45

Workers of All Countries, Unite!

World Marxist Review

PROBLEMS OF PEACE *and* SOCIALISM

October, 1958
Volume 1, No. 2

35 cents

WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!

VOL. I, NO. 2
OCTOBER 1958

World Marxist Review:
Problems of Peace and Socialism

Theoretical and Information Journal
of Communist and Workers' Parties

CONTENTS

Combating the Fascist Menace in France 3
New Documents of Marx and Lenin 7
In Memory of Frederic Joliot-Curie 13
W. ULBRICHT: Some Aspects of the Ideological Work of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany 17
T. ZHIVKOV: The Victory of Socialism in Bulgaria 25
L. GRUPPI: For Communist-Socialist Co-operation 33
Y. OSTROVITIANOV, V. CHEPRAKOV: State-Monopoly Capitalism in the Distorting Mirror of Revisionism 43
V. PESSI: Guarding the Interests of the People 50
R. DIXON: The Struggle for Trade Union Unity in Australia 57
L. BOUHALI: Algeria for the Algerians 61
J. HAJEK: The Matter of the Men of Munich Calls for Vigilance 67
K. MOHY EL-DIN: No More Colonialism for the Arab Lands 72

ACTIVITIES OF COMMUNIST AND WORKERS' PARTIES

Manifesto of the C.P. of Malaya 77
Closer Links Between Party and Masses 79
Consolidating Ranks of C.P.U.S.A. 80
Big Victory of Chilean Communists 81
Safeguarding Jobs 83
Mass Political Work Among Women in Albania 84
Agitation Among Arats in Mongolian People's Republic 86
Lenin's Collected Works Published in Argentina 86

REVIEWS

"Storm-Swept France" 87
Is There a "Middle Class"? 89
REVIEWS IN BRIEF 94

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW: *Problems of Peace and Socialism* **is the Canadian edition of the monthly journal** *Problems of Peace and Socialism*, **published in Prague. The Canadian edition is issued by PROGRESS BOOKS, 924 King St. West, Toronto 3, Ontario, Canada.**

SUBSCRIPTION RATE: $3.50 a year (Canadian or U.S. currency). Single copies, 35 cents. Bundle of five or more, 25 cents per copy.

(Application has been made for second class mailing rights).

The text of this edition is identical with that of the English edition published in London, except for such minor changes as are called for by North American style or usage.

PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM is also published in Russian, Chinese, French, Spanish, German, Italian, Swedish, Czech, Polish, Hungarian, Rumanian, Bulgarian, Korean, Albanian and Vietnamese (distributors: Press Circulation Agency, Sadova 3, Prague 6, Czechoslovakia). Subscriptions to any of these editions may be obtained through Progress Books, 924 King St. West, Toronto.

Combating the Fascist Menace in France

GENERAL de Gaulle's advent to power as a result of the rebellion of the fascist-minded militarists in Algeria is an extraordinary event in the political life of France. One-man rule with military dictatorship, backed by the ultra-reactionary, chauvinist and colonialist circles of the big bourgeoisie, has been installed. A regime of this kind heralds the end of democracy in France.

The government, the outcome of violence, blackmail and intimidation which involved the bogey of the danger of civil war, functions without parliamentary supervision, and the country is left without parliament. One of its first steps was to suspend Parliament until October and to fix September 28 as the date for a referendum on the draft Constitution. The purpose of this notorious referendum is to abolish the Republic.

The political ferment in France has attracted world-wide attention. And this is understandable. For the question: who will prevail —the reactionary imperialist forces or the people—cannot but be the concern of all. This contest is being followed by all working people, all democrats, and by international reaction, with quite opposite feelings. The U.S. imperialists hailed de Gaulle's accession at once, anticipating that he would fall in with American foreign policy. The new government has already demonstrated its adherence to the Atlantic bloc. It leaves France's NATO forces under the command of the fascist General Speidel, it approved the U.S. intervention in the Lebanon and was even ready to take a hand in it. The criminal war against the Algerian people is being stepped up. The intention to join in the nuclear weapons race has been publicly announced. This risky foreign policy runs counter to the peoples' demand for relaxation of international tension.

At this hour the eyes of working people in all countries are turned with sympathy and hope to the working class of France. Headed by its Communist Party and supported by the fraternal solidarity of the international working-class movement and by all who cherish freedom and progress, it is in the van of the struggle against dictatorship, colonialism and the menace of fascism and war.

The regime now established in France may not yet be fascism, but the fact cannot be overlooked that it opens the way to fascism.

Fascism is not something accidental in the capitalist world. It is undisguised terroristic dictatorship of monopoly capital.

The present international situation is certainly different from that of prewar days when Mussolinis and Hitlers came to power in Italy, Germany and elsewhere. The world balance of forces has now radically changed in favour of democracy, to the detriment of reaction. This proves that the outcome of the struggle is predetermined: democracy will triumph in all countries, including France.

It is precisely because of the growth of the forces of peace and progress that the bourgeoisie, headed by the U.S. imperialists, tries to bolster its shaky positions, to strangle democratic liberties, foment chauvinism and precipitate aggressive war. At times of acute crisis the bourgeoisie, unable to rule with the traditional parliamentary means, throws overboard all the values on which it formerly based its prestige. It is precisely at times of acute political and economic crisis, when its rule and interests are threatened, that the bourgeoisie picks people like de Gaulle. Men of this type always bleat about "national interests". But in reality they are simply stooges of the big monopoly bourgeoisie, tools in its hands. De Gaulle's pompous and theatrical gesticulations are designed to conceal the presence in his government of representatives of big capital, banks and trusts on the one hand, and his personal tie-up with the more powerful financial groups on the other. The May-June coup represented an attempt by ultra-reactionary circles of the imperialist bourgeoisie to suppress the democratic strivings of the people and to keep their grip on the economic resources of France and her colonies.

Maurice Thorez, addressing a meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party in June, said that the Gaullist plot against democracy was a sign not of the strength of the bourgeoisie but of its weakness. It was no longer able to ensure its rule by traditional means. In particular, the French bourgeoisie, which ruled the second largest colonial empire in the world, has revealed utter helplessness and inability to resolve

the questions arising from the crisis of colonialism. The nations oppressed by French colonialism have not stood aside, nor could they, from the growing national-liberation movement in Asia and Africa. After the Second World War Syria and the Lebanon won their independence. The people of Vietnam also rose in struggle for liberation. Then came the Tunisian and Moroccan conflicts and, now, the war in Algeria. In fact all the peoples of the French colonies are demanding freedom and independence.

France even now could establish new relations with these peoples, relations based on recognition of their freedom and independence, on voluntary agreement, equality of rights, mutual interests and friendship. Such relations would really correspond to the spirit of the times. But the big bourgeoisie persisted in the old colonial policy. This obduracy led to the unjust and ruinous war in Vietnam and to the shameful war against the people of Algeria. It was solely for the purpose of preventing a negotiated peace in Algeria, for the purpose of stepping up the war, against which the men and women of France are protesting, that the colonial extremists and the insurgent generals in the "Committee of Public Safety" staged their coup in Algeria. They sought to impose fascist dictatorship on France, to "hold down" the people. The revolt which brought de Gaulle to power was backed by the big finance capital of the metropolis, the representatives of which hold the key positions in the state apparatus.

If in the past it was possible to say that *fascism meant war*, it can now be said that war, especially *colonial war, is fascism.*

If the Gaullist plot against democracy is a sign of the weakness of the French bourgeoisie, and not its strength, then it cannot but be admitted that the establishment of a military dictatorship became possible thanks only to the disunity of the Republican and democratic forces, to the division among the working people. In the hour of trial all the Left political parties and groupings, with the exception of the Communist Party, were divided and, because of this, passive. For the purpose of justifying and deepening this division, the reactionaries have threatened and continue to threaten with an imaginary "Communist danger". For years past the French reactionaries have sounded the alarm at every success won by the Left forces. Their anxiety rose especially after the 1956 general election when the Communist Party emerged as the biggest party in Parliament. The U.S. monopoly press started a furore about the "instability" of France where every fourth man and woman "votes for the Communists". Using anti-Communism as a cover, the French big bourgeoisie hopes that with the advent to power of a "strong man", the democratic rights won by the working people through the century-old struggle will be abolished.

A particularly grave responsibility for de Gaulle's advent to power lies at the door of the right-wing Socialist Party leaders. It will not be out of place to recall that these leaders sabotaged unity of action during the sharp struggle in May when the Communist Party again proposed united action with the Socialists and other groupings of the Left. But even then, in the face of the imminent danger of fascism, the right-wing Socialist leaders—parroting the German Social Democratic leaders whose perfidious assertions that Hitler was the "lesser evil" facilitated his coming to power—retarded and sabotaged the unity of all workers and democratic forces. Passive wait-and-see tactics were propagated, and it was falsely claimed that the choice was between de Gaulle and the Communists. In fact, the choice was between democratic institutions and dictatorship.

Some people tried to justify their capitulation by reasoning that de Gaulle played the role of arbiter. It is common knowledge, however, that far from curbing the rebels, he conferred even greater powers on the insurgent generals and the officials who assisted them.

In Algeria, the generals from the notorious "Committee of Public Safety" now hold the posts of prefects and subprefects. They exercise overt military dictatorship, seeking to extend it throughout France. Soustelle, who contrived the fascist plot, has been appointed Minister of Information. The Gaullist generals were promoted to key posts in the army, while top officials and army officers loyal to the Republic were dismissed or demoted. With the connivance of the government, the fascist elements are not confining themselves to anti-Republican propaganda. They commit outrages and attack the premises of trade unions and Left organizations in Paris and other towns. De Gaulle has not condemned these terroristic activities, which are typical of the initial stage of fascism.

To crown all, the ultra-reactionary circles of the bourgeoisie, in an effort to deprive the people of any possibility of influencing state policy, instructed the Gaullist group to draft a new Constitution. The proposed Constitu-

tion is anti-democratic, is directed against the people, and is obviously monarchist in character. In the event of the draft being approved, France will have the most reactionary Constitution in the entire history of the Republic. Whereas the present Constitution recognizes the right to work, the right to strike and the other social gains won by the working people, nothing of the kind is to be found in the draft. Its authors intend to deprive the people of these vital rights. The draft confers dictatorial powers on the President of the projected Republic. Previously the President was elected by Parliament. According to the new Constitution he will be elected by a special corps of electors consisting mainly of "prominent people". De Gaulle dreams of being the new President. The General-President can, if he considers that the situation is "menacing", assume executive and legislative powers. He appoints and dismisses the Premier and Ministers without the approval of Parliament.

The President's powers are excessively widened to the detriment of the rights of Parliament, which are drastically restricted. Parliament, elected on the basis of the vicious system imposed by special decree, is reduced to a merely consultative body. If to this we add the proposed right of the President to dissolve Parliament, then the policy of establishing *unlimited* dictatorship becomes clear.

It is worth dwelling on the article in the draft which obliges all the existing parties to observe the principles of the Constitution. This means that, in keeping with the wishes of the insurgents, the parties are to be subordinated to de Gaulle and their opposition to government policy prevented. This is the first step towards the dissolution of the democratic parties; it is an outright challenge to republican traditions.

What this Constitution implies for the peoples still oppressed by French colonialism is clear from the statement made by de Gaulle. Algeria, he said, will remain "French territory". To the African peoples, insistently demanding independence, de Gaulle, juggling with words such as "federation" and "commonwealth", proposes merely a new form of colonial empire. At a time when millions of Africans are fighting vigorously for the immediate recognition of their right to independence, the draft Constitution is a miserable attempt to hold up the powerful national-liberation movement. The African peoples reminded de Gaulle of this during his tour of the overseas territories.

The police baton in the metropolis and the whip in the colonies—such is the Gaullist day-dream.

One cannot have any illusions about the designs of the French reactionaries. The purpose of the referendum scheduled for September 28 is to legalize and buttress the dictatorial regime established as a result of the rebellion in Algeria. The people are asked to say YES or NO to the draft Constitution which was drawn up without an open debate in Parliament. It will, in fact, be a farce. Through the medium of a Bonapartist plebiscite the French people are asked to confirm the dictatorial powers of the President. The people of "French" Africa, denied the right to settle their own affairs, are all of a sudden invited to take part in the forthcoming referendum. In Algeria, where the war is raging and liberties have been trampled underfoot, the plebiscite will be held under the control of the paratroops. The conspirators want to decide the destiny of France by manipulating the votes of the peoples who are fighting against colonial rule.

De Gaulle is acting craftily; he is making soothing speeches so as not to reveal his real aims before the referendum. But this does not lessen the impending danger. It is worth recalling that at first Mussolini and Hitler resorted to the same tactics.

The aim of the ultra-reactionary circles of big capital standing behind de Gaulle is to curb the working-class movement and, if possible, crush the progressive organizations, abolish the democratic gains and impose a fascist-type dictatorship.

The French working-class and its vanguard —the Communist Party—are staunch defenders of democratic liberties. For them the form assumed by the bourgeois state is not a matter of indifference. Despite its shortcomings and weaknesses, bourgeois democracy with its universal suffrage and Parliament enables the proletariat to organize for defense of its vital rights and interests. The Communist Party fights indefatigably for democracy and the Republic, and advocates broad unity of all the anti-fascist forces.

The necessity of uniting the forces of the Left becomes increasingly urgent. A heavy price may have to be paid for a wait-and-see policy. Is it necessary to wait and take the path of unity only when fascism has installed its political and military machinery? That policy cost the people incalculable victims and suffering during World War II. French democrats, men and women of different views

and convictions, are now giving serious thought to this. Committees for the Defense of the Republic are being formed in the towns, factories and colleges. They are repulsing the fascist attacks and are doing all in their power to get the people to say "NON" to dictatorship, adventurism and war. Similar appeals have been made by many trade unions, and by organizations of the youth, women and colleges, by the associations of Resistance fighters.

Millions of "NON's" will give a new and powerful stimulus to the movement of the partisans of freedom, democracy and national regeneration.

The May events led to important changes in the Socialist Party and even among the Radicals. Many Socialists are insisting that those who, like Guy Mollet, have disgraced their party and who have led the country to catastrophe, be removed from the leadership. The "action groups" now being formed in the Socialist Party are publicly denouncing the dictatorial methods practised by the leaders. Moreover, prominent Socialists are vigorously protesting against revising the Constitution. The duty of the Socialists, reads one of the documents signed by a group of prominent members of the party, is to vote together with all democrats against the draft Constitution.

De Gaulle and his propagandists claim that an authoritarian policy is dictated by concern for the "greatness of France". The people, the working-class and its Communist Party certainly would like to see the country pursue the "policy of French greatness" of which Maurice Thorez spoke more than ten years ago.

Wherein lies the real greatness of France?

The greatness of France is in her freedom-loving people who are forging a happy future for their country. The greatness of France lies in her Republican and democratic traditions, expressed in the motto of the Great French Revolution: "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity". The greatness of France lies in an independent policy of peace which presupposes above all establishing new relations, based on recognition of independence, with the people of Algeria and the other nations which are still oppressed.

The greatness of France is possible only in conditions of broader democracy.

The referendum scheduled for September 28 has the reverse aim, namely to abolish democracy.

The French working class, inheritor of the glorious traditions of the Paris Commune, is utterly alien to one-man rule, to dictatorship. The main strata of the peasants are attached to Republican liberties. In recent times, as was the case during the Resistance Movement, the French intellectuals have demonstrated their hatred of fascism—the enemy of culture. Lastly, a considerable part of the petty bourgeoisie is, increasingly, beginning to realize the demagogic character of de Gaulle's policy and is aligning itself with the old Jacobin tradition, which is hostile to Bonapartism. Unity of action and a broad alliance of the working class, the toiling peasantry, intellectuals and middle sections of the urban population can frustrate the reactionary designs.

To heal the split in the ranks of the working class and by so doing bar the way to fascism and war—such is the urgent need of the times. At an hour when the destiny of France is at stake, the Communists again extend a hand to all who fight against fascism, for peace in Algeria, for the triumph of democracy in a free, independent and happy France.

Everybody remembers how the French working people led by the Communist Party repulsed the first onslaught of the fascist reactionaries in 1934 and built a powerful anti-fascist front. That experience was taken over in those days by the entire Communist movement. All progressives remember the grand political victory won by the people of France in 1935 when the Popular Front was created. The staunchness of the working class and the soul of the nation were manifested during the Resistance Movement when the best sons and daughters of France gave their strength, their blood and their lives in order to deliver their country from the Hitler yoke.

And as it was yesterday, so it is today; the interests of the people of France coincide with the interests of all working people and especially of those battling for freedom.

The international Communist and working-class movement, the peoples of the socialist countries, and the democratic peace-loving forces throughout the world, know the feeling of responsibility and awareness of the gravity of its tasks, with which the French Communist Party is rallying the people for defense of democratic liberties. They cannot afford to underrate the full danger of the situation in France, but they are firmly convinced that the working class and people of France will be able to avert the danger of fascism in this part of Europe.

New Documents of Marx and Lenin

The Editorial Board of "World Marxist Review: Problems of Peace and Socialism" has requested the Institute of Marxism-Leninism in Moscow to supply it with hitherto unpublished Marx-Engels-Lenin documents for publication in the journal. Below we publish the materials received to date. The Institute has agreed to supply us with other unpublished documents by the founders of Marxism-Leninism and these will appear in subsequent issues.

THE EDITORIAL BOARD.

UNPUBLISHED LETTER OF KARL MARX

MARX'S letter to Ludwig Feuerbach, which we print below, is of interest as an important document relating to the formative phase of Marxism and to the early period of Marx's struggle against idealism and for a materialist outlook, a struggle that was closely bound up with the practical revolutionary activity of the founder of scientific communism. In 1844, when the letter was written, Marx saw in Feuerbach a natural ally in his ideological struggle. Going considerably further than Feuerbach in his philosophical and political views, Marx sought to make the most of the rational kernel of Feuerbach's materialism in order to substantiate the ideas of socialism and communism, although at the time Marx somewhat exaggerated Feuerbach's contribution.

The letter was written when Marx was putting the finishing touches to his *Economic-Philosophical Manuscripts*, 1844, and immediately before his joint work with F. Engels on *The Holy Family*. Many of the views expressed in the letter are akin to the fundamental ideas of the foregoing works. By this time Marx's views on the historic role of the proletariat, as the class called upon to emancipate human society from capitalist slavery, were nearing final shape. In the letter to Feuerbach, he wrote that history was molding the contemporary proletariat into the "practical element for the emancipation of man." He expressed warm sympathy and respect for the French and British workers and noted the "theoretical contribution made by the German artisans in Switzerland, London and Paris."

The letter contains a brilliant criticism of the idealistic philosophy of Bruno Bauer and the other Young Hegelians.

It was written in German and is published for the first time from a photo-copy received from the German Democratic Republic.

Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the C. C. of the C.P.S.U.

KARL MARX TO LUDWIG FEUERBACH

Paris, August 11, 1844
Rue Vanneau 38

Dear Sir,

I am taking this opportunity and the liberty of sending you an article of mine outlining certain points of my critique of the philosophy of law.[1] I completed it some time ago but afterwards revised it with a view to making it understandable to all. I attach no particular significance to the article but am glad to have this opportunity of expressing my deepest respect and, if I may use the word, love for you. Your "Philosophy of the Future" and "Essence of Faith"[2] are certainly — notwithstanding their small size — of greater significance than the whole of contemporary German literature.

In these works you — consciously or otherwise, I cannot say — have given socialism a philosophical foundation and that is precisely how the Communists have understood them. Unity of man with man based on the real distinctions between men, the concept of the human race, transferred from the heavens of abstraction to real earth — what can this be but the concept of society!

Your book "The Essence of Christianity"[3] is being translated into two languages — English and French. Both translations are nearly ready for the press. The former will appear in Manchester (Engels has looked it through), and the latter — in Paris (the Frenchman Dr.

Guerrier, and the German Communist Ewerbeck have completed the translation with the help of a French style editor).[4]

The French will readily snatch at the book, for both parties — the clericals on the one hand and the Voltairians and the materialists on the other — are longing for outside help. It is worth noting that in contrast to the 18th century, religion has now gripped the middle estate and the upper class, and irreligion — the irreligion inherent in the man who feels himself as man — has descended into the ranks of the French proletariat. You should have been present at one of the meetings of French ouvriers* to see the virgin freshness and nobleness of these toil-worn people. The British proletarian, too, is making great headway, but he lacks the culture characteristic of the French. However, I cannot but note the theoretical contribution made by the German artisans in Switzerland, London and Paris. But it should be said that the German artisan is still very much the artisan.

In any case history is molding these "barbarians" of our civilized society into the practical element for the emancipation of man.

The contrast between the French character and the character inherent in us, Germans, never appeared before me in such acute and striking fashion as it is revealed in a Fourierist publication[5] which begins with the following points:

"L'homme est tout entier dans ses passions." "Avez-vous jamais rencontré un homme qui pensât pour penser, qui se ressouvint pour se ressouvenir, qui imaginât pour imaginer? qui voulait pour vouloir? cela vous est-il jamais arrivé à vous-même? . . . non, évidemment non!"**

Consequently, the main motive force of nature and society is, it appears, the magic, passionate, non-reflective attraction, and "tout être, homme, plante, animal ou globe a reçu une somme des forces en rapport avec sa mission dans l'ordre universel".*** It follows that "les attractions sont proportionnelles aux destinées."☆

Does it not appear from these points as though the Frenchman had deliberately counterposed his passion to the actus purus☆☆ of German thought? People do not think merely for the sake of thinking, etc.

How difficult it is for the German to overcome his one-sidedness which is of the reverse order; further proof of this is given in the critical "Berliner Literaturzeitung"[6] by Bruno Bauer — my friend of many years who is now becoming more and more alienated from me. I do not know whether you have read that paper. It contains a lot of concealed polemic against you.

The main feature of the "Literaturzeitung" is that its "critique" is turned into some kind of transcendent being. The Berliners who put out this paper believe that they are not humans engaged in criticism, but critics who only in a sort of by-the-way fashion have the misfortune to be humans. Hence they recognize only one actual need — that of theoretical criticism. That is why people like Proudhon are rebuked for proceeding from one or another "practical" "need". That is why this criticism turns out to be woeful and supercilious spiritualism. Consciousness or self-consciousness is regarded as the sole human quality. Love, for instance, is rejected because for the lover the beloved is, if you please, merely an "object". A bas☆☆☆ with the object ! That is why this criticism is regarded as the only active element in history. The whole of mankind is counterposed to it as the mass, the inert mass, which is signifi-

---

*workers

"Man** is completely revealed in his **passions.**" "Have you ever met a man who would **think for the sake of thinking, remember for the sake of remembering, imagine for the sake of imagining, or desire for desire's sake?** Have you ever experienced anything like it? . . . No, of course not!"

***"everything that is—whether man, plant, animal or the globe as a whole—is endowed with a sum of forces which corresponds to its mission in the universal order of things".

☆ **"attractions** are proportionate to **destinies".** ☆☆ pure activity. ☆☆☆ Down.

cant only as the antithesis of the spirit. Hence to be possessed of feeling or passion is considered a grave crime for the critic — the critic should be possessed of irony, he should be an ice-cold sophos.*

That is why Bauer says literally the following:

"The critic participates neither in the sorrows, nor in the joys of society: he knows neither friendship nor love, neither hate nor dislike; he sits in solitude on the throne, and only rarely does the laughter of the Olympian gods escape from his lips at the wickedness of the world."

That is why the entire tone of Bauer's "Literaturzeitung" is the tone of dispassionate scorn and Bauer succeeds all the more in this because he uses the results achieved by you and by our times in general in order to hurl them at the heads of others. Bauer only reveals the contradictions and, satisfied with this occupation, he retires with a scornful "h'm". Criticism, he says, yields nothing, it is too spiritualistic for that. What is more, he forthrightly expresses the hope that "the time is not far off when the whole of degenerating mankind will rally in a crowd against criticism, and criticism,"—that is , Bauer and Co.—"will then sort out this mass into various groups and give them all a testimonium paupertatis**.[7]

It was rivalry, it seems, that impelled Bauer to fight against Christ. I will write a small pamphlet against this distortion of criticism.[8] It would be of the utmost value to me if you would be kind enough to let me have your opinion in advance, and, generally speaking, I would be delighted to receive an early reply from you.

Throughout the summer the local German artisans, that is the Communist section numbering several hundred, have been attending bi-weekly lectures on your book "The Essence of Christianity". The lectures were delivered by their secret leaders and the audiences were most receptive.

A brief excerpt from a letter by a German lady quoted in a feuilleton published in No. 64 of the "Vorwaerts" has been reprinted from a letter written by my wife, now on a visit to her mother in Trier, without her knowledge.[10]

With best wishes,

Yours, Karl Marx

*sage. **pauper's certificate.

NOTES

1. Apparently the reference is to Marx's article "Introduction to a Critique of the Hegelian Philosophy of Law" published in the "Deutsch-Französische Jahrbücher ("German-French Year Books") in February 1844.

2. Ludwig Feuerbach. "Grundsätze der Philosophie der Zukunft". Zürich und Winterthur, 1843 (L. Feuerbach, "The Foundations of the Philosophy of the Future". Zürich and Winterthur, 1843).

Ludwig Feuerbach. "Das Wesen des Glaubens im Sinne Luthers. Ein Beitrag zum 'Wesen des Christenthums'." Leipzig, 1944 (L. Feuerbach, "The Essence of Faith in Luther's Understanding. Appendix to 'The Essence of Christianity'." Leipzig, 1844).

3. L. Feuerbach. "Das Wesen des Christenthums". Leipzig, 1841). A second edition appeared in Leipzig in 1843.

4. The English translation, apparently, did not appear. The French translation appeared as: H. Ewerbeck. "Qu'est-ce que la religion d'après la nouvelle philosophie allemande". Paris, 1850 (H. Ewerbeck. "What is Religion According to the New German Philosophy". Paris, 1850).

Guerrier—French physician, who supported the German democrats and socialists. Under Marx's influence he became a Communist.

Ewerbeck, August Hermann (1816-1860)—German physician and writer, leader of the Paris Associations of the League of the Just, later became a member of the Communist League which he abandoned in 1850.

5. E. de Pompery. "Exposition de la Science Sociale, constituée par C. Fourier". 2-me éd., Paris, 1840 (E. de Pompery. "An Exposition of the Social Science Created by Charles Fourier". 2nd ed., Paris, 1840). The first edition under the title "Résumé d'une exposition de la Science Sociale, constituée par C. Fourier" ("Summary Exposition of the Social Science Created by Charles Fourier") — appeared in Paris in 1839. In the quotations that follow, the italics are those of Marx.

6. "Literatur-Zeitung" — abbreviation for the monthly "Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung" ('Universal Literary Journal"); it was published by the Young Hegelian B. Bauer in Charlottenburg (near Berlin) from December 1843 to October 1844.

7. The quotations are from articles pubilshed in Issues V and VI of the "Allgemeine Literatur-Zeitung". Marx subjected these statements to criticism in Chapters seven and nine of "The Holy Family". Also compare "Economic-Philosophical Manuscripts, 1844" (Introduction and section "Criticism of Hegel's Dialectics and Hegel's Philosophy in General").

8) This idea was realized in the shape of a joint work by Marx and Engels: "The Holy Famiiy or a Critique of Critical Criticism. Against Bruno Bauer and Company", published in Frankfurt-on-Main in 1845.

9. "Vorwärts ("Forward")—a German bi-weekly paper, which appeared in Paris from January to December 1844. On August 7 and 10 (issues No. 63 and 64) the paper carried an article by Marx "Critical Notes to an Article by a 'Prussian' 'The King of Prussia and Social Reforms' ", directed against Arnold Ruge. Beginning with August 31 the paper also published articles by Engels. Influenced by Marx, who in the summer of 1844 began to take part in editing the paper, it became more communist in character; it sharply criticized the reactionary order in Prussia. At the request of the Prussian government the Guizot Ministry in January 1845 issued a deportation order against Marx and other contributors to the paper. "Vorwärts" was thus discontinued.

10. No. 64 of "Vorwärts" dated August 10, 1844, carried an anonymous article entitled "From the Letter of a German Lady". This was the excerpt from Jenny Marx's letter to her husband.

NEW DOCUMENTS OF V. I. LENIN

WE PRINT below a number of hitherto unpublished documents written by V. I. Lenin: "Letter to Clara Zetkin and Paul Levi" dated April 16, 1921, "Suggestions for the Draft 'Theses on Tactics' for the Third Congress of the Communist International" (written not later than July 9, 1921), "Instructions to the Secretary (prior to July 17, 1921, and August 17, 1921), and a note to T. L. Axelrod, dated July 17, 1921.

The "Letter to Clara Zetkin and Paul Levi" was written in connection with the conflict which developed early in 1921 in the Central Committee of the United Communist Party of Germany between the majority of the Central Committee on the one hand, and Zetkin and Levi on the other. The conflict arose out of Paul Levi's support for the Serrati centrist group in the Italian Socialist Party, and was aggravated by the serious differences in the assessment of the March 1921 uprising in Germany.

The other documents testify to the close attention which Lenin gave to the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and the thoroughness with which he studied the state of affairs in that Party, especially in connection with its founding Congress in May 1921. The documents have been taken from Book XXXVI of the Lenin Miscellany, which is now being prepared for the press. The dates given in parentheses have been established by the Institute of Marxism-Leninism.

Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U.

LETTER TO CLARA ZETKIN AND PAUL LEVI[1]

Printed from the typewritten copy with Lenin's notes.

16.4.1921.

Comrades Zetkin and Levi!

Dear Friends! Many thanks for your letters. I regret to say I have been so busy during the past few weeks and so very tired that I have had hardly any opportunity to read the German newspapers. I have only read the Open Letter[2] and regard it as absolutely correct tactics (I have condemned the contrary opinion held by our "Lefts" who were against the letter). As to the recent strike movement and actions in Germany, I have read absolutely nothing about this.[3] I readily believe that the Executive Committee spokesman supported stupid tactics — too Left — in urging immediate action "to help the Russians": this spokesman is very often too Left.[4] In my opinion you should not give way in such cases, but should protest and immediately and officially raise the question at the plenary meeting of the Executive Bureau.

In my view your tactics in relation to Serrati are incorrect. Any defense, or even semi-defense, of Serrati was a mistake. But to withdraw from the Central Committee!!?? That, at any rate, is the greatest mistake of all! If we are going to tolerate a state of affairs in which responsible members of the Central Committee withdraw from it when they happen to be in the minority, then the communist parties will never develop and improve normally.[5] Instead of withdrawing it would have been better to ventilate the issue a few times jointly with the Executive Committee. Comrade Levi now wishes to write a pamphlet, that is, to aggravate the differences! To what end?? My conviction is that to do so would be a grave error.[6]

Why not wait? There will be a Congress here on June 1. Why not discuss the issue privately here, before the Congress? Without public polemics, without resigning and without any pamphlets on differences. Our tempered forces are so few that I am really shocked when comrades declare they are leaving, and so on. Everything — the possible, and the impossible — must be done to avoid at all costs resignations and sharpening of differences.

We had a difficult time in February and March. A peasant country. The overwhelming majority of the population is engaged in peasant farming. There is vacillation. Devastation, discontent. But we must not be too pessimistic. We made timely concessions. And I am sure we shall win.

Kind regards and best wishes,

Yours, Lenin.

Translated from the German

1. The copy of this letter, which is in the archives of the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U., contains the following notes made by Lenin: "My reply to Levi and Zetkin 16/4/1921. To be kept in the archives. Make another **2-3 copies**". **"To be returned"**, "received 17/V/1921".

2. The Open Letter of the Central Committee of the United Communist Party of Germany ("Offener Brief der Zentrale der Vereinigten Kommunistischen Partei Deutschlands") to all sociaist and trade union organizations was published on January 8, 1921, in "Die Rote Fahne" No. 11. Morgen-Ausgabe. In this letter the Central Committee called upon all the socialist and trade union organizations in the country to wage a common struggle for the urgent demands of the working class against the growing offensive of the reactionary forces.

3. The action taken by the German proletariat in March 1921.

The Left majority of the Central Committee of the United Communist Party of Germany (UCPG)—guided by the "theory of the offensive", according to which the offensive was the sole correct tactic in any situation, regardless of the political conditions—urged the workers along the path of a premature uprising. The German bourgeoisie seized on this and provoked an armed uprising in conditions unfavorable to the workers. The revolt, which broke out in a number of regions of Central Germany in March 1921. was not supported by the workers in the other industrial regions and, despite the heroic efforts of its participants, was quickly crushed.

4. Bela Kun, at that time a member of the Presidium of the Executive of the Communist International.

5. Levi attended the XVIIIth Congress of the Italian Socialist Party as the representative of the United Communist Party of Germany (UCPG). The Congress took place in Livorno over January 15-21, 1921; it was at this Congress that the split took place. On returning to Germany, Levi defended the Italian centrists headed by Serrati. On February 24, 1921, following the adoption by the Central Committee of the UCPG of a Resolution denouncing Serrati and his supporters and welcoming the founding of the Communist Party of Italy, five Central Committee members (O. Brass, E. Deimig, A. Hoffmann, P. Levi and C. Zetkin) resigned on grounds of disagreement

6. On March 29, 1921, Paul Levi wrote a letter to Lenin to which the present document is the reply. In his letter Paul Levi, condemning the March uprising, stated that he was withdrawing from the Party leadership and would set out his views in a pamphlet. Levi's pamphlet, entitled "Unser Weg. Wider den Putschismus" ("Our Path. Against Putschism"), appeared on April 3, 1921. He characterized the struggle waged by the hundreds of thousands of the German proletariat as a "Bakuninist Putsch". Levi called upon the workers to condemn the Communists who, allegedly, wore solely responsible for the failure of the uprising. On April 15, 1921 the Central Committee expelled Levi from the Party for gross breach of Party discipline and the harm caused by his pamphlet. It insisted on Levi's relinquishing his seat in Parliament. On April 29, 1921, the Executive of the Communist International endorsed the C.C. UCPG decision to expel Levi. The question of the tactical differences arising from the March uprising was submitted for discussion to the Third Congress of the Communist International which endorsed Levi's expulsion. Ultimately Levi switched right over to the Social Democratic standpoint and fought against the Communist International.

SUGGESTIONS FOR THE DRAFT "THESES ON TACTICS" FOR THE THIRD CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

(Written not later than July 9, 1921)

1) Delete Schmeral's name and the end of the paragraph.

2) Instruct the Commission (or Executive) to prepare a detailed letter to the Czech Party containing a pointed and precise criticism, citing quotations, of what is wrong in Schmeral's position and just where the editors of the Reichenberg Vorwaerts should display more caution.[1]

1, This refers to B. Schmeral's speech at the founding Congress of the Czechosovak Communist Party, held in Prague over May 14-16, 1921. The "Vorwärts" (Reichenberg) No. 114, May 17, 1921, reported Schmeral's speech. Lenin carefully studied the materials of the May Congress of the Czechoslovak Communist Party. In his report on the tactics of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks) to the Third Congress of the Communist International he criticized the stand taken by Schmeral (See Works, Fourth Russian Edition, Vol. 32, page 464).

Lenin's proposals were adopted by the Commission on Tactics.

INSTRUCTIONS TO THE SECRETARY

(Prior to July 17, 1921)

Please obtain a complete set of "Rude Pravo", the Czechoslovak Communist Party newspaper, on the May 1921 Congress of the Party. (Contact Axelrod or Schmeral, the Czech delegate.)

Do likewise with the German newspaper "Vorwaerts" published in

Reichenberg, Czechoslovakia. (Ask Axelrod or Kreibich, the delegate of the German Communist Party of Czechoslovakia.)[1]

Dictated over the telephone.
Printed from a typewritten copy.

1, T. L. Axelrod, head of the Comintern Press Bureau. B. Schmeral and K. Kreibich were delegates to the Third Congress of the Comintern.

NOTE TO T. L. AXELROD

To Comrade Axelrod

I have not yet received from you the Resolutions of the Third Congress which you promised to let me have in a couple of days. I am returning the Czech and German newspapers to you as they do not contain what I asked for. I repeat my request: Let me have copies, and only the relevant copies, of "Rude Pravo" covering the May 1921 Congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. It is these copies that you failed to send me. Please find a Czech comrade who would undertake to carry out this request conscientiously and intelligently.

17/VII/21 12.30

Dictated over the telephone.
Printed from a typewritten copy.

INSTRUCTIONS TO THE SECRETARY

Please find out whether a complete German translation of Schmeral's theses at the 1921 spring Congress of the Czechoslovak Party is available. I gave this translation to Comrade Axelrod during the Congress.[1] It appears that the first part of the theses, up to the paragraph on the moral crisis, is missing. The translation was given to me by Comrade Kreibich. Please find out whether the missing part can be located.[2]

Has my pamphlet on the Tax in Kind been published in any foreign language either in Russia or abroad? If so, please let me have a copy of each translation.

17/VIII/21 Lenin

Dictated over the telephone.
Printed from the Secretary's record.

1. The Third Congress of the Communist International.
2. Upon receipt of the Secretary's—M. I. Glyasser's—note that Schmeral's speech had been found and was being translated, Lenin wrote on it: **"Leave it in my library."**

In Memory of Frederic Joliot-Curie

SCIENTISTS, Communists and peace supporters throughout the world mourn the death of Joliot-Curie, a man whose name is pronounced with deep respect by all people of good will.

His death has deprived mankind of one of the most distinguished scientists of our times. A great humanist and a great patriot has gone from us. The noble and selfless scientific labor which shaped his entire life, his patriotism, love of man, and profound understanding of the international duty devolving on him as a scientist led and could not but lead to the fusing of his personal life with the cause and the struggle of the Communist Party. Addressing the XIIIth Congress of the French Communist Party, Joliot-Curie said: "It is said, and not without reason, that the Communist Party is not the usual type of party, similar to the others. And, indeed, where else will you find a group of people inspired by such lofty ideas, with such a thirst for everything creative, with such power of thought, and ready to give all its energy to the struggle for national independence, freedom and peace? I am proud to belong to this party."

Joliot-Curie was a true Communist. All his strength and ability were devoted to the cause of the working class, to the fight for peace, democracy and socialism. He embodied the finest qualities of the talented and heroic people of France.

It was not an easy matter for this son of a Paris Communard to make his way in the world of science, to get the opportunity to apply his talents. It would be difficult to pinpoint the source of his impulse — whether the youthful enthusiasm for the selflessness of the scientists whose discoveries had fired the public imagination at the turn of the century, or the inherent need of finding outlet for the budding talent which made him turn the bathroom into a "laboratory". In any event the boy Frederic knew what he wanted to do in life. He had made up his mind that he would be a chemical engineer. He attended the Lavoisier school, where tuition was free, in order to prepare for the School of Physics and Chemistry in Paris where Marie and Pierre Curie, whom he had admired from childhood, were working.

It was here he met a man who powerfully influenced his molding as a scientist and as a citizen. This was Paul Langevin, who discerned remarkable abilities in the gay and diligent boy, who was also a sports enthusiast. While employed as an engineer in an iron and steel plant in Luxembourg, Joliot lived among the workers. He came to understand the ordinary people, talked with them, listened to what they had to say, pondered on the purport and the significance of life, viewing it through their eyes, and taking their interests to heart. When, in 1925, Joliot, with Langevin's assistance, found himself in Marie Sklodowska-Curie's laboratory, he was ready to devote himself wholly to science, while fully appreciating its social import.

Marie Curie helped the young Frederic in his calling. It was in the home of his teacher that he met Irene Curie, who became his wife and constant associate in his scientific achievements and, later, in the struggle he waged for freedom and peace.

The Joliot-Curies began research on the atomic nucleus in 1928. In 1933 they discovered that it was possible to produce radioactive nuclei from the usual elements — aluminum, magnesium and boron. And so, 40

years after the discovery by Becquerel, Marie and Pierre Curie of the natural radioactivity of the heavy elements, it was established that radioactivity could be produced artificially in elements standing at the head of Mendeleyev's periodic system of elements. It was discovered at the same time that radiation caused by artificial radioactivity consists of positrons, which hitherto had been observed only in cosmic rays.

The discovery of artificial radioactivity opened up immense possibilities for its practical application in medicine, biology and industry.

In 1935 Frederic and Irene Juliot-Curie were awarded a Nobel Prize. World fame had come to them.

Together with establishing himself as a scientist there grew responsibility for the future of science, for the effect of its accomplishments on the people. None realized better than Frederic Joliot-Curie himself the significance of his discovery. Already in 1935 he spoke of the possibility of a nuclear chain reaction which would release the vast energy contained in the atomic nucleus. He elaborated this idea in a lecture at Moscow University in 1936. Subsequently Paul Langevin, appraising the likely effect of these conclusions and of the research conducted by Joliot-Curie on the basis of them, wrote in 1945: "Even before the war Joliot-Curie foresaw the possibility of building power stations of 300,000 kw. which would consume only one ton of uranium per year instead of the 3,000,000 tons of coal or oil used by the steam turbines of today."

Joliot-Curie devoted the immediate prewar years to the search for ways of releasing nuclear energy and in 1939, together with his students and fellow-workers, Halban, Kowarski and Perrin, built the world's first atomic battery. Simultaneously with the research into methods of producing a nuclear chain reaction Joliot-Curie, and this should be emphasized, sought ways of controlling it, so that it could be guided and used for peaceful purposes. He fully appreciated the threat to mankind inherent in the discovery of atomic energy. He himself experienced the tragedy of a situation in which brains and knowledge could be turned to do great and irreparable harm.

