Workers of All Countries, Unite!

World Marxist Review

PROBLEMS OF PEACE *and* SOCIALISM

January, 1959
Volume 2, No. 1

35 cents

WORKERS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!

JANUARY 1959
VOL. 2, NO. 1

World Marxist Review:
Problems of Peace and Socialism

Theoretical and Information Journal
of Communist and Workers' Parties

CONTENTS

GRAND PROSPECTS OF BUILDING COMMUNISM AND STRENGTHENING PEACE (leaders of the world communist movement on the Theses for the USSR Seven-Year Plan): CHEN YUN, Janos KADAR, Stefan JENRYCHOWSKI, Max REIMANN, Jacques DUCLOS, Wm. Z. FOSTER, Victorio CODOVILLA, Luiz Carlos PRESTES 3

P. INGRAO: The Defense of Democratic Gains Is a Vital Condition for Advance to Socialism 18

L. BOHR: Party Tactics and Contact with the Masses 27

P. REYES: Some Aspects of the Liberation Movement in Latin America 34

HSU PING: Combating the Bourgeois Rightists in People's China 41

W. PIECK: We Have Carried Out Karl Liebknecht's Behests 46

T. DANISZEWSKI: Under the Banner of Proletarian Internationalism 52

J. R. CAMPBELL: The Labor Party Today: Its Policy and Ideology 58

ACTIVITIES OF COMMUNIST AND WORKERS' PARTIES

The Communist Party of Greece is Forty Years Old 66

Against Foreign Intervention in Cuba 67

A Nationwide Movement to Accelerate Development 69

Eleventh Congress of the Chilean C.P. 70

The Hungarian People Vote for the Policy of the Party 71

SHORT NOTICES 74

EXCHANGE OF VIEWS

"Modern Forms and Methods of Exploitation in Capitalist Enterprises" 79

LETTERS AND NOTES

Y. HIRANO: Never Again! 89

L.N.: An Organ of Militant Marxists in France 90

J. GIBBONS: A Policeman Looks at the Communist Party 93

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW: *Problems of Peace and Socialism* **is the Canadian edition of the monthly journal published in Prague under the title:** *Problems of Peace and Socialism*. **The Canadian edition is published by**
PROGRESS BOOKS, 924 King St. West, Toronto 3, Ontario, Canada.
Authorized as Second Class Mail, Post Office Department, Ottawa. PRINTED IN CANADA.

Orders from the United States for subscriptions, single copies or bundles should be addressed to the U.S. distributor:
IMPORTED PUBLICATIONS & PRODUCTS, 4 West 16 St., New York 11, N.Y., U.S.A.

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

PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM is also published in French, Russian, Chinese, Albanian, Bulgarian, Czech, Dutch, German, Hungarian, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Mongolian, Polish, Rumanian, Spanish, Swedish, Vietnamese (distributors: Press Circulation Agency, Sadova 3, Prague 6, Czechoslovakia). Subscriptions to any of these editions may be obtained through Progress Books, 924 King St. W., Toronto. Yearly Subscription Rates for the edition in the following languages: French—$6.00. Czech—$6.50. Russian—$6.50. Spanish—$6.50. German—$3.50.

Grand Prospects of Building Communism and Strengthening Peace

In connection with the publication of the Theses of the Report to be delivered by N. S. Khrushchov to the forthcoming Twenty-First Congress of the CPSU on the target figures for the 1959-65 economic plan, the Editorial Board approached a number of leaders of the world communist movement for their views, which we print below, on the international significance of the Plan.

Chen YUN

Deputy Chairman, Central Committee, Communist Party of China

IT is not only in the Soviet Union that the theses of N. S. Khrushchov's report to the Twenty-First Congress of the CPSU on the target figures for 1959-65 are the subject of discussion these days, and not only in the socialist countries: they are being discussed all over the world. Progressives everywhere have joyfully and enthusiastically hailed this magnificent plan of communist construction in the USSR. As for the bourgeois reactionaries in the West, they are stunned and shocked.

The Seven-Year Plan, a component of the majestic program of communist construction during the next 15 years, signifies that the Soviet Union is entering on a new phase of great importance to all mankind, the phase of paving the way to the transition to communism.

The theses demonstrate to the world that the Soviet Union is advancing along the highroad to communism. They envisage industrial development with an annual average growth of 8.6 per cent, based on the latest achievements of science and technology. while agricultural growth will be determined by wholesale mechanization and electrification; while priority will still be given to heavy industry, output of consumer goods will simultaneously be increased in every way possible; in addition to expanding the productive forces in the European part of the country, special attention will be paid to developing the natural resources in the Eastern regions. Seven years hence the socialist productive forces of the Soviet Union will have grown tremendously; overall output of industry will have risen by 80 per cent and agriculture by 70 per cent. This will prepare the conditions for a steady growth of well-being, for satisfying the constantly growing material and cultural requirements of the people. It will be the material base for the building of communism.

The document also stresses that for the transition to communism there is needed, in addition to a powerful material and technical base, a high degree of consciousness on the part of all citizens. Comrade Khrusnchov calls for a higher level of communist consciousness and activity, for training the people in the spirit of collectivism and diligence, awareness of social duty, in the spirit of socialist internationalism and patriotism, in the spirit of the lofty moral principles of the new society; it is necessary, he says, to overcome the capitalist survivals in the minds of people, to wage uncompromising struggle against the hostile bourgeois ideology, and to intensify the education of functionaries and of all the people in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism. This is an essential ideological condition for the transition to communism.

Proceeding from the principle of the "combining of education with industrial production," as indicated by Marx and Engels in the *Communist Manifesto*, the theses emphasize the need to improve and develop the system of public education. During the seven years the network of general secondary schools in town and countryside will be extended; more people will be attending evening classes and studying by correspondence at special higher and secondary schools; there will be more evening schools for urban and rural youth; all elementary and secondary schools will combine socially useful labor with polytechnical education, study with work in enterprises, on collective farms and in special workshops; the number of schools providing a secondary education for people at work will be greatly increased. Then it is necessary to extend and improve the training of specialists with special higher and secondary education. The Soviet schools will produce people with an all-round education, people who will observe socialist

principles, be acquainted with the fundamentals of science, and take part systematically in physical labor.

Continued growth of the productive forces will be accompanied by perfecting the production relations, and this will bring closer the two forms of socialist property—collective-farm and public property. To achieve this it is planned to develop the collective-farm system, to extend inter-collective farm contacts for the purpose of joint construction of industrial and other enterprises, power stations, roads, hydro-technical installations, schools, clinics and hospitals, clubs, etc.

The theses show that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is taking measures to ensure the gradual abolition of the distinction between industry and agriculture, between town and countryside and between physical and mental labor. This is of enormous importance and will give the peoples now building socialism valuable experience of communist construction. By this experience the Soviet people will enrich the treasure-house of Marxism-Leninism.

The majestic scale and rate of growth envisaged in the Seven-Year Plan are unthinkable in any capitalist country. For years Western bourgeois politicians and scientists sneered at the Soviet plans of socialist construction. Then, when the achievements made the scoffers look ridiculous, they did all in their power to belittle the significance of the brilliant success won by the Soviet Union in building socialism. They used to say that the Soviet First Five-Year Plan was sheer utopianism. But in the years before the war the Soviet people fulfilled two of these plans with flying colors, both ahead of schedule.

Then, after the war, the enemies predicted that it would take the Soviet Union a long time to make good the damage caused by the war. Yet it took less than five years for the Soviet people to catch up with and surpass the prewar level. The bourgeois politicians and scientists then prophesied that the Soviet Union would not be able, in a brief space of time, to reach the Western level of production. But when it rapidly drew level with and then outstripped the highly developed European capitalist states in output of the basic industrial items, they said that, although the volume of Soviet production would, possibly, continue to rise, nevertheless, in per capita output and level of living standards, the USSR would never catch up with the West. Today the Soviet Seven-Year Plan makes it clear that this time, too, the yes-men of the monopolies will have to eat their words.

By the time the Seven-Year Plan is completed the Soviet Union will have outstripped Britain and West Germany—the most developed capitalist countries in Europe — in overall per capita output; and in per capita output of a number of industrial and agricultural items it will have surpassed the United States. And in about five years after 1965 it will catch up with and outstrip the United States in overall per capita output. By this time the Soviet Union will have taken first place in the world both for absolute and per capita output, and its standard of living will be the world's highest. This plan provides an opportunity for all to see the vigor of the rapidly developing socialist system, its incontestable superiority over the decaying and decrepit capitalist system.

Socialism and capitalism are competing now on a world scale. The socialist camp, headed by the Soviet Union, is faced today with the serious task of winning the maximum possible time in this competition. The new Soviet plan shows that this peaceful competition between socialism and capitalism has entered upon the decisive phase. As the theses state, "the international significance of the Seven-Year Plan is that its fulfilment will further consolidate the might of the world system of socialism."

The enormous growth in the might of the Soviet Union, the sweeping economic construction in China and in the other socialist states, accompanied by Soviet aid and mutual support, will result in the socialist camp as a whole having absolute superiority over the imperialist camp in the sphere of production. With the completion of the Seven-Year Plan the output of the socialist camp will have risen from 30 to over 50 per cent of world output. In the competition between the two world systems, this will be a decisive victory for socialism, a victory of historic significance.

There can be no doubt that the Seven-Year Plan will add greatly to the strength of the socialist camp. Since the Soviet Union is the rallying point for the socialist countries, any increase in its might means increased strength for the entire socialist camp. Fulfilment of the Plan will create even more favorable conditions for the economic co-ordination and mutual support of all the socialist countries, will facilitate the general advance of economic and cultural construction in all of them. No brazen provocation of the imperialist reactionaries and no vile revisionist subversion

can break the monolithic unity of the socialist camp, a unity based on identity of ideals, interests and ideology. The peoples of the socialist countries, naturally, are filled with admiration for the majestic communist construction undertaken by the Soviet people.

The Soviet Union has always been the standard-bearer and staunch supporter of peace, national independence and human progress all over the world, and its new plan, with renewed force, inspires the peoples of all countries. This grand plan for building communism shows the working class and working people in all countries the bright future of humanity and strengthens their belief in it. All countries and nations fighting for or upholding their national independence are well aware that the success of Soviet construction is a severe blow to colonialism. All who cherish peace appreciate that the growth of the economic might and defensive capacity of the Soviet Union makes it still more difficult for the imperialists to unleash a new war. A feature of our times is that, thanks to the powerful alliance of socialist forces headed by the Soviet Union with the forces of national revolution and peace, it is now possible to prevent the outbreak of war. And should the imperialists, nevertheless, dare to provoke war, this will but lead to the final collapse of imperialism.

The Chinese people under the leadership of their Communist Party are now engaged in socialist construction on a grand scale. With the Party's general line of building socialism our national economy is forging ahead at an unprecedented rate. In building socialism the Chinese people are receiving all-sided, disinterested fraternal aid from the Soviet Union. We are aided also by the other socialist countries and by the world proletariat. With the splendid example of the Soviet Union before us, our people are building socialism with far greater success. Learning from the Soviet Union, thoroughly studying its experience of socialist and communist construction and creatively applying this experience with due regard to the specific features of our country—such is the invariable policy of our Party, the firm guarantee of the complete victory of socialism in China.

Since the time of the October Revolution the Soviet people, led by their Communist Party, have always been in the van of the world proletariat and the working people, marching in the front ranks of all the peoples. Their glorious example attracts and inspires these peoples. We Chinese Communists and all our people are most happy to see that the correct leadership exercised by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, headed by N. S. Khrushchov, not only shows the Soviet people the straight road to communism, it is also a big contribution to world peace and human progress. The majestic program of communist construction elaborated by the Central Committee of the CPSU is one of the great documents of the new history of mankind now being made by the Soviet people and the working people of the world. This program testifies to the irresistible onward march of the new world, to the steady growth and consolidation of the forces of peace and socialism, to the fact that under the Red banner of Marxism-Leninism the peoples are going forward to ever greater victories.

Janos KADAR

First Secretary, Central Committee, Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party

THERE can be no doubt that thanks to the magnificent Seven-Year Plan of the Soviet Union the ideas of socialism will register impressive victories, will win over wide sections of the working people throughout the world.

In the first decade of this century Marxist scientific socialism won over and drew round it large numbers of people in many countries. And for this reason even many enemies of socialism could not oppose it directly—all they could do was to question whether it could be realized. With the rise of the land of the Soviets and the social transformation carried through there, which demonstrated to the workers of the world that socialism was not only a splendid idea but also fully realizable, socialist ideas spread on a really colossal scale.

In the early 'thirties, with the publication and later the completion of the Soviet First Five-Year Plan, a new discussion on socialism took place, which was followed by a fresh victory and the further spread of socialist ideas. The imperialists and their press described the first Soviet Plan as "a fantasy." What else could they say, when the entire capitalist system was gripped by a profound

economic and political crisis. Even for the developed capitalist countries those were the years when millions of working people starved, while food was destroyed wholesale, when great numbers of people suffered privations and unemployment was rampant. Since the very nature of the capitalist system precludes planned control of industry, the capitalists believed that planning was equally impossible in the Soviet Union. But after the First Five-Year Plan even the bourgeoisie realized that this was a new, socialist system of society, though a society in which, alas, there were no capitalists, a system knowing neither exploitation of man by man nor economic anarchy, neither crises nor chronic unemployment. Under this system, thanks to its planned socialist economy, the entire country is striding forward at an unprecedented rate.

The Soviet Union's Seven-Year Plan affords new possibilities for the workers of the world to compare capitalism with socialism. This comparison, and of this we have no doubt, will further the spread of socialist ideas among the masses. More brightly than the sun, the new plan illustrates the irrefutable truth that the Soviet Union—the world's most advanced, leading socialist state—is developing without crises and at an increasing rate. The 80 per cent increase scheduled for industrial production in a country so highly developed as the Soviet Union and the 70 per cent growth of agricultural output testify that her productive forces have developed at a rate never previously known to humanity.

Fulfilment of this plan will lead not only to a tremendous growth of the productive forces, creating thereby the conditions for the further building of communist society; it will, at the same time, substantially raise the material well-being and cultural level of Soviet man.

The plan reaffirms that under socialism there is no limit to expanding production, to creating new material and spiritual values, developing and perfecting man. Peaceful creative labor, becoming more and more easy physically, and through this labor a life of increasing culture and happiness that is worthy of man—these are the prospects which the Seven-Year Plan opens to the people of the Soviet Union, and indeed to all working mankind.

The Soviet people are firmly convinced that they will make their new plan work. This is also the conviction of their friends, among whom are the people of Hungary. Convinced of this, too, are those who are as yet indifferent or hostile to the Soviet Union. Gone forever are the days when imperialist propagandists could dream of successfully ridiculing or keeping silent about the Soviet Union and its planned socialist economy. Today the top bourgeois propagandists and politicians are scared to death at the prospect of peaceful competition. Not one of them even doubts the feasibility of the new plan. Nor are things any better with the newly-hatched medicine-men of capitalism—the revisionists. Vain are the attacks on the Soviet system, on the system of People's Democracy, by the bourgeois and revisionist advocates of "people's capitalism" and "the third way." Just as they cannot fail to see the stars in the sky, they are unable to deny the historic success of the planned socialist economy.

What alternative can the capitalist advocates suggest to the brilliant prospects opened up by the Seven-Year Plan of the land of socialism?

The fever of economic crisis (now called "recession"), marketing difficulties and unemployment are playing havoc with the capitalist countries—basically, with the masses in these countries. This situation is aggravated by the suffering caused to their peoples and to all mankind by the champions of the cold war, who are becoming more and more discredited. The capitalist system has decayed to the extent that today the U.S. bourgeois press, preaching a suicidal thesis, proclaims bigger war-orders and continuation of the inhuman cold war as the sole panacea for the crisis and unemployment. Ever-growing numbers of people are pondering over the prospects opened up by socialism and comparing them with those offered by imperialism.

Socialism and its magnificent program—the Soviet Seven-Year Plan—offer the peoples the prospect of peaceful labor, crisis-free economic development, disarmament, peaceful coexistence and competition; whereas imperialism implies economic crises and unemployment, the arms drive and the cold war, leading to another world war.

For this reason we are deeply convinced that, as the working people of the world learn more about the Soviet plan, the comparison between the present and the future of socialism and capitalism in our epoch will, increasingly, be more favorable to socialism and the Soviet Union, and that thanks to this, socialist ideas will spread more and more widely.

In a way, the Soviet Seven-Year Plan is a plan for the socialist world system: not only

because Soviet economic advance adds to the economic potential of the socialist system, but also because it ensures greater scope for the development of each socialist country.

At this point I would like to say a few words about my country — the Hungarian People's Republic. In the process of consolidating the forces of our republic, in healing the wounds inflicted by the counter-revolutionary putsch in 1956, we were greatly supported not only by the enormous fraternal help in other spheres, but also by the splendid scientific achievements of the Soviet people—the launching of the Sputniks and the major discoveries in physics and chemistry. These achievements were enthusiastically hailed by Hungarian intellectuals and by the people as a whole. Thanks to the all-round economic ties between the Soviet Union and our republic, the tremendous Soviet economic advance in the seven-year period will stimulate our socialist construction and assist in the realization of our socialist goals.

We are absolutely sure that the Soviet plan —the grand plan of peace and socialism—will enhance the consciousness of revolutionary socialists throughout the world. This plan, a powerful weapon, provides those fighting for peace and socialism in all countries with a multitude of new arguments.

All mankind will benefit from the Soviet plan becoming a reality. It is also of interest to those sober-minded bourgeois representatives in the West who, seeking a way out of the imperialist-created deadlock, stand for mutually advantageous economic relations and peaceful coexistence of countries with different social systems.

The international labor movement is vitally concerned that the Seven-Year Plan be translated into life; its fulfilment will strengthen the Soviet Union and the entire socialist camp —in fact, the whole international labor movement. Workers all over the world are vitally interested—all of them personally, if we may say so—in the fight for peace. Peace signifies preserving the life and health of millions, the opportunity for peaceful labor and the development of all. Realization of the Seven-Year Plan of the Soviet Union will light anew the path of happiness and progress to the whole world.

Stefan JENDRYCHOWSKI

Member, Political Bureau, Central Committee, Polish United Workers' Party

WHEN after the Soviet Union, the pioneer land of socialism, new socialist states emerged at the end of the Second World War, their mutual assistance and close co-operation in all spheres of public life became the concrete embodiment of proletarian internationalism at this new stage of history. The countries of proletarian dictatorship are welded by bonds of friendship and fraternity arising from the immortal Marxist-Leninist idea expressed in the slogan "Workers of All Lands, Unite!" This idea is the basis of the community of socialist countries, united by a common system and ideology.

The existence of the socialist camp multiplies, as a result of mutual assistance among its member-countries, the forces of each, facilitating and accelerating their building of socialism. The constantly developing and ever-improving division of labor within the socialist system permits a more rational use of the natural resources of each country, thus enhancing its economic strength. The unity of the socialist camp does not preclude, on the contrary, it is based on the complete sovereignty of each of its member-countries, on equality in the relations between them.

In forming their community the socialist countries were not guided by military considerations. However, confronted with the aggressive war pacts of the imperialists, they were compelled to set up a mutual defensive organization. Nevertheless, these countries, above all the Soviet Union, have repeatedly declared that they are against the division of the world into hostile blocs, that they stand for a collective security system that would preclude military pacts. The socialist camp has always advocated peaceful coexistence with the capitalist world, suggesting that the question of the superiority of one or the other system should be resolved in the process of peaceful competition. Naturally, until such time as certain imperialist quarters abandon their "positions of strength" policy in relation to the socialist states, their arms drive and war preparations, the might of the socialist camp will be the decisive factor for the preservation of peace.

The Soviet-Polish Statement of November 10, 1958, says that "the indestructible unity of the socialist camp and the strength of the first and leading socialist state—the Soviet Union—and of the Chinese People's Republic

and all the countries engaged in socialist construction are the firm guarantee of the security of the socialist countries and a major factor working against the threat of a new war; they are of decisive importance for the consolidation of peace and the peace forces."

It goes without saying that the leading socialist state—the Soviet Union—owing to its experience in socialist construction and its powerful economy and defense capacity, is of decisive importance for the strength of the socialist camp. The success of the Soviet Union fortifies simultaneously the entire socialist camp, thus promoting the cause of peace and socialism all over the world.

For these reasons all friends of peace and progress have welcomed with joy and pride the theses for the Twenty-First Congress of the CPSU, outlining the magnificent prospects of economic and cultural growth for the Soviet Union. These immediate and realizable prospects gave bourgeois circles in the West a real shock, driving them to seek, though fruitlessly, an answer to the "Soviet economic challenge." They are fully aware that the Seven-Year Plan is of decisive significance for the victory of socialism in its peaceful competition with capitalism; today there is hardly anyone in the capitalist world who doubts the realistic nature of the Plan. By 1965 the socialist countries will be producing over half the world's industrial output. With fulfilment of the Plan, the Soviet Union will be turning out more goods per capita than are produced today in the highly developed European countries. In terms of absolute output of basic industrial goods the USSR will, by that time, have outstripped and, in output of other items, approached the present U.S. level. In both gross and per capita agricultural output it will have surpassed the present U.S. level; and about five years later it will have outstripped the United States in all-round production per head of population, thus reaching first place in the world. This means that socialism will have won a decisive victory in the peaceful competition. As Lenin predicted, the day will come when socialism will take the place of capitalism because it ensures a higher productivity of labor.

Today it is still difficult to appreciate in full detail the tremendous impact which the Soviet economic successes will have on world development. But one thing is certain: they will multiply the ranks of the fighters for socialism and add immeasurably to the power of attraction of socialism among the people of the developed capitalist countries. These successes will demonstrate to the workers in the capitalist world, still under the influence of bourgeois and Social-Democratic propaganda, that socialism, and not capitalism, ensures a high standard of living, a life unimperilled by crises and unemployment, without exploitation of colonial and dependent nations, an economy not dependent on the arms drive and war.

As to the socialist countries, for them the Seven-Year Plan will mean a higher rate of development. Co-operation among the socialist countries—members of the Council of Mutual Economic Aid—and also with those not on the Council, is a powerful lever for their general advance. This co-operation is founded on the principles of proletarian internationalism, fraternal assistance of the stronger and more developed countries to those less strong and less developed, and on each country doing its bit for the common cause of consolidating the socialist camp as a whole. Co-ordination of the long-term economic plans, common effort and mutual aid in resolving difficult and complex problems, scientific and technological assistance, deliveries of complex machinery and industrial raw material—all contribute to accelerating the development of the socialist countries. Of decisive importance in this co-operation is the Soviet Union's economic strength. The Soviet Plan takes into account the vital needs and wishes of the socialist countries and thus creates favorable conditions for the realization of their long-term economic plans.

Last but not least, the enormous economic growth of the USSR greatly strengthens the mighty defensive shield that safeguards the socialist nations and all mankind against the unleashing of a monstrous atomic war by the more adventurous and aggressive imperialist circles; and proves with the utmost clarity that the "positions of strength" policy is both unrealistic and futile. This does not mean, however, that these circles will abandon their gambles; on the contrary, it may be that we shall witness some desperate adventures on their part. But the adventurist policy is bound to meet with the growing resistance of the peoples and also of big sections of the bourgeoisie who are aware of the fatal consequences of this policy. The Soviet plan gives added strength to the idea of peaceful coexistence, of peace among the nations.

There can be no doubt that if today the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is able to announce such far-reaching targets, it is because of the rapid development of the productive forces, flowing from the correct policy

outlined by the Party at its Twentieth Congress, from the creative application of Marxism-Leninism, and the harmony established between the production relations and the productive forces.

The same direction is followed by the other Communist parties in the socialist countries. The Polish United Workers' Party, at the Eighth Plenary Meeting of its Central Committee, taking fuller account of the specific conditions obtaining in the country, launched a new economic policy which has already yielded good results in industry and agriculture and made it possible to begin an economic offensive. This is expressed in the directives for Poland's development covering the period up to 1965, adopted by the twelfth meeting of the Central Committee. These directives, in keeping with our possibilities, provide for notable progress in production and in the well-being of the working people. They are being discussed by hundreds of thousands of Party members and non-Party people and will be finally adopted at the Third Party Congress next March.

Our Party, linked with indissoluble bonds of solidarity to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, joyfully welcomes this grand plan of communist construction and heartily wishes our Soviet comrades complete success in carrying it out for the good of peace and socialism, for the good of all mankind.

Max REIMANN

First Secretary, Central Committee, Communist Party of Germany

UNDER the leadership of the Communist Party and its Central Committee, the international prestige and political influence of the Soviet Union have grown considerably since the Twentieth Congress. The Government and peoples of the Soviet Union have rendered a great service to the cause of peace. At every grave and critical moment, each time the imperialists sought to go over the brink as, for instance, in the case of the Suez, Middle East and Far Eastern crises, the Soviet Union, supported by all the peace forces and in fraternal alliance with the other socialist countries, curbed the reckless war gamblers and saved humanity from the conflagration of another great war.

The grand targets of the Seven-Year Plan are peaceful construction at home and, abroad, peaceful economic competition with the capitalist system. This is so obvious that it makes nonsense of the imperialist propaganda about "Soviet aggression."

This Plan, which will be submitted to the Twenty-First Congress of the CPSU for discussion and endorsement, will forever smash the imperialists' Big Lie about the Soviet Union's wanting war. Its fulfilment will infuse new strength into the peoples of the capitalist countries, in the first place the peace forces in the German Federal Republic in their fight against German imperialism and militarism, for the preservation and consolidation of peace in Europe and for friendship between the German and Soviet peoples.

Publication of the target figures coincided with the outbreak of an economic crisis in West Germany; production is being curtailed, large numbers are affected by part-time unemployment and dismissals. Consequently, for the millions of workers in the capitalist countries the Plan, which envisages in the near future a 35-40 hour week without any cut in wages, is proof that the Soviet Union is concentrating all its energy on raising the standard of living of its people.

The Seven-Year Plan is a great plan of peace. It lays bare the sinister machinations of the war maniacs and demonstrates to the people of the world that the Soviet Union is pursuing a firm policy of peace.

Another factor contributing to peace is the real possibility of considerably expanding trade between the Soviet Union and the capitalist world on the basis of a powerful growth of production in the USSR. This cannot but create a material interest among big sections of the bourgeoisie in establishing good relations with the USSR.

The Soviet Government bases its relations with capitalist countries on the Leninist principles of peaceful coexistence, on the concept that for an entire period of history the socialist and capitalist countries are bound to coexist. The more widely this is recognized in capitalist countries, the more bourgeois politicians become convinced that the wheel of history cannot be turned back, and soberly face up to the fact of the existence of the Soviet Union—the greater will be the chances of putting an end to war incitement against the Soviet Union.

The Seven-Year Plan provides the whole world with irrefutable proof of the boundless vitality of the socialist system.

We are living in the historic epoch of the transition from capitalism to socialism. The stronger world socialism is, the greater the guarantees of peace. The struggle for independence waged by the peoples still languishing under the yoke of imperialism, or who have just thrown off this yoke, finds powerful support in the Soviet Union. The imperialists, as everybody knows, have always used armed force against the attempts of the enslaved peoples to gain freedom.

Today, however, the situation is different.

The Soviet Union is helping countries such as India, Indonesia, the United Arab Republic and others to follow the path of independence. This applies in equal measure to both the political independence of these countries and their economic development.

With Soviet assistance India is building an iron and steel plant, and Egypt — the Aswan dam.

The plan for 1959-65 enormously increases the possibility of aiding the peace-loving nations that have taken the road of independence. In this way the camp of peace becomes stronger, while the opportunities at the disposal of the imperialists for unleashing predatory war greatly diminish.

As the Soviet people fulfil the Plan and thus create the material and technical base of communism, Soviet society will enter a new stage—that of communist construction on all fronts. The material and cultural needs of the Soviet people are being met more fully.

This bright prospect of a secure and happy life greatly stimulates the peoples, exhausted by wars, crises, want and oppression, to step up the struggle against their oppressors.

The Soviet Union has rendered invaluable aid to the socialist countries. With the aid and support of the USSR and the other socialist states, the working people of the German Democratic Republic are carrying out the grand plans charted at the Fifth Congress of the Socialist Unity Party.

The superiority of the first worker-peasant state on German soil over the social system in the Federal Republic, ruled by monopoly capital, is revealed with ever greater clarity.

On their part, the working people of West Germany are intensifying their struggle for peace, democracy, social progress and the regeneration of Germany as a peace-loving and democratic state.

The NATO countries are still refusing to normalize their relations with the German Democratic Republic and the other People's Democracies. But the further advance and consolidation of these countries will create the real prerequisites for overcoming this abnormal situation. The prospect which the plan opens up before the Soviet Union adds enormously to the importance of peaceful proposals such as the Rapacki Plan.

The international prestige of the German Democratic Republic, linked by bonds of friendship to the USSR, will also grow. The GDR will be able much more fully to play its part as a factor for peace in Europe.

Fulfilment of the Seven-Year Plan will accelerate the rate of development of the socialist states and further alter the balance of forces between the socialist and capitalist countries in favor of the former.

Jacques DUCLOS

Secretary of the Central Committee, Communist Party of France

THE announcement of the Seven-Year Plan which will be discussed at the forthcoming Twenty-First Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was made at the height of the elections to the new French National Assembly. Nevertheless, the press and radio were unable to remain silent about the exceptional importance of the plan.

"Economic challenge to the Western world!"—such were the general headlines of the reports and comments, all of which reflected surprise and concern.

The figures made an impression, and the defenders of the notorious "free world" conceal neither their disappointment nor their alarm over the significant progress achieved by the USSR and the prospects now opening up. On November 16 *Le Monde* commented: "It would be a mistake to underestimate the interest which promises of this kind evoke outside the USSR." The same newspaper expresses the fear aroused in the West by "the propaganda which already now draws a parallel between the steady economic growth of

the Soviet Union and the recession in the American economy."

Noteworthy in this respect is the fact that, with the exception of the communist and democratic press, the newspapers had not a word to say about the contrast between the giant strides made by the Soviet economy and the alarming slump symptoms in the French economy. Actually, according to official statistics, the purchasing power of nearly one million French working people has declined, in some cases very considerably, in the past few weeks as a result of short-time work. It is understandable in these circumstances that the de Gaulle-Soustelle information service is not over-eager to announce that in the USSR they will have the shortest working hours in the world and by 1965 real incomes of the workers and other employees will have risen by 40 per cent.

As for the draft theses on strengthening contact between school and life and the further development of the Soviet educational system, they were met with complete silence. The reason is simple, because exactly at this time some 20,000 students, lecturers, laboratory heads and assistants of the natural and exact sciences faculty of the University of Paris were protesting that half of them could not find accommodation either in the lecture halls or in the laboratories; the de Gaulle Government has refused credit for a new building for the faculty and has even reduced allocations for public education and research.

The reactionaries fear the truth about the Soviet Union, whose success throws into even bolder relief both the inadequate allocations for education, which affects the intellectuals, and the declining standard of living of the French working class. There is every reason to believe that the contrast between the Soviet Union which, with remarkable enthusiasm, is building communist society, and France, now caught in the whirlpool of nationalism and reaction, will become even more striking.

With the help of the Socialist leaders, the forces of fascism and reaction staged parliamentary elections in France on November 23 and 30, a continuation of the September 28 plebiscite that brought success to one-man rule. The division in the ranks of the working-class and democratic forces, for which grave responsibility rests with the Socialist leaders, and the new electoral system introduced by de Gaulle, not only with the support but also at the request of Guy Mollet, disastrously affected the outcome of the elections.

As a result, reactionary and fascist deputies are in the majority in the new National Assembly. The Communist Party, the first party in France, given an honest distribution of seats, would have had 88 seats, whereas it has but 10. The Socialists, who previously had 95 seats, have only 40. This shows that their policy of supporting the reactionaries and fascists does not pay. The biggest group in Parliament is now the "Union of the New Republic" (UNR), which includes former RPF leaders, such as Soustelle and Roger Frey, notorious fascists like Biaggi and Delbecque, and also the colonels who took part in the Algerian coup. This Party, which obtained 200,000 fewer votes than the Communists, has 188 seats, which means that a Communist deputy represents 400,000 electors, the UNR deputy—only 20,000.

The electoral swindle shows that the ruling circles of the French bourgeoisie intend to prosecute and intensify the war in Algeria, to go ahead with their reactionary and anti-social policy.

Just before the enactment of the Common Market agreement, in which France is a participant, Guy Mollet and other Socialist leaders lauded the merits of "this vast market without frontiers" which, it is alleged, "will improve the conditions of the workers, and make it possible to achieve equality in the course of progress." The preparations for the Market have already accelerated the concentration of capital and the conclusion of many agreements, industrial and financial, between the French and West German monopolies. Agreements have been concluded with a view to ensuring higher profits for the industrial and financial barons of France, West Germany and Italy through the maximum utilization of the Common Market. The workers are alarmed, and understandably so, at the growing unemployment in some industries, the intensified exploitation and prospect of serious encroachments on their social gains.

France's economic lag compared with West Germany, which has much stronger positions in this sphere, may become even more pronounced. In foreign policy this backwardness is manifest in the attempts to create a Paris-Bonn axis which will bring with it French dependence on the German imperialists just as in its day the Berlin-Rome axis secured the superiority of Hitler Germany. The new axis will mean much greater support by the French reactionaries for the revenge-seeking designs of the German militarists. This was the purpose (to say nothing of de Gaulle's request for a loan to finance the war in Algeria) of the de Gaulle-Adenauer talks.

In contrast to these actions of the imperialists, who simultaneously are both allies and rivals, the Soviet Union tirelessly pursues the wise policy of peaceful coexistence and competition. It is perfectly obvious that despite the silence and falsification on the part of the official and semi-official propaganda, it is now much more difficult to conceal from our people the true meaning of the peace policy of the Soviet Union.

The USSR proposes to the capitalist world not competition in armaments but economic competition with a view to increasing the output of the civilian industries, and ensuring better conditions for the people. This competition, a nightmare for the capitalists, will show which of the two systems—socialist or capitalist—is better. For years the governments of capitalist countries have been saying that the Soviet Union, relying on its armed strength, aspires to world domination. This is an impudent lie! Revolutions are not exported. Every nation determines its own destiny, and it is becoming increasingly difficult, so eloquent are the facts, to cast doubts on the Soviet Union's will for peace.

As we see, the Soviet Union is not issuing a challenge to war, and for this very reason the advocates of the old system of capitalist exploitation dread even to speak about the progress made by the USSR. But, aware that truth will out, they try to capitalize on the grand victories of the socialist countries. It often happens that in the newsreels, on the radio and TV, official propagandists refer to the successes of the Soviet Union (and of People's China), extol the efforts of the Soviet and Chinese people, and appeal to French men and women "to draw inspiration from their example," and raise productivity. But these gentlemen forget about one fundamental difference, namely, that in a socialist country the working people's every effort is exerted to raise the living-standard of society as a whole, whereas in a country dominated by reaction and fascism the workers toil and moil to bring grist to the mills of the capitalist monopolies.

This is accompanied by ever-increasing encroachments on democratic freedoms and the virtual abolition of democracy and the representative system, which the working people and all democrats must defend.

The choice confronting the people of France today is not between fascism and communism. They must, step by step, uphold the democratic freedoms which are now imperiled. The Communist Party, the main bastion barring the way of the reactionary and fascist offensive, is working to rally all forces capable of re-establishing and renovating democracy.

The grand victories won by the USSR in building communist society and its efforts for the triumph of the policy of peaceful coexistence and competition will, without doubt, deliver a shattering blow to the anti-Communist and anti-Soviet ideas circulated with a view to dividing the working-class and democratic forces. These victories will help us to regain the working people who have been misled by the policy of the Socialist leaders; these victories will evoke enthusiasm among millions of workers and peasants, and supporters of the republic, irrespective of their party affiliation. The Communist Party calls them to unity and action in order to curb and rebuff the evil forces of reaction, to ensure the triumph of a policy that will make France free and peace-loving, and restore her spiritual strength and national grandeur.

William Z. FOSTER

Honorary Chairman of the Communist Party of the U.S.A.

ON November 14, 1958, the world was astonished by the theses of Premier Nikita Khrushchov's report on the unprecedented Seven-Year Economic Plan of the Soviet Union for the years 1959-1965.

The capitalists are agasp at the realization, no matter how much they hate to admit it, that the Soviet Union and the rest of the socialist camp represent a totally different kind of economic and political organization, one that is vastly superior.

The economic figures of the Soviet Seven-Year Plan go far beyond anything ever produced by the capitalist countries, including their leader, the United States of America. For many years the Soviet Union has been increasing its industrial output at a much more rapid rate than the United States. From 1928 to 1957 the average annual increase in industrial output of the two countries was 3.6 per cent for the USA and 11.5 per cent for the USSR. That is over three times as fast a rate of growth for the Soviet Union. According to *People's Capitalism* by J. M. Buish, "this is a catastrophic relative failure for the United States."

The capitalists are greatly alarmed at the startling goals of the new Seven-Year Plan. We may be sure that, if they can, they will take desperate steps to block the plan. Their alarm is doubly acute because their own system has been laboring along in several depressions during the last few years and has by no means been able to get out of its latest one as yet.

Everybody knows that the Soviet Union will make good on the striking figures of its new Seven-Year Plan. The bourgeoisie also know that the People's Democracies of Asia and Europe will do the same. China, for example, after 25 years of constant imperialist and civil war and many years of economic and political blockades by the capitalist world, is making a spectacular job of building her industries.

The European People's Democracies have similar striking figures. Total industrial production in these countries was in 1957 approximately three and a half times that of prewar.

Not only is the speed with which the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies are building their industries astonishing, it is even more amazing when the severe man-made difficulties that are placed in the way of the industrialization of the Soviet Union by the capitalist powers, particularly the United States, are taken into consideration. The USA, the principal imperialist country, assumes the right to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries and to block their industrialization in the event of its running counter to American interests.

Ever since the Soviet Republic was founded, it has had to contend with the vicious and often murderous industrial opposition of the United States. To stifle the growth of Soviet industries the imperialists used the most callous and destructive methods of the political and economic blockade. But the Soviet industry was built despite this unscrupulous opposition.

The complete story of Soviet industrialization is one of the untold epics of the Russian revolution. In its historic struggle for a new society the Soviet working class overcame the tremendous economic difficulties caused by World War II. With the aid of their socialist comrades and the democratic forces of the world they bore the brunt of the struggle against Nazism and, to the amazement of every bourgeois military expert in the world, smashed Hitler. Herbert Hoover and Harry Truman openly displayed their disappointment that the Soviet Union had come out so clearly a victor in the war. The Russians had practically defeated the Hitler armies before the niggardly American lendlease arrived. The Soviet people won the war at the cost of millions of lives and with many industrial enterprises wiped out.

The United States took advantage of the damage to Soviet industry, and of their own monopoly of the atom bomb, and tried to establish Wall Street's domination throughout the world. In this effort they were frustrated, however, by the unparalleled rebuilding of the Soviet economic system.

The Soviet people put an end to the atom-bomb monopoly and generally built their mighty industry, military technique and armed forces to the point where the warmakers of Wall Street did not dare precipitate a general war. In a few years after World War II the Soviet Union had doubled the industrial output of the prewar years. This indicates far greater industrial progress than that ever made by any capitalist nation.

The Seven-Year Plan marks the beginning of communist construction on all fronts. With the experience of the past as our guide it is certain that the Soviet Union, despite capitalist opposition and sabotage, will more than fulfil the Seven-Year Plan by the expiration date. This will usher in a new era in the world and a new and better relationship of international forces.

During the past generation socialism has been rapidly overtaking production in the capitalist countries and this process will come to a climax at the end of the Seven-Year Plan. We can be certain that we will be rapidly travelling into the new world seven years from now. The success of the plan will, in particular, stimulate the growth of socialism in every respect. Not only will it mean the rapid advancement of all the socialist countries—the Soviet Union, China, Czechoslovakia, Poland, etc. — the national-liberation struggle will likewise be stimulated by the growth of socialism.

Not the least, the related wing of the peoples' movements, namely the trade union and other mass democratic forces in the capitalist countries, will also feel the impulse of the new and stronger socialist spirit abroad in the world. Central in all this will be the progress made by the socialist countries along the road to communism. Completion of the Seven-Year Plan will make the whole world see the superiority of socialism over capitalism.

Another vital thing that we may expect is that the revisionists will be increasingly de-

feated by the Communists. Revisionism is the modern curse of the labor movement, a stake of the imperialists to retain their domination. It must be resolutely combated. Marxism-Leninism will even more emphatically win its way to the leadership of the masses fighting for emancipation.

The tremendous economic and political growth on a world scale centering around the economic program of the next seven years, will be of major international significance, and will be achieved provided the imperialists are prevented from launching another world war. Peaceful coexistence of the two systems must be resolutely fought for by the socialist preservation of peace. For it is up to the socialist forces of the world to avert war. The capitalists who oppose them are natural supporters of war. Never were war preparations more profitable for the exploiters than at the present time—the United States is now spending 50 billion dollars a year on armament. Why should the capitalists abolish such a rich source of profits? The Communist-led nations and the peoples of the world, on the other hand, reap no profit whatever, nothing but monumental losses and disaster from war and excessive armaments, and they have every reason to do away with mass slaughter. The success of the Seven-Year Plan will be a long stride in this direction.

The Seven-Year Plan will enormously further the abolition of a whole series of major problems which are being progressively solved by the Communist forces on a world scale ever since the Russian revolution—such ulcers in the life of society as unemployment, poverty, illiteracy, etc. Already, the death-blow has been struck to these scourges in the socialist countries, and the impact of the blow is felt throughout capitalism. By the time of the victorious completion of the Seven-Year Plan, further long strides will have been made in the historic work of freeing mankind from the dreadful hangovers of past ignorance and exploitation. We can be sure, too, that the effect of this work will spread with irresistible force throughout the entire capitalist world, despite the employer resistance.

