

# **WORLD MARXIST REVIEW**

**THEORIES OF  
HERBERT MARCUSE**  
R. STEIGERWALD  
Page 88

**NEW UPSURGE  
OF COMMUNIST  
MOVEMENT**

L. HARRIS  
Page 3

**13th CONGRESS OF  
CP OF ARGENTINA**

R. GIBSON  
Page 24

**THE INTERNATIONAL  
AND NATIONAL IN  
COMMUNIST POLICY**

R. HARRIS  
Page 25

## **PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM**

1969

35 CENTS





WORKERS OF ALL  
COUNTRIES, UNITE!

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

Theoretical and  
Information Journal  
of Communist and  
Workers' Parties

AUGUST, 1969  
VOLUME 12  
NUMBER 8

Authorized as Second  
Class Mail, Post Office  
Department, Ottawa and  
for payment of postage  
in cash. Printed in  
Canada.

WORLD MARXIST REVIEW  
is the North American  
edition of the monthly  
journal Problems of Peace  
and Socialism published  
in Prague. The North  
American edition is  
published by Progress  
Books, 487 Adelaide St.  
West, Toronto 133, Ont.,  
Canada.

Copyright © 1968 by  
Progress Books, Canada.  
All Rights Reserved.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES:  
\$3.50 a year. Single  
copies 35 cents. Bundle  
of five or more, 25 cents  
per copy. Outside  
Canada, add 15 cents  
exchange.

PROBLEMS OF PEACE  
AND SOCIALISM is also  
published in French,  
Russian, Bulgarian,  
Czech, Dutch, German,  
Greek, Hungarian,  
Italian, Japanese,  
Mongolian, Polish,  
Rumanian, Spanish,  
Swedish and Vietnamese.  
Subscriptions to these  
may be obtained through  
Progress Books,  
487 Adelaide St. West,  
Toronto, or in the USA  
from New Outlook  
Publishers, 32 Union Sq.  
East, Rm. 801, New York,  
N.Y. 10003.

Published by  
**PROGRESS BOOKS**  
487 Adelaide St. W.,  
Toronto 133, Ontario,  
Canada.



**WMR**

**CONTENTS**

- |                                           |           |                                                                                                                                                                                       |
|-------------------------------------------|-----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| L. BREZHNEV                               | <b>3</b>  | <b>Fresh upsurge of the communist movement</b>                                                                                                                                        |
| Y. TSEDENBAL                              | <b>12</b> | <b>Loyalty to Leninism: guarantee of successful outcome of struggle against imperialism, for peace and socialism</b>                                                                  |
| H. BAGDASH                                | <b>16</b> | <b>Vietnam's just cause will triumph</b>                                                                                                                                              |
|                                           | <b>19</b> | <b>Outstanding event in world communist movement</b><br>(interviews with heads and members of delegations to the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties)             |
| O. GHIOLDI                                | <b>34</b> | <b>In the communist and workers' parties</b><br>TO OVERTHROW THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE MONOPOLIES<br>URGENT TASKS OF PARTY BUILDING<br>HUNGARY: STRENGTHENING LEADING ROLE OF THE PARTY |
| A. SUAREZ<br>M. TOTH                      | <b>55</b> | <b>Viewpoints</b><br>THE INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL IN COMMUNIST POLICY                                                                                                               |
| J. WACLAWEK                               | <b>64</b> | <b>Communications and comment</b><br>FRENCH PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS: SOME CONCLUSIONS<br>IS THE BUNDESWEHR REALLY A "PAPER ARMY"?                                                      |
| P. HENTGES<br>J. ANGENFORT                | <b>75</b> | <b>International conference</b><br>PEACE FIGHTERS MEET IN BERLIN                                                                                                                      |
| Y. Kh.                                    | <b>79</b> | <b>In the capitalist world</b><br>CHANGES IN STRUCTURE OF THE WORKING CLASS IN THE FRG<br>PORTRAIT OF AN ANTI-COMMUNIST                                                               |
| W. GARNES<br>HANS KALT                    | <b>88</b> | <b>The battle of ideologies</b><br>APOSTLE OF THE "THIRD WAY" (critical remarks about the theories of Herbert Marcuse)                                                                |
| R. STEIGERWALD                            | <b>96</b> | <b>Against the persecution of democrats</b><br>FREEDOM UNDER THE JACKBOOT (letter from Mexico)<br>FOUL MURDER                                                                         |
| R. GARCIA<br>R. A.                        | <b>98</b> | <b>Books and journals</b><br>MONOGRAPH ON HISTORY OF THE COMINTERN<br>SUDAN: SOCIAL CHANGE ON ORDER OF THE DAY<br>NEW CANADIAN JOURNAL                                                |
| V. S.<br>M. IBRAHIM<br>NOUGOUD<br>J. BOYD |           |                                                                                                                                                                                       |

## ON THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE OF COMMUNIST AND WORKERS' PARTIES

An article by Leonid **BREZHNEV**, General Secretary of the CC, CPSU, entitled "Fresh Upsurge of the Communist Movement," states: "The International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, held in Moscow from June 5 to 17, 1969, was one of the most important political events of the 1960s. It was a forceful demonstration of the growing role and responsibility of Communists in the modern world. It will go down in history as a major landmark in activizing the struggle of all anti-imperialist forces and uniting the Communist and Workers' Parties on the principled basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism."

