, family status, size of family, etc.

The adolescent of 17 who still attends school naturally has different problems from young people who are about to start a family. For the latter, questions of housing and family may be of prime importance. They want to know whether they will receive allowances for their children, where to find decent accommodation at reasonable rent in a country with a housing shortage, how in present conditions to finance various items of family expenditure, what are the possibilities of placing their children in kindergarten, of obtaining work, or continuing their education. All of which is of less concern to the adolescent. They present different demands to society. They want more opportunities for a good education and interesting and well-paid employment. They believe that they have a right to amuse themselves. All this compels us to give more attention to the interests of the different groups of the youth and to analyze the motives behind certain actions of the young people, their social behavior.

a) *Motives of Political Activity*

Political activity is motivated primarily by a person's social, economic and political position in society. But this is not the whole explanation. There may be other reasons or a combination of different reasons prompting people to engage in political activity: viz., the degree of social maturity, the amount of free time at their disposal, personal considerations associated with character and personality, a need for social intercourse, etc.

b) *Political Sympathies and Antipathies*

The lack of concrete data makes it extremely difficult to draw a clear picture of the political sympathies and antipathies of the youth. The evidence shows that the Social Democrats have occupied a very strong position among the young voters. Some data indicate that in the past 60 per cent of the voters who went to the polls for the first time voted for Social Democratic candidates. As for the Communists, they appear to enjoy less influence among the young voters than among the senior voters. This may be explained both by the difficulties the Communists encounter in pursuing a policy

that would be accepted as both Swedish and Socialist, and by the effect of the propaganda of our political opponents who scare the youth away from the Communists. Our own mistakes in the recent past too have undoubtedly played a big part.

However, the election struggle in 1964 and 1966 helped to change the attitude of the youth to our Party. A preliminary analysis of the results of the last elections shows that the proportion of new voters who cast their ballots for Communist candidates increased while that of those who voted for the Social Democrats declined.

c) *The Youth at Leisure*

It is important to know what specific free-time interests the youth have, what sphere of activity appeals to them most. The answer may be found in the results of the above-mentioned study conducted in Linköping. The poll of 555 young people between the ages of 15 and 24 produced the following picture of how they spend their free time during the week:

—72 per cent of the boys and 52 per cent of the girls went to the cinema at least once; 18 per cent went twice; 6 per cent of the boys and 9 per cent of the girls went to the theatre;

—35 per cent of the boys and 26 per cent of the girls spent at least one evening dancing;

—22 per cent of the boys and 6 per cent of the girls engaged actively in sport;

—19 per cent of the boys and 4 per cent of the girls attended sport events as spectators;

—10 per cent of those polled attended church services or participated in some other religious rally;

—37 per cent of the boys and 17 per cent of the girls went once or several times to cafes.

This far from complete picture of the interests of the youth affords some idea of how leisure time is spent. Unfortunately, the indices given are average only, no differentiation being made according to age, family conditions and other factors. Local conditions likewise laid their imprint on the results of the study. Nevertheless the results are not without interest. They make it possible to draw some general conclusions concerning the youth covered by the poll and the interests of the younger generation outside the political sphere. However the occupations and interests of which we spoke do not preclude political interests.

4. TO WIN THE YOUTH — AN IMPORTANT TASK

a) *"Contradictions between generations"*

From time to time the question of the "contradictions between the generations" is

discussed in political circles. As a rule this question is presented thus: a certain ageing process is taking place in political life, a loss of bold perspectives, etc., all of which it is alleged is more or less directly connected with the age of the political leaders. In reality, however, the problem here of the "contradiction between generations" is not so much that of age, as of ability to understand the trends and potentialities for political development. Objective development is bringing the youth more and more into politics. The number of young voters in the coming years will increase substantially owing to the relatively large population growth in the forties. Moreover, the voting age has been reduced to 20, and this also means a larger number of new voters. Instead of using the concept of the "contradiction between the generations" as a political argument, it is essential to work out exact and effective policies and slogans. Such stereotyped concepts as "the ideas of this young politician must be correct if only because he is young," etc., are no substitute for serious political analysis. There are young and old political leaders in every political organization and in most political groups. But in appraising their political position we apply different criteria than that of age. We use such concepts as "progressive," "reactionary," "neutral," "politically-minded," "politically indifferent," etc. It is of course difficult at times to draw a clear line of distinction between these concepts. It is often not a simple matter of black or white but of certain nuances.

A precondition for drawing young people into politics is thus not the simple replacement of the "old men" by the "young men," but above all the ability of political organizations to formulate the aims of the struggle in such a way as to correspond both in form and in content to the needs and possibilities of social development. It will be no exaggeration to say that the progressive organizations of today have yet to find the right way to attract all the progressive elements among the youth to the movement.

b) *Favorable Trends-*

In working with the youth the progressives should draw on trends favoring the movement to the Left in Swedish political life which in itself facilitates the social education of the youth, their involvement in politics. It goes without saying that the main thing is to strengthen the socialist working-class movement organizationally and politically. The radicalization of certain circles of the Social Democracy should not be overlooked. This process may create a new situation in Swedish politics inasmuch as it serves to strengthen the socialist movement as a whole. It is interesting to note that the Social Democratic Youth League has advanced a number of demands which presuppose a socialist perspective on the part of the government. Of course the policy of this

League is not consistent, nevertheless the fact remains that it is questioning the attitude towards private ownership and the concentration of capital which still dominates the Social Democratic Party.

The Social Democratic student movement is the most consistent in this respect, assailing private ownership, the concentration of capital, the monarchy and those circles which want Sweden to have her own Bomb. Some Social Democrats are demanding a bolder social, cultural, internal and foreign policy than that proposed by the government. In this respect the Left tendencies among the traditional bourgeois strata, expressed above all in the dissatisfaction of the bourgeois youth, are significant. A section of this youth is demanding the withdrawal of U.S. forces from Vietnam, a ban on the Bomb, and a tougher policy toward South Africa, Spain and Portugal. How deep these Left tendencies go is difficult to say. However, it should be stressed that they are not confined to international problems—the fight for peace and against fascism—but affect social policy as well.

We have spoken here about the activity of the school youth expressed, among other things, in the activities of the students' councils. Progressive trends are also to be observed among the university and college youth.

The general leftward trend in Swedish political life is intensified by the popularity of the various forms of activity for peace, the movement against the Bomb, the struggle against neo-nazism, solidarity actions with the peoples of Vietnam, South Africa, Angola, Mozambique, Spain and Portugal. The active participation of the youth in these movements is a promising sign.

One of the principal factors influencing the shift to the left in Swedish political life is the development of the Communist movement. This makes it incumbent on the Communist Party of Sweden to advance the socialist perspective with greater vigor and to chart the path to socialism for Sweden. The Party is keenly aware of the need for new and bolder methods of work, for lively debates on the struggle for socialism, for extensive Marxist study taking into account the situation in Sweden, her history and traditions, and for accelerating the country's transition to socialism.

In order to facilitate the movement to the left, the Communists must focus on the main social trends, and one of the most important problems in this respect is that of winning over the youth.

c) *Tasks of the Communist Party*

The influence of the working-class movement on the youth can be heightened through the political and organizational work of the League of Democratic Youth. The League poses problems directly affecting the lives of young people. The youth today is more independent than ever before. This is true of young people of

all ages, and hence political parties must establish direct contact with them on a broader scale than formerly.

The Youth League is concentrating on the student youth under 20. Work with these age groups requires much flexibility in the choice of organizational forms, and the Youth League has all the facilities for this.

But important as organizational forms of work unquestionably are it is the political position of the Party that is decisive in influencing the youth. Does this position correspond to the interests of the young generation or not? Does the Party's policy reflect the new phenomena in the life of society or does it cling to outworn concepts? That is the essential thing. The second question is particularly significant. The danger of marking time is always great, and clinging to outdated views is fraught also with the risk of losing contact with the youth. To avoid this danger it is not enough to display a readiness to talk to the youth. All political parties do that. If it were only a matter of declarations, there would be no youth problem today. The competition between the parties for "good relations with the youth" often, and especially at election time, assumes forms that tend to frighten many young people away from politics. In practice such "good relations with the youth" often turn out to be another excuse for postponing indefinitely the solution of their problems. The result is that the youth begin to distrust all the promises made by political parties.

Political work among the youth must constantly take account of the fact that its position is changing. In recent years the conditions of political work in our country have changed. In view of the growing attraction of youth community centers of various types in towns and rural localities, political organizations can no longer depend for success on the traditional methods of establishing contact with the youth by arranging dances, recreational facilities, etc. The youth community centers have much better facilities for this than the political organizations.

This does not mean, however, that the conditions for the work of political youth organizations have deteriorated. On the contrary, The Communist Party has always been in favor of promoting the activities of the youth communities in this respect. The Communists themselves have often been the initiators in organizing youth centers, building sport facilities, etc. But the youth clubs (primary organizations of the youth leagues) should do everything possible to create a healthy spirit among the youth and to use forms of work such as arranging dances, encouraging hobbies, outdoor exercise, and sports.

Work among school pupils is another important sphere. The teaching of the social sciences even to children of 12 and 13 acquires a definite political significance. It is in the social science classes that political discussion

usually begins. The textbooks often give inadequate, if not distorted information about the political parties, especially the Communist Party. This makes it imperative for the Communist Party to prepare special literature designed for the youngsters of school age. Moreover, the political parties have latterly been demanding the right to expound their policies in the schools. So far this has been left entirely to the teachers, most of whom orientate on the bourgeoisie.

The "older" youth, i.e., young people between the ages of 20 and 25, have much the same problems as adults: taxes, housing, rising prices, etc. Nevertheless they, too, have their problems. One problem coming increasingly to the fore is that of helping young married couples to get started. The Communist Party submitted a program, a step forward in this respect, which was received by the youth. It should be admitted, however, that the practical possibilities of obtaining any concrete results are extremely meagre owing to the numerical weakness of the Party and its rather limited influence.