Victorio CODOVILLA

Secretary of the Central Committee, Communist Party of Argentina

THE theses of Khrushchov's report to the Twenty-First Congress of the CPSU have produced a big impression on the Latin American peoples, including the people of Argentina.

The Seven-Year Plan, which will consolidate and develop the socialist system and which inaugurates the building of communist society, has aroused the same enthusiasm among the people in the capitalist world as the launching of the Sputniks. This is explained by the deepening economic crisis, the deterioration in living and cultural standards and the threat of war, all of which impel the working people to turn their eyes more and more to the socialist camp in search of an answer to the question: how to find a way out?

The socialist countries, knowing neither upheavals nor economic crises, are advancing with giant strides and steadily improving the conditions of their people; not interested in predatory wars, they are leading the world-wide movement against war and for peace between all nations, both big and small. That is why, when posing the question, what is the way out, there can be but one answer and that is—the path blazed by the glorious Russian revolution forty-one years ago.

The impact of the Seven-Year Plan on the working people and other strata in Latin America is all the greater in view of the fact that while their conditions are steadily worsening, the Soviet program presents the picture of a bright future for the nations that have thrown off the imperialist yoke and capitalist exploitation.

The Latin American peoples (whose life is becoming worse and worse) cannot but be delighted with the news that the Soviet Union's national income will rise by 62-65 per cent in the space of seven years and that because of the just distribution of the social product under socialism, incomes of workers, office employees and peasants will go up by 40 per cent. We cannot hide our admiration when we learn that the working day will be reduced to 6-7 hours, that the Soviet people will have two free days a week without any reduction in wages and that the number of factory, office and professional workers will rise by 21 per cent, while in our countries the working day is being extended and unemployment is growing.

Farm output in the Soviet Union is scheduled to rise 1.7 times, whereas in Latin America it is steadily declining. Public consumption

will show an increase of 60-63 per cent, while in our countries it is falling, in many cases even to the lowest possible level.

The Latin American peoples see that the capitalist world is in the grip of a deep economic crisis, developing against the background of the crisis of the entire capitalist system; the socialist camp, meanwhile, experiencing no crises, aspires to the highest level of production and social welfare. The worst thing is that the United States and Britain are "exporting" their crisis to Latin America, foisting its consequences onto the shoulders of the masses. This worsens the already bad conditions and results in soaring prices and constantly growing unemployment. That is why the Seven-Year Plan enhances the militant spirit of our peoples in their struggles against imperialist domination.

Our people know that the growth of production in the Soviet Union will raise not only material and cultural standards, it will add considerably also to the reserve stocks which can be channeled to the economically underdeveloped countries, such as ours, and this will further the popular struggle for national and social liberation.

Until recently there were people who sincerely believed that our countries could not overcome their dependence on the big imperialist powers, especially the United States. They thought that these states alone, by virtue of their considerable industrial development, could purchase our products and provide us with everything needed for our development. But as Latin American trade with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries expanded, and especially now, with the publication of the Seven-Year Plan, these people appreciate that there is no need to remain hemmed-in by imperialist economic encirclement, that this encirclement can be broken by trading with the powerful socialist countries led by the Soviet Union.

Some sections of the small and middle bourgeoisie tend to submit to the demands of the U.S. monopolies, hoping to get loans from the United States, which would help our countries resolve the acute economic and social problems. Bitter experience has shown, however, that U.S. imperialism demands much but gives next to nothing.

An instructive example in this respect is Argentina—one of the most capitalistically developed of the Latin American countries, which is now experiencing a profound economic crisis owing to increasing dependence on imperialism, above all on the United States. In the guise of "helping" our country to get over the crisis, the U.S. monopolies are meddling more and more in our economic and political affairs. The International Monetary Fund promises "aid" on terms that run counter to the interests, dignity and sovereignty of our country. It demands that Argentina agree to Fund control over the greater part of her oil, power and metallurgical industries, to denationalize rail transport and other state-owned enterprises, cut bank credits to the national industry and trade, devalue the peso and freeze wages, launch repression against the working-class and peasant movements, set up a government-controlled trade union center, place military bases at the disposal of the imperialists and take part in the U.S. policy of military gambles. The IMF insists either that the present government accept these terms or that it be replaced by an openly dictatorial military or semi-military government.

It is precisely this undisguised Anglo-American interference in the domestic affairs of Argentina that in the long run seriously affects her economy and causes political and public anxiety. This interference gives rise to strikes and mass struggles, while the government, on order of the U.S. imperialists and their flunkeys, retaliates by declaring martial law. Lenin's words to the effect that imperialism means reaction all along the line are confirmed once again.

That is why the idea that the economic crisis can and must be overcome by breaking the imperialist encirclement and extending trade with the socialist countries is not only cherished by the working class, peasants and other sections of the working people, it is also winning the support of the small and middle bourgeoisie.

It was not accidental that the Argentina-USSR trade agreement aroused great enthusiasm among the peoples and keen interest among the ruling circles of the Latin American countries. This is a treaty of a new type.

All agreements with the U.S. monopolies, concluded or likely to be concluded, are and will be extortionate agreements. They are aimed at plundering the national wealth and exploiting the peoples. That is why they have encountered and will continue to encounter an increasingly energetic rebuff on the part of all patriots.

Meanwhile, the treaty recently signed in Moscow by the government delegation headed by Liseaga, Deputy to the National Congress, has been warmly approved by all patriots and democrats in Argentina and other Latin American countries (the Soviet Union undertakes

to supply Argentina with oil equipment to the value of $100 million, to be paid over ten years at an interest of 2.5 per cent annually, and no currency will be required to cover the credit). This treaty shows once again that in the fight for freedom and independence our countries can bank on the disinterested aid of the socialist camp.

Extension of trade and cultural relations between Latin America and the Soviet Union, People's China and other socialist countries is beneficial because the latter are developing along peaceful lines, while the U.S. economy is a war economy.

Another reason why our peoples have enthusiastically welcomed the Seven-Year Plan is that it is based on the principle of peaceful competition between the socialist and capitalist camps, so that when the targets of the Plan become a reality this will be the best contribution to peace.

Fulfilment of this Plan will stimulate the growing national-liberation and social movements in Latin America. Conditions are ripe in our countries for breaking the power of the ruling circles that uphold the interests of the oligarchy, big capital and foreign monopolies; and for effecting radical changes in economic, political and public life. Despite the contradictory developments, the forces of democracy, progress, national independence and peace are gaining strength, while the positions of the landed oligarchy and the big capitalists, allies of the foreign monopolies, especially North American, are becoming weaker.

A new factor in our countries is that the peoples now understand that a democratic victory won during the elections under the leadership of the small and middle bourgeois elements cannot be consolidated without the working class playing an active part in political life. After a few revolutionary gestures these elements retreat under the pressure of the landed oligarchy, big capital and the imperialist monopolies. Argentina is a classical example in this respect.

So, the idea of the need for broad national-democratic fronts and democratic coalition governments has been affirmed among the Latin American peoples. This has become possible due to the fact that the Communist parties in Latin America have become, or are becoming, mass parties and, repressions notwithstanding, have taken root among the working masses as the guiding, organizing and leading force of the bloc rallying the broad strata of the people, including the national bourgeoisie opposed to the imperialists, for an agrarian and anti-imperialist revolution.

The victorious socialist construction undertaken by the Soviet people and their gradual transition to communism, thanks to unswerving implementation of the principles of proletarian internationalism and fidelity to Marxism-Leninism, signify another setback for the revisionists—the authors of "national communism." These elements, represented most glaringly by the Yugoslav revisionists, pursue a policy which leads not to socialism but to restoration of capitalism.

Experience has shown that only by translating the Marxist-Leninist teaching into life, as is done by the glorious CPSU and the other Communist and Workers' parties, can the common goal be attained—victory in the struggle for national and social liberation, for socialism and communism.

Luiz Carlos PRESTES

General Secretary of the Central Committee, Communist Party of Brazil

THE Seven-Year Plan of communist construction has had profound repercussions in the Latin American countries. The grand success achieved in building socialism in the USSR has, naturally, aroused real enthusiasm both in Brazil and in the other countries of our continent. This is expressed in the admiration with which the numerous Brazilian M.P.s, scientists, artists and sportsmen who in recent years have visited the Soviet Union speak of it, and also in the spontaneous manifestations of welcome for the Soviet people who have visited us. Although there are no diplomatic relations between our countries, the Brazilian and Soviet people have found common ground in the joint struggle for world peace, in initiating and extending cultural exchanges. And the more success the Soviet Union achieves in developing its economy, science, technology and culture, the more effective will that rapprochement be.

Consequently the recently published theses of the report to be delivered at the Twenty-First Party Congress will add to the interest in Soviet achievements. In Brazil people are following this progress with keen interest.

Brazil, like other Latin American countries, is still an underdeveloped country. It yearns

for progress and prosperity. Now we are witnessing an awakening national consciousness which insists on economic development, industrialization and national liberation. We are in dire need of technological and financial aid, of modern industrial equipment. All this is still monopolized by the North Americans, who use their economic superiority to plunder our natural wealth and keep our country in political subjugation.

Thus, there are sharpening contradictions between the people of Brazil and the U.S. imperialists and their stooges. As long as these contradictions remain unsolved, we will suffer from low prices for our exports and depreciation of our currency (last year, within a few months the cruzeiro declined by one half). In conditions of the general crisis of capitalism and the present economic crisis in the United States, the imperialist drive against our national interests acquires an open and cynical character. Because of pressure from the International Monetary Fund there is a widening gap between what we get for our exports and what we pay for our imports from the United States. U.S. investors are demanding further privileges and "guarantees' for themselves, and the renouncing of Brazilian national investment in the basic branches of the economy. At the same time they are demanding that measures be taken against the working class and to the detriment of the entire nation.

The direct result of this is a worsening of the conditions of the working people, a rising cost of living and lowering of the already miserable real wages.

The acute internal contradictions make necessary an independent solution of the problem of developing the national economy. It is necessary to extend the foreign market. The bleeding of our country, expressed in the pumping out of profits, without any control, must be ended. The situation in Brazil is, in one way or another, typical of all the Latin American countries. N. S. Khrushchov was quite correct when he said in a recent interview with the Brazilian journalist Murillo Marroquin that "for decades the American, British and other foreign monopolies, like giant leeches, have been clinging to the living body of Latin America, greedily sucking dry and plundering its natural wealth, ruthlessly exploiting its peoples, distorting their economies and retarding their independent development."

Even the ruling classes in Brazil seek a way out of this situation which cannot continue forever. An attempt in this direction was made by President Juscelino Kubitchek, when he proclaimed the "pan-American operation," expressing the desire for economic development, to abolish the semi-colonial status and enable our countries to have an equal say in international affairs. This initiative, even though it did not go beyond the confines of obedience to the United States, suffered complete fiasco. Nor did the dramatic warning sounded by August Frederico Schmidt, the Brazilian delegate in the "Committee of 21" in Washington, to the effect that Latin America would be forced to seek more trade with the Soviet Union and People's China unless Washington rendered substantial aid to its Southern neighbors, have any effect on the U.S. representatives.

The people of Brazil, however, like the other nations of Latin America, are fully determined to carry on their fight for an independent national economy, and are seeking new paths which would mean a complete break with the constant dependence on U.S. imperialism. These aims are supported by Oswaldo Aranha, former Minister of Foreign Affairs, and others who in the press and in public lectures have spoken in favor of direct business contacts between Brazil and the Soviet Union; by Assis Chateaubriand, Brazilian Ambassador to London, who wants closer ties with the East European countries, and who in pursuit of this aim visited Prague.

These politicians realize that the socialist countries could be a vast market for our exports, that they could supply, on favorable terms, the machinery and equipment which now eat up our scanty currency reserves. That is why the *O Cruzeiro* interview with N. S. Khrushchov met with a wide response. Khrushchov reaffirmed that the Soviet Government was prepared to aid the industrialization of Brazil by supplying us with machinery and equipment, training Brazilian specialists in the USSR and giving us the benefit of its rich technological experience.

We know that all this is feasible, that we are not alone in the struggle which the Latin American nations are waging against backwardness and for economic emancipation. The Soviet Union's all-round support to all peoples striving for their liberation is meeting with growing sympathy in our countries. People are keenly interested in the fact that the Soviet Union is building an iron and steel plant in India which, when completed, will turn out 2.5 million tons of steel a year, and this without any shares in capital, profits or management, without any strings, either eco-

nomic or political, in other words, the reverse of the practice of other countries. We have been favorably impressed by the USSR-Egypt agreement on the construction of the Aswan dam, the Soviet Union granting a credit of 400 million roubles at very low interest to be paid off over a long period, and this again with no strings. We know that similar agreements have been concluded with other Asian and African countries, and recently with Argentina, not to mention the fraternal aid given by the Soviet Union to the People's Democracies building socialism, and especially to the industrialization program of the Chinese People's Republic. Hence, when the Soviet Union, confident in its strength, in the selfless and valiant labor of its people, launches another majestic plan of economic development, this evokes confidence in the USSR not only on the part of the working people and intellectuals of our countries, but also on the part of the national bourgeoisie and groups of capitalists and landlords whose interests conflict with U.S. imperialism.

Foreign trade can become the cornerstone of a fruitful policy of rapprochement between our country and the Soviet Union. At present our foreign trade is virtually monopolized by the United States. This is one of the most striking manifestations of the North American parasitism in our economic life. Americans exercise their monopoly through U.S. domination of the world market in coffee, sugar, cocoa, cotton and other products, which account for 80 to 90 per cent of our traditional exports, and an even greater percentage of other agricultural produce. Over half of our coffee, sugar and cotton exports, our chief sources of foreign currency, go to the United States. Abolition of this monopoly would be most beneficial to our entire economic activity.

Hence we place particularly big hopes on extending the market for our produce, especially when a new area with a population of over 900 million, including the USSR and China, is opening before us. Hence the prospects which we see in the Seven-Year Plan, summed up in the theses. In view of the realization of the previous economic plans which transformed the Soviet Union into a leading world power, no one doubts that the targets of the new Plan, bold though they are, will become a reality. This Plan will greatly enhance the might of the world's first socialist state, and, through an unprecedented rise in the national income and in purchasing power, will create better conditions for the people.

In this way the Soviet Union will have still greater facilities for rendering aid to the underdeveloped countries, who repose great hopes in it. Brazil is one of those countries. We ardently want to get rid of our poverty and backwardness, the main result of our economic dependence on the U.S. monopolies.

Brazil's existence as a free and sovereign nation imperatively requires that it develop economically. We are confident that the theses of N. S. Khrushchov's report to the Twenty-First Congress of the CPSU will render another great service to the progressive forces in Brazil and other Latin American countries, in the fight for their noble aims, for the realization of their dream of freedom, progress and prosperity.

The Defense of Democratic Gains Is a Vital Condition for Advance to Socialism

Pietro Ingrao

ONLY if one bears in mind the hardships experienced by the Italian people under fascism and the problems which confronted the Communist vanguard at that time can one grasp the full significance of the defense of democratic freedoms for the Italian labor movement.

After World War I, the Communist vanguard led an uncompromising fight against reformism, seeking to bring home to the workers Lenin's criticism of bourgeois democracy, a correct interpretation of the class nature of the state and the need for proletarian dictatorship. At that time the threat of

fascism taking over, which it later did, hung over Italy. That is why the battle against reformism was interwoven with the ideological and political campaigns to expose the true class nature of fascism and counter the idealists and bourgeois radicals who depicted fascism as a petty-bourgeois "aberration" or as a temporary measure for restoring law and order.

However, the Left sectarian wing led by Bordiga, which headed the Italian Communist Party soon after its foundation in Livorno, 1921, failed to draw the correct conclusions from the situation. Bordiga's supporters were blind to the fact that fascism was a new phenomenon; they saw in it only new personalities and groups coming to power and were incapable of drawing up a program to resist fascism, in keeping with the revolutionary aims of the Communist Party. The Bordiga group reduced the Party's task to the training of leading cadres who would head the masses when the course of events brought the Party into the spotlight. This approach threatened to doom the Party to passivity, to turn it into a sect isolated from the masses, incapable of influencing social developments or solving the complex issues confronting it under fascist tyranny.

That is why in the early period of its existence the Party waged a bitter internal struggle against Bordiga's sectarianism and dogmatism. The purpose was to reveal and analyze the essence of fascism and its roots so that the Party could head the mass resistance to fascist lawlessness. The theses of the Third Party Congress held in Lyons in January 1926 marked a turning point in this respect. The document stated that fascism was an instrument of the industrial and agrarian oligarchy. It analyzed the class contradictions which had been aggravated by the advent of fascism, pointed to the possible allies of the working class, called for struggle at least for the most immediate political demands and formulated the task of building a mass party on Leninist principles.

This Marxist analysis of Italian society and of the motive forces of the social revolution, as well as the program of action, signified a resolute break with the arid reformist empiricism and pseudo-revolutionary phraseology of the sectarians and maximalists. The document set forth the basic principles for united action—the keynote of the Party's whole subsequent struggle against fascism.

The theses, it is true, displayed hesitancy in working out a common anti-fascist program. Certain transient demands were advanced rather as a means of unmasking the stand of the non-revolutionary forces than as a basis for united action with other anti-fascist political groups. The Party itself was not yet altogether clear on the point that a just and necessary criticism of bourgeois democracy, its class character and inherent limitations, in no way meant that the working class was indifferent to the methods of oppression used by the bourgeoisie. In 1928, Comrade Ercoli (Togliatti) raised the same question in an article in *Stato Operaio*, the Party's theoretical journal. He explained that the working class could not be indifferent to the change from bourgeois democracy to a regime of outright violence. Failure to see this new feature would be tantamount to the working class surrendering its political role in resisting fascism, tantamount to defeat.

The advent of Hitler, the strengthening of fascism and the war danger, posed this question before the entire labor movement and led to a turn in policy which found expression in the Resolution of the VIIth Congress of the Third International. This Resolution, starting from the definition of fascism as the dictatorship of the most reactionary and aggressive capitalist groups, interpreted in a new light the deepening conflict between fascism and the basic and immediate interests not of the proletariat alone, but also of the vast majority of the people, including the peasants, the middle urban strata and wide sections of the bourgeoisie itself. It pointed out to the non-proletarian sections which suffered from fascism, the common enemy to be combatted, and thereby opened the way to the isolation of the most reactionary capitalist groups, to an alliance between the working class and the masses of town and countryside, and to the setting up of a new regime, not yet socialist, it is true, but at the same time not one that would merely restore the formal freedoms abolished by fascism.

That is why the Resolution of the VIIth Congress was of such importance for the unfolding of the anti-fascist movement and the growth of influence of the Communist vanguard in Italy. The vanguard was ready to assimilate the C. I. decisions precisely because it had been steeled in the theoretical and political struggles waged under Gramsci and Togliatti against the sectarian, anti-Leninist trends. The document gave clarity and vitality to the link between the struggle for democratic freedoms and the demand for a new social system. It was not a matter of *first* winning democratic freedoms and *then*

setting up a new social system, but to work for both simultaneously. It was essential not only to overthrow Mussolini but also to strike at the social base of fascism—the big monopoly cartels. With this aim in view it was possible to rally the broad middle sections which play a considerable role in Italian public life and which were often used by fascism to promote its political ends. These masses were to be drawn into the struggle for socialism through an alliance with the working class in fighting for certain transient aims.

Thus, the struggle against fascism, for democratic freedoms, went beyond the framework of defensive working-class action to restore freedom of association. This struggle enabled the working class—by winning over new allies—to head the general movement for national renovation, for peace and independence, with a view to dealing a blow to big business and paving the way to socialism.

With this objective in mind our Party—during the armed resistance to fascism and after its defeat—unrelentingly fought against those who maintained that the overthrow of fascist tyranny meant merely a "return" to the regime that existed before the "march on Rome"*. The Party proposed to the anti-fascist movement that a new system of progressive democracy be established, a system which would transform the backward economic forms of Italian society, give a new social content to democratic freedoms, destroy the roots of fascism and preclude the resurgence of an openly reactionary regime.

In this way the struggle for democratic freedoms was closely and firmly interwoven with the movement for re-shaping the old social system. On the basis of the unity won in the struggle *against fascism and war*, our Party tried to rally the masses around a constructive program for far-reaching social reorganization and changes.

Its efforts in this direction yielded results. It became possible to consolidate the alliance with the Socialist Party and to influence considerable sections of the Catholic movement and the petty-bourgeois radicals. Thanks to the mass struggles and the broad public action, the monarchy was abolished, a Constituent Assembly convened and a new Constitution approved for a more advanced democratic system than the pre-fascist one. The new Constitution not only extended democratic liberties as compared with the old Statuto Albertino (Charter of King Carlo Alberto), it proclaimed a number of new rights for the working people in the sphere of production, distribution of the national income and implementation of civil and political liberties. The Constitution recognized the need for reforms to restrict the landed estates and the economic power of the monopolies. Through extending the functions of local self-government it decentralized political and administrative power, thereby bringing it closer to the people.

The new Constitution, of course, retained capitalist production relations. It provided, however, for far-reaching changes in the structure of private property. It affirmed the right of intervention and control in this sphere on the part of the state and of the working people and outlined a program which, if realized, would have secured definite gains for the people and the working class.

The old reactionary and conservative groupings soon realized what implementation of the Constitution had in store for them. So they concentrated on subverting the unity won during the Resistance and in the drawing up of the Constitution, and no sooner was the latter adopted than they sought to bury it. Scelba, a clerical leader, former Prime Minister and Minister of the Interior, cynically confirmed this policy, saying that the Christian Democrats would not tolerate the Constitution being turned into a "trap" for their Party.

The reactionaries launched an all-out attack on the Constitution. The shameful fascist legislation, which had been rescinded by the Constitution or which was subject to repeal, was unlawfully left in force. In public life there was political discrimination, which violated the principles of freedom proclaimed by the Constitution. The Church was permitted and encouraged to intimidate the people, to exert pressure and intervene in election campaigns and in other political spheres. Defying the Constitution, the reactionaries refused to adopt reforms or sabotaged those designed to curb the power of big business. This action made it possible to re-establish the despotic regime in the factories and to restore monopoly rule.

That is why in the past decade Italy was the scene of unending battles for social demands, evolving eventually into struggles for freedom and Constitutional principles. The workers, occupying the factories threatened with closure; the peasants, taking over the landed estates; and the unemployed, demon-

---

* In October 1922, Mussolini, instigated by the industrial magnates and the royal court, staged the march on Rome and seized power.

strating in the streets for jobs—all based themselves on the new principles of the Constitution, and insisted that they be respected. The working people came out in defense of constitutional legality, and charged the ruling classes with sabotage and subversion of law and order. In these clashes there were tragic moments when the authorities opened fire on the demonstrators and caused blood to flow in the streets. Hence the question of freedoms acquired a simple, elementary character — to preserve the lives and physical existence of the workers. Therefore, to put an end to these reprisals it was necessary to launch a broad movement (under the leadership of the Communist and Socialist parties and the General Confederation of Labor), to organize general and partial political strikes, street demonstrations, popular assemblies and rallies. The movement, initiated in the factories, extended to Parliament, it spread from the municipalities to the regional councils and, in one way or another, gripped the entire country.

The struggle was a difficult and costly one for the workers' vanguard, for the Left parties, and particularly for our Party. Our Party invariably pointed out that this movement should take the form not of a single decisive battle, but of a multiform, non-stop struggle. Not even a single case of arbitrary action, no matter how insignificant, should be left without protest or rebuff. All methods and means of exposure and protest, even the most elementary, should be used by the working-class parties to achieve their ends in the various spheres of public life.

It was important for this multiform movement to bring home to the people that the democratic system was in danger, and that the totalitarian policy, to which the ruling circles — the employers and clericals — had resorted, was perilous to the entire nation. This resulted in the organization in 1953 of a broad opposition to the open attack launched by the Christian Democrats against the Constitution through a new election law designed to ensure for them and their allies a two-thirds' majority. They needed it to revise the Constitution in a reactionary way and to pass a series of previously drafted bills trampling on freedom.

The fight against this swindle of the Christian Democrats lasted eight months. Our Party sought above all to explain to the masses the grave implications of the proposed measures. And the working-class parties emerged victorious precisely because they made it clear to the masses that it was a matter, not so much of the numerical strength of the opposition in Parliament, as of preventing an openly reactionary government from coming to power.

The success achieved was due to the vigor with which the electoral law swindle was fought in Parliament, to the persistence of the day-to-day struggles in committees and chamber alike; to the unyielding efforts to gain every extra hour in the debate, to the obstruction tactics and the bitter clashes in the chamber. All this made the public aware of the dangerous implications of the issue and helped rally the masses. The parliamentary struggle was linked with the nationwide movement. Hundreds of local strikes, general political strikes and mass demonstrations, accompanied by clashes with the police, took place. Thousands of meetings and protest rallies were held, deputations and petitions flowed to Parliament in a continuous stream with the demand to save Italy from the totalitarian regime plotted by the Christian Democrats.

United action both inside and outside Parliament, action that aroused the entire nation, resulted in the defeat of the swindle in the elections held on June 7, 1953.

It is clear that the reactionary plot failed, not only because of the bitter eight months' campaign, but also because of the depth and scope assured by the Italian labor movement's struggle for democratic freedoms. The reactionaries failed because the working-class vanguard knew only too well how vital it was, in Italian conditions, to uphold parliamentary and democratic institutions, and was aware of the significance of this defense for the immediate demands and needs of the people and for the ultimate aims of the advance to socialism.

* * *

Despite their abortive frontal attack on the Constitution in 1953 and the subsequent failure to get an absolute majority in the 1958 general election, the Christian Democrats have not yet relinquished their plans to nullify the Constitution and impose an authoritarian regime. On the contrary, we are now confronted with new attempts to solve the issues in the interests of totalitarianism, attempts which have deeper roots and which at times assume new, more organic, though concealed, forms.

With the aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism and the sharpening of its internal contradictions, the conservative forces behind the Christian Democratic Party are making

every effort to enact measures in agriculture, industry and distribution, designed to facilitate the concentration of capital and give the monopolies more power. The reactionaries are helping the monopolies retain their positions at a time when the economic situation is changing for the worse and the Common Market agreement is coming into force. They are planning a change in agricultural policy to the detriment of the small peasants and in favor of the big capitalist farmers. This change will lead to the ousting of millions of toilers from the land and to the depopulation of vast mountainous and valley regions. Some of the arable land is to be turned into pasture. The reactionaries are bent on subordinating the state-owned enterprises to monopoly interests, on creating more unemployment, on reducing expenditure on welfare, freezing wages which have already declined due to the high cost of living.

These designs and pressures on the part of reaction are being countered by the active resistance of the working-class and democratic movements, by their unity and the influence which they exert on the masses who, on May 25, 1958, gave the Left-wing parties 11 million votes, of which 6,700,000 went to the Communist Party. The fascist tyranny is still fresh in the minds of the people, and the clerical ruling circles have not yet forgotten their bitter experiences with the electoral law swindle.

Thus, overt attempts to restore tyranny and head-on attacks on the parliamentary system entail difficulties and hidden dangers for the ruling circles. This explains the somewhat unusual forms of the reactionary maneuvers, and why the Clericals prefer clandestine means which, though slower, are no less perfidious. The clerical big-wigs make a pretense of respect for Parliament, but in reality seek to deprive it of real powers. So far the election law remains unchanged, but freedom of suffrage is being infringed, discrimination exercised, people threatened with hunger, and pressures applied by government and Church. Attempts are being made to restrict democratic rights and freedoms, and arbitrary rule by the authorities is encouraged. The authorities either suspend rights temporarily or annul them completely by orders of prefects or police. Autonomy of municipal organs is likewise violated. Convocation of the regional assemblies of electors, though provided for in the Constitution, has been ruled out and discrimination and arbitrariness in the factories stepped up.

More and more clericals are being promoted to leading posts in economic, public and administrative bodies. A network of authoritarian, bureaucratic and anti-democratic bodies, designed to establish control over the masses in various spheres, is being set up. These bodies command the very life of the people and their jobs; they are sapping their militant spirit by making minor concessions and splitting their ranks in the struggle for general political demands.

The specific role of the clerical movement as an ally of the big monopolies is revealed more and more. The clericals are competing with the working-class parties in trying to win the masses. As the ruling party, they use their position in the government not only to weaken the influence of the working-class parties, but to prevent the masses from becoming organized on an independent and democratic basis. Through its organizations the clerical movement canvasses support for big business, and has gained an influence among the masses to a degree unthinkable for the openly conservative parties. The clericals owe much of their success with the masses to the power wielded by the Church and its traditional organization.

Thus, the clerical movement in Italy, and not only in Italy, seeks to divide the masses and keep them in durance. (In other countries this is achieved differently, by the Right-wing Social Democrats.) In this way, the attacks on the rights and freedoms of the workers are combined with paternalist crumbs and administrative pseudo-reforms, as well as with partial concessions, to stay the mounting pressure of the masses.

By means of this combined action big business and the clerical movement intend to maintain the illusion of a parliamentary democracy, to retain its forms and to destroy its substance. In this respect, things in Italy and France are similar. When the Central Committee of our Party discussed the developments in France, it emphasized the differences in the respective countries, but it also noted that the events in France were an episode in a broader offensive against democratic freedoms throughout Western Europe.

Comrade Togliatti recalled that fascism, too, has its specific "national roads" of development, that fascism does not establish tyranny in a single day, but gains its objective through internal conflict and by different methods in the various countries. Of course, we cannot assert that an outright reactionary regime will be established in Western Europe in the same way as fascism came to power, for both the

objective situation and the relationship of forces on the international arena have changed. But it is most important to register in good time the growing power of the big monopolies in Europe, that is, of those capitalist groupings which nursed fascism and encouraged its military gambles. This brings to the fore, both in our country and in other West-European countries, the fate of the democratic freedoms won in struggle against fascism.

The big European monopolies see that, as a result of the success of the socialist world and the national-liberation movement in the colonies, the crisis-shattered foundations of their age-old rule are being destroyed. The monopolies want to subjugate ever larger masses of small independent producers and to shift the whole burden of their own defeats on to the shoulders of the workers. That is why the monopolies can no longer afford to put up with a strong and well-organized working-class movement and democratic system. And indeed, in France a frontal attack is being launched against the democratic institutions built on the ruins of the Vichy regime. In Italy the reactionaries, by means of perfidious intrigues, are endeavoring to establish a virtual totalitarianism. The Communist Party has been outlawed in West Germany. Fascism rules the roost in Spain. A reactionary regime is in power in Greece, despite the blows it has suffered. It cannot be denied that in other capitalist countries of Europe, except Finland, the class enemy has managed to curb the Communist-led mass movement and to strengthen his positions.

Our Party has called on the democratic labor movement of Italy boldly to face the situation, to take into account the delays and obstacles likely to appear on the way to the triumph of socialist ideas, and the danger that this may bode for the destiny of peace.

During the Fascist onslaught in the inter-war period, the working-class movement and the Communist parties managed — learning from the experience gained—to improve their strategy, display more initiative, consolidate the unity of the masses, and head the nation-wide movement which eventually swept fascism away. In drawing attention to the danger of restoration of outright reactionary regimes in Western Europe, we urge that, in the present favorable conditions created by the success of the socialist world, a unity of action be achieved, of a scale and might equal to that of our past struggle against fascism.

The impressive advance of the Soviet Union, People's China and the entire socialist camp, and the sweep of the national-liberation movement, should arouse us not to wait for the ultimate victory which, undoubtedly, will come, but to the consciousness that now new possibilities are opening up for repelling the attacks of reaction, for upholding the freedoms gained and stepping out along the road to socialism even in those countries of Europe which are still strongholds of capitalism.

All this makes a burning issue of the question of unity of the political leadership of the Italian working class and, consequently, of the alliance and co-operation between Communists and Socialists. In the present situation, on the eve of battles which undoubtedly will affect the very foundations of our social system, the Communists hold that their co-operation with the Socialists on occasional day-to-day issues, from time to time, is not sufficient. Even co-operation on broader lines in the trade unions, municipalities and co-operatives is likewise insufficient. We maintain that an alliance on a general political plane is necessary, one that is directed to the great political battle which we must wage together. That is why we engaged in a vigorous polemic against tendencies which could weaken Communist-Socialist co-operation, and which eventually led to the annulment of our agreement on united action; that is why we opposed the reformist and revisionist anti-unity trends now existing in the Socialist Party. Cementing of Communist - Socialist unity, expressed in new forms to meet the present specific conditions is, in our view, the way to deliver a massive rebuff to the offensive launched by the reactionary clericals and employers, and to involve more Catholic, Social-Democratic and non-party forces in the movement for democratic freedoms.

* * *

What was the reaction of our Party and the Italian labor movement to the campaign launched by the newly-formed Fanfani-Saragat government against democratic rights and freedoms? The primary reason for the clash were the Middle East developments of last summer. The advanced sections of the working class reacted to the Anglo-American aggression in the Middle East with stormy demonstrations against permitting the imperialist forces to use Italian ports and air bases. The demonstrators demanded that Italy declare her support for peace and express her solidarity with the Arab nations. Hundreds of rallies were organized by the Chambers of

Labor, and Communists and Socialists held joint demonstrations. The municipalities, provincial councils and trade unions also protested. In the streets there were clashes with the police and people were arrested. Repressions were stepped up.

The movement grew and the Fanfani government instructed the prefects and the police to issue a series of decrees which in fact abolished freedom of agitation and propaganda, permitted, contrary to law, the confiscation of opposition posters, and banned or restricted rallies on the pretext that Middle East problems should be discussed only in Parliament. Actually these bans, enforced in violation of the law, were extended to a number of domestic issues, including labor disputes.

Thus, very serious and fundamental issues bearing on the rights of the opposition and basic civil freedoms were involved.

Our Party called on its organizations to counter these attacks by consolidating the unity of the masses. And indeed, the struggle of those weeks made it possible to extend and strengthen Socialist-Communist co-operation and even overcome some of the differences which had sharpened during the general election campaign. We tried to establish contact with Christian Democratic organizations, suggesting that joint discussions and public debates on the attitude of our respective parties to the Middle East issue be organized. We urged our activists to fight everywhere and not to overlook a single case of injustice or violence, to organize mass protests and delegations, to issue slogans and to use legal channels—the courts of law—should the need arise. Thus, each ban on the part of the police meant a political issue which was fought with varying success. The outcome of the struggle, of course, depended on the strength, initiative and skill of our organizations. Through us this protest movement assumed a universal character, not only because we actively participated in parliamentary debate, but also because we convened an all-Italy Assembly of Communist Deputies, mayors, local and provincial councillors, which helped to collect and present the documentary evidence on all the unlawful acts of the government. Comrades Togliatti and Terraccini submitted the collection of documents and an appropriate memorandum to the President.

As a result we were able to halt the police onslaught and secure a turn to a more organized defense of democratic freedoms. The working-class movement and our Party acquired a better understanding of the designs of the Fanfani government.

This action in defense of democratic freedoms, stimulated by the sharp struggle of July 1958, has now developed into a broader movement in connection with the events in France. Immediately after the colonialist coup in Algeria, the Italian workers, on the initiative of our Party, opened a discussion on the French developments. An exchange of views took place in the factories and, gradually broadening, attracted large masses of people. The discussion helped re-establish unity of action of the Communists and Socialists. This step was furthered by the experience gained during the July peace demonstrations and the joint counter-measures against police injustice.

The rank-and-file Socialists and Communists in one of the Turin plants jointly called on the working people to learn from the lessons of France and to work for unity in order to repel the danger to Italy. The appeal was taken up by the workers in other factories. And in recent weeks there has been a noticeable rise in the number of meetings, rallies and joint Communist-Socialist actions in defense of democratic gains, now threatened by the clericals and the employers.

This movement assumes a variety of forms and pursues a number of objectives, depending on the urgent social and political problems confronting the working class and other working people in the localities. This is explained by the fact that in our country it is most essential to link defense of democratic rights and freedoms with the struggle for changes in the social and political structure, which would strike primarily at the land monopoly, industrial monopoly and the rich, i.e., at the social forces behind the attack on the democratic structure.

Today as never before, defense of the democratic structure in Italy cannot be confined to protection of some abstract or formal freedom; it means the fight for land, for the revision of farm contracts, for the rights of the trade unions and factory committees, for extension of the powers of local government bodies, for regional electoral assemblies, for more jobs, as well as for a policy of peace, trade and cultural exchange with all nations.

It is precisely on this basis that the working-class vanguard can strengthen its ties with those sections which have suffered most from the growing power of the monopolies, undertake united action with the working people—Catholics and Social Democrats alike — and

be not only on the defensive but also assume the offensive, not only protest, but also put forward constructive proposals.

It is on this basis that the organized movement of the masses should be strengthened. A network of democratic organizations should be built to enable the workers to counter violence, intimidation and corruption by clericals and employers.

Typical of this activity was our campaign for the setting up of regional electoral assemblies envisaged in the Constitution. These assemblies are an important defensive weapon against arbitrary action on the part of the clerical authorities and their bureaucratic apparatus. At the same time they meet the requirements of the popular demand that regional development plans for industry, agriculture and social welfare be elaborated. Hence, they give the people an opportunity to exercise more effectively their powers of self-government.

In places where authoritative regional assemblies have been set up, for instance in Sicily, it has been possible, in recent years, to make definite gains by restricting the Christian Democrats' monopoly of government authority. The newly formed regional government will abolish this monopoly.

* * *

How is the struggle to defend and develop the democratic system, to renovate our society, connected with our general struggle for socialism? When we say that implementation of far-reaching structural reforms in our country can open the road to socialism we do not suggest that each of these structural reforms is, in itself, a part of socialism. Moreover, we do not believe that, in the aggregate, these reforms will mechanically bring about the socialist system. Our Party has always rejected such reformist, Social-Democratic concepts. Marxism - Leninism unequivocally states that the principal condition for building a socialist society is the conquest of political power by the working class which, led by its revolutionary party, smashes the old state machine, builds a new state, socializes the main means of production and in this way rallies the broad masses of the exploited and establishes new forms of direct democracy.

However, the working-class vanguard should, in the light of Marxist-Leninist theory, assess and chart the transitional periods and battles that have to be gone through on the way to achievement of the fundamental aim: conquest of political power by the working class, establishment of the proletarian dictatorship. Implementation of structural reforms, enforcement of the republican Constitution and the building up of a democratic system—such is the road we should take to isolate the big monopoly groups, deprive them of their power and rally, under working-class leadership, the majority of the people and the other sections interested in abolishing the monopolies. This is the way to achieve a new relationship of forces which would enable the working class to take over state power and begin to build a socialist society.

This is not a path strewn with roses, the road of compromise, nor is it the sum total of victorious election campaigns. On the contrary it is a road of bitter class struggle, requiring a well-organized workers' movement, organic unity of mass action undertaken to isolate and defeat the main enemy of the working class and win the allies needed for conquest of political power. This is the road demanding a revolutionary Marxist-Leninist party, steeled ideologically and politically and capable of continuous action and of maintaining contact with the broad sections of the population.

That is why we have always considered it erroneous and one-sided to define Italy's road to socialism as a "parliamentary road." On the basis of the instructive conclusions of the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU, our Party has stressed that under the new conditions which have evolved as a result of the victories gained by socialism and the defeats suffered by capitalism, it is possible to use Parliament not only as a propaganda rostrum, but also as an arena for securing gains for the people. But this depends, as Comrade Togliatti constantly reminds us, on a powerful, well-organized movement of the working people, on broad unity of the masses, as well as on a revolutionary vanguard capable of mapping out a correct political course.

We feel that at present a powerful mass movement in Italy can influence the political forces supporting the clerical government, take advantage of their internal contradictions, effect a shift which would break up the rigid division between the government majority and the Left opposition and pave the way to definite achievements. That is why when we talk about the link between parliamentary activity and the general struggle we have in mind not only a broader movement, not only the need for support of the labor opposition in Parliament through propaganda, but such an extension of the front of class battles as would change the relation of forces in Parlia-

ment in favor of the working class and the people.

In order to arrive at this conclusion on the link between action in Parliament and outside we have worked and shall continue to work for a correct orientation of the working-class and democratic movement itself. On the one hand, it is necessary to overcome the tendency of those who believe that a bourgeois government bloc is something immutable and immovable, for this concept tends to obscure its internal contradictions. The ultimate result of this tendency—every time a local or a general election campaign fails to win a majority for the working-class parties — is distrust and passivity on the part of the masses. On the other hand, it is necessary to combat another tendency in the democratic movement and in the Socialist Party which, in an effort to end the stalemate in political life, places its main hopes on inner-parliamentary maneuvers. This tendency was born of the illusion that by weakening the opposition to the Christian Democrats, chiefly by disrupting the Communist-Socialist alliance, it would be possible to induce the Christian Democrats to shift to the Left and thereby achieve a compromise. Actually, the rupture of the Socialist-Communist unity agreement merely weakened the pressure of the masses, achieved through joint effort, and as a consequence, weakened the positions of the opposition. So that instead of inducing the Christian Democrats to move Left, the abrogation of the agreement swung them to the Right.

A closer view of the situation will reveal that both tendencies—first, that the bourgeois bloc is immutable and immovable and, second, that the situation can be changed as a result of inner-parliamentary maneuvers and concessions to the enemy—follow from one and the same misunderstanding and underestimation of the decisive role played by united mass action. It should never be forgotten that the power and effectiveness of the working-class opposition in Parliament depends on its ability to intervene in the class battles in the country, through establishing a dialectical link between its own initiative and the revolutionary struggles of the working class and all working people.