Yumzhagiin **TSEDENBAL**, First Secretary of the CC, Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, deals with the appeal of the International Conference "On the 100th Anniversary of the Birth of Lenin."

"Vietnam's Just Cause Will Triumph," is the title of an article by Haled **BAGDASH**.

Included in this section also are interviews given to **World Marxist Review** by heads and members of delegations taking part in the International Conference: Luis Carlos **PRESTES**—General Secretary, CC, Brazilian CP; Michael **O'RIORDAN**—General Secretary, Irish Workers' Party; Ezekias **PAPAIOANNOU**—General Secretary, Progressive Party of the Working People of Cyprus; Dominique **URBANY**—Chairman, CP of Luxembourg; Maciel **CAMPOS**—Member Political Committee and Secretariat, CC, Paraguayan CP; Henry **WINSTON**—National Chairman, CP USA; Rodney **ARISMENDI**—First Secretary, CC, CP of Uruguay; Leon **FEIX**—Member of CC, French CP; Luis **CORVALAN**—General Secretary, CP of Chile; John **MARKS**—Chairman, South African CP.

### In the Communist and Workers' Parties

Orestes **GHIOLDI**, Member of Executive and Secretary of the CP of Argentina, writes about the 13th Congress of the CP of Argentina.

Alberto **SUAREZ**, Secretary of the CC, CP of Uruguay, discusses questions of building a mass Party.

Matyas **TOTH**, member of the CC, Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, responsible for work of the Party and mass organizations, sets out problems of Party building in the Hungarian People's Republic.

### Viewpoints

Polish journalist Juliusz **WACLAWEK** deals with the international and national in the policy of communists.

### Communications and Comment

Pierre **HENTGES** discusses the results of the presidential elections in France and draws some conclusions.

### The battle of ideologies

A critical analysis of the socio-philosophical views of Herbert Marcuse is made by the West German philosopher Robert **STEIGERWALD**.



# ***Fresh upsurge of the communist movement***

LEONID BREZHNEV

The International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, held in Moscow from June 5 to 17, 1969, was one of the most important political events of the 1960s. It was a forceful demonstration of the growing role and responsibility of Communists in the modern world. It will go down in history as a major landmark in activizing the struggle of all anti-imperialist forces and uniting the Communist and Workers' Parties on the principled basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

The Meeting adopted documents of historic importance, re-affirming our movement's devotion to the ultimate communist goals. It made a searching analysis of the international situation, the socio-political changes and the alignment of class forces over the past few years. It collectively worked out a political platform for the present struggle against imperialism and the continued development of the revolutionary movement.

The documents of the Meeting combine a scientific Marxist-Leninist approach with practical militancy; the common strategy of the Communist movement with the tactical struggle of the fraternal Parties in the specific conditions of their respective countries. Revolutionary theory and practice are thus organically blended, mutually enriching each other. This makes for a more purposeful struggle against imperialism, for peace, democracy, national independence and socialism.

## **I.**

To properly assess this new Communist Meeting, we must look back several years. The fight against heightened imperialist aggressiveness insistently demanded closer

unity of the world Communist movement, of all the anti-imperialist forces. There was also the need for a Marxist-Leninist analysis of the many phenomena produced by the rapidly developing political and economic processes and by the scientific and technological revolution. Besides, after 1960 the leadership of the Communist Party of China launched an open ideological and political struggle against the majority of the Communist Parties. It did not scruple to use every available means to implant its concepts, split the Communist Parties, discredit their policy and undermine the unity of the anti-imperialist front. "Left" and Right opportunism became more active in the world working-class movement. Division in the Communist movement and deviations from Marxism-Leninism only gladdened the imperialists, who stepped up their pressure in an attempt to exploit the situation to weaken socialism and the entire working-class and liberation movement.

It became imperative to raise a barrier to centrifugal proclivities in the Communist movement and to strengthen the unity of the fraternal Parties. Accordingly, the Marxist-Leninist Parties began a struggle for unity of the Communist movement on every sector of the front. There was a suggestion for a new International Meeting of fraternal Parties.

The road to the Meeting was a complex one. The preparations for it passed through a number of stages, requiring extensive and intensive work and the surmounting of considerable difficulties. However, the Marxist-Leninist Parties worked towards the Meeting consistently and purposefully. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union was active in the preparations at all the



stages and in constant and close contact with fraternal Parties. And we gratefully acknowledge their high evaluation of the CPSU's political, theoretical and organizational work in the preparation and conduct of the Meeting.

The preliminary meetings, the exchanges of views, the participation of Party central committees in the discussion of the draft documents, and the work of the Preparatory Committee and the Working Group, made it possible to concretely and in a businesslike manner examine our common tasks, bring our positions closer on many outstanding issues, and unite the Parties around the main theoretical and practical problems to be discussed at the Meeting.

The principal result of this truly colossal preparatory work was, of course, the holding of the Meeting. However, the preparatory work was in itself politically important. For collective discussion of pressing theoretical and practical problems of our movement steadily won an increasing support for united action against imperialism on a Marxist-Leninist basis. The Consultative Meeting in Budapest was attended by representatives of 67 Parties, while 75 Parties were represented at the Moscow Meeting.

The Meeting's success was, unquestionably, predetermined by the profoundly democratic and candid atmosphere that marked its proceedings. Cooperation on an equal footing, wide publicity, which made it possible to keep the world public constantly informed and, lastly, the decision to send the materials of the Meeting to Parties not attending it, show that the Leninist code of democratic and principled discussion is deeply rooted in our movement. It is also added proof of our movement's strength and viability.