The attitude of a party to the youth is characterized in some measure by its attitude to the younger members in its own ranks. A party which nominates young candidates and whose organizations are headed by young people thereby proves that its benevolent attitude to the youth is not confined to verbal declarations. At the same time, of course, the fact that all age groups are represented in the party should not be lost sight of. However, a certain preponderance of active young people can only be of benefit. This provides a certain guarantee that questions vital for the youth are really being advanced and solved by the Party. Incidentally, the fact that the youth is not adequately represented in Party committees is one of the problems facing the Communists today.

The work of the Communists among the youth cannot be confined to the activities of the Party organizations and the youth clubs. The work of individual Communists in mass organizations, primarily the trade unions, is of equal if not greater importance. But more important still perhaps is the activity of the Communists in the enterprises. Here the Communists can help the young worker directly on the job, explain his rights and defend his trade union interests.

A growing section of the youth is studying in universities and other higher educational institutions. The work of the Communists among these young intellectuals leaves much to be desired. It is essential to devote more attention to cultural policy and to publish more Communist literature. The changes in the social composition of the student body, expressed in the fact that the proportion of youth from working class families is considerably higher than a few decades ago, should be a guarantee that such activity can only serve to extend the influence of the Party.

It is important for any party to keep its finger on the pulse of the popular sentiment, study trends and movements within the different strata of society, including the young generation of workers. Experience shows how essential it is for the Communist Party, too, to elaborate the correct policy toward the youth, march in step with them and work in their midst. There is a wide field for this activity. And what is most important, contact is being established with a new and very broad strata of the youth. Not so long ago young people who belonged to the Communist youth movement as a rule came from Communist families. Of course this is hardly a sufficient basis for the growth of the Communist Party whose influence among the older generation is by no means great. Communist activity in mass movements opens new prospects in this respect. The heightened interest of young people in activity aimed at safeguarding peace (primarily the fight against the Bomb), the devel-

opment of former colonial peoples, etc., mentioned above is extremely important for us.

The results of the recent elections clearly show that interest in the Communist Party on the part of the youth has grown. The striving of the Party to raise questions directly affecting the youth is a contributing factor in this respect. But the Communist Party's demand for regeneration, or rather, socialist regeneration, has had an even greater impact. This has given many young men and women a political perspective, raising politics in their eyes to a level beyond that of mere promises.

It is now essential to coordinate our initial successes. The main task is to organize multi-form activity among the youth, utilizing all the organizational forms at our disposal—within the framework of the Communist Party, the League of Democratic Youth, the radical student movement and to a no lesser degree within the framework of the common struggle for peace, democracy and progress.

Communists in action for the happiness of children

THERE ARE APPROXIMATELY 13 million children and adolescents in France today. Nearly a million babies are born each year. About one-fifth of the population are children between the ages of six and 14.

These children, France's future, will be the men and women of the year 2,000, and we are anxious to prepare them for this, to make them healthy, strong, well educated people, capable of participating in the rapidly developing scientific and technological revolution, and contributing their share to social progress and peace on earth.

The lives of our children are closely linked with the interests of the nation. That is why our Party devotes constant attention to the children, and especially to the children of the working people.

The children of today cherish great hopes. But the capitalist system kills the finest dreams and the noblest aspirations. The daily life of the child, his education, his health and development suffer from a regime which is bent solely on protecting and extending its class privileges at the expense of the entire nation.

The regime of personal power established

in 1958 has worsened the conditions of children and the youth. For a child to be happy he must be well housed, well fed and adequately clothed and be able to spend plenty of time in the fresh air.

What are the conditions for all this in France?

More than three million wage-workers in France earn less than 56,500 old francs a month; the cost of living is constantly rising. Many mothers are unable to provide their children with adequate food and healthy recreation.

The family's role is all-important and it is the duty of the state to give it every support. To ensure harmonious development of her children the mother needs the time and the opportunity to bring them up. But the number of working mothers is steadily growing. As things are today, they are burdened by innumerable cares, they have not enough time to devote sufficient attention to their children. Hence the significance of the National Conference held in Paris in 1965 to discuss reducing working hours for women without any reduction of wages.

It should be added that France has less than

600 nurseries to a total of six million working women.

Hundreds of thousands of children live in crowded, noisy, and often unsanitary conditions.

Owing to the meagre appropriations for public education, it is estimated that by 1972 we will be short 90,000 places in kindergartens, 120,000 places in elementary schools and 146,000 in secondary schools. Raising the school-leaving age to 16 beginning in 1966 has been postponed until 1972.

The Malthusian policy of the de Gaulle government is aimed at adapting education to the needs of the monopolies, at providing them with the necessary labor power.

The brief duration of schooling and the obstacles at all levels mainly affect workers' children who are destined to form the bulk of unskilled and semi-skilled labor for industry, trade and office work.

Our statesmen talk much about "civilized leisure." But what is the reality behind these words? Despite the efforts of the organizers of the youth movement (which the present Minister for Youth and Sport regards with scorn) the statistics show how little has been done to organize the leisure of school children.

In 1965 the children of factory and office workers comprised only 22 per cent of the total number of children who spent the summer in holiday camps.

All French towns suffer from a shortage of premises for extra-curricular activity, recreational facilities and health measures. Lacking playgrounds, the children in towns play in the streets or on the tenement stairs, while country children have virtually no facilities for organized activity outside of the schools.

Faced with this situation, the Communists have suggested measures to solve these problems and are fighting vigorously to carry them into effect.

Defense of the children is closely linked with the main issue facing our country today: how to put an end to the regime of personal power, for a genuine policy for the defense of children is possible only under a genuine democracy.

The struggle for a people's government, for economic development, scientific and technological progress in the interests of the workers and all working people, for a firm and consistent foreign policy of peaceful coexistence, national independence and peace is at the same time a struggle for the happiness of our children.

Fighting for the unity of the democratic forces not only to ensure the triumph of genuine democracy but for embarking on the path of socialism means opening to the children the doors to the radiant future they are entitled to expect in our time.

The election program of the Communist Party contains many points relating to the children and the youth. It calls for:

—developing the network of pre-school children's institutions under the system of public education, kindergartens, and nurseries, summer holiday camps for school-pupils;

—urgent measures to reduce working hours for school-pupils;

—urgent measures to reduce working hours for women without lowering wages; motherhood protection;

—improvement of the system of social security and allowances for large families;

—democratic reform of education, from school to university, according to the Langevin-Wallon plan, and notably 25 per cent of all state budget expenditure to be earmarked for public education.

These points are a guide to action for the Communist Party. Even under the present regime it is possible to force the government to make concessions.

Thanks to the struggle of the workers and all democrats, we succeeded in curbing actions of the authorities that infringe the interests of children, and even in achieving notable results.

The Communists are carrying on extensive mass work, upholding and consolidating the gains won by the combined efforts of the popular movement and specialists in the sphere of child welfare.

Headway was made at the time of the Popular Front and immediately after Liberation, when the Communists exerted an important influence on the decisions of government and parliament.

The 1936 achievements—improvement in the conditions of the workers, shorter working hours and paid vacations—helped to create the conditions for the normal physical and mental development of children.

In 1944-46 the system of social security and measures for protection of mother and child were introduced.

The Communists have repeatedly submitted to the National Assembly numerous bills in defense of the interests of children and the youth.

Despite the obstacles raised by the government, the Communist municipalities have achieved impressive results in the matter of child welfare.

Government policy, on the other hand, is oriented on making the population pay for services of all kinds, which places such services beyond the reach of working-class families.

Moreover the state is constantly cutting the funds of the communities, forcing them at the same time to meet extraneous expenditures. At present communities are obliged to pay 50 per cent of the expenses for the construction of secondary schools and technical schools which were formerly financed wholly by the state. In 1947 state subsidies for summer holiday camps for schoolchildren amounted to 50 per cent of the cost of the maintenance of a

child. At present these subsidies have been cut to six per cent.

Nevertheless the Communist municipalities, helped by the public, are making some headway. The town of Aubervilliers in the Paris suburbs is one example. During the past 15 years this town with its population of 71,000 has built 4,000 flats, three schools and four kindergartens, a health center, and eight children's camps, (a ninth is about to be opened). The young mothers of Aubervilliers have at their disposal three nurseries, a mother and child welfare center and a dietetic dining room. In addition, 5,000 children have their midday meal in school dining rooms. During the past five years three gymnasiums have been built and a swimming pool is under construction; 15 playgrounds have been laid out where children can play under the supervision of adults. A children's library and music school are likewise valuable additions to the town's facilities for the children.

This is an example of what a Communist municipality can do for the children.

* * *

Our Party devotes no less attention to organizing the children of working people.

It gives every assistance to the League of the Courageous (Vaillants) founded after Liberation for the purpose of "uniting all French youth. . . and bringing them up in the spirit of love for the republic, in the spirit of democracy and secularism . . . for the purpose of studying their conditions and upholding their rights."

"There can be no nobler task than concern for the well-being of the children of the working people, organizing their leisure, helping to educate them in the spirit of our principles," Maurice Thorez declared in 1959 at the Seventh National Conference of the Vaillant movement. He called on the Party to do everything possible to promote this movement.

The educational work conducted by the Vaillant League corresponds socially and politically to the needs of our time. There can be no real education isolated from the time and the society in which the child lives, without taking account of the conditions of his life. The League has the function of bringing up the children in the spirit of communism in order to counteract the moulding of his consciousness in the spirit of bourgeois morality. It seeks to give the children a class upbringing, to imbue them with love for their country, for the working class, for peace.

In conducting educational work, the age of the children, their home conditions and their needs are taken into account. The League is a mass movement and its work is not limited

to any privileged groups of children.

It organizes games in neighborhood districts, film showings, sport contests and fêtes in which thousands of children take part. It also sponsors solidarity campaigns, which help to promote friendship among children of all nations. At the present time the Vaillants are collecting money and medical supplies for the children in Vietnam.