* * *

With such prospects the fight of the working-class vanguard for democratic freedoms, for an advanced democratic system, for a parliament which would be a true champion of the will of the people, is not a transient measure (not an episode), it is a component of the overall struggle of the vanguard for achieving socialism. That is why the heralds of the Italian bourgeoisie lie when, in self-justification, they characterize our struggles for democratic freedoms as an artful trick or a maneuver.

In defending the freedoms won by the people, and in fighting for their extension, we remain faithful to our ideals, our outlook and our ultimate revolutionary aims. The decisions of the Eighth Congress, it is true, reaffirm that the course of these struggles does not depend solely on the working class and its revolutionary vanguard. The history of capitalist society confirms by numerous examples that the conservative forces, in an endeavor to cling to their privileges, resort to the most savage forms of violence, including war, shed rivers of blood, and abolish even the semblance of political democracy. This should never be forgotten, especially now when the Western capitalist circles are ready to plunge into any reactionary gamble. A theoretical and political understanding of this reality, far from causing us to abandon the struggle for democratic freedoms, should, on the contrary, give us renewed strength to defend and extend the freedoms already won by the people. And the more allies the working class has in these battles, the more decisively will it be able to resist reactionary violence and the better will be its chances of defeating it.

Party Tactics and Contact With the Masses

Leon Bohr

FORTY years ago, in January 1919, Lenin wrote in a letter to the workers of Europe and America that, although formally the Comintern had not yet been established, "the Third International already exists." The class-conscious workers, taught by the lessons of the imperialist war and influenced by the Russian revolution, became convinced of the need to break with the opportunists and form revolutionary parties of a new type. The appearance of such parties in a number of countries marked a new stage in the international labor movement. The workers, Lenin said, slowly but surely were drawing nearer to communist tactics.

Socialism, which in 1919 was gripped in the iron ring of blockade and intervention and underwent incredible sufferings in battling for its existence, has developed into a great world system stretching from the Elbe to the South China Sea. The Communist parties have grown in number and gained in strength. The First Congress of the Comintern was attended by delegates from 20 parties; at the Second, held in 1920, 37 parties were represented. Prior to World War II the Communist parties had an overall membership of 4.2 million. At present there are 75 parties with a total membership of 33 million. Communist tactics have been enriched immeasurably. They have become more flexible, more in tune with reality, but the fundamental principles remain the same; in the changing conditions of 40 years of struggle they have stood the test. These principles form the basis of the activities of the Marxist-Leninist parties in the capitalist countries.

Success in the Struggle is Determined by the Millions

The great objectives of the Communist parties can be attained only through the organized actions of the masses. Neither individual heroes nor separate groups can transform capitalist society in a revolutionary way; what is more, even parties may be powerless if they rely mainly on themselves and fail to bring the millions of workers into action.

Marxism has demonstrated the decisive role of the masses in the development of society and the special historical mission of the working class. All the practical activities of Marx and Engels were an example of unflagging effort to strengthen the contact of the numerically small communist groups with the workers. Already in those days the basis was laid for the tactics of the incipient Marxist parties; the aim of these tactics was, in addition to furthering the class consciousness of the proletariat, to rouse it to revolutionary action.

The theoretical legacy left by the founders of Marxism includes vital principles of tactics designed to draw large numbers of workers into the struggle. Marx and Engels, however, lived at a time which only presaged really mass struggles. The proletarian actions in the revolutions of 1848 and even the valiant struggle of the Paris Communards, "storming heaven" for 72 days, were but harbingers of the approaching storm that set in later. The breaking of the storm was marked by unprecedented mass activity; tens and hundreds of millions, not tens and hundreds of thousands as was the case formerly, now moved into action; the variety of the forms of action and the wealth of revolutionary rank and file initiative were such as could only be dreamed of in the days of Marx and Engels. And the question: how to master all these forms and lead the genuinely mass movement, became the focal point in the tactics of the Marxist parties.

Lenin, relying on the vast experience accumulated in the first round of socialist revolutions, summarized their lessons, pointed to the specific features of bourgeois-democratic and national-liberation revolutions in the epoch of imperialism and fully elaborated the tactical principles of Marxism. The rich experience of the Communist parties has added much that is new to revolutionary Marxist tactics, both as a science and an art, equipping the parties with a scientific approach to the solution of tactical questions in the given conditions.

Communist tactics are determined by the aims, program and revolutionary ideology of the party. The tasks of the major historical stages on the way to the final goal are

solved by strategy. But each stage consists of a series of lesser stages, and the party, by means of tactics, seeks to realize that which has matured at a particular stage, and outlines the forms of struggle and the tasks of the day. Tactics derive from strategy. Hence, a correct understanding of the strategic tasks is an indispensable condition for drawing up correct tactics. The Seventh Congress of the Japanese Communist Party, for example, pointed out that a number of tactical mistakes made towards the end of the 'forties and in the early 'fifties can be explained by the fact that some members incorrectly assessed the present strategic stage as the one which had to fulfil socialist tasks, whereas the country was going through the stage of democratic and national-liberation struggle.

Communist tactics are based on firm principles and are systematically and steadfastly carried out by the party as a plan of revolutionary activity. Leninism teaches that this plan should always proceed from a scientific analysis of reality and pay due regard to the correlation of class forces in the given country and on the international arena.

The present stage of the communist movement, notwithstanding its peculiarities in different capitalist countries, has one common feature: as the Moscow Declaration of the Communist and Workers' Parties noted, there are sharpening contradictions not only between a handful of monopolists, on the one hand, and the working class, on the other, but also between the monopolists and the other sections of capitalist society — peasants, intellectuals and small and middle urban bourgeoisie. This creates the conditions for building a united working-class front, bringing together the majority of the people in the fight against the capitalist monopolies, and helps the Communist parties to become the cementing link uniting all the progressive forces, parties and political trends that are ready to fight against the dictatorship of monopoly capital.

In the countries already enslaved or in the process of being enslaved by U.S. monopolies, the working class is the natural exponent of the national interests, and the Communist parties are able to do a great deal in building a militant national unity in defense of democratic liberties and independence. The colonial and other countries, which have recently thrown off the colonial yoke, have every opportunity for forming a united anti-imperialist and anti-feudal movement. We are now witnessing that unparalleled surge of mass activity foreseen by Lenin.

Leninism provides theoretical substantiation of the cardinal tactical questions. But notwithstanding the wealth of content and the range of tactical problems covered by Leninism, it is not difficult to see the standpoint from which Lenin approached every phenomenon in the spheres of history and ideology and, particularly, the practice of the Communist parties. This is, constant verification of the programmatic and tactical concepts of the parties through mass action.

Much time is needed for a party to develop from a small group of like-minded people, working mainly in the Party, into an organization linked with the masses and capable of influencing them. The duration of the stages experienced by each party in the course of its development is never the same. This depends on the objective conditions in the country and in large measure on the party itself, on its energy, cohesion and tactics. But no matter how uneven the complex process of combining communist ideas with the working-class movement may be, and no matter how the Communist and Workers' parties differ in strength, membership and degree of organization, the world communist movement as a whole has already become a powerful and invincible force. The activity of even the relatively small Communist parties, that have not yet won over the masses, is that inextinguishable flame which sooner or later will flare up into a popular mass movement.

Just as the laws of history are inexorable, so is the process of growth of the Communist parties and of extending their contacts with the working people. But movements forward do not advance in a straight line; in the history of each Communist party there are periods of rise and decline, of greater and lesser influence on the masses. In the everyday work of each party, success alternates with failure. For instance, elections are not always accompanied by a rise in the Communist vote. However, both in periods of success and in times of temporary setback the Communist parties always adhere to the Leninist tradition: in all circumstances soberly to analyze the objective conditions, draw lessons from mistakes and, above all, extend contact with the masses.

Experience has shown that even the parties enjoying prestige and mass support cannot live on the capital of past services. A feature of the party's contact with the masses is that it must be strengthened all

the time, day by day; any slackening of work among the masses inevitably results in a certain loss of positions. The enemy does not sit idle; he tries to seize the initiative, to extend his influence among the masses, and he too draws lessons from his experience and resorts to ever more cunning devices. That is why the party should always deepen and extend its influence among the masses. This should be done after every failure because weakness of the work among the masses is one of the reasons for defeat. And it should be done after every victory, as otherwise it might prove transient and it will be difficult to use it for further progress.

The Masses Learn from Their Own Experience

The Communist and Workers' parties express the vital interests of the working class and other toilers; they therefore have every reason to count on active mass support.

But as we know, more than the publication of a Marxist-Leninist program is needed in order to win prestige among the masses. People learn not only from books. Lenin pointed out that in order to get the whole class, the masses of the working people and all those oppressed by capital, to take the standpoint of the party, propaganda and agitation alone do not suffice. "For this the masses must have their own political experience. Such is the fundamental law of all great revolutions . . ." (*Collected Works*, Vol. 31, Russ. Ed., p. 73)

The Communist parties always take into account this objective law of the revolution in order not to become isolated from the masses, not to be "misunderstood" and, above all, not to make mistakes and to regard as obsolete for the masses that which is obsolete for the party. What has long been clear to the Communists is not necessarily clear to the masses. And the latter should be taken as they are, with their revolutionary instinct and militant spirit and with their prejudices and illusions. There cannot be the slightest shade of idealization or wishful thinking here. With boundless faith in the revolutionary energy of the masses, Lenin always insisted on "doubt" when it was a question of estimating the real mood of the people. He firmly opposed any exaggeration, holding that to base the party's tactics on idealization of the actual relation of class forces was tantamount to killing the tactics. The mood of the masses should be reckoned with, no matter how backward. One should not take offense at the masses. Adhering to this Marxist-Leninist principle, Marcel Servin, addressing the Central Committee of the French Communist Party on the political situation in France after the Gaullist referendum, noted that it would be wrong to label as reactionaries the 17 million who voted "Yes," i.e. approved the reactionary Constitution. That they had been misled should be regarded as an objective factor, and it is necessary to re-establish or maintain contact with the majority of these people; otherwise, the meeting stressed, the Party will condemn itself to isolation and stagnation.

The Communist engaged in popularizing policy may be tempted to work among sympathizers and supporters. It is easier to work here, there are no strangers, nobody will compromise you or attack you. To work among wavering or even hostile people is a different matter. Dirty tricks can be expected here; resourcefulness in argumentation is needed. Sometimes not a few difficulties have to be overcome in order to penetrate into all, even the most reactionary, organizations embracing working people. But, as experience shows, this is the only way in which the party can get to know the real sentiment of the masses and its members acquire the ability to work both among advanced and backward sections of the population alike.

The political level of the masses is the point of departure for the Marxist-Leninist party. But this does not at all mean that it can adopt a wait-and-see attitude, waiting for the day when the masses themselves learn the lessons of life and realize that the Communists are right. The faith of the Marxist-Leninist parties, that sooner or later the people will support them as the sole exponents of their interests, has nothing in common with fatalism or with waiting for the "hour to strike."

In exactly the same way the necessity of taking into account the degree of consciousness of the masses does not mean sinking to the level of the masses, adapting the Party to the backward sections. The Communists call a prejudice a prejudice, an illusion an illusion; at the same time they carefully assess the real degree of consciousness of the masses.

An important principle of communist tactics, as defined by Leninism, is to get the masses to understand from their own experience the correctness of the Party's policy,

to help them acquire the experience necessary for revolutionary struggle.

The history of many Communist parties contains instructive examples of how communist policy, at first received with prejudice by the masses, soon won the hearts of millions because the party followed correct tactics and actively molded the political experience and consciousness of the masses.

The tactics of the Russian Communists between February and October 1917 serve as an example in this respect. It will be recalled that up to May the Communists had received only a tenth of the votes cast at the congresses and conferences of the working people. Not infrequently, people deceived about the character of the war refused to listen to the Bolshevik appeals to put an end to it. There were occasions when working people, who felt that the war should be continued, refused to let Communists speak from the platforms. Yet the Party worked among the masses patiently and painstakingly, and explained its policy, using the exposures provided by life, the developments, in fact all that the masses understood and believed.

The Party directives of that period stressed the need for propaganda in every regiment, at every factory and, especially, among the most backward masses on whom the bourgeoisie relies at times of crisis. Organization, organization and once more organization of the proletariat at every factory, in every street and district — this was the line of the Bolshevik Party, and it was this that enabled it to win over increasing numbers of people. And had it not been for the treachery of the petty-bourgeois parties, the support won by the Bolsheviks could have ensured the peaceful transfer of power to the working class.

The French Communist Party had no wide support when it exposed the warmongers at the time of Munich and in 1939, during the "phony war". The enemies of communism rejoiced at the isolation of the Party. But soon the masses, taught by experience, became convinced that the Communists were right. The Party again enhanced its prestige among the masses.

Nowadays, many men and women in France do not yet realize that de Gaulle's advent to power and all his "reforms" signify an onslaught of fascism. But time will dispel the illusions. It may be that the demagogy, deceit, chauvinist propaganda, the policy of silence and doubletalk, will maintain the illusions for a while. But the facts of life cannot be hushed up forever, nor the things which cannot be changed so long as real power remains in the hands of the monopolies.

Slogans and Revolutionary Initiative

What should be done to help the masses to acquire more quickly the necessary political experience? Is explanatory work enough for this? The significance of this work is very great, but it always runs the risk of becoming mere enlightenment unless subordinated to immediate aims, what we call "immediate demands," and linked to concrete actions. Years of revolutionary practice have taught the Communist parties that the enlightening of the masses, opening their eyes to the real state of affairs, cannot be achieved by words alone. It presupposes organized action.

Insofar as the masses apprehend reality through the facts of daily life, facts which have a direct bearing upon them, the Party brings the masses to the solution of the basic tasks only when it leads the struggle for their immediate needs. Marxists have always censured the reformists who put off the fulfilment of socialist ideals to the distant future; and who maintain that the basic interest of the workers lies in protecting their present interests. By no means do the Communists ignore the everyday needs of the working people. On the contrary, they proceed from the premise that under capitalism these interests can be upheld only by revolutionary parties, bringing the working class step by step to the solution of the basic tasks. Unmasking the falsehood and hypocrisy of all reformist and bourgeois parties, which prattle about reforms, Lenin said: "We try to help the working class to get the smallest possible but real improvement (economic and political) in their situation and we add always that no reform can be durable, sincere, serious if not seconded by revolutionary methods of struggle of the masses. We teach always that a Socialist Party not uniting this struggle for reforms with the revolutionary methods of working class movement can become a sect, can be severed from the masses, and that that is the most pernicious menace to the success of the clear-cut revolutionary socialism." (From Lenin's English original.)

The immediate slogans put forward by the Party are clear to the people; the struggle for their achievement adds to their consciousness. The Communists have never ceased exposing the outmoded capitalist sys-

tem, but they consider it wrong to advance slogans which only criticize and do not say what should be done now, and how. Lenin always opposed the putting forward of slogans which would only "sharpen the consciousness of the proletariat against imperialism." He wrote: "The 'negative' slogan, not linked with a definite positive solution, does not 'sharpen' but blunts consciousness, for such a slogan is nothing but a worthless phrase, a meaningless cry, an empty declaration." (*Collected Works*, Vol. 23, Russ. Ed., p. 60.)

The slogans advanced by the Party indicate that it understands the particular situation, its peculiarities and the real sentiment of the masses. It will be recalled how the Bolshevik Party resolutely opposed those who, immediately after the February Revolution, imposed socialist slogans on it, as slogans of action, calling for the overthrow of the Provisional Government. The Party came to these slogans through a series of intermediate stages, when the masses came to the understanding that not a single vital task facing the country could be solved without the overthrow of this government. The Party did not advance socialist slogans directly. It fought for peace, and the logic of the struggle showed that the war could not be terminated without abolishing the bourgeoisie and landlords. The Party fought for bread, and experience told the masses that the hungry could not be fed as long as power remained in the hands of exploiters. The same can be said about the "land to the peasants" slogan and others, for the realization of which the Bolsheviks rallied the masses. Simple, democratic appeals understandable to all and correctly reflecting the needs of the people, helped enormously in the revolutionizing of the masses, encouraged their initiative and engendered many forms of struggle by the working people.

An important feature of the present revolutionary movement is the drawing closer of the immediate tasks facing the working people, defense of their daily needs, to the fundamental problems of transforming capitalist society as a whole. The very concept of immediate demands is changing. Indeed, under monopoly rule any movement for higher wages, against unemployment, for pensions, etc., cannot but infringe on the interests of the monopolists who completely dominate the state.

The extent to which the concept of immediate demands has broadened is seen more clearly in regard to the struggle for peace and against nuclear weapon tests. The workers are now directly, vitally interested in this struggle, for their very existence depends on its success. In the age of atomic weapons, the political experience of the working class and of all working people teaches them that defense of peace and the movement against the aggressive foreign policy of the imperialist states are not an abstract political protest, they are vitally important to every family.

Defense of peace, national independence and democratic liberties and the fight for agrarian reform have now become the urgent tasks that can rally the different sections of the population in most capitalist countries.

When Communist parties, in some Latin American countries, for example, put forward a program of demands such as protecting and extending civil rights and liberties, safeguarding natural resources from seizure by foreign capital, higher wages and aid to the small farmers and share-croppers, they are fighting for the common demands that impel all sections of the population to joint action.

Notable progress in building this unity has been made, in particular, by the Chilean Communists. In 1958 the presidential candidate supported by the Communist Party received seven times more votes than in 1952 —only 30,000 votes less than his opponent. The political movement which has developed around the working class and the Front of Popular Action has acquired unprecedented power of attraction also in the countryside, which had always been regarded as the pillar of reaction. Some petty-bourgeois and bourgeois parties have joined this Front; Socialist-Communist unity and co-operation with the democratic parties has become stronger.

The rich experience acquired by the Italian Communist Party has enabled it to rally different sections of the population around concrete demands. As a result of the defeat of fascism and the growth of a mass movement, the people won a new Constitution which, although preserving the capitalist system, contains a number of articles providing for reforms of a progressive and democratic character. And the ruling classes, violating the Constitution in every way, refuse to implement reforms. As for the Communist Party, it is organizing the mass struggle for the defense of democratic liberties and their extension, for carrying out the articles of the Constitution.

The Party constantly advances proposals concerning the problems facing the country as a whole and the various strata of the population. The Communists waged a struggle for years in Parliament and outside it, before the peasants' pension law was enacted. They organized a powerful movement of share-croppers and tenants against arbitrary abrogation of agreements by the landowners. At the moment the Communists are heading a mass movement against the high cost of living. Workers, artisans, women and shopkeepers are taking part in this struggle.

Revolutionary practice confirms that only the constant activity of the Communists and their initiative in all spheres of public life can spread the Party's influence among the masses. This is what Lenin had in view when he wrote: "We cannot be satisfied with the fact that our tactical slogans lag behind events, being adapted to them after they have occurred. We must see to it that these slogans lead us forward, illuminate our path . . ." (*Collected Works*, Vol. 9, Russ. Ed., p. 132.)

In order to be able to act in this way the Communist parties endeavor to rely more on the mass organizations where independent action by the working people develops and from which active members and capable leaders emerge. These are first of all the trade unions—the biggest organizations of the working class—co-operatives, women's, youth and sports associations. It is only through these organizations that the fight for a united front can be successful. Experience shows that political campaigns conducted by the party without involving its branches in the plants, villages and residential districts in the town inevitably turn into campaigns chiefly of a propaganda character, whereas every initiative immediately assumes a different character when all the branches take part in it. As a rule, diverse forms of initiative and new forms and methods of work appear, by means of which the Party broadens its influence and reaches the various groups of the population.

At its XIth Congress the Finnish Communist Party which, as we know, wields considerable mass influence, devoted special attention to strengthening and extending the network of branches. The Finnish Party provides instructive examples of the way in which many branches learned quickly to react to the burning topics of the day—both of a general political nature and those affecting the people of a given locality. Some Party organizations initiated a struggle for better conditions. A number of territorial branches won prestige by vigorously campaigning for new roads, water supply and power stations; establishing contact with the people, the Communists found out their needs and helped them to resolve their difficulties. Such branches become a school of activity for all Communists, for it is the activity of the members that largely determines the effectiveness of the Party as a whole.

All the experience of the communist movement teaches that the parties which want to become a really effective and significant political factor in the life of their country, always conduct an active policy, do not confine themselves solely to propaganda and criticism, but advance slogans and proposals that can provide a basis for united action by broader masses of the people. The word "masses" is now interpreted more widely; that is why the Communist parties strive to work among various strata of the population and merge all the rivulets of popular discontent into one mighty anti-imperialist stream.

Unity of the Party is the Condition for Successful Influence on the Masses

To lead the masses and fulfil its leading role, the Party must be united on the basis of Marxist-Leninist principles. Cohesion and discipline are a basic condition for any organized activity by the Party. Where there is dissension and lack of unanimity within the Party, there can be no successful leadership of the masses. First, agree among yourselves; that is what could be said to the representatives of such a Party.

At the same time, internal unity depends on how closely the Party is linked with the masses. The idea of unity as something maintained artificially, as something resembling a mechanical discipline, has always been alien to Communists. The Communist party is a community of like-minded people who devote themselves to a great goal and constantly feel their responsibility to the people for the defense of their interests, for their destiny.

In his *Left-Wing Communism* Lenin, explaining how the discipline of the working-class revolutionary party is maintained, how it is tested and reinforced, gave first place to the consciousness of the members, their devotion to the revolution, perseverance, self-sacrifice and heroism. Secondly, the unity of the proletarian vanguard is determined by "its ability to link itself with, to keep in close touch with, and to a certain extent, if you will,

to merge with the broadest masses of the toilers—primarily with the proletariat, *but also with the non-proletarian* toiling masses." (*Works*, Vol. 31, Russ. Ed., p. 8.) And, finally, the party's unity is conditioned by the correctness of its political strategy and tactics "provided that the broad masses have been convinced *by their own experience* that they are correct." (Ibid.).

The latter-day revisionists are ready to hold forth against sectarianism, dogmatism and everything that hampers closer contact with the masses. But this is sheer hypocrisy. Attacking the very foundations of the revolutionary ideology and seeking to turn the party into a debating society, they strive to divert it from working among the masses. The undermining activities of the revisionists temporarily weakened the contact of some parties with the working people. A disruptive role, in this respect, one which weakened the Party, was played by Axel Larsen, ex-chairman of the Danish Communist Party, by Gates in the United States and by other revisionists. The parties broadened their contacts after the revisionists had been unmasked and their disruptive activity paralyzed.

Revisionists, like the reformists of all hues, are transmitters of bourgeois influence in the labor movement; they adapt themselves to the less conscious workers. Of course, tailing behind the movement and adapting one's self to backward sentiment are also forms of "contact" with the masses, but it is contact which signifies dissolution of the Party and its disappearance as the guiding and organizing force of the movement. Marxism-Leninism on the other hand regards contact with the working people as the essential condition for guiding them and leading them forward.

Revisionism is now the main danger in the communist movement. And though at first glance it may appear that the revisionists stand for contact with the masses, they in fact divorce the party from the masses, depriving the latter of their vanguard and severing the correct relations between the party and the working people. The danger of becoming isolated from the masses should be seen also from the other side. We cannot afford to overlook self-complacent, doctrinaire, rigid sectarianism, which, on the basis of stereotyped recipes, imposes on the Communist party simplified methods of resolving the complex problems of the labor movement. Sectarianism signifies denial of the need to learn from the masses, reluctance to find ways and means of bringing the party closer to the different sections of the working people.

There is nothing accidental in the fact that revisionism and sectarianism, despite the outward show of opposition, always appear on the scene whenever the situation is aggravated. When the Russian Marxists combated the revisionist liquidators after the defeat of the 1905 Revolution, Lenin characterized the sectarians who had then become active as "Liquidators turned inside out" inasmuch as they wanted, by divorcing the Party from the masses, to lead it, in fact, to self-dissolution. This aptly expressed interconnection between revisionism and sectarianism is confirmed by many examples from the practice of the Communist parties in the different countries. In Canada, for example, the revisionists, denounced by the Labor Progressive Party, have aligned themselves with Trotskyites, trying jointly to organize a new party.

The report on the political situation in France after the referendum, made at a meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, calls for vigilance in relation to the danger from the Right and from the Left. "From the Right we can expect manifestations of opportunism engendered by the success of the advocates of the new Constitution . . .

"It is likewise necessary to beware of the danger of sectarianism which could lead to isolation from the working masses . . . It is possible," says the report, "that the numerically small but active members of the opposition, who have set themselves the aim of striking at the Party's unity, will become more furious, attacking both from the Right and from the Left."

Combating revisionism and sectarianism is part of the struggle for the masses, for a broad anti-monopoly front.

The communist movement in each country has its objective difficulties, its specific conditions. But the international communist movement as a whole is now developing in conditions where the socialist camp is rapidly gaining in strength, where the influence of the ideas of peace, democracy and socialism, spreading more and more, is becoming irresistible. All the Marxist-Leninist parties are becoming mass parties, genuine leaders of the nationwide struggle. Proof of this is the valiant work of the biggest Communist parties in Western Europe, and the swift growth of the Communist parties in Asia and Latin America. Even the smallest parties will, in due course, overcome their weak-

nesses and win the majority of the working class. This can be seen from the revolutionary practice of our time. The successful activities of the Spanish Communist Party which, working underground, organized a mass movement on May 5, 1958, when in one way or another millions of Spaniards protested against the fascist dictatorship; the impressive success of the Left forces in parliamentary elections in a number of countries; the growing influence of the Venezuelan Communist Party, whose activities have more than once been instrumental in frustrating attempts at reactionary coups d'état—these and many other examples confirm Lenin's words that the strength of the vanguard—the party—is "ten, a hundred and more times greater than its numbers."

Confident of victory, the Marxist-Leninist parties are celebrating the 40th anniversary of the international communist movement initiated by the Russian revolution and marked by the founding of the Communist International. Tirelessly rallying all progressive and democratic forces, they are winning, increasingly, the confidence and support of their peoples in the fight for peace and socialism.

Some Aspects of the Liberation Movement in Latin America

Pedro Reyes

RECENT developments in Latin America emphasize with renewed force that we are living in the epoch of the liberation of mankind from imperialist domination, when millions of people are taking part in making history, millions whom the oppressors had only yesterday prevented from stepping out along the highroad of progress.

Another large group of nations has begun a determined fight for peace and a bright future. The Latin American peoples, noted for their freedom-loving traditions and their contribution to the treasure-house of world culture, have joined with the other peoples in resisting the threat of war and the lawlessness of the imperialist enslavers. The balance of political forces in the world is changing once again in favor of the camp of peace and progress.

In May 1957, the people of Colombia overthrew the Rojas Pinilla tyranny, one of the most reactionary regimes in the Western Hemisphere. In January 1958, the same fate befell Pérez Jiménez in Venezuela; the fascist dictatorship of this North American stooge collapsed under the impact of democratic, anti-imperialist mass actions. And on February 23, 1958, the reactionaries suffered a setback in the general elections in Argentina, one of the largest countries on the continent. The democratic liberation struggle is gaining momentum in Cuba. The flames of anti-imperialist mass actions are burning more brightly in other countries also.

The U.S. imperialists no longer conceal their profound alarm over the developments in Latin America. They realize that this vast and rich area, the plunder of which in the last century was one of the main reasons for the swift rise of U.S. capitalism, and which is now important from the standpoint of realizing the aggressive schemes of the Wall Street finance oligarchy, is slipping out of their grip. The imperialist vultures shudder at the thought that the Latin Americans will realize their age-old dream of establishing unity within each country and throughout the entire continent, which will enable them to cast off the fetters of foreign oppression and take the path of independent development.

The best sons of our peoples — José Marti and San Martin, Simon Bolivar and Alejandro Petion and many others — dreamed of and fought for a united Latin America, free from foreign oppressors. But the schemes of the foreign sharks and their class confederates in the Latin American countries prevented realization of the noble aspirations of the patriots. And the same schemes exert their influence on the course of events to this day.

The reason why Yankee imperialism is still able to appropriate Latin American wealth is, above all, that it is aided and abetted by the comprador and bureaucratic bourgeoisie. Hence the political instability and recurring coups d'état in our countries.

"The banana of Central America, the oil of Venezuela and, to sweeten the pill, the sugar of San Domingo and Cuba, bring the fortune-seekers greater profits when they rely more on the big stick than on the polling booth where the people can express their own will," is the just comment of Romulo Gallegos, ex-President of Venezuela.

The comprador bourgeoisie (including banking), now fused with the latifundists, is numerically a negligible group. In Argentina, for instance, it comprises only 0.7 per cent of the gainfully employed population. Yet this bourgeoisie, jointly with its North American partners, owns the lion's share of Latin American wealth. In Mexico, foreign firms (excluding "mixed" firms) own 23 per cent of the national wealth. Seven million Mexican families live on the scanty sum of less than 3,000 pesos a year, while some 50,000 big bourgeois or landlord families have annual incomes of over 300,000 pesos each. What is more, these parasites, millstones on the people, are served by retinues of menials — petty-bourgeois elements employed by the North American companies or providing a "national" label for the imperialist "mixed" companies, lawyers, officials, and generals, always ready to sell themselves to the highest bidder. Having risen to leading rank in the administration and in the army, having aligned themselves with the landlord and dollar aristocracy and amassing profits from contracts or becoming partners in foreign companies and local banks, these people form the so-called bureaucratic bourgeoisie.

The basic contradiction, which our patriots are concentrating on solving, is that between the North American imperialists, pursuing a colonialist policy with the backing of comprador and bureaucratic capital, on the one hand, and the vast majority of Latin Americans who aspire to be masters of their own countries, on the other hand. *Attainment of economic and political independence is the principal national task of the Latin American countries at the present stage.*

Unity is the essential thing needed to solve this cardinal task. But no two unities are alike. There is, for instance, the "unity" of governments in the form of the Organization of American States, with the U.S. playing the leading role. This "unity," torn, it is true, by internal strife, is no doubt beneficial to Washington, for without it the latter would find it rather difficult to pursue the policy of military gambles or foist its provocative designs on the United Nations. As for our peoples, this "unity," far from freeing them from brutal exploitation, only tightens the noose of North American bondage around their necks. "The symbol of pan-Americanism is not the white rose of democracy extolled in Washington. It is rather a crown of thorns for Latin America . . . The priestly robe, the dollar and the sword — such is the gloomy combination which bars the road to progress," once noted the Mexican weekly, *Siempre*, not without reason.

We also know another variant of Latin American unity. It was proposed a year and a half ago by the Peruvian President Prado who propagated the idea of a "Latin unity" embracing Latin America, Franco Spain, Salazar's Portugal, France and Italy. Moreover, Prado conceived this bloc as a counterweight to the socialist camp and also to Arab nationalism. It is fairly clear that even this "unity" hardly promises prosperity for Latin America, although it might help us in competing with North American goods on the West European market.

What we need is a unity of another kind, namely, the unity of all the patriotic forces vitally concerned with safeguarding sovereignty, achieving economic independence, establishing multilateral commercial and diplomatic relations, democratization of the state system, democratic agrarian reform and a higher standard of living. Only unity of this kind can ensure the success of the liberation movement both in each country and throughout the continent.

None of us, of course, forgets that despite their common dependent position in the capitalist world system, historical destiny, spiritual make-up, traditions of liberation struggle and geographical proximity, the Latin American countries are far from being uniform. Each has its own national peculiarities and different level of development. Suffice it to recall that along with the politically independent countries of Central and South America there are Puerto Rico, Jamaica and Guiana where millions are still enslaved.

Only a thorough analysis of the features and conditions of each country will enable the working people to find the specific forms of struggle and the ways and means of solving their vital problems.

What is common to all our countries is that they have one main enemy — U.S. imperialism — which lends its backing to internal reactionaries and foments strife. This enemy can be defeated only by the concer-

ted efforts of all our peoples, relying on the solidarity of the world liberation movement.

The question arises: what social force is capable of forging the unity so desired by our peoples?

Perhaps the peasantry? We are deeply convinced that its dispersion, disunity and growing stratification prevent it from leading this movement. This circumstance, however, in no way changes the undeniable fact that the countryside will play a tremendous part in the liberation movement in Latin America. But this will happen only when it rallies around anti-imperialist and peasant slogans. In order to awaken the masses in the countryside we must solve another fundamental antagonistic contradiction — between the big landlords and the bulk of the landless peasants.

Some may think that the national bourgeoisie is capable of building Latin American political unity and solving the agrarian problem. But for the most part this bourgeoisie is weak economically and politically, fears the activity of the working people, constantly dithers and tends toward compromise.

In the past, capitalist enterprises in Latin America were founded by aristocrats, merchants or people who made fortunes by serving foreign oppressors. The national industrial bourgeoisie as a more or less crystallized social stratum took shape later than the proletariat and has feared it all the time. By and large, this bourgeoisie appeared in the more developed South American countries at the turn of this century and gained strength during World War I and in the '30s.

Many industrialists in Mexico (15,000 out of 49,000) belong to the National Chamber of Manufacturing Industry. In Brazil, these sections have their National Industrial Confederation and comprise some 4 per cent of the gainfully employed population. In Chile, they constitute about 10 per cent; the national bourgeoisie here is represented by the Factory Development Society, consisting of 28 associations of industrialists in the chemical, soap-making, timber, footwear, textile and food industries. In Argentina, it comprises 6.6 per cent of the gainfully employed population.

The national bourgeoisie is an essential factor in the liberation movement. The antagonisms between this stratum and foreign imperialism are of a long-term character, while alliances with foreign capital are temporary and transient. Such alliances were actually formed during the post-war boom and the acute stage of the cold war, when the U.S. imperialists tempted the national bourgeoisie in Latin America with the prospect of pots of gold for their participation in the Marshall plan and in the so-called mixed companies. Of late, however, this situation has changed radically. North American imperialism is experiencing acute difficulties abroad, and the U.S. economy is suffering from profound upheavals. Nowadays the U.S. capitalists are hitting hard at their "allies" of yesterday.

In some of the countries the national bourgeoisie placed its hopes in state capitalism. But by means of loans granted by the Export-Import Bank, through concessions for exploring and exploiting the nationalized mineral deposits and through the numerous army of "experts" and "advisers" in the various government bodies and companies, U.S. capital is sapping the positions of this sector and taking control of it. This was the case, for example, with the steel industry of Chile. At first the Yankees did their utmost to prevent the establishment of this branch of industry, and it was only on the insistence of the people that a state-owned plant was built; then the Americans proposed a loan, seized the Compania de Acero del Pacifico, subordinated it to Bethlehem Steel and paralyzed the local steel plants. The U.S. monopolists also launched bitter attacks against the national airlines and especially against the state-owned oil-extracting and refining companies. In recent years they have registered substantial success in this respect in Chile, Bolivia, Argentina, Costa Rica, Guatemala and some other countries. This, naturally, cannot but affect the national bourgeoisie.

Lastly, we should mention one more section — the small business men, artisans, shopkeepers and so on. How numerous these strata are, can be seen from the fact that in Argentina they comprise about one-third of the gainfully employed population, or over two million people. Here, traders and shopkeepers, not manufacturers, predominate. These elements also include some categories of salaried employees. Their incomes are rather low, and it is difficult to distinguish between them and the urban petty bourgeoisie (low-paid office workers, handicraftsmen and so on). These strata, fairly active politically, are extremely heterogeneous. The lower sections become "declassed" and proletarianized. As for the leaders of the political parties expressing their interests, they are extremely

unstable and spineless. Parties of this kind, naturally, cannot lead the popular movement to victory, though they constitute an important factor in the anti-imperialist struggle.

Thus a characteristic feature of the development of the Latin American bourgeoisie today is sharp differentiation and polarization of its forces.

Another important feature is the growth of anti-imperialist and, above all, anti-U.S. sentiment among the national bourgeoisie. The general advance of the anti-imperialist struggle carries it along, too, especially those of its members to whom the present and future of their country are dear.

It will be seen, then, that the position of the Latin American bourgeoisie is somewhat contradictory. On the one hand, its economic interests run counter to those of monopoly capital and, on the other, it is still dependent on this capital to a large degree. The economic and political interests of a part of the bourgeoisie are closely linked with the interests of the big landowners. In contrast to the West European bourgeoisie which fought for its rule together with the people and against the aristocracy, the Latin American bourgeoisie, almost from its inception, united in most cases with the landlords and imperialists against the peasantry, against the working class, and against the masses generally. Hence the restricted nature of the bourgeois-democratic reforms. Despite the fact that in many of our countries the national bourgeoisie at times participates in administering the state, the key positions in the economy and administration are held as before by the spokesmen of big capital and the landowning aristocracy. Lastly, geographical remoteness from the center of the world liberation movement and proximity to the center of world reaction tend to make the national bourgeoisie more cowardly.

That is why, in our opinion, it would be wrong to anticipate that the national bourgeoisie will bring the liberation movement in Latin America to a victorious end and ensure the independent development of these countries.

There is only one class in these countries capable of heading the liberation struggle — the working class.

The working class first rose against the domination of foreign capital early in the 20th century and made the first sacrifices in this struggle. All the major steps in the direction of achieving the economic independence of Latin America were initiated by the proletariat. Suffice it to recall, for example, that the Mexican government nationalized the oil in 1938 as a result of the general strike of the oil workers; and carried out the most far-reaching agrarian reform in Latin America at the demand of the agricultural workers who went on strike in Laguna, Yucatan and New Lombardia. The Bolivian tin mines, too, were nationalized only after a whole series of strikes in which hundreds of mine-workers lost their lives. The Colombian government founded a state-owned oil company after a 50-day strike in 1948.

The industrial proletariat in Latin America has grown into a powerful force. Its numbers have doubled compared with prewar. All in all, over 10 million workers are employed in industry, transport and building in Brazil, Argentina, Chile, Mexico, Uruguay, Venezuela, Peru and Colombia. But it is not only a matter of the numerical growth of the working class. Note should be taken of the growing concentration of the proletariat in factories. There are now dozens of plants each employing five thousand and more workers in Brazil, Chile, Argentina and some other countries.

What is more, the proletariat has the support of the tens of millions of agricultural workers, in contrast to the national bourgeoisie which has no broad base in the countryside. In Brazil alone out of eleven million people employed in agriculture there are nearly five million agricultural workers and landless semi-proletarians.

Thus, *the working class in the Latin American countries has become the decisive force in industry and agriculture. It is becoming a more powerful independent political force. The logical outcome of this is the tremendous growth of the role of the working class in the national-liberation movement.*

The advanced workers of our countries are becoming increasingly aware that the proletariat, more than any other class, is interested in winning national independence and abolishing the feudal survivals and the landlord monopoly of land; they also realize that it alone can rally around the banner of national liberation and regeneration all the patriotic, democratic forces and lead to victory the struggle for national dignity and freedom, for national sovereignty and social progress.

While defending the national interests, the working class persistently upholds its class interests and vital rights against encroachments by foreign imperialism and the subservient comprador bourgeoisie. Recent years

will go down in history as years of an unprecedented upsurge of the labor movement, above all in the strike movement in Central and South America. It is doubtful if our countries have ever seen such bitter strikes as those fought in 1957 and 1958.

New features can now be observed more clearly in the strike movement. Growing trade-union unity, greater solidarity between the various sections of the working class, more frequent support of the workers by revolutionary peasants, students and shopkeepers, and the rallying of government employees, students and pensioners around the working class, the waging of political general strikes — such are the new features of the present strike movement which testify to the growing maturity of the proletariat.

Latin America, clearly, is entering a phase of new sharp and persistent class battles — such is the indisputable conclusion.

The intensified struggle of the working class is awakening and inspiring the masses, showing them the way to solve the national tasks. The main thing, however, is that the working class of our countries is tempering and sharpening the weapon without which it cannot fulfil its mission — the revolutionary proletarian parties. These parties are taking shape and gaining strength in the crucible of bitter class battles. *The feature of the present stage of the liberation movement in Central and South America is that in a number of countries the Communist parties are becoming the leading force of the working-class and general democratic movement.*

The Communist parties were born as anti-imperialist, patriotic organizations, upholding the sovereignty of their countries and democratic liberties. In the fight for democracy and against the dictatorships imposed by U.S. imperialism, the parties gave their best sons, such as Julio Antonio Mella and Jesus Menendez in Cuba; Simon Herrera Farfan in Peru; Farabundo Marti in Salvador; Fredy Valdes in the Dominican Republic; Guadalupe Rodriguez in Mexico; Alberto Candia in Paraguay; Ingalinella in Argentina; Elcias Molina in Colombia; Wainwright in Guatemala, and tens of thousands of other, nameless heroes. Their blood waters the tree of freedom now growing on Latin American soil.

That is why the reactionaries persecute the Communists so ferociously. They see in them the most consistent and organized force of the national-liberation movement. Recent events, however, have convincingly shown *the futility of the attempts of the U.S. imperialists and their stooges to destroy the Latin American Communist parties.*

True, in some countries the pressure of the working-class movement and the other progressive forces has not been strong enough to overthrow the reactionary regimes and secure elementary democratic liberties, particularly the legalization of the Communist Parties. Up to now the fighters for freedom are brutally persecuted in Cuba, Guatemala, the Dominican Republic, Paraguay and in other countries. But in many of them the working class has been able to strike a telling blow at the enemies of democracy.

The legalization of the Chilean Communist Party was a big success for the masses. Speaking of this victory, Elias Lafertte, the Party chairman, justly remarked: "Our enemies, being enemies of the people and of our country, sought to make us live in the catacombs and drove us underground. But it was the people themselves who returned to us the position of a legal party, the recognized vanguard which is guided by the scientific principles of Marxism-Leninism, the principles of the working-class and the national-liberation movement." The Argentine Communists have upheld the legality of their Party. In Brazil, the Communist Party has virtually emerged from the underground. Under popular pressure the anti-Communist laws have been abrogated in Venezuela and Colombia.

In the last 15 years the proletariat of Panama, the Dominican Republic, Nicaragua, Guatemala, Bolivia and Honduras have formed their Communist parties. Every Latin American nation now has its own Communist Party. It goes without saying that the stranglers of democracy are still a long way from being rendered harmless and they still cling to their foul designs. But the fact that in most countries they are no longer able to deny the Communists and other workers' organizations the right to legality is a big gain for the workers and all working people.