We can safely say that this form of work, world Communist meetings, has become an important means of collective discussion of pressing tasks and collective elaboration of an integral program of common action. For us, these meetings are valuable as a Marxist-Leninist school of political experience and revolutionary action; as a forum for a broad exchange of opinions and views and a means for charting a policy that takes fuller account of the interests of the working masses and enables us more actively to fight for these interests.

The Meeting noted that *there has been a further sharpening of the struggle between the forces of socialism and imperialism, between the forces of progress and reac-*

*tion. In this struggle the progressive forces are on the offensive. Ours is the epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism. In what do we see the manifestation of this main trend of modern times?*

*In the economic sphere* socialism continues to grow in strength and scope: the socialist countries' share of world industrial and agricultural output is steadily increasing; socialist social production is becoming more effective every year; its organization and managing are being improved, and the achievements of scientific and technological progress are being more fully applied in socialist economy development; living standards are rising.

*In the political sphere* the socialist world system has won greater international prestige and together with the international working-class and liberation movement is exerting a stronger influence on world political processes. The position of the forces of progress and democracy ranged against imperialism is growing stronger.

*In the sphere of ideology and culture* the ideas of socialism, progress and peace are gaining much more ground and are winning over large segments of society. Socialism and Marxism-Leninism continue to triumph in the battle for men's minds and hearts.

*The Meeting's attention was focussed on the key problem of our epoch, namely, the struggle against imperialism, which has been and remains the main enemy of peace, of the peoples' freedom, independence and social progress. This problem was considered as part of the vital question of united action by Communist and Workers' Parties, by all anti-imperialist forces.*

Sharpening of the contradictions inherent in the processes taking place within imperialism is one of its distinguishing features: uneven economic and political development has become more pronounced; the scientific and technological revolution is further aggravating the contradiction between the social nature of production and its capitalist form of appropriation; the activities of the giant international super-monopolies have intensified the clash between the economic interests of the monopolies of different countries and the competitive struggle for world markets and spheres of influence.

However, it was stressed at the Meeting that imperialism must not be underrated. It has not grown stronger, but for the revolutionary movement it remains a serious and dangerous foe. Aggressive strate-



gy, more tension, local wars, attempts to undermine the socialist community from within, and to split the Communist and entire revolutionary movement — such is the policy of modern imperialism. Its desperate attempts to hold back social development succeed in some countries. More and more frequently the imperialist forces act in a united front against revolutionary contingents, working out a common strategy and taking joint action. A long, difficult and persevering struggle against imperialism lies ahead.

*The Meeting pinpointed the principal directions of the struggle to unite the main streams of the modern revolutionary process — the socialist world system, the working class in the citadels of capitalism, and the national liberation movement — and charted a program of action for them. Its theoretical and practical conclusions thus go beyond the framework of the Communist movement—they provide a revolutionary perspective for the forces of the anti-imperialist front.*

In the 1960s, despite the certain difficulties and setbacks for some detachments, the three streams of the revolutionary process have been gathering momentum and making a growing contribution to the struggle against imperialism.

Experience provides convincing proof that in this common struggle success is achieved only when all the revolutionary streams coordinate their actions and merge to form a united anti-imperialist front. Conversely, the revolutionary struggle of the peoples encounters difficulties when this unity is impaired and the actions of the main forces of the world revolutionary process lack coordination. The Meeting attached paramount importance to unity, and called for unremitting efforts to strengthen the alliance of the socialist world system and the working-class and national liberation movements.

The socialist world system continues to play the decisive role in the struggle against imperialism, giving the revolutionary contingents and the democratic movement their most effective support. The successes of the world's revolutionary forces depend largely on the achievements of the socialist countries, on the ability of their ruling parties to utilize the potentialities of the new social system, and on the unity of the socialist camp. Hence, efforts to strengthen the socialist world system are, at the same time, efforts to advance the world revolutionary process, and make the

anti-imperialist struggle more effective.

*The Meeting reaffirmed that in consolidating the unity of the socialist system, the main emphasis should be on a steadfast implementation of the principles of socialist internationalism, correctly combining the national and international tasks of the socialist states and promoting fraternal mutual assistance and support.*

The Meeting documents disclose the profound meaning of proletarian, socialist internationalism in our epoch, of the relationship between the international and national tasks of each contingent of our movement. It was correctly stated at the Meeting that proletarian internationalism is the key and essential revolutionary component of the class struggle.

Many of the delegations approved the internationalist action taken by the Soviet Union and other fraternal countries in connection with the events in Czechoslovakia, but some expressed disagreement. The delegation of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia disclosed the danger inherent in the new subversive methods employed by imperialism and showed the vital need for resolute action against anti-socialist, Right opportunist forces within the country and its Party. That the cause of socialism in Czechoslovakia had to be consistently defended was stressed at the Meeting.

The rise and development of the international socialist system is part and parcel of the worldwide class struggle. The socialist system is the principal obstacle to imperialism. Socialism's enemies persist in their attempts to undermine the foundations of socialist state power, to disrupt the socialist remaking of society and to restore their own rule. That is why the Meeting emphatically declared the defense of socialism an internationalist duty of all Communists.