The League keeps its young members informed of life in the socialist countries which they can compare with their own. "Friendship Trains" sponsored by the League help them to learn more about the world. French children have visited the USSR, the GDR, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland and others countries where they have seen what socialism means.

During the celebration of the twentieth anniversary of Liberation the League arranged tours of places associated with the Resistance. One of these places was Oradour sur Glane where 2,000 children had an opportunity to learn for themselves of the crimes the enemies of freedom and the working people are capable of.

The organizational forms of the League accord with its popular character. These forms, based on the work of educators like Makarenko and psychologists like Henri Wallon, have fully justified themselves in the 20 years since the founding of the movement. Special attention is paid to training group counsellors, whose work is of decisive significance for the functioning of the organizations.

* * *

Children have many friends and defenders, but it is necessary to coordinate their activities in order to achieve success.

Notable headway has been made in this respect; witness, for instance, the seminar sponsored earlier this year by the League on the theme "For a Policy of Defense of Children in a Democratic France," and the National Happy Childhood Conference called on the initiative of the French Women's Union.

Both of these assemblies enjoyed the support and assistance of child-education experts. Despite differences in interests and political views, they are all ready to place themselves in the service of a genuine child welfare policy.

In this way doctors, teachers, sociologists, members of parliament, writers and artists, child and youth movement activists, mothers and fathers join forces to serve the interests of the children, and hence, of the country.

The French Communists give them effective help in this effort and will endeavor to do still more in the future.

Jacqueline GELLY

Whither Mr. Johnson?

ALL WHO SAW IT must have been shocked by that photo, featured recently in the Press showing what Americans are doing in Vietnam. From the ruins of his house destroyed by American bombs, a villager extricates the body of his daughter, a child with her lifeless limbs hanging helplessly.

Almost simultaneously the U.S. Press carried another picture, which no doubt caught Mr. Johnson's eye at his desk in the White House. This time the photo was of a sumptuous wedding—an "almost monarchic" one, as the *Time* reporter put it — of his daughter Lucy and the bridegroom Patrick Nugent. The newlyweds were shown cutting the wedding cake, the "biggest in the world" — 2.7 metres high and weighing 135 kilograms. The bridegroom was smiling. In addition to his daughter's hand and the cake, the father-in-law presented the young man with 50 per cent of the shares he holds in a film company. For the President, being a sensible head of family, has never put all his eggs in one basket. While "serving the United States," or perhaps we should say "serving Wall Street," he never forgets the Johnson family. In thirty years of politics he has amassed a tidy fortune: a ranch and livestock in Texas, TV and radio stations, shares in many other undertakings, and the useful friendship of the owners of Texas Instrument, who supply electronic war material, and of the Boeing Aircraft Co., manufacturers of the B-52 bombers that have sown so much death in Vietnam. There is enough to provide his daughters with dowries. Mrs. Johnson, for her part, in addition to being the wife of the President, is a businesswoman whose success prompted her husband to say proudly to the Press that, really, a woman who can increase her capital tenfold in five years isn't a fool. A fool? Certainly not. Whatever may be said about the Johnsons no one can say they are fools. What some of their fellow countrymen say about them, possibly not without envy, is that they are too crafty for words. Congressman Alvin O'Konski of Wisconsin has just disclosed that actor George Hamilton, who it is said will marry Lucy's sister, has repeatedly and quite unlawfully had his call-up deferred, thus saving him from going to Vietnam to defend the "free world." Deeply distressed, the poor man says that only his painful family situ-

ation bars him from the battlefield. True, there is his mother to look after, a house worth \$200,000, a Rolls-Royce, and an annual income of \$100,000. Plenty of other young Americans, who also have to support their families but are not so well feathered with money and, above all, who have no prospect of ever getting into the Johnson family, have not had their call deferred. So they have been sent to Vietnam to kill peasant men and women and their children until they themselves meet death in a rice-paddy from a guerrilla bullet or in a sky riddled by anti-aircraft shells and missiles of the People's Army.

As we see, Johnson is waging the war with other people's hands. In the land of the mighty dollar this, too, is known as "not being a fool." Acting on the same principles which caused Goldwater a loss of votes, Johnson is plunging deeper and deeper into reckless adventure and war crimes. The "Republican" opposition will have a hard time accusing him of weakness. The President must have rubbed his hands when word came that, according to the latest Gallup poll, 51 per cent of Goldwater's backers approve his policy.

How many more tons of bombs will have to be dropped on the towns and villages of Vietnam, how many children killed, homes and farms devastated and hospitals destroyed for the proportion of votes "regained" from Goldwater supporters to climb to 52 per cent? Mr. McNamara must have calculated that by one of the Pentagon's electronic brains.

A strange situation, indeed, where politics require that women and children be roasted with napalm so that better preparations can be made for the elections. A strange country where the war industry is the most profitable, because over 50 per cent of the budget appropriations are allocated to it and where the slightest whisper about peace talks causes panic in the Stock Exchange and sends shares toppling. A strange country where, according to Federal statistics, 32 million people have an annual income of less than \$750, considered in that country to be the subsistence minimum, and where, according to the same source, \$534 million is spent on the country's 22 million dogs. A strange country where gangsters declare for free enterprise and, having made a fortune, die

the death of the righteous, in bed. A strange country where, according to an FBI report published last year, they register a car theft every minute, an armed robbery every five minutes, a rape every 26 minutes, and a murder every hour. The number of crimes committed in 1964 alone was 326,461, or 15 per cent more than in 1963. And this list is headed by Texas, the state of oil kings and of lynchings and the native state of the President.

In the light of these facts, some "trouble-makers," among whom I class myself, wonder how these U.S. politicians have the cheek to pose as champions of civilization. They have had their hands so full in the recent years trying to enforce with bombs and dollars the "regime of right and free enterprise" in every corner of the globe — from Guatemala to the Congo, from Korea to the Dominican Republic, and from Ghana to Vietnam — that they have no time to put their own house in order, as a British humorist put it. But the imperialist marauders have little sense of humor, they simply want to impose their "order" — racism, terror and oppression — on peoples casting off the tyranny of the past. In their striving to do this and in piling crime upon crime they may even go as far as to set the whole world on fire.

There are over 300,000 Johnson defenders of "free enterprise" and anti-Communist crusaders in Vietnam today. To this force we must add the 65,000 men of the 7th Fleet, which numbers 125 warships, including three aircraft carriers. For many months the United States has been using its immense technical and scientific power to annihilate a people who for more than twenty-five years have been fighting against heavy odds for their right to live a free life.

Last spring air sorties averaged 200 a day against North Vietnam and 800 against South Vietnam, many more than the number made throughout the Dienbienphu battle. Since February the weight of bombs dropped monthly on North and South Vietnam has been twice as great as in any month of the Korean war. The men in the Pentagon, riding roughshod over international agreements and acting as if they were competing with Hitler's generals, are making ever greater use of weapons that hit mainly the civil population. How can these latest war criminals be forgiven for the scorched faces of women and children—the targets of napalm bombs, for phosphorus shells, asphyxiating gas, anticrop chemicals which lay waste the richest and most luxuriant plantations? With monstrous refinement, Johnson's technicians have devised time bombs charged with steel pellets that scatter as they burst. They use the "lazy dogs" — bombs that scatter steel spokes as they slowly descend. The bomb targets in Hanoi and Haiphong are, as everyone knows, the residential districts. Out to break the will of the Vietnamese people, the invaders are destroying dams to bring on famine. In a book entitled *The New Face of War*, Malcolm W. Browne, former AP correspondent in South Vietnam, described what he saw as "horrible butchery." "Huts are

flattened," he writes, "and civilian loss of life is generally high. In some, the charred bodies of children and babies have made pathetic piles in the middle of the remains of market places."

Small wonder that, after so much effort to rise to the stature of the Nazi war criminals, the American leaders, who call themselves "champions of freedom," have difficulty in making it clear to their flunkies what they must or mustn't say. The State Department will hardly have appreciated the "naive" statement, to say the least, made to the *Sunday Mirror* by General Ky. To show his masters that he was well aware of the purpose of their action and of the model inspiring them, he boasted that his "only hero" was Hitler.

But despite this new total war, despite this deployment of forces and means of destruction, despite the savagery of the aggressors and the thousands of millions of dollars spent on the war (\$30,000 million in two years against \$20,000 million in four years of the Korean war), the "underdeveloped" Vietnamese peasant is not only holding out but is chalking up victories over the well-fed and steel-clad American giant. There is something in this that goes beyond the logic of a political cowboy, be his name Rusk or McNamara. Did not McNamara promise victory in 1965? The resistance of the Vietnamese people and the aid they get from the socialist countries, first of all the Soviet Union, are growing in step with the U.S. escalation. The people of Vietnam owe their extraordinary courage, admired by the whole world, to their conviction that they are fighting for survival and freedom. They owe it to their belief that, however hard and long the fight may be, they are bound to win.

Vietnam will never be defeated. It is not only those who have always been friends of the Vietnam people that are convinced of this. This conviction is also typical of the governments which know from experience — gained at a high price, after much sorrow and destruction — that a people resolved to live free can break any opposition and withstand any hardships. But the rulers and the men of the trusts and their helpers in the White House or the Congress lobby are trying hard to disprove this. They would like to halt the march of history by putting up as a warning sign, such as the Ku Klux Klan gallows, the apocalyptic picture of what the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America can expect should they venture to challenge the advocates of slavery and to lay the foundations of a new society. This is why the Americans have no scruples about resorting to any atrocity and do not hesitate to take the incalculable risk of extending the war — a war of the nuclear age! — to the whole continent and the rest of the world. Indeed, is not the Pentagon talking about increasing the U.S. forces in Vietnam to 700,000 or even 1,000,000, and is not Cambodia threatened now that the sovereignty of Laos has been deliberately flouted?