When their frontal attack on the Communist parties failed, the internal and external reactionaries sought to take revenge by resorting to "Trojan horse" tactics. And here the splitters and revisionist elements offered their services.

Activization of the revisionists is especially dangerous for our countries, for they paralyze the revolutionary spirit of the workers and the other toilers precisely in the period of the rise of the liberation movement. Just as sectarianism constituted a danger to our Communist parties during the

temporary decline, when they were driven underground, and when they were striving might and main to retain their positions in the legal mass organizations; so revisionism, for its part, is dangerous during the upsurge, for it retards the forward movement, the enlightening of the million-fold masses who for the first time are being drawn into political life and who turn to the Communists in search of a correct policy.

This, of course, does not mean that we regard the struggle against sectarianism and dogmatism as a minor task. The experience of some of our parties clearly shows that dogmatism and sectarianism can be the main danger at certain stages of their development. That is why they are firmly rebuffing both the revisionists (including the expulsion of those who have sided with the enemy) and the sectarians.

The reactionaries have failed also in their attempts to drive a wedge between the Communists and the Socialist groups and parties. The conference of the Latin American Socialist parties, held in Chile in the spring of 1958, took a clearly anti-imperialist stand for the first time in the history of socialism on this continent. The right-wing Socialist groups, which subserviently raise the bogy of anti-communism, are discrediting themselves and are being isolated. And conversely, whenever the Communists and Socialists act jointly, as was the case during the recent elections in Chile and Brazil, the working people gain substantially. We should note the gratifying circumstance of the establishment of contacts between the Communists and the democratic parties with anti-imperialist programs (Accion Democratica in Venezuela, the Trabalhista Party in Brazil, Left parties participating in the Fronte de Accion Popular together with the Communists and Socialists in Chile, and so on).

Striving for unity of action by all working people, the Communists are working to weld the anti-imperialist patriotic forces in each country into a united front. In carrying out this line the Communists have no intention of going to extremes. They are aware that only through class struggle will the proletariat be able to build a broad democratic front, in which those sections of the national bourgeoisie to whom the country's interests are dear will also be active participants. The journal *Nueva Era* justly editorialized: "Unity of all the people does not presuppose the disappearance of the contradictions between the various classes and social strata. The contradictions between the working class and the bourgeoisie, between the rich farmers and poor peasants and farm laborers, will not disappear in a national-democratic front. They will manifest themselves, and it is not for the Communists to conceal them. But the method of their solution must necessarily take into account whether it is a matter of internal contradictions, between allies, or of those between allies and enemies. The latter must be dealt crushing blows and attacked with a view to dividing and breaking up their ranks and abolishing them as a class; the allies should be criticized in order to make them go forward, eliminate their inconsistencies and vacillations and consolidate the unity of the masses."

Of great significance is the fact that solid foundations for a worker-peasant alliance — the backbone of the national and social liberation front — are being laid in the course of the struggle for independence and progress.

Heretofore the peasants looked on the city only as an exploiter, but now that the workers with growing frequency are supporting their struggle for land and decent conditions, they are beginning to understand that the workers are their true allies and friends and that they will be able to uphold their rights only in alliance with the working class.

True, the peasant masses in Latin America are only beginning to move, to awaken to active struggle. The peasant movement is at varying levels in the different countries. But everywhere changes are already evident. Peasant organizations, upholding the interests of the rural working people, are being formed for the first time. The peasants are more resolutely entering the struggle for a solution of the burning national problem — a radical agrarian reform which would meet their demands and provide favorable conditions for the successful economic development of each country. On the plantations and in grain-growing areas actions by the peasants and farm laborers are on the increase. In some parts of Colombia, Cuba, Bolivia and Brazil the peasants are waging an armed struggle for land. Joint actions by workers and peasants are becoming more frequent in Uruguay, Chile, Argentina, Mexico and other countries. These are the heralds of powerful peasant movements in Latin America.

The growing worker-peasant alliance has a future that is all the greater now that other social strata are beginning to join it — the strata exploited and oppressed by the latifundists, comprador bourgeoisie and foreign

capital. The reactionaries have failed to isolate the working class and set against it the middle sections, the natural allies of the proletariat.

Growing inflation and rising taxes, the high cost of living, the exceedingly acute housing crisis, unemployment and other inevitable consequences of the imperialist yoke are helping the middle sections in town and countryside to understand that there is only one way out — active, resolute struggle in defense of the national interests and their vital rights. This conclusion is being drawn also by those intellectuals who refuse to become reconciled to Yankee imperialism's brutally trampling on the culture, traditions and dignity of their nations. Students, too, are becoming increasingly active in the anti-imperialist movement. All this means that *the conditions are ripening for building a broad front of struggle for a progressive and patriotic national policy.*

The historic mission of resolving this task has fallen to the working class which, by virtue of its nature and position in contemporary society, is the most consistent champion of the national interests.

As for the national bourgeoisie and its parties they, as mentioned previously, claim a monopoly in leading this movement; but having made a step forward, they usually retreat, vacillate and often take the path of anti-communism which, for them, is disastrous.

In these conditions everything depends on how firmly the working class and its parties will be able to lead the growing movement. The stronger the fighting capacity and unity of the proletariat, the stronger the Communist parties and the higher their prestige, the broader will be the general democratic, anti-imperialist front of struggle. The worker-peasant alliance will be the sole reliable foundation of this front. The independent and leading role of the proletariat, effected through the guidance of the Communist Party, is the decisive condition for the success of the liberation movement. This factor determines, in the long run, the attitude of the national bourgeoisie also. Despite its class narrowness and its fear of the struggle of the working masses, this bourgeoisie will be drawn into the general democratic, anti-imperialist movement on a greater scale, provided the proletariat heads the movement and fights courageously to solve the vital problems of the anti-feudal, anti-imperialist revolution.

* * *

To sum up: Latin America is on the threshold of epoch-making changes. The great battle for national dignity and freedom is being joined in all parts of the continent. A new period is approaching — one of awakening of the broad sections of the population of our countries.

The champions of national freedom are inspired by the fact that the balance of forces in the world is becoming more favorable for their just cause. Gone are the days of unchallenged imperialist rule. Although the countries of the great socialist world system are many thousand miles away from Latin America, the existence of this system has a beneficial influence on the destiny of the people in the Western Hemisphere. The experience of the dozens of Afro-Asian countries which have won political independence in the postwar years convincingly proves that, with the existence of the powerful socialist world system and the rapid growth of the democratic forces throughout the world, the U.S. propaganda to the effect that the non-socialist countries have no alternative but to join the military-political blocs formed and headed by Washington is utterly groundless.

It will not be easy to break down the barriers standing in the way of freedom and progress of the Latin American countries. This task can be carried out only through joint action by those to whom the national dignity and freedom are dear. *The consolidation of all democratic and progressive forces is the key to the solution of the problems facing the peoples of Central and South America.*

It is to this noble task that the Latin American Communists are devoting their energies, rallying ever broader masses of the people. The words of Manuel Gonzalez Prada, the bard of justice and freedom, who keenly felt his country's lack of men who would rouse the masses to struggle against national and social oppression, have a prophetic ring: "The time has come, the dawn is breaking, the hard days of sorrow and darkness are departing, above the groaning of the down-trodden, disillusioned people the cry of victory can be heard . . . Come on, you grave-diggers: the leper is in his death agony, the grave is ready to receive him."

Combating the Bourgeois Rightists In People's China

Hsu Ping

THE success registered on the political, ideological and cultural fronts in the course of the rectification campaign and the struggle against the Right bourgeois elements initiated in 1957 under the leadership of the Communist Party acted as a stimulus to last year's big leap in output.

After the socialist revolution on the economic front, the rectification campaign and the struggle against the Rights can be regarded as a revolution in the spheres of politics and ideology. In this revolution the people have won decisive victory for the socialist as against the capitalist path. The struggle against the bourgeois Rights who had attacked socialism was a vital part of the revolution. It not only culminated in their defeat, it also gave the masses a good lesson in socialist education, resulting in further consolidating the dictatorship of the proletariat and the leadership of the Communist Party.

The Rights in our country are a tiny handful of bourgeois reactionaries who are fighting against the Communist Party, the people and socialism. They are found among the capitalists and intellectuals and also in the democratic parties. Most of them are counter-revolutionaries, elements drawn from the national bourgeoisie; some of them, former landlords and representatives of bureaucratic capital, have not capitulated completely; among them are also former members of the Kuomintang reactionary clique. In the summer of 1957 the reactionaries took advantage of the rectification campaign to launch vile anti-Communist, anti-popular and anti-socialist activities. They aimed their blows at the socialist system, the dictatorship of the proletariat and the Communist Party leadership. They rejected the socialist path and entertained the fantastic dream of restoring capitalism. In the main their standpoint boiled down to (1) lauding the bourgeois economic and political system and bourgeois culture; (2) opposing basic state policy such as, for instance, foreign policy and the policy of democratic and socialist changes; (3) denying the achievements of the people's democratic revolution, the socialist revolution and of socialist construction, denying the ability of the Party and the proletariat to govern the state and the need for this leadership; (4) opposing the Communist Party's leadership of state affairs and attempting to usurp leadership.

The anti-socialist nature of these activities shows that in the transition period the struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat is being waged around the two paths of development—the capitalist and the socialist. The outcome of this battle is a foregone conclusion because over 90 per cent of the people, including the vast majority of the bourgeoisie and bourgeois intellectuals, are taking the socialist road and accepting Party leadership. The Rights alone—an insignificant minority comprising no more than 10 per cent even among the bourgeoisie — have rejected the socialist road.

It is common knowledge that, prior to the emergence of the People's Republic, China was a semi-colonial, semi-feudal country in which the basic contradictions were those between the people and their three bitter enemies: imperialism, feudalism and bureaucratic capital. The revolutionary movement, headed for many years by the Communist Party, was an anti-imperialist, anti-feudal movement, bourgeois-democratic in character. The Chinese bourgeoisie—that is, the national bourgeoisie (mainly the middle and petty strata) and not the bureaucratic-comprador bourgeoisie (mainly the top strata) who then occupied a dominant position and against whom the revolution was aimed—was in conflict with imperialism, the feudal forces and bureaucratic capital.

The dual nature of the national bourgeoisie came to the fore in the course of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. On the one hand it was willing, under certain conditions, to participate in the struggle against imperialism and the reactionary Kuomintang rule but, on the other, it vacillated in the course of the struggle and favored conciliation. This dual character was observed repeatedly during the new democratic revolution when the national bourgeoisie traversed a zig-zag path. At first it participated in the revolution, then it went

over to the counter-revolution; later, it adopted a neutral wait-and-see policy, which was followed by another switch when it again sided with the revolution. On the eve of the victory of the revolution, and in view of the U.S. imperialists' brutal aggression and the utter degeneration of the Kuomintang ruling clique, it realized that reactionary rule held out no perspective. The working class had powerful armed forces and the revolution, sweeping aside all obstacles, was winning victory after victory. So the national bourgeoisie had to make up its mind quickly about the road it would follow. In overcoming its hesitation a big part was played by the united front policy of the Communist Party which exerted every effort to win over and re-educate the national bourgeoisie. The result was that the great majority of its members, together with many people from landlord and bureaucratic capitalist circles as well as from the Kuomintang reactionary clique followed the working class along the road of the democratic revolution and, together with it, embarked upon the socialist revolution.

Those who joined the working class during the new democratic revolution and now participate in the socialist revolution are widely representative. They include the national bourgeoisie and people from different walks of life. But in taking part in the bourgeois-democratic revolution they nurtured subjective hopes; many of them banked on taking China along the path of capitalist development. It was not surprising, therefore, that as the socialist revolution deepened, it encountered the opposition of a small group of bourgeois Rightists.

With the proclamation of the Chinese People's Republic, the country entered upon a transitional period in which the basic internal contradiction was the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, between the socialist and the capitalist paths. As Comrade Mao Tse-tung pointed out in March 1949 at a plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Party: "After the victory of the Revolution throughout the country, there will still be two kinds of basic contradictions in China. The first will be inside the country, namely, the contradictions between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. The second — outside the country, namely, the contradictions between China and the imperialist countries."

At the stage of the socialist revolution the Communist Party, taking into account the position of the national bourgeoisie in the revolutionary movement, pursued the policy of utilizing, restricting and transforming, with a view to ensuring the abolition of capitalist private property by peaceful means, that is, by compensation and, through the medium of ideological re-education, to induce the bourgeois elements to relinquish exploitation and live by their own labor. This policy conflicted with the class interests of the bourgeoisie, with the result that many of its members either opposed this policy or resisted it. And so at a certain stage, the policy of restricting and transforming on the one hand, and the opposition to it on the other, became a form of the class struggle in our country, a struggle that reflected the basic class contradiction in China—that between the working class and the bourgeoisie. Throughout several years of ceaseless struggle the Party not only repulsed the frequent and fierce onslaughts of the bourgeoisie, it worked out a series of measures designed to reconstruct capitalist industry and trade—namely, to turn the capitalist enterprises into state-capitalist enterprises through joint state-private control as the first step and, as the second, to switch from state capitalism to socialism.

The upsurge early in 1956 of the movement for the three great changes—the reconstruction of capitalist industry and trade, agriculture and cottage industry—showed that the socialist revolution had won a decisive victory on the economic front (in the ownership of the means of production). As we know, the Chinese bourgeoisie in 1956 did not, in the main, resist the socialist changes. The explanation is that, economically, they had no other way. Furthermore, as a result of the conflict between restriction and reconstruction on the one hand, and those opposed to them on the other, many of the national bourgeoisie realized the hopelessness of opposing the proletariat. Moreover, after implementing joint state-private control, the people's government undertook to ensure them a place in economic and political life. Thus, the bourgeoisie, hard pressed by circumstances, to the sound of drum and trumpet gave its assent to the changed system of ownership.

As pointed out in the Declaration of the Moscow meeting of the Communist and Workers' Parties, "the overthrown bourgeoisie always endeavors to make a comeback; the influence exerted on society by the bourgeoisie, the petty bourgeoisie and their intelligentsia is still great. That is why a fairly long time is needed to resolve the issue of who will win—capitalism or socialism."

The experience of our country confirms once again that the socialist revolution is the most consistent, far-reaching and extensive revolution on the economic, political and ideological fronts. The basic change in the system of ownership has not completely resolved all the problems of the socialist revolution on the economic front. So far the system of ownership has not been changed completely; the material base of socialism—modern socialist industry and agriculture—is not as yet sufficiently developed; nor have the problems of the socialist revolution on the political and ideological fronts been completely solved. Hence the class struggle is not yet over. The question, "who will win"—socialism or capitalism—has not been solved completely. The struggle will be hard and prolonged, and, at times, even acute. The situation is such that the bourgeoisie and the bourgeois intellectuals are forced to recognize the reorganization of the ownership system; but they are reluctant to relinquish their political and ideological positions. And until their political and ideological re-education along socialist lines is completed, conflict between them and the working class is inevitable.

The bourgeoisie and the bourgeois intellectuals are the main force capable, during the transition, of measuring swords with the proletariat. They have scientific knowledge and experience in running industry, they participate in the work of government bodies and occupy political positions. In a word, they have political capital and exert political influence; and the working class needs their knowledge.

Thanks to the ideological re-education movement which has now been under way for several years, big changes have taken place among the former bourgeois elements and intellectuals; they have now split into Left, intermediate and Right groups. A small Left section has taken shape as a political Left wing and joined forces with the working class. The main force of the national bourgeoisie occupies an intermediate position; they are distinguished by their dual policy and their relations with the working class are determined by the class struggle between the two ways—the socialist and capitalist. Although they have not become completely reconciled to the changes in the ownership system and the need to submit to proletarian leadership, these intermediate elements can, nevertheless, take the socialist path and recognize the leadership of the proletariat; hence the contradictions between them and the proletariat, as a rule, take the form of contradictions among the people. It is only the bourgeois Rightists who are reactionaries and counter-revolutionaries. Politically speaking they are agents of imperialism, of the landlord class and bureaucratic capital. As the socialist revolution forged ahead, the Rights played the hypocrite, shouting "Long live the Communist Party!" and acclaiming the achievements of socialism. But deep in their hearts they cherished the hope of attacking socialism at the first opportunity, with the aim of restoring capitalism.

The Rights launched their base onslaught against the people and the Communist Party in the summer of 1957, having wrongly assessed the home and international situation. The campaign against the Communists, against the people and against national independence, a campaign which the imperialists and reactionaries in all countries have been prosecuting ever since the 1956 events in Hungary, created what the Rights took to be a favorable international situation. They also regarded as favorable the political situation at home arising from the rectification movement against subjectivism, sectarianism and bureaucracy; this movement, initiated by the Central Committee of the Communist Party, called upon the people, including bourgeois elements and intellectuals, to express their views on the shortcomings and mistakes of the Communist Party. Initially, the Rights intended to seize the leadership in the cultural, educational and scientific spheres, in the press and in publishing, calculating that subsequently they could spread their influence throughout the country. But their efforts to draw the factories and the people of the countryside into their subversive activities failed utterly, thanks to the decisive opposition of the workers and peasants. The Rights did meet with a measure of sympathy in offices, educational establishments and organizations employing large numbers of intellectuals. But the moment they began their drive, their real physiognomy revealed itself with the result that they found themselves blocked and rebuffed by the masses.

The question arises—if the contradiction between the Rights and the people is the same as the contradiction between ourselves and our enemies, if the Rights are reactionaries and enemies of socialism—why are they not subjected to repressions? Clearly in our state where we have the democratic dictatorship of the people, dictatorship methods, that is, methods of suppression, could be used against all enemies of socialism, and we could deal our enemies powerful blows. But in

handling the contradiction between the people and the bourgeois Rights as one of the contradictions between our enemies and ourselves, we, as heretofore, employ the method of persuasion (full and broad expression of views, discussion, citing facts and elucidating truth) in relation to all Rights with the exception of those who, despite repeated warnings, do not reform, persevere in their disruptive activities and break the law. The method of persuasion is based on confidence in the overwhelming majority of the people and gives free rein to initiative. Its application facilitates greater activity by the people and helps to expose and isolate the Right elements and furthers differentiation among them. It enhances socialist consciousness among the people and helps them to distinguish clearly between the socialist and capitalist paths.

This method facilitates the education of the intermediate bourgeois elements and intellectuals, helps to win them over and remold them in the spirit of socialism. Hence it is used also among the Rights with a view to enhancing the division in their ranks and re-educating the overwhelming majority. Naturally, we are still on the alert, for we realize that, in view of the class struggle, the existence and emergence of Rightists is inevitable for some time yet, and that their influence cannot be rooted out straightaway. There is no doubt that some of them will never change. Given certain circumstances, new Right elements may appear and, in collaboration with those we have at present, launch a new offensive. We shall then again have to deal a retaliatory blow, to isolate them and divide them. Our aim is gradually to reduce the numbers and influence of the Rights by waging an unceasing struggle to split their ranks, to win over and remold the majority of the bourgeoisie and bourgeois intellectuals by way of persuasion and education.

How is it that Right elements are to be found in the ranks of the Communist Party? There is nothing strange in this. Our Party is the powerful leading force in the socialist revolution and socialist construction, and it goes without saying that the Chinese Communists must be revolutionary. The ranks of the Party are, of course, pure. But our Party is not isolated, nor is it walled off from society. Every time important social changes occur, whenever there is a sharpening of the class struggle and new political and ideological changes are carried through, there are inevitable repercussions within the Party. Clearly, when they joined our Party many people thought in terms of the tasks of the national-democratic revolution. Upon joining, some ostensibly recognized the rules and program; in reality they merely adopted its minimum program, that is, the tasks of overthrowing imperialism, winning national independence and carrying through the bourgeois-democratic revolution. They did not adopt the Party program of building socialism and communism.

The socialist revolution in China, moreover, was accomplished without violence and although this has had its advantages for the working class and the entire people, it has aggravated the political and ideological struggle. Most of the Rights who have been exposed and expelled from the Party came from the exploiting strata: some were alien class elements who had wormed their way into the Party. These included profiteers and adventurists who joined the Party for mercenary motives. Some, under the impact of rotten bourgeois ideology, became corrupt and lost their revolutionary will; then there are those who seek personal power or who are opposed to the fundamental policy of the socialist revolution and, hence, are dissatisfied with the Party. Taking the path of bourgeois individualism, they slipped gradually, landed in the morass with the bourgeois Rights and, in the long run, betrayed the Party's cause. In the course of the struggle the mask was ripped off these traitors and they were driven out of the Party. This strengthened the Party, and was a big victory for it.

In the socialist revolution on the political and ideological fronts, our Party has once again combined the universal truth of Marxism-Leninism with the concrete practice of the revolution in China and, proceeding from the general laws of the socialist revolution, has creatively elaborated its political and tactical lines. In combating the Rights and the revisionists, it simultaneously fought the dogmatists. The dogmatists, resorting to primitive and crude methods of compulsion, sought to suppress the Rights and revisionists who fanned the evil wind. But there could be no radical solution of the problem by these methods. The dogmatists feared a widespread airing of views, for they lacked faith in the strength of the working class and the masses, they did not believe in Marxism-Leninism. In reality their outward "Leftism" reflects their "Right" essence.

Our Party, basing itself on Comrade Mao Tse-tung's instructions, foresaw this inevitable struggle and prepared accordingly. It resolutely pursued the policy of granting the

Rights the opportunity to voice their views, declaring that it did not fear the poisonous weeds, that it would uproot them and use them as fertilizer. Objectively the poisonous weeds exist, but it would have been injudicious to have stopped their sprouting or to have stamped out the shoots as they appeared; this would have been a method born of lack of knowledge of the tactics of class struggle. The root of the evil would have remained intact and much more effort would subsequently have been required to discern and uproot the weeds. Our Party firmly believes in the masses' ability to recognize and uproot them. We permitted these weeds to appear initially so that later they could be more conveniently uprooted and used as fertilizer, and in order to train and steel our worker-peasant teams in dealing with them.

As a result of the struggle the anti-Communist, anti-popular and anti-socialist Rights were completely isolated and a cleavage occurred among them. After the victory over them another telling blow was delivered at the counter-revolutionaries and malefactors who still remained and who were subverting the socialist cause. The socialist system gained considerably in strength. In the struggle against the Rights and in the campaign against extravagance and conservatism which followed, and in the process of the big advance in industry and all sectors of socialist construction, the bourgeoisie and the bourgeois intellectuals who had taken a middle-of-the-road attitude and had not complete confidence in socialism, changed or are changing their former political outlook. The majority of them already realize that "circumstances compel" them to continue their forward march, that they cannot simply continue to mark time in the middle of the road. They are beginning to become conscious of their dual attitude towards the socialist revolution, to appreciate the need to rectify their erroneous views and have even voiced their determination to remold themselves, "to give their hearts" to the Party, to turn "Left." Many intellectuals have taken an active part in the rectification movement and announced their readiness to become both "Red and expert," genuinely Red and highly qualified; some have gone among the people and, engaging in manual labor, have established real contact with the working masses.

The struggle against the Rights has resulted in big changes in the political sentiments of the working people. The faulty style of work, mirroring the survivals of bourgeois ideology, is vanishing, while the communist spirit is becoming stronger. The productive forces of society are now developing at an unprecedented rate, for the great achievements of the socialist revolution have created objective opportunities for a big leap in production. The revolution is clearing the way for the steady growth of the productive forces. All the conservative systems and antiquated views which do not conform to the requirements of the expanding productive forces are on the way out, and new systems and new ideals in tune with these requirements are demonstrating their viability.

Having overthrown the exploiters and gotten rid of the fetters of bourgeois ideology and obsolete ideas, the Chinese people, under the leadership of their Communist Party and Comrade Mao Tse-tung, have raised aloft the Red banner of the general line of socialist construction and have released powerful revolutionary energy. Industry, agriculture and construction are making rapid progress. The technological and cultural revolution, developing apace, is really nationwide in scope. Great indeed are our achievements. The great socialist People's China, now that it has a base for a modern industry and agriculture, for modern science and culture, will be built at an accelerated rate.

Among Our Contributors

PIETRO INGRAO is a member of the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the Italian Communist Party;

HSU PING is deputy head of the department of united front work in the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China;

TADEUSZ DANISZEWSKI is director of the Institute of History of the Polish United Workers' Party and a member of the C.C. of the PUWP;

J. R. CAMPBELL is the editor-in-chief of the British "Daily Worker".

We Have Carried Out Karl Liebknecht's Behests

Wilhelm Pieck

"STEADY! We have not fled, nor have we been routed. And should they put us in irons, we will still be here and we will remain! And victory will be ours! Whether or not we will be alive when the goal is reached, our program will live on and will rule the world of emancipated humanity. In spite of everything!"

When these words appeared in the *Rote Fahne* on January 15, 1919, their author, Karl Liebknecht, was dead. Brutalized counter-revolutionary officers had murdered him and Rosa Luxemburg in the Eden Hotel. The instigators of this foul crime sat in the big banks and government offices. Placards with the call: "Kill Liebknecht" had appeared long before the murder. The reactionaries hoped that by resorting to terror they would deal a mortal blow to the revolutionary movement and the newly-founded Communist Party. But Karl Liebknecht was right: neither the murder of workers' leaders, the persecutions in the Weimar Republic, nor the terror of the Hitler dictatorship—to which Ernst Thaelmann fell victim—could prevent the triumph of our program in a large part of Germany.

Only a short while ago the working class celebrated the 40th anniversary of the November Revolution in Germany. Then, on December 30, we observed the 40th anniversary of the Communist Party of Germany and on January 15 we commemorate the anniversary of the death of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg.

When the revisionists became active at the turn of the century, a Left revolutionary trend arose in the German Social-Democratic Party. Rosa Luxemburg and Clara Zetkin urged the expulsion of the reformists and revisionists, but when the Centrists, including August Bebel, refused to support them, Luxemburg and Zetkin did not pursue the matter further. However, despite errors, weaknesses and failure to understand certain questions of strategy and tactics in the new conditions, the German Left selflessly defended the revolutionary principles of the labor movement and proletarian internationalism.

Karl Liebknecht was a fearless leader of the German workers. A man of outstanding ability, he put his whole heart into the cause of the emanciptaion of the working class, into the struggle for socialism. He mercilessly exposed Prussian reaction and militarism, which poisoned the life of the German people.

Karl Liebknecht was the teacher, friend and inspired leader of the German youth. His objective was to educate the young people in a spirit of opposition to the system of militarism, which degraded human dignity and killed the ability to think independently. As founder and leader of the Youth International, as organizer of socialist papers for the youth, he constantly strove to rally them against militarism. In campaigning against imperialist war he appealed above all to the working-class youth, who responded by selflessly serving the revolutionary cause.

Liebknecht, who entered the lists against German imperialism long before 1914, became particularly active when the war clouds began to gather. In speeches in the Reichstag he exposed the foul machinations of the industrialists who made millions on war contracts. He laid bare the conspiracy of world capital against peace.

"Our country is in danger," he declared on April 26, 1913, "but the danger emanates from enemies at home, rather than from enemies abroad, above all, from the international war industry."

It was a tragedy for the German labor movement and the entire people that the Left wing—led by Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg — though it fought bravely for their interests, was unable to win over the majority of the Social-Democratic Party. Its leadership was increasingly influenced by the opportunists, who initially displayed a conciliatory attitude towards the war preparations and later, on August 4, 1914, voted for the first war credits and openly deserted to the war camp.

This treachery reaffirmed the incontrovertible Marxist truth that *the working class can not achieve its aim without a revolutionary*

party. The slogans of the Left, calling for the preservation of peace, undoubtedly coincided with the demands of the people, but the Social-Democratic leadership and the numerous Party officials were opportunist. They controlled the Party press and other means of molding public opinion, and used them without scruple to achieve their demagogic purposes. That is why the Left could not prevent the betrayal.

Although the German Social-Democratic Party had long suffered from the lack of an ideological unity based on Marxism, the formal unity of revolutionaries and opportunists within a single party concealed the internal split. Hence, the view held by the Left—that their stay in a party disrupted by opportunist activity was vital for the unity of the labor movement—proved to be a tragic misconception.

The Kaiser's government regarded the endorsement of the war credits by the Social-Democratic group as the formation of a "front of national unity." Karl Liebknecht's defiant "NO" to the second War Credits Bill, voted on December 2, 1914, nullified the false national unity built on an imperialist basis. Liebknecht alone spoke on behalf of millions. His speech was the only ray of hope for the working people in the nightmare of the world slaughter. The chauvinists hurled invective against Liebknecht and threatened him.

His speech was no less significant internationally. Whereas the clamor raised after August 4 about "national unity" helped the imperialists of all countries to suppress the anti-war sentiment and the peace movement, Liebknecht's militant call stimulated the growth of the anti-war forces. "Each step of ours in the fight against the imperialist war," he said, "evokes a response abroad, thereby intensifying the struggle for peace." Karl Liebknecht inspired the fighters for peace everywhere.

The Left forces rallied more closely around Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg. Beginning with the spring of 1915 they held more and more anti-war demonstrations. Having formed the "International" group in January, 1916 (later re-named the "Spartacus Group" and "Spartacus League"), the Left heroically fought for freedom and peace, using legal and illegal means. Their appeals and leaflets—the so-called Spartacus letters and others—were circulated throughout the empire and at the front, acquiring international significance. But their struggle was hampered by persecution, arrests, imprisonment and conscription.

A big rally was held on May 1, 1916, on the Potsdamer Platz. At this gathering Liebknecht proclaimed the slogan which echoed in every corner of the world: "Down with the war! Down with the government!" Brought before a military tribunal he spoke proudly of his activities and denounced the rulers of imperialist Germany as war criminals. Replying to the accusation of treason, he said: "I have no need to defend myself. But since treason is mentioned, I can say that it has long been the privilege of the ruling classes, the princes and aristocrats. It is a 'glorious' tradition with them. Those really guilty of treason are not yet in the dock, for they are in control of heavy industry, the munitions plants, the big banks and the Junker estates. . . ."

The monopoly bourgeoisie, the military caste and the state machine were not alone in attacking the Left. To the shame of the German working class the leaders of the Social-Democratic Party and the trade unions joined in. They still held key posts in the legal organizations of the workers. These traitors enabled the Kaiser and his government to continue the criminal war in spite of the growing strike movement and anti-war demonstrations.

The anti-war movement was greatly stimulated by the February Revolution in Russia. The idea that peace could be won only by destroying the imperialist state machine found increasing support among the German people.

The imperialist government was overthrown under the direct impact of the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia. German and Russian soldiers fraternized. At home demonstrations were held demanding an end to the war and the liberation of Liebknecht.

Karl Liebknecht enthusiastically welcomed the Russian revolution. Despite the scanty information he realized its epoch-making significance. On the fourth day of the Revolution he wrote that revolutionary socialist changes and economic progress in Russia would open up boundless prospects. "I would like to help," wrote Karl Liebknecht from his cell, "if it meant sacrificing my life a thousand times; I would like to be with the others to work for the Russian revolution and peace."

Karl Liebknecht was released on October 23, 1918, as a result of the military and political collapse of the Hohenzollern regime and the struggle of the masses for peace. His first greetings were addressed to the young Soviet Republic. A few days later, in an appeal to the workers and soldiers of the

Entente countries, he urged them to support the Russian Soviet Republic and to turn their weapons against world imperialism. He wrote: "In the conditions of the upheaval caused by the world war and the chaos created by the collapse of the autocratic imperialist regime, the Russian proletariat despite misunderstanding, hatred and slander has established its rule — the Socialist Republic of the workers, soldiers and peasants! This is a colossal undertaking aimed at building a new socialist world, the beginning of the struggle for the cause which has now become the historic goal of the world proletariat. . . .

"The working class of the world will not permit the cradle of the socialist revolution to be destroyed, unless it wishes to see its own forces sapped and its hopes wrecked. The downfall of the Russian Soviet Republic would signify a defeat for the world proletariat. Friends, comrades, brothers! Turn your arms against your rulers! Long live the Russia of the workers, peasants and soldiers!"

In Germany, too, conditions made it possible to put an end to the imperialist war. On October 7, 1918, while Liebknecht was still in prison, an All-German Conference of the "Spartacus Group" was held. It was attended, among others, by Left radicals from Bremen. The Conference adopted a program of action in anticipation of a revolution, particularly, a decision concerning the workers' and soldiers' Soviets. But the Spartacus movement was not as yet aware of the necessity for an independent mass party based on sound organizational principles. Notwithstanding the courageous and consistent struggle waged by the Spartacists against the war, they were still a relatively small group of revolutionary Marxists.

Along with the Spartacus people there were the authorized representatives ('revolutionary delegates") who were engaged in preparing the revolution in the localities. These delegates had been elected in the factories by the workers, chiefly in the metal-working industries. After his release from prison Liebknecht returned to Berlin where he tried to convince the revolutionary delegates of the need to rally the workers for mass action. But the latter, influenced by the leaders of the Independent Social-Democratic Party*, hesitated to call a general strike. However, it was already impossible to restrain the revolutionary zeal of the masses. Hence, the call of the Spartacists for direct action was taken up by the workers of Berlin who, on November 9, together with the soldiers, took to the streets. Thus the revolution was launched.

The avalanche overwhelmed the age-old monarchy and put an end to the war. Democratic rights and freedoms, for which the working class had fought for decades, were gained. Freedom of assembly, association and of the press were proclaimed. Workers' and Soldiers' Soviets after the Russian model were set up in the Lands (districts) and in nearly all the towns. Their aim was to do away with capitalism. Yet they were incapable of fulfilling the role of revolutionary organs of power because of the Social-Democratic leadership. Many of the workers who for years had been trained by the Social Democrats to believe in the omnipotence of parliament, maintained that a republic with bourgeois-democratic freedoms and in particular with universal suffrage was equivalent to the conquest of political power and hence to securing the conditions for the victory of socialism. This concept found wide currency at the All-German Congress of Soviets on December 16, 1918, which refused to concentrate all power in the hands of the Soviets, and thereby facilitated the work of the counter-revolution. Confident of victory, the worker-members of the Soviets failed to see that Ebert and Scheidemann had wormed their way to power and created a government of "people's representatives" in order to strangle the revolution.

The Spartacus leaders realized that a popular victory had not yet been secured. That is why they demanded that the state apparatus be purged of all counter-revolutionaries, that the property of the big capitalists be alienated, that the big landlords, princes and generals responsible for the war be expropriated and brought to trial, that the reactionary forces be disarmed and the revolutionary workers armed; they called for a single, undivided socialist German Republic; for an alliance between the German and Russian revolutionary movements. In order to carry out these tasks the Spartacus Group rallied the masses and sought to win them over. It was then the only political force capable of giving the German working-class—on the basis of

*The Independent Social-Democratic Party of Germany was formed early in 1917 as a result of the split in the Social-Democratic Party, whose outspoken chauvinist policy more and more evoked the indignation of the workers. The revolutionary-minded rank-and-file Social Democrats joined the Independent Party. But leadership of the new party was in the hands of the Kautskyite centrists who opposed the war as petty-bourgeois pacifists and spread illusions about a "democratic peace" without the revolutionary overthrow of the bourgeois government. In the belief that it could facilitate the revolutionary re-education of the masses, the Spartacus Group joined the Independent SDPG.

a Marxist analysis of the situation—correct guidance, of showing the way out of the national catastrophe and of taking Germany along the road of democracy, peace and socialism. But it was impossible to regain what had been lost. Lenin's conclusion of that period, that "the great tragedy of and the danger to Europe is that it *lacks* a revolutionary party," applied in full measure to Germany.

Spartacist influence over the working class was insufficient to prevent the betrayal of the revolution by the Social-Democratic leaders, because the group was still in the ranks of the Independent Social-Democratic Party, and was subjected to persecution and vilification. It did not have a sufficient number of functionaries capable of explaining to the masses the counter-revolutionary essence of the policy of the Social Democratic leaders and their "Independent" supporters, people who could convince the working class of the necessity to develop the revolution further. Party functionaries are molded and steeled only in the ranks of a solidly united and independent Marxist-Leninist party.

In 1918 the objective conditions in Germany were ripe for the bourgeois-democratic revolution evolving into a socialist revolution. But the absence of a proletarian party which could guide the working class in abolishing the bourgeois system as a whole, and not only the monarchy, made it possible for the opportunists to maintain their grip on the masses, and this factor determined the range and character of the German revolution. The November Revolution did not go beyond the framework of the bourgeois-democratic revolution which was, to a certain degree, carried out by proletarian methods and means. The revolution failed to achieve the aims cherished by the masses—abolition of imperialist rule and the building of socialism.

A proletarian revolution can triumph only if the masses are guided by a Marxist-Leninist party—this is one of the basic lessons of the November Revolution. The Communist Party of Germany was formed on December 30, 1918. By forming their Party, the German revolutionaries complied with a basic requirement of Marxist-Leninist theory and revolutionary practice. In the subsequent years of hard struggle against Right opportunist and Left sectarian tendencies, the Party matured ideologically and extended its influence over the masses. The founding of the Party cleared the way for working-class unity on Marxist-Leninist principles. Under the guidance of Ernst Thaelmann, whose memory will ever be cherished, the first Leninist Central Committee was set up. Today it is most important to remember that the Communist Party educated hundreds of thousands of fighters who enjoyed the sympathies of millions of German workers and small peasants. Our Party organized active resistance to Hitlerism. It is on record that hundreds of German Communists fought heroically against German and world fascism in the ranks of the international brigades in Spain.

The unity of the working-class movement on Marxist-Leninist principles—achieved in a large part of Germany through the fusion of the Communist and Social-Democratic parties in the Socialist Unity Party in April 1946—was a big victory for the working class and a guarantee of its invincibility. This unity was not accidental. It was the logical outcome of many years of selfless struggle on the part of the Communists for the purity of Marxist-Leninist theory, their devotion to the cause of the working class and their unbending will and dauntless courage in defending the interests of the people. The fact that the Socialist Unity Party has been created, with a policy based on the teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin, means that the main lesson of the November Revolution has been learned.

It should be emphasized that *only a Marxist-Leninist party is capable of waging a consistent struggle against opportunism and revisionism. The experience of six decades in the leadership of the German labor movement has shown me that any attempt to divert the Communist and Workers' parties from the principles of Marxism-Leninism only confuses the working class and benefits the imperialists.* The undermining role of revisionism was never so pronounced as in 1918 when the clique of traitors—the so-called "government Socialists"—having deceived the masses with their "march of socialism" slogan—succeeded in diverting them from the revolutionary path. *The need to preserve the ideological purity of the Marxist-Leninist party is another important lesson to be deduced from the November Revolution.* Revisionism is not an accidental phenomenon. It was and remains an instrument of the imperialists in their struggle against the working-class movement.

After 1917 revisionism was, generally speaking, distinguished by its more or less concealed anti-Soviet tendencies. The German revisionists of those days joined the imperialists in the fight against the October Revolution and to this day have remained faithful to this vile alliance.

One of the favorite methods of latter-day revisionists in masking their positions is speculation on specific, national conditions. Individual countries, it is true, have specific differences which call for the adapting of revolutionary tactics to the concrete conditions. But these specific conditions must never be made the pretext for abandoning the general principles of the socialist revolution, the transition period and socialist construction. The success of socialist construction in the Soviet Union, the purity of Marxist-Leninist theory, the unity and friendship of the socialist countries, are important gains of the international working class, which we will uphold to the last.

There are other lessons to be drawn from the November Revolution. The arming of the people was a decisive issue, for instance. The organized working class was sufficiently strong to disarm the enemies of the people. But because the arms were concentrated in the hands of the reactionary generals, and because, on the orders of the Social-Democratic Government of "people's representatives," the revolutionary-minded soldiers were forcibly disarmed, the fate of the November Revolution was sealed. Power was not taken over by the people as Karl Liebknecht and the Spartacus Group had demanded. The reactionary state machine was not demolished. The monopolists and the Junkers retained their property and their economic power. Militarism and imperialism, mortal enemies of the people, were not smashed.

Another serious weakness of the November Revolution arose from its failure to draw upon that mighty source of revolutionary energy — proletarian internationalism. The "government Socialists" disrupted co-operation between the German workers and the workers of other lands in the struggle against international imperialism. They refused to establish friendly relations with Soviet Russia —the world's first socialist state. Far from displaying solidarity with Soviet Russia and rendering aid to her at the crucial stage of the Russian revolution, they supported world imperialism in its armed intervention against the Soviet Republic. Thus from its inception the Social-Democratic government was marked with the brand of Cain, as a traitor to international working-class solidarity.

The working class of Germany has paid dearly for the betrayal by the Right Social-Democratic leadership of the November Revolution and the continuation of that harmful policy under the Weimar Republic. The Social-Democratic leaders persistently ignored the proposals of the Communists for a united working-class front against fascism. They refused to endorse a joint appeal for a general strike in July 1932, when von Papen dispersed the Social-Democratic government of Prussia. They were deaf to the warning of Clara Zetkin, veteran of the labor movement, who in opening the session of the Reichstag on August 30 spoke of the need for united action by all workers in the hour of danger, for the threat of a fascist coup was imminent. In the previous general election the Nazis, by means of demagogy, polled 13,730,000 votes. The Social Democrats brushed aside the hand of friendship extended by the Communists on the day of the funeral of three workers murdered by the Nazis in January 1933. And on January 30 when Hitler came to power, the appeal of the Central Committee of the Communist Party to the leaders of the Social-Democratic Party and the trade unions to declare a strike was characterized by them as a "provocation." Thus, by perpetuating the split in the working class the Social-Democratic leaders objectively helped the Nazis to win.

At a heavy cost the Soviet Union defeated fascism, which had threatened world civilization with destruction. And the German people were freed from Nazi tyranny by the sons of Red October.