The war clouds were gathering, and Joliot-Curie entered the fight against the war danger. With Langevin, his teacher and friend, he became a member of the Vigilance Committee of the Anti-Fascist Association of Intellectuals and at the Congress of the International Peace Alliance in London spoke in defense of peace.

When France, betrayed by her rulers and the bourgeoisie, found herself under the heel of the German invaders, Joliot-Curie from the very first days joined the ranks of the vanguard fighters. The 200 liters of "heavy water" which he saved from the Germans was the feat of a scientist and a soldier, the significance of which cannot be overestimated. Had this "raw material" of nuclear reaction fallen into Hitlerite hands, the consequences might have been frightful.

And because he loved his people, because he had faith in their indomitable will for life and victory, and sought for more effective means of achieving victory over fascism, Joliot-Curie became a Communist.

Scorning the Gestapo terror, which did not spare his friends and relations, Joliot-Curie converted his laboratory into an arsenal of the Franc-tireurs and began the production of explosives, grenades, mines and bombs.

From now on the social and professional activity of the famous scientist were indivisible. And if before the war Joliot-Curie assessed the social results of his discoveries through the prism of his conscience and an abstract conception of his moral duty, he now linked his work as scientist and citizen with the struggle of the class destined to bring about the revolutionary reconstruction of society. His humanism now acquired the force and conviction of a scientifically substantiated world outlook. "The evolution of the world," wrote Joliot-Curie in a message to the XIVth Congress of the French Communist Party, "interrupted at times by swift, revolutionary changes, could not but be accelerated as a result of the activity of ever-increasing masses of people, who have resolved, despite all the obstacles, to abolish the exploitation of man by man, and to create the conditions for the material and spiritual emancipation of mankind.

"With what force and scope does the immense progress achieved, thanks to Marx's work which scientifically established the basic laws of the development of human society, reveal itself today! . . . How valuable for us is the enrichment of Marxism and the direct proof of the correctness of its method, supplied by Lenin and his followers on the basis of the experience of the Russian Revolution and the building of the Soviet system! . . ."

The struggle which Joliot-Curie waged together with his Party enabled him better to understand the correlation of the social forces in the world, equipped him with a genuine-

ly party spirit and theory which has absorbed the century-old experience of the revolutionary struggle of the proletarian masses. As he explained later, when addressing a Party Conference of the Fifth Arrondissement of Paris in April, 1951: "It is only the Party, and contact with the Party, that gives each of us an exact perspective, that enables us better to understand and chart our own particular task and place within the framework of this perspective."

The Communists bore the brunt of the Resistance, they saved the soul of the nation during the terrible years of fascist terror. After the war they were ready to assume responsibility for the regeneration of the country. And Joliot-Curie was with them, at his post. An organizer and leader of research, he worked tirelessly. He organized the National Scientific Research Center and the Commissariat for Atomic Energy. His chief aim was to complete the plans, started before the war, to meet the country's power requirements with atomic "fuel". When founding the Commissariat, Joliot-Curie said outright that he and his colleagues would work only for atoms for peace. "We began work only after clearly stating that we considered the object of our research to be defense of peace, and the government agreed to this . . . The entire personnel, workers and scientists in the Commissariat for Atomic Energy in France have solemnly declared that they will leave this establishment if they are forced to work on the manufacture of atomic weapons."

Many considered the work started by the famous scientist to be quixotic, others regarded it with hostility and fear. Some were in sympathy, but had little faith in it. Bernard Baruch, the American banker, once said that Joliot-Curie was crazy in thinking that he would succeed in building an atomic pile in France where everything had gone to wrack and ruin. Baruch told the scientist that French industry was incapable of furnishing him with equipment and suggested that he should remain in the U.S.A. where he would be supplied with the means of work. And although, as Joliot-Curie himself said, "We had to start from scratch", France's first experimental atomic pile was built in a very short period. It was inaugurated on December 15, 1948. Joliot-Curie named it Zoe ("Life"). The second phase of the work (one or two piles and a research center) was scheduled for completion by 1953. But this was not to be. In 1950 the Bidault government, contrary to the national interests and the national honor, dismissed Joliot-Curie from his post as High Commissioner for Atomic Energy and even banned him from the territory of Fort de Chatillon, the site of the atomic pile built under his guidance. This was an act of base political vengeance against the scientist who wished to serve his people and refused to subordinate his research to those who saw in it merely an auxiliary weapon for undermining peace and freedom.

What was his "crime"? That he had proudly and courageously unfurled the banner of genuine humanism which he had taken over from his predecessors, whose names are inseparable from French and world culture.

By this time Frederic Joliot-Curie had achieved world renown. His authority as a scientist was now recognized by academies and universities in dozens of countries; he had taken his place in the ranks of the foremost scientists of the world; his whole life and his personal charm made his name the symbol of the powerful peace movement, placed him in the heart of this movement. And when the new pretenders to world dominion launched the atomic arms race, when the fearful specter of Hiroshima and Nagasaki once again appeared as a grim reminder, the Communist Frederic Jolio-Curie, who had implicit faith in the boundless strength of the masses, the scientist who fully realized the tragic consequences of an atomic war, again took his place in the van of the fighters for humanity. But Joliot-Curie kept in mind the experience won in the prewar peace struggle. "Who does not remember the actions for peace before the war?" asked Joliot-Curie afterwards. "Alas, the people of good-will, whose courage we so much admire, whose sincerity we respect, failed to achieve the desired results, although it would appear that they had reason to count on the success of their undertaking. The sole reason why they failed was that at that time millions of men and women lacked faith in their strength and thought that nothing could be done to save peace — the idea that war was inevitable as fate itself had become embedded in the minds of the millions . . ."

He now had a much deeper understanding of the motive forces of society. He now had his Party which, as he expressed it, by its collective mind safeguarded each of its members from making mistakes and, what is more, from repeating them. The unity of all those capable of fighting and the support of the people — these were the cardinal conditions for success. Consequently, when calling on scientists to put all their effort into the

struggle for a new social system, a just and peace-loving system in which science would undoubtedly prove the decisive factor for the material and spiritual emancipation of man, Joliot-Curie indicated to them the sole way to reach this goal: go forward in unison with the workers and peasants, support them and learn from them. For without them the men of science are powerless and many run the risk of becoming pawns in the hands of those they should combat.

With all the weight of his prestige and influence, Joliot-Curie ceaselessly exposed the opportunist pacifism so deeply rooted among bourgeois scientists, the pacifism which left the battlefield to the enemy and created a favorable atmosphere for imperialist demagogy. "It is not enough to say 'I am for peace' ", he wrote. "That is easy. It does not expose you to any danger and everyone concurs. Our profession imposes certain obligations upon us and if we are required to work for war, to make atom bombs, our answer will be NO. That is our bounden duty and we shall do it."

This vow, made on April 23, 1949, at the National Conference of Intellectuals for Peace — which was held at the same time as the First World Peace Congress — will go down in history as the supreme expression of noble thought, of a scientist's awareness of his social responsibility. Joliot-Curie constantly stressed that the unity of scientists with the movement of the working masses was the guarantee of success in the struggle for peace.

Unanimously elected Chairman of the World Peace Council, it was he who, at the historic Stockholm session, proclaimed the famous Stockholm Appeal for prohibition of atomic weapons:

"We insist on unconditional prohibition of atomic weapons, which are weapons of aggression and wholesale annihilation of peoples.

"We insist on strict international control to ensure that this prohibition is observed.

"We shall regard as criminal that government which first uses atom bombs against another country." Joliot-Curie spoke on behalf of the Permanent Committee, but the word "we" soon came to mean the voice of tens of millions. His was the first signature to the Stockholm Appeal. The peoples appended their signatures to the Appeal, and it became a material force which struck fear, and to this day strikes fear, into the aggressors.

Although engrossed in scientific work, Joliot-Curie never ceased his activity in guiding the peace movement. He inspired the men and women of France and of the whole world to enter the struggle, organizing people and inculcating in them awareness of their responsibility for the future of mankind. The task, he reiterated, was not to ask for peace, it was to impose peace on the warmongers.

A man of science, a Communist and humanist, he knew that the Soviet Union was the bulwark and the hope of world civilization, that defense of the Soviet Union, support of it, concern for its prestige, was the international duty of all who cherished peace, progress and the cultural treasures and achievements of mankind. In disseminating this idea—one of the fruitful ideas of the times—among the intellectuals in the capitalist countries, and in rallying all the peace forces in his own country under this slogan, Joliot-Curie rendered an invaluable service. "In the fight against the aggressive war being prepared against the U.S.S.R.," he said at XIIth Congress of the French Communist Party, "I have in mind all the scientists who devote themselves to science in order to serve the people and who set us a magnificent example. I have in mind those people of the new world who have already once saved mankind and who constitute its hope. That is why progressive scientists and Communist scientists will never yield a particle of their knowledge for war against the Soviet Union. In this we shall be firm, upheld by our conviction that in so doing we are serving France and mankind."

Joliot-Curie was mandated by the millions of peace supporters to act as their spokesman before governments and the United Nations. The official messages sent by him on behalf of the Peace Council breathe calm and confidence in the ability of the peace forces to curb the warmongers.

His solidarity with the national-liberation struggle of the peoples was boundless, and he never tired of stressing its linkage with the struggle for world peace. In his splendid address to the 1957 Conference of the peoples of Asia and Africa in Cairo, Joliot-Curie wrote: "We note, as a fact of enormous progressive significance, the ever-increasing role now being played in international affairs by the countries which have thrown off the yoke of colonialism, or which have taken the path of liberation. Their opinions, demands and interests can no longer be ignored. The immense moral and material force which these countries constitute in the struggle for peace was demonstrated in the historic Ban-

dung Conference held in 1955. Since then the 'Bandung spirit' has inspired not only the countries represented at that conference, but all the peoples interested in maintaining peace."

Joliot-Curie taught the people to be vigilant, and taught them first and foremost by his personal example. His undoubted competence in matters of atomic energy and his indefatigable energy were always at the disposal of the peace supporters. And no matter what subterfuge the imperialist atom maniacs resorted to, in order to divert the people's attention and lull their vigilance (whether it was the use of rockets with atomic warheads, detecting atomic explosions, the effects of radiation), Joliot-Curie always gave the peace fighters timely and competent information and sound advice as to what should be done.

Up to the very last he continued his efforts to make science an instrument through which people could achieve happiness and prosperity. In the banning of atomic and nuclear weapons he saw not simply the removal of a deadly danger to mankind. The cessation of the tests and destruction of nuclear weapons would save vast sums which could be utilized for an immediate and substantial improvement in the conditions of the working masses. Much of his report to the Stockholm Congress for Disarmament and International Co-operation last July was devoted to this aspect of the problem.

The life and personality of Frederic Joliot-Curie, the model intellectual of the new type, the Communist intellectual devoted heart and soul to the revolutionary movement of the working class, testify to this truth which, increasingly, is penetrating the minds of millions of people: Communism is the most humane of all the movements known to history; and precisely for this reason it is invincible, to it belongs the future.

Professor Bernal, friend and colleague of Joliot-Curie, wrote of him:

"We honor him not only as a scientist, although he found the key to atomic power, we esteem him still more as a courageous man, the only one among outstanding scientists who immediately, without reserve or hesitation, devoted himself once and for all to the task of using atomic energy for the good of mankind. He realized that unity between scientists and the rest of mankind was essential to avert the threat of war. We are entering an era of scientific achievements and in Frederic Joliot-Curie we see a man equal to the tasks with which the new era confronts us. He had, partly, his intellectual powers and high moral qualities to thank for this, but mainly it was because he was and remained a son of the people."

Millions of people—mental and manual workers, men and women the world over, for whom Frederic Joliot-Curie was not simply one of the most eminent scientists of our times, but also a friend and leader, join in this appreciation. The loss is a heavy one. But, following Joliot-Curie's behests. they vow at his graveside to go forward with greater resolution towards the aim to which he wholly and utterly gave himself; they are convinced that the solidarity, unity and will of millions of people can smash any plot the imperialists may hatch against mankind.

EDITORIAL BOARD.

Some Aspects of the Ideological Work of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany*

Walter Ulbricht

DELEGATIONS of the Communist and Workers' Parties from all parts of the world met in Moscow on the fortieth anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution and discussed current international issues of the struggle for peace and socialism. The historic significance of this friendly meet-

*This article was written prior to the Fifth Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany.

ing was that it revealed an identity of views on all the points discussed, and further consolidated the fraternal ties between the Communist and Workers' Parties.

The meeting was the most representative in the history of the international working-class movement. It demonstrated the magnitude of the world communist movement, which now embraces more than 70 Communist and Workers' Parties with a total membership of over 33 million. This growth in the last few decades testifies to the impact which the victory of the Russian proletariat in the Great October Socialist Revolution has had on the working-class movement throughout the world.

The representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist countries unanimously adopted a Declaration in which the experience and wisdom accumulated by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Chinese Communist Party and the Communist and Workers' Parties of the other countries are summed up. All the Marxist-Leninist Parties welcomed and endorsed this Declaration.

"The main content of our epoch", the Declaration begins, "is the transition from capitalism to socialism which was begun by the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia." This historic document formulates the basic laws of the socialist revolution and the building of socialism. Pride of place in the Declaration is given to "guidance of the working masses by the working class, the core of which is the Marxist-Leninist Party".

The Declaration delivered a stinging rebuff to the offensive against Marxism. The bourgeoisie, alarmed at the successes of the socialist camp, had stepped up the attacks especially since the spring of 1956, when the Twentieth Congress of the C.P.S.U. called on the Soviet people to exert every effort in order to surpass the U.S.A. in per-capita production as well as in science and technology.

With the rise of the world socialist system the Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist and other countries found it necessary to pursue a still broader policy of peace, peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition between the socialist and capitalist states. This task required that dogmatism and narrow sectarianism be overcome, further success ensured in socialist construction and the socialist revolution carried forward in the spheres of ideology and culture.

In an attempt to hold up the advance of socialism the imperialists launched a campaign against the Marxist-Leninist parties. For this purpose they made use of the latter-day revisionists who, in the guise of criticizing dogmatism, fight against Marxism-Leninism.

The imperialists sought above all, with the help of revisionism, to subvert the Communist and Workers' Parties, undermine people's democratic rule and retard the socialist revolution in the spheres of ideology and culture. In Hungary, for instance, the revisionists succeeded in striking at the Communist Party, due to the fact that the former leadership of the Party had slackened the struggle against opportunism and revisionism, turned Marxist teaching into dogma and divorced itself from the working class. The Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party headed by Comrade Mao Tse-tung made an invaluable contribution by formulating the theory of the connection between the general laws of socialist construction and the specific conditions under which socialist changes occur in the various countries, and by outlining the ways for its practical application in China. This greatly stimulated the theoretical and practical work of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the other socialist countries.

The Central Committee of our Party, taking into account the specific conditions in Germany where the struggle between the two social systems is taking place in one country, with the German Democratic Republic having an open frontier, has drawn similar conclusions.

The cardinal issue in the ideological struggle in recent years has been that of the leading role of the Marxist-Leninist party. It was precisely against this role that the main attack of the bourgeoisie and the right-wing Social Democratic leaders was directed.

Bitter experience brought home to the German working class that the reason for the failure to destroy German imperialism during the November 1918 revolution was the absence of a revolutionary Marxist party; the bitter experience of 1932-33 showed that the working class failed to prevent the seizure of power by the Nazis because of the influence exercised by the bourgeoisie on a considerable part of the working-class movement; and though the entire course of development in Western Germany proves that Social Democratic reformism was instrumental in restoring the power of monopoly capital, still, there

were those in the G.D.R. who in 1956 and 1957 took up revisionism and attacked the Marxist-Leninist unity of the Party and its leading role. The lessons of the Hungarian events, however, sobered them. The seizure of power by the Hungarian revisionists headed by Imry Nagy demonstrated in full measure that revisionism revives all the counter-revolutionary forces and clears the way for them, that the revisionists themselves, pressured by the reactionaries within and the imperialist forces without, turn into open counter-revolutionaries.

And yet, despite these lessons and NATO's aggressive policy in Europe, the leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia at the VIIth Congress counterposed their revisionist program to the Declaration of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist countries, which is a programmatic document. In a situation where Dulles and the right-wing Social Democratic leaders declare that the socialist countries can be undermined only with the help of revisionism, when Dulles becomes an advocate of "national communism" or, as some say, "national socialism", the Yugoslav leaders should realize that their revisionist program signifies support for the "cold war" against the socialist countries.

In talks with the Yugoslav leaders it was recognized as a truth that the transition from capitalism to socialism is accomplished in each country in conformity with the specific features of the given country. But, in contrast to the Yugoslav leaders, we hold that socialism can triumph only on the basis of a policy deriving from the general principles and the laws formulated in the Declaration of the Communist and Workers' Parties. If the Yugoslav leaders think that another way is possible for Yugoslavia, that is their own business. But when they counterpose their program to the Declaration of the Communist and Workers' Parties, this can only be regarded as a blow at the unity of the Marxist working-class movement on the international plane.

The Yugoslav program is especially harmful because it hinders the efforts to create a united front of the Communist and Social Democratic Parties in the struggle for peace, democracy and socialism. For the incorrect evaluation of the role of the U.S.A. and the Western powers' imperialist policy plays into the hands of the right-wing Social Democratic leaders who are retarding the popular movement of protest against the threat of atomic destruction.

International developments since the Yugoslav Congress have refuted the main theses of its program. The aggression by American and British imperialism against the Arab countries, on the one hand, and the efforts of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries to halt it, on the other, make nonsense of the Yugoslav theory of equal responsibility of both "blocs".

The revisionist theories have been refuted by the practice of socialist construction as well. The groundlessness of the revisionist concepts and the soundness of the Leninist line are evident in the bold realization of the Twentieth Congress decisions by the Central Committee of the C.P.S.U. headed by Comrade Khrushchov, and in the impressive advance of Soviet science, technology, industry, agriculture and culture. The experience and the success of socialist construction in the German Democratic Republic also refute the revisionist line suggested and even followed by some comrades; it was spurned by the working people. The opportunist factional grouping of Schierdewan, Zieller, Oelssner, Wohlweber and Selbmann—which attempted to change the policy of the party and its leadership, as well as the composition of the government—was completely isolated in the course of the preparations for the Vth Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany.

To the imperialist propaganda onslaughts against the Party and worker-peasant rule in the G.D.R., the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party counterposed a clearly defined *perspective of struggle in Germany*. It pointed out that the consolidation of worker-peasant rule and the building of socialism in the G.D.R. were the main conditions for easing the tension in Germany, safeguarding peace and creating a confederation of the two German states.

Since our adversaries in their attempts to undermine the Socialist Unity Party and the G.D.R. had concentrated on subversive activity in the political and ideological spheres, we found it necessary to direct our main attack against the influence of bourgeois ideology and against revisionism. The task, then, was to further develop and consolidate the Socialist Unity Party as a Marxist-Leninist militant party. We improved the educational work on the basis of the fundamentals of Marxist-Leninist theory and simultaneously established closer contact between the Party and the people. We abolished the excessive centralism in the administrative apparatus, extended the prerogatives of the local authorities and took measures to involve

broad sections of the working class and other working people in the management of state and economic affairs. The source of inspiration for our Central Committee in pursuing this bold and active policy lay in the experience and glorious traditions of the revolutionary working-class movement. Rosa Luxemburg in her time put the matter aptly: "The sole means of radical struggle against opportunism is to go forward, to develop tactics, enhance the revolutionary spirit of the movement. Generally speaking opportunism is a marsh plant. It blooms in stagnant water but fades in fresh, swift flowing water. Here in Germany the march forward is a pressing and burning necessity." (From Rosa Luxemburg's letter to Henriette Roland-Holst, December 17, 1904.)

Why has revisionism become the main danger? Because the West German bourgeoisie and NATO tried to weaken the worker-peasant rule by means of revisionism. Moreover, some people in our Republic cherished the illusion that the reunification of Germany could be accelerated by the G.D.R. leaders' taking a revisionist stand. And although the Imry Nagy case showed clearly enough the price paid by the people for such a revisionist policy, there were those in our Republic who wanted to find an "easier way".

Revisionism also has its roots in the G.D.R. They have their source in the conditions of petty-bourgeois production in agriculture and small-scale industry, in the petty-bourgeois habits of some of our officials in the economic and administrative bodies, and also in the way of life of some members of the free professions and intellectuals influenced by the traditions of the trusts and their ties with the West, who take little or no active part in socialist construction. The purely professional life led by some of our intellectuals has divorced them from socialist construction and makes it difficult for them to appreciate the objective dialectics of the struggle for solving the contradictions, and to appreciate the aims, tasks and problems of this construction. They would like to see things go smoothly, without conflicts. Some of them either ignored or, on the other hand, exaggerated the contradictions, failed to see the link between things, to notice the new qualitative changes. They came up against the new social developments, but failed to understand their essence and dialectical inter-connection. Their inability to discern the actual contradictions and the problems associated with growth, engendered the illusion that there is an easier way of building socialism, a way without conflicts, along which one can advance in peace and quiet, in conditions of "perfect harmony".

A feature of modern revisionism is that it manifests itself at a time when the proletarian revolution has triumphed in countries that already embrace one-third of mankind, has triumphed because it was guided by the Marxist-Leninist theory. And to this day the revisionist road has nowhere led, nor could it have led, to the establishment of a socialist system of society. Time has refuted the revisionist theory concerning the evolution of capitalism into socialism, advanced in the Yugoslav program and advocated by many Social Democrats in West Germany.

Recent history has shown that the revisionists, insofar as they are still to be found in the socialist countries, not only hamper the activities of the Party, they also endanger the socialist gains of the working people. The facts prove that revisionism, far from furthering the advance of the working people towards a better future, inevitably fosters counter-revolutionary attacks by imperialism, which involves the working class in unnecessary battles, entails more suffering and victims, and temporarily throws back socialist construction. Should any socialist state neglect the struggle against revisionism and allow it to raise its head in the working-class party and the administration, this would inevitably result—in view of the existence of NATO and other imperialist blocs—in fostering and promoting counter-revolution, in furthering the aggressive war plans of the imperialists.

Struggle Against Revisionism in Political Economy

The revisionists are incapable of understanding the dialectics of social development. This is strikingly illustrated in their economic "theories". I shall briefly dwell on their assessment of the general crisis of capitalism. Under the impact of the present economic situation—which I shall not analyze here—the impression was created among certain economists that the Marxist theory of crisis is no longer able to explain the economic phenomena of modern capitalism; and that in view of the improved standard of living in the main capitalist countries, West Germany included, the law of absolute and relative impoverishment of the proletariat is no longer valid.

What are the fundamental differences between the Marxists and the revisionists on this question? They are found, first, in the different approach to and assessment of the

facts and, second, in the different definition of the main motive forces of international development today.

As to the first difference I will cite—without going into detail—two arguments which are important for a Marxist analysis to refute the embellishment of modern capitalism. First, we should bear in mind that the law of uneven development under imperialism, which was put forward by Lenin, affects the law of absolute and relative impoverishment of the proletariat and in some countries weakens its effect. Second, and this is closely linked with the foregoing, we should remember that the imperialist war and its long aftermath had also affected the law of absolute and relative impoverishment. It would be a violation of dialectics were we to disregard the imperialist war and its aftermath while examining the operation of this law.

The second difference between the Marxists and the revisionists concerns the role of the class struggle, which, as we all know, is the law of class society. The founders of the Marxist-Leninist teaching stressed that under capitalism the class struggle of the proletariat counteracts, to a certain extent, the operation of the law of absolute and relative impoverishment of the working class and that, in this, the degree of organization and consciousness of the proletariat and correct leadership of the working class by its Marxist party are of cardinal importance. Hence the conclusion suggests itself that now, with the existence of a powerful world camp of socialist countries rapidly developing its productive forces and making outstanding progress in technology, the position of the working class of the capitalist countries in the class struggle is incomparably more advantageous than before. The capitalists, frightened by the dread specter of the revolutionizing of the masses, are forced, much more frequently than in the past, to meet the reformist trade union leaders halfway.

Of this change, brought about by the activities of the Communist and Workers' Parties in the socialist countries, we German Marxists are quite conscious and are in a position to assess it. A socialist society now exists in the very heart of Western Europe. In one part of Germany the working class has established its rule. So the main problem of preserving their rule that now faces the West German imperialists is to weaken, in the sphere where they hold sway, the influence of our worker-peasant state—the first in the history of Germany. To achieve this they are trying to dig a deep and, if possible, unbridgeable gulf between the workers of the two German states, and this constitutes the main goal of the German imperialists. That is why they are trying might and main to crush the working class in the Federal Republic by means of the anti-communist witch-hunt, and to shackle it to the Bonn regime. That is why they are doing all in their power to foster opportunism and revisionism in the working-class movement in Western Germany.

The possibility of a rallying of the workers throughout Germany, of unity of action and militant solidarity of the working class, which holds power in the G.D.R. but is deprived of power and oppressed in Western Germany —such is the Achilles heel of the German imperialists and their nightmare. They are in a difficult position, and their difficulties will grow in proportion as the G.D.R. wins success in socialist construction. Under pressure of the masses, the leaders of the West German trade unions are taking advantage of the predicament of the imperialists in order to wrest economic concessions.

The dialectics of development is such that the struggle of the working class in those capitalist countries which find themselves right in the center of the conflict between socialism and capitalism can temporarily and partially restrict the operation of the law of absolute impoverishment; but not until the proletarian revolution can it abolish the general laws of capitalism. Hence contradictions are bound to become sharper as the general crisis of capitalism develops.

The revisionists are well aware that the existence of the socialist camp influences the capitalist countries. But they distort the facts. In their interpretation these changes are depicted as democratization of capitalism; capitalism, they say, has become more humane and, to a degree, all this has come about as a result of the free will of the monopolies.

One need not be a prophet to foresee that the consistent application of the policy of peaceful coexistence, the success of socialism in the peaceful competition with capitalism, the consolidation of the socialist production relations, the rapid growth of the productive forces and the progress in socialist science and culture, will in the days to come have a still greater impact upon the capitalist system and the struggle of antagonistic classes in capitalist society. But these phenomena and processes can be analyzed correctly only by approaching them from the viewpoint of the Marxist-Leninist party, by correctly assessing the strength and the profound influ-

ence exerted by the socialist camp on the march of history.

Consolidating the People's Democratic State and Combating Revisionism

The revisionist concept of the Yugoslav leaders on the withering away of the state and restricting its apparatus under socialism has been spurned by the working people of the G.D.R. Every peace-loving citizen in our Republic appreciates that, with NATO turning West Germany into its atomic war base in Europe, any slackening of state power in the German Democratic Republic would be tantamount to direct fostering of imperialist aggression.

Yet some comrades in the Institute of Economics of the German Academy of Sciences advocated a theory on the state not unlike that of the Yugoslav revisionists. They ignored the real interconnection of social phenomena and, in particular, the struggle between the socialist and imperialist camps; they arrived at the conclusion, utterly defeatist, that the main danger to the building of socialism was "bureaucracy in the state apparatus".

Abandoning dialectics, they failed to see the real problem of the correct relationship and unity of democracy and centralism in running the national economy. Instead they counterposed two ways of doing the job—namely, centralized guidance, which they identified with administration, and economic management by utilizing economic laws, especially those of commodity production. This incorrect concept had its source in the equally incorrect assessment of the correlation of the conscious and the spontaneous in socialist planned economy.

It is typical of the revisionists to underrate the conscious activity of people, their creative efforts in elaborating and carrying out economic plans and in applying the economic laws. They, therefore, flatly deny the role of the people, particularly that of the working class, in social production. For the revisionists the working people are merely individuals acting spontaneously on the market. Their prescription for the bureaucratic disease is "decentralization", gradual abolition of the state apparatus even at the present stage, and replacement of the state's economic functions by "self-government in economy", effected by the working people.

From their appreciation of the correlation of class forces the revisionists drew the conclusion that the state, particularly where its organizing and economic functions were concerned, was no longer needed, that the economy could now be safely left to self-governing corporations.

Our Party, on the other hand, paying due regard to objective necessity, has ensured a unity of democracy and centralism which conforms to the requirements of social development at the present stage. It coped with this task by submitting a bill to the People's Chamber, in February this year, designed to improve the state administration. It was drafted in close consultation with the leading personnel and many workers. The essence of the new law consists in extending socialist democracy, in establishing a unity of democracy and centralism that will enable the people's democratic state to exercise its functions in full, in keeping with the social requirements of the times.

The new unity of democracy and centralism corresponds to the present correlation of class forces in the G.D.R. and, on the world scale, to the new balance of forces, in favor of socialism, between the socialist and the imperialist camps.

The law takes into account the higher educational level and improved qualifications of most of our leading people and the deeper political consciousness of the working class. The correct combination of democracy and centralism clears the way in our national economy for giving free rein to the most powerful locomotive in expanding the socialist productive forces — the creative activity of the working people, based on their deep consciousness and personal interest in material benefits. The creative activity of the working people is manifest in discussing and carrying out plans, in verifying their fulfilment, in running the publicly-owned enterprises and the economy as a whole. This way of doing things ensures the proper degree and the necessary forms of centralization necessitated by the basic economic laws of socialism and by the law of planned development of the national economy, while establishing and preserving the correct proportions between the particular branches of the economy.

The new unity of democracy and centralism guarantees the working people freedom to take part in discussing and solving political and social problems both at local and national levels; it simultaneously ensures the discipline on which the people's democratic rule of workers and peasants should rely in tackling the cardinal tasks of economic and cultural construction and in the struggle against enemies of the people. It follows, then, that our Party, in eliminating the contradiction which arose as a result of administrative forms lag-

ging behind the requirements and tasks of economic development, based itself on the fundamentals of Marxism. And we can say that this contradiction is being eliminated successfully.

Our Party has also given a clear answer to the question of leadership in the class struggle and how the worker-peasant power should exercise its function of suppression. In view of the fact that there is an open frontier between the two German states, that NATO policy in Western Germany is becoming more active, that the German imperialists are making desperate efforts to continue the "cold war" in contrast to the policy of peaceful coexistence, it is essential to keep a vigilant watch on enemy activity and resolutely suppress it. And the more the majority of the working people are drawn into active and creative participation in running the worker-peasant state and the more successfully the economic and organizational functions of the state are exercised, the easier it will be to do this.

Socialist Changes in Agriculture and the Struggle Against Revisionism

"The alliance of the working class and the bulk of peasantry and other sections of the working people" is a general law of socialist revolution and socialist construction. (From the Declaration of the Meeting of Representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the Socialist Countries.)

The content of this alliance varies in accordance with the level of social development. Under the democratic dictatorship of workers and peasants its main purport is carrying out the land reform and radical democratic changes in the countryside. Under the dictatorship of the proletariat the development of commodity relations between industry and agriculture, between town and countryside, acquires special importance, but the socialist reconstruction of the countryside becomes, increasingly, the main content of the alliance.

The position of the revisionists on this question is that they regard the formation of agricultural producer co-operatives as a matter of secondary importance, as something which should go its own way. They argue that a considerable marketable surplus could be ensured sooner by preserving the private households of the individual farmers. Comrade Oelssner, for example, advocated the revisionist idea that consumer needs should be ensured by way of increased output by individual farmers. He suggested that the weak, unprofitable producer co-operatives be dissolved, and the tractors and other machinery be sold to individual peasants. In advocating this shortsighted view he argued that the sale of the machines would exhaust the surplus savings of the individual farmers. For the purpose of solving this secondary problem he was prepared, after selling modern machines to the individual farmers, to put the brakes on peasant co-operation and thus clear the way for the growth of capitalist forces.

Vieweg, ex-director of the Institute of Rural Economy of the German Agricultural Academy, put forward a complete revisionist program. He proceeded from the assumption that we would not succeed in drawing the bulk of the middle peasantry into the producer co-operatives. Hence his deduction that socialist and petty-bourgeois, individual farming should coexist for a long time, for generations to come. He recommended that large family farms of 30 to 40 hectares* each be set up with a view to creating a base for utilizing machinery, with the means of production privately owned. (It should be noted that, taking into account the normal intensity of agriculture in the G.D.R., a farm of 30 hectares would be a capitalist enterprise.)

Adhering to his line of abandoning the socialist reconstruction of the countryside and restoring a capitalist kulak economy, Vieweg suggested doing away with the machine-and-tractor stations and that a considerable part of their machines should be sold to individual farmers. His proposals largely coincide with the agrarian program of the right-wing Social Democratic leaders in West Germany. The main point in this program is the creation of so-called family farms of 30 hectares.

The 33rd plenum of the Central Committee of our Party smashed the *laissez-faire* theory in the reconstruction of agriculture, set the aim of increasing agricultural output through all-round support for the existing co-operatives and instructed the Party organizations to work for new co-operatives. This sound policy yielded immediate results. About 1700 new producer co-operatives have been established since the 33rd plenum (between mid-October 1957 and the end of June 1958). Last year the cash income of the co-operatives rose 48 per cent compared with 1955; the rate for the work-day unit rose by 1.46 marks. The increased output of livestock raising in the co-operatives was much greater than that of the individual farmers. For example, the co-operatives produced 24 per cent more cattle for slaughter and 22 per cent more milk

*one hectare = 2.471 acres.

—the corresponding figures for individual farmers were 3 and 9 per cent. Thanks to the general advance the overall target for livestock raising was considerably exceeded.

The Struggle Against Revisionism in Philosophy and Pedagogics

The sources of revisionism in philosophy and pedagogics are the same as those mentioned previously. Here, too, the revisionists divorce the theory of social development from the practice of the class struggle. This leads to a glaring underestimation of the role of the masses and the working class, to denial of the role and importance of the Marxist-Leninist working-class party. The divorce from the class struggle is expressed in substituting the theory of a conflictless evolution for the Party teaching of class struggle.

The philosoper Harich is a striking example of how quickly the revisionists become counter-revolutionaries. In the guise of criticizing the personality cult, Harich evolved a counter-revolutionary program and tried to organize his supporters. Under the slogan of "struggle against Stalinism", he wanted to change the leadership of the Socialist Unity Party, wrest the G.D.R. from the socialist camp, abolish centralism in the economy and in the administration, and create conditions for restoring capitalist production relations. He tried to turn the "Aufbau-Verlag" Publishing House and the newspaper *Der Sonntag* into an organizational base for his group. He hoped for a counter-revolutionary putsch which would enable him to seize political power (an attempt to provoke a putsch through the medium of a student demonstration outside the People's Chamber was made by agents with whom Harich was in contact). Harich's intellectual arrogance, narrow-mindedness and hostile attitude towards leading workers of our Party made him the ideal instrument for the German imperialists. The objective logic of the struggle landed Harich, who advocated the "easy way" to socialism, among those who actively contribute to fanning civil war in Germany; he became an organizer of counter-revolution against worker-peasant rule in the German Democratic Republic. One can easily imagine what this counter-revolution would have precipitated: it would have been a match thrown into the powder-magazine of a third world war.

In the sphere of pedagogics the revisionists advocated replacing the socialist education of the young generation in the uniform school by formal education and abandonment of the uniform school for the sake of concentrating on selected brilliant pupils. This practice, clearly, runs counter to socialist reality.

The Party's policy of consolidating worker-peasant rule in the Democratic Republic and going ahead with socialist construction calls for methods and forms of education corresponding to the needs of socialist production relations. We need pedagogical work which, right from the onset of consciousness in young people, brings them closer to the new, socialist system of society, and molds their way of life, feelings, aspirations and actions along socialist lines.

The basis for the further development of education is the introduction of polytechnical training and educating the children in the spirit of love for labor and the working people. Our educational experts still lag far behind these urgent requirements. They are not coping with their tasks because they have not drawn conclusions for their scientific work from the fundamental demand of our Party concerning the further consolidation of worker-peasant rule. Incorrect ideas about the relationship between the classes and the two German states, about the duties of Party members, have sent them chasing the phantom of a uniform German pedagogy. Some of them evolved a revisionist concept deriving from the old bourgeois theory of "encouraging the brilliant", neglecting children of worker and peasant origin and denying the necessity of polytechnical training and socialist education of children.

These revisionist views were associated with manifestations of arrogance towards Soviet pedagogics; contemporary problems were ignored and the accent placed on past history and on purely methodological problems. In the discussion with educationalists our Party took as the starting point that in a socialist state of workers and peasants it was essential to elaborate and apply a socialist pedagogical science. Our point is that socialist and bourgeois methods of education cannot be mixed up, that pedagogy is not above classes and independent of them.

* * *

Experience shows that revisionism is the main danger in the working-class movement. It is an expression of the influence of bourgeois ideology on this movement, it retards socialist construction and the consolidation of the people's democratic state power, and helps to preserve or restore capitalism.

In saying this we in no way underestimate the danger of dogmatism. Dogmatism hinders the development and creative application of Marxist-Leninist theory, cultivates sectarian

tendencies and makes it difficult for the Communist and Workers' Parties to convince the working class, intellectuals and other strata of the working population of the correctness of the Marxist-Leninist teaching, of dialectical materialism. In all countries, including those where the economic foundations of socialism have largely been laid, and where the socialist revolution in ideology and culture is, increasingly, becoming the main task, it can be dangerous if it is not tirelessly combated. Combating dogmatism is an indispensable condition for successful struggle against revisionism.

The Declaration of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist countries stresses that dialectical materialism, the Marxist-Leninist outlook, reflects the general laws of the development of nature, society and human thought, and that its application in practical work is an urgent task confronting them. Application of dialectical materialism enables us to avoid one-sidedness and conservative thinking, and helps combat revisionist deviations and dogmatic errors. A broad discussion is now under way in the Socialist Unity Party and throughout the country on dialectical materialism and its significance for socialist construction and for inculcating socialist consciousness. In a letter to the branches the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party has stressed the importance of studying dialectical materialism and of linking theory with practice.

The campaign for changing the style of work in our Party, in the administrative bodies and public organizations is of major importance in the struggle against dogmatism and sectarianism. By developing criticism and self-criticism and introducing a new style of work we have combated schematism and dogmatism, which are associated with complacency and liberalism. For the purpose of drawing the entire population into socialist construction we need trained personnel for our Party committees, persons closely linked with the workers and those in all walks of life; ones who are able in good time to discern, generalize and utilize for the cause of socialism everything new and creative engendered by the working people. By improving the style of work of its members, regardless of their positions, our Party will draw closer to the masses and make better use of their experience to the benefit of socialist construction.

The decision obliging the leading Party officials, administrative personnel and leaders of public organizations to take a regular part in production work or in national construction is not only of practical value, it enables those comrades to gain useful experience and overcome bureaucracy. Changing the style of work signifies, moreover, regular participation by our comrades in cultural life and concentration on raising their educational level.

The Communist and Workers' Parties, creatively applying the Marxist-Leninist teaching and utilizing the great experience gained since the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU, are now paying more attention to the questions of the socialist revolution in ideology and culture. This will make the Marxist-Leninist parties stronger and enable them, heading as they do the movement of the working class and the masses of the people, to solve their historic tasks with still greater success.

The Victory of Socialism in Bulgaria

Todor Zhivkov

FOURTEEN years have passed since the victory of the people's democratic revolution in Bulgaria which opened the way to the building of socialism in our country.

The Seventh Congress of the Communist Party of Bulgaria, held last June, which has gone down in the history of the Party and the people as the congress of victorious socialism, noted: *"Today socialism reigns supreme in the whole of the national economy—in industry, transport, construction, trade, finance and agriculture. Socialist ownership of the means of production is the inviolable foundation of our society. The victory of socialist production relations throughout the economy has opened broad vistas for the rapid development of the productive forces."*

These historic achievements of the Bulgarian people under the leadership of the Communist Party have become possible above all

because of our Party's loyalty to the principles of Marxism-Leninism. This deep, unswerving, uncompromising and at the same time creative loyalty is combined with the ability to apply these fundamental principles in the specific conditions of Bulgaria. Furthermore, our national peculiarities—historical, political and economic—have never been regarded as something absolute; they have been used by the Party to implement the general principles of socialist development more fully, painlessly and fruitfully.

The general line of building a socialist society, charted by the Fifth Congress of the Party in 1948 under the leadership of that great son of our people, Georgi Dimitrov, is an instance of creative application of the principles of Marxism-Leninism in Bulgaria. It is this general line, resolutely carried out by the Party in the course of the two five-year plan periods (1948-57), that has ensured the steady growth of socialist production relations and their ultimate predominance in the country's economy.

I

The building of socialism in Bulgaria necessitated above all the establishment of socialist production relations not only in industry but in agriculture and other branches of the national economy. It was necessary to turn the means of production into public property, to end the exploitation of man by man. During the first and second five-year plan periods these aims, as noted by the Seventh Congress, were successfully attained. We have also come to the solution of the task set by Georgi Dimitrov at the Fifth Congress: "through the industrialization and electrification of the country and the mechanization of agriculture, to achieve in 15-20 years what it had taken other countries in different conditions a hundred years to attain."

Bulgaria's industry became a socialist industry after the nationalization in 1947. However, its technological level was still low. We had practically no heavy industry. In terms of industrial output Bulgaria held one of the last places in Europe.

In keeping with the Leninist principle that it is impossible to build socialism without an industry capable of reorganizing agriculture, we were faced with the task of building up our own heavy industry, of industrializing the country. This was achieved in ten years. In the course of the first two five-year plan periods new towns and industrial centers appeared in different parts of the country, hundreds of kilometers of railway track were laid, newly built fuel-burning and hydro-power stations were commissioned, new, hitherto unknown mineral deposits were discovered, and oil was found for the first time. *In an historically brief space of time Bulgaria was transformed from a backward agrarian country into a socialist industrial and agrarian country.*

The country now has its own engineering, non-ferrous and ferrous metallurgical and chemical industries as well as other totally new branches. Industrial output holds a leading place in the gross output of the national economy. The correlation between heavy and light industries has changed in favor of heavy industry. Basic capital in industry has been practically entirely renewed and greatly increased. Volume of industrial output in 1957 was approximately eight times the 1939 figure.