The danger of the divisive activities of the present leadership of the Communist Party of China for the world Communist movement, and the harm they are doing to the anti-imperialist struggle, were clearly brought out at the Meeting. Many examples were cited of the Mao Tse-tung group's subversive activities against individual fraternal Parties and against the Communist movement as a whole. Almost all the delegations, which stated their attitude on the policies of the CPC leadership, emphatically condemned attempts to substitute Maoism for Marxism-Leninism. It can be definitely said that the Meeting



trenchantly condemned this ideology and policy.

The policy of the CPSU with regard to China is clear and definite. Our position was stated in the speech of the CPSU delegation at the Meeting, in Soviet Government statements, and in the decisions of the June plenum of the CC, CPSU and at the recent session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. And our position is firm and resolute as regards the defense of the interests of the Soviet people and the security of our socialist country. At the same time, however, it is calm and restrained. We will not permit anyone to provoke the Soviet Union into unconsidered action. Our principled and constructive policy takes into account the long-term interests both of the Soviet and the Chinese peoples. In unanimously endorsing the CPSU delegation's stand at the Meeting, the CC plenum pointed out: "The CPSU will conduct an irreconcilable struggle against the anti-Leninist ideological propositions of the present leaders of China, against their divisive activities and chauvinist foreign policy. It will do all in its power to defend against all encroachments the interests of the Soviet people, who are building communism. At the same time, the CPSU is guided by the fact that the Soviet and Chinese peoples have identical basic interests. The CPSU will continue its efforts to preserve and maintain the friendly feelings that exist among the Soviet people for the Chinese people. There is no doubt that among the Chinese people similar feelings exist for the Soviet Union and other socialist countries."

*The Meeting documents underlined the vanguard role of the Communist movement in the modern world and expounded its program of action, strategy and tactics and also the ways and means of further activating the revolutionary struggle.*

The Meeting's conclusions are based on a profound generalization of the experience of all the Parties functioning under the most diverse conditions: Parties in power and those fighting for power, Parties functioning legally or illegally and utilizing various means and methods of struggle, veteran Parties and those that joined our movement in recent years.

In speeches at the Meeting, delegation heads raised a wide range of fundamental problems and general questions of a theoretical, programmatic nature affecting the Communist movement as a whole. Controversial and contentious questions were not

by-passed. On the contrary, they were discussed and, in our opinion, the answers to them were in most cases correct.

The ideas embodied in the Meeting documents are a treasure-store for the entire Communist movement. In the conclusions drawn by the Meeting each Party can see a particle of its own experience and its own contribution, and for every Party these conclusions can serve as a guide to action under specific national conditions. At the same time, these conclusions are based on the general objective laws of our movement and on general theoretical questions of a programmatic nature, thereby forming a platform for the movement as a whole.

The Meeting reasserted—and formulated in its documents—the main points on which we are united: identity of class interests and the understanding that the joint struggle against imperialism, against its aggressive policy and anti-communist ideology, must be intensified: the desire to achieve the unity of world socialism, of the entire Communist movement and enhance the responsibility of each fraternal Party; the struggle for creative development of Marxism-Leninism and its defense against Right and "Left" opportunist distortions; faith in the justice and inevitable triumph of our common cause.

True, the preparations and the Meeting itself did not remove all the difficulties and differences existing in the Communist movement. It will be recalled that not all Parties were represented. Some Parties, while supporting united action, agreed only with the section of the Document outlining a program of joint struggle against imperialism. Other Parties signed the Document with reservations on some of the formulations.

The crucial consideration, however, is that we achieved unity of positions and views among nearly all delegations on a wide range of pressing questions of principle. The Communist and Workers' Parties thus demonstrated anew their full sense of responsibility at the present important stage in history, and their resolve faithfully to apply the approach of Marx, Engels and Lenin to problems of the development of our movement from positions of revolutionary theory and irreconcilable struggle against all distortions of that theory. The Meeting confirmed that *what unites Communists is much stronger than what disunites them.*



## II.

Marxists do not believe in magic and do not expect automatic operation of their decisions. They hold that the accepted program can be fulfilled if the experience and ideas of the Communist movement, as generalized in the documents of the Meeting, are adopted by all the Parties, can win the minds and hearts of the working masses, can become their weapon and illumine their path of revolutionary struggle. The main thing today, therefore, is to translate into practice the ideas proclaimed by the Meeting.

The first steps taken by the fraternal Parties convincingly show that, with their customary efficiency and energy, Communists have started to propagate and implement these ideas. The Central Committees of the different Parties have held plenary meetings and there have been functionary and general membership meetings. The documents of the Meeting are being widely popularized through oral and printed propaganda. At the CC CPSU plenum convened immediately after the Meeting, there was a comprehensive discussion of the conclusions our Party should draw from the results of the Meeting and its documents for its future practical and theoretical work. Similar meetings were held by all Party organizations. The Central Committee is now working out concrete political, economic and ideological measures based on the results of the Meeting.

The job now facing Communists is to bring home the ideas of the Meeting to millions, and to work towards further elaboration and practical implementation of its main conclusions and aims.

What should they concentrate on today? Along what lines should they work to carry out the tasks set in the documents of the Meeting?

*The first objective, we believe, is a fresh upsurge of the anti-imperialist, revolutionary movement.*

The Meeting Document — "Tasks at the Present Stage of the Struggle Against Imperialism and United Action of the Communist and Workers' Parties and All Anti-Imperialist Forces" — contains important conclusions relating to the tactics and strategy of the Communist movement, and indicates the new reserves and possibilities of the revolutionary forces in the struggle against imperialism.