In the German Democratic Republic the working class benefited from the defeat of Nazism by taking power into its hands. In West Germany imperialism has again been restored. The fact that this has occurred under the Western occupation powers in no way justifies the leaders of West-German Social Democracy, who once again have betrayed the cause of the working class. It is they who are responsible for the split in the West-German working class. This split has prevented the expropriation and removal from power of the monopolists and Junkers, and has made possible the re-establishment of the shattered imperialist state machine and the banning of the Communist Party, the true champion of the workers' interests. Forty years after the November Revolution, German imperialism and militarism, still dominant in West Germany, have reappeared for the third time as the main danger to peace in Europe.

But the death of Karl Liebknecht and many Spartacists has not been in vain. The behests of our dear comrades who gave their lives to the cause of the working class have been carried out in a large part of Germany—in the German Democratic Republic. The program drawn up by Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg during the November Revolution

has been translated into practice. The Socialist Unity Party—the working-class party of the German Democratic Republic—is firmly founded on Marxist-Leninist principles and is resolutely fighting all revisionist deviations. The party ensures the leading role of the working class in its alliance with the working peasantry, in its close co-operation with all the democratic forces of the country rallied in the National Front of Democratic Germany—the political foundation of the Republic.

Imperialism and fascism have been uprooted in the German Democratic Republic. The monopolists and war criminals have been expropriated and their factories have been transferred to the people. The militarist Junkers have been removed from their estates and the land handed over to the landless peasants and peasants with small plots. The capitalist state machine has been broken up. The army, police, organs of justice, administration, public education and the other state institutions have been reconstructed within the framework of an anti-fascist democratic system. The steady advance of the revolution has resulted in the creation of a worker-peasant government and the establishment of proletarian dictatorship. In conditions of an unprecedented economic upsurge, industrial output has more than doubled compared with 1950. The standard of living has gone up proportionately. Socialist enterprises are responsible for nearly 90 per cent of the industrial output. In agriculture 33 per cent of the arable land is cultivated by producer co-operatives. The co-operative movement among the artisans is growing, and the share of the state in the remaining privately-owned enterprises is increasing. The social revolution and our successes in construction are the guarantee that imperialism and militarism will never return.

Good progress has been made in the field of international relations. The supreme principle of our foreign policy is proletarian internationalism. Friendship and close co-operation with the Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic and the other socialist countries have always been the cornerstone of our foreign policy. The German Democratic Republic is an inalienable component of the socialist camp headed by the Soviet Union. In all circumstances it will honor the commitments it has taken upon itself in relation to the other friendly nations. We maintain contact with all interested countries on the principle of mutual respect and non-interference in internal affairs.

In 1918 Karl Liebknecht pointed out that the working class is the reliable champion of the national interests. The lessons of history in the two parts of Germany since 1945 prove that our national problems can be solved only if the people are led by the working class. With two German states in existence, the country can be reunited only on the lines proposed by the German Democratic Republic, that is, through negotiations between the two governments and the formation of a confederation. The West German rulers are opposed to this, for they are bent on atomic armament and war.

Maintenance of peace is the keynote of the German problem. Therefore the reunification of Germany depends chiefly on when the peace forces in West Germany, in friendly co-operation with the German Democratic Republic, will succeed in getting the Federal Republic to pursue a policy in harmony with the national interests of our people.

The task can now be accomplished with greater success because the present situation at home and the prospects for our national development have changed considerably compared with 1918. Today the German working class in addition to its revolutionary parties —the Socialist Unity Party and the Communist Party—has a powerful base in the form of the German Democratic Republic which will facilitate solution of the problems confronting the nation. Today we are in a position to offer real and generous aid to the West-German workers and the workers of West Berlin. We can make wide use of our achievements to the benefit of the German working class as a whole. The successes of the German Democratic Republic in socialist construction and fulfilment of the historic tasks set by the Fifth Congress of the Socialist Unity Party will have a tremendous impact on the entire situation in Germany and will accelerate the final change in the relation of forces to the advantage of the workers and peasants.

Thus, in the German Democratic Republic the behests of Karl Liebknecht, national hero and fighter against militarism and war, have been carried out. *The German Democratic Republic is a bastion of peace and friendship of the nations, blocking the way of German militarism to the East. It has taken over the best traditions of the German working class and the nation.* Whereas the history of the German bourgeoisie is a history of humiliation, the history of the German working class is a history of the heroic lives and struggles of people like Karl Liebknecht, Rosa Luxem-

burg and Ernst Thaelmann, of such heroic fighters as the Red sailors from the People's Naval Division,* and the thousands of workers who gave their lives in the struggle for the emancipation of mankind from exploitation and oppression.

The German working class will be worthy of its great sons. Under the leadership of its revolutionary party, the Socialist Unity Party, the working people of our Republic are rapidly and confidently marching towards socialism. They will render every support to the Communist Party of Germany, now waging a hard underground struggle, and will aid the people of West Germany in order to pave the way to the national resurgence of all Germany as a freedom-loving and democratic state.

The immortal words of Karl Liebknecht will thus be translated into practice throughout our whole country. The program of the revolutionary working-class movement will, despite the obstacles, triumph in West Germany also!

*The People's Naval Division, formed in Berlin after November 9, 1918, as an armed force of the Ebert-Scheidemann government, later went over to the side of the revolutionary workers. The Division twice took part—late in December 1918 and in January 1919—in the street engagements in Berlin, and fought heroically for the Revolution.

Under the Banner of Proletarian Internationalism

Tadeusz Daniszewski

DECEMBER 1958 marked the fortieth anniversary of the Communist Party of Poland, the revolutionary vanguard of the working masses in the interwar period, one of the leading sections of the Communist International. Together with the United Workers' Party, which carries forward the noble traditions of the CPP, the anniversary was also observed by the other fraternal Communist and Workers' parties.

The Communist Party was born at the beginning of the new era ushered in by the October Revolution. From the very outset its ideology was imbued with the spirit of this revolution, of relentless war against the world of oppression and exploitation.

It came into being when Polish independence had been regained as a result of the Russian Revolution, and the revolutions which took place under its impact in Germany and Austria. The Party began its activities at the time when the revolutionary and counter-revolutionary forces of Poland were engaged in the bitter struggle which decided the question of the class character of the state.

In contrast to the other Communist parties, which arose in most cases from the split in the Social-Democratic parties, the CPP was formed by the *merger* of the Social Democracy of Poland and Lithuania (SDPL) and the Left wing of the Polish Socialist Party (PSP).

The SDPL, founded and led by such prominent leaders of the labor movement as Rosa Luxemburg, Julian Marchlewski, Leon Jogiches-Tyszka and Adolf Warski, resolutely opposed the nationalist program formulated in the PSP in the early 'nineties. The position of the Right-wing leaders derived from their hostile attitude to the revolutionary movement in Russia. In contrast, the SDPL always regarded the Russian working class as its best ally in the struggle against tsarism. Julian Marchlewski said: "Only he who fights for the international proletariat can fight for the Polish people."

During the revolution of 1905-07, the flames of which enveloped the tsarist empire and turned Poland into an outpost of the revolutionary struggle, the SDPL supported the Bolsheviks against the Mensheviks on a number of basic points of strategy and tactics. This was particularly evident at the May 1907 Congress of the Russian Social-Democratic Labor Party which included the SDPL. During Lenin's stay in Galicia, Polish Party workers attended the meetings of the Central Committee of the RSDLP held there. The conference held in October 1913 was attended by delegates from the SDPL.

Lenin always displayed keen interest in the Polish working-class movement and more than once criticized a number of erroneous views of the SDPL and its spiritual leader—Rosa Luxemburg. His criticism dealt particularly with the national problem. Although it was a revolutionary party, the SDPL was not without incorrect views on some issues. But among all the groupings of the prewar Left wing of the Second International this Party,

together with the Bulgarian "Tesnyaks" and the Latvian Social Democrats, was nearest to the Bolsheviks.

The Left wing of the Polish Socialist Party, led by H. Walecki, W. Kostrzewa and other prominent figures in the international communist movement, broke with the Right wing in 1906 chiefly because the Lefts could not accept the policy pursued by the Pilsudski adherents, who wanted to dissociate themselves from the revolutionary movement in Russia. The path of the Left wing of the PSP in the direction of a consistently revolutionary standpoint often zigzagged, but it always pursued a correct line in relation to the Russian labor movement.

The SDPL and the Left-wing PSP were undoubtedly correct when, during the First World War, they refused to orientate on either of the imperialist groupings, and linked their hopes for the national and social liberation of the Polish people with the victory of the revolution.

An indication of their internationalism was the mass participation of rank-and-file and leading members, residing in Russia, in the revolutionary battles of 1917 and subsequently in consolidating Soviet power. Many Polish units serving in the Red Guards and the Red Army fought valiantly against the counter-revolutionaries at the crucial fronts. Felix Dzierzinski, son of the Polish people and a prominent SDPL leader, was an outstanding leader of the Bolshevik Party. He was justly called a hero of the October Revolution.

Towards Leninism

The Communist Party of Poland* inherited the traditions of internationalism from its predecessors. This was evident at its First Congress in December 1918.

The Congress resolutions stressed the significance of the October Revolution as a turning point in the destiny of mankind, stressed the international character of the laws governing the transition to socialism, which the Revolution brought to light. The Congress urged that the example of the Russian workers be followed: "The era of direct struggle for the socialist system, the era of social revolution, has set in. Revolutionary Russia has become the pioneer in this gigantic clash between the world that is dying and the world that is being born."

Carrying forward the cause initiated by the SDPL and the Left PSP, the Polish Communists strove to extend to the maximum the network of Soviets of Workers' Deputies, regarding them, on the basis of Soviet experience, as the embryo of proletarian power. However, by mid-1919 the Soviets had been crushed by the reactionaries.

The Communist Party closely followed the struggle in other countries, expressing its solidarity with the rising revolution in Germany and with the entire international revolutionary movement in which it saw its best ally.

The Polish Communists resolutely defended the worker-peasant state in 1919 and 1920 when the Pilsudski legions, jointly with the aggressive forces of world imperialism, conducted hostilities against the Soviet Republic. They explained to the masses that "the war against the socialist proletariat of Russia is a war against the socialist proletariat of Poland."

The Party raised aloft the banner of internationalism. Striving for the revolutionary overthrow of capitalist and landlord rule, it always regarded Poland as a link in the international front of struggle.

But it did not immediately realize that for the overthrow of bourgeois rule it was necessary to utilize all the revolutionary forces in the country, not only among the working class but among the peasantry and the oppressed nations, and that by doing this it would be realizing its international duty. Neither did it realize immediately that by upholding the national interests betrayed by the propertied classes, and strengthening thereby its position in Polish society, it would render a big service to the international communist movement.

Poland was one of the links in the Versailles system—the Eastern springboard of international imperialism against the Soviet Republic.

A feature of the Polish economy in those years was the interweaving of capitalism with numerous feudal survivals. Key positions in industry were held by German, French, American, British and other capitalists. At the same time, Polish imperialists oppressed other nations, occupying Western Ukraine and Western Byelorussia.

The task of the proletarian party in these conditions was properly to combine the democratic and socialist demands, to launch a direct attack on capitalism by drawing the working masses into the struggle for common democratic aims.

In the first years of its existence the Party was unable to muster all the reserves of revo-

*Prior to the Third Congress (March, 1925) it was known as the Communist Workers' Party of Poland (CWPP). In this article we refer to it as the Communist Party of Poland (CPP).

lutionary energy in town and countryside, because the erroneous views inherited from its predecessors and typical of the prewar Left wing of the Second International pressed heavily upon it. Although the Party led many revolutionary battles, it was unaware as yet of the allies the working class could rely on. Neither did it understand who should be neutralized and who made the object of the main attack. This was explained by the fact that the Party was then strongly influenced by Rosa Luxemburg's theory of spontaneity; it believed that Poland, too, would be brought into the orbit of world revolution.

In a hitherto unpublished letter to the Polish Communists dated October 19, 1921, Lenin pointed out that the carrying through by *internal* forces of a fully mature revolution in Poland would signify a gigantic victory on a world scale. This revolution, in his opinion, would help undermine the imperialist regime based on the Versailles Peace Treaty. In this connection Lenin emphasized the special responsibility of the Polish Communists before the whole world.

On the basis of its own experience of big gains and severe setbacks, and relying on the ideological help of the Communist International and its foremost section — the CPSU(B) — the Party gradually became convinced of the need for a radical change in its work.

Among the Party leaders who consistently sought to rectify the erroneous views, especially on the agrarian and national problems, mention should be made of A. Warski, W. Kostrzewa, H. Walecki, E. Brandt and E. Prochniak.

A serious obstacle on the way to Leninism at that time was the sectarian-dogmatic group which, in Polish conditions, represented the "infantile disorder" of "Left-wing communism." This group opposed the demand for breaking up the landlord estates and denied the revolutionary character of the national-liberation movement of the Ukrainians and Byelorussians.

In the bitter struggle waged against this group at the Second Party Congress (1923), the Leninist ideas on the main problems of strategy and tactics triumphed. The Congress decisions signified the victory of Leninism in the Polish labor movement. They clearly defined the role of the proletariat as the leader and exponent of the interests of all the working people.

The Polish bourgeoisie, which betrayed the country to foreign capital and entered into alliances with the German and other reactionary forces hostile to Poland, led the people to catastrophe. Overcoming the sectarian views, the Communist Party hammered out a correct line on the vital question of national independence. "Bourgeois rule in Poland," the Congress resolution read, "is a mortal danger to her independence. Only a victorious revolution can bring state independence to the Polish people."

The Congress called upon the proletariat to overthrow bourgeois rule and take the destiny of the country into its hands. The proletariat will achieve this, it was pointed out, by concluding an alliance with the peasants demanding land and with the Ukrainian and Byelorussian peasants fighting to throw off the yoke of the Polish landlords and for unification with the Soviet Ukraine and Soviet Byelorussia. Guided by Lenin's teaching, the Communist Party at this Congress adopted a consistently internationalist position, having advanced the slogan of self-determination all the way to secession of the nations forcibly joined to the Polish bourgeois state.

Warmly sympathizing with the German revolutionary workers who at this time were waging an armed struggle for their just cause, the Congress stated that victory for the counter-revolution in Germany would have disastrous consequences for the people. "Independent Poland, too, would meet its death in the rivers of workers' blood that would flow in Central and Eastern Europe." Only a party equipped with Marxism-Leninism could make such a correct assessment of the situation and foresee the course of events.

The Congress decisions helped the Party to reach those strata of the population which it had been difficult to reach before. The Independent Peasant Party, founded in 1924, launched a struggle for land without compensation; it recognized the leading role of the Communist Party. Strong revolutionary peasant organizations, such as "Gromada" in Western Byelorussia and "Selrob" in Western Ukraine, were established.

At the Head of the Working Masses

The Communist Party was driven underground in the first days of its existence. Its members and leading workers were brutally persecuted.

Here, for example, are eloquent figures taken from official sources, dating back to June 1925-June 1926. During this period there were 497 anti-Communist trials; 2,431 members were tried, the total prison sentences constituted 3,648 years; 6,757 Communists were arrested.

The Party overcame tremendous difficulties in the effort to maintain contact with the workers, peasants and intellectuals. Rousing the masses to struggle for partial demands and common aims, it followed the Leninist principle: "Together with the masses—at the head of the masses."

True, mistakes were made. Especially grave was the "May mistake" in 1926. The Party leadership failed to realize in time the fascist character of the coup carried through by the so-called Sanacja camp led by Pilsudski. This mistake, although quickly rectified, was the reason for the ideological and factional struggle which ended only in 1929.

Under the fascist dictatorship the Communist Party was the only party that called the working masses to overthrow the fascist-Sanacja dictatorship and headed their struggle. The Communists played a leading part in the strike movement; they organized the famous "occupation strikes," in which the workers refused to leave the enterprises; they headed the demonstrations and hunger marches of the unemployed all over the country. The Communists led mass peasant actions in Poland proper, in Western Byelorussia and in Western Ukraine. Shoulder to shoulder with their Polish comrades a heroic revolutionary struggle was waged by the Communist Parties of Western Ukraine and Western Byelorussia, which had been admitted to the CPC on an autonomous basis. The Communists were always in the forefront, suffering the heaviest losses in the big class battles, in the clashes with police and troops.

The Communist group in the Sejm set an example of the revolutionary use of a bourgeois parliament. The Communist deputies—Dabal, Lancucki, Krolikowski, Warski, Sochacki, Zarski and others — boldly exposed the reactionary policy of the bourgeois governments, denounced the bourgeoisie and the opportunist leaders of the Socialist Party for slandering the first socialist state, and declared their solidarity with the international communist movement.

The Communist Party was an important detachment in this movement. On its tenth anniversary the Executive Committee of the Communist International sent "warm greetings to the Communist Party of Poland, as one of the best sections of the International, which holds aloft the banner of communism and, in the grim conditions of fascist dictatorship, wages valiant struggle for the proletarian revolution."

The Party widely used the experience and ideological help of the International and the Bolshevik Party and, in turn, contributed to the international communist movement. Its achievements in leading mass strikes and, in part, the peasant movement, as well as in combining illegal and legal forms of struggle, in creating a network of legal and semi-legal organizations and in publishing legal newspapers were assessed by the International as examples well worth following.

It was one of the first Communist parties in the West to draw up a program.

The program adopted at the Sixth Party Congress in 1932 stated that it was an application of the policy-directives of the International to Polish conditions. It was permeated with the spirit of genuine internationalism, advancing the slogan of self-determination for Western Ukraine and Western Byelorussia up to and including secession from Poland. It declared that the future Poland would conclude a fraternal alliance with the Soviet Union and with every nation liberated from capitalism, for the purpose of common struggle against imperialism and for socialism.

The Polish Communists realized that revolution depended not only on the development of the class struggle in Poland but also on the world balance of political forces. It supported the anti-fascist movement of the German people when the Hitler dictatorship was installed in Germany; it initiated a broad campaign in defence of Georgi Dimitrov, hero of the Leipzig trial, and Ernst Thaelmann, leader of the German proletariat. In the spring of 1934, when the nationalist elements in Poland and Czechoslovakia fomented strife between the two fraternal peoples, the Communist parties of these countries issued a joint statement proclaiming their fidelity to proletarian solidarity and calling the working people to joint struggle.

The Polish Communists quickly reacted to every important event in the international movement. They particularly sympathized with the valiant struggle waged by the Chinese people in the 'twenties and 'thirties.

After the fascist coup in Germany the Pilsudski government resorted more and more to fascist methods of rule. The Sanacja clique connived with Hitler's aggressive policy which, sooner or later, was bound to boomerang against Poland.

In these circumstances the Communist slogans of a united working-class front and a broad anti-fascist popular front found fertile soil among the masses.

New methods of struggle for winning the masses necessitated overcoming the sectarian tendencies which impeded the Party's taking

the correct path. Big help in this was rendered by the Seventh Congress of the International (1935), which called for the united efforts of all anti-fascist forces in defense of democratic liberties, national independence and world peace.

The Party leadership, which then included J. Lenski, E. Prochniak, B. Bronkowski and I. Ryng, worked hard to broaden the anti-fascist bloc. In response to a Communist appeal the Left members of the PSP, including N. Barlicki, W. Wasilewska and J. Cyrankiewicz, radical groups of the peasant movement and progressive intellectuals joined the united popular front. Powerful anti-fascist manifestations in town and countryside added to the strength of this front and enhanced its militancy.

And when the fate of Poland was at stake, the Communists once again acted as genuine patriots and internationalists. The Fourth Meeting of the Central Committee (March 1936) pointed to the direct threat to the independence of Poland on the part of Hitler Germany and outlined the tasks: ". . . combating the military machinations of Beck and Hitler, our Party is upholding peace and national independence, because the adventurist policy of the Sanacja clique dooms Poland to vassal dependence on Hitler Germany; we Communists will not allow our country to be turned into a springboard or a corridor for the Hitler generals who want to enslave both the Polish and Soviet peoples. . . ."

In 1938, when the Sanacja government, continuing the pro-Hitler policy, planned a march to Kovno and took part in the shameful dismemberment of Czechoslovakia, the Party vigorously denounced these actions.

Guided by a deep understanding of the interests of the people and a sense of their international duty, thousands of Polish Communists made their way to Spain where they fought in the ranks of the Republican Army. The names of the Polish Communists — Swierczewski-Walter, Strzelczyk, Jaszuniski and many others — are inscribed in the glorious epic of the liberation struggle of the Spanish people.

In the summer of 1938 the Party was dissolved by a decision of the Executive Committee of the Communist International on the charge that the leadership had been extensively infiltrated by enemy agents. The statement issued by five Communist parties on February 19, 1956 emphasized that this charge had been based on evidence falsified by provocateurs who had since been exposed, and that there had been no grounds whatever for dissolving the Party. The statement read in part:

"In the hard conditions of fascist terror, the Communist Party of Poland led the struggle of the workers and peasants against capitalist and landlord oppression, for the social and national liberation of the working people. It took over and carried forward the glorious traditions of joint revolutionary struggle of the Polish and Russian proletariat, consistently adhered to the principles of proletarian internationalism and close co-operation with the fraternal Communist and Workers' parties, with the international revolutionary movement."

The United Workers' Party Carries Forward the Traditions of the Communist Party

In 1941, activists of the former CPP founded the Polish Workers' Party, which took over the noble traditions of the Communist Party and creatively developed its ideological principles in the new situation. During the Second World War the Workers' Party became not only the vanguard of the working class but also the leading force of the entire nation in the battle for people's Poland. Proceeding from the same principles of patriotism and internationalism which formed the foundation of the activities of the Communist Party, the PWP showed the working people the only correct way to liberation, the way of armed struggle jointly with the Soviet Union.

History has confirmed the soundness of this policy. The Soviet Army smashed the Hitler war machine. Soviet and Polish soldiers fighting side by side liberated our country from the Nazi invader who had slaughtered five million people, ravaged the economy and destroyed Warsaw. The victory of the Soviet Union ensured our people independence and made it possible to unite all the Polish territories into a single state.

Thus, twice in its history—in 1918 and 1944 — the Polish people gained independence thanks to the anti-imperialist struggle of the country that was born of the October Socialist Revolution.

The Soviet Union's victory over fascism brought us national and social liberation. The people, led by the working class, took power into their own hands.

The Treaty of Friendship, Mutual Aid and Co-operation (1945) was a turning point in Polish-Soviet relations, now based on a common ideology — Marxism-Leninism, identity of interests of our peoples, and their desire for peace and progress. The Workers' Party, jointly with the regenerated Socialist Party,

constantly explained to the people the significance of Polish-Soviet friendship for strengthening and developing the young Polish state.

People's Poland, realizing the aims advanced in its day by the Communist Party, carried out agrarian reform, nationalized industry and, with Soviet aid, laid the foundation for a planned socialist economy.

The noble cause of socialism is now in the hands of the United Workers' Party, formed in December 1948 by the amalgamation of the Workers' Party and the Socialist Party. In the past fourteen years, despite all the shortcomings in fulfilling the 1949-55 plan, our country has made considerable progress in building a new life. In close co-operation with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, people's Poland has become an advanced industrial-agrarian country; her industrial output is now five times the 1938 level, while her agricultural output per head of population surpasses the pre-war level by 40 per cent.

The United Workers' Party is now preparing for its Third Congress, which will chart the further advance of the socialist economy. The draft directives for the 1959-65 plan, approved by the Central Committee meeting, envisage another big leap in socialist construction—an 80 per cent increase in industrial output as compared with 1958. The draft directives also provide for continued progress in agriculture and the raising of living and cultural standards. Fulfilment of these tasks is unthinkable without still closer co-operation with the entire socialist camp, in which the Soviet Union plays the leading role.

The revisionists tried to divert our Party from the internationalist path. They attacked the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism. To the general laws governing the transition from capitalism to socialism they counterpose the specific features of Poland's development, although the latter are but the concrete manifestation of these laws. Seeking to make capital out of the past mistakes, the revisionists fomented nationalist mistrust of the Soviet Union and the entire socialist camp, tried to weaken the ties linking people's Poland with the other socialist countries and the fraternal Communist and Workers' parties.

The United Workers' Party and its Central Committee headed by W. Gomulka strongly combated the revisionist tendencies, which are one of the varieties of nationalism, and upheld proletarian internationalism against all attempts to undermine it.

The decisions of the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU, and the principles of solidarity and co-operation between socialist countries developed on the basis of these decisions, have reinforced the fraternal relations between Poland and the Soviet Union. The idea of alliance and friendship with the Soviet Union—the cornerstone of our policy—freed from the mistakes of the past, has acquired new strength, and is making its way to the hearts of the people.

The recent visit of our Party and Government leaders to the Soviet Union and the cordial welcome accorded them everywhere they went provided a further expression of the great strength of internationalism.

The Moscow talks revealed the identity of views of the two friendly countries on all points. The Polish-Soviet Declaration states that any weakening of the ties between the Polish and Soviet peoples and of the unity of all the socialist nations could only injure the cause of socialism and peace; and would be advantageous to the revenge-seeking chauvinist elements in West Germany. The Declaration added that Polish-Soviet friendship, based on the principles of proletarian internationalism, is stronger than ever before.

The imperialist attempts to sow discord between Poland and the Soviet Union, to separate Poland from the socialist camp, have failed ignominiously. The conviction is growing among our people that the stronger the Polish-Soviet alliance, the stronger people's Poland will be.

"Consolidating the unity of the socialist camp and the fraternal friendship with the Soviet people is the main principle of the policy of people's Poland, which is building socialism," said W. Gomulka in a speech at Minsk on November 2, 1958. "The emergence of people's Poland, her progress and her achievements are closely linked with the socialist camp and first and foremost with the fraternal aid of the advanced socialist country —the Soviet Union. Poland's membership in the socialist camp and her friendship and alliance with the Soviet Union ensure her strong positions in the world, protect her security and safeguard her integrity. There is no force on earth that can separate Poland from the socialist camp or the Soviet Union or that can weaken our fraternal alliance. We are united by the common, vital interests of our peoples and of all mankind, we are united by the common historic goal of socialism, by the common ideology of Marxism-Leninism, which guides us in the building of socialism and communism."

The most ardent champion of this friendship and alliance is the United Workers' Party

—the leader of the people in the fight for peace and socialism. Close bonds of friendship link the United Workers' Party with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, whose rich experience is invaluable in the day-to-day practical work of all the Communist and Workers' parties.

The Party unswervingly applies the principles of the Moscow Declaration of the Communist and Workers' parties, which state that Marxist-Leninist internationalist policy, education of the working people in the spirit of combining internationalism with patriotism and resolute struggle to eliminate survivals of bourgeois nationalism and chauvinism, are essential for consolidating fraternal relations and friendship between the socialist countries.

The chief motto of the United Workers' Party, as stated in the draft Rules to be submitted for discussion to the Third Party Congress, is loyalty to the principles of internationalism and struggle against all manifestations of nationalism.

Time has confirmed the principled correctness of the path charted by the Polish Communist Party. The latest achievements of people's Poland, won under the leadership of the United Workers Party, are linked with the selfless struggle of the Communist Party which steeled the people for the decisive battles for independence, power and socialism.

At the Twelfth Meeting of the Central Committee of the Party W. Gomulka solemnly declared:

"The idea, which forty years ago formed the basis of the Communist Party of Poland, is today the guiding star in the work of our Party. It is the immortal idea of Marxism-Leninism, the idea of struggle for socialism. And if today we are building socialism in our country, this is due in no small measure to our predecessor—the Polish Communist Party. It was this party that educated and steeled the indefatigable fighters for socialism: cadres who later, in the new setting, although greatly depleted in numbers as a result of extermination-measures and the war against Hitlerism, became the buttress of people's Poland, the backbone of our Party."

The Labor Party Today: Its Policy and Ideology

J. R. Campbell

IN THE LAST three years at least the British Labor Party has been overhauling its policy in preparation for the General Election, which will evidently be held some time in 1959. The policy adopted, on the whole, abandons all pretense that the Labor Party aims at achieving a socialist order of society. The aim of all the statements of policy which the party has adopted is to attract increasing numbers of the petty bourgeoisie and the more backward sections of the workers. It is assumed that the main body of the working class will vote Labor as a matter of loyalty. It is the wavering sections, who fluctuate between the Labor and the Conservative parties, whom the new policy is expected to win as Labor voters.

Before describing the policy documents, it is necessary to outline the rather peculiar organization of the British Labor Party. At present it claims to have over 6,796,000 paying members, of whom 1,000,000 are members who joined as individuals, in the same way as the members of any Social-Democratic party. In these individual sections women constitute almost half the membership. Then there are the trade unions, which are affiliated to the Labor Party on a national scale and form an absolute majority.

Socialist organizations (the Fabian Society, the Socialist Lawyers' Society, the National Association of Labor Teachers, etc.) and Co-operative Societies with about 40,000 members are also affiliated. The majority of the Co-operative Societies in Britain are affiliated to the Co-operative Party, which has an electoral agreement with the Labor Party but is not affiliated to it.

There are three basic units of the Labor Party: 1) the constituency Labor Party consisting of representatives from the individual members' sections, from the local branches of the trade unions, the Socialist Societies, and women's and youth organizations in a parliamentary constituency. 2) The city Labor Party—in large cities, where there are a

number of constituencies. 3) The regional Labor Party—in counties or regions, co-ordinating the activities of the county and city bodies. All these units are affiliated members of the party. Delegates representing the constituency Labor Party have voting cards each commanding the votes of 5,000 individual members, while the delegates from the city and regional organizations have single cards irrespective of membership.

These local organizations are represented on the Executive Committee of the Labor Party by seven members, elected at the National Conference by the delegates of these organizations only. These are people who in the recent past have claimed to be Lefts. The ex-chairman of the party, Mr. Driberg, and the present chairman, Mrs. Castle, are members of this section of the Executive.

The trade unions are represented at the conference by delegations, elected according to the rules of the various unions. Each trade union delegation has a vote equal to the number of members for whom it pays affiliation fees to the Labor Party. The unions are entitled to elect twelve members to the Labor Party Executive.* Generally speaking, the union representatives on the Executive Committee are, with few exceptions, to the Right of those elected to represent the local Labor Parties and few of them are political personalities in their own right.

There is one Executive member elected from the Socialist (e.g. Fabian Society) and Co-operative section, and five women members. The party treasurer can be nominated by any organization and, like the women's representatives, is elected by all the delegates to the conference. The leader and deputy leader of the Labor Party in Parliament sit on the party Executive, without being elected.

On the surface the Labor Party structure is one of broad democracy and independent action. Experience has proved, however, that this ramified party mechanism channels the activity of its rank-and-file into the current and local tasks and electioneering, while policy problems are elaborated and implemented by the National Executive, actually the main body of the party, which, through its tough policy in selecting the personnel and no less tough regulations in discussing national issues, ensures majority support.

*A custom has grown up in the British trade unions in which the outstanding leader in any given union — the General Secretary — usually tries to get elected to the General Council of the Trades Union Congress, and the second most prominent leader to the Executive Committee of the Labor Party.

In the past it has generally been the local Labor units which have fought for progressive policies inside the Party. It was here that the most Socialist-minded members of the party were to be found. Since the Second World War these sections have been increasingly infiltrated by middle class intellectuals, posing as Lefts. At the same time in recent years there has been a leftward swing in some of the trade unions, and progressive policies now often come from this direction.

The Communist Party has sought, in all ways, to encourage these policies both in the trade unions and the local Labor Parties.

The Right wing has done everything possible to prevent the association of rank-and-file members of the Labor Party with rank-and-file Communists. Every Labor Party conference report contains a list of what the Executive calls "proscribed organizations." Any member of the Labor Party associating with such organizations can be expelled. In addition to the Communist Party these organizations include the British-Soviet Friendship Society, the Britain-China Friendship Association, Scientists for Peace organization, the British Peace Committee and the World Federation of Democratic Youth. Nevertheless, in the trade unions, on shop stewards' committees and in tenants' organizations Labor Party and Communist Party members associate, and the Communists are able to influence their Labor colleagues in a number of ways.

* * *

Since 1951 a struggle has been proceeding in the Labor Party between those who want the party to adopt what they consider to be a more advanced socialist program, and those who want it to drop even socialist phrases from its program.

From 1951 to 1957 there gathered around Mr. Aneurin Bevan a group of Lefts who criticized the Labor leadership for timidity and who demanded a clear-cut statement of socialist policy. In 1952 various personalities associated with this group were elected to represent the constituency organizations on the National Executive. At first the main question on which they assailed the Right wing was that of West German rearmament. Supported by all the Lefts in the Labor Party and reinforced strongly by the trade unions, in which the Communists had conducted a powerful campaign against West German rearmament, they almost succeeded in overthrowing the Right-wing policy of arms for Adenauer, which was only carried by 3,270,000 against 3,022,000, a vote which gave a con-

siderable stimulus to the Left wing in the party.

When at the 1955 conference the Executive announced that it was going to appoint a series of committees to consider all aspects of party policy, this was regarded as being the great opportunity for the Left.

The policy statements dealing with such questions as "Towards Equality," "Personal Freedom," "Aid for the Colonies and Underdeveloped Countries," "Industry and Society," "National Superannuation" (a new pensions policy), "Speed the Plow" (the agricultural policy) and "Plan for Progress" have now appeared. Those documents in the main represent a victory for the Right-wing and a complete capitulation of the former Left leaders. So, far from the Labor leaders being forced to adhere to the traditional aims of the Party as set down in its 1918 reformist program ("the common ownership of the means of production," etc.), they have succeeded in those policy documents in revising that program which, though always ignored by the Labor leadership in practice, nevertheless outlined the goal of the movement as being socialism. But since the policy documents are the result of a struggle ending in compromise, they are not always of a consistently Right-wing character. Left and Right phrases are to be found on the same page of some of the documents. But the Right wing has made the actual policy on the basis of which any Labor Government will operate.

* * *

The essence of the policy documents is that the concept of socialism as a system of society based upon "common ownership of the means of production" and therefore quite distinct from the capitalist system, is repudiated. In its place a new concept of "socialism" appears, according to which socialism is a set of moral principles about equality, personal freedom, co-operation and mutual aid in opposition to competition, which the Labor Party proposes to apply in the shape of social reforms within the existing capitalist system of society. Anyone who approves of such moral principles and who supports the various reforms which the Labor Party proposes, is to be regarded as a Socialist. The basic statement of this position will be found in two documents: "Industry and Society" adopted by the Labor Party's 56th conference and "Plan for Progress" adopted in 1958.

Like similar Right-wing Social Democratic documents, notably those of West Germany and Austria, a great deal is written about the changed nature of present-day capitalism as compared with capitalism between the two world wars.

In assessing these changes the Labor Party claims that the monopoly capitalism which existed in Britain between the wars was a *laissez faire* economy, with the functioning of which the capitalist state did not interfere. This is false. The policy documents deliberately understate the close relations between the capitalist state and the monopolies before the war in order to present the changes which have taken place in British capitalism since the war as something fundamentally new.

Indeed, after the Second World War the state-monopoly tendencies in the British economy have drastically intensified. This can be explained by the growing political activity of the working class, the worsened economic relations with other countries and the balance of payments crisis, the sharp postwar disparity in the levels of the processing industries and the fuel base. But the first explanation is British capitalism's seriously weakened positions as a result of the disintegration of the colonial system. In order to make British goods more competitive and maintain highest profits, in order to save capitalism, the monopolists use the state to accelerate concentration of production, rationalization of some industries and other measures.

As a result British capitalism, which had for long lagged behind German and American in the level of concentration and state-monopoly "organization" of production, has overcome this lag and, in some respects, even outstripped these countries. The document "Industry and Society" points out that while there are 11,000 companies, one-half of the profits appropriated by them are reaped by 512 of the largest companies and that these tend to grow faster. The document sees in this natural process of the concentration of capital certain specific features, allegedly facilitating the control exercised by the state, "an institution above the classes," over industry—and not only because the leading monopolies decrease in number but, primarily, because, they say, the above process is accompanied by a "managerial revolution." The large firms today, it says, are less and less controlled by powerful financial groups of large shareholders, and more and more controlled in policy-making by Boards of Directors whose members do not hold many of the shares of the companies. The strongly organized groups of large shareholders, who are intent on obtaining the maximum profit, are being replaced, according to the Laborites, by

managerial elites who are not concerned with maximum profits but with capital investment and expansion of production. "Salaries, pensions, status, power and promotion—these rather than wealth are their operating incentives." What an amazing discovery! This, in any case, is meant for those who have never heard of capitalist accumulation which embraces the growing capital investments, profits, salaries, pensions, etc.

In support of these conclusions the Labor Party quotes data from a book by the well-known British economist, Professor Sargent Florence. Yet in this book Professor Florence states the opposite of what the Labor Party is trying to prove. He says: "There is certainly evidence for believing that the managerial revolution has not proceeded as far as is sometimes thought (or stated without thought) and that leadership and the ultimate decision on top policy may remain in many companies or corporations with the largest capitalist shareholders."

Of course, as we know, the big shareholders need control only a minority of the shares in order to have effective control of a company. This, which Professor Florence calls "oligarchic minority owners' control," makes nonsense of the theory of the managerial revolution.

At the very moment that the Labor Party was declaring that the financial oligarchy no longer controlled British industry, struggles were taking place in companies in relation to what are called "take-over bids." In a "take-over bid" a financial group, outside a given company, seeks to buy shares from the smaller shareholders, in order to wrest control from the group at present controlling the company. If they succeed of course they would be able to change the "managerial elite" also. Nothing could more clearly demonstrate the fact that control rests with an organized group of the biggest shareholders and that the managerial revolution is a myth.

This myth, however, is to serve another Labor "statement of policy." "The Labor Party recognizes," says "Industry and Society," "that, under increasing professional managements, large firms are as a whole serving the nation well. Moreover, we recognize that no organization, public or private, can operate effectively if it is subjected to persistent and detailed intervention from above. We have, therefore, no intention of intervening in the management of any firm which is doing a good job." So the Labor leadership has openly abandoned the idea of gradual nationalization of the whole economy as the rank and file and the whole working class expected it to do in 1945. Instead the Labor Party proposes that heirs to capitalist fortunes when paying inheritance tax (the so-called "death duties") should do so not in money but in shares in capitalist concerns. "By these means," the document goes on, "the community will acquire a stake in the expansion of industry. Such acquisitions of shares will of course be made at full market values. They will be guided solely by investment considerations and will not be aimed at securing control" (of capitalist enterprises). This is said to be quite enough for sustaining a "mixed economy."* And should there be close co-operation between a Labor Government and the large firms, we are told, state control of the economy, up to preventing the slump from occurring, will be ensured.

Many supporters of capitalism claim that the good and bad features of capitalism are closely related, and no matter what reforms are carried out, it is impossible to eliminate the bad features without simultaneously eliminating those which they hold to be good. But the Labor Party claims that all this is in its power. This is the essence of its policy document, "Plan for Progress."

This document proceeds from the assumption that the cycle of crisis, depression, revival and boom has become obsolete in capitalist society and that in present British capitalist society it is possible, by means of certain state controls, to have sustained expansion of production, rising real wages, stable prices, full employment, planning to achieve a higher rate of investment, and a strong balance of payments.

In short, Right-wing Labor is saying that it is possible to have an eternal boom without any of the evils associated with such booms in capitalist history. This document therefore buries for ever the idea of a socialist transformation. For where is the need for socialism if such aims can be achieved within the framework of capitalism?

The first question which naturally arises when reading "Plan for Progress" is, why didn't the Labor Party free Britain from the evils of capitalism when there was a Labor Government between 1945 and 1951? For the "requisites" now quoted to substantiate the possibility of effective control over capitalist economy were also available at that time. Everyone remembers that there was full employment and investment expansion, but there was also, despite controls, steadily rising

*Reference is to partial nationalization of the economy with the leading industries under the control of private capital.

prices. And everyone knows that the Labor Government was swept aside by a wave of inflation. This document gives a detailed and rather exact picture of the present state of Britain's economy, but its falsity is that it ascribes the unstable and deteriorating position of the economy exclusively to the policy of the Tories, who (in contrast to the Labor leaders, evidently) are incapable of exercising "effective control."

"Plan for Progress" was the main document at the last Labor Party conference. It was introduced by Harold Wilson, who is expected to be the Chancellor of the Exchequer in the next Labor Government. His speech was successful as an attack on the Tory party, but it completely omitted to explain how the plan could stop the development of the recession or how it could maintain full employment.

There were two aspects of the plan which might be expected to arouse a great deal of discussion. The plan called for an increased proportion of Britain's national income to be devoted to the expansion of the country's basic equipment. This could only mean that consumption was to be prevented from increasing meantime, so that more resources could be devoted to the expansion of the productive apparatus. The question naturally arises, whose consumption is to be kept from rising or even reduced? Is the consumption of the mass of the people to be prevented from increasing in order to free resources for the expansion of the great privately-owned monopolistic industries?

The Executive members kept silent on this point, but two Labor M.P.s, Roy Jenkins and Desmond Donnelly. explained what, in their opinion, it meant. Jenkins said that it should be made clear to the people that Labor was postponing the development of some social services now in order to find means of expanding the productive capacity of British industry. Donnelly put it in a more popular way: "If a choice has to be made between (building) a machine-tool factory and a hospital he would choose the factory because it would mean a better hospital in the end." It is noticeable that though the Executive spokesmen did not endorse those remarks, they did not contradict them, as they would have done if they were incorrect. Thus the Labor Party stipulates that some of the expansion of British capitalist industry, if the Labor program is operated, will be at the expense of the consumption of goods and of the standard of life of the mass of the people.