Surely it must have dawned on the policy-

makers in Washington that their task is not as easy as they had imagined. They have to do, not only with the people of Vietnam, but with the community of nations which has made the cause of the Vietnam people its own. Armed with modern weapons supplied by the Soviet Union, the people of Vietnam are delivering telling blows to the aggressor, who no longer dares to announce the number of aircraft shot down by the People's Army. All over the world, including the United States, millions of men and women are becoming more and more active as they realize that their fate too is at stake in Vietnam. They denounce the American war criminals and identify themselves with Vietnam. They insist that the bombing of North Vietnam be stopped immediately, that the fighting in South Vietnam be ended, the aggressor's

troops withdrawn and the Geneva agreements respected.

At a time when the nations are exposed to grave danger, one cannot but back the appeal of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union for joint action against the imperialist policy of aggression. Nor can one but feel angry at the Chinese leaders' attacks on the Soviet Union and against the unity of the Communist and other progressive and anti-imperialist forces of the world. Their attitude benefits none but the imperialists and reactionaries.

The pressing task of every revolutionary and of every champion of peace and progress is to do all in his power to curb the Pentagon aggressors and warmongers and compel them to retreat.

Henri ALLEG

Communist electoral success in Sweden

ALTHOUGH THE ELECTIONS which took place in Sweden last September were held at municipal and regional levels, the electoral campaign was clearly of a nationwide character, with local policy matters being taken up only tangentially. The reason was that the Landstings (regional parliaments) and the municipal councils outside Landsting jurisdiction — those of Stockholm, Goeteborg and Malmoe — elect deputies to the first chamber of the Riksdag (151 out of a total of 383). The bourgeois parties regarded the 1966 elections as a rehearsal for the 1968 elections to the second chamber, in which they hope to win a majority and a new government, as happened in Norway last year.

Having concluded a "civic peace" for the duration of the election campaign, the bourgeois parties refrained from publicly airing their disagreements on many major political issues; instead they concentrated their fire on the workers' parties. The People's Party and the Center Party campaigned from a common platform and in some areas, including Stockholm and Norbotten, advanced joint lists. In Goeteborg, where they were joined by the Right Party, they drew up a common program and strictly observed the "civic-peace" agreement.

The Communist Party also called for a common front of the labor movement, but the idea was cold-shouldered by the Social-Democratic leaders.

1966 ELECTION RESULTS

The bourgeois parties made gains at the expense of the Social Democrats. In the table below the results of the 1962 election are given in brackets.

	Percentage of vote		Number of Seats	
Right Party	16.5	(15.2)	278	(255)
Center Party	15.2	(13.1)	295	(227)
People's Party	17.8	(17.1)	310	(285)
Social Democratic Party	42.3	(50.5)	789	(898)
Communist Party	6.4	(3.8)	79	(29)

The recently-founded Christian Democratic Union received 1.8 per cent of the vote and one seat.

The number of votes cast for the three bourgeois parties rose by 4.1 per cent, but they failed to secure a majority. Even if the demand of the People's and Right parties for the dissolution of the first chamber and for new elections had been granted, the bourgeois parties would not have outnumbered the Social Democrats and Communists, for the latter would have gained another two seats.

The change in the distribution of votes among the bourgeois parties is insignificant. The Center Party (former Peasant Union), which is more consistent in advocating Swedish neutrality, registered the biggest increase in the votes and seats.

DEFEAT FOR SOCIAL DEMOCRATS

The Social Democrats suffered a heavy defeat. Their 42.3 per cent of the poll was the lowest since 1934, when they got 42.1 per cent. By way of comparison, they polled 53.8 per cent in 1940, 48.6 per cent in 1950, 47.8 per cent in 1960 and 50.5 per cent in 1962. Since 1962 the number of their supporters has dropped by 8.2 per cent.

This defeat was indicative of the electorate's attitude to the government policy. There is no doubt that many workers and young people did not go to the polls because of their dissatisfaction with this policy. The Government had yielded to the pressure of the bourgeoisie on a number of vital issues. Instead of making every effort to end the housing crisis, it cut back housing, with the result that waiting lists, especially in the towns, grew longer. In the cities applicants often have to wait ten years and more. There are no curbs on real estate profiteering. Building companies and millionaires are piling up profits from the high rent. The steady rise in interest rates has forced the rents to a level that factory and office workers find difficult to pay. Nothing was done to check rising prices. On the contrary, the government maintained that annual increases of three or four

per cent were natural and inevitable. The tax burden grew heavier, particularly as a result of the rise in indirect taxation, which weighs heaviest on those with low incomes. Company taxes were reduced, and the tax on capital is insignificant. The low-income categories (people physically or mentally handicapped or seriously ill, pensioners, etc.) did not receive from society the support to which they are entitled.

On many international issues, especially on Vietnam, the Government's stand can be described as ambiguous and hesitant. Sweden maintains diplomatic relations with the South Vietnam puppet government, but refuses to establish relations with the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the South Vietnam National Liberation Front.

The discontent to which this policy gave rise was skilfully and demagogically exploited by the bourgeois parties and yielded them a definite measure of success.

COMMUNIST ADVANCE

The Communists made considerable gains, although this did not compensate for the defeat of the Social Democrats. They polled 283,000 votes (6.4 per cent of the total) — almost 130,000 more than in the 1962 municipal and regional elections, when their vote was 155,000, or 3.8 per cent of the total.

The significance of this success should not be measured by the number of votes and seats alone. The distribution of the newly-gained votes is also important. The Communists made the biggest headway in the towns and in industrial areas. They are now represented on the municipal councils of all cities with more than 40,000 residents. In the Stockholm council, they now have ten seats out of 100 — double the previous figure. In Goeteborg, where there are 80 seats, their representation grew from five to nine; in Malmoe they were elected to the municipal council for the first time, winning three seats; in Norkjoeping they have four seats, and so on. An impressive result — one of every five electors voting Communist — was achieved in Norbotten, the northern-most region where mining, metallurgy and timber-processing predominate. It can be said, therefore, that the Communists had their biggest successes in the industrial areas. On the other hand, it was precisely in these areas that the Social Democrats had their heaviest losses. Their losses in the sparsely populated areas were not so marked.

The Communist Party fought the elections on a program which had been approved by the 20th Congress in January 1964. It called for greater democracy, and for curbing the big monopolies. Before the elections this line was concretized in "Program 66," with the following basic points:

International solidarity. Support for the peoples fighting for national and social emancipation and for progressive, i.e., socialist development. Support for the struggle waged by the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam

and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. Recognition of the DRV and establishment of contact with the NLF.

A ban on all nuclear weapon tests. Reduction of stocks of nuclear weapons. Reduction in armament expenditure. Conclusion of a European peace and security treaty. Conversion of Northern Europe into a disarmament zone incorporating non-aligned states.

Promoting and deepening democracy. A bigger say for factory and office workers in extending democracy in the enterprises. Setting up a State Investment Bank. Public control over investments. Coordination and augmentation of the resources of the state-owned enterprises. More state participation in the economy. A more equitable distribution of incomes and wealth.

An end to the rise in prices. Prohibition of cartel agreements, and legislation making it obligatory for price increases to be announced in advance. A low and fixed interest rate to reduce expenditure and prices. Measures to increase the influence of consumers' committees on price policy.

A democratic taxation policy to ease the burden on taxpayers with low incomes. Heavier taxes on big fortunes, on profits of the enterprises, and on profits obtained on the stock-exchange and from increased real estate prices.

Expanded housing construction to eliminate the shortage. Curbs on profiteers to make housing cheaper. A low and fixed interest rate for State Investment bank building credits, as an effective means of lowering rent.

Equality of males and females. No discrimination against women in the matter of employment. Rapid extension of the network of creches, public utility centers and other services.

Adoption of a democratic Constitution. A one-chamber Riksdag. A democratic electoral system based on equal suffrage. Establishment of a Republic.

The election results have shown that this program accords with the wishes of large numbers of factory and office workers and of young people.

Commenting on the outcome of the elections, Party Chairman C. H. Hermansson stressed that "the continued Communist advance is due to several factors. Public prejudice against the Communist Party has been dispelled in recent years, with the result that greater attention has been paid to our concrete proposals regarding the solution of political problems. Many wage-earners want a more dynamic policy to do away with the housing shortage, check the rise in prices and rent and improve things for the low-paid groups; they want democratization of economic life. Young people are vigorously demanding greater effort on issues involving international solidarity—those of Vietnam, South Africa, aid to the developing countries. Many voters from among the wage-earners and young people insist on a more promising and imaginative policy which would not stop at infringing

on the present correlation of forces and property relations."

The election results came as a shock to Social Democracy. Influential forces in the party called for the dissolution of the Riksdag and new elections to its second chamber. Young Social Democrats insisted, in addition, on rejuvenating and renovating the government and "enlivening" policy. But the SDP leadership declined these proposals, just as they did the demand of the bourgeoisie for the dissolution of the first chamber.

THE COMMUNIST POST-ELECTION PROGRAM

The Communist Party, which is against dissolving parliament, has put forward a proposal for a program of action by the labor movement. Despite the Communist success, it states in the proposal, the elections ended in a setback for the labor movement as a whole. The Communist gains did not compensate for the losses sustained by the Social Democrats. The overall vote of the workers' parties decreased.

Hence the need for a "deep analysis of the policies and activities of the workers' parties . . . The policy of the ruling Social-Democratic Party was based on collaboration with so-called private enterprise. But a society conforming to the socialist ideals of the working-class movement cannot be built if the monopolies and big capital are allowed to retain key positions in the economy. We hold that the solution of many urgent problems — those of housing and real estate, regional development, democracy in the factory — calls for interference in the present correlation of forces and in property relations. The labor movement should work out a socialist strategy clearly indicating the necessity and the possibility of decisive changes."

Proceeding from this general aim, the Party sets forth a ten-point minimum program embracing the pressing tasks of the movement.