The fraternal Parties have received a clear-cut program of work among the work-

ing class, which is the main motive and mobilizing force of the revolutionary struggle, and among working peasants and progressive intellectuals. The great revolutionary potentialities of the youth have been fully revealed. The Meeting gave the fraternal Parties of Asian, African and Latin American countries a platform for broadening the national liberation movement in the world revolutionary process.

Important, too, is the Meeting's special stress on the indivisibility of the struggle against imperialism, for peace, and the struggle for the ultimate goals of the working class, the struggle against capitalism as a social system, for the triumph of socialism and communism.

These are Marxist, Leninist concepts. They help Communists in the struggle against imperialism, for Marxist-Leninist unity, against Right and "Left" opportunism. The Document also contains many propositions addressed to all the anti-imperialist forces, thereby providing a platform of broad unity between Communists and other anti-imperialist forces.

*The second objective is that every Party should make full use of all its potentialities to fight for the interests of its people and, simultaneously, to fight for the common international cause.*

Communists have always been in the van of the fighters for the vital interests of the working people, heading the popular movements for peace, national independence, social progress, democracy and socialism. And now that the Meeting has elucidated the situation in which different contingents of the Communist movement are working and brought to light new possibilities for their struggle, success depends on the fraternal Parties' ability to pursue a Marxist-Leninist policy, on the flexibility and maneuverability of their tactics, on their ability to broaden their ties with the masses and draw all strata of society into the anti-imperialist struggle.

Naturally, in this work every Party proceeds from its own experience and takes into account the national specifics of the life and struggle of its people. However, in accomplishing concrete tasks in their own countries, the Communist and Workers' Parties are fighting also for their general class interests on a world scale. Joint struggle against imperialism reveals more clearly what policy and what views are in line with the common interests of the Communist movement, and what clashes with these interests and hinders or even harms



the common cause.

The nature and substance of communism are such that, without infringing on independence, the Communist movement is able to arrive at a correct solution of problems confronting each national contingent and the movement as a whole. Proletarian internationalism and correctly understood national features and interests are inseparable from a Party's responsibility and rights.

*The third objective is to heighten the theoretical activity of the Communist Parties and of the Communist movement as a whole.*

The great Lenin taught Communists that without revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement, that a Marxist must be the master of events and not vice versa. "The absence of theory," he wrote, "deprives a revolutionary trend of the right to existence and inevitably condemns it, sooner or later, to political bankruptcy" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 6, p. 188).

We rely on the comprehensively developed Marxist-Leninist teaching, which has been tested in the practice of revolutionary struggle and the building of socialism. But life is in constant flux, posing new problems, confronting the revolutionary forces with increasingly complex tasks, and requiring theoretical interpretation of the changes taking place in the world. Finding answers to these new problems and providing a scientifically grounded perspective for our further advance require constant development of Marxism-Leninism.

That is why we urge the fullest generalization of the theoretical work of the fraternal Parties. And in this respect, we believe, there is no overestimating the value of theoretical conferences and creative discussions. If such discussions are correctly organized, if they are oriented on concrete aims and tasks, and if the most qualified Marxist-Leninists take part in them, they will unquestionably contribute to Marxist theoretical thinking, and we need not be apprehensive about holding them.

Naturally, they should be conducted in a Party spirit, with creative debate allowing everyone to state or uphold his views. The journal *World Marxist Review* could, in our opinion, be more active in sponsoring such Marxist theoretical discussions and conferences.

Marxism-Leninism has been and remains the ideological platform of the Communist Parties. We shall be guided by one of the Meeting's documents—the Address on the

Centenary of V. I. Lenin. In it, we proclaim anew our fidelity to Leninism and stress its international relevance. The Address is a blow at Right and "Left" revisionism.

*Lastly, the Meeting's action platform cannot be implemented without stepping up the struggle against imperialist ideology and opportunism in the working-class movement.*

Lenin enjoined us to overcome all resistance from the capitalists—not only military and political, but also ideological, which is the most powerful and far-reaching. Communists of all countries know they must conduct a determined offensive on bourgeois ideology and expose the man-hating substance of imperialism.

The enemy gives us no respite—he does not wait for us to resolve our differences and unite our efforts in the struggle against him. On the contrary, the ruling elements in the imperialist powers seek to use every difference in the Communist movement to further their own ends. They have set themselves the adventurist aim of carrying the war of ideas into socialist countries and the Communist movement. They are disseminating the spurious theory of "humane socialism"—a cover-slogan for attempts to undermine the foundations of the socialist system from within—the theory of gradual "convergence" of capitalism and socialism, "degeneration" of the Communist Party, and so on. In the capitalist countries anti-communism has been given the status of state policy. Hence, a maximum active fight against anti-communism is one of the conditions for the successful development of the world revolutionary process.

Marxist-Leninists have always consistently fought deviations from our revolutionary teaching—Right and "Left" opportunism, bourgeois distortions of our Marxist-Leninist theory under the guise of "renewing" it, and hidebound dogmatism. They have never retreated one iota from their scientific principles, nor will they ever do so.