The second peculiar feature of "Plan for Progress" is that it calls for wage restraint. Practically any and every policy can be justified by the contradictory character of its statements. On the one hand the Plan says that (1) the growth of money incomes of the workers and employees must keep broadly in step with higher productivity. But (2) that is not to say that increases in productivity must necessarily precede higher wages and salaries. On the contrary, the pressure for wage increases may be instrumental in improving production and modernization of technology by the managements, thus bringing about greater productivity. At last, the document states that (3) wages should be related to productivity but not in any particular industry, that this principle should be applied with due account of the state of the economy as a whole.

It is only too obvious that the second proposition, for example, which all trade unionists will approve, would work against the third and first propositions, for workers in an industry whose productivity grows at a faster rate cannot hope for a proportionally equal wage increase, since in another industry productivity develops more slowly or is even marking time. The benefits of increased productivity would not be shared by "the community as a whole," as the Laborites would like to present it—the employers would only pocket the difference between the fast-growing profit (a result of increased productivity) and the slower growing wage.

Speaking at the Scarborough conference Hugh Gaitskell actually confirmed that such would be the consequences of the Plan when implemented by a Labor Government. Gaitskell declared that the party Executive was against a wage freeze (that is, a decision on the part of the Government to prevent wages from rising at all), but it was also against a wage squeeze (that is, a powerful drive by the trade unions to extract from the employers the maximum possible wage increases). Clearly what the unions are expected to do, under a Labor Government, is to cut down their demands for increased wages to very modest dimensions. That is obviously a policy of what is called wage restraint. Yet Frank Cousins of the Transport and General Workers' Union supported the "Plan for Progress" because, in his opinion, it did not involve wage restraint. The plain fact is that may delegates who supported the Plan because it was necessary to preserve the appearance of party unity, did not grasp the wider implications of this document. We must also bear in mind that "Plan for Progress" was issued after the majority of union conferences were

held, so there were no union conferences' instructions to delegates reflecting the attitude of the party rank and file towards this document. So the Plan was accepted practically unanimously.

With the acceptance of this document the Labor Party's discussion on policy has been completed. The results have been summarized by the Right-wing Labor writer, C. A. R. Crosland, as follows: "Broadly one may say that the 'revisionist' period is over: that is, the business of giving the Labor Party a policy attuned to mid-twentieth century conditions is more or less complete. On the theoretical plane, this period began with the new Fabian essays and continued with the analytical works by Strachey, the Socialist Union group and by myself. On the practical plane, it culminated in the recent series of Labor Party statements, all bearing the mark of Gaitskell's personal influence. British socialism now lays much less emphasis on old-style nationalization and detailed physical controls, and much more on economic expansion, social welfare and social equality; while its pristine semi-Marxist analysis of capitalist society has given way to a more subtle revisionist theory of post-capitalist society."

It should be noted that Crosland uses the term "revisionist" not only in relation to Marxism, but also in relation to the old reformist program of the Labor Party. In spite of the smooth, deceptive reformist phrases his attitude is quite clear — "a policy attuned to mid-twentieth century conditions" really means a policy adapted to British monopoly capitalism, which is described as a "post-capitalist society." Capitalism has evidently vanished in Britain, according to him, without affecting the capitalists or their control over the major industries, and indeed without affecting the capitalist offensive now in full swing against the workers.

In addition to the "Plan for Progress" the Labor Party conference discussed other issues such as educational policy, which was opposed by some of the big unions and local branches. The Executive, however, managed to turn down the demand that the privileged schools be abolished. These schools (Eton, Winchester, Harrow, etc.) are accessible only to the children of the rich and ensure privileges for their pupils (easy access to the university and top Army, Navy, Civil Service jobs later in life).

The Executive resolution on foreign policy presented to the conference embodied many of the relatively progressive attitudes adopted by the party in 1957 and was therefore an advance. But alongside those progressive demands, there was also support for NATO. So the resolution clearly faced two different ways. On the one hand, it faced in the direction of a new policy reflecting the real interests of the labor movement and the country, but on the other, it looked backward to NATO and the cold war. But in the debate cold war expressions of opinion were played down. Even Healey, M.P. for East Leeds, who usually took an anti-Soviet line in the past, did not do so on this occasion. A member of the Parliamentary leadership of the party, George Brown, who came out strongly in favor of tactical nuclear weapons, aroused the hostility of the conference. One could say that the conference was behind what was new and progressive in the Labor movement. The debate therefore centered round a resolution moved by the Fire Brigades' Union, calling for Britain to end the manufacture of nuclear weapons of all kinds. The conference, however, defeated this resolution by 5,611,000 votes to 890,000. The resolution of the Executive which pledges a Labor Government to stop H-bomb tests was then carried. But Gaitskell's concluding speech in this debate fully illustrated the evasive attitude of the Executive. He said that if the Labor Party could be assured that other states now proposing to manufacture nuclear weapons would cease to do so, provided Britain abandoned the bomb, then he was willing to consider that proposal. This would leave only the United States and the Soviet Union in possession of nuclear weapons. Yet only a few minutes before, in the same speech, Gaitskell declared that for Britain to abandon the manufacture of nuclear weapons was to shelter behind the American bombs, an attitude which he clearly regarded as undesirable.

The two faces of the resolution adopted at Scarborough reflected the struggle waged in the Labor Party over the past few years on international issues. It is a matter of common knowledge that the previous conference in 1957 marked a break with the cold war policy and an advance in the direction of a policy of peaceful coexistence (on such points as an end to H-bomb tests, destruction of stocks of nuclear weapons. disarmament, reunification of Germany within the framework of a European Security System, admission of the Chinese People's Republic to the United Nations, etc.).

In 1958, however, the debate assumed a new intensity. It was stimulated by two events. The first was the announcement by the American General T. S. Power that relays

of American bombers, armed with H-bombs, were flying over Britain, and the second was the interview by the Prime Minister, Macmillan, who showed by his replies to questions that he did not really know what was happening in the American air force. The possibility of a nuclear war being started by mistake was in everybody's mind. The public alarm increased when the Prime Minister went to Washington and made an arrangement that American rockets should be installed in Britain. A number of scientists and other intellectuals, headed by Earl Russell, started an organization called the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, which attracted unprecedentedly large audiences. At the same time the Communist Party successfully launched a campaign against the installation of American rocket bases in Britain. The result was that members of the Labor Party began to demand that the Executive should organize a campaign.

After a considerable delay, the Executive issued two statements. They said that pending international agreement the British Government should suspend H-tests, refrain from allowing American bases to be installed on British soil, stop the flights of American bombers over Britain, and seek a non-aggression pact between East and West; the British Government should take the initiative in demanding summit talks, support the withdrawal of all foreign forces from East and West Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary, support German reunification on the basis of free elections and that West Germany should withdraw from the NATO pact, provided the other countries mentioned withdraw from the Warsaw Pact.

It will be noted that there are positive and negative aspects in these statements of policy. On nuclear disarmament the Labor Party Executive went further than it had previously. On other questions, however, many of the traits of the previous cold war policy remain (for instance, the proposition that a European security pact should be dependent on the prior unification of Germany by so-called free elections, the German Democratic Republic being completely ignored).

The greatest weakness in the Labor foreign policy program is with regard to the Middle East, which is one of the focal points of the war danger. While the Labor Party opposed the Anglo-French aggression in Egypt in 1956, it has never had a consistently friendly policy towards the Arab states.

When the imperialist troops were landed in Lebanon and Jordan, the leadership of the Labor Party showed its usual hesitations. While it strongly criticized the American landing in Lebanon it did not in Parliament vote against the British Government, which had supported the American landing. Only when the British Government sent troops to Jordan did it initiate a parliamentary debate and vote against the Government. It also demanded a summit conference on the Middle East.

Taking into account the experience of the past few years it can be inferred that the policy of the Labor leadership, hence of a future Labor Government, will be largely determined by the weight of the pressure exerted by the working people.

* * *

With a General Election approaching the question arises as to what attitude should be adopted to the Labor Party in view of its recent decisions. From the very moment the aforesaid documents of policy appeared the Communist Party has been tirelessly explaining to the working class their non-socialist character and bourgeois essence. Now they have been approved and will be recommended to a future Labor Government. Does this change the attitude of the Communist Party towards the Tory-Labor rivalry at the forthcoming elections? No, it does not. As on previous occasions the Communists will do all they can to bring nearer the election day and defeat the Tories. At the same time the Communist Party will continue to explain to the people that at present a victory for the Labor Party does not signify that a Socialist government will be created capable of resolving the vital social problems facing the country. Now that they have their "Plan for Progress" and other documents, a Labor Government will be even less capable of doing this than in 1945 when it linked socialism with nationalization (although in a reformist interpretation).

Since the schemes to build a Welfare State, in which the monopoly ownership of the means of production will be preserved, are doomed to failure, the Communists are bound to see to it that the disillusionment of the British working class and the entire people in these projects should not lead to further disillusionment in the possibility, in the near future, of realizing the socialist ideals in our country, i.e., that imperialist reaction should not add another victory to its list. Therefore the Communists will conduct a fight to eliminate the reactionary features of the Labor Party program and, in the long run, radically

change it, making it a genuinely socialist program.

The opinion is still current in Britain that the most effective way of giving the Labor Party a revolutionary reorientation would be for the Communists to leave their Party and join the Labor Party with the aim of conducting educational and explanatory work there. The Communists hold that the opposite is true. Because the stronger and the more united the Communist Party, the wider its influence in industry and in the trade unions, and the greater its political activity based on its Marxist-Leninist program, the greater will be the impact of socialist ideas on the masses and the greater the possibilities of success for the militants in the local Labor branches, in the trade union and co-operative movements, and the more active and numerous will be the Left wing in the Labor Party and the more real the perspective for defeating its present Right-wing leadership. It is only the Communist Party, equipped with Marxist theory, the experience of the class struggle and profound knowledge of the national peculiarities of Britain and the traditions of her people, that can ensure this.

The electoral field affords the greatest opportunity to explain the policy and role of the Communist Party in the labor movement. The Communists maintain that the interests of the country and the working class require that Communist M.P.s be returned to Parliament. The time has come for every branch of the Party to work among the people so that it can contest the local elections with Communist candidates.

The Party holds that preparations for the General Election should commence now, particularly by the creation of a broad anti-Government front in the large factories. The attempts of the Labor bureaucracy to keep the Communist and Labor Party workers from co-operating with each other, must be frustrated in the factories. It is here that a united working-class opinion on what to do in the immediate struggle is of decisive importance.

The problem of united action by the rank-and-file Laborites and Communists is closely connected with the prospects facing the Left in the Labor Party. Its present weakness is due to the fact that it allowed itself to be influenced by the anti-Communist drive at the height of the cold war. "Especially in the post-war years," writes John Gollan in a recent pamphlet, "anti-communism has crippled Left movements. Attacked by the Right wing, many Left supporters and leaders seemed to think that they could protect their position by dissociation from or attacking the Communists. As was inevitable all such attacks simply played into the hand of the Right wing.

"The Scarborough conference (of the Labor Party) shows how urgent it is to regroup the forces of the Left. For if Bevanism has collapsed, the Left forces in the unions and in the constituency parties remain, and we will do everything in our power to support Left developments now as in the past."

But the Left forces must draw a conclusion from the recent developments, which remind us of what once happened to them in the past of the Labor movement: as long as they ignore the Communist Party and therefore split the Left of the British working-class movement they will not defeat the Labor Rights.

The recent policy successes of the reformists gravely imperil the British labor movement. Now more than ever before it needs a strong Communist Party, a mass party capable of rallying all the progressive forces to fight for a socialist Britain. The Communists are now reminding the people of their slogan put forward in *The British Road to Socialism*: those who cherish the cause of socialism and regard themselves as able fighters for a bright future for Britain should support the Communist Party and join its ranks.

Activities of Communist and Workers' Parties

The Communist Party of Greece Is Forty Years Old

ON its fortieth anniversary the Communist Party of Greece issued a number of documents which are of importance for the people's struggle for national and social emancipation.

The "Theses on the Fortieth Anniversary of the Communist Party of Greece," adopted by the Ninth Central Committee Meeting, outline the Party's history, summarize its experience and specify the task facing the working class and the national-liberation movement.

This document shows that, despite many difficulties, temporary failures and mistakes, the Party numbers hundreds of thousands of members and supporters, that it has become a mass party of the working class heading the nationwide movement for peace and democratic changes.

Of the main stages in the Party's history priority is given to the war and postwar periods. During the Second World War the Communists were the most consistent patriots; they led the national-liberation struggle against the invader. On the Party's initiative a National-Liberation Front (EAM) was organized in the autumn of 1941, which united all the Resistance forces. The Greek People's Liberation Army (ELAS) was formed and inflicted heavy blows on the occupation forces. In many parts of the country the people took power into their hands.

But at the time of the turn in the anti-fascist war the Party leadership made a number of grave mistakes. The internal reactionaries, supported by the British imperialists, now did all in their power to sabotage the national-liberation struggle. The Party failed to take the necessary measures to stop this sabotage. The fundamental error of the leadership was that it overestimated the strength of the British imperialists and the internal reactionaries and underestimated the forces of the people. Although the Resistance movement was crushed, the National Liberation Front did not lose its significance. Under its banners the people for the first time set up their own rule and began to introduce democratic changes; this patriotic movement was headed by the working class.

A large part of the theses deals with the struggle waged by the Party for national independence, peace and democracy in the postwar period when plutocratic reaction prevailed. The latter harnessed the country first to the chariot of British imperialism and later to the American imperialists; they turned Greece into a bridgehead against the socialist countries and the national-liberation movements in the Middle East.

At this time the Party headed the struggle against the British-American interventionists and plutocratic reaction. The leadership, however, failed to understand the character and immediate tasks of the revolutionary movement, calling for an immediate socialist revolution at a time when the liberation struggle could be successful only as an anti-imperialist and democratic struggle. This sectarian policy led to a certain isolation of the Party from the masses and to the defeat of the democratic movement in 1949. The mistakes made in the subsequent years caused a profound crisis in the Party.

The theses point out that the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU, which marked a new stage in the international Communist and working-class movement, helped the Party to rectify its errors. The Sixth Enlarged Meeting of the Central Committee and Central Control Commission in 1956 led the Party out of the crisis and defined its tasks.

"The Declaration of Policy" worked out by the Central Committee explains that in Greece, a backward country dependent on foreign imperialism, providing certain conditions obtain, liberation and democratic freedoms can be won peacefully. Needed for this is a National Front that would unite all the social forces interested in effecting changes—the working class, which is called upon to play the leading role; the peasantry, its natural ally; the middle urban strata; the national intelligentsia, patriotic officers and clergy, and the national bourgeoisie.

In recent years the prestige and influence of the Party among the masses have grown noticeably; its slogans have the support of the people. The Left democratic forces are making headway.

Despite terror and persecution, the United Democratic Left Party (EDA) won a major victory in the general election on May 11, 1958, polling 25 per cent of the votes and winning 79 seats; it is the leading opposition party.

The working people and some of the political parties are insisting on legality for the Communist

Party. The strike movement is growing, and the peasants are fighting with renewed vigor. There is ferment among civil servants, intellectuals, handicraftsmen and self-employed who are protesting against the high prices and the onerous tax burden. Big sections of the national bourgeoisie are protesting against the free imports, the high taxes, and the ruthless exploitation of the country's resources by foreign capitalists.

The overwhelming majority of the people support the demand that Greece shall not be involved in the war gambles of the American-British imperialists, that her territory, ports and air-space shall not be used for aggressive actions by the militarists. They are demanding that Greece unconditionally take the side of the friendly Arab nations now combating colonialism, nations which are her allies in the struggle to liberate Cyprus; that she should support the proposals made by the peaceful countries for eliminating the war danger, annul the agreement which aligns the country with "the Dulles-Eisenhower Doctrine," and the American-Greek agreement of October 12, 1953.

A large part of the theses is devoted to inner-Party problems; education of the members, struggle on two fronts—against revisionism, the main danger today, and against dogmatism and sectarianism.

The Tenth Meeting of the Central Committee, devoted to the Party's fortieth anniversary, stressed that features of the present situation in the country were the imminent national crisis, the further regrouping of the internal forces in favor of the patriotic and democratic movement, and the upsurge of the popular struggle. The Karamanlis Government has launched another offensive against the people and the democratic forces. An unprecedented anti-Constitutional "administrative regime" has been introduced, designed to turn the whole country into a concentration camp for the extermination of the Government's political opponents. The administration is becoming more and more fascist-like, the entire life of the country is subordinated to the rule of the police.

Under the conditions of a police regime, the Party is working to unite all the progressive forces for the common struggle to put an end to the repressions and arrests, to preserve what remains of democratic rights, to stop the country from being turned into an atomic outpost of the imperialists, and secure the liberation of Cyprus.

In the messages of greeting from the fraternal parties on the occasion of the anniversary, the Communist Party of Greece has been praised for its work. "Loyal to the ideas of Marxism-Leninism and the granite-like principles of proletarian internationalism, the Communist Party of Greece has waged a consistent and selfless struggle for the working-class cause, for the national liberation and independence of Greece, for the vital interests of her people," said the message of greetings from the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

The Central Committee of the Italian Communist Party said in its message: "The Communists and people of Italy understand and appreciate the militancy of their Greek comrades. They understand and appreciate the methods by which the Greek Communists, under the difficult conditions of illegality, are leading the masses in all fields of struggle for national independence, a better life and peace, always having before them the task of achieving broad unity and broad alliances."

The message from the Chinese Communist Party, noting the progress of the patriotic and democratic movements of the Greek people, inseparably linked with the heroic struggle of the Communists, expresses confidence that "ultimately the gloom will be dispersed and replaced by light."

Against Foreign Intervention in Cuba

We print below the text (abridged) of the appeal to the people of Cuba released by the National Committee of the Popular Socialist Party in connection with the threat of North American armed intervention.

"THE crisis in Cuba is deepening. The reactionary and anti-national Batista government in unable to quell the armed insurrection and hold back the growing popular movement for freedom and democracy, for progress and peace. Because of this, the North American ruling circles are interfering more and more in our internal affairs, resorting to naked military invasion in an attempt to bolster up the dictatorial Batista government and maintain the present regime. This can be seen from the recent pronouncements of Lincoln White, spokesmen of the U.S. State Department, and the despatch of an aircraft carrier from the Guantanamo naval base to the Nicaro zone. There is nothing surprising in this.

"It is no secret that the reactionary coup of March 10 was aided and abetted by the North American imperialists, as we demonstrated and proved at the time.

"It is also known that the American Government has given diplomatic and other support to the government brought into being by the coup. By

declaring the elections of November 1, 1954—the biggest electoral swindle ever seen in Cuba—valid and genuine, while those who opposed this lawlessness were described as gangsters and equated with lawbreakers in the United States, Mr. Gardner, U.S. Ambassador, crudely interfered in our internal affairs, in a manner intolerable for any independent country."

On the pretext of combating communism, the Appeal goes on, the Batista government has received from the United States armaments and munitions of all kinds, including aircraft and bombs for reprisals against the Cuban insurgents; FBI agents take part in hounding Cubans and instruct the Batista police in the arts of torture and provocation; on the territory of the United States, government bodies persecute, arrest, put on trial and jail Cuban emigrants fighting against tyranny, and confiscate the arms collected by them for Cuba. Agents of Yankee imperialism and the North American consulates have hindered in every way the formation of a united front in Cuba against tyranny and reaction, for independence, democracy, progress and peace.

The Pan American trade union agency of the imperialists (ORIT) prevented the workers from rallying in the struggle against the government formed in March 1952, while its agents in Cuba—the henchmen of Muhal, waxing rich on the sweat and blood of the working people—acted as heretofore as provocateurs and informers, thwarting every attempt at a peaceful and democratic solution of the Cuban crisis, despite the fact that this could have been done through vigorous and concerted effort by the workers jointly with students, office employees, peasants and other strata of the population.

"However," the Appeal continues, "the imperialist support so far rendered to the Batista government is not adequate.

"It has not held in check the growing national resentment, the sharpening crisis and the spreading armed revolt which began in the mountain districts in the East of the country; it has not prevented the workers from ridding themselves of the bureaucratic control of the Muhal clique, the peasants from fighting for their demands, the popular movement from spreading, nor the program of national liberation, economic development, agrarian reform, race equality, democracy, progress and peace from taking more concrete shape and attracting bigger sections of the population.

"Open support by the present U.S. Ambassador Smith for the election farce did not prevent the people from seeing through the rigged elections and rejecting them.

"That is why the American imperialists and the Batista government, acting in concert, are now trying to turn the support from the outside into naked intervention in order to crush the people of Cuba with American men and weapons.

Lincoln White's vilification of the Revolutionary Army and the July 26 Movement in connection with the detention by the Revolutionary Army of two U.S. citizens, who had been released before he made his statements, constitutes open, intolerable interference in the internal affairs of Cuba and brazen support of the tyranny and its crimes."

The brief detention of the two U.S. citizens, says the Appeal, was "distorted by White and used as the pretext for foul propaganda against the insurgents with a view to preparing public opinion for the projected direct military invasion, for it is precisely this that explains the recent developments and moves of the U.S. authorities in relation to Cuba.

"Provocations pursuing this aim do not end with statements by Lincoln White, they go farther. . . . The Washington Government despatched an aircraft carrier to Nicaro on the pretext of 'helping' to evacuate 50 American women and children from this part of Cuba. But it is perfectly clear that this is neither more nor less than a demonstration of force in support of the tyranny and against the insurgent army and Cuba.

"The U.S. Government, posing as a champion of the 'free world' and 'democracy,' abetted the installing in our country of the most anti-national, reactionary, terrorist dictatorship in our history, a dictatorship which maintains itself by murder and by the most brutal and incredible torture and repression.

"We categorically protest against Lincoln White's statements, against the despatch of an aircraft carrier to Nicaro, against the interference by the North American authorities in Cuba's internal affairs and their support of the Batista dictatorship.

"We denounce the designs of the North Americans for even more naked and crude interference in Cuba's affairs.

"We call upon the people of Cuba, all public personalities, all who have preserved at least a little love for their country and some feeling of national dignity, to protest against this foreign intervention in our domestic affairs and against the attempts to place our country in an even more difficult and humiliating position as a result of open military invasion.

"We expose these facts and designs of the imperialists before Latin America, before the people of North America and all the people of the world so that their support can help us to put an end to foreign intervention in our affairs and prevent our country from becoming another Lebanon as

a result of foreign occupation and support for the Batista dictatorship and the policy of maintaining the present regime.

"People of Cuba, workers, peasants, office employees, students, women and youth! Protest and rally against the foreign intervention! Uphold the right of the Cuban people to decide their own destiny!

"This is a severe test for patriots. Let us face it with dignity!"

A Nationwide Movement to Accelerate Development

AT the Seventh Congress of the Bulgarian Communist Party it was announced that socialism had triumphed in the economy and cultural life of the country, marking a new stage in its development—the period of completing the building of socialist society and creating the material and ideological conditions for the gradual transition to communism.

In view of the enhanced economic potentialities, the Central Committee advanced the slogan: cut down the time scheduled for carrying out the national-economic tasks and reach the Third Five-Year Plan (1958-62) targets for output and national income in three or four years.

At the November meeting of the Central Committee Todor Zhivkov, First Secretary of the Party, pointed out that while the transition to communism is a gradual process, it is, nevertheless, accompanied by leaps. The profound changes that have taken place, he said, have paved the way for a swift economic advance.

In the last ten years industry has made rapid and all-round progress. Agriculture has been completely reconstructed along socialist lines. There is considerable mechanization of labor processes both in industry and agriculture, in building and in transport. The country now has large numbers of highly qualified specialists, possessing secondary and higher education and boundlessly loyal to socialism. Professional skill and political consciousness among workers and co-operators are at a high level. The Party has improved its work, and the leading role of the branches has been enhanced. After the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU and the meeting of our Central Committee in April 1956, elements of subjectivism in the leadership of the country were eliminated and the conditions created for a timely solution of pressing social, political, economic and cultural problems.

These developments have made possible and necessary a further leap in economic expansion and an accelerated rate of growth.

Fulfilment of the Five-Year Plan in three or four years in the spheres of output and national income will not be an easy matter. It means that in 1959 agriculture should nearly double the 1958 output and treble it by 1960; it is anticipated that by the end of 1961 industry, transport, the building industry and trade will contribute 15,000 million leva more to the national income than envisaged in the plan. This task is quite feasible, it is within the power of the people.

The relatively high level of development reached so far facilitates utilization of vast untapped reserves. These are to be found first and foremost in making fuller use of production capacities, in the good prospects for extending the raw material base of industry and construction, in manpower resources by drawing the co-operators into useful work throughout the yearly cycle and by using office employees in industry and building from 30 to 40 days a year.

Amalgamation of the co-operatives offers very favorable opportunities for a rapid advance in agriculture. Co-operatives farming 500, 1,000 and 1,500 hectares are merging to form bigger farms with an area of 5,000, 10,000 and more hectares. This is a qualitatively new stage in the co-operative movement. The enlarged co-operatives, using their own resources and manpower, are concentrating on extending the material-production base, making fuller use of the land, enlarging the planned irrigated area of 0.6 million to one million hectares by the end of the plan period, on rapidly developing livestock-raising and perennial cultures, and on raising the yields of grain and industrial crops.

The Central Committee and the Government are aware that fulfilment of the Five-Year Plan in three or four years is bound to raise new problems in the spheres of timely procurement and processing of products, their transportation, sale and so on. Measures are now being taken quickly to expand the capacities of the processing industry and transport and the material-production base of the co-operatives. Numerous specialists have been sent to co-operatives to help build irrigation systems.

A vital factor in the drive to fulfil the Five-Year Plan ahead of schedule is the growing economic might of the socialist world system, the vast fraternal aid of the Soviet Union and the growing mutual aid and co-operation between all the socialist countries.

The call to fulfil the Five-Year Plan in 3 or 4 years has met with a ready response among the workers, co-operators and intellectuals. It has engendered a powerful nationwide movement. Research workers, engineers, technicians, agricultural experts, factory workers and peasant co-operators are discovering and utilizing fresh resources. Better labor organization and technological methods are being introduced; machinery and equipment modernized; measures taken to economize on materials, improve quality and commission new production capacities ahead of schedule. Steps are also being taken to make wider use of local water resources, to drain marshland, improve meadows and pastures, use stable manure, extend the area under perennial crops and improve the care of poultry and cattle.

Naturally, the nationwide drive to fulfil the economic tasks ahead of schedule is not without its difficulties. But these in the main are of a subjective nature. They arise because of misunderstanding of the new tasks and because of bad management. We still have not a few leading Party and Government officials and executives and some workers who fail to see that the task is not simply to overfulfil the plan but to make such a leap in development that every year will, by its results, be the equivalent of several years of gradual development. The new movement is also retarded by a lack of faith on the part of some leaders in the strength of the working people, in the possibility of accomplishing the task; it is retarded, too, by conservatism and bureaucracy. Persuasion and widespread explanatory work are the chief means of getting over these difficulties.

The Party's organizational and political work, and the press and radio, are now centered on removing these obstacles, on overcoming conservative and backward methods and norms and on drawing all the working people into the drive to fulfil the economic tasks ahead of schedule.

The Party leadership—from Political Bureau to branch secretary—is participating in the organizational and political work in order to give free rein to popular initiative and activity and to extend the movement as widely as possible.

The working people are well aware that fulfilment of the Five-Year Plan in 3-4 years will result in a substantial increase in income and pave the way for a considerable rise in living and cultural standards. This makes them work with increased vigor for overfulfilment of the plan.

The dimensions of the popular movement led by the Communist Party give grounds for believing that in the next few years Bulgaria will succeed in making the planned leap and, by doing so, make her contribution to the victory of the socialist world system in its competition with the capitalist world.

M. GRIGOROV
Secretary of the Central Committee,
Bulgarian Communist Party

Eleventh Congress of the Chilean Communist Party

THE Eleventh Congress of the Chilean Communist Party, attended by over 300 delegates, took place in the Conference Hall of the National Congress in Santiago in mid-November. For the first time after eleven difficult years of underground struggle the Communists again met legally to discuss the burning problems of the Party and the ways and means of implementing the Program adopted at the 1956 Congress. The Congress was opened by Elias Lafertte, and in addition to delegates from fraternal parties of Latin America and Europe, leaders of the parties affiliated to the Popular Action Front were present at the opening. The Congress demonstrated the cohesion and the growing activity of the Party. It was preceded by 1,500 branch meetings and 159 district and 25 regional conferences.

The report on the work of the Central Committee, delivered by Luiz Corvalan, Secretary-General, reviewed the valiant struggle waged by the people and the Party in recent years and mapped out new tasks.

Jose Hernandez, member of the political commission of the Central Committee, spoke on the organizational, ideological and political strengthening of the Party and its mass work. He reported that the Galo Gonsalez Enrolment (announced in March 1958) had more than doubled the membership.

After regaining legal status the question arose of revising the Rules adopted at the Tenth Congress, held when the Party was underground. Elias Lafertte reported on the amendments aimed at strengthening inner-Party discipline, collective leadership and extending contacts with the masses. The section on probationers, which had the effect of impeding the growth of the Party, was left out, the section dealing with sympathizers was extended and the scale of membership dues reduced. With a view to enhancing revolutionary vigilance, control

commissions under the auspices of the regional Party committees will be set up. Special attention was devoted to the factory branches. The leading body of the Party will now have, in addition to full members of the Central Committee, alternate members.

Factory and office workers, intellectuals and dozens of delegates from the recently formed Party organizations in the countryside took part in the four-day discussion. Some of the delegates employed on nearby estates had to leave the sessions earlier so that they could get home before the landlord closed the gates. Delegates from the Indian communities spoke of the privations and struggle of their people in Coquimbo, in the Central Valley and in the Indian South.

At the closing session Orlando Millas, member of the political commission, on behalf of the Central Committee summed up the work of the Congress which unanimously endorsed the Party Program and elected the central bodies. The first meeting of the new Central Committee re-elected Elias Lafertte and Luiz Corvalan chairman and secretary-general of the Party respectively.

Keynote of the Congress was unity and unshakable fidelity to Marxism-Leninism. The Congress associated itself with the other Communist parties in condemning Yugoslav revisionism and denounced the revisionist tendencies that had appeared recently in the Party and were reflected in the demand that it should not contest the presidential elections since this might "irritate the bourgeoisie." The attempts made by vacillating elements to stress the antagonisms between the working class and the national bourgeoisie and to regard as secondary the basic antagonism with U.S. imperialism were strongly rebutted.

In view of the formation of the reactionary Jorge Alesandri government the Congress advanced the task of consolidating all forces, including the Popular Action Front and the centrist parties, in the struggle for broader democracy and popular rights, for a higher standard of living and measures to reduce unemployment, protection of the country's resources, above all oil, from encroachments by foreign monopolies and for multilateral economic, cultural and diplomatic relations. The Congress set as the primary task the drawing of the working people into the trade unions and consolidation of the worker-peasant alliance.

The delegate from Mejillones expressed the opinion of all when he said: "We must work more among the masses. If I bring a tree into the house it will cease to grow and wither. But if I plant it outside, in the fresh air and sunshine, it will thrive."

The Hungarian People Vote for the Policy of the Party

THE political aim of the elections to the State Assembly and the local councils in the Hungarian People's Republic was to strengthen people's rule. This aim has been achieved. People's rule has been strengthened and, after the counter-revolution, the consolidation of the forces of the people has been completed, both formally and as a fact.

The elections proved that the Party's policy during the past two years, which has secured a considerably higher standard of living, eliminated the distortions so harmful to the peasants' interests and re-established socialist law, is based on the unity of the whole people. The working class unanimously supports this policy, with the result that it now feels itself much more the master of the land. First and foremost the Party relies upon the working class and one of its constant concerns is to improve conditions for the workers. The working class marked the elections by new successes and fulfilment of production plans.

The peasants—members of the producer co-operatives and individual tillers—also voted "FOR." During the election campaign, the Party and the Fatherland Front left no doubts that they fully supported the development of agriculture along co-operative lines. It is a fact that many individual tillers still hesitate and cannot make up their minds about joining the co-operatives. But they feel certain that no one will force them to do this against their will, and appreciate that the co-operative movement is a purely voluntary one. The peasants now understand that the future of the countryside lies in socialism. And though many are still holding back they no longer recoil from the thought of the co-operatives.

The election results have further consolidated the worker-peasant alliance.

The intellectuals also voted "FOR." Their aims, plans, worries and problems link them to the Party. They are asking for more laboratories, school equipment and other facilities, and this is in line with the strivings of people and Party, the plans for continued construction of socialism.

The past mistakes caused confusion among the intellectuals, but they were shaken even more by

the counter-revolutionary terror of 1956. Time has shattered the petty-bourgeois illusions harbored by some of the intellectuals who dreamed of "class peace," and has given them an object lesson in imperialism's unrestrained brutality and the revisionists' base betrayal of the interests of their people and country.

Our intelligentsia now holds another opinion on the nature and significance of the errors committed, and declares unequivocally that the Hungarian People's Republic has, nevertheless, tremendous achievements to its credit and that, thanks to the dictatorship of the proletariat, Hungary is now an industrially-developed country in which a national cultural revolution is taking place, in which life has taken a turn for the better. They are convinced that the mistakes did not stem from the essence of the Party's policy, or the tasks of socialist construction, and note with satisfaction that dogmatism has now no place in Party practice. No small role was played by the discussion of the Party's policy in the field of culture. Many fundamental questions were cleared up during these frank and sincere talks, many doubts dispelled and new contacts, based on mutual respect, established.

Some intellectuals still have reservations on particular questions, but, in the main, they agree with the Party on all important problems of socialist construction, resolutely oppose capitalism, condemn the counter-revolution and participate actively in peaceful, constructive labor.

The working people as a whole are feeling the beneficial effects of the Party's policy.

And the people have also learned more about the so-called Western prosperity. The Western "democratic" countries did the agitational work for them. Nearly forty thousand sincere Hungarians who, in October 1956, found themselves in the West, enticed there by irresponsible promises, have now returned home. Bitterly disappointed and ashamed of their credulity, they are now convincingly exposing the "delights of the Western way of life." Their words find confirmation in the letters of tens of thousands of refugees expressing the wish to return home.

Whom did the people put forward as their candidates? Communists and non-party people who had stood the test of the 1956 counter-revolution and have unswervingly and consistently pursued our Party's policy—a policy that reflects the interests of the people. All the members of the outgoing State Assembly qualifying under these counts were re-elected. The members not returned were those who failed in fulfilling their duties, who, over the past few years, did not steadfastly uphold the dictatorship of the proletariat, made concessions to revisionism, vacillated in time of trouble and supported sectarianism.

Parliament now has more worker deputies; the composition of the State Assembly is as follows: 169 workers, 75 land workers (both members of producer co-operatives and individual tillers), 78 professional workers, 16 office employees and others.

Among them are representatives of the Church, many non-Party people, and ex-leaders and members of the former political parties. The composition truly reflects the unity that has now been established among the people on the basis of the Party's policy.

The working people, through their vote, have confirmed their friendship with the Soviet Union, their adherence to the socialist camp and their loyalty to the principles of proletarian internationalism. The hostile anti-Soviet instigations have had the reverse of the desired effect. It was precisely October 1956 that showed to all who was friend and who the enemy. The people saw that the Soviet Union defends the independent national existence of Hungary even at the cost of heavy losses to itself. Proletarian internationalism, fraternal solidarity of the people building socialism and their disinterested aid were felt with exceptional force in Hungary.

It is characteristic that even the Western capitalist press was unable to by-pass the election results.

Over 60 foreign journalists, including about 20 from Western news agencies and newspapers, reported the elections. Nothing was concealed from them either in the course of the campaign or during the voting. They were free to go wherever they wished, see what they wanted to see and speak to whoever they desired.

The pre-election atmosphere was calm, relaxed, and there was no demagogy about the meetings; most of them turned into talks, i.e., gatherings where leaders and rank-and-file, Party and non-Party people, exchanged views. The people were impressed by the fact that there was no ballyhoo about the election campaign, there was absolute frankness, and the agitation was not over their heads. Ordinary people said: "We are not casting our votes for promises, but for results." "The work of two years has won and justified itself, the Party doesn't need a lot of noisy electioneering."

There was no duress, each could exercise his right to vote, but none was under compulsion to do so.

Foreign correspondents saw for themselves that every polling station had separate booths, each supplied with pencils in case the elector wished to make any changes in the list or vote against. The use of sealed envelopes and urns guaranteed secrecy. The gay crowds chatted and sang in the streets and at the polling stations. In all some 416,000 people—65 per cent non-Party—helped

throughout the country at the polling stations or acted as tellers and served on other committees.

There was not a single organized hostile provocation; the forces of reaction were isolated, demoralized, incapacitated.

The pre-election campaign and the elections were fully constitutional, met the requirements of law and in all respects manifested the far-reaching democracy of our people's-democratic system.

It is to the credit of some bourgeois journalists that they wrote objectively about the calm and free atmosphere, the abundance of goods in the shops and the increasing well-being, and made a point of the confidence reposed by the people in the Party and Government, although they denied that proletarian rule was democratic. In their view there was nationwide voting but no election in Hungary. They claimed that there could only be elections where several parties contested seats. Yes, our election was also nationwide voting for the Party's policy and socialism, and the electorate gave free expression to its will. As far as the candidates are concerned, the voters had every opportunity to discuss their relative merits and of choosing the most reliable champions of their interests.

Forty-five per cent of the electorate attended the pre-election meetings which nominated the candidates, who were only placed on the list by the decision of the meeting. Of the more than 100,000 candidates for the urban and rural councils, 5,458 proposed by local bodies were rejected, and the electors nominated others. Ninety-one candidates to local bodies failed to secure election, and additional elections will be held in these districts. The democracy of our electoral system and regime was not disputed, but, on the contrary, found confirmation in the fact that the approximately three million voters who attended the election meetings did not nominate a single former landowner, banker or exploiter.

And it is precisely for this reason that the Western propagandists do not like the democracy of our electoral system.

The election took place two years after the imperialists unleashed their counter-revolutionary putsch. At that time about 70 small parties sprang up, and each of them, no matter what it called itself, had the same objective on the question of power—the major question—and that was, to wrest it from the workers, destroy the socialist system and re-establish capitalism. But the Hungarian people will not allow this question to become an issue, for the problem has been solved once and for all. Wise with the experience of combating counter-revolution, our people have matured politically. The election results are convincing proof of this.

We had no particular election slogans, neither did we proclaim a new program. On the contrary, what we said was: "Citizens, vote for the policy pursued by our Party and Government since November 4, 1956, a policy which, in effect, is the one the party has been conducting since the liberation." This policy has now become the people's program. The allegation that the revolutionary worker-peasant government merely represents the views of a "group" are false and absurd, and the elections exploded this falsehoood.

A broad unity of the people within the framework of the Fatherland Front, led by the Socialist Workers' Party, has emerged out of the struggle to implement the policy of the Party and Government. The 6,500,000 votes cast on November 16 testify to this unity.

Our enemies hypocritically lament that this policy does not guarantee the country's independence, although, as the whole world knows, it was they who, relying on their accomplices within the country, threatened our independence in 1956, and are now inspiring new provocations against us. The election results attest that the Hungarian people firmly reject all interference, whether under U.N. auspices or not, in their domestic affairs. With the help of the Soviet Union and the entire socialist camp, our people are consolidating their socialist state, safeguarding the sovereignty of People's Hungary.

In the election campaign the enemy found himself completely isolated: 99.6 per cent of the electorate voted for the Fatherland Front candidates.

The people expressed their complete confidence in the policy pursued by our Party and Government and have empowered them to continue it. They approve our firmness in wiping out the counter-revolutionary forces, our relentless struggle against revisionist ideas and against dogmatism. They approve also the fact that in the past two years we have spoken frankly of our difficulties, have been boldly overcoming them, and consistently pursuing a policy in keeping with the interests of the people.

The ideological, political and organizational unity of our Party gained strength during the electoral campaign, the militancy of our organizations and the activity of the Party membership grew, and the Party's ties with the masses became stronger.

The splendid election results give us no right, however, to rest on our laurels. They do not mean that we have solved all our problems, that every difficulty has been overcome. There are still grave shortcomings in the work of our Party and Government bodies. Our leaders and the masses spoke of these frankly, both before and during the election campaign. We shall try to bring non-Party people

still closer to our Party by improving the style and methods of the Party work. We hold that it is just as important to lend an ear to the opinions of non-Party people after the elections, and to make still greater efforts to draw them into state management.

The election results will promote socialist construction which our people will carry out still more resolutely and faster.

ISTVAN SZIRMAI,
Member, Central Committee,
Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party.

Short Notices

Austria

A VISIT TO CZECH FRIENDS

LAST autumn 2,046 members of the Austrian Communist Party spent a couple of days in 53 towns and rural districts of Czechoslovakia with a view to familiarizing themselves with the problems of socialist construction and the life of the working people. Among them were hundreds of members of factory committees and municipalities. They toured factories, agricultural co-operatives and various institutions. About 75 per cent of the Austrian comrades put up at the homes of Communist workers and intellectuals, and this enabled them to get a better knowledge of the every-day life of the working people and to make friends with them.

This visit proved most instructive to both the Austrian and Czech comrades. The visitors were able to see for themselves the achievements of the fraternal Communist Party. They took back with them telling facts and new arguments which would help in their day-to-day Party work. They told their Czech friends about life in capitalist Austria, which is far from being the "paradise" of bourgeois propaganda, and the Communists of Czechoslovakia were able to compare the economic position of their socialist country with that of their capitalist neighbor.

The talks, during which members of both Parties exchanged views on the situation and experiences in solving the problems of their countries, proved particularly interesting.

The guests were most impressed by the cordiality and hospitality accorded them by the Czech and Slovak people.

The visit served to strengthen proletarian internationalism and the fraternal ties between the two parties.