This program coincides in all essential respects with the program advanced by the Communists before the elections. At this writing the response of the Social Democratic leadership was not to hand. However, the proposal is bound to give rise to a discussion among the Social Democratic membership, what with their disappointment and critical attitude towards the policy of their leaders. One could quote at length from the Social Democratic press concerning this sentiment, but we shall confine ourselves to a quote from *Statensteld*, a Government employees union journal:

"How can Social Democracy regain viability and change the trend that has been in evidence since the important elections associated with the problem of pensions (the elections of 1958-60-G.E.), when Social Democracy made its second major breakthrough . . . The reasons for the present defeat are to be sought in a number of issues — housing for the young people, especially in the towns; the insufficient rigidity of the price policy; the attitude displayed during collective bargaining which must have appeared ambiguous to the wage workers. To put it bluntly, the old saying, 'as you sow, so shall you reap,' has not lost all its meaning yet.

"The young voters are a factor whose influence on the election results has yet to be ascertained. But the nearly 400,000 voters who participated in an election for the first time must have greatly influenced the results. Evidently their imagination had not been captured by the ruling Social Democracy, and it would hardly be out of place to give thought to the matter of effecting a change in the spirit of the young people."

The statement needs no comment. It reflects a sentiment that has set in widely among Swedish Social Democrats after the 1966 elections, a sentiment conducive to the development of the broad labor unity of action for which the Communist Party is working.

Gunnar OEHMAN

Conference of the British Labor Party

TWO SIGNIFICANT facts emerged from the 65th Annual Conference of the Labor Party held in Brighton from October 3 to October 7.

The first is that the Labor leadership was able to secure approval of the chief aspects of the Government's policy; secondly, the possibility became apparent of the emergence of a new left-wing led by a trade union leader of the calibre of Mr. F. Cousins, General Secretary of the one-and-a-half million strong Transport and General Workers' Union.

It was indeed a foregone conclusion that the Government would win, seeing that a few weeks earlier the Prime Minister had managed to persuade the Trades Union Congress to accept his economic policies which were leading to redundancies, short-time, dismissals, "redeployment" (a polite euphemism for unemployment), the wage-freeze and infringement of trade union rights. It is true that it was accepted reluctantly with four million votes cast against it, but it was accepted.

The Prime Minister won at the Labor Party Conference as he had won at the TUC because of the deliberate confusion he and his ministers had spread earlier. Unless the economic policies of the Government were endorsed, they told both Conferences, unemployment could mount to a figure of two million. If on the other hand the Government's economic "stop-go" and curbs on the unions were adopted, then by such "planning" the economy would be saved and unemployment would remain a "mere" 2½ or 3 per cent. The Labor journal "New Statesman" and Minister Crossman lauded these policies as a step towards socialist planning. It was a choice between planned economy and capitalist individualism, they declared. In short, the Labor Government was claiming that unemployment, short-time working, decreasing output in the export industries, as in the motor-car industry, and a possible jailing of trade unionists for carrying out their normal functions, would lead not only to increased production and modernization of industry but would be also an advance towards socialism!

Small wonder therefore that Mr. Frank Cousins, who resigned from the Cabinet and from his position as Minister of Technology on precisely this issue, could tell Conference the day after the Government had decided to implement the punitive Part IV of the Prices and Incomes Act:

"We in the T. & G.W.U. regard this as a

tragic day. It is a tragic day both for principles and common sense. We regard this as a day we shall live very seriously to regret — a day when the Government for the first time tells us that the Labor administration believes that the way to solve our economic problem is to use the instruments of the Conservatives against the trade union movement."

He was supported by Mr. D. McGarvey, President of the Amalgamated Society of Boilermakers, who said:

"My union has functioned for 132 years, we have hard-won rights, and we are not giving up these rights for anybody."

The white-collar unions, too, threw down the challenge to the Government.

Thus although the Government won victories on paper, neither Mr. Wilson as head of the Government, nor Mr. Callaghan, Chancellor of the Exchequer, nor Mr. Gunter, Minister of Labor, can rest secure that their policy will be carried through.

By pushing through their policy of wage freeze, unemployment and the threat of imprisonment for trade unionists, they seem to have set out on a course for collision and conflict, possibly on a scale not seen for years. The real reply, clearly, will come from the factory floor.

Perhaps a foreboding of this was the militant demonstration held outside the Conference hall on the opening day. One thousand representatives of the 13,000 car workers made redundant by one of the big motor-car firms in the Midlands marched on Conference declaring that unless it received a deputation they would force their way in.

Massed outside the hall with banners aloft and shouting slogans, the angry workers stood in the pouring rain and biting wind.

Their leader, Mr. Dick Etheridge, a trade union leader and member of the Executive Committee of the Communist Party, said:

"We have come to Brighton to make our presence felt with banners and voice. We want an immediate change in Government policy so far as the motor industry is concerned, and we want ultimately to see a change in the Government's freeze policy generally."

Mr. Cousins, who came out of Conference, greeted the men. "This is a demonstration of the seriousness with which the men regard the situation," he said. "The workers of this country will not stand for sackings and short time. Their demands are just," he told them, "and

should be accepted by the Government."

"We are with you one hundred per cent, all the way," roared back the workers.

They expressed their feelings about the Prime Minister and the other ministers responsible for the economic policy which had thrown them out of work with cries of "Traitors!" and "Come out, Wilson! Come out, Gunter! Come out and face the workers! We voted Labor. We put you in power in March."

So insistent and prolonged were the angry cries that Wilson emerged from his hotel, and tried to speak. At first he was shouted down. Then, borrowing a loudspeaker, he managed to make his voice heard above the tumult. He told the men that they were justified in protesting and invited leaders to come and discuss their grievances with him.

The interview with Wilson was most important, it was a victory for the men, since he had tried to avoid it, and although he made no basic promises or concessions, he listened to their case and made a number of points on redundancy payments. The demonstrators also made a deep impression on the Conference.

The Government won Pyrrhic victories for its economic policy, the wage-freeze, anti-trade union legislation, and for a very limited nationalization, for their foreign policy and for their attitude to Rhodesia. But when it came to issues like unemployment, defense expenditure and Vietnam, Conference rejected its policies. No comfort could have been felt by the Government from the outcome of this deeply divided, split, and somewhat puzzled Conference. On the other hand, the Left emerged strengthened, encouraged, invigorated and more fortified than it has been for some time.

For the first time in many years, a clear case was put by the Left on the inextricable relationship between the Government's stringent economic measures at home on the one hand, and its foreign policy and huge military expenditure on the other. A number of striking speeches by trade union leaders, Left Labor MPs and rank and file delegates made this relationship abundantly clear. This was another reason why Conference passed the Left's three resolutions which the ministers and the National Executive Committee asked it to reject.

Even on the issues on which it was defeated, the Left obtained, on average, over two million votes — a substantial minority vote.

Two of the big unions joined forces to defeat the government and the Labor Party National Executive Committee on the issue of unemployment — the T. & G.W.U. with approximately one million votes, and the Amalgamated Engineering Union with its voice of 768,000.

By 3,289,000 votes to 3,127,000, Conference passed the Emergency Resolution tabled by the T. & G.W.U.

"This Conference," said the resolution, "expresses its grave concern at the sharp growth in unemployment throughout the country, particularly in the car industry, and calls upon the government to take urgent measures to prevent

employers from discharging workers without consultation and negotiation with the unions, and to insist upon the operation of short-time working and/or other measures as an alternative to dismissal whilst planned re-deployment where appropriate can be arranged on a voluntary basis with the assistance of the Ministry of Labor."

The adoption of this resolution was undoubtedly helped by the presence and determination of the demonstrating car workers.

Even more significant was the opposition of Conference to the government's defense policy.

Conference, by 3,470,000 votes to 2,932,000, passed the following resolution (also tabled by the T. & G.W.U.).

"This Conference recognizes that unless there is a substantial reduction in military expenditure the Labor Government's ability to achieve the national economic recovery, social progress and prosperity, to which it is pledged, will be impeded by recurring balance of payments crises.

"Conference calls upon the Government to contract its role in Western Germany and make a decisive reduction in military commitment East of Suez, including the withdrawal from Malaysia, Singapore and the Persian Gulf, by 1969/70, thus ending excessive strain on the armed forces and over-dependence on American support and making possible a defense budget well below £1,750 million."

This resolution and the one on Vietnam negated the support Conference gave later to the overall Policy Statement on "Defense and Foreign Policy" issued by the National Executive Committee which supported the Government's line.

Formally these are now the policies of the Labor Party, but Wilson had already announced that he would ignore them. Conference could not set itself up as a substitute for Government, he declared.

The resolution on Vietnam, tabled by the Fire Brigades Union, was endorsed by 3,851,000 votes to 2,634,000. It read:

"This Conference, in view of the increase in suffering of the people of Vietnam, calls upon the Government to bring all pressures on the United States of America to end the war in Vietnam.

"Conference recalls that the 1954 Geneva Conference provided for an independent, neutral, unified state of Vietnam with no foreign bases and therefore urges that negotiations be re-opened and a settlement reached on the lines envisaged by the 1954 Geneva Agreement.

"Conference calls for the cessation of the bombing by the United States of North Vietnam as a step towards securing a political atmosphere more likely to secure the negotiated lasting peace desired by all for the war-stricken people of Vietnam."

It says much for the Left both inside and outside Conference that finally the majority of

the delegates managed to cut through most of the deliberately created confusion, the appeals to loyalty, the misleading statements and half-truths and the other quite formidable pressures.

Although it was only six months after Labor's electoral victory, the delegates were neither elated nor flushed with success. Many had arrived both puzzled and bewildered, not fully understanding the vital issues which were at stake.

In 1965 they had been told that the financial mess left by the Tories after thirteen years of rule was the reason why the Government had abandoned its election program. The Government had been forced, most reluctantly, to appeal to the "Gnomes of Zurich" who in turn insisted that certain drastic measures must be undertaken before they would advance the necessary loans. Because of this and because of the paper-thin majority on which the Government then rested, the policies with which Labor had fought the election had to be dropped, but only temporarily, until the economy had recovered and Labor had a bigger majority, the Government had said. Yet despite the fact that now they had a big majority, what can only be described as anti-working-class legislation was still being passed and the Labor Government was coming still more under the dominance of Washington and monopoly capitalism. Their policies seemed to be little different from those of the Tories.