The history of the Communist movement teaches that the struggle against opportunism is especially sharp during revolutionary upsurges. Furthermore, it shows that where and when contingents of the revolutionary movement failed to smash opportunism, they inevitably suffered defeat. These are lessons of history we cannot afford to forget.

For all their distinctions, deviations from Marxism-Leninism, whether Right or



"Left," sap the Communist Parties of their combatability and undermine the revolutionary positions of the working class and the unity of the anti-imperialist forces. Revisionism is extremely dangerous also because, in some cases, it fuses with bourgeois nationalism.

Of course, the struggle against opportunism is primarily a matter for the Party concerned. But it is also true that it affects the interests of the entire Communist movement, for if the struggle is neglected, it will inevitably reflect on our movement as a whole and will undermine its class positions.

In upholding the purity of Marxism-Leninism we aim at genuine unity and at strengthening the international Communist movement. At the same time, we feel that there should be a differentiated approach in the ideological struggle. It is one thing when this struggle is directed against the class enemy, against imperialism, and another when it is a struggle of ideas within the Communist movement, a struggle with those who, though sometimes expressing erroneous views, remain our allies. In the latter case it is not only a struggle against erroneous and harmful views, but above all a struggle to win back to correct positions our comrades in the movement, even if they temporarily labor under delusions. Here comradely, friendly polemics, even restraint, can prove useful. Thus, the question of the forms and methods of ideological struggle now acquires fundamental importance.

A creative approach to problems posed by life is the guarantee of further triumphs of Marxism-Leninism over opportunism. We can proudly say *that at no time in human history has a political movement and ideological trend played such a tremendous transformative role as the international Communist and working-class movement*. In the face of incredible difficulties it led the peoples of many countries onto the highroad of socialist development and moulded a new world outlook and a code of morals and habits that have been adopted by tens and hundreds of millions of people. Today the entire diversity and wealth of modern society's social progress and political and cultural life is inconceivable without the growing influence of the Communist movement. The future of mankind in this last third of the twentieth century depends largely on the strength and might of our movement, on united action of the Communist and Workers' Parties.

### III.

We take pride in the Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties' high appraisal of the activity of our Party, its internationalist position. For Soviet Communists this is a fresh source of revolutionary optimism and energy and a stimulus for creative endeavor.

Throughout its history, the CPSU has founded its policy on the Leninist concept of proletarian internationalism. We have always been guided by the well-known Leninist definition that to be an internationalist is to do "the utmost possible in one country for the development, support and awakening of the revolution in *all countries*" (Collected Works, Vol. 28, p. 292). *The CPSU has always striven to make full use of all inner potentialities to strengthen and promote socialism and communism to the utmost in the Soviet Union and, at the same time, to support and develop the revolutionary struggle throughout the world*. Such is our approach to our internationalist duty to the world Communist and working-class movement.

How do we spell this out in concrete terms?

*First of all, we believe that we shall be exerting our main influence on the world revolutionary process by continuing to set an example of economic achievement.*

The USSR has entered a qualitatively new stage of its development: the full-scale construction of communist society has been started and is being successfully continued, and great and complex tasks in the economy and social relations are being accomplished.

Rapid intensification of the economy is a characteristic feature. It has been prepared by the whole development of our productive forces, and by the requirements of the worldwide scientific and technological revolution. The accent is on higher efficiency of social production and productivity, rapid introduction and optimal use of new plant, and maximum involvement in production of available reserves. This, in turn, calls for constant improvement of socialist economic management and planning, and fuller use of the vast advantages inherent in the socialist system.

The economic reform in the USSR is now in its third year. One of its main objectives is to shape an economic mechanism assuring maximum growth of productivity, plus unhindered and accelerated scientific and technical progress extending



to every pore of the economy, from top to bottom. The reform is still to be completed, but the results already to hand are highly encouraging. Our economy is becoming more dynamic, more efficient, and with a faster rate of scientific and technological progress. The powerful economic potential built up over the years is producing an ever greater yield in terms of real values for the consumer.

We see all this as the way to enhance our influence on the world revolutionary process, the impact of our example on peoples fighting imperialist oppression.

The advantages of socialism and the effectiveness of its international example are not, naturally, confined to its ability fully to use scientific and technical achievements for the common good and for systematic and uninterrupted improvement of the people's conditions. Our system also creates the best prerequisites for developing the full man, for the flowering of all human endowments, spiritual resources and talents. That is the high and truly humane goal of our society, and, seen against the background of the spreading spiritual and ideological devastation inflicted on men by modern capitalist society, it has a very special appeal.

We have been steadily improving the whole complex of socialist social relations, striving further to consolidate our Soviet state, and to achieve the utmost development and amplification of socialist democracy.

There is much history to show that wherever the role and power of the socialist state is weakened, anarchy supervenes and socialist gains are jeopardized. Our adversaries have tried to make use of the CPSU's policy of strengthening the Soviet state for propaganda purposes, by contrasting it with the policy of further developing and perfecting socialist democracy. However, we have repeatedly declared—and say this again—we regard democracy in terms of class. This means that the main point is: democracy for whom? Socialist democracy is—not nominally but actually—a democracy for millions upon millions of workers and peasants, for the people's intelligentsia, it is a reflection of their vital interests. We take the content and meaning of socialist democracy to be the massive involvement of men and women in government, economic construction and the administration of all public affairs. That is the direction in which we have been steadily improving the legislative foundations of

our state and of our democracy. To take an example. We are now working to write into the Constitution the changes that have taken place in Soviet society over the last few decades. The people have been invited to discuss a draft Rules of the Agricultural Artel reflecting the level achieved and the new conditions of collective-farm management. A decision was recently taken to improve the information available to the public on domestic and foreign affairs.