The industrialization was of decisive significance in abolishing the age-old backwardness of our economy and its dependence on foreign monopoly capital. At the same time it made it possible to solve one of the most difficult problems of the transition from capitalism to socialism—that of socialist reconstruction of agriculture.

Formerly, farming in Bulgaria was small-scale and backward, the land was parcelled out in approximately 12 million plots and cultivated in the most primitive fashion. Ruin perpetually dogged the peasantry who gradually joined the ranks of the proletariat.

At present about 92 per cent of the arable land is farmed by the producer co-operatives. Our agriculture has become a large-scale and increasingly mechanized socialist economy. Favorable conditions have been created for the extensive introduction of machinery in agriculture, for extensive land-reclamation, for raising the level of agriculture and its productivity. In the past ten years the output of agriculture has risen approximately by 20 per cent; there has also been a large increase in output for the market.

The socialist reorganization of agriculture, as noted by the Seventh Congress of the Party, is the most splendid achievement of socialist construction in Bulgaria in the past five years.

What was it that facilitated the victory of the co-operative system in the countryside?

The chief thing was the progress achieved in the economic and political development of our people's democratic Republic, the consistent policy of the Communist Party aimed at strengthening the worker-peasant alliance, at expanding socialist industry and the steady growth of socialist elements in the economy in general. This, it should be noted, is typical

of all the socialist countries. But there were, in addition, other favorable factors in Bulgaria which to a large extent facilitated and quickened the process of establishing co-operation in agriculture.

One factor is that the co-operative movement in the Bulgarian countryside dates back many years. It arose and developed under capitalism as a means of protecting the poor and middle peasants from being robbed by the urban and village rich and by usurers. In conditions of the capitalist system co-operation could not, of course, change the capitalist production relations. But the credit and consumer co-operatives formed in nearly all the villages and towns, and also the few producer co-operatives, to some extent protected the peasants against shackling loans, helped them to market their produce and supplied them with the needed manufactured goods.

Already then, in the period of bourgeois rule, the co-operative movement in our country enjoyed the wide support of the Communist Party and the Agricultural People's Union—the latter a mass political organization of the peasants. In many places the Party took the initiative in establishing co-operative associations. Very often Communists were leading figures in the village co-operatives which were widely used by the Party as a legal form of economic struggle against capitalist exploitation, and also for developing political work among the poor and middle peasants.

A highly important role in the success of co-operation in agriculture was played by the fact that the Communist Party enjoys great prestige among the broad masses of the peasantry with which it is closely linked. This influence has its roots in the long and selfless struggle of the Party in defense of the interests of the working peasantry and against capitalist exploitation and the dependence of our country on imperialism. Even in the black years of fascist occupation the Party had its organizations in nearly all the villages, had many followers who by their struggle and devotion to the country had won the love and trust of the people. Later, in the period of the socialist reorganization of the country, these people headed the co-operative movement in the village, became pioneers and organizers of the producer co-operatives and by their personal example persuaded the poor and middle peasants to join these co-operatives.

The Communist Party, learning creatively from the experience of collectivization in the U.S.S.R., regarded the producer co-operatives as the most suitable form of the socialist reorganization of agriculture for Bulgaria. Georgi Dimitrov repeatedly stressed that this form of co-operation best combined personal and public interests. As a form of the building of socialism in the countryside in our conditions the producer co-operatives proved to be the most understandable not only to the poor peasants but, what is particularly important, also to the middle peasants; for in them the peasants get remuneration not only for their work, but also for the land they have given as their share to the co-operative. This has facilitated their transition to socialism.

Marx and Engels in their day foresaw that the proletariat would, after the conquest of power, use co-operative forms as a means of turning the private property of the peasants into collective property. Lenin, developing this teaching of Marx and Engels, elaborated a concrete program for the transition of the peasant economy from the old, capitalist way to the new, socialist way through co-operation, and substantiated the possibility and the necessity of the co-operative way of agriculture under the dictatorship of the proletariat. The establishment of producer co-operatives in our country is an instance of the realization of Lenin's co-operative plan, its creative implementation in Bulgaria.

At the same time our Party, while strictly adhering to the Leninist principle of voluntariness and resolutely combating purely administrative methods, took care not to let the process of co-operation develop blindly. The Party and the Government constantly guided the co-operative movement of the working peasantry and saw to it that it became a mass, nation-wide movement. They rendered the producer co-operatives extensive organizational, technical and financial assistance. Over three thousand experienced Communists were sent from the towns to work permanently in the villages as chairmen of the co-operatives, secretaries of Party organizations, etc.

Of great significance in strengthening the co-operative system and developing agriculture were the decisions of the April 1956 plenum of the Central Committee of the Party. In accordance with these decisions, state delivery and procurement prices of many agricultural products have been substantially increased, the system of deliveries, payment in kind and in cash for state services have been greatly modified; a new, more effective way of planning agriculture which gives the

working peasantry broader scope for initiative, has been introduced; the co-operatives themselves decide the forms and methods of organization and payment of labor. These measures of the Party and Government have made for the consolidation of the common economy of the co-operatives.

Thus, *the Bulgarian peasants,* states the resolution of the Seventh Congress, *"firmly and unswervingly following the road of their Soviet brothers, the collective farmers, are the second after them in Europe to have won complete victory in building socialism in the countryside".*

With industrialization and the victory of the co-operative system, socialist ownership of the principal means of production, both in town and countryside, has been established. Socialism now prevails in the national economy. The socialist sector accounts for 98 per cent of industrial output, nearly 90 per cent of agricultural output and for over 99 per cent of retail trade. In 1957 more than 93 per cent of the national income came from the socialist sector.

These deep-going economic changes have fundamentally changed the appearance and class structure of our society, the correlation of class forces and the very nature of the classes, and have led to the establishment of new relations between them.

Exploiters in our country have already been abolished as a class. The remnants of the bourgeoisie in the towns and the kulaks in the villages, deprived of the means of production, are no longer in a position to exploit the labor of others and are compelled to work for their livelihood. Big changes have taken place also in the position of the middle and petty bourgeoisie both in town and countryside. Part of them have gone to work in state industry, and part, breaking with private enterprise, have joined large-scale co-operative production, that is, socialist production.

The appearance and nature of our working class, its working and living conditions, have completely changed. It has grown numerically, acquired new features, and its cultural level and industrial skill have risen considerably. A class economically and politically oppressed in the past, it has become the ruling class which plays a leading role both in production and in the spiritual life of society. It has supplied the leading core of the Party and the Government, and from its ranks have come specialists and the technical and engineering intelligentsia.

As a result of the victory of the co-operative system in the countryside a new class has taken shape and is developing—the co-operative peasantry, forever freed from exploitation; its well-being is based on collective labor and common ownership. In alliance with the working class, and under its leadership, the co-operative peasantry now occupies a merited place in the political, economic and cultural life of the country.

The intelligentsia, too, has changed. The greater part of the old intelligentsia, correctly assessing the significance of the revolutionary changes in our country, sided with the people's power and is taking an active part in building socialism. Then there is the new intelligentsia, steadily increasing in numbers, that has sprung from the ranks of the working class and the co-operative peasantry and which is closely linked with the people whom it loyally serves.

Thus, instead of the former three classes—the working class, the capitalist class and the petty-bourgeois class—there are now in the towns and villages two friendly classes kindred in status and interests, and socialist in character—the working class and the class of the co-operative peasantry. The militant alliance of the two classes is being strengthened in all fields: economic, political and ideological. The intelligentsia is indissolubly linked with these two classes. All are rallied around the Communist Party and, under its leadership, actively participate in building socialism. This is the basis of the growing moral and political unity of our people, of which the Fatherland Front is the embodiment.

The fundamental changes in the class structure of Bulgarian society and in the nature of the classes have affected the character and forms of the class struggle as well. It is no longer a sharp and bitter one. The remnants of the exploiting classes are no longer in a position to imperil the existence of the people's power which has a stable basis and deep roots among the masses. However, these remnants hope that they will be able to enlist the support of the imperialist states to overthrow the people's power and restore bourgeois dictatorship. Not all the former manufacturers, big merchants and kulaks, monarchist officers, legionnaires and other anti-popular elements have become reconciled to their present position; it is not possible to re-educate all of them. That is why the Communist Party, while making every effort to re-educate the remnants of the exploiting classes and former fascist elements, stresses the need for increasing the revolutionary vigilance of the masses, of being

on guard against any attempt to infringe on socialist law and order.

The profound changes that have taken place in the national economy and in the class structure of society enabled the Seventh Party Congress to affirm that *socialism as a new social order has triumphed in the People's Republic of Bulgaria.*

The building of socialism in Bulgaria has been accompanied by a steady improvement in living standards. The radical changes in the sphere of production relations brought with them changes in the demand for material and spiritual benefits. This is evident, above all, in the rapid growth of the national income and its distribution in the interests of the working people of town and countryside. In 1957 the national income was 2.3 times greater than in 1939 and 1.5 times bigger than at the end of the first five-year plan period in 1952.

The steadily growing incomes are a practical expression of our Party policy in raising the living standards of the working people. Thus, during the second five-year plan, average annual earning of factory and office workers increased from 6,462 to 8,152 leva. This and also price cuts and increased government allocations for social and cultural amenities have raised the real income of the working people by 55 per cent.

The standard of living of the co-operative peasantry too has risen sharply in the past few years. The average payment for a workday unit rose by 80 per cent during the second five-year plan period. Housing construction in the countryside has developed on a big scale. Between 1945 and 1957 more than 388,000 houses were built. In other words, in the 13 years of people's rule approximately a fourth of the peasant householders built themselves new dwellings.

An intrinsic part of socialist development is the socialist cultural revolution, the purpose of which is to make culture accessible to all. That is why very great significance is attached to education, which in our country has been extensively developed. In numbers finishing secondary school and students in colleges and universities we now hold one of the first places in the world.

Experience shows that communist education and re-education—important tasks of the cultural revolution—are an intricate and protracted process. Therefore the Fifth Party Congress, the first congress after the victory of the socialist revolution, stressed that one of the major tasks was political and ideological education of the working people in town and countryside along communist lines. We can now say that the Party is successfully coping with this task: socialist ideology holds sway everywhere.

The Party is doing much to propagate Marxism-Leninism both among its members and among the working people generally. It regards the ideological steeling of its members as one of the cardinal tasks, one which it carries on in close connection with the practice of socialist construction. As a result of the vast Party education network, established in recent years, the ideological level of members is now much higher.

Education, science, literature and the arts are being reshaped on the basis of Marxism-Leninism.

Thanks to the concern of the Party and the people's power, conditions have been created for the steady advance of science and culture. Our scientists are doing much work in the 35 research institutes of the Academy of Sciences and in the many institutes attached to departments and chairs of the higher educational establishments. They have already made a valuable contribution to our socialist development. Writers and art workers have created important works in literature, music, painting, sculpture and cinematography—works which vividly portray the past of our people, their liberation struggle and the selfless labor of the builders of socialism.

Cultural and education work among the population is widespread. A particularly important place in it belongs to people's libraries —a distinctive Bulgarian form of popular enlightenment. Proof of their popularity is that at present over 550 such libraries are being built with the funds subscribed by the local population.

The Party is guiding the cultural revolution; it defines the main ideological and political channels and forms of ideological struggle. Experience shows that the strengthening of the Party's leading role on the cultural front is indispensable for the socialist cultural revolution.

II

The victory of socialism in Bulgaria is the most important outcome of the socialist revolution; it is the culmination of the fourteen years along the road confidently traversed by the Bulgarian people under the leadership of the Communist Party since September 1944.

When reviewing the conditions that made possible the victory of socialism in such a historically brief space of time we should give primary importance to the existence of

the world socialist camp. The great Soviet people, as we know, encountered enormous difficulties in building the world's first socialist state, travelling unexplored paths in their historic work of creating a new life; far from receiving help from outside, they had to overcome the hostile actions of the capitalist encirclement that was seeking to overthrow Soviet power.

The establishment of the world socialist system has led to radical changes in the balance of forces throughout the world. Today we cannot say that we are building socialism in a capitalist encirclement in the way the Soviet Union did for almost thirty years. The socialist countries now occupy about a quarter of the globe with more than a third of its population. We are building socialism as a member of the fraternal family of socialist countries united by the idea of communism. This is one of the decisive conditions which in a brief space of time made possible the victory of socialism in our country—a small country that until recently was one of the most backward agrarian countries in Europe.

The very fact of the existence of the world socialist system and the indisputable advantages which socialism has over capitalism are a source of inspiration to the Bulgarian people and give them immeasurably greater strength and confidence in the victory of socialism. *Our membership in the mighty camp of socialism strengthens the international position and the independence of Bulgaria and safeguards the peaceful work of our people. The existence of the socialist camp, its solidarity and economic might are, in our time, the surest guarantee of the successful building of socialism.*

Our advance along the road to socialism has been accelerated and facilitated by the fact that our Party and people have assimilated and applied the historic experience of socialist construction in the U.S.S.R. The existence of the world socialist system has given a new aspect to the problem of establishing a socialist economy in the People's Democracies. And now that the socialist revolution has triumphed in a number of countries, their mutual support in building socialism is absolutely indispensable to each. This is dictated by reality.

In compiling and implementing our economic and cultural plans we proceed from the premise that Bulgaria is an integral part of the world socialist system, that the development of our economy is closely bound up with that of the entire socialist camp and, primarily, with the national economy of the Soviet Union. There is no doubt that this greatly facilitates the development of our productive forces. The economic might of the socialist camp, expanding economic co-operation and the international socialist division of labor enable Bulgaria, like any other socialist country, to develop her productive forces with maximum speed and to specialize in producing those items for which we have the most favorable natural and economic conditions.

We have built up a non-ferrous metal industry because we have rich deposits of ores, the extraction and processing of which meet not only our own needs but part of the requirements of the other socialist countries. We are developing an iron and steel industry, building up engineering and heavy chemical industries and our own power system because they are absolutely essential to the economic development of our country. We are also developing the food and light industries that enable us greatly to extend our trade with the socialist countries. At the present stage this is the principal way in which we are effecting the international division of labor within the framework of the socialist camp.

The Soviet Union and the other socialist states render our country considerable help in developing industry and agriculture, in electrification and in furthering our science and culture. The fraternal aid and support of the Soviet Union and close economic co-operation with the other socialist countries are a guarantee that the tasks set by the Seventh Congress will be fulfilled.

For this reason the contention of the leaders of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, who allege that the Soviet Union strives to "exploit" the small socialist countries, is a gross distortion of the truth. Our people indignantly repudiate such slander. Their own experience has convinced them that the Soviet Union's sole aim has always been to help our country prosper, to turn Bulgaria into a strong, economically developed socialist state. If we are to speak at all about advantages in the economic relations between us and the Soviet Union (which the Yugoslav leaders slander unscrupulously), it should be said that the advantages are mainly on our side. During the past ten years the U.S.S.R. has granted Bulgaria long-term credits on extremely favorable terms to a total of 7.8 billion leva. The Soviet Union delivers to us metals, machinery, chemicals, chemical fertilizers, etc., mainly in exchange for the produce of our farms, our light and food industries.

It is quite obvious that no comparison can be made between the disinterested aid that

we receive from the U.S.S.R. and other socialist countries and the so-called "aid" granted by the imperialists to countries that have freed themselves from the colonial yoke. It is not difficult to understand whose interests the Yugoslav leaders serve when they resort to such inventions as the Soviet Union's "intentions to dominate" or their attempts to prove that Yugoslavia co-operates with the U.S.A. on an equal footing.

Experience has shown that successful socialist construction is unthinkable without close co-operation with the U.S.S.R. and the other socialist countries. This confirms the Marxist-Leninist thesis that "the interests of labor demand the fullest confidence, the closest alliance between the working people of different countries . . . Capital is a world power. To conquer it an international alliance of workers, their international brotherhood, are essential." (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Fourth Russian edition, Vol. 30, page 268.)

The world socialist camp, that has emerged as a result of the objective development of modern society, is the embodiment of this brotherhood. One of the most important features of the relations that have taken shape within the socialist camp is fraternal mutual aid: "Relations between the socialist countries," said N. S. Khrushchov at a meeting of friendship between the people of the Soviet Union and Bulgaria in February 1957, "are permeated with the lofty, noble principles of friendship, fraternal co-operation and mutual assistance . . . It is the duty of the Communist Parties, the working class and all working people of those socialist countries that have made progress in developing their economy to extend fraternal aid to other countries that need it."

The Communist Party of Bulgaria regards the further strengthening and extension of economic co-operation and mutual assistance between Bulgaria and the other socialist countries, headed by the Soviet Union, as a vital necessity for our state. Its Seventh Congress stressed that the further progress of our country was possible only under conditions of the international socialist division of labor, the specialization and co-operation of production and the exchange of scientific and technological achievements and advanced methods of production between the socialist countries. The Congress also pointed out that it was essential to further develop trade and other forms of economic co-operation with the non-socialist countries on the basis of mutual benefit and non-interference in internal affairs.

III

In the struggle to carry out the socialist revolution and build a socialist society our Party has always been guided by the principles of Marxism-Leninism and has applied them creatively to the concrete conditions prevailing in Bulgaria.

The rise of the world socialist system put on the order of the day the question concerning the general laws and national peculiarities of socialist development in different countries. There has recently been a tendency in certain countries to overestimate the role and importance of the national road and underestimate, revise and deny the fundamentals of the theory of proletarian revolution and socialist construction.

Our Party has always held that the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism are valid in our country, too, and has been guided by these principles in its revolutionary activity. The process of the people's democratic revolution and socialist construction in Bulgaria bears the same features as the October Revolution and the Soviet experience in socialist construction.

The motive and guiding force in our people's democratic revolution was the working class in alliance with the peasants, just as it was in the October Revolution. In Bulgaria, too, the revolution was carried out under the leadership of the Communist Party; the victory of the revolution resulted in establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie; the main capitalist property was nationalized; the socialist industrialization and reconstruction of agriculture and the cultural revolution began.

The revolution in our country, however, is not an exact replica of the October Revolution, it has its own specific features in which it differs from the latter and from the people's democratic revolutions in other countries. These specific features derive from the different historical, political and economic conditions; they were skilfully used by our Party which creatively applied the basic laws of Marxism-Leninism to the given conditions.

The main specific feature of our socialist revolution was stated by Georgi Dimitrov at the Fifth Congress of our Party—the fact that it was carried out under the slogan of "People's Democratic Power" and not "All Power to the Soviets". This enabled the working class to enter into an alliance with the middle as well as the poor peasants in the struggle against fascism; this also neutralized part of the bourgeoisie and gave some of its representatives an opportunity to take part in the

struggle on the side of the people. The outcome was that the victory of the revolution was followed by the dictatorship of the proletariat in the form of People's Democracy and not in the form of the Soviets. Typical of our country is the active participation of the party of working peasants — Agricultural People's Union—in running the country, under the leadership of the Communist Party: a fact which, in our conditions, facilitates our progress towards socialism.

An important feature of our revolutionary struggle and of our social and political system since September 9, 1944, is the existence of the Fatherland Front, the political form of the militant alliance of the working class, the toiling peasantry and the people's intelligentsia. Created in June 1942, on the initiative of the Communist Party, it proved to be the best form for rallying all patriotic forces against the fascist dictatorship; moreover it enabled broad sections of the people to join the socialist revolution under Communist Party leadership. Now this Front, with a membership of over 3,200,000, is doing much for the socialist education of the working people. It is a major achievement of the Party and people.

Socialist construction in Bulgaria also has its specific features. The industrialization, carried out at a time when there is a world socialist system, differs somewhat from that in the Soviet Union in the 'thirties when the latter was the only socialist country. The world socialist camp enables us to carry out industrialization without repeating the Soviet tempo and without developing all types and branches of industry. In developing our industries we take into account our natural resources and economic possibilities, as well as our own requirements and those of the socialist world.

Furthermore, our agriculture has developed into a large-scale socialist farming system as a result of the masses of peasants' joining the producer co-operatives. Our co-operatives differ from the Soviet collective farms mainly in that the land has not been nationalized and is retained as the private property of the peasant members of the co-operatives, which pay them rent for its use. It would, however, be a mistake to confuse this rent with absolute ground rent based on the monopoly of private ownership of land under the capitalist mode of production. Rent, as it exists in the co-operatives, is a new economic category that is not based on exploitation. It is a small part of the co-operative income, distributed not in accordance with the amount of work performed, but in accordance with the amount of land contributed. This specific feature, the existence of rent, does not change the socialist character of the producer co-operatives. They are not an immutable economic form but are steadily developing. As they grow stronger organizationally, economically and financially their members, voluntarily and with a full consciousness of their action, lower the rent or even abolish it. By 1957 the rent had been reduced to an average of 4.9 per cent of the total net income as compared with the maximum 20 per cent envisaged by the co-operative model rules. On July 1, this year, rent was abolished in 1,319 co-operatives (41 per cent of the total) by general meetings of their members.

Thus, the members of the co-operatives are, in fact, themselves carrying out the socialization of the land as conditions point to the necessity for it, and are turning the co-operatives into consistent socialist farms of the Soviet collective farm type.

These are some of the basic and specific features of the socialist revolution and socialist construction in Bulgaria. They concern the forms, methods, rates and ways in which the general laws operate. The fundamental question for any Marxist-Leninist is that of the general principles and laws of the revolution; national peculiarities and the forms and methods of their manifestation are subsidiary. *Our experience has taught us that the Bulgarian People's Republic is advancing towards socialism not by some "special" or "national" road differing in principle from the road of the Soviet people and the peoples of the other socialist countries, but by essentially the same road.*

The Bulgarian Communist Party is combating dogma and doctrinarism, mechanical application of the general laws and experience of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries to our conditions, combating any ignoring of our national peculiarities. At the same time it does not tolerate any attempt to belittle or detract from the international significance of the basic laws of the socialist revolution, to underestimate or deny the significance of the Soviet experience, to make absolute and give primary importance to national peculiarities, forms and ways of the transition from capitalism to socialism. Our Party takes this line because it is fully convinced of the vital necessity of the historical experience of the CPSU and the Soviet people in building socialism in our country. The victory of socialism in Bulgaria is further confirmation of the indisputable thesis that

the Soviet experience in socialist construction contains features and laws of the socialist revolution and of socialist construction that are common to all countries.

* * *

Our Party realizes that, despite the victory of socialism in Bulgaria, the development of production and the productive forces has not yet reached the level that would enable us to say that the building of a socialist society has been completed. Though in the past decade Bulgaria has become a socialist industrial-agrarian country, though the life of her working people has radically improved and their material and cultural levels have risen sharply, the per capita production and consumption of basic goods and raw materials are still not enough, for the growing raw materials requirements of our industries are not fully met.

Proceeding from this, the Seventh Congress of our Party advanced the following as the main political and economic task for the immediate future: to further develop the material-production basis of socialism and, in this way, go ahead with the building of a socialist society and satisfying the growing material and cultural needs of the working people.

This means that in the future, too, our Party will continue, in the words of the Congress resolution, "to pursue the policy of industrialization with priority development of heavy industry. In line with economic co-operation and the international division of labor in the world socialist system . . . our country must develop those branches of industry, including heavy industry, for which we have the most favorable natural and economic conditions."

The directives for the Third Five-Year Plan (1958-1962) adopted by the Congress envisage an approximate 77 per cent increase in the output of the means of production. At the same time considerable attention will be paid to the food and light industries, which are scheduled to increase their output by about 50 per cent.

In agriculture our main efforts in this period will be directed towards making fuller use of all the land, machinery and other means of production, improving methods and increasing labor productivity with a view to obtaining the maximum output per unit of land with the minimum expenditure of labor and funds, better organization of labor and strengthening each co-operative in order to raise the incomes of the co-operatives and those of their members. The basic slogan of our farmers at present is to overtake in output of produce per unit of land and per capita of population those European countries which employ intensive farming methods.

The present level of Bulgaria's economy and the prospects of further development in the near future are such that we are able to put forward the practical program of raising the real incomes of both urban and rural working people by no less than 30 per cent as against 1957 during the period of the Third Five-Year Plan, gradually achieving by the end of that period the six- and seven-hour working day without reducing wages.

We are fully convinced that, with the fraternal support of the great Soviet Union and in close co-operation with the other socialist countries, the Bulgarian people, under the leadership of their Communist Party, will, in the near future, complete the building of socialist society and create the necessary conditions for the gradual transition from socialism to communism.

For Communist-Socialist Co-operation

Luciano Gruppi

1. *The Need for Unity*

WE LIVE at a time when every hour brings with it alarm and hope, when at any moment decisions vital to the fate of mankind may be taken.

We have only to recall the events of recent months that have aggravated the world situation and have intensified, we would even say have made urgent, the pressing need for adopting decisions on questions now facing

the leaders of the working-class movement, and enhanced their responsibility for these decisions.

The gravity of the situation was clearly expressed by *Vorwaerts*, the German Social-Democratic Party's weekly, on July 18 this year: "The die has been cast. By its intervention in the Middle East, the United States has embarked on a policy that may well bring the world to the brink of a new war."

To this we should add that such aggression in our day may lead to a general atomic conflict.

If the broadest possible alliance of various political movements, the closest possible unity of all social sections working for peace is essential to ward off the danger incipient in the present situation, then there can be no doubt that the unity of the working class is decisive to the solution of the problems that confront us today. In other words, it is essential at the present time to reach agreement and ensure co-operation between Communists and Socialists.

The economic and social development of our times has resulted in the working class bearing an ever-increasing responsibility. It is becoming increasingly evident that its class interests coincide with the interests of social development. The facts confirm that the proletariat is the most consistent fighter for peace and freedom and for higher living standards for all who labor.

For this reason we believe that today special attention should be paid to the slightest possibility of establishing an alliance between the Communist and Socialist Parties. And these possibilities are increasing. The Moscow Declaration of the Communist and Workers' Parties emphasizes that, despite the opposition of Right-wing Socialist leaders, opportunities for co-operation between the Communists and Socialists on many issues are increasing.

The Communists urge co-operation and joint action with the Socialists, primarily in the struggle for peace and on other major issues. In a number of countries — France, Italy, Japan and others—the Communist Parties have frequently proposed to the Socialists to take concerted action in the common interests of the working class. An important initiative was displayed in the letters of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union calling for joint action in defense of peace. These letters were addressed to the Italian and French Socialist Parties, the German Social-Democratic Party, the British Labor Party, the Norwegian Labor Party, the Danish Social Democratic Party, the Netherlands Party of Labor, the Belgian Socialist Party and the Socialist Party of Austria.

Recent events show once more that there is a certain similarity in the positions adopted by the Communists and the Socialists on questions concerning the struggle for peace.

Nevertheless we cannot close our eyes to the complexity of the problem of the unity of the working people. There are fundamental differences in the views of the Communists and Socialists on the socialist revolution, dictatorship of the proletariat, the role of the Marxist-Leninist party and other problems. The existence of various parties and organizations within the working-class movement is due to a number of social and economic factors. We know that with the development of monopoly capitalism the bourgeoisie in most imperialist countries corrupts the top layers of the working class by throwing them crumbs from the superprofits obtained through the exploitation of colonies. The bourgeoisie has succeeded in spreading its ideological influence to this section of the working class. It is in this way that social democracy, as the ideological and political expression of this factor, enters into the working-class movement. Social-democracy is one of the political instruments through which the big bourgeoisie seeks to restrict the influence of the Communist Parties and prevent the establishment of working class unity of action.

But despite ideological differences, there still remain the opportunity and the need for co-operation between the Socialists and the Communists. The interests of the working people, including those who are Socialists, differ so radically from those of the bourgeoisie as to be diametrically opposed to them. This antagonism is particularly evident when class and political differences become more acute, when reaction strengthens its offensive against democratic liberties or when peace is gravely menaced. And this is just what is happening today.

In particular, as a result of the intervention of American and British imperialism in the Lebanon and Jordan, which caused such a grave threat to universal peace, deep-going changes have taken place in the views of the rank and file of the Socialist parties.

The leaders of these parties, no matter how much they may try to belittle or ignore those changes, cannot disregard them. Even a man like Saragat has said that the Italian government should pursue a different foreign policy. At first he justified American aggres-

sion in the Lebanon but was later compelled to make serious reservations on the question.

The Socialist workers are criticizing the leaders of their parties more and more, and the leaders have to reckon with this.

In these circumstances there are greater opportunities for co-operation between the various units and organizations of the working people despite the resistance of the Right-wing Social-Democratic leaders. The objective conditions for unity of action are being created among the rank and file, with the result that the Right-wing leaders, under pressure of the masses, have had to change their attitude on some issues. True, these moves are taking place unevenly, haltingly and in contradictory fashion. But they are taking place. Here are a few examples.

It is well known that the British Labor leaders, who condemned the Suez gamble, also criticized the imperialist aggression in the Lebanon and Jordan.

Significant statements on this question were made by some Socialists in the Scandinavian countries. The Norwegian Social-Democratic Party addressed an appeal to the Governments of the U.S.S.R., the U.S.A., Great Britain and France, and also to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, in which they said: "The recent events in the Middle East give rise to the greatest alarm. People have the feeling that we are not far from a third world war. The measures taken by the United States and Great Britain in the Lebanon and Jordan are a grave threat to peace and are fraught with unforeseen consequences. In this serious situation it is necessary as quickly as possible to reach through diplomatic channels a decision that would relieve the world of the threat looming over it. Norwegian Social Democrats most emphatically call on the Great Powers and the Secretary-General of the United Nations to achieve, by the speediest summoning of a conference, a stable peace settlement in the Middle East. A world catastrophe must be avoided. Responsibility to mankind should be given priority above all".

Characteristic too is the stand taken by the Japanese Socialist Party towards the imperialist aggression in the Lebanon and Jordan. The Party leadership demanded immediate withdrawal of British and American troops from the Middle East, recognition of the new Iraqi government and convocation of a summit conference. A resolution adopted by this Party stressed that the revolution in Iraq was the outcome of the popular struggle against feudal oppression and imperialism. The resolution thus underlined the historical necessity and validity of the Arab national-liberation movement.

Among the points of contact between the Socialists and Communists on other problems we must also mention the attitude of the Socialists to the struggle against the atomic danger.

We recall, for example, the decision of the British Labor Party and Trades Union Congress to launch a national campaign against the danger of atomic war. They called on the British government to end the nuclear tests, to take action for a general agreement on ending the tests and not to allow rocket launching sites on British territory before talks are held with the U.S.S.R.

Known likewise is the stand taken by the German Social-Democratic Party as a result of the popular movement against arming the Federal Republic with atomic weapons.

The Socialist Party of Japan has long waged a struggle against atomic weapons and against foreign bases on Japanese territory. In July 1957, at a meeting of the International Council of Socialist Women, Kimiko Abe, representing Japanese socialist women, urged that atomic weapons be outlawed.

The Fifth Congress of the Socialist International, held in Vienna over July 2-6, 1957, was indicative of some of the changes now taking place in the world Socialist movement. It is possible to say this despite the fact that many of its resolutions bore the hallmark of the compromise policy typical of the Social-Democratic movement. At this Congress the Right leadership of the French Socialist Party found itself virtually isolated on the Algerian question; representatives of many Social-Democratic parties sharply condemned colonialism and those who support it. Both Ollenhauer and Gaitskell admitted that Western Germany's inclusion in NATO was one of the main obstacles in the way of German reunification. Ollenhauer also spoke in favor of a system of collective security in Europe .

The Council of the Socialist International, at its meeting in Brussels in June 1958, again stressed the demand of the Socialists to stop nuclear tests and expressed its opinion on the need for a summit meeting.

Rapprochement between the Communist and Socialist positions has been facilitated recently by circumstances arising from the economic crisis now affecting the economy of the capitalist countries. There are now greater possibilities for joint action by the different sections of the working class in the struggle for economic and social rights.

And so, without going into greater detail, it can safely be said that there are definite points of contact between the Communist and Socialist positions on a number of problems that are decisive to the future of mankind. What is more, in many countries, we find not only similar declarations but also examples of joint action by Communists and Socialists in the struggle for a number of political, economic and social demands of the working people.

2. *Obstacles to Unity*

It should be said, however, that the drawing closer of the Communist and Socialist viewpoints on a number of issues has not yet yielded the political results that it could and should have produced. The ardent desire of the working class and wide sections of the people to see a solution of the urgent problems of peace, national independence, democratic liberties and social progress often fails to yield the desired results. The fact is that identical viewpoints do not always lead to united action. The words of the Socialist leaders do not square with their deeds.

Far too often one observes that some of the Socialist leaders take a stand that has nothing whatever in common not only with Socialist but at times even with general democratic ideals.

The trouble here is that many Social Democratic leaders prefer to collaborate with the bourgeoisie, descending in this respect to direct betrayal of the working class.

This, in our view, is clearly expressed in the attitude of the leaders and in the situation in the French Socialist Party. One cannot but acknowledge the absolute validity of the point made by the French Communist Party in a resolution adopted by its Political Bureau in June, 1958, a propos the recent events in France: "The establishment of a dictatorship would have been impossible without the policy of the leaders of the Socialist Party, the features of which are: violation of the program proclaimed during the general election of January 2, 1956, continuation of the Algerian war, capitulation to the colonial extremists, anti-Communism and persistent refusal to rely on the working class and the democratic forces. General de Gaulle's advent to power was ensured by the Pflimlin government's shameful retreat in face of the military revolt and the treachery of Guy Mollet who renounced the Republic and his party."

Undoubtedly there were forces in France that could have put an end to the war in Algeria and by doing so could have forestalled the crisis of the 4th Republic, which led to the one-man rule of de Gaulle and, as a consequence, to an increased threat of fascism. The Left forces, now as in the past, still constitute the majority in the country and in parliament.

These forces are headed by the Communist Party, the first party in the country, which has consistently urged unity of action with the Socialists.

The Right Socialist leaders, however, rejected co-operation with the Communists. They found themselves confronted with one of those alternatives which show how utterly illusory is their position of a so-called "third force": either the policy of working-class and democratic unity and, consequently, co-operation and alliance with the Communists, or the crisis of French democracy and the dictatorship of de Gaulle. And it was his anti-Communism that made Guy Mollet choose de Gaulle.

This was stressed by the Central Committee of the French Communist Party at its meeting at Ivry last June: "The responsibility of the Right socialists and of Guy Mollet, in particular, is a heavy one—refusal to rely on the working class and to form an alliance with the Communist Party led to the capitulation of February 6, 1956 to the ultra-colonialists and to the treachery of June 1, 1958."*

The stand taken by the majority of the Socialist Parties of Europe in relation to the events in France is indicative of the profound alarm felt by the Socialist workers in connection with the growing threat of fascism. In view of all the statements made by the Socialists, beginning with those of the British Labor Party and ending with the German Socialists, the speeches of the Belgians and the pronouncements of the Scandinavians, the Socialist International should have condemned the leaders of the French Socialist Party. Although ultimately the tendency to compromise prevailed in this organization, at the Brussels meeting of its Council in June a number of delegates sharply criticized the French Socialist leaders for their attitude in relation to de Gaulle.

And so the main conclusion to be drawn from the crisis of the 4th Republic is clear enough. It can be expressed in the following words from the statement of the Political Bureau of the French Communist Party: "Thus, in the eyes of all sincere republicans,

*February 6, 1956 was the date of Guy Mollet's visit to Algeria as head of the French Government; June 1, 1958, when de Gaulle was given extraordinary powers.—Ed.

anti-Communism appears as the herald of fascism."

The French experience, therefore, is full of lessons for all—for democrats, Socialists and Communists and for the working-class movement as a whole. It shows whither the two different policies lead—the policy of the French Communists directed towards unity of the working class and all the democratic forces, and the policy of the leadership of the French Socialist Party, dictated by fear of the specter of the people's front and ready to do anything rather than permit an alliance with the Communists.

Analyzing the results of the events in France and their lessons, Comrade Luigi Longo, Deputy General Secretary of the Italian Communist Party, said at a meeting of the Central Committee (June 9-11, 1958): "Guy Mollet is now de Gaulle's Minister. The Communists now head the resistance to de Gaulle's dictatorship and have the support of Socialists, Radicals and Catholics." Comrade Longo justly added: "It was precisely the French Communist Party that did everything to unite the working-class and republican forces for joint action, to prevent the treachery of the Pflimlin government and the Socialist Secretary Guy Mollet. The attempt to divide the responsibility for what happened in France between the Socialists and the Communists is sheer slander."

Thus, the French experience, like the experience of other countries, teaches that if the working class is to advance, if democracy is to be extended and success in the struggle for socialism is to be achieved, *anti-Communism must be overcome.*

In speaking here of anti-Communism we are not referring to the ideological opposition of the Socialists to the views of the Communists. The serious ideological differences should not be an obstacle to unity on practical issues. We have in mind the the anti-Communist blindness typical of the Right-wing leaders of Social Democracy who will even let bourgeois democracy be thrown overboard rather than act together with the Communists who always and everywhere uphold the interests of the people. Anti-Communism is nothing more than the result of the ideological influence that the bourgeoisie has succeeded in bringing to bear on part of the working class.

The experience gained by the masses in their economic struggle, in the struggle for freedom and peace, brings home to them the depth of the contradiction between anti-Communism and the interests of the working people. Consequently, in the process of the everyday activity of the working people, anti-Communism will inevitably lose its hold.

In order to overcome anti-Communism the Communists must wage an unrelenting struggle for unity, without relinquishing frank criticism of the stand taken by the opponents of co-operation, the Right Social-Democratic leaders.

Communists subject the harmful ideological position of these leaders to principled criticism. For without this criticism the fight for unity will be mere shadow boxing. The type of criticism necessary to achieve unity is that which weans from bourgeois influence the sections of the working class still infected by it. This criticism, however, will not achieve its object if it does not proceed from the striving to ensure the co-operation of all sections of the working class and concerted action against the main enemy of the working people, monopoly capital.

3. *Some Basic Questions*

We Communists stress the need for agreement and co-operation between us and the Socialists and draw attention to the most urgent problems: material well-being, social progress, democratic liberties, national independence and peace. We specially stress these immediate problems because the basis for agreement on them *already exists* and because we strive for unity, not disunity. Too often the Social-Democratic leaders indulge in talk about basic ideological differences, and do so because they want to divide the workers.

But in drawing attention primarily to the urgent problems, since it is easier to achieve unity on these questions, we know that among the Socialist workers and among the veteran members of the Socialist movement there is a sincere interest in the fundamental questions of our movement. This is natural, and it is good that it is so. We Communists are even more interested—deeply and sincerely—in these matters. So that in drawing attention to the urgent problems we do not by any means wish to evade discussion on basic ideological questions.

Between our conception of socialism and that of many Socialists there is a world of difference. We have no desire to belittle the difference or keep silent about it. *We have no intention of renouncing our principles and for this reason we are waging a vigorous struggle against revisionist tendencies inside our movement.*

We criticize the erroneous position of the Right Social-Democratic leaders chiefly on

the issue of the class struggle, the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

But on the question of socialism there are doubtless some points on which we and the Socialists could agree: for example, socialism means public ownership of the means of production. We, Communists, are striving for this socialized ownership; the same objective is proclaimed in the program of some Socialist parties too. But de Gaulle, Adenauer, the British Conservative Government, the Christian Democratic Government in Italy and the American monopolies are intent on preserving in every possible way private ownership of the means of production.

The obvious question, therefore is: What should be the attitude of those who call themselves Socialists? With whom should the Socialists be in closer affinity?

In the socialist countries public ownership of the means of production already prevails. For which countries should Socialists show greater, sympathy, even if they have their reservations? Should they not sympathize more with the U.S.S.R., People's China and other socialist countries, than with the countries dominated by capitalist monopolies? What should sincere Socialists think of those of their leaders who pour streams of invective on the socialist countries and who laud to the skies the "American way of life"?

The Socialists often accuse us Communists of wanting to establish socialism by force. An accusation formulated in these terms lacks any foundation, either historical or theoretical. Marx wrote: " . . . proletarian revolutions, like those of the nineteenth century, criticize themselves constantly, interrupt themselves continually in their own course, come back to the apparently accomplished in order to begin it afresh, deride with unmerciful thoroughness the inadequacies, weaknesses and paltrinesses of their first attempts, seem to throw down their adversary only in order that he may draw new strength from the earth and rise again, more gigantic, before them, recoil ever and anon from the indefinite prodigiousness of their own aims, until a situation has been created which makes all turning back impossible and the conditions themselves cry out:

"Hic Rhodus, hic salta!

"Here is the rose, here dance!"*

In his analysis of the class struggle Marx pointed to the reasons that could confront the proletariat with extreme forms of struggle. It is the bourgeoisie and the objective vicissitudes of the class struggle that compel the proletariat to resort to these forms of struggle.

Did not Lenin in his *April Theses* indicate a peaceful line of development for the Russian revolutionary movement? And was it not the Kornilov conspiracy and the subsequent developments that forced the Bolshevik Party to prepare for the uprising which triumphed in October 1917 and without which the factories would never have been transferred to the workers, nor the land to the peasants?

Then there are the postulates of the XXth Congress of the CPSU which speak of the possibility of the proletariat of certain countries, under existing conditions, gaining power peacefully, without a civil war. And there is the thesis of the XXth Congress which speaks of the new role that parliament may now play in bringing about profound social transformations in the democratic sense, in the direction of socialism.