If any one point emerged clearly it was that not a single issue was resolved at Conference. The issues could not be resolved either by appeals to loyalty to leaders or by appeals to give the Government another chance until next year.

The wage-freeze, the 100,000 car workers threatened with short time, the threat of rising unemployment and, above all, the introduction of the anti-trade-union legislation raised tension to a high point and ruled this out.

It was in this situation that the powerful figure of Frank Cousins emerged as potential leader of the Left opposition to the Government's policies. This was one of the really positive aspects of Conference. Cousins was joined in his opposition not only by such well-known Left Labor MPs as Michael Foot, Sidney Silverman and Konni Zilliacus, but also by D. McGarvey, President of the 120,000-strong Amalgamated Society of Boilermakers, Clive Jenkins, General Secretary of the Association of Supervisory Staffs, Executives and Technicians with its 45,000 members, and other trade union leaders. They, together with many hundreds of rank and file delegates, declared war at Conference on the economic and defense policies of the Government.

This fighting opposition made itself felt not only inside Conference but outside too. In addition to the previously mentioned demonstration by the car workers, there took place

three packed meetings attended mostly by Conference delegates.

The first was held under the auspices of the five technicians' unions affiliated to the TUC and Labor Party and which have opposed the incomes and prices policy from the start. At this meeting, held the day before Conference opened, the general secretary of each of these unions declared his intention to fight every inch of the way against the prices and incomes policy.

"We will never surrender our hard-won trade union rights to a government pursuing a war-like course and which is not transforming the economy," declared Clive Jenkins, and it was re-echoed by the other four general secretaries.

Jenkins pursued this line at Conference when he moved his union's resolution. This attacked the Government's prices and incomes policy and called for its replacement by a "Socialist plan for incomes, productivity and prices" which alone could win the support of the working class. It further called upon the Government to pledge itself to increase real wages and to attack the wealth and power of the ruling class.

Perhaps the most impressive of these meetings was that organized by *Tribune*, a Left journal. Eight hundred delegates and left-wing supporters listened to speeches by Cousins, Foot, Driberg, and Stanley Orme.

It was not disloyal, Cousins declared, to criticize the Government if it was going wrong. On the contrary, it was the duty of the Labor Party to do so. He reminded the meeting of what the Labor leader Dalton had said referring to 1931, when MacDonald, Snowden and Thomas deserted to the Tories "in the interests of 'the nation':" "We should have been more loyal to principles and less to leaders."

Stating that he had resigned from the Government because he could not support its policies, particularly its anti-trade union policies, Cousins said that he would work for the Government but not under it. The Labor movement wants to be partners of the Government, not its servants. If the trade unions are weakened, the Labor movement is weakened, concluded Cousins.

The alternative policies advocated at this meeting fitted in closely not only with the three Left resolutions passed at Conference, but also with those advocated at two other meetings, one of which was the "Brains Trust" organized by Left Labor MPs, some of whom had been leaders of the now defunct "Victory for Socialism" group (Zilliacus, S. Silverman, F. Allaun, Mikardo) and two new MPs, S. Orme and S. Newens. A platform round which a Left movement could develop was beginning to be established. Most of the left-wing MPs who spoke at the meeting side by side with trade union leaders had signed the policy pamphlet "Beyond the Freeze. A Socialist Policy for Economic Growth" issued in time for Conference.

For the first time in many years there appears to be a growing unity of purpose between a number of trade union leaders and Left MPs. Such unity could radically alter the situation in the Labor Movement. For many years since 1945, the opposition to the Right in the Labor Party has been mainly in the hands of individual Constituency MPs, divorced from the trade unions and often acting on their own. These MPs, refusing also to work alongside the Communist Party, had no roots among the masses and no mass support. As a consequence it was easy for the Right to discipline or expel them. But now that the biggest union in the country, as well as a number of smaller ones, have openly linked on the platform with Left Labor MPs, and this position has the support of many rank and file members of the Labor Party, a different picture is emerging. Given two important factors, the Left might well be able to prize the Labor movement free from the vice-like grip which the Right has been able to exert on it for decades.

The two important factors which could bring about this change are, whether Cousins and the other leaders are prepared to rally and lead the organized workers into action against the Government's policy and secondly, and most vital, is whether the Labor Left is prepared to work alongside the Communists.

For a long time now the Communist Party has been making precisely the same criticism as the Left union leaders and the Left MPs. Moreover, the Communist Party issued warnings on the consequences of the Government's

home and foreign policies at a time when many of the Left MPs were firmly maintaining that Mr. Wilson, once he had got rid of the Rights in the leadership, would introduce a Left policy. It was with this belief very much in mind that the Lefts voluntarily dissolved their "Victory for Socialism" group which they now might well try to re-form.

Writing in the *Morning Star*, John Gollan, General Secretary of the Communist Party, pointed out that Brighton had shown the positive Left counter-policy: the cutting of military expenditure, the assault on the monopolies, the extension of nationalization.

Fighting for these demands, enforcing them on the Government, is the only way to unite the Labor movement and prevent any Tory advance, Gollan wrote. The Left therefore is fighting not only for immediate interests but for the future of the Labor movement. It will succeed all the better if it consolidates its own unity, Labor and Communist, and removes, where possible, bans and proscriptions which impede the full cooperation of the Left forces.

When asked what he intended to do now that Conference had rejected some aspects of his policy, Wilson tersely replied: "Govern." But the question of questions which this reply prompts, is, "In whose interests?"

If the Labor Government is to be forced to "govern" in the interests of the working people and not in the interests of a handful of monopoly capitalists, Washington, and the international bankers, then a strong unified Left is essential.

In Memoriam

TO THE LIST OF HEROES who gave their lives in the course of the past year fighting oligarchic regimes and U.S. imperialism in Latin America another name has been added—Luis Turcio Lima, the Guatemalan guerrilla commander and revolutionary leader.

In this roll of honor you will find the many Dominican patriots who fell fighting to expel the imperialist aggressors from their country, the Chilean and Peruvian miners shot down by governments that boast of their "representative democracy," the defenseless students killed by the "gorillas" in Argentina and Brazil, and the peasants, armed and unarmed, who fell in the Andes. These sacrifices are the tragic but inevitable result of the development of the class and national struggle, a feature of the present stage of the revolutionary movement in Latin America, when the working masses and the peoples generally are rising against exploitation, oppression and imperialist domination.

We do not propose to give here a chronological list of the victims; the martyrs are too many, and there is more to be said about each than can be encompassed by a single article. Instead we would like to dedicate this tribute to the memory of three of the many revolutionaries who gave their lives this year—Luis Turcios, the Guatemalan; Fabricio Ojeda, the Venezuelan, and Camilo Torres, the Colombian. Their example is instructive — and not only because each was a peerless fighter.

* * *

Luis Turcio laid down his life before he was 25. But his youth notwithstanding, the last six years of his amazing life were closely linked with the main events of the time in Guatemalan political life. After graduating in 1959 from a military college as a second lieutenant of infantry, he was sent to the Ranger and Marine school in Fort Benning in the USA. But the indoctrination to which he was subjected in the special anti-guerrilla warfare training center could not stifle his awakened consciousness and keen mind. A few months after returning to Guatemala in November 1960 he and other officers joined in an armed uprising against the reactionary government of Ydigoras Fuentes. This revolt was sparked off to a large extent by the fact that the government had allowed Guatemalan territory to be used for training the Cuban counter-revolutionaries who later came to grief in the Bay of Pigs.



The uprising failed and its participants had to leave the country. Soon, however, the most resolute of them returned, among them Alejandro de Leon Aragon, Marco Antonio Yon Sosa and Luis Turcios who, together with others, set about organizing the armed resistance movement which later came to be known as the November 13 Movement. Some of the trailblazers, De Leon among them, fell in the initial clashes with the police. In 1962 the survivors organized a short-lived guerrilla detachment. The young rebels had expected the outbreak of guerrilla action to induce other officers to lead the army against the government. This, however, did not happen. The role played by the army in the brutal repressions of March and April that year convinced them that the guerrilla struggle was destined to be a long drawn-out one and that in the course of this struggle an organization had to be built up capable of defeating the army. The decision to build a stable guerrilla movement under a unified command thus matured. The first units of the Rebel Armed Forces came into being, consisting of the November 13 Movement, the Communist-organized October 20 Movement, and the student organization known as the April 12 Movement. In March 1963 guerrilla struggle flared up again in the Izabal and Zacapa departments. Luis Turcios was given the command of one of the guerrilla fronts, the Edgar Ibarra front.

Unfortunately, however, the November 13

Movement was infiltrated by Trotskyites who managed to induce it to fall in with some of their provocative slogans. The Guatemalan Party of Labor exposed their machinations and the danger they presented to the unity of the revolutionary movement and the further development of the struggle in general. Fully aware of the complexities of the situation, Turcios did not fall into the Trotskyite trap. He left the November 13 Movement and condemned the Trotskyite position. From this point on his link with the Communists became increasingly close. This link led to the formation of the new Rebel Armed Forces (FAR) with the participation of the Guatemalan Party of Labor, the Edgar Ibarra guerrilla front and some other zones of armed resistance. Turcios became a member of the Provisional Revolutionary Leadership. Under his command the guerrillas struck blow after blow at the military dictatorship of Peralto Azurdia which had come to power through the coup d'etat of March 1963.

Last January Major Turcios headed the FAR delegation to the Tri-Continental Solidarity Conference in Havana.

Towards the end of February a national conference of the Guatemalan Party of Labor adopted decisions of prime importance for the development of the popular revolutionary war and for strengthening Communist unity, and a few months later Turcios joined the Party. This sealed the unity of the revolutionary forces and the choice of armed struggle as the strategic line of the Guatemalan revolution.