Argentina

MARXIST-LENINIST EDUCATION

WITH the spread of the democratic liberation movement in Argentina, the ranks of the Communist Party are growing rapidly. Thousands of railwaymen, textile workers, metal-workers, builders and workers from other trades, intellectuals and housewives, are joining the Party. The Party organization in the capital registered 10,000 new members in 1958. Hence Party education is most important, for we must help the new members to acquire a knowledge of Marxist-Leninist theory.

Numerous classes — the first stage of Party education — have been arranged and will study the international situation and the Communists' tasks in the fight for peace and national independence. The home situation and the solutions advanced by the Party are discussed in broad outline; the building of a national-democratic front is one of the main topics. One class deals with the functions of a Party branch.

These classes aim to equip the members with an understanding of the role of the Party, the importance of unity of will and action, the duties of members and other basic points of the Party Program, tactics and Rules.

A large edition of the study-outline for the classes has been published as an aid to propagandists.

Party journals and newspapers carry articles on these subjects and excerpts from the classics of Marxism-Leninism. On the occasion of the 41st anniversary of the October Revolution, *Nueva Era*, the Party's theoretical organ, carried a column with maps, diagrams and illustrations on the theme of "41 years of rapid growth of socialism and the world crisis of imperialism."

Alongside a network of elementary Party schools we are organizing independent study of Marxist-

Leninist theory. The Party education commissions of the provincial (regional) committees are arranging three-year courses for students of theory. The syllabus includes political economy, the fundamentals of Marxist philosophy and problems of tactics. Lenin's "What is to Be Done?" "Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution," " 'Left-Wing Communism,' an Infantile Disorder" are studied. The students are given a syllabus with advice on the method of studying these works; they attend lectures and meet once a month at group consultations where their questions are answered, and take part in talks. There are usually about ten to twelve people in a group.

Local (district) Party committees also arrange courses of this type. In Buenos Aires Province they cater for more than 300 members, among whom are many workers. If a Party member is unable to attend the group consultations he is mailed the material and a meeting is arranged with his tutor. Many of the comrades who have completed these courses function as tutors, speak in the Party organizations and deliver public lectures.

So great is the interest displayed in the study of Marxism-Leninism that trade union leaders—non-Communists and rank-and-file workers—often ask local Party organizations for help in studying the Marxist-Leninist classics.

Venezuela

A PUBLIC REPORT ON UNDERGROUND ACTIVITIES

THE overthrow in January 1958 of dictator Perez Jiménez, stooge of U.S. imperialism, ended the almost eight years of underground activities by the Communist Party of Venezuela. Since then the ranks of the Party have grown rapidly and its activities evoke increasing interest. At the same time the anti-Communist campaign is being stepped up, and the reactionaries are playing their old record—accusing the Party of being "unpatriotic."

The exhibition of illegal publications arranged by the Communist Party and the Young Communist League in one of the largest exhibition halls of the capital was a fitting reply to these slanders. It was timed to open on the Young Communist League's 11th anniversary and developed into a kind of public report of the Communists' glorious activities during the years of illegality.

The many visitors saw, among others, newspapers such as *Acero* (Steel), *Patria Nueva* (New Fatherland), *Joven Guardia* (Young Guard). The journal *Amistad* (Friendship) attracted widespread attention. During the years of trouble and terror it told the people the truth about the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies. In addition to publications put out by the Party printshop there were on view numerous newspapers, leaflets and proclamations which had been mimeographed or simply copied by hand. Considerable interest was also displayed in the outlines for political study groups which were printed in brevier type.

Possession of illegal literature during the fascist dictatorship was punishable by death, so many papers were burnt after being read. Many editions were destroyed during searches and arrests. No copies of the hand-written papers issued by political prisoners in jails and concentration camps have been preserved.

Only the joint publications of the Party, the Youth League and youth committees were exhibited. But separate Party papers and journals summoning the people to fight the North American oil monopolies and their henchman Perez Jiménez, were also published. The Party's central organ *Tribuna Popular*, a 12-16-page daily, appeared on February 17, 1948, (the Sunday circulation was in the neighborhood of 22,000); 550 issues were published legally. The censorship suppressed the paper seven times until finally, in May 1950, it was banned altogether. But eight days later the first illegal issue appeared, reporting the arrest of 6,457 strikers. The circulation of 4,000 during 1955-56 rose to 8,000 in 1957. The paper was kept going by collections and was published by a small group in an underground printshop. It had voluntary contributors all over the country and kept its readers regularly informed on major events at home and abroad.

Many Communist newspapers such as *Estrella Roja* (Red Star) in the capital and Cabimas, *La Cispa* (Spark) in Anzoategui, *Tribuna* in El Tigre, *Marina Roja* (Red Fleet) in Zulia, *Combate* in San Tomé, *Hoz y Martillo* (Hammer and Sickle) in Lagunillas, *El Organizador* (Organizer) in the Federal district, *Triuchera Popular* (People's Trenches) in Lidice, *Paz* (Peace) in Valera and others, also did their bit in mobilizing the masses for the overthrow of the pro-imperialist regime.

Yellow with age, these publications attest to the heroic struggle waged by the Communists of Venezuela for democratic rights, the sovereignty of their country and its socialist morrow. The exhibition makes a lasting impression. A visitor expressed the general opinion when he said: "The passion, risk, ardent love for freedom and heroism in every line of these exhibits are immeasurable."

Canada

FIGHTING THE REVISIONIST-TROTSKYITE BLOC

HAVING suffered a crushing defeat at the Sixth Convention of the Labor-Progressive Party of Canada, the revisionists, in conjunction with Trotskyites and an anti-Party group of bourgeois nationalists, are trying to knock together a new political party.

The National Executive Committee (Political Bureau), in addition to other measures for drawing Communists into actively combating revisionists of all hues, has circulated a letter to the Party membership calling upon them to expose this unprincipled alliance which is based on the struggle against Marxism-Leninism and socialism, while covering itself with the mantle of Marxism.

The letter warns that "in Canada there is a very serious tendency to ignore the activities of this Trotskyite group. Many of our comrades assume that, because the group commands limited support, it is not necessary to combat its anti-Communist activities. This attitude is completely erroneous. It is quite clear now that the anti-Communist groups are receiving direction on an international scale. They are joining forces on the completely unprincipled basis of opposition to the Soviet Union, that is, in fact, against the socialist world system."

The letter goes on to say that this revisionist-Trotskyite activity is "the Canadian aspect of attempts being made by heterogeneous elements in several countries. The leaders of the Yugoslav League of Communists are trying hard to create at least an appearance of worldwide support for their anti-Leninist, anti-socialist position. They want to claim organized support in a number of countries for their mish-mash of brazen revisionism and double-talk. Their position is quite acceptable to the United States government . . ."

Continuing, the letter calls upon the Party members to develop a militant ideological offensive against the revisionists. The Party press shows where the class roots of opportunism lie; how the right and left variants of opportunism objectively serve the same ends and, eventually, join forces to fight Marxism-Leninism and socialism and so enter the slippery path leading to renegacy.

The Party has come out of these struggles stronger, with a leadership and membership whose understanding of the principles and method of Marxism-Leninism has been greatly strengthened, and with a deeper appreciation of the need to combine the concreteness of Canadian reality with the general laws of the struggle against capitalism and for socialism, which are common to all countries.

The letter expresses confidence that the new attacks of the Trotskyites and revisionists against Marxism-Leninism will be defeated.

Korean People's Democratic Republic

MASS MOVEMENT FOR UNTAPPED RESERVES

ALL organizations of the Party of Labor have discussed a letter adopted at the September plenary meeting of the Central Committee. It calls on Party members and all working people to step up activity and give free rein to initiative in seeking new ways of developing the country's productive forces.

A decision adopted by the meeting calls for irrigating 70 per cent of the cultivated land within the next two or three years, including rice-fields and arid land. In a country where arable land is limited and severe droughts are common, the Party's program for transforming nature will mean a big leap in agricultural producton. An output of more than seven million tons of grain is envisaged for the near future.

The second task set by the meeting was development of the iron and steel industry. The foundations will be laid for a solid material base which, in the next four to five years, should ensure a production of over four million tons of pig-iron and from three to three-and-a-half million tons of steel. With this aim in view iron and steel plants and ore-mines will be re-equipped and time schedules cut for building new enterprises. The nationwide movement for economizing on metal is acquiring tremendous importance.

These tasks have aroused enthusiasm among the people, and many proposals are being advanced at Party and public meetings. Workers' suggestions for the mechanization and automation of production processes, the introduction of advanced labor methods, and improving skills, will make it possible to double or treble productivity at many plants and mines and to overfulfil the 1959 plan by at least 100 per cent without increasing manpower. Managerial staffs are being cut extensively and office workers are volunteering for industry. A mass movement for innovations has been launched at the factories, and a struggle against conservatism, apathy and stagnation is under way.

The building of socialism is advancing rapidly: the urgent need of the moment is to modernize the enterprises and accelerate the tempo of socialist construction. The Party organizations are concentrating on solving this task.

Portugal

FREE ALVARO CUNHAL!

FOR ten years Alvaro Cunhal, member of the Central Committee of the Portuguese Communist Party (a member of the Secretariat before his arrest), has been languishing in a fascist torture-chamber. In January 1957 his term of imprisonment expired, but under the "security measures" he will have to serve another three years.

Alvaro Cunhal has been an active fighter for peace and socialism all his life. As a member of the Communist Youth League he participated in student actions, courageously upholding the interests of his fellow-students who held him in high esteem. Arrested when in the last year of the faculty of law, he graduated with honors, having prepared for the finals in prison.

Upon his release in 1940, Alvaro Cunhal immediately resumed revolutionary work. The leaders of the Party, including Benito Gonsalvez, were then in prison. Adventurists and provocateurs had worked their way into the leadership. Together with other loyal comrades Cunhal purged and reorganized the Party. In 1942 he was elected to the Secretariat of the C.C. in which he worked until his arrest in 1949.

At the trial in May 1950 he ably rebutted the charges made against him and the Party by the fasicsts. His speech from the dock, known to the people and published in the journals of a number of fraternal parties, was an indictment of fascism.

He exposed the vile actions of the secret police. Speaking of the staunchness of the Communists who had fallen into the clutches of the enemy, he stressed that the Communist Party was a school of political education, of molding will, courage and fidelity to the people.

The reactionaries, he said, act in unison throughout the world, and the Communist Party should, therefore, establish contacts with all fraternal parties in order to uphold peace and national independence. He laid bare the aggressive designs of NATO, of which Portugal is a member, and declared that, in the event of the imperialists succeeding in unleashing war against the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies, then "the people of Portugal, in the interests of the independence, freedom, welfare and future of thir country, will not fight against their best friends and allies."

At that time the calls made for the release of Alvaro Cunhal did not prevent the severe sentence. Now that his term of imprisonment has long expired, an appeal is being circulated in the country demanding "freedom for Alvaro Cunhal or at least permission to live abroad." The appeal has been signed by, among others, 92 prominent lawyers, writers, professors, former ministers and deputies, journalists and army officers—people of diverse political views and religious beliefs. It is meeting with the support of all working people.

Progressives all over the world support and sympathize with the Portuguese people fighting for the release of their faithful son from the fascist torture-chamber.

Federal Republic of Germany

CALL FOR UNITY

IN connection with the fortieth anniversary of the November Revolution, a plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany adopted the following appeal to the members and functionaries of the Social Democratic Party:

"Let us reach out our hands to each other and fulfil the behests of the best fighters of the German working class! Let us join efforts in winning peace and democracy!

"Tell the SDPG leadership that you emphatically insist on combating atomic armament and imperialism and will never agree to support the policy of the Christian Democratic Union! Stand firm by the principle proclaimed by Bebel: 'Not a single man or farthing for this system!'

"Young workers, young Socialists!

"Do not volunteer for the Bundeswehr! Let your slogan be: *uncompromising struggle against militarism, down with conscription!*

"Social Democrats!

"Demand rejection of the fatal collaboration with the militarists, of the pernicious anti-Communist witch-hunt! You will then, with still greater force, be able to counteract the menace of atomic death, militarization and fascization. And this will add to the influence exerted by the peace forces and, not least, by the Social-Democratic working people, as well as their political say in the decisive problems of our time. Discuss our proposals and those of the Socialist Unity Party on how to reach mutual understanding in the working class and its organizations! Rise in joint struggle, for by joining our forces we shall defeat our enemies!

"We appeal to the members and functionaries of our own Party:

"In the present conditions we must, now more than ever before, continue to try to establish broader contact with Social Democratic workers and functionaries. But we must not, because of the SDPG Right-wing leadership's stand, depart one iota from our Party's general line, or slacken our fight for working-class unity of action. For it is only through the co-operation and joint struggle of the working class and all peace-loving forces

against the common enemy—aggressive monopolies, militarists and atom-bomb politicians—that we can secure peace and the national regeneration of Germany!"

Japan

DIFFERENT FORMS OF WORK AMONG THE MASSES

SINCE its Seventh Congress the Communist Party of Japan has stepped up its work among the masses. It is conducting this work in a variety of ways and spreading its ideas among different sections of the people. A number of departments have been set up to replace the former Central Committee Mass Movement Department: a trade union department, a department for work among the peasants, departments for activities among youth, students and women. Much importance is attached to Party work among the non-trade unionists in the small factories and among handicraftsmen. The Central Committee has assigned organizers to give practical help to the Party branches in the big industrial centers and has pin-pointed a group of districts in which it is most important to extend Party work among the peasants.

The three C.C. plenary meetings held since the Party Congress, discussed the question of mass work. The last meeting reviewed the problems facing the labor movement and discussed the report on Party work among students and measures to ensure better guidance of the students' movement. The meeting recognized the need for Party organizations to take a more active part in the election campaign for the House of Councillors and local government bodies.

The Communist Party is launching a big campaign in support of the movement for the acquittal of those sentenced under the "Matsukawa case." It has worked out slogans formulating the pressing demands of the people and showing how to unite the democratic forces. Among them are demands for the resignation of the reactionary Kishi cabinet; revision of the "peace treaty" and rejection of the "security pact" imposed on Japan by the American imperialists; the closing of military bases; the annulment of the Japan-Chiang Kai-shek agreement, and the establishment of diplomatic relations with the Government of People's China; raising the standard of living of the workers and peasants, struggle against the elements hindering the unity of all progressive forces and for a national-democratic united front and a government of this front.

The slogans are being discussed on a nationwide scale.

Exchange of Views

"Modern Forms and Methods of Exploitation in Capitalist Enterprises"

An exchange of views between Marxists from European, American and Asian countries took place at the end of 1958 in the Gramsci Institute in Rome.

Among those present were Comrades: L. Hornik and F. Margulies (Austria); M. Drumaux (Belgium); H. Horne (Britain); H. Schreiner and W. Mehlis (Federal Republic of Germany); M. Alicata, L. Barca, L. Gruppi, B. Manzocchi, M. Pirola, R. Spesso, M. Spinella, B. Trentin, F. Ferri, A. Dina (Italy); A. Dewhurst (Canada); V. Porkkala, S. Taisto (Finland); M. Dufriche (France); K. Tell nd J. O. Zenstrom (Sweden); I. Yonehara and S. Takahara (Japan). Comrades who were not granted visas: P. G. Alberdi (Argentina), G. Morris (USA) and A. Rumyantsev (USSR), submitted written reports.

The agenda contained an item ON THE THEORIES AND PRACTICE OF SO-CALLED HUMAN RELATIONS UNDER CAPITALISM. In the course of the discussion, however, the speakers touched upon a much wider range of problems bearing on the conditions and the struggle of the working class in the capitalist countries.

The Editorial Board of World Marxist Review: Problems of Peace and Socialism wishes to thank the Gramsci Institute for having placed at its disposal the materials of the meetings, which have been used in the following review of some of the forms of exploitation and the methods used by the monopolies against the labor movement.

The exchange of views demonstrated the keen interest shown by Marxists in all countries in the new problems of the working class struggle. Taking into account the wishes of those present at the meeting, who pointed out that a number of questions had not been sufficiently dealt with either at the conference or in Marxist publications, the Editorial Board invites theorists in the Communist Parties and other activists in the labor movement to join in the further elaboration of the issues, for which purpose it will gladly provide space in this journal.

Why the Bourgeoisie Resorts to New Forms of Exploitation

DEVELOPMENTS in the capitalist countries show that the monopoly capitalists are resorting to new forms of exploitation, to new methods of struggle against the working class and its organizations, and that this struggle is being waged on political, ideological, economic and social lines.

Mario Alicata, member of the Italian Communist Party leadership and Conference chairman, spoke of the varied forms and the complex nature of the monopolies' offensive, of the extent and diversity of their activities. He pointed out that in examining the new phenomena of capitalist society, Marxist-Leninists should not confine themselves to general statements, but should make a thorough and concrete analysis of the processes taking place, and thus enable Party members to wage an effective theoretical and practical fight.

The complex of monopoly capital's practice and bourgeois theories, known as "human relations," is now one of the most widespread forms of the struggle waged by the monopolies against the working class.

In the new conditions in which capitalism finds itself, accompanied as they are by a series of factors, among them the existence of a powerful socialist camp, a socialist world market, the considerable technological progress made by capitalist industry and the growth of the working-class

movement, the monopolies are seeking new means and ways of preserving their domination, of intensifying exploitation. By introducing new technology, and using new and complex methods of labor organization, the capitalists are striving to intensify the speed-up and add to their profits. To disguise their aims and get the workers 'interested" in higher productivity, the capitalists resort to economic, social, "public", cultural and sports measures, etc. In this indirect form the workers receive a part of their wages—a sort of "payment in kind".

Speakers said that a distinction should be made between the "traditional" paternalism (the old capitalist policy of "the stick and the carrot," which means in fact the corruption and bribery of some strata of the working class) and the current "human relations." In applying the latter method the *main* emphasis is laid on the *utmost development* of the worker's *"initiative"*, on influencing *all aspects* of his life. They want the worker to do a better job, to "win" him to the employer's side. As things are, the bourgeoisie cannot hope to attain their aims (maximum profit, undermine the workers' class consciouness) solely through the old paternalism and the usual ways of exploiting the working class. They have no option but to resort to subterfuge, to new methods of exploitation, to the method of "human relations", without in any way relinquishing their paternalism.

In analyzing the motives underlying the "human relations"— the factors associated with internal development of the capitalist countries — a distinction should be made, in the view of M. Alicata, L. Barca, B. Trentin and other speakers, between the results of objective and subjective factors. The former include the definite objective processes now taking place in capitalist production such as technological changes (automation etc.) and the consequent changes in organization of production and payment of labor with the object of obtaining maximum profits; hence the new forms of exploitation in the enterprises. Among the subjective factors mention was made of the new tactics adopted by the bourgeoisie in relation to the working people and the labor movement generally.

Speakers showed how in present-day conditions the bourgeoisie use a variety of methods in combating the labor movement, including violence, concessions and reforms.

Speaking of the changes in bourgeois tactics, Lenin pointed out: "If the bourgeoisie's tactics were always the same, or at least always uniform, the working class would soon learn to answer them by similar or uniform tactics. As a matter of fact, the bourgeoisie in all countries inevitably works out two systems of management, two methods of upholding its interests and maintaining its domination; and what is more, these two methods either replace one another or are combined in a variety of ways. First and foremost is the method of violence, the method of refusing to make any concessions to the working-class movement, the method of clinging to all the old and obsolete institutions, the method of obdurately denying the need for reforms. . . . The second method is the method of 'liberalism', of steps towards political rights, towards reform, concessions, and so forth." (*Works*, Russ. Ed., Vol. 16, page 320.)

The present forms of monopoly capital's struggle against the working-class movement in France, West Germany, Italy, the USA, Japan and other countries show that use is made of different combinations of these two methods of attack on the working class and its organizations. Schreiner, Yonehara, Takahara, Tell and other speakers pointed out that the growing pressure of the monopolies on the working class is manifested in administrative repressions. At the same time the ruling circles in a number of capitalist countries resort to social demagogy with the aim of deceiving the working masses and camouflaging the new forms of exploitation and the new methods of bolstering capitalist rule.

Explaining this phenomenon, speakers noted that in the eyes of the working people the power of attraction of the socialist countries is growing. M. Drumaux, L. Hornik, H. Schreiner and others underlined the significance of the socialist achievements for the working-class movement in the capitalist countries. Hornik stated that thanks to the existence of the socialist camp many workers no longer believed in the myth that the capitalists were indispensable. The working class in the socialist countries has proved that not only can the proletariat do without the capitalists, it runs things infinitely better without them.

In the capitalist countries the working masses are becoming more and more convinced that it is only under socialism, under the production relations of the socialist system, that genuine human relations in society as a whole and in the enterprises take shape. This principle is emphasized in A. Rumyantsev's report. The equality of people in socialist society is due to such important factors as the public ownership of the means of production; the emancipation of all working people from exploitation, unemployment and other evils of capitalism; the equal right and duty of all to work according to ability and to receive according to work. Under socialism all enjoy the same right to run the state, to education, leisure and rest, old age pensions and sickness benefits, to enjoy the benefits and treasures of culture.

The "secret" of the grand economic, technological, scientific and other achievements of the socialist countries, which now astonish (and terrify) the enemies of socialism, is to be sought ultimately in the new attitude towards labor, in its being regarded as the vital concern of each and all.

One of the aims of "human relations" is that *the capitalists, in the endeavor to strengthen their worsening positions in the economic competition with socialism, seek for new "stimuli" to "enthuse" the workers and raise productivity.* The monopolists try *to make it appear that under capitalism not less, but even more, concern is displayed for the workers than in the socialist countries.*

Some exponents of "human relations" and "social partnership" admit that the measures advocated by them have been engendered by the rapid progress of the socialist world. The views expressed in *Social Partnership Instead of Class Struggle,* a book recently published in the German Federal Republic, are typical. Its author, a West-German capitalist by the name of Spindler, operates a "social partnership" policy at his works and frankly owns that his system is designed to "set up a barrier against the Bolshevik menace from the East."

One of the main objects of "human relations", it was noted in the exchange of views, is to *weaken the organized labor movement, to paralyze the influence of the Communist parties and trade unions.*

Reports by B. Trentin and R. Spesso, G. Morris, I. Yonehara and S. Takahara, and the speeches by A. Dewhurst, M. Spinella and others, stressed that the employers aim at depriving the trade unions of the functions of collective representation, at smashing the workers' unity, undermining trade union and political rights in the factories.

The monopoly bourgeoisie aims—and this is one of the major goals of "human relations" — at *intensified exploitation of the working class by increasing relative surplus value, and greater intensity of labor.* This idea was the subject of reports by A. Rumyantsev, P. Alberdi, I. Yonehara and S. Takahara, and the speeches by M. Spinella and other comrades.

Many spokesmen of monopoly capitalism make no attempt to conceal that their main objective in introducing "human relations" into industry is to get greater output per worker and maximum profit. Henry Ford II said in an address: "If we can solve the problem of human relations in industrial production, I believe we can make as much progress towards lower costs during the next 10 years as we made during the past quarter century through the machinery of mass-production. . . . In industrial human relations, then, we have a new and relatively unexplored frontier. And beyond this frontier lie opportunities perhaps greater than any of us can imagine."

The real aims of "human relations" are given with equal candor by representatives of Japanese monopoly capital, who are quoted in the reports made by I. Yonehara and S. Takahara. Ijiro Nakayama, president of the Central "Labor Relations" Committee, speaking in October 1956 at an extraordinary general meeting of the Japan Federation of Employers' Associations, said:

"Unless the human relations method is introduced in labor-capital relations, Japanese monopolies will never be able to catch up with world technical innovation. So far, questions on collective intervention by state administration or productivity drives within enterprises have been tackled separately, but it is now time to re-examine the whole question with a monistic background centering round HR as a basis of labor-capital relations."

A number of speakers showed that "human relations" methods, if examined from the concrete technical-industrial viewpoint, were in fact a further development of Taylorism, Fordism and other "sweating" systems — *applicable to the new conditions* obtaining in capitalist industry of today in view of mechanization and automation, electronics, atomic power, etc. The "human relations" system is largely tied up with this new stage in the capitalist rationalization of industry.

Referring to the widespread practice of "human relations", "social partnership", "paternalism", and so on, "neo-capitalist" theorists among the bourgeois ideologists and reformist and revisionist elements in the labor movement have proclaimed the approach of a *fundamentally new* epoch in labor-capitalist relations, in capitalist society as a whole. "Marxism," they declare, "has been disproved," and Marx's teaching on the socio-economic essence of capitalism has proved to be "unfounded."

Many *Right-wing Social Democrats* in effect say the same thing, although their attitude and tactics on "human relations" in the different countries have specific features.

Do the monopolists' activities, concealed though they are behind the "human relations" smoke-screen, change the nature of capitalism, its essence as a system of exploitation? To this the speakers gave an unequivocal reply.

"Human Relations" in Practice

THE so-called human relations system which has been introduced into a number of modern capitalist enterprises, introduced to encourage the employer activities: organizational, psychological, economic, "social" and others.

What are the most important aspects of these capitalist activities?

Changes in the System of Wage Payment

One of the pillars of the "human relations" method is the new form of remuneration in capitalist enterprises, introduced to encourage the "initiative" of the workers and secure higher productivity. The changes in industrial organization facilitate the usc of these new wage systems.

As a rule wages now consist of two parts: the fixed wage and the variable part (which includes bonuses). The first part, in a number of countries, is now often less than half the wage. Thus the workers depend largely on bonuses.

In *France*, for instance, as M. Dufriche pointed out, there are now three main categories of bonuses:

1) Individual bonus. This is fixed by the employer with a view, apart from other things, to increasing the number of grades of workers and intensifying competition among them. This makes it more difficult for all the workers of a shop or factory to make joint demands.

2) Collective bonus. This is designed as an incentive to greater productivity by groups of workers and to ensure their "class collaboration" within the factory. A group risks losing its bonus unless every worker turns out the maximum.

3) Differential bonus. This is paid regularly either monthly, quarterly or half-yearly: employers hope by these means to prevent their workers from going on strike.

M. Pirola told the meeting that changes were being made in the wage system of the Fiat Works in Italy, which employs 60,000 persons. There was a tendency to increase that part of the wage which was fixed by the management and to reduce the rates envisaged in the national agreement. A considerable part of the wage paid to the Fiat workers is fixed unilaterally by the board of directors.

The big capitalists are trying to widen the split in the workers' ranks by undermining the unified wage scales, by the policy of differential wages, of increasing the number of grades based on skills and breaking down the workers into small groups. An agreement signed in Federal Germany between the employers and the union embracing textile and clothing workers envisages 21 wage categories. At the SIMCA works in France there are 101 categories. The SOMUA iron and steel works has four basic wage rates for 13 skilled workers of the first grade and seven for 32 skilled workers of the second category. For young workers, women and immigrants the rates are different again. In this way grounds for grievances between the working people are created and their ranks divided.

"Job evaluation," a new system of determining wages, is becoming increasingly widespread in the big capitalist countries. It was first introduced in the USA, whence it spread to other capitalist countries. Under this system, the machine is first examined and its speed ascertained; the worker is also tested to see whether he can operate the machine efficiently; he undergoes a series of tests among which are the following: his power of endurance, rapidity of movement, memory, susceptibility to the influence of his surroundings, will power, thoroughness, sense of responsibility, etc. In some countries "loyalty to the firm" is also a most important factor. Points are given on each count.

What is the purpose of this wage system? Wages are determined arbitrarily by the management. The number of grades is substantially increased, thereby facilitating division among the working people. It becomes more difficult to sign collective agreements by industries, and trade union activities are disrupted. There is a show of a "scientific" approach to wage rates; illusions are sown among the working people as to the employer's "human" and "fair" attitude.

In his report H. Schreiner cited examples of this in the iron and steel industry of West Germany. In 1956, 220,000 out of 260,000 workers in this industry came under the "job evaluation" system. The application of a highly differentiated "system of points" ended in the old wage system being replaced by a whole series of wage rates. At the Huckingen Works (Mannesmann firm) there are 1,200 differently paid jobs for 5,000 workers! This system induces the man on the job to work more quickly and to do more, and hinders collective action for a wage increase.

As many speakers noted, these "incentives," in the guise and in the name of "human relations," have, in the USA, the German Federal Republic, France, Italy, Japan, and other capitalist countries, led to intensified exploitation of the working class, greater intensity of labor and—its inevitable consequence—a higher accident rate.

New Functions of Intermediate Personnel at Enterprises

This "organizational" aspect of "human relations" is most widespread. With the technological advance of capitalist industry definite changes are taking place in the organization of production and in the internal structure of the enterprises. This means that the functions of charge-hands, foremen and shop superintendents, etc., are changing. In their capacity as technical experts these people, because of the growing centralization of production management, are now less important as supervisors of production processes; and their functions are becoming less technical and increasingly disciplinary and political. In addition to their functions in checking up on production fulfilment, the employer tries to use the intermediate personnel as spies.

Their new functions and their training are an important aspect of "human relations." A special method of training "chiefs," known as "TWI"—"Training Within Industry"—has been elaborated in the USA. About three million underwent this training in the U.S. during the Second World War. This method subsequently spread to Britain and other West-European countries. Various categories of "chiefs" and some skilled workers attend the numerous courses for "training industrial personnel."

The Montecatini and Pirelli enterprises (Italy) were cited by M. Pirola in demonstrating what the new functions meant and their effect. At these works the management empowers the intermediate heads to decide such matters as individual allowances, loans to those in need of them and the awarding of bonuses to those who, in their opinion, merit them. Hence these chiefs now perform what in fact are functions of a political and not technical nature. They are in a position to exert moral and material pressure on workers. In this way the capitalists wish to restrict and change the activities of the workers' organizations (internal commissions and trade unions); to get the worker to solve his problems individually and not collectively, and to divide the workers.

In the view of Trentin, Spesso, Spinella and others, training the intermediate personnel in industry to master these new functions is the *main and particularly dangerous* aspect of "human relations."

"Contacts" Between Capitalists and Workers

Among these are: shop meetings, "managerial councils," receptacles for rationalization proposals, publications put out by management, and other measures which are nothing but a travesty of what has been accomplished in the socialist countries.

H. Horne (Britain), M. Pirola and A. Dina (Italy), K. Tell (Sweden), M. Duriche (France), F. Margulies (Austria), I. Yonehara, S. Takahara (Japan) and others described some of these activities.

At the Vauxhall Motor Works in Bedfordshire (*Britain*), a subsidiary of General Motors, so-called "Joint Consultation" machinery has been set up, and a "Management Advisory Committee" established consisting of management and workers' representatives. It has several sub-committees: Suggestions, Personnel and Absentee, etc. The Committee meets monthly and is advisory only.

Various types of factory organizations have been established at the Olivetti factory in Ivrea (*Italy*) which manufactures typewriters and calculating machines and has some 6,000 workers. Through them the employer exerts influence on all aspects of the worker's life. Among these organizations are the "factory commune" (its aim is to replace the trade unions and to weaken their influence), and "works management councils" whose duties, in fact, are limited to philanthropic measures.

Under the slogan of "industrial democracy" so-called factory commissions have been established in many factories in *Sweden* with the aim of promoting "constant collaboration" between owners and workers with the object of obtaining the best production results. These commissions are of a purely advisory nature and in no way affect the one-man power of the employer who can, if he chooses, ignore any of the commission's decisions.

One of the most widespread ways of establishing "human relations" in *France* is through factory papers published by the employers. The purpose of these papers can be seen from an article written by the owner of the big Les Forges de Chatillon Commentry iron and steel works in one of the works' bulletins. "The weakness of any large factory," the capitalist wrote, "is the inability to maintain real human contact between all its workers . . . Hence the main function of this paper is to establish contact . . . And to attain this goal the paper must try to bring together the people of one and the same plant spiritually and cordially, for subordination in a modern plant divides them."

In some plants in *Austria* papers published by the owners are handed out to the workers free of charge. They are well got up and well illustrated. Frequently the factory owner is photographed with a worker's baby in his arms, or dancing with the office-cleaner at the plant's social evening. The object of these papers is to popularize the idea of "social partnership" and improve the "situation in the factories."

In *Japan* employers also make a practice of keeping "contact" with the workers. For instance, foremen memorize the names of all the workers in the shop and speak to each of them at least

once a day. Periodically, at the New Year, for instance, owners of enterprises deign to look in at the workers' homes or send their children presents on birthdays or when they start school. Attractive bulletins are published from time to time at the majority of the bigger factories for distribution among the workers and their families. Attempts are made to "condition" the workers on a pseudo-scientific basis, with reference to figures and statistical calculations. Thus one employer distributed calendars among his workers which gave daily menus with the corresponding number of calories. These menus were worked out in a manner designed to make the workers believe that their low wages sufficed for normal nutrition.

"Public Relations" Measures for Workers and Their Families

These in the main are arrangements made by the management of capitalist enterprises for their workers' "leisure hours," and include the setting up of cultural and sports societies, groups, etc.

The owner of the Olivetti factory boasts about his "moral" support to workers in carrying through cultural, sports and other measures.

In *Argentina* and other Latin American countries, stated Alberdi, employers have established a network of clubs in order to deflect the workers from their class organizations and from taking part in the class struggle.

In *Japan* the families of workers are invited to the enterprise, to take part in religious ceremonies, to attend socials, dances, "play days" and other entertainments.

One of the principal aims of these activities is to inculcate in the workers an *indifference to politics*, deaden their class consciousness, to get them and their families to become reconciled to exploitation and the capitalist system.

The Employer's "Social" Activity

These include the granting of privileges to some categories of workers, pensions, housing, medical services, loans, works canteens, kindergartens, etc. This "social" activity is by no means evidence of the "magnanimity" or "disinterestedness" of the capitalists. They are in fact financed by money that should go to the workers.

Under capitalism wages lag behind the value of labor-power, do not keep pace with the growing needs of the workers and society in general. Hence one of the main demands of the proletariat is higher wages. The *"social aid" rendered by the capitalists*—aid given in the demagogic guise of "human relations"—*is, in fact, part of the value of labor-power, an element of the worker's wages.* It should be borne in mind, however, that this part, firstly, is not paid out to all workers; the capitalist decides this as he sees fit. Secondly, he can at any time decline to pay paternalist allowances. And he often refuses to do so either on economic grounds, particularly during slumps, or for political reasons (as a reprisal against this or that section of the workers). Thirdly, it should be borne in mind that the employer's so-called social expenditure is, as a rule, tax-exempt.

It is not surprising, therefore, that many employers regard this expenditure as being every bit as vital as capital investment. In their view they will be repaid with interest, for, on the one hand, they raise productivity and intensity of exploitation and so add to profits and, on the other, they can, in some measure, blunt the more acute forms of the proletariat's class struggle.

A worker standing up for his rights at the Fiat Works runs the risk of being dismissed, B. Trentin told the conference. He not only faces unemployment and the loss of wages for a time, but, in the event of being taken on again, would most certainly be paid at a lower rate on the grounds that he had lost some of his skill in the meantime. The chances are that he would not only lose his wages, but also the apartment rented from the employer at a lower rent and other benefits for which he qualifies as an employee of the given factory.

The monopolists use pension funds for their own ends. In the *USA*, as G. Morris pointed out in his report, the workers after long struggle secured the provision of "welfare funds." Capitalists are trying to use these funds in their own interests. On the one hand, with the help of reactionary trade union bosses, they are trying to realize employer-worker "collaboration" in administering the funds and, on the other, are taking advantage of the worker's fear of losing his pension to render him docile and turn him against strikes. In many plants a worker has to have from 25 to 30 years' continuous conscientious work with the firm to qualify for a pension at 65.

Working-Class Resistance

THE spread of the "human relations" system and other new forms of exploitation, it was noted, poses new problems before the working class and its organizations. It is highly important for the proletarian parties and trade unions to work out a correct approach to the solution of the new tasks at enterprise level and on a national scale. The conference summed up the initial experience accumulated in this sphere although, as M. Alicata pointed out in his final speech, the matter had not been sufficiently dealt with during the exchange of views and could well form the subject of a future discussion.

The conference noted the negative attitude of the working people and their political and trade union organizations that stand foursquare on the platform of class struggle, to the "human relations" system. In Italy, for instance, the General Confederation of Labor stressed in one of its documents that "to defend the working people's rights successfully, special attention should be paid to the employers' program of action known as 'human relations,' aimed at using the new criteria, the psychological and professional molding of people, at engendering among the masses, in the social environment, the family, and every individual, *a way of thinking that would imply acceptance of the forms of exploitation linked with monopoly capitalism*. The object of this is to *reconcile* the worker to the need for speed-up, and make him forget that the capitalist mode of production is based on *exploitation*, to foster in him the belief that *the employer has to work too*, and that conditions can be created in industry for translating into life the aspirations of both employer and employed." The proletarian organizations of France, West Germany, Austria, Japan, the Latin American countries and other capitalist nations have also adopted a negative attitude to the new forms of exploitation.

Delegates spoke about the intensified economic and political struggle waged by the working class, about the big strikes and other actions which show that the bourgeoisie's new plans for "class conciliation" are meeting with opposition from the workers.

With regard to the work of the Communists and active trade unionists in the factories, representatives of the Communist parties of Germany, Italy, Britain, Austria and other countries voiced the opinion that different tactics should be applied, depending on the moves of the owners.

As concerns the "amenities" (cheaper canteens, medical treatment, housing, sports, etc.) these are a component, an essential part of the worker's wage. In view of the fact that the management grants these "amenities" out of purely political considerations, the workers and their organizations should take measures *strictly to supervise these social activities*, to see to it that no discrimination is permitted in administering the "benefits," that all workers qualify for them and that workers take part in their distribution.

As concerns other aspects of the employers' activities (particularly "organizational," disciplinary, "psychological," etc.), aimed at blunting the class consciousness of the workers and subordinating them to bourgeois domination, the working people and their organizations should fight hard against any measures involving intensified exploitation.

Communists and militant trade unions should block all efforts to strengthen capitalist rule at factory and national levels.

Speakers stressed the need to counter the employers' drive to introduce new "job evaluation" systems. It is the duty of the Communists and progressive trade union leaders to firmly oppose proposals of this kind, to prepare themselves for conflicts and disputes with the owners.

H. Schreiner, M. Pirola, F. Margulies and others spoke about factory publications. The employers have stepped up their activity in this respect, Schreiner said, and it was up to the Communists to get out their own factory papers and participate actively in publishing trade union papers.

In Italy the Communists and the other democratic forces in the labor movement are publishing their own factory and shop papers or bulletins. This also applies to offices with large numbers of employees.

Margulies told the conference about the experience of the Austrian labor movement in this field. The employers' papers, he said, are read in factories where we are not doing any work, in other words, where we have no influence. He cited the case of the Salzburg Aluminum Association's factories in Lend to show that communist agitation should and could be improved and made more effective than the employers' propaganda machine. For the past seven years these works had been putting out a well got-up management paper which had done its best to embellish the "analytical job evaluation" system. But the agitation carried on by the Communists resulted in the *workers twice rejecting this system by a majority*. Newspapers of the trade union solidarity group—i.e., newspapers published under Communist guidance—are now sold in 150 Austrian factories. The entire edition are sold out (they cover 15 to 20 per cent of the workers). Their influence is much greater than that of the employers' papers.

The conference also raised problems concerned with the change in the composition and skills of

the workers in modern capitalist enterprises. The report made by Spesso and Trentin, which dealt with these questions, noted that an absolute and relative numerical increase of office workers in industry was typical of Italy. A certain "leveling of skills" was also taking place. This is the outcome of reducing the number of both highly-skilled and un-skilled workers in the factories and, as a consequence, the greater role played by workers with medium skills. This is a general tendency, the operation of which, it goes without saying, does not preclude one or another counter-tendency (as, for instance, the emergence of highly-skilled, but as yet relatively small number of workers of new trades, engaged in supervising and maintaining automatic and semi-automatic equipment). These and other new processes now taking place in capitalist enterprises call for further study by Marxists. But, as some speakers noted, these processes should be taken into consideration now so that the urgent tasks facing the labor movement can be solved in the right way (the struggle for unity of action by workers of all skills and trades, work among office employees, etc.).

However, the new problem confronting the labor movement cannot be solved through economic struggle alone. This idea was emphasized by Alicata, Barca, Yonehara, Schreiner and others. Hence the proletariat's political struggle actually acquires exceptional importance, for one of the aims of the "human relations" drive is to focus the workers' attention on issues that concern only their particular factory, to divert them from home and foreign politics. This state of affairs should be combated.

The concrete forms and results of the workers' fight against "human relations" in this or that country depend, in a certain measure on such factors as the general level of the proletarian class struggle, the influence exerted by the working-class revolutionary organizations (the Communist parties, Left trade unions), and the role and influence exerted by the Social-Democratic and Clerical parties, the reformist trade union organizations, etc.

In this connection the speakers drew attention to *the peculiarities* of the labor movement in the different countries.

Some of the specific features of the labor movement in *Italy*, noted Alicata and others, were determined by the fact that the Italian working class had not only a mass Communist Party, but also a strong Socialist Party which differed from the Social-Democratic parties of the usual type. There were powerful trade unions in Italy and this fact created better conditions for the working people's fight against the so-called human relations.

Conditions are different in, say, the *United States of America* where many of the trade union leaders hold that the workers should have an ideology more or less similar to that of the bourgeoisie, that not class consciousness but "job consciousness" should be developed. This does not mean, of course, as G. Morris pointed out, that the American working class is not militant. It has shown a high degree of militancy in numerous strikes, but its struggle is so far limited mainly to economic objectives, with the result that the monopolies and trade union bosses can practice "class collaboration" on a wider scale in the USA than elsewhere.

To some extent the typical features of the U.S. labor movement also apply to the working-class movement in *Canada*, although the Canadian workers are faced with a number of specific problems. A. Dewhurst spoke of the growing dissatisfaction in the country over the dominance of U.S. monopoly capital, the difference in the position of workers of French and British origin, the role of immigration, the changed political character of the immigration since the Second World War, certain distinguishing features of the Canadian trade unions, etc. He noted the role played in Canada and the USA by the growth of debt among the working people. The bourgeoisie utilize this to prevent the workers from becoming class conscious.