Like the way of all discoverers, our way to communism is hard and tortuous. To keep our bearings, we need a good compass, and for us this has always been and remains Marxism-Leninism, by which the CPSU is guided in working out its plans in building communism. These are mapped out in the decisions of the Party's 20th-23rd Congresses, and in the Program of the CPSU. Our Party abstracts the experience gained in socialist and communist construction into theoretical propositions, and makes a study of the new phenomena and tendencies in the development of Soviet society. Now that the scale and complexity of the tasks of communist construction objectively require enhancing the Party's leading role, we have also been giving thought to ways of developing the Party itself, strengthening its ideological and organizational unity, and backing up with theory the whole of our Party and ideological work in society.

Of the remarkable traits of the highly conscious Soviet citizen, the one that stands out in the present conditions is his sense of pride in the Communist Party and country, dedication to their prosperity, and a profound understanding of the international significance of communist construction in the USSR. The Party considers its primary task to be continued education of our people in the spirit of Soviet patriotism, in the spirit of friendship, brotherhood and international solidarity with the peoples of the socialist countries, and with all the peoples fighting for social emancipation and national liberation, democracy, peace and socialism.

Assistance to peoples who are victims of aggression and are fighting imperialism, for their national, political and economic liberation, and for social progress is an integral element of our internationalist duty to the Communist and working-class movement. The scale and effectiveness of this assistance depends directly on our success in developing Soviet society. In Soviet Russia's early years, her influence on the



course of world development was determined chiefly by the power of revolutionary example. With the growth of the Soviet Union's economic and political might, not only did our example become more attractive, but material and military assistance to peoples who are fighting imperialism increased.

That is not to say, of course, that we engaged in the "export of revolution." We are fully aware that revolutions are not imported, but spring from the internal development of each country and the determined struggle of the masses for their social emancipation. But we are also fully aware of the importance of giving fighting peoples timely and varied assistance and support.

The world is aware of the Soviet Union's great military and material assistance to the people of Vietnam in their just fight against U.S. imperialist aggression. The Soviet Union's economic ties with the young states of Asia and Africa and with the countries of Latin America have been growing stronger. We strive to assist the economic development of liberated countries, help them establish a national industry, train their own personnel, etc. This kind of assistance to the young states lessens their dependence on the imperialist monopolies and helps strengthen the common anti-imperialist front.

Our Party believes that peace offers the best conditions for the revolutionary and liberation movement. *That is why we also regard our peaceable foreign policy, our struggle for world peace as a component—and very important—part of our internationalist duty to the worldwide Communist and working-class movement.*

We shall continue to develop our foreign policy activity, which is of considerable importance for our common revolutionary cause. We shall go on helping to strengthen the might and cohesion of the socialist community, striving to frustrate the aggressive plans of imperialism, fighting to maintain peace and to establish the principles of peaceful coexistence of states with differing social systems, and supporting the people's liberation struggle.

The Soviet people are engaged in peaceful labor and have no need of war. Nor does the vast majority of mankind want war. That is why Soviet foreign policy, with the struggle for peace as its cornerstone, meets the vital interests of all peoples and has their growing support. Together with the other Parties, we have now

started active preparations for the convocation of an anti-imperialist congress of the peoples of the world, and a congress of the peoples in defense of European security.

Soviet Communists have always been and will remain true to their internationalist duty. We solemnly reaffirmed this at the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties. By our constructive endeavor in building a communist society, by strengthening the country's defense capability, by our assistance to fighting peoples, by our peace-loving foreign policy, we have been doing and will continue to do everything in our power to advance the cause of peace and social progress, the cause of socialism and communism.

\* \* \*

The first Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties was held a little over ten years ago. We have now once again worked out a platform for united action. From one Meeting to another, from one strategic stage to another, the Communists' revolutionary and creative activity has gained in scope; we have acquired more experience and greater ability to go to the heart of social processes and to exert an influence on them.

At the last Meeting we stated that the present stage in the fight against imperialism offers growing possibilities for fresh advances by the revolutionary and progressive forces. Imperialism is no longer capable of regaining the historical initiative, and to reverse the course of social development. Mankind's highroad is determined by the socialist world system, the international working class, and all the other revolutionary forces.

We are aware that the world revolutionary process is not a walkover, with victories all the way. Unfortunately, now and again we have to taste the bitterness of defeat and regress. The impact and the significance of the Meeting lie in its warning against an oversimplified approach to the tasks before the Communist movement at its new stage. The impact and the significance of our Meeting lie in its Marxist-Leninist assessment of vital problems and its realistic approach to solving them. It has confirmed that despite the difficulties, the Communist movement is in the van of the anti-imperialist struggle, that it is the mightiest political force of our day, capable of finding creative solutions for



complex political and theoretical problems.

The political atmosphere of the world is filled with the ideas of the Meeting. Our activity, practical and theoretical, is marked by endeavor to realize them. In the spirit of the Meeting's decisions, we are going forward to mark the centenary of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, the immortal genius

of our revolutionary epoch, staunch fighter against imperialism and reaction, great champion of proletarian internationalism.

In the struggle against imperialism, for the revolutionary renewal of the world, Communists will carry even higher the militant banner of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.