These postulates, authoritatively expressed by the XXth Congress and developed in accordance with the specific conditions by the other Communist Parties, derive from the profound changes that have taken place both at international and national levels in the correlation of forces between the working class and big capital. They represent a consistent development of Marxism. And we believe that in this new situation it is easier to find grounds for agreement between the Communists and Socialists, even if their views differ substantially on theoretical aspects of these questions.

Of course, the degree of bitterness of the class struggle does not depend so much on the proletariat as on the degree of resistance of the reactionaries to the will of the majority of the people.

One thing we must add: *the more united the working-class movement, the less painful will it be for the working class to assume power in a number of countries. The greater the unity of the working people, the greater the possibility of the working class assuming power irrespective of the manner in which it is achieved.*

We Communists, looking back at history, experience pride when we say that wherever socialism has taken root or is taking root it has done or is doing so as a result of the hegemony of the working class in relation to the other sections of society and, what is more, that standing in the front ranks of the working class is the Communist Party. We

---

*Karl Marx. **The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte.** Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. Selectd Works Vol. 1, page 223. Moscow.

emphasize this to the working people and all who are working for socialism.

The experience of the international labor movement, summarized in the Declaration of the Moscow Conference of the 12 Communist Parties, shows that socialism can be achieved only through the dictatorship of the proletariat. Although the forms and methods of building socialism may differ in the various countries, socialism always retains this class content.

It should be said that the process which brings the working class to power and leads to socialism is extremely complex and varied, as Marx, and later Lenin, pointed out, depending on the situation in the given country and on the given conditions. The building of socialism depends not on one party alone, but on a whole complex of relations between political forces and especially between all the forces willing to participate in its construction. It depends on the unity established among the working people and especially between the Communists and Socialists. Everyone who has followed developments in the countries where socialism has been or is being built will agree that the reason why the Communists have been able to lead the working people in the fulfilment of this task is that their policy proved capable of organizing the unity of the working class and of wide sections of the people in the struggle for socialism.

Moreover, discussion of the issues that divide us from the Socialists, in particular on the question of freedom, would be more fruitful if the concept of freedom were examined from a class standpoint, not formally. It would be much easier for us to understand each other if both sides were to recall the history of the working-class and socialist movement, and the cost—often paid in blood—at which the working people won, say, only one right, such as the right to celebrate May Day freely. All the rights won by the working people were wrested from the bourgeoisie in bitter struggle, and daily defense of them involves great sacrifice.

4. Unite the Forces

We have touched on a few of the questions vital to the working-class movement and which we would like to discuss calmly and fraternally with the Socialists. We, Communists, are firmly convinced of the justice of our principles, the soundness of which has been confirmed by the march of time. These principles, the common property of the entire working-class movement, are alien to any form of dogmatic intolerance. We are always ready to enrich this common ideological heritage (it is not only ours, it belongs to all working people) by way of discussion and comparison of ideas.

The discussion will be more fruitful if it is based on common class positions and if those taking part in it stand politically in the ranks of the same army opposed to the enemies of the working people.

We repeat, however, that today it is important to be united in the struggle for the solution of those problems which confront mankind and the working class at the present moment. In the struggle for peace, for the independence of the peoples, for democratic liberties and for the economic and social progress of the working people, the Communists and Socialists should find a common language and points of contact not only in words but in deeds also.

Interesting in this respect is the polemic that developed in the Netherlands Party of Labor in 1957-58 on the attitude of the Social Democrats to the Communists. The polemic began with an article by Professor Tienbergen which appeared in 1957 in the Party's journal *Socialism and Democracy*. Professor Tienbergen favored a more objective discussion between Socialists and Communists, urging, in particular, that the Communists be approached with greater understanding. Among the problems which he listed as confronting both Communists and Socialists were the necessity of avoiding war and the struggle against poverty in the underdeveloped countries. Some of the extreme Right elements sharply criticized Professor Tienbergen's views. They, in turn, came under fire from many prominent Party members. Articles published recently in *Socialism and Democracy* on this subject (especially those of Dr. Buskus and Dr. Tolhoek) show that many Netherlands Social Democrats share Professor Tienbergen's views on the desirability of reaching a better understanding with the Communists.

Asia is a part of the world where the national liberation movement is especially powerful. In a number of Asian countries the Communists and Socialists have agreed on concerted action, which is one of the reasons for the successes achieved by the working people there.

In Japan this agreement is already bringing positive results. The experience of the Japanese working-class movement shows once again that ideological differences should not lead to a split in practical activities. In this connection it is worth while recalling

some of the points made by the leaders of the Japanese Socialists. "For the sake of the cause of peace, for the sake of restoring the complete independence of our country, we should welcome the co-operation of the Socialist and Communist Parties," was the way in which Jusimizi, chairman of the Political Commission of the Executive Committee of the Socialist Party, expressed this idea. Comrade Sandso Nosaka, President of the Japanese Communist Party, commenting on such pronouncements, said with every justification that "the different points of view of the Communist and Socialist Parties on vital questions of the socialist revolution cannot be an obstacle to their co-operation in the struggle for the immediate demands of the people."

The experience of the working-class movement in a number of countries shows the urgency of the next question we should like to raise: What is this or that political position of the Socialists worth if they do not draw from it the conclusions necessary for practical action? The Socialists speak in favor of ending nuclear weapon tests, of a summit meeting and of satisfying certain demands of the working people. This is quite correct. But the forces of big capital continue to resist these proposals and its forces are great. How is this resistance to be broken?

It is obvious that unity of action and the most varied forms of alliance of all those who wish to achieve this aim would be of great help.

Can those Socialist leaders be right who maintain that working-class unity is not essential and that in all circumstances the Socialist Parties can work better and more effectively for the aims of the working people without joint action with the Communists? Experience shows that this is not so. It shows that all the gains "won" by the Socialists on the basis of the policy of splitting the working people in reality bind the latter to the policy of the bourgeois ruling circles; that this has prevented the Socialists from making a single serious change in the social structure. This is not working-class or Socialist tactics since it lacks the aim of co-operation between the parties of the working people.

We ourselves should be quite clear that it is not enough to have an aim, however just it may be: the forces capable of achieving that aim by joint action must be defined. The decisive problem is precisely that of joint action by these forces with the object of solving common tasks and the attainment of peace, freedom and progress.

And it is just this problem that many Socialist parties, or, at any rate, many Socialist leaders, are by-passing for the moment. In many cases, moreover, Socialist leaders refuse to co-operate with the Communists even for immediate common aims. In such cases only one thing can be said about these leaders and that is: they are not bent on achieving the objectives they talk about.

5. From Italian Experience

The working-class movement in Italy, as we know, has considerable strength despite the difficulties that lie in its way. This is due to the fact that for many years Communists and Socialists have not confined themselves solely to declaring their common viewpoint on various questions but, in one form or another, depending on circumstances, have acted together.

There are, of course, objective reasons for this which should be sought in the particular development of capitalism in Italy where the wide stratum of working-class aristocracy typical of other countries is absent.

The development of the Italian socialist movement in recent years is clear evidence of the operation of the laws of dialectics, the laws of the relationship between theory and practice. Indeed, immediately after the defeat of fascism there was in the working-class movement only one Socialist Party apart from the Communist Party—the Italian Socialist Party of Proletarian Unity (ISPPU). Soon a discussion arose in this party on the question of whether it was necessary to maintain close contact with the Communists as in the past. And on this question a split occurred in 1947; afterwards, Saragat headed a typical reformist party whose leadership managed to make anti-Communism its main political line.

What did this lead to? Saragat's splitting activities enabled de Gasperi to oust from the government the Communists and those Socialists who were co-operating with them, and place the government machinery at the disposal of the big capitalists. Italy became embroiled in Atlantic politics. The political disunity of the workers facilitated the split in the trade unions a year later. This was a severe blow to the working people both on a national scale and in the factories. The industrialists began to pursue a policy of persecution and discrimination and the implementing of the economic and social reforms envisaged by the Constitution was postponed. All this was done while Saragat's

Social-Democratic Party participated in the government together with the Christian Democrats.

The outcome was that the balance of forces changed to the detriment of the working people. Anti-Communism again led to the strengthening of reaction.

The majority of the working people, however, were and still are in favor of united action.

The practical results enable us to assess the two lines of policy. The policy of unity of action with the Communists enabled the Socialist Party to overcome the crisis arising out of the split and to gain strength as one of the larger parties on a national scale. The 4,200,000 that voted for this Party together with the 6,700,000 votes polled by the Communists formed an opposition front of 11,000,000 voters as opposed to the 12,000,000 voting for the Christian Democrats. The number of votes cast for the Social-Democratic Party, which has split the ranks of the working people and is collaborating with the Christian Democrats, was reduced to 1.3 million, or 4.6 per cent (compared with 1.8 million, or 7.1 per cent of the votes in 1948). Whereas the Socialist and Communist parties are increasing their influence from election to election, the Social Democratic Party is on the decline.

Glancing back at the recent past of the Italian working-class movement, we see that the unity of all democratic and patriotic forces on a nation-wide scale which turned the anti-fascist struggle into a powerful movement of the people had its roots in the pact on unity of action that had existed between the Communists and Socialists since 1934. The unity of the Communists and Socialists served as a basis for national unity that, in the years of the war of liberation, found expression in the committees of national liberation. This unity of the Communists and Socialists was the basis of trade union unity and, at the present moment, forms the basis of the General Confederation of Labor, a body that is more powerful than any other Italian trade union alliance.

Without the unity of Communists and Socialists it would have been impossible to draw up the Constitution which contains a number of democratic principles. Despite the fact that these principles are constantly being violated by the clerical governments, they serve the people as a powerful unifying political force.

The Constitution recognizes the right of the working people to participate in the government of the country and contains a number of conditions which, if realized, as the Italian Communist Party points out, would facilitate that participation and permit of considerable progress in transforming society in the direction of socialism.

Without the unity of Communists and Socialists it would have been impossible to defend the Constitution when it was in extreme danger as a result of the adoption of the swindling electoral law which, in the elections of July 7, 1953, could have led to the extinction of the present parliamentary system in Italy. The unity of Communists and Socialists in this case was the basis of the election alliance that defeated the election law swindle. It was due to this unity—and this should always be remembered—that the ICP and the ISP experienced their greatest electoral success of the entire recent period.

A frank and honest discussion is now under way between Italian Communists and Socialists in the light of past experience. The Communists remind the Socialists of the consequences of some of their vacillations in respect of the unity policy, vacillations that were most pronounced at the time of the events in Hungary, when the Communists again confirmed their loyalty to the principles of proletarian internationalism.

And, indeed, during the municipal elections that took place in the big cities after the Hungarian events we saw that the Communists had made progress; and, incidentally, they had strongly reaffirmed that their policy aimed at unity. The Socialists, on the other hand, lost ground in those towns in which they belittled the significance of unity of action with the Communists. In the last election campaign the Communists honestly and openly carried the discussion on unity to the masses in order to make the opinions of the people one of the determining factors in the struggle for unity.

Imperialist aggression in the Lebanon and Jordan once again underlined the necessity to strengthen unity of action. The public demonstrations in Italy against this aggression were carried out, under the slogan of greater unity between Communists and Socialists, which was also to be seen in Parliament.

The policy of unity pursued by the vanguard of the Italian working class is expressed also in the effort to extend cooperation to the Social-Democratic Party, although its leaders have so far rejected all proposals to co-operate.

Communists do not forget that although the Social-Democratic Party is not a mass party and does not possess the working-class basis of some other Social-Democratic parties, there is, within the party itself, a contradiction between the policy of the leadership and the interests of its rank-and-file members. The efforts of the Communists and Socialists to achieve unity of action with the Social-Democrats have, in many instances, resulted in agreement being reached at the lower levels between Communists, Socialists and Social-Democrats on immediate problems that confront the working people. Agreements in trade union work are more common and more extensive. The General Confederation of Labor and the Social-Democratic unions have frequently reached agreement, even on a national scale.

Italian reality poses the question: If there had not been co-operation between Communists and Socialists, what would have been the prospects for the working people?

In a situation where the working class movement is confronted with serious difficulties, the unity of the working class, its alliance with the peasantry, creating a wide consolidation of democratic forces, prevent all attempts to revert to the past and strengthen reaction. This unity, furthermore, opens up before the people the prospect of the successful implementation of the republican Constitution on the basis of their active struggle and also the prospect of the working class winning the power necessary for the advance along the road to socialism.

* * *

The experiences that we have cited and the conclusions to be drawn from them help explain why the Communists, in the present tense and dangerous situation, are making a particularly insistent appeal to the Socialists and to all sections of the working people to reach agreement.

The goal towards which the Communists are striving is Socialism. The immediate task of the working class in the capitalist countries is, the Communists believe, the winning of peace, democracy and the independence of the peoples. For this reason they believe that agreement with the Socialists is an important condition ensuring the unity of the working class. They want to achieve this unity both in the struggle to solve urgent problems and in the struggle for the power of the proletariat.

When we appeal to the Socialists for agreement and co-operation with us we know that the appeal will meet with widespread response among the rank-and-file. We also know that the more widely the idea is taken up by the rank-and-file the sooner will agreement be reached at the top. *Nevertheless the Communists address their appeal for agreement and co-operation to all Socialists—to the rank-and-file members and to the leadership, that is, to Socialist Parties as such.*

There are various trends contending within the Socialist Parties, and the Communists welcome those that are striving for unity. The appeal of the Communists—and this must again be stressed—for agreement and co-operation is, however, addressed to the entire Socialist movement.

On their part the Communists have always fought and will continue to fight against any manifestation of sectarianism in their ranks, against any underestimation of the all-important unity of the working class and against scepticism in respect of the possibility of achieving this unity.

The present situation impels the working people to regard each other as brothers and the peoples to draw together. The Communists, conscious of their special responsibility for the destiny of mankind, are fighting and will continue to fight for the unity of all forces of the proletariat in order to achieve its immediate and ultimate goals.

State-Monopoly Capitalism in the Distorting Mirror of Revisionism

Y. Ostrovitianov and V. Cheprakov

THE latter-day revisionists, now "critically revising" the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism, are successors to the revisionists of the late 19th and early 20th century, fellow-travellers of the bourgeois and Right-wing Socialist theorists. Having borrowed the old revisionism's notorious theory of the peaceful evolution of capitalism into socialism which, they allege, has found confirmation in the development of state-monopoly capitalism, they now take up the fashionable theories of the ideologists of monopoly capital and stick their pseudo-Socialist labels on them. And all the while they profane Leninism by citing its principles.

But the most concentrated form of modern revisionism is the Yugoslav one. Having absorbed and generalized all the current revisionist theories, it in turn supplies the opponents of Marxism-Leninism with sophistic arguments.

Their Masters' Voice

One of the main issues in the controversy between Marxism and revisionism is the evaluation of present-day state-monopoly capitalism.

The success of the struggle waged by the working class against bourgeois ideology calls for profound scientific research into the developments in modern capitalism and a sound, principled evaluation of these processes. This struggle implies both the exposure of revisionism, which propagates bourgeois ideas among the working people and is the main danger in the working-class movement, and the overcoming of dogmatism, which hampers creative application of Marxism-Leninism in the concrete historical conditions of various countries.

While the dogmatists ignore the changes that have taken place in the development of capitalism over the past decades, the revisionists follow the lead of the apologists of monopoly capital and the Right-wing Socialists in speculating on these changes and alleging that modern capitalism is "basically different from the imperialism of Lenin's day". What they try to prove is that the structure of capitalism is undergoing profound, fundamental changes, as a result of which it "is ceasing to be capitalism".

The revisionists, naturally, claim that their conceptions are original and independent. They indignantly reject the charge that these conceptions are reformist and bourgeois both in their content and origin. But whether they like it or not, the fact remains: the spiritual fathers of the revisionists, their ideological inspirers, are the ideologists of monopoly capital and their Right-wing Socialist henchmen. The ideas contained in the books of Cole and Strachey — ideas fashionable in Right-wing Socialist circles — in Keynes's "regulated economy", Slichter's "mixed economy", Gelbright's "counterbalancing forces", the technocratic theories of J. Burnham and A. Frish, the different variants of "people's capitalism" — all these apologist theories figure, though in slightly modified forms, in the pronouncements of the present-day revisionists.

The revisionist claims regarding the radical change in the economic nature of capitalism, the supra-class character of the modern bourgeois state, the planned economy in capitalist countries, the socialist character of bourgeois nationalization, etc., have all been borrowed from bourgeois and reformist sources. More, the latter-day revisionists agree with reactionary bourgeois ideologists on the definition of the character of the social and economic system in the U.S.S.R. and the People's Democracies, which they slanderously and without any proof designate as state capitalism. It is typical that the revisionists laud the capitalist state's intervention in the economy in the interests of the monopolies, while they vilify the economic functions of the socialist state. Like the bourgeois and Right-wing Socialist theorists, the revisionists seek to find socialism in capitalism and capitalism in socialism, that is, to make white black and black white. And it is this profanation of common sense, this pseudo-scientific concep-

tion that they vociferously proclaim as the latest discovery, a sort of theory of "single world-wide development towards socialism".

New Developments in Capitalist Society

To get an idea of how far the revisionists are removed from Marxism, it will be necessary to dwell, at least briefly, on the new phenomena in the economics and politics of capitalism. What is behind all this revisionist talk about "f u n d a m e n t a l changes in present-day capitalism"? The most typical phenomenon in bourgeois society today is the growth of state-monopoly trends, which exert a tremendous influence on the political and economic development of the United States, Britain, France, West Germany, Canada, Italy and other countries. No deep-going process in capitalist society can be correctly assessed if it is taken in isolation, out of the context of the role played in this society by state-monopoly capitalism.

State-monopoly capitalism has developed considerably in the leading capitalist countries. In Britain, the state's share in total capital investment amounts to 20.1 per cent; in Italy, the state's share in the country's total joint-stock capital is 36.1 per cent; in West Germany, it is 14 per cent. In France, one-fifth of all the industrial and office workers are employed by state-owned or state-controlled industries and transport. In the United States, atomic and munition works, large hydro-power stations, banks, part of the railways, etc., are owned by the state.

This direction of capitalist development was not unexpected so far as the Marxist-Leninists were concerned. In his works, Lenin brilliantly anticipated the basic trends of imperialism. He spoke of imperialism as the era of the development of monopoly capitalism into state-monopoly capitalism. "Imperialism, the era of bank capital, the era of gigantic capitalist monopolies, *the era of the development of monopoly capitalism into state-monopoly capitalism*" (italics ours), he wrote, "has demonstrated with particular force an extraordinary strengthening of the 'state machine' and an unprecedented growth of its bureaucratic and military apparatus, in connection with the intensification of repressive measures against the proletariat both in the monarchical and in the freest republican countries" (Lenin, *Works*, 4th Russian edition, Vol. 25, p. 382). Capitalist development, Lenin pointed out, "advanced from capitalism to imperialism, from monopoly to state ownership" (ibid., Vol. 24, p. 210).

State-monopoly capitalism has been engendered by the increasing concentration and centralization of capital, a process which, at a certain phase, places control over the main branches of the capitalist economy in the hands of the monopolies. In the United States, the 500 largest industrial concerns account for about half of total industrial output, 59 per cent of the assets of industrial companies and 54 per cent of their total trade turnover; their enterprises employ approximately half of all the industrial workers; according to the reactionary bourgeois ideologists, Kelso and Adler, a substantial part of the capital which supplies some 90 per cent of the country's output, is concentrated in the hands of about five per cent of the employers. In France, the economy is dominated by 100 trusts, with 11 per cent of the joint-stock companies pocketing 84 per cent of total profits. In Britain, one-third of all the profits made by industrial and trading companies is cornered by the 50 biggest firms. In West Germany, 10 per cent of the joint-stock companies control 81.7 per cent of stock capital. In Italy, two-thirds of all joint-stock capital is controlled by 40 firms.

The monopolies use their economic strength *to seize the capitalist state and subordinate its apparatus to themselves*. The result is coalescence (and in some cases, amalgamation) of the state and monopoly apparatuses. The changes in the capitalist economy, in their turn, cause changes in the character of the bourgeois state's intervention in the economy.

Under pre-monopoly capitalism, production was divided up among a multitude of capitalists and developed in conditions of a free flow of capital, in accordance with the law of the average rate of profit as a form of manifestation of the basic economic law of capitalism.

In that era, the bourgeois state represented the interests of all the capitalists, who vied with one another in appropriating as much surplus value as possible in conditions of free play of prices and unbridled competition. The state's role was limited to creating the most favorable conditions possible for the development of capitalism in general. In the sphere of the economy, the bourgeois state pursued a policy of protection or, conversely, of free trade, and took measures aimed at perpetuating the exploitation of the working class and toiling peasantry. In short, the state's role was to safeguard bourgeois property and the general conditions of capitalist production.

The situation changed materially in the era of imperialism, particularly as a result of state-monopoly trends. Monopoly capital is using the state apparatus for direct interven-

tion in the economy. In its activity, the state relies on the economic and financial power of the leading monopoly groups, whose interests it represents.

Monopoly-capitalist control over the economy, effected through the state apparatus, is rendered necessary by the character of present-day capitalist reproduction. Concentration of production in the imperialist countries has brought into existence giant economic concerns which account for the overwhelming part of commodity production. Given the growth of the organic composition of capital, further expansion of production requires huge capital investments, which cannot be obtained in the form of shares alone. This being the case, monopoly capital uses the state apparatus to mobilize as much public capital as possible and appropriates considerable amounts of money from the workers for the needs of the leading monopoly trusts and to maintain the level of extended capitalist reproduction. The state redistributes among the monopolies a substantial part of the capitalist profit and of working people's incomes.

The growing success of the world socialist system, the tremendous popularity of its principles of planning among the working people the world over, the increasing instability of capitalist development and the fear of crises and economic upheavals — all compel the monopoly bourgeoisie to seek for new state-monopoly forms of economy and economic policy.

State-monopoly capitalism is a complex system under which monopoly capital uses the bourgeois state in its own interests. It includes, in the main, *state property, state consumption, government control and regulation.*

What is the economic and social essence of state property under capitalism? With the monopolies in power, state property does not belong merely to the bourgeois class as a whole; it is mainly the joint property of the monopolists. Nowhere and at no time under capitalism do the state monopolies act to the detriment of monopoly capital as a whole.

Monopoly capital adopts partial nationalization when it deems it generally advantageous. The fact that nationalization is sometimes effected under popular pressure does not alter things. The former owners of nationalized enterprises are generously compensated. In other words, they are given an opportunity to withdraw their capital from the enterprises that are being nationalized—usually non-paying concerns—and re-invest it in paying enterprises.

The profits made out of exploiting workers in state-owned enterprises are pocketed, in one way or another, by private companies. At the same time, bourgeois nationalization helps to reduce production costs at private enterprises. In France, for instance, the nationalized industries are used in one way or another by the monopolies. Monopoly capitalism stands to lose through nationalization only in the event of it being accompanied by severe restriction of the monopolies.

A big role in the state-monopoly system of measures is played by state consumption, or, as it is sometimes called, "working for the government" orders. Government orders help monopolies to dispose of a considerable part of their goods, particularly war production. A specific and highly profitable sales market is thus created for monopoly capital, and its importance is constantly growing. For instance, in the United States, government purchases from the private monopolies increased almost thirteenfold between 1903 and 1949. In 1955, the government purchased upwards of 19 per cent of U.S. gross output. To some extent, this market frees the monopolies of the worries engendered by the ups and downs of capitalist business activity. Under this system, it is the state which risks most from the possible decline in production, and the working people pay for a considerable part of government purchases.

Now about government control and regulation, which boil down to such measures as redistribution of part of the capitalist profit and of the incomes of the working people among the monopolies, establishment of discount and exchange rates, regulation of import and export quotas, etc. The whole problem here is, who is controlling whom and in whose interests? There are no two answers to that. Capitalist practice clearly reveals that control and regulation pursue just one aim: to maintain by every means possible the capitalist mode of production and to safeguard the fundamental interests of monopoly capitalism. Capitalist control of this kind is strikingly seen in the budgetary policy of the imperialist states. In the United States, Britain, the Federal Republic of Germany and other countries, the state re-distributes through the budget from one-quarter to one-half of the national income. The bulk of those funds ultimately finds its way to the monopolies. Although monopoly capital does not always exercise its power over society openly, it invariably uses this power to perpetuate exploitation. "In the capitalist state," Lenin wrote, "state capitalism is recognized by the state and

controlled by it in the interests of the bourgeoisie and to the detriment of the proletariat" (Lenin, *Works*, 4th Russian edition, Vol. 32, p. 467).

State-monopoly capitalism is closely tied with the militarization of the economy. Military expenditure now accounts for 63 per cent of the budgetary provisions in the United States and 27 per cent in Britain and the Federal Republic of Germany. According to official statistics, armaments constituted more than 12 per cent of the output of the British engineering industries in 1957.

Militarization is also a typical phenomenon of post-war imperialists because it is the flexible tool with which *monopoly capital makes the bourgeois state serve its interests.* Using the mechanism of the militarized economy, the state creates new spheres of capital investment for the monopolies, finances them, supplies them with fixed capital, labor power and scarce raw materials, and keeps prices of their goods at a high level.

This is seen most strikingly in wartime. During the Korean war, for instance, ten of the largest U.S. corporations obtained 40 per cent of the war orders. Between June, 1950 and November, 1953, some of the monopolies, with government sanction, wrote off 17.5 billion dollars of profits on the pretext of accelerated amortization of fixed capital.

The last few years have shown with the utmost clarity that extended capitalist reproduction and high monopoly profits are the direct consequence of the militarization of the economy, and that is striking proof of the decay of present-day capitalism.

We thus see that the bourgeois nationalization and capitalist control and regulation of individual enterprises and branches of industry do not abolish exploitation, but merely alter its forms. That is what Lenin's theory of imperialism teaches, and the correctness of his far-seeing conclusions is confirmed over and over again by the entire process of capitalist development.

A Play on Terminology or Betrayal of Marxist Principles?

The revisionists disagree with the Marxist-Leninist evaluation of state-monopoly capitalism. They claim that it no longer conforms to the new situation and lay claim to the discovery of new scientific truths. Have the Yugoslav revisionists drawn any new theoretical conclusions? Frankly speaking, no. They merely reject indiscriminately the Leninist theory of imperialism, repeating almost word for word the trivial arguments of the bourgeois economists and reformists. They criticize Leninism from positions of "statism" —the bourgeois and reformist pseudo-theory which alleges that in the capitalist society of today the state is above classes and is eliminating the power of the monopolies. The program of the Yugoslav League of Communists makes wide use of the bourgeois political economy term "étatism" (statism) to camouflage the real character of modern bourgeois society and the dominating role of the monopolies, and at the same time to slander the socialist countries.

The Yugoslav revisionists reject the very concept of state-monopoly capitalism, calling it state capitalism and ignoring the most important feature of present-day bourgeois society—the rule of monopoly capital.

In his report to the Seventh Congress of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, Edvard Kardelj admitted that most of the amendments tabled by a number of Yugoslav Communists called for the substitution of "state-monopoly capitalism" for "state capitalism". Kardelj rejected this justified proposal. "We think it would be correct to retain the term 'state capitalism' in our program," he declared. This is necessary in order to embrace all the processes taking place in the imperialist, former colonial and socialist countries.

The program thus deliberately confuses completely different things — state-monopoly capitalism in the imperialist countries; state capitalism, which arose out of the need of the former colonial countries to achieve economic independence of imperialism; and the state-capitalist sector in the transition from capitalism to socialism. The Yugoslav revisionists deliberately confuse these incompatible concepts to whitewash and embellish imperialism, to show that there really is no fundamental difference between socialist and capitalist societies, to disorientate the working class and divert it from the only right way to socialism. That is what sometimes lies behind the seemingly innocent game of revising Marxist-Leninist terminology.

In the wake of the avowed anti-Marxists, the revisionists claim that the development of state-monopoly capitalism in the last few decades has changed the very nature of capitalism, and that such features of capitalist production as the market element, competition and anarchy of production are things of the past. The Yugoslav journal *Nasha Stvarnost* alleges that "the freedom and independence formerly enjoyed by private capital and private-capitalist monopolies have been substan-

tially altered by the state. This has brought into existence a specific economic structure —state capitalism, under which certain laws of capitalism have been either invalidated or pushed into the background". And here the Yugoslav revisionists again, in a disguised form, embellish modern capitalism.

As we have seen, state monopoly capitalism is engendered by the capitalist socialization of the productive forces, that is, by the same objective processes which led to the establishment of monopolies at the turn of the 20th century and to the growth of pre-monopoly capitalism into imperialism. And capitalist socialization, that is, concentration and centralization of capital, is in its turn the outcome of such objective laws as competition and anarchy of production, which are based on a contradiction peculiar to all stages of capitalism — the contradiction between the social character of production and the private-capitalist form of appropriation. The source and primary cause of all the contradictions of capitalism is the private-capitalist form of ownership, which has been the basis of bourgeois society in all the phases of its development. State-monopoly capitalism does not negate private-capitalist ownership, for it is based on it and simply cannot exist without it, just as it cannot exist without commodity production, anarchy, competition and crises. "Pure imperialism, without the fundamental basis of capitalism, has never existed, nowhere exists, and never will exist." (Lenin, *Works,* 4th Russian edition, Vol. 29, p. 144.). The sole purpose and historical mission of state-monopoly capitalism is to protect and strengthen private-monopoly ownership and capitalist production relations. Being a consequence of the development of the basic properties of capitalist production, state-monopoly capitalism is not only incapable of eliminating the contradictions of capitalism, but, on the contrary, aggravates them to the extreme. Antagonisms cannot be eliminated within the capitalist system—they disappear only with the disappearance of capitalism itself.

Why, then, have the Yugoslav revisionists had to parrot the reformist arguments regarding changes in the capitalist structure? In no small measure, they do it to repeat yet another trite thesis of the bourgeois ideologists and Right-wing Socialist leaders—the thesis of the omnipotence of the modern capitalist state.

The points in the program of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia on the supra-class role of the capitalist state have been widely aired in newspapers and journals. "Wherever the state, by assuming economic functions, acquires a broader economic base," writes Y. Almuli in the *Borba,* "the advocates of state-capitalist measures and the state apparatus strive to achieve a greater or lesser degree of independence and, in a measure, to act as the arbiters of the classes, restricting the role of the classes." To show how close the revisionists are to reformist ideas, it will suffice to mention the book by the Fabian G. D. H. Cole, *Capitalism in the Modern World.* According to Cole the state in the more developed capitalist countries, even if it has substantially preserved its former class character, has ceased to be simply the instrument of class oppression and has, to some extent, become the means of safeguarding the interests of the subordinate classes and of re-distributing incomes as between rich and poor.

The revisionists and the reformists like nothing better than to parade as opponents of dogmatism, claiming that they keep abreast of the times and generalize new facts. But their analysis of state-monopoly capitalism, unlike the Marxist-Leninist, contains absolutely nothing new and merely reproduces the dogmatic schemes of development of society.

The revisionists' attempt to pass off the concept of an independent bourgeois state resting on the balance of antagonistic classes as a "new theoretical discovery" is really nothing but illegitimate transplantation on to the soil of modern capitalism of certain aspects and features of the absolutist state of the 17th and 18th centuries, on the eve of the bourgeois revolution. The revisionists prefer schemes and superficial analogies with past history to a concrete approach to reality. But ignoring reality does not pay. There is no place in present-day capitalist society for the phantom of the absolutist state of the 17th and 18th centuries. The absolutist state was based on a compromise of the two *exploiting* classes, the nobility and bourgeoisie, at the expense of the working people. Historically, such compromise is both feasible and logical. But there can be no such compromise in the imperialist countries between the *exploiting* class (the bourgeoisie) and the *exploited* class (the proletariat). The working class, whose mission is to liberate mankind from all oppression and exploitation, is the grave-digger of capitalism, not the bourgeoisie's partner in managing the state. Compromise with the oppressors is possible only at the expense of the oppressed. It is such a compromise that the reformists and

revisionists make with the monopoly bourgeoisie, sacrificing the interests of the working class and socialism.

"Capitalist Abolition of Capitalism"

The new version of the reformist theory on the development of capitalism into socialism or, if you will, the new argument in favor of this old, invalid theory, pursues the aim of proving that, as the result of the growth of "statism" and automation of production, the owners of enterprises are no longer owners, that they have become "hired workers", that the capitalist class is gradually disappearing.

One can understand when such things are written by ideologists of monopoly capital, such as Burnham and Frish, for their job is to find some justification for the decrepit capitalist system. But then we take Markovic's book *State Capitalism,* and learn that there are two ways of abolishing bourgeois society: socialist and "capitalist", the latter way being through the reform of capitalism. The author claims that "the development of state capitalism means precisely the abolition of the capitalist mode of production".

"Capitalist abolition of capitalism" is really a masterpiece of revisionism!

Markovic wrote his book a fairly long time ago (in 1953) and there would have been no need to recall it if it had not been for the fact that the revisionists continue to propagate such ideas, though in a more veiled form. Only recently Ratkovic affirmed that "the state deprives the capitalist class of its ownership of the means of production", that "with the expansion of state ownership the capitalist class disappears", that "since state property no longer has individual owners, its interests in society are looked after by the representatives of the common owner, those who manage it in its name—the functionaries, bureaucracy".

The revisionists' arguments quoted above follow from their concept of a "single worldwide process of development towards socialism". This is the *leit-motif* of the LCY program. "The development of socialism in the contemporary world," it says, "reflects the intertwining and interrelation of the economic and political influences of the achievements of socialist construction in a number of countries, as well as the diverse revolutionary and evolutionary processes in the capitalist countries."

Replying to the critics of these revisionist views, Kardelj delared in his report to the LCY VIIth Congress that they had been misunderstood. The evolution of capitalism into socialism, he claimed, meant that the evolutionary processes in capitalist society were gradually paving the way to revolution. These reservations will deceive nobody. The attitude taken by the LCY leadership to modern capitalism is irrefutable proof that it is not a question of syntactic or semantic errors, but one of fundamental theoretical errors, of the revisionist distortion of Marxism.

"Evolution of capitalism into socialism" has a history all its own. Suffice it to recall Kardelj's ill-famed lecture to the Norwegian Labor Party functionaries. "West-European socialism," he declared, "is following another path. It is strengthening the political and economic positions of the working class, that is, socialism, gradually, by evolutionary means, making use of the existing mechanisms of the classical bourgeois democracy. To what extent any one concrete poliy of this type is a real step towards socialism is, of course, open to debate. But, on the whole, there can be no doubt that in the case of a number of countries, evolution to socialism with the aid of the political mechanism of the classical European bourgeois democracy is not only possible, it is already becoming a fact." Here you cannot say that this "meant that the evolutionary processes in capitalist society were gradually paving the way to revolution". Kardelj's statement requires no explanation. What he propagates and his followers repeat is not evolution that paves the way to revolution, but evolution to socialism without revolution.

The Yugoslav revisionists hold that the activity of the working class should be limited to a struggle for leadership in the mechanism of bourgeois power and not for the destruction of the old, capitalist state machine and the establishment of a new, socialist state, as Marx and Lenin teach us. The monopolies, however, are not afraid of the struggle for "participation in the bourgeois mechanism of government". In fact, they welcome such slogans, for they divert the attention of the working class from the real struggle for its vital interests.

Under capitalism, the slogan of "economic democracy" is opportunistic, for it envisages labor's growing-over into the system of capitalist organizations. What it calls for is not working-class leadership in society, but further subordination of the working class to the bourgeoisie.

The essence of the "economic democracy" slogan is revealed in detail in the Austrian Socialist Party's new program. "For industrial and office workers," it says, "the exponents of the economic democracy idea are the trade

unions and workers' councils, factory committees and employees' organizations; for the employers and non-hired professionals they are their councils and free bodies representing their interests." Hence it is clear that the notorious "economic democracy" is the same old bourgeois and opportunistic sermon about "the harmony of interests", and "co-partnership" between the workers and their exploiters. The struggle for "economic democracy" is a reformist, trade union program, limited to demands for higher wages but ignoring the fundamentals of capitalist relations, despite the fact that the vital interests of the working class demand abolition of capitalism.

The Working Class and State-Monopoly Capitalism

The international communist movement holds a clear-cut view on state-monopoly capitalism. In its assessment, it is consistently guided by Marxism-Leninism. The Communists resolutely counter all the revisionist and reformist attempts to embellish state-monopoly capitalism and pass it off as a form of transition from capitalism to socialism.

The development of state-monopoly capitalism is the main trend of present-day capitalist society, an *objective process* which cannot be reversed. That is why the Communists denounce the bourgeois and reformist apologists of state-monopoly capitalism and at the same time regard as a reactionary utopia the appeals of certain petty-bourgeois ideologists, to stop the development of state-monopoly capitalism and return to "the golden era of free enterprise".

State-monopoly capitalism is the last link in the chain of capitalist development. It leads to further aggravation of all the insoluble capitalist contradictions and primarily of its basic contradiction—between the social character of production and the private form of appropriation.

State-monopoly capitalism is the embodiment of the historical contradiction in the general trend of capitalist development. *On the one hand,* its job is to mobilize all the economic, political and ideological factors to prolong the existence of the doomed capitalist society; *on the other hand,* it is objectively preparing, and cannot do otherwise, the material basis for socialist society. "State-monopoly capitalism," Lenin wrote, "is complete *material* preparation for socialism, the *prelude* to socialism, a rung in the ladder of history between which and the rung called socialism *there are no intermediate rungs*" (Lenin, *Works,* Vol. 25, 4th Russian edition, p. 333). Lenin emphasized that socialism is in fact a state-capitalist monopoly made to serve the entire people and for that reason divested of its capitalist character.

That is why the contradictory character of state-monpoly capitalism requires a concrete historical approach to all state-monopolist measures. The working class fights every attempt to use them to strengthen the power of the monopolies and prolong the existence of capitalism. At the same time it cannot but take into account the fact that the development of state-monopoly capitalism is creating the material basis for socialism. A concrete historical approach is especially important in assessing such phenomena of state-monopoly capitalism as nationalization of means of production and the bourgeois state's intervention in the economy.

It should be pointed out that the post-war nationalization of some branches of industry in the capitalist countries was a definite concession to the demands raised by the masses. This notwithstanding the fact that it was widely used by the monopolies in their own selfish interests—to withdraw capital from non-paying branches and increase their profits—and was then directed against the economic gains of the working class.

The working class demands the most far-reaching nationalization, regarding it as a measure that, to a certain degree, undermines the "sanctity" of private ownership and facilitates the subsequent socialization of production which the socialist revolution renders inevitable. At the same time, the working class is opposed to nationalization being used to strengthen state-monopoly capitalism (it is opposed to full compensation of owners for the nationalized enterprises, to economic support being given the monopolies at the expense of the nationalized branches, to prohibition of strikes in these branches, etc.).

So far as state intervention in the economy of the capitalist countries is concerned, the working class wages a persistent struggle against the general line of state support for the monopolies, against the militarization of the national economy and against increased taxation of working people. It demands an end to the arms race, lower taxes for the working people and higher taxes for the monopolies, lower prices for consumer goods, the use of budget allocations for financing public works and utilities, housing, social security, public health, education and other measures that raise living standards. The struggle for democratic liberties in the capi-

talist enterprises, for greater powers for bodies representing the workers in industry is of great importance. The working class as a whole seeks to carry out and support measures restricting the power of the monopolies, measures that undermine their influence and weaken their positions.

The economic struggle of the revolutionary working class is inseparable from the political struggle. In upholding their immediate economic interests, both in private and state-owned enterprises, the workers inevitably come into conflict with the bureaucratic machine of the bourgeois state.

In fighting for reforms that weaken the capitalist system and improve the position of the working people under capitalism, the proletariat and its party always keep in mind their chief goal—conquest of political power and the revolutionary transformation of society along socialist lines. Only the abolition of capitalism and its state will free the working people from exploitation and open up the road to a happy future.

State-monopoly capitalism creates objective possibilities for extending the social basis of the anti-monopoly movement. Monopoly dictatorship, exploitation of the overwhelming majority of the population in the capitalist countries by the financial oligarchy, growing political reaction in all the spheres of public life—all show that there is an objective necessity to effect democratic transformations in the developed capitalist countries too. This will make it easier for the working class to unite wide sections of the population and lead them in the struggle against monopoly rule. And no revisionists, reformists or bourgeois ideologists can divert the toiling masses from this correct path to social liberation.

In the final analysis, all the revisionist distortions of the nature of state-monopoly capitalism are nothing but homilies on its peaceful growing-over into socialism. In reality, socialism can be achieved only through a struggle for political power by the working class and the toilers allied with it. The transition to socialism, peacefully or otherwise, is possible only under the dictatorship of the proletariat. Lenin pointed out that imperialism was gradually reorganizing the economy along the lines of state-capitalist monopoly. "Imperialism," he wrote, "is gradually transforming all trusts into organizations of a similar type, in which, standing over the 'common' toilers, who are overworked and starved, is the same bourgeois bureaucracy. But the mechanism of social management is here already to hand. We have but to overthrow the capitalists, to crush the resistance of these exploiters with the iron hand of the armed workers, to smash the bureaucratic machine of the modern state—and we shall have a splendidly equipped mechanism, freed from the 'parasite', a mechanism which can very well be set going by the united workers themselves . . ." (Lenin, *Works*, 4th Russian edition, Vol. 25, p. 398.)

These prophetic words reflect the general line the international labor movement has taken in its struggle against imperialist reaction, for the liberation of people from the monopoly yoke, for a bright future for the working people, for socialism.