As the Executive Secretary of the Asian, African and Latin American People's Solidarity Organization noted, the indefatigable anti-imperialist, revolutionary and unitarian activity of Luis Turcios is a "living example both for the youth of Guatemala and for the entire young generation of Africa, Asia and Latin America, the banner of struggle against the imperialist aggressors and their agents."

* * *

Four months before the Guatemalan people were shocked by the news that Major Turcios was dead, another Latin American people experienced a similar tragedy. The dead body of the guerrilla commander Fabricio Ojeda was found in a SIFA (army intelligence department) prison in Caracas, the capital of Venezuela, two days after his arrest. Next morning the capitalist press splashed the official explanation: "Fabricio Ojeda committed suicide in his cell."

The official announcement was clearly designed to cover up the crime and to calumniate a staunch and consistent revolutionary whose life was an example not only to the Venezuelan people but to all peoples fighting for liberation.

Who was this man and how did he become a symbol of the anti-imperialist struggle?

Ojeda launched out on independent life as a teacher in his native province and soon was



wholly immersed in political activity. As an active member of the Republican-Democratic Union, a petty-bourgeois party in opposition to the Perez Jimenez government, he won the sympathy and support of the masses and experienced the rigors of prison life. When he was released in 1953 his party has been suppressed and he began working as a journalist. In 1957 he still was for the people of Caracas merely a newspaperman noted for his trenchant reporting.

But at dawn on January 23, 1958, after the overthrow of the dictatorship, the public learned that Ojeda had been, under an assumed name, chairman of the Patriotic Junta which had led the underground struggle against the dictatorship.

The fact is that in 1957, on the initiative of the Communist Party (the only organization which was able to carry on in spite of the repressions) a broad front of struggle was organized with the Patriotic Junta as its leading body. Besides the Communist Party, left groups in the Republican-Democratic and Democratic Action parties as well as some of the younger members of the Social-Christian COPEI Party took part in establishing this front and in its activities. Gradually people of all classes, including members of the clergy and many armymen, joined the struggle. In less than a year the movement had grown strong enough to overthrow the dictatorship. Ojeda was now the man of the day.

Ojeda's name was associated with all popular actions during the months between the overthrow of the military dictatorship and the establishment of Betancourt's civilian dictatorship. In the 1958 elections he was elected to parliament from the Federal District of Caracas. He was now in a position to use parliament as well to uphold the ideals which inspired the popular movement of January 23.

After the victory of the Cuban revolution in 1959 Ojeda was one of the first Venezuelans to visit the Island of Freedom.

Step by step he renounced his former re-

formist views, coming closer and closer to the ideals of socialism. As he discarded the principles of his old party his ties with the Communist Party grew stronger. When the Communist Party took the path of armed struggle Ojeda unhesitatingly gave up his privileges as a member of parliament as well as the important post he held in the leadership of the Republican-Democratic Union. He went to the hills in order to carry on the fight.

This was a time of upswing in the popular movement. The patriotic military men Ponte Rodriguez, Medina Silva, Molina Villegas and Vegas Castejon, issuing an open challenge to the anti-national regime, headed the military-civilian uprisings in Carupano and Puerto Cabello.

Some time later the government forces succeeded in capturing Ojeda and he was sentenced to 18 years imprisonment in a trial with no parallel in Venezuelan history as a travesty of justice. Ojeda's spirit was not broken nor was his faith shaken. He was as determined as ever to carry on the fight and in September 1963, after a sensational escape from prison, he again went into the mountains. Subsequently he was appointed chairman of the National Liberation Front in the Archimiro Gabaldon military area (the states of Lara, Portuguesa and Trujillo). In June 1966 he was recaptured. This time the government decided to silence him forever.

Born into a family belonging to the intelligentsia, Fabricio Ojeda, though he started his political life in the ranks of a reformist party, came close to the Communist Party in the course of the struggle, becoming one of its best friends and allies. The Venezuelan Communists, whose joys and hardships he shared so often and who have not forgotten his boundless capacity for self-sacrifice, will not allow his memory to be blackened by fabrications. Even though some people managed to abuse his trust and capitalize on his transient differences with the Communist Party to split the movement, they have no right to cancel out the ten years of sincere comradeship between him and us. Ojeda belonged to the entire revolutionary movement; his memory and his example are cherished by the Venezuelan people; his blood, like the blood of the hundreds of other patriots fallen in battle, is a priceless though tragic contribution made by an embattled people to the defeat of the brutal enemy, to ensure the victory of the noblest and justest of ideals.

* * *

The short political life of the Colombian Catholic priest Camilo Torres was extraordinarily eventful. In April and May 1965, side by side with the students, he took part in stormy demonstrations against the resumption of marital law and against the U.S. intervention in the Dominican Republic. In September he delivered a lecture in the club of the Communist Party of Colombia — something no



Catholic priest had ever done before in this country. In October, when he already enjoyed the support of big sections of the people, he decided to go to the mountains and join the guerrillas. In January 7, 1966, he issued an appeal to the people to take to arms. And on February 15 he fell in action against the government troops.

Camilo Torres was born in 1929 into a well-to-do family. In 1954 he was ordained, after which he enrolled in the Social and Political Science Department of the Louvain University. Upon his return in 1960, he was appointed chaplain of the National University, and then dean of the Higher School of State Administration. During these years he published ten sociological studies devoted to Colombian problems.

What impelled him to break with Christian conformism and to throw in his lot with the revolution? Camilo was more than the product of new trends in the church. Study of national problems, personal contact with the culture and atmosphere of Europe, friendship with the students and, finally, the contempt for human values with which the Colombian ruling classes carry out their policies—all had a decisive influence on him.

Unhesitatingly he voiced the views which had been maturing in his mind for years. And when the higher clergy poured their wrath on him, he published his platform of struggle. This platform included the demand for a democratic agrarian reform giving the land to those who till it and providing for the expropriation of uncultivated land without compensation; it called for the nationalization of the banks, the oil industry and the services, free education and establishment of relations with all countries. He urged all the revolutionary forces of Colombia to support this program.

An idea may be gained of the level of Camilo Torres's political consciousness from the fact that he always gave his unconditional support to the Communist Party, the only organized

Left force which was able to survive and gain strength during the years of *violencia*. In a message to the Communist Party he wrote: "I believe that the Communist Party consists of truly revolutionary elements, and hence I cannot be an anti-Communist either as a Colombian or a sociologist, a Christian or a priest... I am prepared to fight together with the Communists for our common goals: against the oligarchy and United States domination, for the winning of power by the people."

The young priest matched his actions to his sentiments. The researcher became a student leader, and the mass leader evolved into a soldier of the revolution. Torres realized that the struggle would develop beyond the bounds of student and academic activity. He gave his support to the demands of the masses. In a speech enlarging on his platform he said: "Above all we need an alliance that will be above ideology. We shall not debate whether the soul is mortal or immortal, for it is clear that if anything is deadly it is the poverty of the people. All genuine revolutionaries are agreed on this. Secondly, we need an alliance that will be above group interests, an alliance without egoism, so that we shall not attack one another but stand together against the common enemy... Finally, we need an alliance that will be above parties. Like Bolivar, we must declare war to the death against counter-revolution."

The united front of the most diverse forces, from Christian Democrats to Communists, was both the result and a reflection of the revolutionary upswing among the masses, who supported Camilo's platform. Yet when the people began to take to arms to combat the repression unleashed by the government, Torres went into the hills as a rank-and-file guerrilla.

When the Communist Party learned of his decision it could not approve of it although it paid tribute to his courage and integrity. To the Communist Party, the leader and the main organizer of the peasant guerrilla detachments, it was clear that Torres's place was at the head of the mass movement, for it was here that he could have made his biggest contribution to the Colombian revolution. That this was so is evident from the fact that with its leader gone the united front soon ceased to exist.

The Colombian Communists hold that to believe that peasants who were forced to take to arms by the war of annihilation launched against them more than two years ago can win without the mobilization and organization of the urban masses is sheer utopia.

Torres, however, thought that all opportunities for legal mass struggle had been exhausted and that the people had only one choice left—armed struggle. Yet his thinking was never superficial. "As I see it," he said in an interview granted to *Voz Proletaria*, "violence is a fact of life imposed on the country by the ruling class nineteen years ago. The reply to it

must come not from small groups but from the people as a whole. This reply should consist of defense of their socio-economic interests, defense which even in the context of Christian morality may take the form of armed action."

* * *

In paying homage to the three revolutionaries, the sons of three Latin American peoples fighting arms in hand, we cannot but note that which was common in their lives, the similarity of the paths that led them to the camp of the revolution, to anti-imperialism and to socialism. They all started their political activity outside the ranks of Marxist-Leninist parties. Each was an exponent of the aspirations and anxieties of some group of the intermediate social forces—the democratic intelligentsia, progressive Catholics and patriotic army officers—the entry of which into the revolutionary struggle is one of the most significant phenomena of the present period of this struggle in Latin America.

The point of departure in the ideological evolution of these three fighters was not conscious anti-imperialism and still less scientific socialism. Their initial ideology was petty-bourgeois radicalism, Christian humanism and nationalist aspirations. But in the tense atmosphere of contemporary Latin America, an atmosphere permeated by the "Cuban radiation," consistent struggle for democratic, humanist and nationalist aims inevitably impelled them towards resolute anti-imperialism, made them realize that a life-and-death struggle against the enemies of democracy, national sovereignty and human dignity was an imperative of the day. Life, the experience of revolutionary struggle, rapidly brought them to the masses, to socialist ideology and to the revolutionary parties—the custodians of this ideology.

The path they traversed was not easy. They had to overcome countless obstacles of both a subjective and an objective order. But their lives testify to the fact that in Latin America today the Catholic priest, the petty-bourgeois member of parliament and the graduate of a U.S. anti-guerrilla warfare school can become revolutionary leaders.

This is the lesson to be drawn from the lives of Luis Turcios, Fabricio Ojeda and Camilo Torres, lives which were not, are not, and will not be the exception. The history of the last ten years has convincingly shown that neither social origin nor initial motives, nor yet the hardships encountered on the road to the revolution, are an obstacle to hundreds and thousands of selfless fighters emerging from this source of revolutionary strength.