Monopoly capital in *West Germany*, stressed H. Schreiner, as was the case in a number of other West-European countries, was at present largely orientating on political clericalism in combating the working class movement. In post-war West Germany, after Hitler had been defeated and Nazi ideology discredited, German imperialism held Catholicism and its social teaching to be the most suitable ideological weapon for maintaining its domination. Hence the wide application in West Germany of "social partnership" and other measures conducted in the spirit of Catholic social doctrine (or, to be more precise, concealed, with its aid), and this confronts the working-class movement with special problems.

In the *Latin-American* countries the dominant role in imposing "new forms" of worker-employer relations is played by the U.S. government and monopolies. The first Latin-American "seminar for raising productivity," conducted under the auspices of the U.S. State Department through its so-called International Corporation Administration, took place in Mexico at the end of 1955. It studied among other subjects the working of "human relations" in Latin-American enterprises, "psycho-technical" testing of workers, and so forth.

P. Alberdi showed from the example of *Argentina* how these methods are applied. Peronist union leaders were sent to the USA to study the "new deal" in employer-worker relations. These methods became particularly widespread in the national enterprises which passed over to the financial control of North American concerns. Due regard should be paid, stressed Alberdi, to the part played by the

ideology and practical experience of Peronism in arresting the growth of an independent labor movement. Peron and his associates preached the "humanization of capital," "justicialism" (regime of justice), "non-exploiting capitalism" and so on, and, relying on powerful anarchist and syndicalist traditions, diverted the workers from politics. But they were not very successful. The Argentine Communists organized a movement for independent and democratic trade unions, urging the workers to take up the struggle over the heads of those union leaders who sided with the employers. This was done without forming new unions and no split was caused in the labor movement. The Communists called upon the workers to conduct a political struggle against the coups d'etat organized by reactionary groupings in the army and navy. The Party's tactics are meeting with success. The workers, Peronists and non-Peronists, are holding big strikes in which millions of people are taking part.

Many speakers emphasized that *a successful political and economic struggle by the proletariat, and successful opposition to the "human relations" method and the other forms of monopoly capital offensive, called for the utmost unity of action by the workers in the trade unions and other fields.*

The conference dwelt in detail on certain aspects of the *ideological* work of the Marxist-Leninist parties. Emphasis was laid on the importance of giving a timely rebuff to the attempts at substantiating "theoretically" the "human relations" method. Speakers pointed to the need for a profound study and analysis of the new social phenomena and processes, including the latest forms of capitalist exploitation, and the modern methods used by the monopolies in their economic, political and ideological offensive against the working class.

Marxist-Leninists, it was pointed out, should pay due regard to all the new phenomena in life. Alicata (Italy), stressed that the working class in the developed capitalist countries faced two dangers. The first was revisionism in the ranks of the labor movement. There was, however, another danger. This was that some members of the working class movement did not always see the new in good time, did not always link up their activities at the right time with the class struggle, with the tasks advanced by the new developments. Combating revisionism, the main danger, noted Alicata, should not hinder our search for closer contacts with life, our study of the new forms in which exploitation and the rule of capital manifest themselves. I. Yonehara, member of the Secretariat of the Communist Party of Japan, stated that on the "human relations" question the most important thing at present was to explain the fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism, not as some kind of dogma, but as a teaching, closely linked with life.

An important part of the ideological work of the Marxist-Leninist parties is, on the one hand, to expose the myth of the different forms of "industrial democracy" under capitalism and, on the other, to refute the falsehoods in relation to socialist, genuinely human, democracy. These points were posed in A. M. Rumayntsev's report.

Bourgeois and reformist ideologists, distorting reality, are trying to make things appear as if the socialist enterprises have the same social problems as capitalist enterprises. Thus the French sociologist George Friedmann, Chairman of the International Sociological Association, affirms in his book *Whither Human Labor?* that ". . . the problem of labor humanization has not been solved in Soviet society." Friedmann assures his readers that labor "in the factories of Milan, Chicago, St. Etienne or Sverdlovsk" is essentially the same, and as he expresses it, yields similar "bio-psychological results."

But what can the capitalist system, founded upon the exploitation of man by man, have in common with socialist society, where the means of production belong to the people, where the people work for themselves? It is only on the basis of public ownership of the means of production, when exploitation of man by man has been ended, that real democracy is possible and, therefore, genuine humanization of labor.

Even if we approach the problem of humanization of labor in the narrower sense (that is, in the sense of the extent to which people engaged in manual labor can develop their mental faculties and satisfy their spiritual needs both at work and in leisure time) the facts show that only in socialist society is this problem being successfully solved. Already now, with the use of increasingly perfected technology at socialist enterprises, the worker is able to spend a growing part of his working day in mental labor. About 60 per cent of the workday of steel-makers in the Soviet Union, for instance, is now allotted to mental labor (calculations, supervising production, calculating the efficiency of equipment), the remainder to manual labor (accomplishing arduous operations, technology of production and so on).

The genuine humanization of labor in the socialist countries is revealed most clearly in the rising cultural level of the working class. Many Soviet enterprises, among them the Uralmashzavod, Uralvagonzavod and Magnitogorsk Metallurgical Works, have become regular training centers where workers improve their skills and receive a secondary general or technical education, and also higher education, after working hours. Between 1953-1958 the Uralmashzavod trained 6,000 new workers; 2,500 workers studied after working hours and completed secondary school. Half the workers of the Magnitogorsk Metallurgical Works study after

the day's work in general or technical schools and classes. And could the Soviet worker spend so much of his time and energy after work in improving his education if he came home exhausted physically and mentally?

The cultural and technological advance registered by the Soviet working people, A. Rumyantsev stressed, was of fundamental importance in the light of the tasks for the gradual elimination of the distinctions between manual and mental labor. Here it will not be amiss to recall what Marx said about the content of the education of the working class.

"By education," wrote Marx, "we understand three things:

Firstly—*mental training*

Secondly—*physical training* . . .

Thirdly—*technical training*, which will give the pupil knowledge of the basic principles of all production processes . . .

"A combination of paid productive labor, mental training, physical exercise and polytechnical training raises the working class considerably above the level of the higher and middle classes." (Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Works*, Russ. Ed., Vol. XIII, part 1, p. 199.)

Everything is being done in the USSR to solve this task. Special attention is paid to improving the education of the growing generation, and the school reform now being elaborated in the USSR is called upon to play a big part in this. Its aim is to find the best ways of combining education with productive labor, of bringing the school closer to life. The aim is to equip youth for work in the best possible way, to secure a higher general educational and technical standard for those who will replenish the ranks of the working class. The measures now being implemented for the transition to a shorter working day clear the way for raising the standard of general education and the cultural level of the working people. In a few years' time the Soviet Union will have the *shortest working day in the world and the shortest working week*. The shorter working week will, moreover, be accompanied by higher real wages.

A. Rumyantsev emphasized the growing opportunities in the USSR and in the other socialist countries for man's all-round, harmonious development. He touched upon other points which showed that only in socialist society is there real humanization of labor and genuinely human relations.

* * *

The conference participants noted that joint discussions among Marxists are well worth while and play an important part in studying the problems confronting the labor movement. The wish was expressed that conferences and exchanges of opinion on an international scale should be held more frequently.

D.T.

Letters and Notes

Never Again!

Letter from Japan

NO nation can guarantee its security through stockpiling nuclear weapons. This applies equally to the countries manufacturing these weapons and those receiving them from other powers. In the latter case the country is turned into an atomic base: nuclear missile sites are built on its territory, its armed forces are equipped with nuclear weapons, pilots undergo special training and its air and naval bases are placed at the disposal of foreign armed forces.

At present we see this kind of nuclearization in West Germany and Japan. The peoples must expose the hypocrisy and trickery of Chancellor Adenauer and Prime Minister Kishi who in words are for the suspension of nuclear tests, but in practice are ready to accept nuclear arms "for the sake of self-defense."

In this connection one cannot pass over the Swiss Government's statement to the effect that Switzerland's neutrality, proclaimed in 1813, can be preserved only by nuclearizing its armed forces. Is this view correct? Can peace and neutrality be preserved by such means? No, this is simply imitation of "the policy of strength," and blindness to the danger arising from the present world situation—a situation fraught with terrible consequences for mankind.

Any limited atomic war can develop now into an all-out atomic war. It is quite obvious therefore, that neutrality cannot be preserved by nuclearization. The "neutrality" of the 19th century enabled a neutral country to keep out of war and brought her big profits from it. The "neutrality" of the atomic age means that such a country must side with peace and international co-operation, and work to avert atomic war and nuclear armament whatever shape they may take.

The reason why I have mentioned the statement of the Swiss Government is that the Japanese militarists refer to Switzerland as an example. They at once seized on the Swiss statement as a convenient pretext to justify their dangerous stand. As a result, the militarists suggest that Japan should be armed openly in defiance of its Constitution, which renounces remilitarization and war and makes neutrality possible. Only neutrality and an independent policy of peace can ensure real independence and security for Japan.

The Swiss nuclearization theory seeks to justify abandonment of neutrality. But we firmly believe that our European friends — peace supporters, including the Swiss—will succeed in their fight against nuclear armament.

As for nuclearization of Japan, some major factors should be singled out.

Japan was the first country to suffer from atom bombing and, further, the first to suffer from the "ash of death," which originated from the thermonuclear weapon tests in the Pacific. Now she herself is engaged in stockpiling this weapon. This is being done in the interests of the United States. U.S. atomic weapons are brought not only into U.S.-occupied Okinawa, South Korea and Taiwan, but into Japan proper.

Japan is allocated the role of an IRBM launching base against China. The United States controls the Misawa Base in the Aomori Prefecture, Johnson Base in the Saitama Prefecture, Itazuke Base in the Fukuoka Prefecture, Tachikawa and Yokota bases near Tokyo, the last two being logistic and transportation bases for the U.S. Strategic Air Command stationed in Guam as well as in Japan.

One can visualize how terrible it would be if the atomic bases in the vicinity of Tokyo—a city with a population of over 8,000,000—were subjected to atomic retaliation in the event of war. The people of Japan are deeply concerned about this.

Okinawa is of special importance. Some of the islands of this group have been turned into mammoth air bases designed for heavy jet bombers carrying atomic loads.

F-86 and F-86-1 jet fighter-bombers, capable of carrying A-bombs, have already been sent to Japan, while planes of the F11-F type are manufactured in the country. Japanese pilots are undergoing special A-bomb training. The so-called Self-Defense Board has recently announced that its forces will be equipped with rocket weapons. In addition to the missiles imported from the USA, Japan's monopoly armament manufacturers are making their own missiles. They are produced not only for the use by the "self-defense forces" but also for shipment to Taiwan, South Korea and some South-East Asian countries.

Such being the situation, *the Japanese people emphatically demand not only immediate and un-*

conditional suspension of nuclear weapon tests but also prohibition of the manufacture of these weapons. They insist that *these two problems* should be regarded as the urgent issues of the times. That is why people in all walks of life took part in the month of joint action for the prohibition of nuclear weapons and cessation of tests.* Meetings and rallies held in hundreds of towns and villages sent delegates to the bigger centers, whence they started a two-week march to Tokyo.

Resolutions against nuclear armament have been adopted by the local government bodies and public organizations. They will constitute the basis for a general resolution to be submitted to Parliament. Some prefectures, dozens of towns and many trade unions have already passed resolutions denouncing the decision to equip the "self-defense forces" with nuclear weapons. A 3,000-strong meeting in Iwakuni unanimously demanded that the Government should renounce nuclear weapons and close the U.S. base in the town. For three hours after the meeting all the people demonstrated with banners and posters in the vicinity of the base.

Similar meetings were held near the U.S. bases in other places.

The people are also insisting that the bases must not be used by the U.S. armed forces for war against China. They accuse the Kishi Government of collaborating with the USA in pursuing a criminal war policy and are calling for its resignation.

That is why the movement for the closing of U.S. atomic bases is linked not only with that against nuclear weapons; it aims, in addition, at restoring Japan's independence and sovereignty. Proof of this is the popular struggle for renunciation of the American-Japanese "Security Treaty", concluded during the Korean war and spearheaded against the alleged enemy—People's China and the Korean People's Democratic Republic. Like the Japan-Chiang Kai-shek "treaty," it is aimed at creating "two Chinas," with the Chinese People's Republic being looked upon as a hostile nation.

And since the people's peace movement aims at closing the American military bases and attaining renunciation of the "Security Treaty," it is directed against the treaty with Chiang Kai-shek and for restoration of relations with People's China.

The Kishi Government is supporting the U.S. war gambles in the Taiwan Strait and is trying to revise the "Security Treaty" in order to make it even more aggressive. It wants to militarize the country in order to deprive the working class and other sections of the people of their democratic rights by force of arms. Therefore the people's will for peace and independence is not fortuitous, the anti-nuclear action is also aimed at defending democracy and against reviving militarism, against imperialism.

In the course of the month of joint action the peace fighters achieved considerable success. This truly national movement has united all progressive forces and democratic mass organizations. They are guided in their struggle by a broad program of joint action, for only the solidarity of the people as a whole can thwart the lunatic designs of the imperialists and those who, acting on their orders, are instigating war.

The movement for ending the nuclear weapon tests must be developed into a movement for unconditional prohibition of this weapon and destruction of the stockpiles, and for atom-free zones. This movement is inseparable from the common struggle against the atomic arms race.

Yoshitaro HIRANO,
Secretary-General of the Japan Peace Committee

*In response to the appeal of the Fourth World Conference against A- and H-Bombs and for Disarmament held in Tokyo last August, many countries held, between October 15 and November 15, a month of joint action for the prohibition of nuclear weapons and an end to the tests. By a decision of the National Council for the Prohibition of Atomic and Hydrogen Weapons, the month was held in Japan in October.

An Organ of Militant Marxists in France

THE appearance of the 100th issue of *La Nouvelle Critique** in November 1958 coincided with its tenth anniversary.

Founded on the initiative of Maurice Thorez, *La Nouvelle Critique* has become a medium for disseminating Marxist ideology among intellectuals and primarily among the youth. This organ of militant Marxism fulfils an important and responsible role in the battle of ideas in France. Its purpose is to win the intellectuals to the side of the working class and thus strengthen its alliance with the middle strata. ". . . We present ourselves to the world not as doctrinaires with a ready-made principle: here is truth, bow down to it . . . There is therefore nothing to prevent us from linking our criticism with a criticism of politics, with a definite party stand in politics and, therefore, from linking and identifying our criticism with real struggles." Taking as its motto these words of Marx, written in connection with the founding

*Paris journal devoted to politics and culture.

of the *German-French Year Books* in 1843, the journal pursues the aim of wresting the intellectuals from the influence of bourgeois ideology, helping them critically to assess the realities of capitalism, convincing them of the correctness of the Marxist outlook.

This aim determines the basic trend of the journal which systematically exposes bourgeois ideology and propagates Marxism-Leninism, upholds the progressive traditions and the cultural heritage of the people, responds in good time to major international events and explains the burning social problems of the country. It devotes space also to life in the socialist countries, to science, literature and art.

Guided by the Leninist principle of partisanship, *La Nouvelle Critique* imparts to the intellectuals the party's class approach to all the phenomena of social life: politics, science, culture. Linked with this are essays and polemics against ideological opponents, exchanges of opinion on current cultural problems, conferences, etc. In this way it maintains constant contact with its readers. It attracts to Marxism scientists, artists, writers and students, who have renounced the idealist outlook; it helps the intellectuals to acquire a deeper understanding of the social conditions of their work, brings them closer to the people and draws them into the struggle for peace, democracy and socialism.

The battle of ideas in postwar France has been of an extremely sharp character and has had a profound impact on the political life of the country. Ever since 1945 the French monopoly bourgeoisie, seriously weakened as a result of the war and alarmed by the growth of Communist influence, have sought salvation in a "strong man" dictatorship. Even after the unsuccessful experiment with de Gaulle's RPF in 1947-1953, they still clung to their cherished hope. The preaching of skepticism, irrationalism and overt mysticism, which became pronounced in France in the 'fifties, was designed to pave the way ideologically, this time more thoroughly, for the advent to power of a "strong man."

In this connection the struggle waged by *La Nouvelle Critique* against the two ideological trends that cleared the way for de Gaulle — the torrent of skepticism and the preaching of "voluntarism" —acquired a topical significance.

In a series of articles in 1958 it rebutted the attempts made by reactionary ideologists to shake the faith of the people in social justice, democracy and progress.

Exposing the "strong man" myth André Gisselbrecht in an article entitled "The General and Faust" (No. 98) writes that the Walpurgis night of Gaullism was prepared by reaction, in an attempt to make the masses believe blindly that de Gaulle could, as if by magic, pacify Algeria, bring the workers into the embrace of the capitalists and achieve a touching concord in Parliament. But just as Faust, upon freeing himself from the magic of Mephistopheles, realizes his dream of "a free people in a free land," so will the people, not the dictators, decide ultimately the destiny of France. The author discloses the true meaning of the philosophy of skepticism — the bourgeoisie's dread of the morrow, its fear of the people and its inability to offer anything positive as a counterweight to scientific communism.

These features are especially manifest in the philosophy of "heroic pessimism" preached by the fashionable writer Camus, and by Malraux, now a minister in de Gaulle's Government. This ideological trend is criticized in the article "Albert Camus or the Metaphysics of Counter-Revolution" (No. 92), which clearly reveals that Camus's writing, although seemingly indifferent to politics, expresses the views of the more reactionary circles of the bourgeoisie. In preaching the futility of human effort, and declaring that evil, war and injustice are natural phenomena, Camus tries to depict the absence of prospects for his own class as the crisis of humanity and civilization. All Camus's writing is permeated with the striving to infect the proletariat with pessimism. Faith in the future yields to a longing for the golden past, human solidarity to romantic loneliness, and social revolution to a mutiny of individuals, who challenge not the social system, but fate, heaven, God . . . Such is the metaphysics of the counter-revolution, which seeks salvation in the "man of will," concludes the article.

Realizing that only an alliance of all republican forces can bar the way to the dictatorship of monopolists and colonialists, *La Nouvelle Critique* seeks to draw into the general democratic movement big sections of the public, particularly the Catholic working people and intellectuals on whom reaction relies, and not for the first time. Michel Verret in the article "Christians and Politics" (Nos. 96 and 97) comments on the growing political activity of Catholics and warns against attempts to label religious people as one reactionary mass. A significant part of the Catholics, says the author, condemn colonialism, capitalist rivalry and exploitation. The Marxists, he goes on to say, should not antagonize these people, they should win them from the influence of clerical ideology, help them to advance from the religious utopia to scientific communism, so as to turn their moral protest against injustice into the common channel of social protest, the class struggle against capitalism.

The struggle against the influence of bourgeois ideology on the masses can be successful provided

it is accompanied by struggle for the ideological unity of the working class itself. That is why the journal, naturally, could not ignore the revisionist writing of H. Lefèvre who smuggles into his latest works bourgeois ideology in the guise of "creative revision" of the fundamentals of Marxism.

In the article "Henri Lefèvre and Marx's Dialectics" (No. 94) Lucien Sève criticizes Lefèvre's distortion of the main formative stages of Marxism. Asserting that Marx came to dialectics only in the third phase of his activity, after 1858, and only thanks to a "casual" re-reading of Hegel's *Logic*, Lefèvre deliberately debases the vital works written by the founders of Marxism in the earlier period. Lefèvre's distortion of the history of Marxism, says the author, has a definite aim, that of rehabilitating bourgeois liberalism, syndicalism, reformism and utopian socialism, which Marx castigated particularly in his early writing.

J. Suret-Canale's "Remarks on Henri Lefèvre's Method and the Burning Problems of Marxism" (No. 95) tackles the question of Lefèvre's understanding of dialectics and the practical conclusions to be drawn from it. The author notes that Lefèvre queries the objective nature of Marxist philosophy; materialism, in his view, is merely a postulate; dialectical materialism is not a science of the most general laws of nature, society and thought, it is but a method. Lefèvre substitutes for the Marxist teaching on absolute and relative truth a vague demand for "methodological doubt," thus opening the doors wide to agnosticism and subjective idealism and giving currency to idealistic conceptions among Marxists on the pretext of "competition between different schools" of Marxism.

Suret-Canale also analyzes the reasons for the recent revival of revisionism in the labor movement. The anti-communist campaign, he writes, which swept the capitalist West after the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU, although it did not attain its object, left its traces. "It shook, corrupted and immobilized some sections of the revolutionary movement, particularly among the intellectuals. It wanted them to believe that everything done in the name of Marxism over the past thirty years was now nullified, that all the sacrifices of that period had been in vain, that there could no longer be any confidence in anything. Lefèvre's arguments, which have precisely this meaning, are designed to 'justify' this trend philosophically."

In connection with the criticism of Lefèvre's revisionism Lucien Sève poses an important question—"the style of work of the philosopher and perhaps, on a broader scale, the style of work of the Communist intellectual." This question is examined by Gilbert Mury in No. 100.

The style of work of the Communist and his mode of living, he writes, are determined by the materialist and dialectical nature of his outlook. Materialism enables the Communists to gain a deeper understanding of life, actively to participate in the social struggle, for "the protest against injustice and objective research have common roots." Dialectics, says the author, enables the Communists to make a thorough analysis of the facts, to see the complexity of social life and, consequently, not to fall into despair during temporary setbacks. Marxist optimism constantly derives strength from the class solidarity of the working people; alien to it are the loneliness and pessimism peculiar to bourgeois ideology. Genuine humanism consists in transforming life, not in abstract protest.

The exposure of bourgeois ideology in the articles mentioned above does not, naturally, exhaust the rich and varied content of *La Nouvelle Critique* for 1958. The struggle against the pernicious influence of idealist philosophy, against reformist illusions and the revisionist infection among some intellectuals is now, as in the past, an important feature of the journal. In a message of greetings on the occasion of the 100th issue Maurice Thorez wrote: "The fact that since the Liberation, Marxism has become a pivot of the intellectual and cultural life of our country in large measure to the work done by *La Nouvelle Critique*."

Ten years is a relatively brief span for a periodical. Nevertheless, even in this brief period the journal has taken firm root in the fertile soil of French culture, it has acquired a style and traditions of its own, and has won the sympathies of considerable sections of the intellectuals. That is why it is read with such interest and finds willing contributors among prominent scholars, workers of literature and art in France and in other countries. Perhaps its greatest merit is that it has developed a school of talented Marxist writers, who now set its tone.

La Nouvelle Critique is faced with a hard struggle for the triumph of Marxist ideology in France. In summing up the results of the past decade, we share the confidence expressed by Maurice Thorez that "in all fields *La Nouvelle Critique* will prepare and accelerate the defeat of the forces of reaction and obscurantism. It will rally the intellectuals around the working class in the struggle for enlightenment, progress and freedom, in the struggle for the triumph of communism."

L. N.

A Policeman Looks at the Communist Party

*MASTERS OF DECEIT**, written we rather suspect not by, but for, J. Edgar Hoover, chief of the American secret police, is the "story of American communism" as a policeman sees it.

And, as one would expect, the "story" is in the best (or worst) tradition of that galaxy of ephemeral police chiefs who in nineteenth century Prussia and France, in Czarist Russia, Hitler's Reich and other countries, furnished their overlords with tomes of fabricated materials for sensational Communist trials.

But the police chiefs of the Old World who harried Marx and his followers, odious though they were, differed in one respect at least from their contemporary transatlantic colleague—they conducted their nefarious work in the backrooms, behind the scenes, without undue publicity. Not so Mr. Hoover. He revels in the glare of the klieg lights, in newsreel and television appearances and in granting newspaper interviews. And now with his policeman's notebook, and with anti-communism fashionable as a criterion of literary values, it may well be that we shall witness the interesting spectacle of America's top gendarme being nominated for some literary prize.

Never did Marx display his insight more than when, upon finishing his titanic labor on Volume One of *Capital*, he wrote in a letter to Engels that the bourgeoisie would remember his carbuncles for the rest of their lives. For even though he has been in his grave in Highgate Cemetery for more than 65 years, he, judging by *Masters of Deceit*, still has a special dossier in the vaults of the FBI.

And it is from this dossier, and from the dossiers of Engels, Lenin and other Communist leaders, that the ghost-writers, with an air of erudition, add the historical touch, and interpret, or rather distort, in the manner so dear to the heart of a Goebbels. For instance, Marx is sneered at as "an egotistical, crabby, stubborn man who from student days showed no interest in productive labor to support his family." Lenin is a "crafty tiger," American Communists are "barbarians in modern dress." Trade unionists, teachers, doctors, scientists, writers—all who stand by the revolutionary traditions of America—are reviled as "spies," "foreign agents," "un-American," and "enemies."

The idea running through the book is that Mr. Hoover is the amiable old gentleman, the "guardian angel," whose sole concern is love for America and Americans. "I," we are sanctimoniously told in the foreword, "have deep faith in the American people." And he quotes scripture in support of the contention that "truth" is the chief weapon of his G-men. Yet truth is precisely the one element missing from the FBI arsenal, and one would need a pretty powerful microscope to discover much of it in *Masters of Deceit*.

That Hoover is a "guardian angel" none will deny, but not of the working population, not of the millions whom we know as the American public. Hoover fears the great American public, so much so that for the last forty years or more he has been waging an unrelenting struggle against it. He is, then, to vary the metaphor, a "fallen angel," the guardian of Mammon, of what Jack London termed the Iron Heel — the handful of big corporations who rule the USA.

The body of secret police which he heads, known as the FBI, was born of deceit in 1908. Its immediate founder, a man named Bonaparte, the Attorney General of the day, was, and the point is not without interest, a grandnephew of the first Napoleon. The point whether there should or should not be a secret police in the United States had been keenly debated, and rejected, by the Sixtieth Congress. Bonaparte, undaunted by his rebuff, took advantage of the Congress recess to form his Bureau of Investigation in defiance of Senators and members of the House. When the members returned to Washington they found themselves faced with an accomplished fact in the shape of an incipient secret police.

From the standpoint of the Iron Heel, the times called for strengthening of the state machine. For this was the period of the "big stick" and of U.S. imperialist expansion. It was also a period when the American workers were becoming more articulate and better organized. Trade union membership had risen from 865,000 in 1900 to over 2,000,000 in 1908, and membership of the Socialist Party headed by Eugene Debs was rising rapidly. The workers were now challenging the ruling class in both the economic and political spheres.

Formed by a Bonaparte, what more natural than that the Bureau should have a Fouché. And a Fouché it found in the person of J. Edgar Hoover who in 1919 submitted his first detailed report on the activity of the newly-born American Communist Party.

A year earlier, in 1918, the Bureau had carried out the first really big operation of its ceaseless

*"Masters of Deceit." By J. Edgar Hoover. New York, 1958.

war against the American public. The war in Europe was none too popular with ordinary Americans, who saw no reason why they should cross the Atlantic and risk their lives in a war for monopoly profits. In the police jargon of the day they were "draft-dodgers," and so the G-men got busy. Raids were planned and carried out in all the major cities. In New York alone 75,000 men were arrested. The American lawyer Max Lowenthal in his book on the FBI makes the point that out of every 200 arrests, 199 had been mistakes.

A year later Hoover's G-men, setting a precedent for the future Hitler SS, launched another nationwide night affray against "radicals." This time they chose "easier" victims—the large numbers of "foreign born" who had emigrated from Europe to the "land of the free." As they sailed up the Hudson on the immigrant ships many of them no doubt recalled the splendid words emblazoned on the Statue of Liberty: "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free." Little did the yearners dream as their ships passed the Statue that on a night in November 1919 in cities all over America some ten thousand of their number would be seized by ruthless police squads and herded into jails, and detained in conditions which shocked the conscience of all decent Americans.

The hue and cry against this outrage was so vociferous that most of the victims had to be released within a few days. But Mr. Hoover had to have his revenge—the Navy conveniently loaned him the S.S. Buford and many of the unfortunate men, torn from their wives and families and not allowed to bid them farewell, were shipped back to Europe. Senator Walsh said apropos of the "radical raids": "The indignities and outrages suffered by the victims, the majority of whom were released, will rankle in their breasts to their dying day."

During the interwar years Hoover devoted his energies to strikebreaking. In every strike fought in these years, and there were thousands, he saw "the hand of Moscow." Here he was in his element, working directly for his paymasters — the big corporations. These empires of high finance and industry maintain their own secret service bureaus for spying on their workers, and most of their agents are recruited from the FBI, no doubt with a suitable recommendation from its chief. In 1922 when railroad shopmen were resisting a wage cut, FBI detectives arrested 1,200 workers and, of course, broke the strike.

But of all his "accomplishments" this American Fouché is proudest of his record collection of fingerprints and dossiers. Before becoming a gendarme, Hoover followed the more modest and certainly more honorable profession of librarian. The card-index system in the library seems to have fascinated him. From the moment he left the quiet of the bookshelves for the more secluded quarters of the secret police, he began to develop card-indexing and fingerprinting on a scale so vast that by 1931 he was able to boast of "the largest identification bureau in the world." Nor was his boast an idle one, since by April 1, 1954, his score had risen to 130,460,252 — all, according to Mr. Hoover, acquired "voluntarily." When an astonished Congressman remarked that he had "the fingerprints of almost everybody in the United States," he replied, solemnly and gravely: "No . . . not yet." This preoccupation with fingerprinting impelled a newspaper reporter to the somewhat irreverent comment that Mr. Hoover, apparently, would not be satisfied until he had added the fingerprints of the Statue of Liberty to his collection.

"Fingerprinting," said the FBI in 1922, "will reduce crime to the minimum." The crime statistics explode this subterfuge. In 1954, the number of major crimes officially listed reached the record figure of 2,267,250. Crime, said the official report for that year, had increased four times as fast as the population. And Mr. Hoover's unsleeping FBI, the streamlined, "world's best" police force, is so busy with witch-hunting and persecuting law-abiding citizens that it can claim a bare one per cent of all the criminal arrests and convictions in the U.S.A.

With the launching of the cold war, Mr. Hoover stepped up his blitz against the American public. The huge armament orders had to be justified, the people had to be prepared psychologically for war. So a division of labor was arranged between Dulles and Hoover. In foreign policy Dulles proclaimed brinkmanship, in home policy Hoover worked to create an atmosphere of fear and hysteria. All who opposed the war preparations and the nuclear tests, all who advocated coexistence with the socialist countries, were denounced as "spies" and "agents of Moscow." Hoover inspired McCarthy, encouraged him and supplied him with "documents." The Internal Security Act (1950) and the Communist Control Act (1954) were enacted in an all-out effort to destroy the Communist Party.

Hoover now used agents-provocateurs by the thousand. "You can imagine," he told Congress, "the difficulty we have in getting men who can do that character of work." But, lavishly spending the American taxpayer's money, the police chief found creatures for his dirty work. One of these was Harvey Matusow, whom the Communist Party expelled in 1951 as an agent-provocateur. After three years spying for the FBI, Matusow, like the Biblical Judas, began to have pangs of remorse

and, in mortification, confessed: "I have lied again and again in my reports and statements to these committees, and I want to go to each individual about whom I have falsified to ask his forgiveness." (During his three years as a professional perjurer for the FBI Matusow smeared 244 people, many of whom lost their jobs and were sent to jail.) Hoover, as always, acted resolutely, and Matusow, who had told the truth for the first time in his career, was charged with . . . perjury, and jailed. David Brown, another FBI "agent," confessed that he had "betrayed the working people generally; all of the American people, my coworkers, my family—everybody who ever trusted me and had confidence in me."

In the notorious Foley Street trial which sentenced Eugene Dennis and the other Communist leaders to long terms of imprisonment, of the thirteen FBI witnesses four were renegade Communists, seven were professional informers, while two were "special agents." In the course of the cross-examination one of the professional informers admitted that he had recruited two cousins into the Communist Party in order to betray them to the FBI.

The professional informer is the most despised and detested creature in all lands at all times. But Hoover had had him photographed, televised, lauded in the press and elevated to the status of national hero.

One wonders what Jefferson and the other men who signed the Declaration of Independence in 1776 would say if they could step out of their graves and see what Hoover has done to their country. The Declaration, it will be recalled, castigated "the King of Great Britain" who, in his efforts to establish "an absolute tyranny over these states," had erected a "multitude of New Offices, and sent hither swarms of Officers to harass our people, and eat out their substance." Now, nearly two hundred years later, by the irony of history, J. Edgar Hoover, in an endeavor to establish the tyranny of the Iron Heel, and trampling on the Declaration of Independence, harasses the people of America with an army of special agents and professional informers.

Fear, hysterial, bookburning, telephone tapping, wholesale victimization and character assassination—such are the bitter fruits of the inglorious reign of Hoover, the master of deceit. This degradation of public life in the United States has evoked protests even from circles far removed from communism. Cyrus Eaton, a big industrialist, declared that Hitler "in his prime, through the Gestapo, never had such a spy organization as we have in this country today."

Many elections, Presidents and Congresses have come and gone since Hoover first took command, but he, like the old man of the sea, clings to the body politic. The $2,242,240 FBI budget of 1924 and its 441 special agents had risen to $57,400,000 and 4,602 special agents by the mid-1950's. And no one knows the total of undercover agents and professional informers.

For all its bluster the Hoover book is a testament to failure. "Remember," he complains, "that within four decades (that is, the period coinciding with Hoover's policemanship—Author) communism . . . has spread through roughly 40 per cent of the world's population and 25 per cent of the earth's surface." And for a man who has spent the best part of his lifetime trying to destroy the American Communist Party, it is a rueful admission that "the Party is today influencing literally thousands of Americans."

Policeman Hoover, precisely because he is a policeman, is incapable of understanding the simple truth that the Communist Party is indestructible because it is the flesh and blood of the working class.

Many years ago the American authorities murdered the Swedish-born worker Joe Hill. Today the words of the Joe Hill song are part of the folklore of America. Who can forget its stirring words —especially when sung by that great American Paul Robeson — "from San Diego up to Maine, in every mine and mill, where working men come out to fight, 'tis there you'll find Joe Hill."

And in the America of today names like Foster and Gurley Flynn who fought alongside Joe Hill and Tom Mooney, who fought to save Sacco and Vanzetti, and who in the past decades have taken part in a hundred class battles in the United States, are legendary in working class communities. They and their fellow Communists, and the legion of non-Communist people who have refused to be intimidated by Hoover and the Iron Heel, enjoy the sympathy and respect of hundreds of millions outside the USA, from Britain all the way across Europe and Asia and south to Australia. On the other hand, their traducers — the Hoovers and Dulleses — are despised abroad and spurned at home, as the latest elections have proved.

In working up the notes supplied by his retinue of informers into an "expose" of the American Communist Party, the unoriginal Hoover remained true to bourgeois police-chief tradition. Just over a hundred years ago a wretched Prussian police-chief named Stieber submitted to the court a collection of anti-Communist forgeries, also concocted by informers, under the title *The Original Minute Book of the Marx Party*. The brilliance with which

Marx flayed this Prussian gendarme and exposed him is now a matter of history. But his final comment on the affair is fully applicable to the Stieber of the FBI:

". . . if one considers the tremendous efforts of the official world against us, the ransacking of the *Code Penal* against us, the slanderous tongues of the 'Democracy of Stupidity', which has never been able to forgive us for displaying greater intelligence and greater strength of character than it did itself, and the history of all parties *of that period*, and if, lastly, we ask where are the facts that could be adduced against the Party, one must come to the conclusion that in this nineteenth century our Party is distinguished above all by its *purity*." And as it was in the nineteenth, so it is in the twentieth century, despite all the machinations of Hoover the "cop" and his army of spies and informers.

John GIBBONS

NEW BOOKS

Below are listed a few of the many interesting Marxist works that have been published recently. The list will be continued in forthcoming issues of the magazine.

J. Arnault, Procès du colonialisme. (Colonialism on Trial). Paris, 1958, 331 pages.

G. Bondi, Monopoltheorie—Monopolpraxis. Kritische Beitrage zur Theorie und Praxis der Monopole in Westdeutschland. (Monopoly Theory—Monopoly Practice. A Critical Survey of the Theory and Practice of West German Monopolies). Berlin, 1958, 150 pages.

Din lupta PCR pentru inchegarea aliantei clasei muncitoare cu taranimea muncitoare in batalia pentru reforma agrara din 1944-1945. (The Communist Party of Rumania in the Struggle to Strengthen the Worker-Peasant Alliance during the Fight for Agrarian Reform in 1944-45). Vol. 2. Bucharest, 1958, 383 pages.

Gh. Gheorghiu-Dej, Pentru consolidarea si dezvoltarea sectorului socialist al agriculturii, pentru sporirea productiei agricole. (Strengthening and Developing the Socialist Sector in Agriculture, for Higher Agricultural Output). Bucharest, 1958, 134 pages.

A. Gramsci, Scritti giovanili (1914-18). (Early Works: 1914-18). Turin, 1958, 392 pages.

Jednotne proti soudobemu revizionizmu. Ohlas bratrskych komunistickych a delnickych stran na VII. sjezd Svazu komunistu Jugoslavie. (Unity Against Modern Revisionism. The Reaction of the Fraternal Communist and Workers' Parties to the Seventh Congress of the Communists of Yugoslavia). Prague, 1958, 325 pages.

J. Kadar, Szilard nepi hatalom—fuggetlen Magyarorszag. (Cikkek es beszedek. 1957-1958). (Stable People's Rule Signifies an Independent Hungary: Articles and Speeches. 1957-1958.) Budapest, 1958, 429 pages.

Коларов П. Производителният труд при капитализма и социализма. София, 1958, 139 стр.
(P. Kolarov. Productive Labor under Capitalism and Socialism.) Sofia, 1958, 139 pages.

Marxistische Philosophie und sozialistische Politik. Aktuelle Probleme der marxistischen Philosophie in der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik. (Marxist Philosophy and Socialist Politics. Current Problems of Marxist Philosophy in the German Democratic Republic.) Berlin, 1958, 191 pages.

Основы марксистской философии. Москва, 1958, 688 стр.
(Fundamentals of Marxist Philosophy.) Moscow, 1958, 688 pages.

Павлов Т. Характер и значение на социалистическата революция в България. София, 1958, 141 стр
(T. Pavlov. The Character and Significance of the Socialist Revolution in Bulgaria). Sofia, 1958, 141 pages.

H. Rechowicz. Walka o antyfaszystowski front ludu slanskiego 1935-1937. (Silesian People's Struggle for an Anti-fascist Front in 1935-1937.) Katowice, 1958, 123 pages.

A. Rothstein. The Munich Conspiracy, London, 1958, 320 pages.

Содружество стран социализма. (Сборник статей). Москва, 1958, 338 стр.
(Friendship of the Socialist Nations: A Collection of Articles), Moscow, 1958, 338 pages.

W. Ulbricht. Zur Geschichte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung. Band 4. 1950-1954. (History of the German Working-Class Movement. Vol. 4. 1950-1954). Berlin, 1958, 863 pages.

J. Harvey and K. Hood. The British State, London, 1958, 288 pages.

S. Heretik. Nacrt dejin politickey ekonomie. Do vzniku marxismu. (Essay on the History of Political Economy: Pre-Marxist.) Bratislava, 1958, 313 pages.

Aspects du capitalisme contemporain. (Features of Contemporary Capitalism). Paris, 1958, 220 pages. *(Recherches internationales,* No. 5.)

Editions of the Journal

"PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM"

EDITIONS IN ENGLISH

(World Marxist Review):
Central Books Ltd.,
37 Grays Inn Road,
London, W.C. 1., England

Progress Books,
924 King St. West,
Toronto 3, Ontario,
Canada

FRENCH EDITION:

(La Nouvelle Revue Internationale)
Societe Parisienne d'Edition et
d'Information 9, Boulevard des Italiens
Paris (2e) France

RUSSIAN EDITION:

Stredisko pro rozsirovani tisku,
Praha 6, Sadova 3
Czechoslovakia

CHINESE EDITION:

Guozi Shudian,
38 Suchouhutung,
Peking, China

ALBANIAN EDITION:

Ndermarja Shtetnore Botimeve
'Naim Frasheri'', Tirana

BULGARIAN EDITION:

Raznoiznos,
1, Rue Tzar Assen,
Sofia

CZECH EDITION:

Artia, Praha 2,
Nove Mesto, Ve smeckach 30

DUTCH EDITION:

Progressief Algemeen Vertaalbureau,
Chr. Snouck Hurgronjehof 22'',
Amsterdam-W

GERMAN EDITION:

Deutscher Buch-Export und -Import
GmbH,
Leipzig C 1, Leninstrasse 16

HUNGARIAN EDITION:

Kossuth Kado, Budapest, V,
Vorosmartyter 4

ITALIAN EDITION:

Libreria Rinascita, Via delle Botteghe
Oscure 2, Roma

JAPANESE EDITION:

Nauka Ltd.,
2, Kanda-Zinbocho
2-chome, Chiyoda-Ku, Tokyo

KOREAN EDITION:

Central publications distribution office,
Phyongyang, Korea

MONGOLIAN EDITION:

Mongolgosknigotorg,
ul-Stalina, Ulan-Bator

POLISH EDITION:

P. K. W. Z. ''RUCH'', Warszawa,
Wilcza 46

RUMANIAN EDITION:

Directia Difuzarii Presei,
Palatul administrativ C.F.R.,
Bd. Dinicu Golescu, Intrarea G,
Bucuresti

EDITIONS IN SPANISH:

Agencia de Distribucion de Prensa,
Praha 6, Sadova 3

Editorial Anteo,
Calle Entre Rios 1039,
Buenos Aires
Argentina

SWEDISH EDITION:

Arbetarkulturs forlag,
Kungsgatan 84,
Stockholm K

VIETNAMESE EDITION:

Editions HOC TAP,
61, Rue Nguyen Du,
Hanoi.