Guarding the Interests of the People

Ville Pessi

THE Communist Party of Finland was formed in the course of the historic events of 1918. The Socialist Revolution of 1917 in Russia overthrew the rule of the capitalists and landlords and showed the working people of the world the road to liberation, the way out of the imperialist war and the chaos engendered by it. A revolutionary situation was maturing in Germany, Hungary and other European countries. In Finland a general strike broke out in November 1917, and civil war began in January 1918 which ended with the defeat of the working class. This was due to the intervention of German imperialism which sent contingents of German-trained Finnish soldiers to Finland and, later, regular troops of the German army. The savage White terror which followed took a toll of tens of thousands of workers.

The victorious bourgeoisie did not confine itself to persecuting those who had summoned the people to revolutionary struggle, it exerted every effort to split the working class. With the aid of Right-wing leaders of the Social Democratic Party, the bourgeoisie began to form a party which would take the working

class along the road the bourgeoisie would like it to follow. As early as April 1918, when German troops were disembarking in Helsinki, Vaino Tanner, leader of the Right-wing Social Democrats—who in after years sided with the Hitlerites—and his associates contacted General von der Goltz's headquarters and, on its instructions, issued a document in which they denounced the revolutionary struggle waged by the workers and the landless peasants. The Tanner men bitterly attacked Soviet Russia, slandering the Bolsheviks and the Socialist Revolution. The Finnish working-class movement, Tanner declared, should adhere to the "Western pattern"—that of Right-wing Social Democracy, which in all European countries had already entered into collaboration with the imperialist bourgeoisie against the working class of their countries and the Socialist Revolution in Russia.

These, then, were the conditions in which the Communist Party of Finland was founded. In those days it could emerge only as an underground party. The foundation meeting took place in Moscow on August 29, 1918. It was attended by rank-and-file members and many leaders of the old Social Democratic Labor Party of Finland, who had escaped the reprisals of the bourgeoisie and found asylum in Soviet Russia. Among them were such well-known figures in the international working-class movement as Otto Kuusinen, Jukka Rahja and Jrjo Sirola who had often met Lenin and had co-operated with him.

The resolution adopted at the founding meeting was imbued with the revolutionary spirit of the times, though a number of paragraphs reflected an insufficient knowledge of Marxism-Leninism, which was characteristic of the old revolutionary Social Democracy.

The resolution categorically rejected the line of class conciliation adopted by the Tanner Social Democrats. The Party called on the working class to fight the White terror and pointed out that the transition to socialism could be effected only through the dictatorship of the proletariat.

To the blockade of Soviet Russia declared by the imperialist powers and supported by the Finnish bourgeoisie aided by the Right-wing Social Democratic leaders, the Communist Party replied by calling on the Finnish workers residing in Soviet Russia to join the Red Army and defend the Soviet power against the interventionists. The foundation meeting proclaimed that the Socialist Revolution in Russia had opened a new era in world history and that the Party would work for the realization of socialist ideas in Finland.

Thus from its very inception the Communist Party of Finland linked its struggle for the interests of the working class of its country with those of the working people of other lands. It became the embodiment of proletarian internationalism in the Finnish working-class movement.

Upholding the Democratic Rights of the Working People

The foundation meeting manifested a tendency to neglect work in the trade unions, in the co-operatives and in parliament. However, a deeper study of Lenin's works and the experience of the Bolshevik Party soon convinced the leadership that a revolutionary Marxist-Leninist party should utilize all forms of mass struggle. The Party launched activity in the enterprises and in the legal mass organizations in which the Tanner splitters tried to gain influence.

The revolutionary line pursued by the Party triumphed in 1919 in the Social Democratic youth and women's movements. Here Tanner's followers were in the minority, so they proceeded to form their own youth and women's organizations. In the trade union movement Communist influence began to grow as early as 1918. By the 'twenties the central trade union body had become an organization in which unity of the working people prevailed and the Communists occupied the leading positions. If at that time the rudiments of bourgeois democracy had been observed in Finland, the Tanner trend in the working-class movement could never have consolidated itself, the overwhelming majority of the working class would have rallied round the militant Communist banner.

The bourgeoisie, however, hastened to the aid of its underlings by attacking the Communist Party and all other organizations of the working people adhering to the standpoint of class struggle. Many organizations, in which the supporters of class struggle were in the majority, were dissolved on the pretext that they were "Communist" bodies. Such was the fate of the legal Socialist Labor Party founded in 1920, which had 27 seats in the Diet. The Socialist Youth League, the working youth self-education groups, women's associations, children's organizations and even temperance societies were likewise dissolved.

In 1929 when a severe economic crisis struck Finland, the reactionary bourgeoisie resorted to naked fascist terror. It organized the so-called "Lapuas movement" the basic aim of which was the "final eradication of communism". As a result, all the legal Left-

wing working-class organizations were outlawed, members of the Diet representing the Socialist workers and small farmers were arrested and the Left working-class newspapers suppressed. All social organizations, newspapers and journals not to the liking of the bourgeoisie were declared "Communist" and suppressed. From the exceedingly restricted bourgeois democracy of the 'twenties the Finnish bourgeoisie switched to a semi-fascist regime.

In the early thirties, after the majority of Communists occupying leading posts in legal organizations had been thrown into prison, the Communist Party found itself isolated from the masses. In these conditions it was confronted with the task of rebuilding its ranks, re-establishing contact with the masses and finding new openings for legal work. First of all it set about freeing itself from certain sectarian tendencies which found expression in some members' refusing to work in the legal Social Democratic, trade union and other organizations. The Party rejected the idea of forming underground trade union organizations and, defying the Social Democratic leaders, began to work in the branches of the Central Association of Trade Unions which had been set up at the time. This made it possible for the Communists and Left Social Democrats to take a united front stand in opposition to the reactionary Social Democratic Union leaders. As a result the Central Association grew stronger. Between 1934-39 it successfully defended the economic interests of the working people and helped considerably in raising their standard of living after the economic crisis of 1929-33.

Communist policy, aimed at creating a united front, helped to consolidate the Left opposition in the Social Democratic Party. This opposition was headed by the Academic Socialist Society. The Party tactics contributed to the appearance of an anti-fascist opposition in a number of other Social Democratic and legal organizations.

The united front, naturally, had the backing of the working people. Under Communist Party leadership the mass struggle assumed wide dimensions in 1934-36 when the fascist court framed a charge against Toivo Antikainen, First Secretary of the Communist Party. The prosecutor demanded the death sentence. A broad international campaign waged in defense of Antikainen resulted in the death sentence being commuted to life imprisonment.

The success of the united front policy pursued by the Communist Party led to a situation in which not only Social Democratic but also bourgeois circles began to manifest dissatisfaction with the Kivimaki fascist government. This fascist government was supported by Tanner. The differences that arose in the pro-fascist parliamentary majority in connection with the secret police memorandum which denounced many prominent bourgeois personalities as "Comintern agents", led to the downfall of the Kivimaki government. (Eventually Kivimaki was condemned as a war criminal.) This was regarded as a blow to fascist policy. It inspired the anti-fascist and anti-militarist forces to renewed struggle on the basis of united front tactics proposed by the Communists.

When the Second World War started and the reactionary rulers went into an alliance with Hitler and involved Finland in the war against the Soviet Union, the Communist Party was again deprived of any opportunity for legal activity. Thousands of Communists were thrown into concentration camps and prisons and sentenced to hard labor. Hundreds were butchered. All opposition activity was suppressed; anyone who opposed the war was declared a Communist and subjected to savage persecution. The ruling circles were now thinking in terms of installing a permanent fascist regime which would grant civil rights only to opponents of communism.

But this was not fated to be realized. In the great battle of the peoples headed by the Soviet Union, fascism was laid low. The Communist Party of Finland, though unable to develop guerrilla war on a large scale, took part in this liberation struggle of the peoples to the best of its ability. The savage repression failed to break the Party. It called on the people to oppose the war might and main. Many Communists fell in the unequal battle, among them Vejko Peojusti. The activities of the Party resulted in large numbers of soliders deserting and in growing discontent among the people at home. *The struggle conducted by the Party contributed to the formation of an anti-war opposition in Finland and paved the way for the changes that took place at the end of the war.*

The anti-fascist democratic movement, which appeared as if from under the earth, began to spread with unprecedented speed. The fascist rulers were forced to yield to a more democratic form of government.

The Communist Party appeared on the political scene as a legal party at a public meeting in Helsinki on November 1, 1944. In importance this event can be compared with the foundation meeting. The period of under-

ground activity, which lasted 26 years, had come to an end. *The small party, ever the victim of police terror, had now grown into a big mass party. This was a turning point in its history.*

For Finnish-Soviet Friendship

Even the old Socia! Democratic Party of Finland was to a considerable degree imbued with the spirit of proletarian internationalism. Its prominent figures maintained contact both with the Russian and the West European labor movements. Many of them had worked personally with Lenin, true, without paying due attention to the study of Leninism. Experience of the struggle impeiled the leaders of the Finnish working-class movement, who later became Communists (Comrades Kuusinen and Sirola in the first place), to undertake a deeper study of Leninist teaching. This fact played a decisive role in the sense that the foundation meeting declared the Communist Party of Finland a supporter of proletarian internationalism.

"Glory to you, our Russian Communist comrades who so valiantly performed the work of pioneers in the interests of the world proletarian revolution!" reads the address to Lenin endorsed by the foundation meeting. The address was written by Otto Kuusinen. "Great effort and many irreplaceable sacrifices will undoubtedly have to be made by you and the working class you represent. But what is even more certain is that the triumphant international march of socialism initiated by your arms will definitely reach its goal."

This fundamental position of decisive support for the victorious Socialist Revolution was the basis of the persistent struggle which the Communist Party waged against the opponents of friendship between the peoples of Finland and the Soviet Union.

The Party adopted an unequivocal position in relation to the predatory attacks organized in 1918-22 by the reactionary bourgeoisie against Soviet Russia and against the policy of blockade. It explained that struggle against the Soviet state signified struggle against the interests of the working people of all countries and especially against those of the Finnish workers and of the Finnish nation.

At the end of 1921 the Communist Party, jointly with the then legal Socialist Labor Party, launched a mass campaign to stop the invasion of Soviet Karelia. This campaign, in which tens of thousands of people took part, prevented the Finnish government from giving official support to the predatory attacks and from embroiling Finland in a war against Soviet Russia, although this measure was demanded by the extreme Right-wing elements.

The Party was again forced to combat the attempts of Finnish reaction to start a military gamble in 1929-30. The Party and the legal Left working-class movement which followed its leadership resolutely opposed the military provocations of the fascist Lapuas movement and demanded the establishment of friendly relations with the Soviet Union. Over 100,000 workers and small farmers joined in this action and the government, even after the fascist coup of 1930, was forced to reckon with these anti-war and anti-fasicst campaigns.

Later, with the establishment of the fascist regime in Germany, the Finnish rulers renewed their preparations for war against the U.S.S.R. And again the intrigues of the Finnish fascists encountered the stubborn resistance of our Party. One of the principal demands of the united front headed by the Communist Party was that calling for friendly relations with the Soviet Union and relinquishing the arms race. But the fascist terror was ferocious and the heroic anti-war struggle ended in defeat. In 1939 the reactionary rulers, having turned the country into a Hitler bridgehead, in compliance with the will of international imperialism provoked incidents on the Soviet Finnish border and involved the country in war against the Soviet Union. All the political parties except the Communist Party supported the war policy of the fascist government.

After peace was concluded in 1940 the Party once more headed the movement for friendship between Finland and the Soviet Union. A Finnish-Soviet Peace and Friendship Society was formed with a membership of tens of thousands. But the government, which had concluded the peace only to renew its attack on the U.S.S.R. at the opportune moment, dissolved this mass organization and in 1941 entered the war as Hitler's ally.

This war, which lasted until the second half of 1944, brought incalculable suffering to the Finnish people. In its leaflets and in individual agitation by its members, the Party tried to bring home to people that the defeat of the fascists was inevitable and that peace and friendship between Finland and the Soviet Union were in the interests of the Finnish nation.

The persistent struggle waged by the Party for Finnish-Soviet friendship bore fruit. It paved the way for the historic change in Finland's foreign policy, which was of decisive

importance for the country and of great significance internationally. Some bourgeois leaders, Paasikivi for instance, who later became President of the Republic, were forced to acknowledge that the official foreign policy had been wrong precisely because of its anti-Soviet trend. All the bourgeois parties officially recognized the need to switch from a policy of war to a policy of peace, from hostility towards the Soviet Union to co-operation with it.

However, many bourgeois and Social Democratic bellicose politicians recognized the armistice commitments only in order to wait for the opportune moment to return to an anti-Soviet policy. That is why the Communist Party has throughout the postwar years fought, together with the other democratic organizations, firstly for fulfilment of the armistice terms, and then the peace treaty and, finally, for the 1948 Treaty of Friendship, Co-operation and Mutual Aid between Finland and the U.S.S.R.

It is gratifying to note that at present the movement for friendship between the two neighboring countries is being carried on by large masses of people and by the rank and file of all parties. Only die-hard militarists and their few supporters are opposed to friendship. *Today Finnish-Soviet friendship is an accomplished fact. It is the granite foundation of the stand taken by the people in the sphere of foreign policy. It is a foundation which the reactionaries are no longer able to undermine.*

The program adopted by the Party at its XIth Congress on June 2, 1957, says: "The growth of friendly relations between Finland and the Soviet Union after the war proves that the Communist Party of Finland was right when it indicated this course and fought steadfastly for its implementation. The Party will continue, as in the past, to cement in every way this friendship and co-operation which correspond to the vital interests of our country and our people and which are based on the principle of equality. The Party will resolutely combat any attempt to undermine this friendship and co-operation."

The policy of friendship and co-operation between Finland and the Soviet Union, which is based on the principle of peaceful coexistence between two states with different social systems, has contributed much to Finland's economic development in the postwar years. Finnish-Soviet trade, negligible before the war, now comprises nearly one-fifth of Finland's foreign trade. Trade with all the socialist countries accounts for more than a quarter of her foreign trade.

As early as 1948 the Soviet Union granted Finland easy terms in respect of reparation deliveries. In 1956 it returned the territory of the Porkkala-Udd Peninsula, leased for a naval base, and in 1958 it agreed to grant Finland the right to use the Saimaan Canal. In 1954 and 1955 the Soviet Union granted Finland long-term credits in gold, each to the value of 40 million roubles. This year Finland has been granted a goods credit of 400-500 million roubles. The Soviet Union agreed to alleviate the complicated employment situation in Finland by permitting her to build a hydro-electric power station on Soviet territory. These agreements are advantageous to Finland. That is why the favorable development of Finnish-Soviet relations evokes widespread support not only among the working people but also among the bourgeoisie. For instance, one of the main bourgeois parties—the Agrarian Party—constantly points out that Finland should pursue its foreign policy on the basis of Finnish-Soviet friendship. Although the leadership of this party is not always consistent in adhering to this principle, it at least refrains from rendering support to the extreme reactionary party—the Coalition Party—and the Tanner Right-wing Social Democrats in their efforts to aggravate relations between the two countries.

The reactionary circles, disregarding the national interests, are trying to change the foreign political course. In this they still get support from certain bourgeois leaders, but the overwhelming majority of the nation, opposed to the schemes of reaction, favor a foreign policy aimed at strengthening Finnish-Soviet friendship. This policy, which gives Finland obvious benefits and advantages, is influencing the Scandinavian peoples and is helping to consolidate throughout Northern Europe the forces standing for peaceful coexistence and opposing the transformation of the Northern countries into an imperialist bridgehead. In its fight for peace the Communist Party seeks united action with the Communist Parties of the Scandinavian countries.

Thus, the policy of friendship between Finland and the Soviet Union, for which the Communist Party of Finland has fought at all stages of its existence, now serves the interests of strengthening peace throughout Northern Europe.

For Rallying All the Forces of the Working People

"There are too many Communists in Parliament," proclaimed the war criminal Tanner

on May 1, 1958. Salminen, leader of the Coalition Party, expressed a similar thought a few days later. Such statements by the enemies of democracy and of the policy of peace are understandable: the large proportion of Communists in the Diet makes it impossible for the bourgeois and Social Democratic parliamentary groups to pass reactionary decisions. Although the Communists and the other members of the Democratic League (DLPF) had but one-fifth of the seats in the Diet prior to the July elections of this year, they, nevertheless, were able to prevent the passing of decisions running counter to the interests of the people.

The role of the Communist Party in the public and political life of Finland has grown considerably in the post-war years. Party membership is ten times larger than before the war.

Many democratic organizations such as the youth, women's and others are working alongside the Communist Party. The largest of these, the Democratic League, was formed in 1944. The Communist Party is affiliated to the League and it is through it that the Party participates in parliamentary activities. The Communist Party wields considerable influence in the trade union movement, despite the fact that there are Social Democrats in the leadership of the Central Association of Trade Unions. The Communists see in the Association an organization which rallies the working class, and take part in its activities, and in those of other mass organzations, with the aim of cementing the unity of the working masses.

In 1945-48 the Communist Party formed part of the People's Democrats (DLFP) group in the Diet and was represented in the government on the basis of an agreement between the three main groups: Social Democrats, People's Democrats and the Agrarian Party. At this time, in keeping with the terms of the Peace Treaty, public life was democratized: fascist organizations were dissolved and democratic organizations were enabled to function. Furthermore, foundations were laid for a policy of friendship between Finland and the Soviet Union. The war-devastated economy was rehabilitated, productivity increased and the standard of living of the working people improved. The conditions for all-round democratic development were created in the country.

But democratic development was halted in 1948 when the parliamentary groups of the Social Democrats and the Agrarian Party violated the agreement on co-operation. Furthering the desires of the Right-wing circles, the two factions initiated a policy designed to isolate the People's Democrats. The latter, together with the Communists, were ousted from the government, exactly as had been done somewhat earlier in France and Italy on the orders of the American imperialists. Fagerholm, leader of the Social Democratic Party, acted as the trustee of foreign and Finnish reaction. He formed a Social Democratic government which began to pursue an anti-democratic policy. It even tried to complicate relations with the Soviet Union by taking a line against the Treaty on Friendship, Co-operation and Mutual Aid. This evoked differences among the anti-Communist forces. A split took place in the Social Democratic parliamentary group and later in the Social Democratic Party. Part of the Social Democrats, including the official leadership headed by Tanner and Leskinen, joined forces with the extreme Right-wing Coalition Party, thereby rendering support to its policy. The opposition, led by Skog and Simonen, relied on the support of the Agrarian Party. The Social Democratic leaders in the Central Association of Trade Unions, including Uero Antikainen, and others, announced their intention of forming a third group, though they actually supported the Skog group. This regrouping of forces explains the frequent changes of government in recent years, since no single group commanded a stable majority in the Diet.

The split in the anti-Communist groups was also caused by the popular discontent with the reactionary economic policy which began with the removal of the Communists from the government. This policy worsened the economic situation in the country, bringing it to the verge of an economic crisis. Between January and April of this year industrial output declined nearly 8 per cent compared with the corresponding period for the preceding year. Building work declined 20 per cent and exports—approximately 7 per cent.

The working class fought back in an attempt to prevent the further deterioration of its position and, as a result of a general strike, won a wage increase early in 1956. However, the subsequent rise in prices and rent reduced real wages by 17 per cent compared with the 1956 level. Last winter there were about 80,000 unemployed in the country. Some of these were engaged in emergency schemes organized by the municipalities, but their wages were considerably lower (in some cases even 50 per cent lower). There are still tens of thousands of unemployed, which is

unprecedented for Finland. Incomes of small farmers have likewise fallen.

Thus, living standards have declined in recent years with resultant mass discontent. That is why the leaders of the parties responsible for government policy, especially the leaders of the Agrarian Party and the Social Democratic Party, tried during the recent election campaign to evade responsibility for the difficulties and the unsatisfactory economic situation.

The Social Democratic leaders still refuse to co-operate with the Communists. The rank and file of the Social Democratic Party criticize their leaders for indulging in interminable controversies as to which of the bourgeois parties offers the best opportunity for collaboration. The Social Democratic leaders have also been criticized for their reluctance to co-operate with the Communist Party. This attitude of the rank and file Social Democrats favors rapprochement between the Communist and Social Democratic workers and the small farmers; conditions are being created for co-operation at lower levels—in the enterprises, in the villages and also in the trade union branches.

The consistent policy of unity pursued by the Communist Party is winning ever-increasing support among the people. However, a sharp change in this direction is hardly to be expected in the near future. Consolidation of working-class unity and the formation of a common militant alliance of all working people can be achieved only by painstaking and concentrated effort. Hence the XIth Congress included in the Party program a paragraph stating the Party's favorable attitude towards all democratic organizations, including the Social Democratic Party: "The Party will do its utmost to establish relations of confidence and close co-operation between workers of different political convictions and the organizations representing them; it will seek to remove all obstacles standing in the way of co-operation between the working class parties. It will work tirelessly to cement the ties between the workers and the small farmers. The Party is ready to co-operate fruitfully with all parties enjoying the support of the working people both under capitalism and during the transition to socialism, as well as in the period of socialist construction."

The persistent struggle of the Communists for working-class unity and for broader co-operation of all the democratic forces is supported neither by the Social Democratic leaders headed by Leskinen and backed by the Right-wing bourgeoisie, nor by the Skog followers backed by the moderate bourgeoisie. The Agrarian Party likewise rejects co-operation with the Communists. Confident of their victory on the eve of the general election in July, both the Social Democratic and Agrarian leaders supported the anti-Communist slogans of the reactionaries and predicted defeat for the Communists. Had their prediction come true it would have seriously undermined the unity of the working people and the co-operation of the democratic forces.

But the hopes of the enemies of working-class unity were dashed. The People's Democrats (with whom the Communists co-operate)—formerly the third largest parliamentary group—emerged as the largest group, polling 450,000 votes and winning 50 seats. The Social Democratic Party, formerly the largest parliamentary group, polled 448,000 votes and won 48 seats. The Agrarian Party—formerly the second largest party in the Diet—polled approximately the same vote as the Social Democrats and won 48 seats. The so-called "independent Social Democrats" won 3 seats. After the Scog followers formed an independent parliamentary group of 13 deputies, the number of seats held by the Right-wing Social Democrats headed by Leskinen and Tanner was reduced to 38 (provided the Social Democratic groups fail to reach agreement).

The correlation of forces among the Right-wing bourgeois parties—the Coalition, Popular and Swedish People's parties—has also changed: the Coalition Party won 5 seats, the Swedish People's Party — 1, while the Popular Party lost 5 of its former 13 seats.

Thus the greatest success in the general election was registered by the Democratic League, the main force of which is the Communist Party.

The Tanner Social Democrats, who hastened to announce a "socialist majority" as a result of the elections (the People's Democrats, Social Democratic Party and the "independent" Social Democrats hold 101 seats against 99 held by the bourgeois parties), have again refused to co-operate with the Communists. This reactionary attitude feeds the Right-wing bourgeoisie with the hope that, as in the past (notwithstanding the considerable growth of the democratic forces), it will be able to retain its rule.

The Communist Party has proposed that a government of genuinely democratic co-operation be formed. It cautions that the formation of a reactionary government will lead to economic crisis, infringement of civil rights and possible complications in the sphere of foreign relations. In a statement published on

July 12, the Central Committee of the Party pointed out: "Such a turn of events, disastrous for our whole nation, can be averted. The People's Democrats, the Social Democrats and the Agrarian Party control three-fourths of the seats in Parliament. With such a majority, and given the desire, a stable democratic government could be formed, capable of defending the interests of the workers and small farmers who comprise the vast majority of the people."

The Central Committee outlined a number of urgent measures by means of which it would be possible to improve the conditions of the working people; it pointed out that the bourgeois parties would be unable to prevent the implementation of these measures provided all the members voted into Parliament by the workers and small farmers are prepared, like the Communists, to honor their election pledges.

* * *

During the forty years of its existence the Communist Party of Finland has done much to improve the conditions of the working class, the working peasantry, progressive intellectuals, the middle strata and the people as a whole. The Communist Party has always been in the forefront of the struggle for democratic rights. It has waged a persistent struggle against revisionists of all hues, for the purity of the Marxist-Leninist teaching, for educating the masses in the spirit of proletarian internationalism. The fight waged for Finnish-Soviet friendship is a glorious tradition of the Finnish Communist Party. At present the Party is the most reliable force standing guard over the peace-loving policy of Finland.

The history of the Communist Party of Finland convincingly disproves the revisionist assertions that the Communist Party of a small country has neither weight nor significance. Even while underground, the Party was the backbone of all the militant anti-fascist democratic forces. After emerging from the underground it grew into a large mass party, without which Finland would have been unable to ensure her democratic development.

And although the Communist Party and the People's Democrats have not yet succeeded in piercing the front of reaction, which still prevents them from playing a part in deciding important questions of state, the People's Democrats, nevertheless, have secured a place in Parliament, and the Communist Party enjoys such mass support, that they are in a position to exert considerable influence on government policy. The complaints of the reactionaries that "there are too many Communists in Parliament" proves in the first place that the democratic forces, under the leadership of the Communist Party, are capable of frustrating the attempts of reaction to change the country's political course.

The history of the Communist Party of Finland teaches that the stronger the Communist Party, the firmer the positions of democracy in Finland. The further strengthening of the Party will, undoubtedly, help accelerate the democratic development of the country, ensure peace, and guarantee that in the future Finland will make an even greater contribution to peace in Europe, and Northern Europe in particular.

The Struggle for Trade Union Unity in Australia

Richard Dixon

AUSTRALIAN trade unionism, which is essentially reformist, has made important advances in building unity, strengthening trade union organization and raising the class understanding of its members.

The last Congress of trade unions, September 1957, reflected these trends by including four prominent Communist trade union officials and other progressive leaders on the sixteen-member Australian Trade Union Council.

Moreover, at this Congress, much to the dismay of reaction, the organization of the extreme Right-wing, the Industrial Groups, was completely routed. With the full support of the capitalist press, they had tried to disrupt the Congress by raising anti-Communist issues, but failed ignominiously. Only

a small minority of delegates voted with them.

The post-war history of the labor movement in Australia has been marked by stormy internal struggles to overcome the splitting activities of the Industrial Groups.

The Industrial Group organization was established shortly after World War II, for the express purpose of combating Communism in industry and in the trade unions.

The Australian Labor Party made the decision to organize the Groups, but the initiative, as well as the drive, came from forces linked with the Catholic Church.

In its development, the Industrial Group organization became the directing center of the extreme Right-wing in the Australian Labor Party and the trade union movement. Industrial Groups were formed in factories and unions to fight the Left.

The centrist forces in the Australian Labor Party and trade unions, afraid of the Left, connived with the Right. As a consequence the Industrial Groups were able to exert an influence in the leading bodies of the Australian Labor Party and the central organs of the trade union movement that far exceeded their support among the workers.

In foreign affairs they were ardent advocates of the policy of the American warmongers. They slandered the Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic and the People's Democracies. They condemned the national-liberation movements and supported colonialism and, during the war of liberation in Vietnam, advocated intervention on the side of French imperialism.

Internally, they were the banner-bearers of McCarthyism, slandering the Communist Party and smearing all progressive people and organizations. They collaborated with the employers and state forces, played a disruptive role in the trade unions and opposed or sabotaged strikes. They supported the Menzies Tory Government in its attacks on the Communist Party and the trade unions.

The Communist Party led the fight against the reactionary trends in the labor movement, calling for united action to win the economic demands of the workers, to defend liberties and peace.

About 25 per cent of the workers in Australia are Catholics and, obviously, it is impossible to build working-class unity without them. The Communist Party urged all workers, Catholic and non-Catholic alike, to unite in order to defend their living standards, which were under attack from the employers.

The Industrial Groups tried to foment Party divisions among the workers, claiming that the main issue in the factories and unions was A.L.P. versus the Communist Party. Pointing out that this attempt to set worker against worker could only benefit the capitalists, the Communist Party countered with the slogan: Unity of all workers, irrespective of Party or religion, against the boss.

The splitting activities of the Industrial Groups met with some success in union elections. The most serious set-back for the Left was in the Iron Workers' Union, a union for unskilled and semi-skilled metal workers.

In this union Communists, who were tireless union workers and certainly the most capable forces available, had been elected to nearly all the leading positions, though the majority of the union members were supporters of the Australian Labor Party. Failure to ensure a correct united front in the union leadership and among the rank and file, together with other sectarian mistakes, weakened their influence amongst the members. The Industrial Groups, supported by the reactionary press and organs of the capitalist state, in union elections that were controlled by the Government returning officer and not the union, succeeded in defeating the Left and gaining control of the union.

Obviously, if defeats such as that in the Iron Workers' Union were to be avoided, the united front had to be consistently and thoroughly applied in all aspects of union activity and leadership. Not only was it imperative to consult fully with the members of the union on their problems, it was essential that the union leadership should include representatives of the Labor Party and non-Party workers. This form of unity in the leading committees of unions was called: "Sharing the leadership."

Concerned at these developments, the Industrial Groups engineered the expulsion from the Australian Labor Party of members who had agreed to unity and a joint union ticket. Many were expelled, but the idea of "sharing the leadership" caught on. Unity at the top helped consolidate unity among the workers in industry.

Defense of democratic liberties has occupied the attention of the trade union movement since the election of the Menzies Government at the end of 1949.

This Government, whose policy is dictated by monopoly capital, immediately proceeded to associate Australia more closely with the imperialist war camp and to foster reaction.

It sought to remove the Communist influence from the trade unions by forceful means

and to create what Australian Labor Party leader J. B. Chifley called "Tame Cat" unions.

The Government passed legislation in 1950 declaring the Communist Party illegal and making it unlawful for a Communist to hold any official position in a trade union. Under this legislation the Government would decide who could, or could not, contest trade union positions.

Not only the Communist Party but the Australian Labor Party and the trade union movement condemned Menzies' legislation as a most dangerous threat to the rights and liberties of the people and especially of the labor movement. There was powerful opposition to the anti-Communist law. The High Court, when called upon by the trade unions and the Communist Party to decide on the validity, or otherwise, of this law, declared it invalid.

The Menzies Government then sought the constitutional power to ban the Communist Party, by submitting the fascist law to a referendum of the people, in September 1951.

All sections of the labor movement, the Labor Party, Communist Party and trade union movement campaigned vigorously to reject the Menzies law.

In the outcome, 2,317,927 voted for the Government and 2,370,009, or a majority of 52,082, voted against. The legality of the Communist Party was, thereby, preserved.

In this vital campaign there was no formal agreement on unity between the Communists and the Labor Party, but in the factories many unity committees sprang up as Communist, Labor and non-Party workers jointly campaigned for the defeat of the Menzies Referendum.

Another line of the attack of monopoly and the Federal Government against the trade union movement was through the Arbitration Courts.

In Australia, Arbitration Courts and Wages Tribunals, established by State and Federal Governments, determine wages, hours, conditions of work, and deal with industrial disputes. The decisions of the Courts have the force of law.

According to the moth-eaten theory of the bourgeois and the reformist Labor and trade union leaders, the Arbitration Courts are impartial bodies, standing above classes, with the function of regulating the relations between capitalist and worker and preventing or settling industrial disputes. In this atmosphere of class collaboration, the class struggle, presumably, was to disappear. Unfortunately for this miserable theory, which the revisionists now so hopefully expound, the class struggle could not be banished, nor could the class character of the Arbitration system be hidden.

In practice, a strike brought the workers, almost invariably, into open conflict with both the employers and the Arbitration Court. Thus, the very system of compulsory Arbitration lends a political significance to strikes. Inevitably, the close relationship of employers, Government and state forces are forcibly revealed.

In the post-war years, the offensive of monopoly capital against the working class intensified and the number of strikes increased as the workers fought to maintain and improve their living standards.

Government action was sought by the monopoly interests to curb the trade unions.

Legislation was passed by the Menzies Government increasing the powers of the Federal Arbitration Court to deal with the unions. In the first place, this legislation empowered the Court to impose heavy fines on unions for strikes or other forms of action for limiting production, such as "go slow" or overtime bans. Provision was also made for fining or jailing union officials and strikers.

In 1956, after a successful Court challenge to this legislation, the Menzies Government set up a special court, known among the workers as the "Court of Pains and Penalties," to deal with the unions in breach of decisions of the Arbitration Court.

Menzies' anti-trade union law makes strikes illegal. Although this law was directed mainly at the militant unions, which were spearheading the resistance to the capitalist offensive, various reformist-led unions have also come under its penalties.

Opposition to it is growing on a wide trade union front. The Australian Council of Trade Unions in condemning penal action against unions, reaffirmed the "right to strike" as a principle vital to the trade union movement and is calling for repeal of the legislation.

Under the anti-trade union law, a small minority of union members can petition for a court ballot and secure the appointment of the Government Returning Officer to conduct the ballot which is then taken completely out of control of the union. There were also other provisions in this law under which the Arbitration Court could interfere in trade union ballots and in internal union matters. The Court has extensive power to enforce its decisions, including heavy penalties, removal of officers and appointment of others.

This vicious section was introduced on the proposal of the Industrial Groups. Its imple-

mentation depended upon co-operation of the latter with the Government and the state authorities. Union after union was forced to submit to ballots controlled by the Government Returning Officer.

Opposition to these anti-trade union practices grew as big sections of Labor Party supporters joined with the militant workers in the fight for union-controlled ballots.

The anti-trade union law was designed to suppress strikes, eliminate the militant trade union leaders and break the workers' resistance to the attacks of monopoly capital.

In all this, it has failed. Strikes have continued. Criticism of the Courts has multiplied. The Australian Council of Trade Unions has urged unions to negotiate directly with the employers instead of submitting claims to Arbitration.

In this wide field of union rights and liberties, the trade unions are heading for a showdown with the Tory Government. Unity is on the march. Reformist and militant unions alike are insisting on the abolition of laws providing for penal action against strikes and interference in the internal affairs of unions.

At the end of 1954 a major change came over the labor movement when the Industrial Groups split the Labor Party.

In order to swing the Australian Labor Party more sharply to the Right, the Group leaders had planned to capture the main national positions and policy-making bodies. The bitter internal struggle that ensued burst into the open when the national leader of the Party, Dr. Evatt, publicly denounced the Industrial Groups for disruption and betrayal of the Labor Party. This was followed by decisions of the Australian Labor Party Conferences to disband the Groups.

In the State of Victoria, and later in Queensland, the Group leaders split the Labor forces in the Parliaments and brought about the downfall of Labor Governments and the defeat of the Labor Party in the subsequent elections. They formed a break-away party, the so-called Democratic Labor Party which, in fact, is anti-Labor and anti-democratic.

With no hope of succeeding in Parliamentary elections, the main purpose of the Democratic Labor Party, as its leaders admit, is to divert sufficient votes from the Australian Labor Party to defeat it and thereby keep the Tory party in office.

Thus have the Industrial Groups, the extreme Right-wing in the Labor movement, appeared in their true colors. Under the tattered banner of anti-Communism, they attacked everything working class. They used their position in the Australian Labor Party to disrupt the working-class movement. Finally, when exposed, they emerge as bitter opponents of even the moderate-reformist policy of this Party and openly espouse the cause of the worst enemies of the working class, the monopoly capitalists and the Menzies Government.

With the defeat of the extreme Right-wing, Australian Labor Party Conferences reviewed various aspects of Labor policy, eliminating the reactionary influence of the Groups. In foreign policy a more progressive stand was taken. The Party called for the withdrawal of Australian troops from Malaya, for the abolition of the testing and use of A- and H-weapons and, more recently, they supported the idea of a Summit Conference to ease world tension and strengthen peace. They also declared for repeal of the penal clauses of the Arbitration law and for a number of moderate social reforms.

The position in industry and in the trade unions was marked by a growth of working-class unity. Labor supporters no longer feared the Groups. The Center in the trade union movement, dominated, despite its majority, by the extreme Right, now began to assert itself, and relations with the militant unions improved.

Many trade union positions were wrested from Right-wing control as a result of the joint effort of Communist, Labor Party and non-Party workers.

On the economic front the trade union movement was faced with big decisions. The Arbitration Court froze wages and the Government and employers were on the attack, especially against the waterside workers. In this situation the attitude of the Australian Council of Trade Unions to the pending battles was crucial.

In 1949, when the miners launched a national strike for higher wages and better conditions, they were opposed not only by the coal barons but also by the Federal Labor Government, in office at the time, and the Australian Council of Trade Unions. These bodies succeeded in swinging the reformist unions against the strike. They isolated the militant unions and the miners were defeated.

Profiting from that experience the Shipowners and Government tried to isolate the Waterside Workers' Federation from the main body of the trade union movement and then smash it.

They did not succeed in this. In the big

National Waterfront Strikes in 1954 and again in 1956 the Waterside Workers' Federation secured the support of the Australian Council of Trade Unions. The trade union movement rallied around the Union in a powerful expression of unity and, as a result, significant gains were won.

These big struggles, and many smaller ones, helped to build trade union unity on a national scale and to strengthen the authority and influence of the Australian Council of Trade Unions, as the central body of the trade union movement.

A marked change is also to be seen in the approach of the trade union movement to international relations.

The Australian Council of Trade Unions is affiliated to the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions. When the Industrial Groups were dominant, they forced through a decision forbidding any union to maintain links with the World Federation of Trade Unions.

In 1957 and 1958, however, the Australian Council of Trade Unions sent a delegation to the People's Republic of China as guests of the Chinese trade union movement. It was also represented at the all-China Trade Union Congress at the end of 1957 and has decided to invite representatives of the Chinese trade unions to visit Australia as guests of the A.C.T.U.

In the struggle for world peace there has also been a notable change. When the Industrial Groups were at the height of their influence, peace organizations were on the banned list and activity for peace in the reformist unions was negligible. Now, these unions are much more ready to support the struggle for peace. The A.C.T.U. supported the Stockholm Peace Congress. Also, the trade union movement organized a week of peace activity in support of the Summit Conference and to demand the abolition of A- and H-bomb tests and the banning of nuclear weapons.

The conditions for the trade union work are changing. All the signs of capitalist crisis are apparent in the Australian economy. Full employment is giving way to mass unemployment. In these circumstances the trade union struggle becomes more difficult.

The growth of working-class unity and the strengthening of trade unions and their leadership signify that the Australian trade union movement is better equipped to meet and solve the problems of future class battles.

Algeria for the Algerians

Larby Bouhali

THE four-year-long armed struggle of the Algerian people for independence and national dignity has smashed completely the colonial barriers erected to isolate the country from the rest of the world and turn her "forever into a French territory" (de Gaulle). This struggle has clearly shown the existence of the Algerian nation which for over a century the French colonialist bourgeoisie have sought to deprive of its national identity.

The French imperialists and their theorists allege that in 1830 Algeria was "nothing, a void." Harping on the fable about "the dark ages of the Maghreb,"* they want to erase the glorious past of our people and prove that our history dates only from 1830, that is, from the year they began the colonization of Algeria. The French historian E. F. Gautier claims that, by "nature," the Algerians "are unfitted for self-government." These assertions are invoked in an attempt to justify France's "civilizing mission" in Algeria.

There is no denying, of course, that in 1830 the Algerians, in the scientific sense of the term, were not yet a nation. But Algeria was no more backward at that time than the peoples of the neighboring fraternal countries, Morocco and Tunisia. The factors that later contributed to the formation of the Moroccan and Tunisian nations also existed in 1830 in Algeria.

One of the sources of the national sentiment of our people is their eventful history. There was the struggle waged by the Algerian peasants against the foreign invaders, for freedom and land; and there were the vigorous activities of the Berber kings, among them Massinissa, who strove to unite the country. We are proud of Jugurtha,

*Maghreb ("West" in Arabic) is the name of the Northwest African countries—Morocco, Algeria and Tunisia.—Author's note.

Tacfarinas and Firmus, whose names remind us of the glorious battles fought by our forefathers against the Romans, Vandals, Byzantines and other invaders, and inspire our young National-Liberation Army in its struggle.

The Arabs who came to North Africa put an end to the nightmare of ceaseless invasions, which brought nothing but devastation and enslavement. Bearers of a splendid civilization, they were hailed as liberators and not invaders. Like their brethren in Morocco and Tunisia, the Berbers of Algeria adopted Islam. The impress of the Arab-Moslem civilization in these three North African countries is so deep that they consider their destiny to be closely linked with that of all the Arab nations fighting against imperialism, for their unity.

The organization by the three fraternal peoples of independent states dates back to the 16th century. It was at that time that the Algerian state took shape under Khair-ed-Din, and the city of Algiers became its capital. At first a vassal of Turkey, it gradually grew more and more independent. It was at that time, too, that its modern frontiers, embracing the Algerian part of the Sahara, were delineated.

In 1830, when she became the object of French colonial expansion, Algeria was an independent state and maintained diplomatic relations with a number of countries, France included. She had her own administrative establishments, her own army, her own central government. Agriculture was so developed that she exported large quantities of grain to France and other European countries. Algeria was then on the threshold of a new phase of political, economic and social development. On the one hand she was united as a state and, on the other, her people were rallying in opposition to the ruling minority, the feudal beys of Turkish origin.

It is difficult to say precisely how Algerian society would have evolved after 1830 if the French colonialists had not invaded the country. One thing, however, is certain, that even then our institutions were not a whit less modern than those of some of the sovereign states of today. The epic struggle of Emir Abd-el-Kader* and his rapid achievements in setting up new state institutions testify to the powerful tendency for unity, and show that, economically, Algeria was about to cross the border-line of pre-capitalist relations. Subsequent development would have seen the formation of the Algerian nation in conditions of independent statehood. But this process was hampered by the French invasion.