We Communists who have fought for so many years in the forward lines—more often than not alone or with temporary allies—wholeheartedly welcome the influx of new fighters, new comrades-in-arms in the struggle for democracy, independence and socialism.

The fact that they gravitate to the parties and movements of the proletariat is one of the most important developments of recent years. Consequently, our parties, while exerting every effort to build up their own organizations, to strengthen their unity and to heighten their militancy and ability to lead the struggle, categorically reject self-complacent and sterile sectarianism and gladly welcome to the common battlefield every new contingent of revolutionaries prepared honestly and selflessly to dedicate their lives to the cause of national and social liberation.

This is not to say that struggle to safeguard the principles of Marxism-Leninism against the splitters and demagogues can be allowed to weaken. On the contrary, it is the affirmation of these principles which enables us steadily to widen the camp of consistent revolutionaries, to consolidate fraternal feeling and understanding among all sincere champions of the people's cause regardless of whether they are Communists or not. This is the case even when tactical and ideological differences — and such differences are practically inevitable — arise.

* * *

As we have said above, the loss of these three men is not the only grievous loss we have suffered. Other Communist leaders and prominent anti-imperialist fighters have been killed or have died in Latin American prisons in recent months. Among them, to mention only a few, are Victor Manuel Gutierrez and Leonardo Castillo Flores in Guatemala, Luis de la Puente Uceda and Guillermo Lobaton in Peru, Luis Emiro Arrieta and Alberto Lovera

in Venezuela, and Venancio Loaiza and Hernando Gonzales in Colombia. The resolve with which these men fought was a reflection of the prevailing trend in Latin America and of the spiritual strength of our revolutionaries. Never since our America was enslaved by the United States has its history recorded anti-imperialist movements so powerful as the present movements which have adopted the road of armed struggle in order to put an end to the slavery and to change the socio-economic structure of the countries of our continent. There is no doubt that the influence of the Cuban revolution is also making itself felt. The present armed struggle in our countries stems from the objective conditions in each and the inspiration provided by Cuba's example. On the other hand, the Cuban revolution too cannot be regarded as an isolated phenomenon. It is part of the general upsurge, and its victory is proof of the revolutionary maturity of the entire Latin American continent; Cuba is the first stage in a revolutionary process which is bound to make a deeper imprint in history than the winning of their political independence by the Latin American countries at the beginning of last century. That is why future generations will surely accord Camilo Cienfuegos, Abel Santamaria, Luis Turcios, Fabricio Ojeda, Father Torres, Luis de la Puente and the other heroes and martyrs of the Second War of Independence the veneration and admiration due to the heirs of Hidalgo and Morelos, Bolivar and San Martin, O'Higgins and Marty.

A. DELGADO
J. RODRIGUEZ
J. M. FORTUNY

Books listed here are in the language of the country of publication unless otherwise indicated

MARX, K. *Salario, prezzo e profitto*. (Wage, Price and Profit.) Rome, Editori Riuniti, 1966. 125 pp.

Anuarul statistic al Republicii Socialiste Romania. (Statistical Yearbook of the Socialist Republic of Rumania.) Bucharest, Directia centrala de statistica, 1966. 709 pp.

ANGHEL, J. *Teorii si modele ale cresterii economice. Contributii critice*. (Theories and Patterns of Economic Growth. Critical Notes.) Bucharest, Editura Politica, 1966. 461 pp.

CHATER, A. *Race Relations in Britain*. London, Lawrence and Wishart, 1966. 64 pp.

GODELIER, M. *Rationnalite et irrationnalite en economie*. (The Rational and Irrational in Economics.) Paris, 1966. 293 pp.

Einfuehrung in die soziologische Forschung. (Introduction to Sociological Research.) Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1966. 265 pp.

HAJEK, J. *Lidska situace. Kriticke stati*. (A Human Situation. Critical Articles.) Prague, Ceskoslovensky spisovatel, 1966. 184 pp.

KARNIK, Z. *Prvni pokusy o zaloseni komunisticke strany v Cechach*. (Early Attempts at Founding the Communist Party in Bohemia.) Prague, Academia, 1966. 67 pp.

Imperialismus und Weltanschauung. Zu neuen Tendenzen der buergerlichen Philosophie und Ideologie in Westdeutschland. (Imperialism and World Outlook. New Trends in Bourgeois Philosophy and Ideology in West Germany.) Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1966. 192 pp.

Istoria Kommunisticheskoi partii Sovetskogo Soyuza. (History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.) In six volumes. Vol. 2. 1904—February 1917.) Moscow, Politizdat, 1966. 775 pp.

LONDON, A. *Espagne . . .* (Spain.) Paris, Editeurs francais reunis, 1966. 411 pp.

MEHRING, F. *Vita di Marx*. (The Life of Marx.) Roma, Editori Riuniti, 1966. 600 pp.

Privetstvia XXIII syezdu KPSS. (Messages of Greeting to the 23rd Congress of the CPSU.) Moscow, Politizdat, 1966. 408 pp.

Protiv reformizma, za yedinstvo rabochego dvizhenia. (Against Reformism, for the Unity of the Working-class Movement.) Moscow, Politizdat, 1966. 503 pp.

Strucny filosoficky slovník. (A Short Philosophical Dictionary.) Prague, Svoboda, 1966. 535 pp.

Teorie si metoda in stiintele sociale. Cercetaria sociologica. Vol. II. (Theory and Method in the Social Sciences. A Sociological Study. Vol. II.) Bucharest, 1966. 318 pp.

ULBRICHT, W. *Zur Geschichte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung*. Aus Reden und Aufsätzen. Bd. X (1961-1962). (On the History of the German Working-Class Movement. Speeches and Articles. Vol. X [1961-1962].) Berlin, 1966. 803 pp.

1870-1871
1871-1872
1872-1873

1873-1874
1874-1875

1875-1876
1876-1877

1877-1878
1878-1879
1879-1880

1880-1881
1881-1882
1882-1883

1883-1884
1884-1885
1885-1886

1886-1887
1887-1888
1888-1889

1889-1890
1890-1891
1891-1892

1892-1893
1893-1894
1894-1895

1895-1896
1896-1897
1897-1898

1898-1899
1899-1900
1900-1901

1901-1902
1902-1903
1903-1904

1904-1905
1905-1906
1906-1907

1907-1908
1908-1909
1909-1910

1910-1911
1911-1912
1912-1913

1913-1914
1914-1915
1915-1916

1916-1917
1917-1918
1918-1919

1919-1920
1920-1921
1921-1922

Editions of the journal

"PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM"



EDITIONS IN ENGLISH
(World Marxist Review):
Central Books Ltd.,
37 Grays Inn Road,
London, W.C. 1, England

Progress Books,
44 Stafford St.,
Toronto 3, Ontario,
Canada

FRENCH EDITIONS
(La Nouvelle Revue Internationale)
Société d'Édition et
d'Information 9, Boulevard des Italiens
Paris (2e) France

Librairie Du Monde Entier,
5, Place St-Jean,
Bruxelles

Librairie Rousseau,
36, rue J.-J. Rousseau,
Geneve

RUSSIAN EDITION
Stredisko pro rozširovani tisku,
Praha 6, Thakurova 3
Czechoslovakia

BRAZILIAN EDITION
(in Portuguese)
Rua da Assembléia, 34
3.º andar, sala 304,
Rio de Janeiro, Estado da Guanabara
Brazil

BULGARIAN EDITION
Raznoiznos,
1, Rue Tzar Assen
Sofia

CEYLON EDITION
(In Sinhalese)
91 Cotta Road
Colombo, Ceylon

CYPRUS EDITION
(in Greek)
Laikon Praktorion,
Tricoupi Street, 53 T. Nicosia

CZECH EDITION
Artia, Praha 2,
Nove Mesto, Ve smekach 30

DUTCH EDITION:
Progressief Algemeen Vertaalbureau,
Chr. Snouck Hurgronjehof 22",
Amsterdam W

GERMAN EDITIONS
Deutscher Buch-Export und Import
GmbH,
Leipzig C 1, Leninstrasse 16

"Globus" Vertrieb ausländischer
Zeitschriften, Wien XX,
Höchstädtplatz 3,
Austria

Genossenschaft Literaturvertrieb
Zürich, Zürich 4, Feldstrasse 46,
Switzerland

HUNGARIAN EDITION
Kossuth Kiado, Budapest, V,
Arpad-U6

ITALIAN EDITION
Libreria Rinascita, Via delle Botteghe
Oscure 2, Roma

JAPANESE EDITION
Nauka Ltd.,
2, Kanda-Zinbocho
2-chome, Chiyoda-Ku, Tokyo

MONGOLIAN EDITION
Mongolgosknigotorg,
ul. Lenina 41, Ulan-Bator

POLISH EDITION:
P. K. W. Z. "RUCH", Warszawa,
Wilcza 46

RUMANIAN EDITION
Directia Difuzarii Presei,
Palatul administrativ C.F.R.,
Bd. Dinicu Golescu, Intrarea G.
Bucuresti

EDITIONS IN SPANISH
Agencia, de Distribucion de Prensa
Praha 6, Thakurova 3

Ediciones Paz y Socialismo,
Apt. Nacional 1253,
Bogota, Colombia

Ediciones Pueblos Unidos,
Casilla Correo 589, Montevideo,
Uruguay

Fondo de Cultura Popular
Apdo. postal 2352
Mexico I, D.F.

Empresa Editora Austral
San Francisco 36,
Casilla 13201
Santiago, Chile

Editorial "Anteo,"
Entre Rios 1033,
Buenos Aires,
Argentina

SWEDISH EDITION
Arbetarkultur, Kungsgt 84,
Stockholm K, Sweden

VIETNAMESE EDITION
So'o xuất nhập khẩu sách bao 32,
Hai Ba trung, Hà-noi