Algeria has a population of about 10,000,000 of whom 9,000,000 are Arabs and Berbers (the overwhelming majority of the latter are Arabized) and 1,000,000 Europeans. Approximately half the Europeans are French, the rest are Spaniards, Italians, Maltese and others. It should be noted that this million includes about 130,000 Jews, descendants of the Jews who were among the first settlers in Algeria. It was not fortuitous that a considerable part of the European population, mostly workers, officials, handicraftsmen, small merchants and settlers, found themselves in Algeria. Settlement of Frenchmen and other Europeans was encouraged by the colonialists, who thus hoped to create a counterbalance to the Algerian masses. Like the inhabitants of metropolitan France, the Europeans and Jews are French citizens.

So that Algeria and her riches should serve none but the colonialists a special political and administrative system of the colonial type was needed. Having occupied the country, the colonialists proceeded to systematically abolish Algerian state institutions, replacing them with a colonial administrative system. Algerians were removed from the government and power passed into the hands of the French colonialists and their stooges.

Algeria is now ruled by a French governor-general appointed by the French government. As in France, there are municipalities, but three-fifths of the councillors are Europeans and the mayors, as a rule, are settlers (i.e. European landowners). In the rural areas, where the greater part of the native population lives, power is in the hands of a semi-military, semi-feudal administration, the chief function of which is to keep the Algerians in submission by means of violence and cruel repression.

This system has brought definite results to its organizers.

Take, for instance, agriculture (the population is 80 per cent peasant). As a result of confiscation and downright robbery. the most fertile land is now in the hands of European settlers or big capitalist companies. The peasants have been pushed into arid and mountainous areas. For instance, 21,650 European landowners own 2,703,000 hectares of cultivated and pasture land, while

*National hero and leader of the Algerian liberation movement against the French colonizers in 1832-47.—Author's note.

600,000 Algerian peasants own but 7,133,000 hectares.

Agriculture was shaped to bring maximum profit to the colonialists, not to meet the requirements of the population. Yet, prior to the French invasion of 1830, Algeria grew more grain than she could consume. In those days, only 2,000 hectares were planted to grapes. Today, grapes are grown on upwards of 400,000 hectares of the best land for, although most Algerians do not drink wine, it brings huge profits to the colonialists. The end result is that there is not enough grain for local consumption.

The French rulers have always regarded Algeria as a colony. That is the reason why, despite her mineral wealth, no basic industries have been built. Iron, phosphates, copper, lead and other ores, and oil (its estimated annual output may reach 10 million tons by 1960), instead of being processed locally are exported to France and other European countries. The almost complete absence of manufacturing industries has made Algeria an excellent market for French production. She is thus doomed to remain an agrarian country, a source of cheap raw materials and labor for French capitalism. Mines, banks, transport, the greater part of wholesale trade, some branches of light industry and public utilities are all in the hands of the colonialist bourgeoisie.

The colonialists' policy in agriculture, industry and trade has retarded the growth of Algeria's national bourgeoisie and proletariat. It has ruined large numbers of Algerian handicraftsmen, increasing the ranks of the unemployed to over 1,500,000.

France's "civilizing mission" boils down to filling the pockets of the financial tycoons at the expense of the native people. The baseness of this "mission" can be seen from the state of Algeria's cultural life. Arabic, which is spoken by the overwhelming majority of the population and which even the Kabyles want as the official language, is taboo. It is not taught in schools; moreover, officially, it is considered a foreign language: the colonialists fear that it may help to spread national ideals and promote rapprochement with other Arabic-speaking nations. Private schools and teachers undertaking to teach Arabic at the request of the people and with their financial support are constantly persecuted. French, a language which is really alien to the overwhelming majority of Algerians, is the official language.

Education is conducted only in French, and the school text-books distort Algeria's past. But even with this system, education is accessible only to the children of Europeans. Algerian children are almost completely deprived of the opportunity to go to school, with the result that 85 per cent remain illiterate.

Attempts are also made to deprive art of its national character. In 1947, for instance, the Arab Theatre was allowed to perform at the Algiers Opera House only once a week. Patriotic singers, poets and artists suffer from censorship and are often jailed.

Nor has Islam, whose role in the people's anti-imperialist struggle has been and continues to be progressive, escaped persecution. It is the only religion placed under supervision of the colonial administration; the others are professed freely. The administration gives every support to the white missionaries, who have been given the job of converting the Moslems to Christianity (unsuccessfully, by the way, for the number of converts over the past century has not exceeded a few thousand) and of lauding France's "civilizing mission".

Everything has been done to turn the Algerian into a man without a country, to make him a foreigner in his native land. But all the attempts to break our people physically and spiritually have failed. They have preserved their traditions, their language and their religion which has helped them in the struggle against the invaders.

Moreover, the colonial policy, all unconsciously, is accelerating certain factors conducive to the formation of the Algerian nation. By ruining the tribal economy the colonialists effected economic unification, which is essential for national unity. The mass expropriation of peasants, the transport developments, the growth of the towns, the influx of landless peasants to the urban communities and the emerging working class—all have enhanced the national consciousness.

The development of the Algerian nation, now a living reality, has been influenced also by such factors as the Great October Socialist Revolution—which smashed the chains fettering the tsarist colonies and showed the oppressed nations the way to liberation; by the Second World War and the promises contained in the Atlantic Charter; and by the liberation of a number of Asian

---

*Kabyles live in Greater Kabylia (a mountainous region in Western Algeria) and Small Kabylia (in the north-west of the Constantine Department).—Author's note.

colonies. The Algerian nation of today is composed mainly of Algerians of Arab and Berber origin, but it does not exclude those Europeans who live in Algeria and regard it as their country. In fact, many Europeans are taking part in our struggle and many have given their lives for freedom and independence.

Whether the French colonialists like it or not, the Algerian nation exists, and its viability has been proved by the glorious four-year struggle waged by the National-Liberation Army.

* * *

It would be a grave error to think that the present resistance movement in Algeria began on November 1, 1954. It really began in 1832-47 with the epic struggle of the Algerian national hero, Emir Abd-el-Kader, and has continued in diverse forms to our day. Time and again Algerians have taken to arms against the invader. There were the Ziban uprising, the Aures and Oases insurrection of 1851, the revolts of the Beni Snassen and Ouled-Sidi-Cheikh tribes and the uprising led by Mohamed El Mokrani in Kabylia in 1871. The Ouled-Sidi-Cheikh tribe again rebelled in 1882, and in 1916 there were the Aures uprising and the insurrection launched by the Beni Chougran tribe.

The national-liberation movement of the modern type began during the inter-war years. Its demands were invariably rejected by France, although at first all it called for was peaceful reform. After the war the national political parties, the trade unions and some cultural and religious organizations —for instance, the Moslem Ulema Association—strove, within a legal framework, for a just and peaceful solution of the Algerian national problem. But, bent on retaining their dominating positions and privileges, the French colonialists resorted more and more to force.

In May 1945, the Algerian people, who had displayed their will for freedom during the war, joined the other nations in celebrating victory over the Nazis. This served the colonialists as a pretext for a monstrous provocation. As a result, the French military slaughtered 45,000 Algerians in the space of a few months. The idea behind this provocation was to drown in blood the national aspirations of the Algerian people.

On November 1, 1954, no longer willing to reconcile themselves to the violence which was an affront to their national dignity, the Algerians again took to arms for their national liberation. The above-mentioned facts clearly show that the national-liberation war of today is not an isolated fact, not a chance phenomenon, but the logical continuation of the people's century-old resistance to the colonialists.

The insurrection of November 1, 1954, was launched not by a group of parties or by any of the parties then in existence. It was started by a group of young patriots of modest social standing—petty bourgeois and workers—with the support of the poor peasants, the backbone of the first guerrilla units in the mountains. Its organizers then set up the National-Liberation Front and its National-Liberation Army. The Algerian people, who saw no way out of their unbearable position other than armed struggle, responded enthusiastically to the call of the National-Liberation Front. All the nationalist parties and organizations dissolved and their members joined the Front organizations. Now the fight for freedom is being waged in one way or another by all strata of the population—peasants, workers, intellectuals, petty bourgeoisie, bourgeoisie and even by many feudalists who have broken with the colonial administration.

Thus the national unity of the people has been forged in the struggles led by the National-Liberation Front. Fully aware of its significance, the Algerians are ready to make any sacrifice for their right to independence. Everywhere they give every possible support to the National-Liberation Army, which is fighting under a unified command and according to a unified strategic plan. It is led by well-trained officers and is increasingly better armed. Never before have the French imperialists encountered such well organized armed resistance.

The Algerians know what they are fighting for and why they are making the sacrifices. At its Congress in Soummam on August 20, 1956, the National-Liberation Front stressed that its aims were independence. a democratic and social republic, radical agrarian reforms, the right of the Europeans in Algeria to Algerian citizenship on a par with the native population, relations with France on a basis of freedom and equality, close ties with Tunisia and Morocco within the framework of a North-African alliance, implementation of the Bandung principles.

The Algerian Communist Party is actively and fully participating in the liberation struggle. In 1956, anxious to promote the unification of all the national armed forces it transferred, in agreement with the Na-

tional-Liberation Front, all its armed units to the command of the National-Liberation Army. The Party has called on all its members and sympathizers, on all the working people of Algeria, to unite in a single national trade union center—the General Union of Algerian Workers.

The Party, however, does not think it would be right to dissolve itself and call on its members to join the National-Liberation Front individually, as suggested by the latter. And not merely because this would be contrary to its principles. The Algerian Communists believe that they can best serve their fighting country by acting as the organized party of the working class and poor peasantry, as a party equipped with Marxist-Leninist theory. But, while remaining independent politically and organizationally, our Party fully supports the anti-imperialist activity of the National-Liberation Front and the idea of unity of action.

★ ★ ★

The French colonialist bourgeoisie, still guided by 19th century concepts, wants to smash the resistance of our people just as its predecessors crushed the uprisings of Emir Abd-el-Kader in 1847 and Mohamed El Mokrani in 1871. That is why it is pursuing a policy so costly for the French people. For the war in Algeria entails a daily expenditure of two billion francs, further deterioration of France's financial and economic position, corruption of the young men taking part in the colonial war, attacks on rights and liberties and the danger of fascist dictatorship, subordination to American imperialism, which is giving France credits, arms and diplomatic support against the Algerian people; then there is the growing world-wide indignation at France's imperialist policy. The desire to suppress the resistance of the Algerian people has forced the colonialist bourgeoisie to resort to its last trump: to appeal to the "Man of Providence," — General de Gaulle. Speaking in Lyons on May 11, 1958, the ardent Gaullist Georges Bidault frankly declared: "If the Republic proves incapable of saving Algeria, I shall mourn over Algeria more than over the Republic."

According to General de Gaulle, "Algeria is France." There are 10 million "Frenchmen" there, he said. This denial of the Algerian nation and its unchallengeable right to independence can only signify the continuation and intensification of the ruinous war.

But belief in the possibility of military victory of French imperialism over the Algerian people signifies an utter lack of understanding of the international situation and the spirit of the times.

The November 1957 Declaration of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist countries forcefully stresses: "The tremendous growth of the forces of socialism has stimulated the rapid extension of the anti-imperialist national movement in the post-war period . . . The progress of socialism and of the national-liberation movement has greatly accelerated the disintegration of imperialism."

Out of the 1.5 billion people held in colonial durance before World War II, 1.3 billion have won freedom, and some nations, like the 600 million Chinese, are already building socialism!

The people of Algeria, whose fight against the French colonialists has grown in scale during the past four years, know that they are not alone in their aspirations. They know that their struggle is a component of the vast anti-imperialist movement for independence and peace. They know that their valiant struggle is a modest contribution to this movement, and that this movement, in its turn, is giving them invaluable support.

The people have enjoyed the effective and inviolable solidarity of the Arab nations, particularly of the fraternal Egyptian people, since the very first days of their liberation struggle. The solidarity of other nations with our people is likewise growing stronger. This can be seen in the resolutions adopted at Bandung, Cairo, Accra and Tangier. And true to the principle of self-determination, the socialist countries and the international Communist and labor movement fully support the Algerian people's aspirations to freedom and independence.

An important new factor emerged in April of this year, and the French rulers will err badly if they underestimate its impact on the war in Algeria. This factor was the Tangier Conference and its momentous decisions. As already reported, the representatives of Morocco, Algeria and Tunisia resolved to reach a goal that is dear to every North-African — the establishment of a united Maghreb federation. They decided to set up a Maghreb consultative assembly of representatives of the Moroccan and Tunisian National Assemblies and the National Council of Algerian Revolution, to establish a permanent secretariat of the Arab Maghreb and to recommend that the leaders of the three countries meet periodically to discuss ways and means of implementing the consultative assembly proposals. It is clear, however, that

Maghreb unity can become a reality only after the re-establishment of Algeria's independence and the withdrawal of all imperialist forces (French, Spanish and American) from North Africa.

The Tangier Conference stressed that the early establishment of a federation of the three North-African countries necessitated the immediate liberation of Algeria. Our country cannot languish in chains when there exist side by side free Morocco and Tunisia. And these two fraternal countries cannot really enjoy independence while Algeria remains under the colonialist yoke and suffers from a devastating war. That is why the solidarity of 25 million North-Africans was so vividly reflected at the Tangier Conference. Moreover, it is common knowledge that the three North-African nations are linked by strong bonds of solidarity with all the Arab countries. These bonds are being cemented by the necessity of opposing the imperialist policy of colonial domination, exploitation and war. In these circumstances, he who decides to continue the war against the Algerian people endangers not only the security of Tunisia and Morocco, but also peace in the Mediterranean.

The colonialists pretend that the notorious idea of Franco-Algerian "integration" is the only real solution for the Algerian problem. In reality, this "solution" is tantamount to recognition of the failure of a policy proclaimed more than 100 years ago. For Algeria was proclaimed a "French territory" away back in 1848. In those days the colonial powers were carving up the world, subordinating the weaker peoples and subjecting them to merciless exploitation. At that time no state opposed the colonial plunder undertaken by the French capitalists. On the contrary, the figment that "Algeria is a component of France" was tacitly accepted. It is precisely on these grounds that Algeria was later automatically included in the Atlantic alliance, despite the unanimous opposition of her people. And this is also played up by the French rulers when they declare in the United Nations and other international bodies that the Algerian problem is the domestic affair of France.

In a senatorial decree dated July 14, 1865, Napoleon III said that "the Moslem native of Algeria is a Frenchman". The ordinance signed by General de Gaulle on March 7, 1944, stated that "the French Moslems of Algeria enjoy all the rights and fulfil all the obligations of the French non-Moslems." The Statute for Algeria, adopted by the French Parliament in 1947, also proclaimed "the effective equality of all the French citizens of Algeria, irrespective of their origin, race, language and religion."

But these solemn declarations (which the Algerians never asked for) were never translated into deeds, for French imperialism never intended nor does it intend now to place Algerians and Frenchmen on an equal footing. The purpose of these declarations is merely to deprive Algerians of their national individuality and to confuse public opinion in France and elsewhere. It should be pointed out that a considerable section of public opinion has become so befuddled that recently, despite our people's heroic four-year struggle, there were some who sincerely believed that "Franco-Moslem reconciliation" was possible.

Suffering badly from the colonial war, the Algerian people long for a peace that would ensure independence and national dignity. The presence of 1,000,000 Europeans on Algerian soil is no obstacle to peace, for the Algerian Communist Party and the National-Liberation Front have stated time and again that it depends on them whether or not they want to be the citizens of tomorrow's free Algeria with the same rights and duties as other citizens.

The Algerian Communists are of the opinion that de Gaulle will not be able to end the war. As a man who is loyal to the "French Empire", who represents the monopoly interests in the colonies, who is paving the way to military dictatorship in France (established earlier in Algeria), who has obtained, like his predecessors, the support of the American and British imperialists, he cannot recognize Algeria's independence, and that is the main condition for ending the war. That is why in reply to de Gaulle's speech in Algiers on June 4, the Algerian Communist Party issued a statement next day, saying it "categorically and indignantly rejects the policy of integration announced by the head of the French Government. Our people have taken to arms to defend their existence as a nation. They will not agree to a foreign oppressor legislating for them. The elections envisaged by General de Gaulle can only be a sinister masquerade which the Algerian Communist Party denounces before the whole world. Despite the trials they have undergone the people of Algeria harbor no hatred for the people of France, *but they are not French, do not want to be French and never will be French.*"

In those conditions, the Algerians are com-

pelled to continue and intensify their liberation struggle, relying on the growing solidarity of the freedom- and peace-loving forces throughout the world.

The people of France, to whom the colonial war in Algeria has brought de Gaulle's one-man rule which is paving the way to military dictatorship and fascism, face the same enemy as the people of Algeria. The French people should know that, in rebuffing fascism, they can rely on such staunch and sincere allies as the peoples of Algeria, of Tunisia and Morocco. To reinforce this alliance, which is necessary for both sides and is in accord with our aspirations, it is necessary to combine the struggle in defense of republican institutions with the struggle for the Algerian people's right to national independence, resolutely following the lead of the working class and its Communist Party.

The people of Algeria have not taken to arms merely to win the franchise for women and the limited economic and social reforms which the General at the head of the French Government has offered in return for capitulation. They have taken to arms to win recognition of their nation and their indisputable right to independence. And they will not lay them down until this honorable task has been fulfilled.

The Matter of the Men of Munich Calls for Vigilance

Jiri Hajek

THERE are historical events which leave deep scars and terrible memories in the hearts of the peoples but, at the same time, serve as an object lesson for the future. Those who ignore these lessons, and especially if they happen to be top-ranking politicians, those who consciously distort their meaning and significance, do grave injury to their country and to peace.

Twenty years ago in Munich the "democratic" governments of Great Britain and France, with the U.S.A. in the wings, signed an agreement with the two fascist dictators — Hitler and Mussolini — and sacrificed Czechoslovakia to German imperialism. The Munich "deal" encouraged Nazi Germany to naked aggression and plunged the peoples of the world into the horrors of the Second World War. The events which led to Munich and its aftermath shocked public opinion in Europe and throughout the world. In the political vocabulary of every European nation the words "Munich" and "the men of Munich" have become synonymous with treason and the foul machinations of the imperialists.

Many bourgeois politicians and propagandists, who sing praises to freedom, democracy and the peaceful intentions of the capitalist West, would like to forget the whole Munich affair. After all, the country sacrificed to the Nazis was bourgeois Czechoslovakia, that Czechoslovakia which the West had regarded as the model democracy east of the Rhine. Its Constitution was trampled underfoot and its democratic institutions destroyed. France, Czechoslovakia's ally, and Great Britain, a member of the League of Nations, having betrayed their obligations, became active partners in lawlessness and violence against a small nation. The ruling classes of these countries cynically trampled upon the principles, ideals and slogans which they have always professed to champion.

Silent about these facts, the imperialist propagandists try to falsify history, to camouflage the class forces which bred Munich and to distort its essence. During the crisis in the Middle East, when the armed forces of the United States and Great Britain invaded the Lebanon and Jordan and created a grave danger of war, and when the great majority of mankind supported the Soviet proposals for a peaceful settlement of the crisis, the imperialist press and radio raised a hue and cry about the danger of an "another Munich". The selfsame newspapers and, often, the selfsame people who in 1938 defended and justified the Munich diktat, are now with hypocritical anger trying to present as "neo-Munichism" the demand of the peoples for an end to the military intervention of the colonialists. What is more, the countries resolutely demanding non-interference in the domestic affairs of other coun-

tries are depicted as "aggressors". In this false analogy, invoked for the purpose of befuddling public opinion, there is nothing new. The advocates of the "cold war" policy resorted to the same method both during the 1954 Geneva Conference and after it, whenever the pressure of the peace forces led to a lessening of international tension, whenever the profits of the capitalist monopolies, which gain from plundering other nations, were threatened. But these subterfuges have always been exposed and defeated. For instance, the British Government's historical parallel suffered complete fiasco when, trying to justify its aggression in Egypt, it compared the Nasser Government's nationalization of the Suez Canal with "Hitler methods", and qualified the support of this just action, by the world's peoples, as "encouragement of aggression". But, as we know, few simpletons believed this, and the Eden government suffered ignominious defeat.

It can hardly be doubted that any future attempt by the imperialists at such historical pseudo-analogies will yield just as little success.

★ ★ ★

What was the essence of the Munich events of 1938? It is common knowledge that the inspirers of Munich talked a lot about "peace for our generation". In reality, their actions were the outcome not of a sentimental pacifism, not of their unpreparedness for war with Nazi Germany, and certainly not of more or less accidental mistakes, as the literature upholding and justifying imperialist policy depicts the history of Munich. The Western powers entered into a deal with Hitler for altogether different reasons.

In fact, the fascist countries headed by Nazi Germany pursued an aggressive policy which threatened the independence, territorial integrity and the very existence of all nations and those of Europe in the first place. This policy aroused the growing resistance of the people. The democratic and progressive forces insisted on curbing and isolating the forces of fascism and war. The Communist Parties, especially after the Seventh Congress of the Communist International, rallied the masses for the creation of an anti-fascist popular front, and greatly contributed to the scale of this struggle. The consistent peace policy of the Soviet Union, which advocated a system of collective security in Europe, was of great help to the anti-fascist movement.

But the prospect of the rise and development of this front alarmed the reactionary bourgeoisie in all countries, and none more so than the imperialist circles of Great Britain, France and the U.S.A. And although these circles suffered somewhat from the expansionist policies of fascist Germany and Italy, the feeling of class solidarity and the deep hatred of the Soviet Union and the progressive forces of the world linked them with the ruling cliques of the two fascist countries. The fear which haunted the governments of the Western powers was that if they resisted the aggressors, they might, against their will, become allies of the progressive forces and, objectively, make the U.S.S.R. a partner in deciding the fate of Europe. Such a development would have shattered the basic foreign policy concept of the reactionary circles, which envisaged a Europe united within the framework of the Versailles system against the Soviet Union.

For the West European powers, however, this was an unattainable aim. From 1933 onwards the British imperialists, together with their French counterparts who were becoming increasingly dependent on them, set out to make a deal with German fascism — the shock force of counter-revolution. And since the German fascists claimed that to play this role they must not be hampered by the restrictions of the Versailles Treaty, the Western powers expressed their readiness to ease or completely abolish the restrictions.

In the new world situation the Versailles guarantees to the small nations of Central and Eastern Europe stood in the way of agreement with Germany. Hence, the governments of Britain and France resolved to rid themselves of the encumbrances.

The first and biggest obstacle to Hitler's eastern expansion was Czechoslovakia, especially after its government, faced with the direct threat of German invasion and pressured by its people, signed a treaty with the U.S.S.R. in 1935. The signing of this treaty was a triumph for the Czechoslovak Communist Party, which had persistently campaigned for an alliance with the U.S.S.R. as the only valid guarantee of national independence for the Czechoslovak Republic. The Party initiated a struggle for popular defense of the Republic, which resulted in the creation of a broad anti-fascist front.

In accordance with the agreement signed in 1924, France was obliged to aid Czechoslovakia against the threat of German aggression; and Britain, as France's ally, was likewise committed. If in the circumstances which prevailed in 1935-38, the Western

Powers had honored their obligations, this would have united them in a single front with the Soviet Union and the peace-loving forces throughout Europe. The result, undoubtedly, would have been the defeat of fascism.

But this was not the intention of the British and French governments. Their concern was, regardless of the cost, to avoid fulfilling their obligations to Czechoslovakia, and to force her to capitulate to Hitler. The attitude of the fascist circles of the Czech bourgeoisie played into the hands of their Western allies. They feared a strong anti-fascist front, seeing in it a threat to their privileged position. In 1938, Nazi Germany and its Henlein fascist stooges in Czechoslovakia, abetted by the Western Powers, exerted an ever-mounting pressure on Czechoslovakia which bordered on diktat. The consequence of this foul maneuvering by the reactionary combination of internal and external forces was that the Czechoslovak Government submitted, by degrees, to the extortionist demands. The false propaganda machine harped on the theme that only by the sacrifice of Czechoslovakia could peace be preserved. The impression was created that this was the sole alternative to war.

By means of crude threats and crafty artifice the reactionary combination achieved its aim at the decisive moment. Czechoslovakia was surrendered to fascism, the world was confronted with an accomplished fact. An important role in this was that in those decisive days the ruling bourgeoisie in Czechoslovakia rejected the aid of the Soviet Union.

As the documents relating to the history of Munich show, the Soviet Union on the eve of the Munich deal had on its Western borders thirty divisions and the corresponding air support ready for action. At the first call from the Czechoslovak Government these forces could have come to the aid of its people.* But the ruling group of the bourgeoisie showed no desire to avail themselves of the opportunity. By submitting to the Munich diktat they betrayed the people who were ready to defend the Republic.

Thus, the essence of Munich was to exclude the U.S.S.R. and the popular masses from world politics and, by bartering the small nations, temporarily to overcome the contradictions among the imperialists — all for the sake of mutual anti-Communist and anti-Soviet aims. Munich was an attempt on the part of the British and French governments to turn the threat of Nazi aggression towards the Soviet Union.

As we know, this policy failed completely. In the course of events the class character of bourgeois democracy was unmasked once and for all as a ruthless and selfish dictatorship of a handful of monopolists. The ruling monopoly circles of Britain, France, the U.S.A. and Czechoslovakia, through the medium of Chamberlain, Wilson, Runciman and others, prevented the masses from solving basic and vital problems. They violated the Constitution, laws and democratic institutions, clutching desperately at the right to decide the destiny of the people of Czechoslovakia and then, in the end, transferred this right to Hitler. Simultaneously, the nature of the alliance of imperialist powers with a small nation was disclosed; they supported the latter just as long as it was of use to them. But they readily bartered and betrayed it the moment the possibility of agreement with the fascists against the U.S.S.R. arose.

Czechoslovakia was not the only victim of this policy. The same lot befell the Spanish Republic, Austria and Albania. And in the Far East the Western powers were bargaining with the Japanese militarists at the expense of the people of China. As a result of the Munich policy of appeasing the fascist aggressor, most European countries suffered and, later, during World War II, the same happened to all the nations of the world.

The Munich policy — the selfish class policy of the bourgeoisie, born of its fear of the masses — became the Nazis' best ally. Between 1939 and 1941 this policy gave them the whole of Europe with its vast industrial potential as a basis for further predatory marches. When fascism hurled the entire weight of its military machine against the Soviet Union in the hope of drawing the capitalist world into a "crusade" against communism, the Munich politicians were unable to overcome the ever-deepening conflict between the German and Anglo-American imperialist blocs. The Western governments were forced at long last to concede to the demand of public opinion — which was opposed to the policy of encouraging the aggressor — and take part in an anti-Hitler coalition. This resulted in a broad coalition of the peace-loving peoples against the Hitler aggressors. The Soviet Union, which the

---

*Foreign Ministry Archives of Czechoslovakia. From a letter of the Czechoslovak Ambassador to the U.S.S.R. to his Foreign Minister, September 29, 1938.

men of Munich had hoped to elbow out from European politics and destroy, became the main force of the anti-fascist alliance, the defender and liberator of the European peoples, the grave-digger of fascism.

★ ★ ★

Despite the failure of the Munich policy the reactionary bourgeois circles of the West continued their treachery, even at the height of the struggle of the world anti-fascist front against Nazism. Holding key positions in the economy and in politics, these circles, even while the war was raging, tried to sabotage co-operation with the Soviet Union within the anti-Hitler coalition. For them, of course, the destruction of fascism was a terrible blow. They were unable to save German and Japanese militarism from defeat. And so they endeavored to preserve at least those remnants of fascism which escaped the blows of the Soviet troops and the national-liberation forces operating on the Nazi-occupied territory.

Immediately after the war, world capitalist reaction, headed by the U.S.A., began to reach out for the goals which they had failed to reach in 1938. At present the American imperialists, trying to assume the role of the Nazi aggressors, are threatening the freedom and independence of the peoples. They are, moreover, adopting the Munich methods, patronizing the West German revenge-seekers and confronting the peoples with another round of accomplished facts.

It is not fortuitous that John Foster Dulles, who even before the war was among those who inspired Munich, has become the herald and ringleader of this policy.

Using the pretext of regional security, these circles have formed aggressive military blocs — NATO, SEATO and the Bagdad Pact — imperialist instruments for meddling in the internal affairs of other nations.

The spirit of the 1933 Four Power Pact, the spirit of Munich and the anti-Comintern pact has been revived in the North Atlantic bloc. It unites British, French, Italian and West German imperialism under American leadership. The Wehrmacht, commanded by former Nazi generals, is now once again, as in the 'thirties, beginning to assume the role of shock force in this alliance, and the American imperialists readily supply it with weapons of wholesale annihilation.

An objective assessment of the real, not imaginary, analogies of the Munich policy of 1938, leads to the conclusion that the Munich of today is expressed most strikingly in reviving German militarism and revanchism. As was the case twenty years ago, the class interests of the ruling circles of the U.S.A., Great Britain and France, coupled with their fear of the growing forces of peace and socialism, impel them to seek alliance with the German militarists.

This time they are building the alliance through exclusive military blocs. The imperialist propaganda machine, seizing on the fact that the West German army is being formed as part of NATO and that the Paris Agreements officially prohibit the manufacture in Western Germany of atomic, rocket and other weapons of wholesale destruction, is trying to blunt the vigilance of the European nations. In France and in other West European countries bourgeois propaganda would have the people believe that these countries are fully protected from the threat of German militarism, since Western Germany is subject to military restrictions and is under NATO control.

It is difficult to say which plays the greater role here — lies or shortsightedness. But one thing is quite plain, namely, that those blinded by their hatred of socialism have learnt nothing from the lessons of Munich.

The fact that Western Germany is a NATO member hardly makes the German militarists any "tamer", or less dangerous for their "allies". History teaches that the moment the German imperialists feel strong enough, they cease to fulfil treaty obligations and act on their own. Suffice it to recall the Locarno Pact which Hitler tore up in 1936, then proceeding to remilitarize the Rhineland. At present the West German monopolies are cashing in on their participation in the various Western blocs in order to strengthen their economic, military and political positions. For them NATO is a temporary means of facilitating the revival of the Wehrmacht's war potential. Even now the West German militarists are ignoring the formal restrictions and are violating the reservations of the Paris Agreements concerning atomic weapons and guided missiles. The Bundestag decision of March 25, 1958, to equip the West German army with atomic weapons, and the formation of the Bonn-Paris-Rome triangle for the manufacture of missiles and atomic weapons, wipe out these reservations. What guarantee is there that in the hands of the West-German revenge-seekers these weapons will serve the security of Bonn's "allies"? There is no guarantee.

It would seem that the French bourgeoisie has ceased to think about this altogether, especially now that its chauvinist leaders

have embroiled the country in the hopeless war against the people of Algeria. Nowadays French statesmen turn to their West German "ally" for a variety of services, so that together with yesterday's executioners of France they can act against peace and progress. Actively assisting the resurgence of German militarism in their anti-Communist and colonialist aims, the French rulers, in exactly the same way as the men of Munich in 1938, are placing the security of the country under a grave threat.

As for the plans for the neo-Munich men, of directing German aggression towards Eastern Europe again—all that can be said about them is that they are simply adventurism. If the men of Munich suffered defeat in the past, so much the less can they count on success now. They were unable to prevent the growth of the Soviet Union's influence on European and world politics in 1938, when the socialist part of the world comprised but ten per cent of the population, when it accounted for about ten per cent of the world's output, and when Asia and Africa were still under the colonial rule of the imperialists. How, then, can they expect to do this now when the socialist world, whose technological potential has been demonstrated so strikingly by the Soviet Sputniks and atomic power stations, comprises nearly a billion inhabitants, when it produces nearly one-third of the world's output, and when most of the former colonies have thrown off the imperialist yoke?

Munich was a bitter and unforgettable experience for the peoples of Czechoslovakia. In those days in Munich, the imperialists could decide our destiny without us. But 1958 is not 1938. And the Czechoslovakia of today, in alliance with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, is not the pre-Munich bourgeois Czechoslovakia — a pawn in the hands of its Western "allies". The strong and sovereign people's democratic Czechoslovakia will never permit anyone to meddle in her internal affairs.

Whereas twenty years ago Czechoslovakia and many other countries which have now turned to socialism were satellites of the imperialists, and whereas the imperialist powers then regarded the territories and vital interests of the small nations as pawns in their dirty imperialist game — which is exactly what took place at Munich in relation to Czechoslovakia — today this is absolutely ruled out. The countries of Eastern Europe are prosperous and strong socialist countries, genuinely free, independent and equal, linked in fraternal solidarity. As a result of the Soviet Union's assistance and of persistent and selfless struggle, these countries have rid themselves of the ruinous consequences of the Munich policy of the Western imperialists. They have ensured for themselves a situation in which no Chamberlains, Runcimans, Dulleses or men of their ilk will ever decide their fate for them.

The modern imperialist and reactionary forces still seek — as Hitler and the men of Munich sought in 1938 — to confront the peoples with the policy of "accomplished facts". Thus, they attempted to break the European peoples' resistance to the remilitarization of Western Germany by confronting them with the accomplished fact of a new Wehrmacht. Likewise, the peoples were confronted with the aggression against Egypt, the American invasion in the Lebanon and the British in Jordan. And, lastly, contrary to the interests and demands of humanity, the U.S.A. and Great Britain are going ahead with nuclear weapon tests, they are building rocket launching sites and are preparing to confront the world with the fact of another devastating war.

Whereas in 1938 the imperialists succeeded with comparative ease and impunity in their machinations and deals, ignoring the opinions and vital interests of other countries, today they can no longer do so, the risk is too great.

The socialist camp is now so powerful. that no international problem can be solved without its participation. Its very existence and its active, peaceful policy are a reliable support for the peoples fighting against the danger of a new war, against the attempts of the imperialists to decide their destiny without them and contrary to their will. World public opinion, with the Communist and Workers' parties and other progressive and peace-loving forces in the fore, has become infinitely more vigilant.

The peoples of the world succeeded in terminating the aggressive wars in Korea and Indo-China, they halted the intervention in Egypt, warded off an attack on Syria in 1957. and prevented intervention in Iraq. World public opinion, on the alert, is doing everything to unmask and thwart in good time all the evil designs of the neo-Munich plotters.

The latest Munich manifestations, especially in the matter of reviving German militarism, are fraught with dire consequences for the security of the European countries, including France and Britain, whose govern-

ments show no desire whatever to learn from the lessons of the past. And precisely because of this the growing fight of the peoples of these countries against supplying Western Germany with atomic weapons, against a policy of encouraging revanchism, is of exceptional importance.

On their part, the socialist countries are working persistently for a lessening of international tension and elimination of the threat presented by German militarism. With a view to taking the first step towards friendly coexistence of all European nations, the Soviet Union recently suggested the conclusion of an agreement for friendship and co-operation of all European countries, to which the United States of America could also be a partner. Acceptance of this proposal would go a long way towards restoring trust among the nations which, in turn, would contribute to stable security in Europe.

Our Czechoslovak Government is working ceaselessly to ensure collective security in Europe. Jointly with the Government of the German Democratic Republic it actively supported the Polish proposal for an atom-free zone in the heart of Europe, a proposal which met with the support of the Soviet Union and other peace-loving countries.

The anniversary of the shameful Munich deal is a reminder of the dangerous consequences to peace of a policy of this kind.

However, it should be noted that the balance of forces in Europe and throughout the world is not at all in favor of the neo-Munich men, the latter-day inspirers of the policy of war and reaction.

The cause of a great historical truth, beneath whose banner mankind has crossed the threshold of the new era of atomic energy and the conquest of outer space; the cause of socialism, which has educated hundreds of millions of people to be conscious makers of the new, free history worthy of mankind, is winning; and despite all the manipulations and machinations of world imperialism, its triumph is assured.

No More Colonialism for the Arab Lands

Khalid Mohy El-Din

The Editorial Board requested Mr. Khalid Mohy El-Din, Editor-in-Chief of the Cairo "Al-Missaa", a prominent public figure in the United Arab Republic, to express his opinion on U.S. policy in the Arab East. In publishing this article we avail ourselves of the opportunity to express our thanks to the esteemed author.

AFTER the Second World War the Arab peoples stepped up the struggle for their freedom and independence, and for the right to develop their national economy. In that period the issues were fought mainly between national forces in the different Arab countries on the one hand and the classical Anglo-French colonialism on the other.

Most of the national forces thought at the time that the U.S.A. would take their side and help emancipate them from the chains of the old colonialism. That dream was cherished by many until August 1947, when Egypt took her case against the British occupation to the U.N. Security Council. In the Security Council the U.S.A. opposed Egypt's legitimate demand that the British troops be withdrawn from her territory. The U.S.A. openly backed colonialist Britain, thus administering a shock to those who had hoped for U.S. support. After that, the U.S.A. supported with money and arms the state of Israel, which was created in the very heart of the Arab world. This backing enabled Israel to evict one million Arabs from their native land and make them homeless.

In 1951 Egypt denounced the 1936 Treaty and demanded the immediate evacuation of the British troops from the Canal Zone. A few days later the ambassadors of Great Britain, the U.S.A., France and Turkey presented a joint Note to the Egyptian Foreign Minister containing a proposal for a collective defense treaty which would allow the Western forces to occupy Egypt in the event of war or threat of war. The proposed treaty

would have turned Egypt into a major military base of the Western powers. The Arab peoples clearly saw that the U.S.A. fully supported the classical colonialism, and were in alliance with that colonialism against their aspirations.

Then, in the summer of 1953, came the reactionary coup d'etat in Iran, when the pro-American General Zahedi ousted the Mossadeq regime which two years previously, in 1951, had nationalized the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company. The Mossadeq regime had intended to turn the oil into a national resource owned by the Iranian people.

The Zahedi coup d'etat revealed the American colonialist ambitions in the Middle East, particularly when the U.S.A. got hold of 40 per cent of the Iranian oil through an argument with the Zahedi Government in 1954.

American colonial penetration into the Middle East began after the Second World War. At first the penetration was barely discernible, due to the fact that the method employed differed from the classical one — that of military occupation of foreign lands.

In fact, American imperialism became active in the Middle East as early as the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century.

World War I brought about far-reaching changes in the colonialist division in the world. Germany was defeated, the Ottoman Empire disintegrated, and the U.S.A. emerged from the war economically more powerful. After being a debtor to other countries, especially Britain, it became a creditor to the whole world, Britain included. The inter-war years witnessed an increase in the influence of U.S. monopoly interests, notably in China and to a lesser degree in the oil-rich Middle East. In the Middle East, the U.S. pressed for oil concessions, since oil, as compared with other investments, brings in the highest profits.

After the First World War, Britain and France were eager to divide the Middle Eastern oil among themselves. The American monopolies were aware of this and in March 1920 they succeeded, with the help of their agents among the Congressmen, in getting Congress to demand from the President information about the restrictions, direct or indirect, imposed by foreign governments on Americans exploring for oil.

That was the first link in the chain of American intervention in the Middle East. The American Government demanded from Britain that the U.S.A. be invited to any further negotiations about oil. Britain retreated, and in July 1928 negotiations between British and American oil magnates began. The talks resulted in the liquidation of the Turkish oil company and the establishment of the Iraqi Petroleum Company, in which the U.S. held 23.75 per cent of the shares, France held the same amount, while the remainder belonged to Britain.

This concession on the part of Britain was the price she paid for American and French support in joining the oil rich area of Mosul to Iraq.

Later, the U.S. alone exploited the Bahrein oil. The biggest American triumph was in winning in 1933 the exclusive right to exploit the oil of Saudi Arabia, after Britain had abandoned it owing to her failure in exploring this area.

In February 1944 the U.S. announced its intention to build oil pipelines across Syria and Jordan, and thus began to oust Britain and France from these mandated territories. And so already during the Second World War it became clear that the U.S.A. was bent on dominating the Middle East.

U.S. foreign policy in that area serves above all the interests of the big oil companies, which after the Second World War succeeded in getting a grip on the bulk of the Middle East oil.

Compared with 30 years ago when the U.S. oil monopolies had no oil in the Middle East, in 1957 they possessed 64.4 per cent of the extracted oil in the area, and 80 per cent of the deposits. It is worth noting that while the United States' production of oil increases, her appetite for Middle East oil increases too.

In recent years some American officials have been complaining that American oil resources are nearing exhaustion. There are, however, many facts that cast doubt on the veracity of these statements. The authors of *Oil and the Arab Policy* confirm these doubts. The book contains an important quotation from one of the top men of *Standard Oil of Indiana.* In the U.S.A., he says, the local demand for oil and its export will amount in 1957 to 10,400,000 barrels daily, with home production of oil and natural gas running to 20,900,000 barrels daily. This means that oil in the U.S., far from drying up, will remain a major article for export, since its production will be in excess of home consumption.

Now, what is it that draws the American oil monopolies to our countries and makes them so persistent in plundering our resourc-

es? If the purpose is not the defense of the life and future of the American economy, as its official spokesmen claim, what is it? Some Americans say: "The real and strong reason that apparently impels the U.S.A. to apply different methods to obtain oil-producing regions beyond her borders is her desire to get hold of permanent oil deposits on which she can depend when a third world war breaks out." This is an odd statement, for the aim, clearly, is to camouflage colonial exploitation.

What, then, is the real reason for the eagerness of the U.S. oil monopolies to exploit the oilfields of the Middle East?

The answer to this question is found in the U.N. report on the economic conditions in the Middle East, which says: "There are indications that the cost of producing crude oil in the Middle East is excessively lower than in the other main oil producing regions." Mr. Howard A. Korden, Chairman of the American Consumers Co-operative, confirms this. In May 1955 he said: "World oil monopolies prevented the co-operatives from participating in their operations and I can guess the reason. If the co-operatives could obtain oil directly from the oil fields of the Middle East where the cost of production is low, people would discover the immense profits gained from transporting this oil to Europe and selling it at its present prices."

Europe, which depends for its oil supplies on the Arab fields, certainly strains her economy because of high oil prices. The U.N. Economic Commission for Europe said in 1956: "The prices of crude oil are at a standard which bears no relation at all to the cost or to the condition of the market, nor to the cost of transporting oil to the refineries."

Since oil prices are fixed by the world monopolies according to the American cost of production, it becomes evident what enormous profits the monopolies gain from Middle East oil, where the cost of production is so low. It is also evident that the American oil monopolies have no intention of losing the excessive profits derived from Middle East oil. Their interest in the Arab countries is largely due to the abundance of oil and to the cheap labor in these countries, the latter resulting from the poverty caused by colonial exploitation.

The annual profits gained by American oil monopolies from Arab oil amount to 1.2 billion dollars. There is no doubt that the safeguarding of these immense profits greatly affects the trends of American policy in the Arab world, where it aims at protecting oil monopoly exploitation against the national aspirations of the Arab people. This policy is aimed also at maintaining in office governments which further the interests of the American oil monopolies and do not argue about their profits or about fulfilment of the terms according to which the oil concessions were granted.

For the sake of preserving these profits, Truman's Point Four was proclaimed in 1947, aimed at binding the economy of the Arab countries and the Middle East to the U.S. imperialist economy and placing it under the control and guidance of American advisers. It aimed also at keeping the Middle East countries as agricultural or raw-material producing countries, preventing them from developing their economies to meet modern requirements and raising the standard of living.

Point Four contained provisions for agreements regarding the export of American capital to these countries and the legislation necessary for its protection against the threat of nationalization.

Despite the fact that most of the Middle East countries signed these agreements, Point Four died forever when broad strata of the national bourgeoisie realized that the plan would retard the development of national capital.

In order to defend their interests in the Middle East and dominate the peoples of the area, the U.S.A. supported the collective defense plans, military pacts and the establishment of military bases in the Middle East. In Turkey, a NATO member, there are military bases. In every sphere this country is dependent on American imperialism, which causes great harm to her economy. There are U.S. military bases in Libya and in Saudi Arabia. The U.S. Sixth Fleet, equipped with atomic weapons, is cruising off the coast of the Lebanon. The purpose behind these bases and atomic weapons is to intimidate the peoples and to prevent the national movements in the Middle East from growing — all with a view to safeguarding the high profits of the oil magnates. It should also be mentioned that the U.S.A. supports, directly and indirectly, the Bagdad Pact.

We have discussed U.S. policy and the efforts of the American oil companies to intensify their exploitation of the Arab peoples in order to maintain their profits. But this is only one side of the contradiction; the other side is represented by the peoples of this area and their struggle to restore their

independence and wrest their wealth from the hands of their exploiters.

This brings us to the profound changes that have taken place in the international situation since the Second World War, namely the rise of the socialist camp as a world power, China's entry into this camp in 1949 and the success of the national movements in Asia and the Far East against colonialist oppression. All this has affected the peoples of the Middle East.

The struggle began in Syria and the Lebanon and they won their independence in 1946. Then it developed in Egypt in 1946 against the Sedki-Bevin collective defense plan and in 1951 for the evacuation of the British troops. In Iraq there were successive movements and uprisings between 1948 and 1952. In 1951 in Iran there was the oil nationalization movement headed by Mossadeq.

During the Second World War some industries grew in the Arab countries, particularly in Egypt, Syria and Iraq. Trade flourished and local people gradually got control of the field of commerce. Thus, there emerged a class of national capitalists, both in commerce and in industry. This class found it necessary to get complete hold of the local market, to strengthen its positions. It also wanted to be independent, in its economic dealings, from colonialism in order to be able to market cotton and other products in all countries and especially in the socialist countries. In return, it could import machines and industrial equipment which the imperialist states had refused to export in the past.

Side by side with national capitalism there has emerged an Arab working class. These two forces have united to fight the colonialists. In fact, we cannot speak about the national struggle against colonialism without mentioning the Arab working class and, in particular, the oil workers about whom the colonialists are so apprehensive.

This working class fights persistently for its economic demands and for raising its standard of living. Its struggle against the monopolist companies virtually becomes a direct battle against imperialism. The working class, through its solidarity and struggle against its enemies, fights for the right to trade union and political organization and, in this way, gradually enhances its role in the national struggle. The oil-producing centers have become fortresses of the working-class struggle. There are some small principalities such as Bahrein and Kuwait where practically the entire population works in the oil industry.

In March 1956, the Bahrein oil workers demonstrated against the British Foreign Minister Selwyn Lloyd, who was passing through their country, and gave him a stormy reception, pelting him with stones. During the colonialist aggression against Egypt in November 1956, the Bahrein workers demonstrated in solidarity with the Egyptian people. And this despite the brutal measures taken by the colonialists.

The Arab people will always remember the heroic action of the Syrian oil workers when they damaged the oil pipelines in support of Egypt's struggle against the invasion. In the Sudan, the workers headed the struggle in support of Egypt. In Saudi Arabia where imperialism has also penetrated, the working class plays the leading role in the national awakening. It does not hesitate to go on strike for trade union and economic demands.

The American oil monopolies, conscious of the strength of their doughty opponent — the working class — have done their best to keep the Arab labor movement weak and disunited both politically and organizationally.

After the revolution of July 23, headed by Gamal Abdel Nasser, the struggle against colonialism entered a new stage.

It reached its peak when Egypt nationalized the Suez Canal Company. With the help and solidarity of the Arab peoples, aided by the U.S.S.R., People's China and other socialist countries, and also with the help of the Afro-Asian and all peace-loving peoples, Egypt succeeded in defeating the aggression and dealing a severe blow to British imperialism.

As a result, the unity of the Arab peoples grew stronger, particularly the unity of Arab workers; and a federation of Arab workers was formed which, although weak at first, is growing day by day; soon the unity of the entire Arab working class will be achieved.

After the defeat of Britain and France in the Suez war, American imperialism entered the battle against the Arab peoples under the banner of the Eisenhower Doctrine which professes to see a "vacuum" in the Middle East. This vacuum, in the American view, signifies the contraction or complete elimination of British and French influence in the Middle East.

The real purpose of the Eisenhower Doctrine is to maintain U.S. domination over most of the oil sources in the Middle East, where the cost of production is as 1:7 com-

pared with that in the United States. The U.S. considers that the nationalization of the Suez Canal by Egypt is a danger to her interests in the Middle East, fearing that other countries in the area may follow Egypt's example and nationalize their sources of natural wealth.

As to the so-called "communist aggression" about which the sponsors of the doctrine make so much noise, it has never been felt by the peoples of the Middle East, nor do they have any fear of it because the Soviet Union has never attempted to infringe upon the sovereignty of any of the states of the area; on the contrary, the Soviet Government has always supported the peoples and governments of the independent Middle East countries in their struggle to attain full sovereignty and preserve their independence. The Soviet Government has never interfered in the internal affairs of any of our countries.

Eisenhower and his advisors were astute enough to use an elastic formula about "aggression coming from countries dominated by international communism", but without elaborating what international communism meant. Had they meant by this, countries with communist governments, they would not have needed this expression. Had they said "direct communist aggression" only, the Eisenhower Doctrine would have been meaningless, for the communist countries have never attacked nor will they ever attack the Middle East countries. But "aggression from countries dominated by international communism", as they call it, is an elastic expression which allows of many interpretations and thus conceals the main purpose of the Doctrine — intervention and aggression against the Arab countries.

While Egypt, Syria and the Sudan rejected the Eisenhower Doctrine, the other countries of the area accepted it. One of its results was a reactionary coup d'etat which overthrew the nationalist regime in Jordan. Then followed the threat of aggression in Syria, with the concentration of the Sixth Fleet off its shores and the Turkish troop concentrations along its northern border. However, the firm support of the Arab peoples to Syria, and also the stand of the Soviet Union and of the peace and freedom-loving peoples of the world, forced American imperialism to retreat.

The Arab peoples have come to know the blessing of an independent policy based on positive neutrality and renunciation of military pacts — the policy pursued by Syria and Egypt, which has greatly enhanced the prestige of the two countries. This policy led to the formation this year of the United Arab Republic. In May, the people of the Lebanon revolted against their reactionary government, threatening to bring it down. American imperialism, seeking a pretext for intervention, accused the U.A.R. of interfering in the affairs of the Lebanon. But the reports of the U.N. Secretary-General and the U.N. observation group have proved the falsity of the charges.

In July the glorious Iraqi revolution put an end to the monarchy and to the regime of Nuri Said, and undermined the Bagdad Pact. By joining the front of positive neutralism, peaceful coexistence and national liberation, Iraq has ceased to be a base of imperialism and has joined the front of the liberated Arab peoples. This was "the last straw that broke the camel's back", as an Arab proverb says. American troops were landed in the Lebanon, and British troops in Jordan, Kuwait, Bahrein and Libya. The Sixth Fleet concentrated in Lebanon waters, and the U.S. bases in Turkey were filled with planes and atomic weapons.

In defending its positions American imperialism increased its help to Israel — its aggressive base — with the aim of creating bridgeheads from which to attack the Arab peoples who are fighting for freedom, independence and peace. Once again, therefore, the U.S. plans to use Israel as a tool of colonialism in the Arab world.

Recent events once again confirm the fact that the history of American imperialism in the Arab East is a history of blood, coercion and suppression.

The Arab peoples, who long for freedom and peace, are not alone on the battle-field. Standing with them are all the peoples of Asia and Africa and also of the Soviet Union and People's China. The struggle of the Arabs against the aggressions of the colonialists finds support among all the freedom and peace-loving peoples.

We are now at the beginning of the last round in the fight against colonialism in our Arab East: and once the peoples of the world unite and fight together for peace and against aggression, the end of colonialism in our area will be soon decided, and this will expedite the end of world colonialism.

We are on the threshold of a new dawn for humanity, in which the banner of freedom, the banner of peace, will wave over all the world.

Activities of Communist and Workers' Parties

MANIFESTO OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF MALAYA

ON JUNE 20, 1948, the British imperialists unleashed a full-scale attack against the people of Malaya. Throughout the length and breadth of the country, army, police and detectives were sent out to round up Communists and progressives. Above all, the British army, equipped with modern destructive weapons, launched an armed suppression of those Malayan patriots who had been compelled to go underground. This was how the British imperialists, bent on stamping out in one fell swoop the flames of revolution in Malaya, started the colonial war in our country.

But the people of Malaya, who have the glorious tradition of armed resistance to Japanese fascist occupation, were not frightened by this brutal force. On the contrary, led by the Communist Party of Malaya, they took up arms and returned a relentless blow to the blood-thirsty imperialists.

In this war, the British colonialists mobilized over 400,000 fighting men and employed such barbarous methods as bombing, wanton burning and killing and even chemical warfare. They enforced such vicious policies as eviction, collective punishment and food control measures aimed at starving the Liberation Army to death. They resorted to all sorts of fascist methods of terrorism, from imprisonment and banishment to torture and hanging. Despite all these they failed to wipe out the Liberation Army, which has behind it the wholehearted support of the broad masses. On the other hand, the Liberation Army emerged from the serious tests and trials more steeled than ever. The protracted struggle it persisted in has tremendously inspired the people of the whole country and given an enormous impetus to all forms of struggle against colonial domination.

It should be pointed out that the proclamation of independence of the Federation of Malaya, August 1957, was mainly the outcome of this protracted armed struggle led by the Communist Party of Malaya. This new page in the history of our country was written with the blood of thousands of our national heroes.

We must refute the platitude that the independence of the Federation was attained through negotiations and that this was an eloquent example of how independence could be won by struggles without bloodshed. Those who circulate these absurd arguments pursue but one aim: to ignore the credit due to our Party and army for its fight for independence, and to reap, without striking a blow, the fruits of the long and arduous struggle waged by the people of all nationalities. But facts speak louder than sophistry: if it were not for the heroic struggle waged by the guerrilla fighters and the various forms of struggle carried on by the whole nation, independence would remain forever an empty promise of the imperialists.

The proclamation of independence of the Federation provided favorable conditions for the restoration of peace in our country; and our Party had declared time and again that we were ready at any moment to resume talks on a just and reasonable basis with the Alliance Government. Had the Alliance Government respected the aspirations of the people and redeemed its promises of ending the state of emergency by peaceful means, the colonial war unleashed by the British imperialists ten years ago could have been terminated and internal peace restored, and our fight for complete independence would, with the attainment of the great unity of all nationalities and groups in our country, have entered a new phase. But the Alliance Government, in reply to all our sincere efforts for peace, intensified its military and political offensives. It subserviently acted on orders of the imperialists by carrying on frantically the anti-Communist and anti-popular war, so as to win the favor of the monopoly capitalists. Thus the war which was directly engineered by the British colonialists is now continued through the Alliance Government.

Therefore, the armed resistance still being carried on by our peoples at present is not only a fight for the realization of internal peace and democracy, but also a fight against colonialism and for national liberation. In this respect, we must refute the slanders levelled at the armed struggle of our people, alleging that the people's resistance movement receives orders from foreign countries and hence serves foreign interests. The object of repeating these brazen lies as fabricated by the colonialists is none other than to find a pretext for employing foreign troops to suppress the people of Malaya, and to disrupt the amiable relations between the Chinese and Malay nationalities and, in particular, to draw wool over the eyes of our Malay compatriots, so that the rulers may succeed in their intrigue of instigating the Malays against the People's Army.

Ever since the independence of the Federation of Malaya, the Alliance Government has bragged quite a lot about its so-called "administrative achievements", but lies cannot cover up the naked truth.

During this period, instead of safeguarding the integrity of national sovereignty, the Alliance

Government has lost all sense of national dignity by concluding the so-called "mutual defense" pact with Britain, permitting the latter to retain the prerogative rights of stationing troops and establishing military bases in Malaya.

Instead of pursuing an independent, peaceful and neutral foreign policy, establishing friendly relations with all countries and developing trade with them on the basis of equality and mutual benefit, it has steadily followed in the wake of the imperialist bloc, with the result that the Malayan economy, which has already encountered grave difficulties, further deteriorates under the impact of the economic crisis of the United States of America.

Instead of safeguarding the democratic freedom of the people, it has wantonly applied the Emergency Regulations, arresting students and trade union leaders, ordering its troops and police to assault students holding peaceful and orderly meetings, and restricting the people's freedom of speech, assembly, association and of paying visits to other countries.

Instead of protecting and developing national industries, agriculture and commerce, it has discriminated against national capital and introduced a "tax holiday" policy with a view to attracting more foreign monopoly capital, thus strengthening the imperialists' economic power which already has a stranglehold on the Malayan economy.

Instead of ameliorating the livelihood and promoting the welfare of the people, it has levied heavier and heavier taxes so as to maintain its gigantic war expenditure, thereby increasing the burden on the people. Moreover, with the closure of one tin mine after another and the steady drop in prices of rubber, the number of unemployed is ever-mounting, wages are decreasing continuously, and consequently the masses are becoming more and more impoverished.

Instead of practicing a policy of equality and mutual aid among the various nationalities and forging a great unity among them, it has, on the one hand, in the name of "protecting Malay interests," spared no efforts in defending the prerogative rights of a small clique, while failing to take positive steps to improve the livelihood of the Malay peasants who constitute the overwhelming majority of the Malay population; on the other hand, it has taken no account of and even denied the proper rights and interests of the Chinese and Indian nationalities, thereby creating discord and suspicion among the various nationalities.

Instead of supporting and developing national culture and education, it has carried on the policy of colonial slave education. On the one hand, it has, by every possible means, hampered the development of Chinese and Indian education, while on the other hand, owing to its national inferiority complex and its superstition about the superiority of the English language, it has lost faith in the future of the Malay language which has been constitutionally adopted as the national language. Hence it has no intention whatsoever of encouraging the development of Malayan education; on the contrary, it has made a perfect fetish of the English language and spread the idea that it would be difficult for the Malay language to replace English in our country.

Instead of speeding up the Malayanization of government service, it has put off time and again the Malayanization measures, with the consequence that a great majority of former British colonial officials are still occupying important positions and making final decisions on everything.

Instead of promoting the merger of Singapore with the Federation of Malaya, it has persisted in the colonial policy of divorcing Singapore from the Federation. It has even regarded Singapore as a foreign land and imposed all sorts of restrictions on the political, economic and cultural relations between Singapore and the Federation, thus hampering Singapore's fight for self-rule and independence, adversely affecting Singapore's economy and causing great damage to the basic interests of the people of the Federation.

All these retrogressive policies of the Alliance Government have already given rise to grave consequences. If the Alliance Government does not want to see itself forsaken by the people, now is the time for it to rein its horses on the brink of the precipice, take a new road and abandon the policies that run counter to the interests of the people. It should immediately convene a National Consultative Conference to which representatives from all circles and political parties (including the Communist Party of Malaya) should be invited to discuss state affairs and determine new state policies, so as to unite all the forces of the entire nation in the common struggle for complete national independence and in building our fatherland.

The 10-year arduous armed struggle carried on by our people has evoked sympathy and praise from the peace-loving peoples all over the world. Today, when the Alliance Government intends to remain hostile to the people, the people of all nationalities and strata should give full play to their glorious tradition of rendering assistance and extending support to the Liberation Army. The liberation Army, on its part, should unite and persist in the struggle, so that the military and political offensives of the Alliance Government will meet with the same disgraceful defeat as Briggs, Templer, Bourne and others suffered previously.

At present, the international situation has undergone a fundamental change. The strength of the camp of peace, democracy and socialism has far surpassed that of the camp of imperialism. The tide of the national liberation movement of the oppressed peoples in Asia, Africa and America is on the upsurge. The east wind prevails over the west wind. Under such favorable circumstances, the righteous struggle of our people will certainly achieve final victory.

People of all nationalities and strata, and all patriots including those in the Alliance of the United Malayan National Organization, the Malayan Chinese Association, the Malayan Indian Congress—unite and, together with the Communist Party of Malaya, fight for the realization of complete independence, democracy and peace.

Central Committee, Communist Party of Malaya. *June 20, 1958.*

CLOSER LINKS BETWEEN THE PARTY AND THE MASSES

SINCE its XXVth National Congress the Communist Party in Britain has emerged as a stronger political force, and has played an increasingly effective role in the battle for peace, independence and a better life for the people. Using the various forms and means of political work it is extending its ties with the people.

The steady growth of unemployment and the attempt of the Tory Government and the employers to establish a wage freeze have called forth a sharpened struggle throughout Britain. Defense of jobs and wages has assumed increasing importance this year. In every case the Communists have been in the forefront of the battle.

When the London busmen came out on strike, Party branches distributed leaflets, organized selling the *Daily Worker* to the strikers and the public generally. At garages and depots, strike meetings and mass demonstrations, the Communists were on the job, exposing the anti-labor Tory policy, explaining the meaning of the strike and working to strengthen support in London and other towns for the busmen. The result was that from all parts of Britain, from factories, pits and union branches, donations flowed in from working men and women expressing their support for the strike.

With unemployment growing steadily in Britain, increasing attention has been paid to this problem, especially in places like Dundee in Scotland, Hull in Yorkshire, West Wales and others, where it has become particularly acute.

Recently in the Scottish city of Dundee every factory closed down for half a day and 10,000 workers marched through the city in protest against the mounting menace of unemployment. In Hull four percent of the working population is idle. The Communists in this city organize regular meetings at the Labor Exchanges to explain to the unemployed workers the real reason for their plight.

On other social issues such as rents and old age pensions, considerable activity has been conducted in various places in Britain, in which the Communist Party branches have played a notable part. A big and successful fight was waged recently in the county of Yorkshire against the proposal of the National Coal Board to increase the rents of houses owned by them and occupied by miners and their families. In Scotland, a large-scale campaign was conducted in support of increased pensions for the old folk. This resulted in hundreds of delegates being elected to travel to London to present to the Members of Parliament the case for increasing the old age pensions.

One of the forms of mass political work is the selling and popularizing of the new edition of our Program, "The British Road to Socialism". Since publication, four months ago, nearly fifty thousand copies have been sold. There have been some very good discussions in trade union branches where speakers have been invited to address the members on the meaning of the Program, thus arousing interest among non-Party people.

In our campaign for the Right to Live and Work, and the annual celebrations in support of the *Daily Worker*, which are of great importance in explaining the Party policy and in strengthening its ties with the masses, nearly 100 meetings were organized. Some 3,000 attended the rally in Glasgow and, two weeks later in London, 4,000 attended the demonstration in the famous Albert Hall.

An important aspect of our political and educational work is the exposure of the aggressive foreign policy of the British and U.S. rulers, and the struggle conducted by the national democratic forces for world peace, British independence, against the A- and H-arms race.

Following the Day of Demonstrations against the American Bases this spring, the Communist Party called for a national demonstration for Peace, Work, and British independence in London. On June 29, ten thousand men and women marched five abreast in a column that stretched for two miles, carrying posters and tableaux which expressed our policy. Fifteen thousand crammed into Trafalgar Square in the heart of London to hear the policy of the Communists as proclaimed in the speech of John Gollan, General Secretary of the Party. This great rally showed in unmistakable manner the spirit and militancy of the Party, its increasing influence on the masses of the working people.

When the American and British imperialists committed their acts of aggression in the Lebanon and Jordan, meetings were organized by Party branches in towns, cities and villages to defend the cause of peace and the national independence of the Arab states. Poster parades were carried through in many places. Meetings outside factory gates were multiplied. Within a matter of days hundreds of thousands of leaflets were produced and distributed, and a pamphlet hurriedly rushed from the press sold 17,000 copies in two weeks.

Typical of the initiative displayed by many branches was the effort of one of our branches in Tottenham (London). At the height of the holiday season the branch went into action immediately to explain the international situation to the workers and to raise the question of more anti-war activity with key people in the Labor movement. A deputation from the branch visited the Labor M.P. and met with a sympathetic response. Local Councillors were also visited and all the local Labor Party branches written to, as was the Trades Council. Two thousand leaflets were produced and distributed, extra sales of the *Daily Worker* were arranged, and letters sent to the local press. An emergency Bulletin was issued to Party members, and support won for the all-London demonstration.

All this shows that the Communists consistently express the interests, thoughts and aspirations of the British people. This is understood by ever larger numbers of the working people. It is not fortuitous that during the Municipal Elections held throughout Britain last May, the success won by the Communist Party was reflected in twenty-one seats being won, eight of these being gains.

With continued attention to improving the work and organization of our branches and strengthening our ties with the masses we can look forward with confidence. Our Party and Program show the way forward for the British people.

W. LAUCHLAN,
Member, Executive Committee,
British Communist Party.

CONSOLIDATING THE RANKS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES

RECENT developments in the Communist Party of the United States indicate an important move in the direction of consolidating its ranks and improving its work among the masses.

During the past few years the Communist Party was forced to conduct a serious struggle against the revisionists and splitters who sought to disrupt and destroy it.

The undermining activities of the Gates revisionist group gravely injured the Party. However, the hopes of the enemies of the working class were not fated to be realized. The sound elements in the Party leadership, supported by the organizations chiefly in the industrial areas, fought hard to preserve and consolidate the Party. The first gains are now evident.

The XVIth National Convention (February 1957) stressed that the main task was to strengthen and consolidate the Communist Party and overcome its isolation. It clearly defined the essential features of the Party, reaffirming that it must be a working-class party based on the scientific principles of Marxism-Leninism, which it applies and develops in keeping with the conditions in the country and the traditions of the class struggle in the United States. The Convention decisions were, therefore, a severe blow to the revisionists. They were also of no small importance in the fight against Left-sectarianism and dogmatism.

The revisionists, however, did not give up their factional activity even after the Convention. They put up an especially hard fight against the Party's endorsing the Declaration of the Communist and Workers' Parties.

The National Commitee meeting held in February played an important part in the fight against revisionism. The resolution, passed by a majority vote, called on all Party members to defend the Party, and to fight for its Marxist-Leninist program, theory and principles. It called on all Party members and organizations to develop the maximum political and organizing initiatives, to strengthen the Party and its mass contact and influence, to help shape the course of events in the interests of the working class and the country.

The meeting expressly re-affirmed the tried and tested principles of all revolutionary working-class parties, according to which the minority submits to the majority. It also pointed out that a resolute struggle should be waged against Left-sectarianism, which is a formidable obstacle to Party work and a serious menace to the unity and political line of the Party. On the other hand, the meeting pointed out, there still existed the "dangerous Right-opportunist and revisionist viewpoint, exemplified most strikingly by the anti-Marxist views and actions of a Gates.

"While vigorously opposing and consistently striving to overcome sectarianism and doctrinairism, we must also relentlessly combat the ideas and positions of revisionism. Without a decisive repudiation and defeat of the revisionist trend in our ranks, we cannot carry on a systematic and effective struggle against Left-sectarianism and dogmatism . . . "

In supporting the Communist Parties of other countries which unanimously endorsed the Decla-

ration of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist countries, the National Committee declared:

"This is a document of far-reaching, historic importance. Together with the 64-Party Manifesto on Peace, it serves to unite all peace forces in a successful struggle to avert war and promote peaceful coexistence. It reinforces the unity both of the socialist countries and of the international working-class and Marxist movements. It is a major Marxist-Leninist contribution to the fight for world peace, democracy, national freedom and socialism. Communists, socialists and progressives everywhere should study it and learn from it, Americans no less than others."

The fight of the CP USA against all forms of opportunism is part and parcel of the struggle waged by the Communists in all countries against international revisionism. The American Communists have criticized the new program of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia, which, in itself, is a concentrated expression of modern revisionist views. Comrade Dennis pointed out at an Executive meeting that the Yugoslav program deviates essentially from Marxist - Leninist principles, that it is revisionist and is in opposition to the views expressed both in the Moscow Declaration and the Manifesto on Peace. The policy of the Yugoslav leaders, he said, runs counter to that of the CP USA, particularly because it is based on an un-Marxist estimate of the international situation and overlooks the fact that it is American imperialism that is responsible for the tension.

The defense of Marxist-Leninist principles, naturally, is not to the liking of those who would like to see the Party turned into a debating society. However, the National Committee meeting held in June has again convincingly shown that the advocates of this line have failed.

The June meeting (the fifth full session since the XVIth National Convention) noted the growing unity in the Party ranks as well as definite progress in the work for peace, for the economic and social demands of the workers and the rights of the Negro people.

Comrade Eugene Dennis, National Secretary, reported on the latest international developments. He declared that despite all obstacles, temporary difficulties, and the dangers created by the monopolies, State Department and Pentagon — the main trend in international development indicates a weakening of the imperialist positions and growing intensity in the struggle for peace, national liberation and social progress. The overall perspective for peaceful coexistence and the fight for national liberation continues to grow.

Comrade Bob Thompson, Executive Secretary, reported on the work of the Party. He noted the progress made since the February meeting of the National Committee in consolidating the Party, the considerable improvement in Party registration, the promise of a rising circulation for *The Worker*, and improved morale. He also pointed to greater understanding of the Party's policy on the basis of the general line of the XVIth Convention.

At the same time he did not minimize the two extremes in the Party, opposed to its main line: on the one hand, the dwindling group that continues to adhere to revisionist policies and views, and on the other, the ultra-Lefts, who also challenge the line of the Party and engage in factional activity.

After a lively discussion the two reports were adopted. The vote on the Dennis report was 30 for, 1 against and 8 abstentions. The vote on the Thompson report was 28 for, 8 against and 3 abstentions.

Four of the six vacancies on the National Executive Committee were filled. The meeting approved the selection of officers of the National Committee previously elected by the NEC on the authority granted to it by the February meeting. They are Eugene Dennis, National Secretary; Robert Thompson, Executive Secretary; James Jackson, Negro and Southern Affairs Secretary; Hy Lumer, Educational Director; Arnold Johnson, Legislative Secretary, and Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, National Field Organizer.

The committee sent greetings to William Z. Foster, Chairman emeritus, who is making excellent recovery from the stroke he suffered last October.

Facts show that the CP USA is surmounting the numerous obstacles and exposing the opportunists of all hues. It is making better headway along the road mapped out by the XVIth National Convention.

BIG VICTORY FOR CHILEAN COMMUNISTS

A LAW annulling the ban on the Chilean Communist Party was enacted on August 2. This closed an important phase in the indefatigable struggle waged by the Communists against internal and external reactionaries.

It should be recalled that the Communist Party was made illegal by the "Defense of Democracy Law" adopted by the government in 1948 under pressure of North American imperialism. At that time the United States secured the enactment of anti-communist legislation not only in Chile but in a number of other Latin American countries. The Chilean people dubbed it the "damned law".

Senator Faivovich, Radical, whose party forced the law through Congress, admitted that its "sole purpose was to break up and destroy the workers' organizations".

The Communist Party warned that the repression which followed the adoption of the "damned law" would be felt not only by the Communists. Actually, 40,000 citizens were disfranchised on grounds of belonging to the Communist Party. Thousands of progressives and patriots — non-Party people, Socialists, Democrats, Christian-Democrats and even Radicals — were discharged from the civil service and removed from the leading bodies of public organizations. Hundreds of non-Party, trade union and peasant leaders were exiled and thrown into concentration camps.

In this atmosphere of terror the government concluded a bilateral military agreement with the United States, while the reactionary army brass and financial magnates tried to disperse Parliament.

The reactionaries failed, however, to destroy the Communist Party which not only preserved its branches but also initiated a broad democratic movement. This movement thwarted the putsch engineered by the fascist organizations of army officers known as "Linea Recta".

A big strike movement developed in the country in 1955 and 1956. The general strike of June 1956 involved 1,200,000 workers, that is nearly the entire adult urban population. Trade union unity was restored.

The Communists established close contact with the Socialist Party which grew considerably after the merger with the People's Socialist Party. This made it possible to go ahead with the work of building the Democratic Front of National Liberation. The core of this organization — the Popular Action Front (FRAP) — was formed in 1956. The presidential candidate nominated by the FRAP is supported not only by the Communist and Socialist Parties, but also by the Democratic Party, the Doctrinal-Radical Party, the Party of Labor and the National Alliance of the Working People. Branches of the Front function all over the country. The wide support accorded the FRAP in the election campaign and the poularity of its slogans have forced the other parties, which have a certain influence among the petty-bourgeois and the backward sections of the working population, to support its demands.

In April 1958, the FRAP, the Radical, the Christian Democratic, Agrarian-Laborist and National parties formed a parliamentary bloc of democratic regeneration, to secure the repeal of the "Defense of Democracy Law", and democratization of the electoral law. The "damned law" was annulled thanks to the votes of the deputies and senators of the bloc.

The repeal of the "Defense of Democracy Law" testifies to the vitality and strength of the Communist Party, which for many years was closely linked with the people. The participation of the Communists in the People's Front of 1936-40 and in the government (from November 1946 to April 1947) demonstrated that they were the genuine exponents of the innermost aspirations of the people. The Communists proved themselves to be excellent organizers, concerned with the welfare of the people; they ensured bread for the starving population and suppressed profiteering. They insisted on the employers' abiding by labor legislation. They fought tirelessly for the independence and sovereignty of Chile. This explains why the Communist Party polled the greatest number of votes during the 1947 municipal elections.

During the years of underground work the Party purged its ranks, expelling the adventurists and opportunists. It preserved its basic factory branches. While underground it succeeded in maintaining its contact with the masses. The workers elected Communists to the leading trade union bodies.

At the time of the brutal repressions, when many Communists perished in concentration camps and in exile, some 200 illegal newspapers were published in different parts of the country, as well as the Party journal *Principios*. In recent years the Party has launched the daily newspaper *El Siglo* and the weekly *Orientacion*. The people donated money to maintain their publications. In the columns of progressive newspapers and journals the Communists constantly explained to the people the Party's stand on the vital issues. With the help of the public at large they secured the arrest and conviction of officials and secret police agents who had attacked the *El Siglo* Publishing House and printshop.

Despite the severe persecution, the Party, while underground, held its Tenth Congress in April 1956 and afterwards published the Congress documents. Collected articles on the history of the Party by Galo Gonzalez Diaz, "Life of a Communist" by Elias Lafertte, the Chairman of the Party, popular biographies of Luiz Emilio Recabarren (founder of the Party and its General Secretary from 1922 to 1925) and Ricardo Fonseca (General Secretary in 1946-49), a number of novels and collections of stories dealing with the activities and history of the Party ("Coal" by D. Munos, "The Son of Niter" and "The Seed in the Sand" by V. Teitelboim, "The Basis" by Luis Enrique Delano and others), and the poems of Pablo Neruda and other Communist poets, have been published in large editions.

The reactionaries were unable to isolate the Party from the people. In point of fact it functioned legally even before the repeal. During the election campaign this year Communists invariably spoke at the public meetings alongside the FRAP speakers. In May, Luis Carvalan, General Secretary of the Party, spoke over the radio. Following the death

of General Secretary Galo Gonzalez Diaz, the campaign of recruitment, named for him, resulted in a forty per cent increase in membership between February and June.

The repeal of the "Defense of Democracy Law" signifies a major success for the people of Chile and a big defeat for U.S. policy in the Latin American countries. Commenting on the significance of the Communist Party regaining legal status, Senator Salvador Allende, the FRAP Presidential nominee, said: ". . . this is striking proof of the failure of the policy designed to suppress the popular movement and divert the country from the highroad of history." The repeal takes on all the more significance because it practically coincided with such important events as the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship in Venezuela and Colombia and the victory of the democratic forces in Argentina during the February elections.

One of the main reasons for the outstanding success won by the Party of the Chilean proletariat lies in its fidelity to scientific Communism. The recent XXVIIIth meeting of the Central Committee confirmed the decision adopted at the XXVIth meeting, that the Party approved the Moscow Declaration of the Communist and Workers' Parties and condemned latter-day revisionism. In his speech at a public meeting in Santiago, Cesar Godoy Urritia, a member of the Central Committee, said: "Under the most difficult conditions the Party remained faithful to the Marxist-Leninist principles, loyal to its class, consistent in its proletarian internationalism and true to the country and her sons."

SAFEGUARDING JOBS

SO FAR the economic crisis in the United States has had no great effect in Austria. But inasmuch as the country's exports—the basis of the high business level—are channeled mainly "to the West", her economy is highly susceptible to crises. The economic deterioration has resulted in the employers' resorting to mass lay-offs.

The decline is taking place at a time when the capital invested in recent years for industrial rationalization is beginning to yield results. The higher labor productivity in many plants is making for "redundancy". For instance, of the 2,000-odd workers employed in three factories of the "Austria-Emmil-Werke" 600 have lost their jobs in the space of one year. Volume of output, however, is practically at the same level, while profits, as the recently published balance-sheet of this enterprise shows, have risen considerably. As a result of the rationalization over three hundred workers—over 15 per cent of the personnel—have been dismissed at the "Voeslauer Kammgarnfabrik".

Even when business was at peak many workers were unable to find jobs. Last winter the registered unemployed numbered 213,000 (a record figure), of whom 76,000 had been employed of late in the building trades. This summer, with a total of 1,300,000 employed in big industry and handicrafts, there were 70,000 jobless. True many of those discharged, mainly skilled workers, find jobs elsewhere. Aged workers, particularly women over 45 and unskilled male workers over 55, are barred from industry. (It should be borne in mind that in Austria men retire on pension at 65 and women at 60.) Loss of work, even if one finds another job, considerably restricts the right to benefit from the social services, which requires a certain period of work. This affects holidays, the length of which depends on the number of years worked in a particular factory, holiday and Christmas bonuses, scale of temporary disablement allowances, and so on. It is understandable, therefore, that the workers are upholding their right to work.

That is why the Communist Party of Austria sees one of its basic tasks in helping the working people to defend their right to steady work. In most cases where dismissals threatened at the big factories, the Communists organized the workers to combat them.

The forms of this struggle are varied: the factory committee decides that the dismissals were illegal and transfers its decision to the State Arbitration Court; demands are advanced for a change in economic policy in favor of extending trade with the socialist countries, which is of particular significance for neutral Austria; and, lastly, direct action by the workers.

The Communists explain to workers that first of all they should insist that the leaders of the government parties, namely, the parties of the big bourgeoisie—the People's Party and the Right-wing Socialist Party—fulfil their promises to maintain full employment.

Here are two examples of the struggle.

"Moosbrunner Glasswerke," one of the oldest glass-works in Austria, employed some 300 people. Until 1955 this enterprise was managed by the Soviet authorities as former German property. Immediately after its transfer to the Austrian Government the glass cartel tried to oust its rivals and forced the closing of the works. But the workers, led by the Communists—members of the factory committee—fought for several months and at last secured its reopening.

The cartel, however, did not relinquish its efforts with the result that in June 1958 the danger of closure again threatened. At first 80 and then another 105 workers were laid off. The cartel offered the Central Savings' Bank of the Vienna Municipal Council (the principal share-holder, which is headed by the Right-wing Socialists) a sum equivalent to the value of the annual output of the plant as compensation for suspending work. The workers,

however, rallied public opinion against the intrigues of the glass cartel. Members of the factory committee jointly with the Mayor of Moosbrunn (closure would have been a grave blow to the local finances) visited the bodies concerned. The cartel had to acknowledge defeat, and the plant was not closed.

The second example is Wiener Neustadt—the center of an old industrial region—which is now in a bad plight. Nearly 2,000 workers were dismissed there in the space of a few weeks. The lay-off of 20 per cent of the workers in the big Raks-Werk plant was alarming news for the district. In the fight for their jobs the workers sought the support of the population in the town. This was facilitated by the fact that every dismissal meant not only loss of job and wages, it directly threatened the activities of the municipal authority. (Taxes on industrial enterprises are the main source of municipal revenue.) Wholesale dismissals also endanger the housing construction carried on mainly by the urban and rural authorities, jeopardize payment of social insurance benefits, and public works—road building and so on.

To alert people to the impending danger, the Raks-Werk workers organized demonstrations in Wiener Neustadt and in Vienna. They sent telegrams to the Federal Chancellor and to the Minister of Trade. Posters were issued and articles published in newspapers urging all public organizations to support the workers. True, it was impossible to prevent the firing of 175 workers. Nevertheless, some success was achieved. The Government was compelled to promise credits to ensure jobs for the workers.

These examples, and their number could be multiplied, show that the Communists are the most consistent participants and, as a rule, initiators of the struggle against dismissals. The Communist members of the factory committee, members of the communal councils, Land and Federal Parliaments, trade union funcitionaries, and the Party press, play an important part in this struggle. One cannot but note that, although the Association of Trade Unions claims in its program that full employment is one of its main demands, the leaders of some unions—members of the Right-wing Socialist Party—do not call the workers to militant action, and place the interests of their alliance with the bourgeois party above those of the workers.

The struggle against dismissals helps the workers to realize from practical experience what the theory of "transformed capitalism" advanced by the Right-wing Socialists means. They are becoming more and more convinced that there can be no success without struggle and that the struggle can be successful only if it is waged by the united front of the Communists, Socialists and all workers.

Egon KODICEK,
Member, Central Committee,
Communist Party of Austria.

MASS POLITICAL WORK AMONG WOMEN IN ALBANIA

PRIOR to the victory of the people's democratic revolution, Albania was under foreign rule; the lot of women was particularly hard. They had no political rights whatever and were at the lowest rung in society. A woman was not permitted to be present at a gathering of men; this was considered immoral, and for a woman to work in a factory or field was a disgrace. Women had no electoral rights and were nearly all illiterate.

During the partisan war for the liberation of the country the Albanian Party of Labor carried on large-scale political work among women. The League of Albanian Women, a mass organization, was founded in 1943. At that time there were some 6,000 women in the partisan detachments, many of whom died the death of the brave on the battlefield. Peasant women supplied the partisans with food and clothing, and those in the towns helped in underground activites. Under the Constitution adopted immediately after the liberation, women gained equal political rights.

But it was no easy task to free the women from the prejudices and survivals of the past, to get them to exercise the rights granted them under the people's democracy, and to enlist them for socialist construction. Throughout the postwar years the Albanian Party of Labor has devoted much attention to this task.

It regards mass political work among women as an important part of its activity and carries out this work in three main directions.

First and foremost the Party set out to draw the women into social production. Helped by the example of the leading women — mainly those who fought in the national-liberation struggle—the Party organizations conducted mass and individual agitation with a view to encouraging the women to work in the factories. It was pointed out in the press and in the talks with women that labor was a matter of honor. The wives of the Party members were the first to respond. Party branches had talks with the men who refused to allow their wives and grown-up daughters to work. Women were addressed by old men who explained to them that there was no disgrace in going out to work, and that the Turks had deliberately deceived the people by alleging that the Koran forbade women to work.

Classes and training courses were arranged for women to enable them to acquire trades; good conditions were created in the factories to attract women with children. At present the industrial enterprises have 87 nurseries (there were none before the liberation) and 330 kindergartens. Canteens have been opened in the factories, food is also prepared there for consumption at home. In keeping with the Party decision adopted in 1950, "On Work

Among Women", the Government began to plan the recruiting of women for industry. As a result there were over 32,000 working women by the end of 1957. In many factories (tobacco, textile and others) up to 70 per cent and more are women. Many of them have become highly efficient and exceed the production targets. In some factories women have begun to take charge of production sectors. The Central Committee of the Party holds annual conferences at republican level of the best women workers—those who have distinguished themselves in the various branches.

With the development of large-scale co-operation in the countryside the task of drawing women into farm work is also being solved successfully. The majority of the women work in the co-operatives. The women's councils in the co-operatives act as initiators in accelerating the development of publicly-owned livestock and poultry farms. In the Durres District, for example, 45 poultry farms were organized in the co-operatives on the initiative of women—they supplied their own fowl to give the farms a start.

The participation of most of the women in social production makes them active builders of socialism and facilitates their cultural and political education.

Immediately after the liberation the task of the day was to abolish illiteracy among the women. One, three and five-year courses were arranged in towns and countyside—in factories and places of residence—with the result that an important victory was won: illiteracy among the population up to the age of 40 has been abolished. Special conditions have been created for women entering vocational schools and higher educational establishments.

Simultaneously with the abolition of illiteracy large-scale cultural work was carried on among women. As a result of individual and group talks, regular lectures on scientific and educational subjects, women have begun to lose many of their prejudices. At public meetings many of them discarded their paranjas (veils), which were burnt on the spot. Women began to go to the theatre and cinema. In the town of Shkoder, for instance, group visits to the cinema are arranged for the women every Monday and Friday. On Thursdays they go to the theater. The price of tickets has been reduced from 15 to 5 leks for group visits to the cinema, while the price of theater tickets has been halved. The film is preceded by a short talk on science and technology, on health and political subjects.

A network of women's groups functions in factories, villages, clubs, houses of culture, in the reading-rooms, and in the residential quarters in the towns. The groups known as "Book Friends", for instance, consist of lovers of classical literature. Extracts from books recommended for individual reading are read at meetings of this group. "Reading Groups" with about 20-30 members have been formed for those just taking to reading. Articles from newspapers and journals are read and discussed in these groups. Many working women and housewives attend groups where they are taught domestic science, sewing and child upbringing.

The Party organizations devote close attention to rural sanitation and improvement of peasant homes. The co-operatives have ensured the peasants substantial incomes, in kind and in cash; the money, however, in view of the old habits is not always used to buy furniture, crockery, window curtains and so on. The Party organizations in the leading co-operatives hold talks with the peasants and advise them to furnish their homes in the proper way. In the village of Libonik, Korce District, for instance, the peasants have spent 1,200,000 leks on furniture. Members of the Spital co-operative, Durres District, have built themselves new houses and installed electricity. They have bought new furniture, crockery and wireless sets. The District Party Committee has arranged, through the branches, for the peasants of the surrounding villages to visit this co-operative. It is a common practice in Durres for women's teams consisting of medical workers, teachers and others to spend ten days in the villages of the district where they visit the homes of the members of four or five co-operatives. In accordance with a District Party Conference decision, the houses in 50 co-operatives of this district will, by the end of the year, be furnished on the Spital model. Some 200 co-operatives in the Republic have already followed this example.

Political work among the women proceeds in a third important direction—deepening their political consciousness and acquainting them with home and world politics. Lectures and talks on these subjects are given at special meetings, and also before a film or performance. The Party organizations attach agitators to the domestic science, sewing and other groups for talks on political subjects either before the group studies begin or during the interval.

Women took an active part in the election campaign this summer. Many of them acted as canvassers, decorated the polling stations and arranged exhibitions.

The women of Albania respond eagerly to important international events. At women's meetings throughout the Republic they welcomed the decision of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. to end tests of nuclear weapons. Women speakers addressed hundreds of meetings protesting against the Anglo-American aggression in the Lebanon and Jordan, thus displaying their political maturity. Interesting meetings took place with the Women's Peace Caravan. A wide campaign was launched in support of the Algerian people. In Tirana, Durres, Elbasan and Korce the women made some 5,000 garments—trousers, dresses, blouses and other articles —for Algerian children.

The women's groups regularly correspond with women of other countries. A week of Friendship and Solidarity with the Women of the World is held annually.

The Party organizations conduct all their work among women through the Women's League and its councils in factories and among the population in the towns and villages. The Party Committees and organizations help the women's councils daily and guide their work. For instance, the Durres District Party Committee recently discussed the question of work among the women. The question was carefully prepared with the help of women—active social workers. The District Committee's decision outlined ways and means for improving the work. Seminars and meetings are held regularly with the chairmen and members of the women's councils, and their work discussed. In some districts the chairmen of the women's councils are also members of bureaus and plenums of the Party Committees.

The mass political work conducted by the Albanian Party of Labor draws all women into active participation in social life. In recent years many women have been promoted to leading posts in Party, economic, administrative, trade union and other organizations. Forty-six women held prominent positions in the Party and state apparatus (Liri Belishova, Secretary of the Central Committee of the Party, Fikrete Shehu, Deputy Chairman of the Presidium of the People's Assembly, three Deputy Ministers, and so on). Seventeen women have been elected to the People's Assembly, 1,614 are members of the people's councils, 658 are judges or their assistants.

The impact of the socialist transformations that have taken place in the country can be observed first and foremost in the changes in the life and consciousness of the women of Albania.

AGITATION AMONG THE ARATS IN THE MONGOLIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC

THE People's Revolutionary Party attaches great importance to political agitation among the arats who constitute the majority of the population of the Mongolian People's Republic. In the past the arats engaged in extensive cattle-raising and led the life of nomads. Agitation is aimed at ensuring the successful fulfilment of the national-economic tasks and rooting out the survivals of the past in the minds of the people.

Thousands of agitators explain the policy of the Party and Government to the working people, and thus help deepen their political consciousness. At present each agitator works with about 14 families.

The Party works closely with the agitators. Seminars and meetings are held regularly and aids to agitators in the shape of books and pamphlets are published. Once every three months, seven-day study courses are arranged for Party members engaged in stock-raising, some of whom are also agitators.

Leading workers regularly lecture on Party and Government decisions, on the friendship and fraternal co-operation of the peoples of the socialist countries, the international situation, etc. Agitation among the arats also includes educational meetings, collective listening to the radio, reading of newspapers and books, film shows, performances by amateur art groups, the issuance of wall-newspapers and agitators' leaflets.

The purpose of the agitation is to convince the arats of the advantage of collective labor, to promote the further development of agricultural co-operation, the application of the achievements of science and technology and advanced methods in agriculture. It is also to ensure gradual transition from a nomadic to a settled life.

Where the mass-political work among the arats is conducted properly and agricultural knowledge is broadly popularized, good results are obtained in fulfilling the tasks of the socialist reconstruction of agriculture. In 1952 only 5 per cent of the arat families were organized in co-operatives, in 1957 the figure had risen to 35 per cent. Implementing of the decisions adopted at the XIIIth Congress of the People's Revolutionary Party, held last March, has resulted in a new advance of the arat co-operation movement. There are now more than 700 co-operatives embracing 42 per cent of the arat families. In the four months between April and July of this year, nearly 100 co-operatives were set up.

The arats, together with the working class and the people's intelligentsia, resolved to fulfil the Three-Year Plan (1958-60) ahead of schedule, and are taking an active part in the building of socialism.

LENIN'S COLLECTED WORKS PUBLISHED IN ARGENTINA

THE "Cartago" Publishing House in Buenos Aires is now putting out the *Collected Works* of V. I. Lenin in the Spanish language (the translation is from the fourth Russian edition). Six volumes, the 1st, 3rd, 23rd, 24th, 25th and 26th, have already come off the press. A multi-volume *Collected Works* of Lenin is thus being issued in Spanish for the first time. This enterprise, said the Brazilian weekly *Voz operaria*, is an "invaluable contribution to the Marxist-Leninist education of Communists in Latin American countries."

Reviews

"Storm-swept France"

STORM-SWEPT FRANCE. A Special Issue of *Rinascita,* Nos. 6-7, June-July, 1958.*

"STORM-SWEPT FRANCE" is the heading of the issue of *Rinascita* devoted to the events in France and to the struggle of the French people against the fascist danger and in defense of the Republic. The leading article, " 'NON' to de Gaulle," tells us that this issue was prepared in co-operation with French Communists. Its appearance coincided with the days when Europe and the whole world were in the grip of tension. That is why the special number, as stated in the editorial, "cannot merely be an act of moral solidarity with the French Communist Party, now engaged in a bitter struggle, it must be a contribution to our common struggle."

Analyzing the alignment of class forces in France, it emphasizes the solidarity of the progressive forces of Italy with the French working people who are combating war and fascism.

"France's place in Europe and in the world," the journal writes, "and the task which her people, her parties and her state institutions are called upon to perform at the present time are great. The question as to who will prevail — the reactionary imperialist forces, or the popular democratic forces — is of decisive importance. The alarm experienced by all Italian democrats when they learned that on June 1 in Paris the government and the majority of the deputies had capitulated to the rebels shows that in Italy people understand the role of France, and that real and profound ties link the two peoples."

This alarm, the journal points out, is felt not only by the Italian working class but by ordinary people and progressive intellectuals alike.

The events in Algiers, Ajaccio and Paris, it continues, show that "in France, as in Italy, capitalism is prepared to trample upon the banner of democratic liberties: now that the twilight of imperialism and colonialism has set in, it seeks the support of the extreme Right and the forces doomed by history, who in a vain attempt to stave off their inevitable doom are raising the banner of revolt, war and fascism. These forces are opposed by the working class which emerges from all trials with head erect because justice is on its side."

The lesson of the French events, according to the journal, is that "the foundations of the traditional policy of the bourgeoisie, faced with the threat of the Gaullist revolt, crumbled; none can deny that the Communist Party alone, as an organization, as a political and ideological force, stood up to the crafty and frenzied attacks, whereas the leaders of the bourgeoisie and social democracy displayed their weakness and corruption."

The vigorous struggle waged by the French Communist Party in defense of the Republic has added considerably to its prestige. It gave the people timely warning of the fascist danger and created the necessary conditions for mobilizing the democratic forces.

"The French Communist Party," Palmiro Togliatti writes, "by its entire past and by its present strength, is, undoubtedly, equal to its tasks."

Laying bare the essence of fascism's "national roads," he explains that "the fascist danger, a permanent danger at the present stage of the profound crisis of the capitalist system, becomes more serious in those countries and in those conditions where the crisis is so acute that the old ruling classes are no longer able to govern by means of the traditional parliamentary methods and to observe some of the popular liberties." Saying that the Italian Communists, fully confident of their strength and of the strength of the Italian labor movement as a whole, are fully alive to the danger of the rebirth of fascism in Italy as well, Togliatti writes:

"True, we are not faced with such acute problems as the Algerian problem is for France. In Italy, however, there are problems arising from the profound social and class contradictions and the different levels of development in separate regions, which are even more acute than those in France. Our country is almost splintered by these differences, and while the majority of the gainfully employed population seek the necessary solutions in the right direction pointed out by our Party, this striving is suppressed and partly paralyzed by the infringing of electoral rights by the all-powerful clericals and the corrupt civic authorities. Thus, we live under a regime whose democratic foundations have been seriously sapped. The temptation to thwart the progressive development of our democracy is very strong among those who imposed a fascist tyranny on us for 20 years, and for this it is not absolutely necessary for those who sported black shirts in the past to

---

*Rinascita (Regeneration)—journal of political and cultural affairs, edited by Palmiro Togliatti.

take them out of their cupboards."

Jacques Duclos, in an article headed "The French Communist Party Against Dictatorship and Fascism," points out that the situation requires the broadest unity of the working class and Republican forces. But, "unfortunately, despite the gravity of the situation, the Socialist minority and other Republicans still continue to harp on 'unity of the non-Communist Left forces,' hinting at the possibility of achieving unity with the 'others,' that is the Communists, at some future date.

"Anti-Communism, to which some of de Gaulle's ministers resort, for example Malraux, continues to be the basis of the splitting maneuvers that have already caused serious damage and through which de Gaulle's Government hopes to create favorable conditions for establishing fascism in France."

Some of the articles show that the creation of a government of military dictatorship signifies a break with legality, heralds the destruction of bourgeois democracy, and clears the road to fascism.

For example, in the article "The Monopolies and the Class Struggle in France," Henri Krasucki shows that the reason behind the support of the capitalist magnates for de Gaulle's Government is their belief in his loyalty. The presence in the Government of such ministers as Jacquinot, Couve de Murville, Antoine Pinay and others closely associated with the financial oligarchy indicates that the financial magnates trust de Gaulle and count on his full support.

That France, as a result of her colonialism, has lost her liberty and that colonial war means fascism, is the subject of Leon Feix's article "The Nature of French Colonialism." He shows that the French bourgeoisie, which ruled one of the biggest colonial empires in the world, has proved incapable of solving the problems that have arisen as a result of the crisis of colonialism.

Malleret-Juinville takes as his subject the part played by the army in the plot against the Republic. He rejects the view of those who would like to explain the events as the consequence of militarism, and points out that the militarists who aided and abetted the plot against the Republic, are merely a component of French reaction and impart a militarist flavor to de Gaulle's dictatorship.

De Gaulle is backed also by the Catholic church. This is the theme of the article by Angelo Franza. In the article "The Right Wing and the Fascists in the Gaullist Adventure" Auguste Pancaldi underlines that "the extreme Right in France is not all that strong," it is inspired and instigated by the ultra-reactionaries, the Algerian colonists.

Some adhere to the view that de Gaulle's Government is a "limited experiment," while others think that the "first stage" ended with his advent to power, and that the second stage will begin with the establishment of a military fascist dictatorship, which will eradicate the vestiges of democratic liberties.

Pancaldi draws the conclusion that since de Gaulle's advent to power has not solved a single one of the major problems (Algerian, economic improvement, the contradiction between metropolitan and colonial capital), things may develop in one of two directions: either the democratic forces will defeat de Gaulle or the Right will ultimately impel France onto the road of fascism.

Unity of the democratic forces can block the way to fascism in France. French men and women of all shades of opinion — Communists, Socialists, Radicals, Catholics, prominent intellectuals, workers, peasants and students — are joining the Committees for Defense of the Republic. This activity by the democratic forces is described by Raymond Guyot, who notes that these Committees, formed all over the country, have expressed the firm resolve of the masses to fight fascism.

Much space in the journal is devoted to the attitude taken by non-Communist Republicans. Velio Spano in an article headed "The Limits of the Activity of the French 'Left'," criticizes the indecision of those "Lefts" who, influenced by anti-Communism, are waiting for something to happen, thus hindering the unity of the Republican forces. It is precisely because of the division in the ranks of the workers and the Republican forces, because of the disastrous policy of anti-Communism, that the Government of one-man dictatorship has become possible. The reactionary forces, resorting to the old bogey of a "Communist danger," are trying to divert the masses from the real threat. And the threat to France at the present time is fascism. In these conditions the non-Communist "Lefts" could, undoubtedly, reach agreement with the Communists on united action for the purpose of preventing fascism.

In an article on "Frontism" Emilio Sereni castigates the fear of "frontism" (fear of a popular front—*Ed.*) which is typical of some of the Lefts in France and in Italy.

Of great importance in ensuring the success of the French people in their struggle for peace and in defense of the Republic is the support accorded them by the working people of other countries.

The subject of international working-class solidarity is treated by Arturo Colombi and Mario Montagnana, who analyze the exchanges of experience between the Communist Parties of France and Italy, and also the close links that have been established between the working people of the two countries.

In "The Historical Links of the Struggle of the French and Italian Communists," Mario Montagnana writes: "The bonds of fraternal friendship between the two peoples are not merely the result of similarity of language, customs and past history.

They are mainly the result of the struggle which the masses of the working people and Italian anti-fascist exiles waged jointly with the working people of France against reaction and fascism, often at the cost of liberty and life."

* * *

The special number of *Rinascita* is a striking manifestation of a growing proletarian internationalism, an instructive example of solidarity and fraternal co-operation between the two biggest Communist Parties in the capitalist world.

The significance of this co-operation, as is justly emphasized in the leading article, goes far beyond the bounds of moral solidarity. It reflects an understanding of the identity of the vital interests of the people, of all the progressive forces in the fight against reaction and war, against the fascist danger. A review of the contents of the journal shows that both Parties are acting as genuine leaders of the people, as staunch champions of universal peace and democracy. Exposing the reactionary essence of "Gaullism" and barring the way to fascism, the Communist Parties are striking a heavy blow at international reaction, which is inspired by American imperialism.

Jan NOVAK.

Is There a "Middle Class"?

Andrew Grant. *Socialism and the Middle Classes*, London, Lawrence & Wishart, 1958, 171 pp.

THE aggravation of antagonisms in the capitalist countries impels bourgeois ideologists to devote ever increasing attention to the classes and class struggle. Distorting the true nature of social relationships, numerous bourgeois sociologists are trying in vain to refute the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the classes; their purpose is to divert the masses from the fight for socialism and to discredit the instructive experience gained from the abolition of the exploiting classes in the U.S.S.R. and the other socialist countries, where a new, classless society is emerging. That is the social significance of the concepts now fashionable in bourgeois sociology, such as "social stratification," "social mobility," "open society," etc.

In all these concepts prominence is given to the myth of the so-called "middle class," with the help of which it is intended to embellish the gloomy capitalist reality. The myth of the "middle class" is persisently professed by both bourgeois sociologists (J. Bernard, H. Grayson, H. Shelsky, R. Bertrand-Serret) and Social Democratic reformist theoreticians (C. Crossland, G. D. H. Cole, J. Moch, B. Kautsky), and, of course, by the revisionists. In spreading this myth they allege that, contrary to Marx's prediction of the inevitable polarization of the social classes, a rapid numerical growth of the "middle class" is taking place in modern capitalist society; this "middle class," it is claimed, is beginning to play a leading economic and political role and will, in time, absorb both bourgeoisie and proletariat, so that capitalism will gradually outlive itself and a classless society will gradually emerge. The myth of the "middle class' has become a kind of official doctrine in many capitalist countries: the "middle class" is referred to with growing frequency in the speeches of statesmen, in official documents and in government statistics.

It should be pointed out that among some Marxist theoreticians there is not sufficient clarity on the social and economic position of the middle elements. Recent discussions on the subject have revealed that some of them had a wrong idea of the place and role of the middle sections in modern capitalist society and were unable to distinguish them from the proletariat on the one hand, and the capitalists on the other. This was largely due to the fact that the real problem of the role of the middle sections — intermediate between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie — and their importance as allies of the working class was confused with the pseudo problem of the "middle class" of the bourgeois sociologists. The first, the **real** problem of the middle sections is set forth with the utmost clarity in the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin and in the policy documents of the Communist and Workers' Parties, whereas the other, *the pseudo problem*, should be critically analyzed and rejected as unscientific.

In preaching the myth of the "middle class", the ideologists of the monopoly bourgeoisie are obviously endeavoring to disunite the working people, to divide the working class. That is why Communists resolutely combat this myth, and do so on the grounds that it is directed against the emancipation movement of the working people. In recent years there have appeared in the communist and progressive press a number of useful works by Marxist scholars containing a critical analysis and exposure of the bourgeois apologist concepts of the classes and the class struggle and, in par-

ticular, the myth of the "*middle class*".* Among these the interesting book *Socialism and the Middle Classes*, by the British sociologist Andrew Grant, merits attention.

Upholding the Marxist-Leninist teaching on classes and class struggle, Andrew Grant first of all shows the fallacy of the definitions of social classes on which bourgeois sociologits and reformists base their concepts. Neither a poll to find out which class people wish to belong to, the size of their incomes, nor the nature of their work, manual or mental, as the author stresses, can reveal objectively the real structure of society — these are arbitrary yardsticks and those who use them deliberately ignore the chief thing — man's place in production. Polls on class membership, extremely popular among modern bourgeois sociologists, Grant notes, are doubly subjective: they depend not only on people's class consciousness, but largely on the way the question is posed, and on the groups of people among which the selective questioning is carried out. For it is perfectly obvious that the results of a poll on whether a person belongs to the "bourgeoisie, petty bourgeoisie or proletariat" will differ greatly from those obtained in one listing the divisions as "higher class, middle class or lower class"; millions of people who think of themselves as workers will answer in the negative when asked whether they belong to the "lower class". Nor can income level be taken as a measure of class relationship, for the fact that the incomes of a considerable section of farmers, self-employed and small shopkeepers are lower than the wages of skilled workers by no means transforms the petty bourgeois owning means of production into a proletarian deprived of them and obliged to sell his labor power. Neither can the nature of the work be accepted as the basis for the class division of society, as the bulk of the petty bourgeoisie, like the working class, earn their livelihood by manual labor. "If a person secures his livelihood by selling his ability to work to an employer, and this is his *main form* of earning, then he is a member of the working class," Grant writes. "The fact that he is conscious or unconscious of his class relationship is immaterial as far as his real position in society is concerned, although obviously if large numbers of workers think of themselves as 'lower middle class' for any length of time, this is a political factor of considerable importance, and can retard the development of the working-class movement." (p. 43.)

In contrast to the arbitrary subjective yardsticks of the bourgeois sociologists, the Marxist-Leninist definition of the classes (cf. Lenin, *Works*, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. 29, p. 388) based on their relationship to the means and instruments of production, Grant concludes, is consistently scientific and objectively reflects reality. It is man's relationship to the means of production that determines all his social relationships, his position in society, the source and size of his income, the nature of his work, and so on. Andrew Grant refutes the arguments of bourgeois sociologists and Labor reformist theoreticians to the effect that Marxism has become outdated, that it has failed to foresee the new "tendencies" and the complex social relationships in contemporary capitalist society. Quoting Marx and Lenin, Grant notes that their assessment of the laws of capitalist development and their prediction of the social differentiation of the petty bourgeoisie and the polarization of the social classes* have been brilliantly confirmed by statistical data in the main capitalist countries over the past century. The Marxist-Leninist teaching on classes and class struggle, Grant says, fully retains its validity for contemporary capitalist society, whereas the myth of the "middle class" has no real grounds whatever.

Grant's book contains much factual evidence concerning the social structure of Britain today. Using census figures and the results of various investigations, he carefully examines the status of the social sections, which, according to bourgeois sociology, comprise the "middle class": small manufacturers, shop-keepers, farmers, handicraftsmen, clerical and professional workers and others. He notes the peculiarities of the social structure in Britain where, compared with other capitalist countries, the petty bourgeoisie is relatively small in number and plays no significant role in production; skilfully applying the Marxist method, he brings out the real correlation of the classes in present-day Britain and the basic changes in this relationship over the past hundred years.

Although capitalist development has not been accompanied by the complete disappearance of the intermediate strata between bourgeoisie and proletariat, Grant observes, it has, however, led to a substantial change in their character, as Marx, Engels and Lenin foresaw. Throughout the century there has been a steady decline of the petty bourgeoisie in town and countryside, accompanied by a relative and, in some cases, an absolute decrease in the number of small manufacturers and shopkeepers, handicraftsmen and farmers, so that at present the proportion of wage workers among those gainfully employed has already reached nearly 90 per cent. (p. 61.) The rapid social differen-

*See, for example, M. Thorez' article "New Data on Impoverishment" in **Cahiers du Communisme**, No. 7-8, 1956; V. S. Semyonov's articles "The Myth of the 'Middle Classes' and Capitalist Realities" in **Voprosy Filosofii**, No. 5, 1957, and "Unscientific Theories on the Classes and Class Struggle in Modern Bourgeois Sociology" in **Kommunist**, No. 3, 1958; Ake Bengtsson's article "To What Class Do the Small Capitalists Belong?" in **Var tid**, No. 3, 1958.

*See K. Marx, Theory of Surplus Value, part I. Moscow 1955, p. 394; Lenin, Works, 4th Russ. ed., Vol. 3, p. 142 and Vol. 15, pp. 24-25.

tiation of the petty bourgeoisie and the polarization of the social classes are clearly seen from the fact that between 1935 and 1951 the number of workshops employing from 1 to 10 workers diminished by half—from 132,300 to 65,900—while the number of industrial enterprises employing 1,000 or more wage workers, practically doubled — from 533 to 984. In 1954-55, Grant tells us, 4,000 firms with an income of more than £100,000 each accounted for 70 per cent of the total profits; of these, 300 firms with an income of over £1,000,000 each, took 34.1 per cent of the total profits. In the same year 1,300,000 small shopkeepers, partnerships and firms had incomes of less than £1,000 each (p. 104.)

Most of the self-employed, shopkeepers and farmers, the author goes on, do not employ labor in their workshops, shops or farms; many of them are simply tenants or agents. Their standard of living is not high and their annual income is even lower than the wage of the worker in industry. This compels them or the members of their families to secure a livelihood by selling their labor power, which brings them closer to the proletariat. In 1952, out of 22 million families and individuals only 1.25 million, or 6 per cent, owned shares or other securities. (p. 106.)

The British petty bourgeoisie of today, Grant says with every justification, has lost the social and economic independence so assiduously ascribed to it by bourgeois sociologists and reformists. "The small owner in industry and agriculture—the idealized 'little man'—has declined . . . But none can deny that the 'independence' of the 'little man', while it may have been real enough in many cases in the 1850's, is largely mythical in the 1950's.

"The small shopkeeper is dependent on the big suppliers of brand goods, who decide his rate of profit and limit his livelihood to that of a mere agent or distributing point for their products; the small manufacturer is dependent on big combines for his supplies of materials and is in a rather similar position to those in the nineteenth century and earlier who received raw materials and worked them up into finished articles in the 'putting out' system. The tenant farmer is also dependent on the landowner, and on the suppliers of raw materials, agricultural machinery, etc." (pp. 53-54.) The independence of the small manufacturer today is, therefore, an illusion; he is the victim of twofold oppression, that of the monopolies who tie him down economically, and the fiscal policy of the state which controls and regulates his activity down to the smallest detail.

If in the 1850's, Grant notes, the concept "middle class" may have had some objective meaning in Britain, since it implied a relatively compact and numerous *petty bourgeoisie in town and countryside*, it had lost it by the 1950's in the developed capitalist countries, while retaining a certain significance in the economically underdeveloped countries. In order to cover up the wholesale ruin of the petty bourgeoisie and at the same time to provide an illusion of "middle class" growth and prosperity, the bourgeois sociologists and reformists include in it numerous sections of office workers, intellectuals and professional workers. Their rapid numerical growth in Britain during the past few decades is due to a number of reasons: 1) the growing parasitism of the bourgeoisie and decline of the capitalist system, which has been accompanied by an expansion of the administrative apparatus and the army, service personnel, unproductive expenditure on publicity, etc.; 2) the importance of Britain, especially London, as the administrative, business and financial center of a still vast empire; 3) expansion of social insurance, the health service and education, largely due to the working-class struggle; and 4) technological progress in industry.

As a result, in the three decades from 1921 to 1951 the number of clerical workers, for instance, rose from 1,294,000 to 2,332,000 and the number of technical experts and professional workers from 690,000 to 1,267,000. (pp. 67 and 117.)

However, neither clerks, shop assistants, specialists nor professionals, the author believes, can be lumped as "middle class" according to social status; nor do they form any particular "new middle class". Their rapid growth has been accompanied by mechanization of office work and at present most of them have lost their privileged position in society; only by stretching the imagination can the monotonous routine of clerks be described as mental work; before them, too, looms the specter of unemployment, and the salaries of most of them are even lower than the wages of skilled workers (this partly explains why two-thirds of the clerks and employees in trading establishments are now women). Most of the army of clerks and office workers, Grant remarks, are workers, but "white-collar workers". "Their method of earning a living is to work for an employer, more and more a big employer, for a salary or a wage." (p. 87.)

Major changes have taken place recently, the author continues, in the composition of the professional people, too. Whereas at the beginning of the twentieth century considerable numbers of specialists and professional people were self-employed, by 1951 some 87.7 per cent were working for a salary. The material position of the bulk of these people has also sharply deteriorated and differs but little from that of industrial workers.

A social analysis of capitalist society in Britain today, Grant concludes, confirms the correctness of the Marxist-Leninist teaching on classes and class struggle and refutes the "middle class" fic-

tion of the bourgeois sociologists and reformists. The "middle" elements — the petty bourgeoisie in town and countryside and the highly-paid clerical employees, specialists and members of the professions — amount to 17-18 per cent of the population.

"The 'middle class' is growing, say the wise men with their brand-new thinking — see how Marx is confounded by history! The fact remains that in the terms which Marx clearly defined — in terms of men's relationship to production, and not of collars or salaries or incomes or clothes or accents or any other inexact and subjective yardsticks — the little capitalist is squeezed, the self-employed are squeezed, the small farmer and smallholder are squeezed, if not out of existence, then into a very subordinate and relatively minor role.

"The 'middle' elements remaining are of a vastly different composition than in the 1850's or even in the 1890's or the 1910's. They include a new hybrid — the 'professional worker' whose collar may be white but who wears a sports jacket and flannels to work in the summer, and not a pinstriped suit and bowler hat." (p. 63.)

Grant criticizes Labor Party policy in regard to the middle elements and shows how Labor theorists are gradually slithering over to the tenets of the bourgeois sociologists on the question of classes, after having borrowed from them the idea of the "middle class". Despite the spread of trade unionism among clerical and professional workers, the Labor Party, according to the author, is neglecting these sections. The sectarian attitude adopted by many Labor leaders to the middle elements was one of the reasons for the Conservative victory in the 1950 and 1951 elections. The data cited by the author show that since the war the Conservatives have strengthened their position among clerical and professional workers, and among civil servants, while the Labor influence has proportionately diminished. Citing the example of Germany in the 1930's and the Poujadist movement in France, the author warns against the fascist danger which arises when the working-class movement is split and the Right Socialist leaders turn a blind eye to the reactionary political forces. Unity of the working class, the author tells us, is the vital condition for winning the support of the many clerical and professional workers and the petty bourgeoisie in town and country.

The picture of a growing and prospering "middle class" in modern capitalist society is simply one more ideological myth of bourgeois sociology which has been taken up by the reformists. It is a myth with a very definite purpose — to cover up the ruin of the petty bourgeoisie and the rule of monopoly capital, to split the working class and counterpose it to the remainder of the working population, to compel the latter to relinquish the idea of socialism and win them for class collaboration with the capitalists.

Andrew Grant's instructive book convincingly shows that there is no "middle class" in modern capitalist society. The concept "middle class" in bourgeois sociology embraces the most heterogeneous intermediate strata: the ruined petty bourgeoisie in town and countryside, office workers and members of the free professions; skilled workers and foremen, middle capitalists in industry, trade and agriculture, company directors, high-ranking officers — all are fitted into the category of "middle class". To say nothing of the fact that a considerable part of this imaginary "middle class" consists, by virtue of its social status, of workers, while another part consists of capitalists, the remaining intermediate strata do not form a special class in capitalist society. The circumstance that they belong neither to the working class nor to the class of capitalists is certainly not sufficient reason for placing them in a special class of their own, for *in composition the intermediate strata are extremely heterogeneous; their relationship to the means and instruments of production is not identical, nor are the sources of their income, their status in society or their interests.* It follows, then, that this special "class" has no *economic basis* whatever.

Pointing to the fallacy of the speculations of the bourgeois apologists about the destiny of the middle sections under capitalism, Maurice Thorez wrote: "In defiance of the facts, the revisionists deny the proletarianization of the middle sections; moreover, they ascribe to the Marxists, in order to be in a better position to 'refute' them, the vulgarized concept that the two main classes in society — the proletariat and the capitalists — will be the only classes and that the intermediate sections will disappear. In point of fact the Marxists are far from these absurd views. On the contrary, they say that a certain part of the middle sections can even grow. Marx in his day rebuked Ricardo for neglecting this fact . . . A twofold process is now taking place — the proletarianization of the middle sections which occupied a place in production is underway; it is accompanied by a tendency for parasitic elements to increase (army, police, officials, administrative personnel in industry, trade, credit organizations, and so on). The working class experiences growing difficulties because of the ever-increasing burden of maintaining the non-productive categories of society — from the pen-pusher to the subprefect and from the financial inspector to the clergyman". (New Data on Impoverishment, *Cahiers du Communisme*, No. 7-8, 1955, pp. 820-821.)

It should be noted that the word "middle" is not always applied in the same sense to the various

intermediate sections of capitalist society. In one instance (in characterizing the petty bourgeoisie in town and countryside) it implies the relationships to the means of production: the petty bourgeoisie is called the "middle" section because its members simultaneously own means of production as capitalists, and earn a livelihood by their labor as workers. Then (when characterizing, for example, members of the free professions), it implies the material and social status of people, and so on.

With the exception of the peasantry — a class which emerged from preceding formations and is disintegrating in the conditions of capitalist commodity production, but which still preserves its independent significance in many capitalist countries — the other intermediate sections are not separate "middle classes", for they have no independent role in social production. The basic interests of the bulk of these middle elements coincide with those of all the working people, with the interests of the working class, whose natural allies they are in the fight against monopoly capitalism, for national independence, peace and democracy, and, in the final count, in the fight for reshaping society on socialist principles. And only an insignificant part of these middle sections—the highly-paid officials, managers of big enterprises and other parasitic elements, who live on the exploitation of the working people—have linked their interests with state monopoly capitalism.

"The working class of Britain in industry and agriculture, with their families, constitute fully two-thirds of the population. The security and future prospects also of other sections of the people are closely bound up with those of the industrial workers. The great majority of clerical and professional workers, teachers, technicians and scientists, working farmers, shopkeepers, self-employed, and small businessmen, are victims of the reactionary policies of Tory big business at home and abroad.

"A working class united in action for progressive aims will win the support of many of these professional workers, small business people and working farmers. Like the industiral workers, they too suffer from high prices and rents and heavy taxation; they and their families are affected by the restriction of education, health and housing services. They suffer from the effects of aggressive imperialist policies and colonial wars. They fear the H-bomb; they want peace and social and economic progress, because only such a policy will give security to them and to their children. On all these issues the middle sections of the people can be drawn into the fight alongside the labor movement." *(The British Road to Socialism,* London, 1958.)

The myth of the "middle class", assiduously spread by bourgeois ideologists, is directed against the working-class emancipation movement; it is, in the long run, doomed to failure, for it runs counter to the basic interests of the working people. It can, however, for a certain period cause grave injury to the unity of the working people if it is not resolutely combated by educationg the masses of the people in a spirit of solidarity of interests and aims.

The problem of the middle sections in capitalist society and the attitude of the working class towards them are of great theoretical and practical importance, for this is a question of the allies of the working class in the struggle for socialism, of the strategy and tactics of the Communist Parties. While flatly rejecting the attempt of the bourgeois sociologists to create a "middle class" problem, Marxist scholars should thoroughly investigate the real position of the middle sections in contemporary capitalist society in specific capitalist countries, closely study their interests in order to win them to the side of the working class. It is to be hoped that more Marxist works and articles will be written on this important subject.

Edward ARAB-OGLY.

Reviews in Brief

G. Amendola. *La democrazia nel Mezzogiorno.* Roma, 1957, 446 p.
G. Amendola. *Democracy in Southern Italy.* Rome, 1957, 446 p.

GIORGIO AMENDOLA'S book is a compilation of articles and reports relating to the period when the author was in charge of Party work in Southern Italy (1945-57). Analyzing the present situation in the South, Amendola substantiates the views expressed by Antonio Gramsci about the colonial position of South Italy in relation to the bourgeois North, and that an alliance of the proletariat with the peasantry in Italy means an alliance of the working class of the North with the peasantry of the South. At present the Communist Party of Italy is fighting to extend this alliance and to draw the democratic middle sections of the population into the movement for socialism.

The author shows how the Communists are applying in specific Italian conditions the Leninist thesis on the alliance of the working class with other sections of the working people, how they implement the policy of the firm alliance of the working class and middle elements in the struggle for democratic changes. Amendola's conclusions are based on the experience of the Communist-led democratic movement in Southern Italy.

Of particular theoretical interest is the exposure of the essence and aims of the "paternalism" of the Christian-Democratic Party in connection with the agrarian reform. Amendola characterizes it as a policy designed to keep the peasants divided and in this way sidetrack a real agrarian reform.

Amendola's book contains valuable material, of both theoretical and practical interest, on the Marxist solution of the agrarian question in capitalist countries.

K. Backstrom. *Arbetarroerelsen i Sveriga.* B.I. Stockholm, 1958, 371 s.
K. Backstrom. *The Labor Movement in Sweden.* Stockholm, 1958, Vol. I, 371 p.

VOLUME ONE of Knut Backstrom's book covers the period from the first labor organizations and labor press in Sweden in the middle of the 19th century to the beginning of the 20th century. It tells us about the penetration and spread of scientific socialism in Sweden, about the development of the scattered and spontaneous actions of the working class into a mass political struggle. Special attention is devoted to an analysis of liberal-labor policy, its sources and practices, to the origin and struggle of the two trends in the Swedish labor movement — the revolutionary and opportunist. This struggle is shown as characteristic not only of the Social Democratic Party but of the trade unions as well.

The author has drawn on a wealth of documentary material; the work is the first serious attempt to write a history of the Swedish labor movement from the Marxist standpoint.

The principal theoretical value of Backstrom's book is that he has been able to prove conclusively the unsoundness of the bourgeois and Social Democratic theses about the general laws of the class struggle being invalid for Sweden, about the Swedish working class having no revolutionary history and no revolutionary traditions.

T. Vladigerov. *Fictitious Capital. Changes in Modern Capitalism.* Sofia, 1957, 296 p.

THIS BOOK examines a number of important questions of modern capitalism: the development and changes in the role of joint-stock capital, the amount and rate of securities, changes in the structure of loan capital, monopoly and average profit, etc. On all these points the author gives a critical analysis of bourgeois apologists' theories and revisionist views.

Vladigerov's conclusions, based on a study of rich factual material, give us a better insight into modern capitalism and disclose certain new trends in its development. The growth of fictitious capital, the greater role played by share capital, the comparative decrease in long-term credits and increase in short-term credits, the transference of investments to non-productive spheres, the conversion of an increasingly greater part of capital into loan capital, the growth of the stratum of rentiers — all this, the author shows, is indicative of the decline of modern capitalism. The sections dealing with monopoly profit (which the author distinguishes from ordinary super-profit) and its relation to average profit are highly interesting. Vladigerov notes that the growing economic role of the bourgeois state and the increasing concentration of fictitious capital in its hands are leading to the deformation of the cycle of capitalist reproduction. Very interesting, too, are the sections in which the author exposes the current bourgeois and revisionist theories (about the regulation of capitalist competition, social harmony, people's capitalism) and the proponents of these theories: Strachey, Searing, Beblem, Moch.

Vladigerov's book is undoubtedly a contribution to Marxist literature on the economy of modern capitalism.

J. Gollan. *Modern Revisionism and 'Democratic Socialism.'* "Marxism Today," London, 1958, No. 8.

IN HIS article J. Gollan exposes the revisionism of the authors of the program of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia by comparing their views to those of the British Labor leaders.

He conclusively demonstrates that the Yugoslav program repeats the old reformist theories of British Labor. This is proved by comparing the views expounded by Labor ideologists (Strachey and Crossland, for instance) with similar passages in the Yugoslav program.

John Gollan notes the complete identity of views of the British reformists and Yugoslav revisionists to the effect that the nature of the capitalist state has changed, has given way to the "independent" state, which controls and distributes the national income, etc. Citing concrete examples, Gollan exposes these anti-Marxist inventions. He makes the point that, although the state apparatus in Britain does, indeed, play a major role in the economy, this cannot conceal the fact that the state itself is under the control of the growing power of the trusts. He likewise explodes the myth about the supraclass character of the state and the revisionist theory that, with the state playing an increasingly leading role, capitalism evolves peacefully into socialism.

John Gollan's article carries forward the critical analysis of modern revisionism and lays bare its ideological roots.

A Magyar Szocialista Munkaspart Kozponti Bizottsaga Politikai Akademiajanak eloadasai. Budapest, 1957-58.

Reports of the Political Academy of the Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party. Budapest, 1957-1958.

THESE reports by leaders of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, published as a series of pamphlets, expose the counter-revolutionary character of the events of October 1956 and at the same time unmask modern revisionism and its role. The pamphlet by D. Kallai contains a Marxist analysis of the counter-revolution. Strengthening the dictatorship of the proletariat is the theme of B. Bisku's pamphlet; K. Kiss writes about the role of the Party, and J. Horvath on the unity of the socialist camp.

The reports also set forth the program of reinforcing the dictatorship of the proletariat in Hungary, reorganizing the Party, building socialism, developing culture, etc. These subjects are treated in reports by D. Marosan on the Party's contact with the masses, L. Feher on agricultural development, J. Friss on the management of the national economy, F. Munnich on the Fortieth Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, D. Kallai on the Party's cultural policy and J. Fok on the Party's economic policy.

In examining some basic questions of socialist construction, the authors show how the general laws of socialism should be applied in Hungary. They explain, for instance, why priority should be given to development of heavy industry, why a centralized planned economy is essential, why certain changes are called for in the structure of industry, and elucidate the most suitable forms of economic management. Sharply rejecting the revisionist views, current mostly among the Hungarian intellectuals, the authors analyze the latter's past and present situation and explain the Party's policy on this question.

The reports give a comprehensive picture of the main lines of the policy of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party.

Read

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW

Problems of Peace and Socialism

THIS monthly magazine deals with a wide range of questions of Marxist-Leninist theory, problems of Socialist and Communist construction, the struggles of the working class and the national-liberation movements. It provides a tribune for the exchange of experiences and opinions in the international labor movement. Its contributors include leading figures of the Communist and workers' movement, as well as scholars, writers, representatives of democratic opinion.

The magazine is published in English, French, Spanish, Italian, Swedish, Russian, Chinese, Czech, German, Polish, Rumanian, Bulgarian, Hungarian, Korean, Viet-namese, Albanian.

SUBSCRIPTIONS may be obtained from PROGRESS BOOKS, 924 King St. West, Toronto 3, Ontario, Canada.

SUBSCRIPTION RATE: $3.50 a year. Single copies 35 cents. Bundles of five or over, 25 cents a copy. (U.S. or Canadian currency.)

C-590.8-47