---

## ***Loyalty to Leninism: guarantee of successful outcome of the struggle against imperialism, for peace and socialism***

YUMZHAGIIN TSEDENBAL

The approaching Lenin jubilee is a historic date of worldwide significance. The Address "Centenary of the Birth of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin" which was enthusiastically adopted by the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties is, consequently, a document of profound political importance.

In this Address, 75 fraternal parties pay tribute to the immortal genius of our epoch, to the greatest of revolutionaries and leaders. The Address underscores the international significance of the Marxist-Leninist teaching, reaffirms the unswerving loyalty of the Communists of the world to Leninism—the ideological foundation of the revolutionary militancy and unity of the world Communist movement.

### **I.**

The history of our epoch is indissolubly associated with the name of Lenin. Lenin's ideas continue to revolutionize world developments. Lenin has come to symbolize the magnificent revolutionary achievements

of the 20th century, which have fundamentally changed the social face of the world and signify mankind's transition to socialism and communism.

Lenin was an eminent scholar and thinker. He enriched and further developed in new historical conditions the integral components of Marx's and Engels' teaching: dialectical materialism, political economy, the theory of the socialist revolution and the building of communist society.

Lenin is the founder of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the first proletarian party of a new type. He is the leader of the world's first victorious socialist revolution and the architect of the world's first state of workers and peasants.

Lenin is the acknowledged leader of the international working class, the founder of the Communist movement of today. Generations of Communists, dedicated to the working class, to the people, to socialism, have grown up and become tempered in battle under the impact of his great ideas. It is under the banner of Leninism that the



revolutionary movement in most countries has risen to new heights, that Communist parties have been formed and have grown strong, that the international Communist movement has become a truly worldwide political force, the most influential of our time.

Lenin was a fearless antagonist of imperialism and reaction. He championed unity of action of all contingents of the working people against the common class enemy. He was a consistent internationalist, the friend of all oppressed nations and showed the way to victory in the struggle against colonialism and for the independence and freedom of peoples.

Lenin gave the world the pattern of a new type of international relations based on the principles of full equality of all states, big and small, and mutual respect, formulated the principles of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, worked tirelessly for a durable peace, security and friendship among nations.

## II.

Lenin combined a profound scientific approach to the processes of social development with a truly revolutionary approach. In this lies his genius and it explains why Leninism has become the axis of the ideological and political life of today, of the class struggle. For imperialism there are no more dangerous ideas than the great teaching of Lenin. It is not accidental, therefore, that the fight against Leninism was and remains the intrinsic feature of anti-communism, of imperialism's ideological subversions.

The ideologists of imperialism and the reformists have redoubled their attacks on Leninism, in connection with the approaching centenary. The enemies of Leninism understand only too well that this centenary will be a review of the great revolutionary transformations that have taken place in the world under the direct impact of Leninism.

They are therefore spearheading their ideological offensive at the Leninist stage in the development of Marxism, in an attempt to splinter the integral Marxist-Leninist theory and to minimize its universal significance, to engender different interpretations of communism and thus weaken the socialist community and unity of the Communist parties and the general anti-imperialist front.

One cannot fail to see that anti-Communist propaganda has redoubled its attacks particularly on the Leninist teaching regarding the leading role of the working class and its Marxist vanguard in the revolutionary and liberation movements, in the building of socialism and communism. Bourgeois and other anti-socialist ideologists particularly single out for attack the principle of democratic centralism — the underlying principle of Party building. These spurious "defenders of democracy" zealously advocate freedom of factions and groups in the Communist parties, knowing that this can only undermine the principle of democratic centralism and, consequently, the militancy of Marxist-Leninist parties.

In its onslaught on Leninism imperialist propaganda gladly uses the anti-Soviet inventions of the Right and "Left" revisionists, their "theories" which virtually negate the revolutionary forms of struggle and dictatorship of the proletariat, and put the accent on nationalism rather than on proletarian internationalism, all of which can only split the revolutionary forces to the advantage of imperialism.

The complexity of conditions and variety of forms of the anti-imperialist struggle in the world of today are among the objective factors engendering certain difficulties. The enemies of Leninism would like to exploit these difficulties in their drive to discredit our revolutionary teaching and thereby disarm, ideologically and politically, the working class and its vanguard—the Communist parties. What these enemies fail to understand is that Communists see in the teaching of Lenin not only the key to overcoming existing difficulties, but also how to use more skilfully the present world situation that favors the revolutionary cause, to reinforce the anti-imperialist struggle of the peoples.

That is why the Communist and Workers' parties, paying tribute to Lenin's supreme services to the revolutionary world movement and steadfastly adhering to his teaching, are stepping up their revolutionary activity, their political and ideological work among the masses, are broadening and reinforcing their ranks in preparation for the Lenin centenary.

## III.

The potency of Leninism lies not only in the fact that it showed the revolutionary way to solving the social and national problems of our time, but also in the fact



that it equipped the Communist parties with the only true dialectical method of analysis and assessment of social phenomena, the creative method when elaborating the strategy and tactics of the people's struggle. Hence, defense of the purity of Leninism and its creative, scientific elaboration, the correct application of its great ideas in a given situation, constitute two indissoluble and mutually complementary aspects of one and the same task that is ever present in the theory and practice of the Communist movement.

A splendid example of such a creative approach to the problems of revolutionary theory and practice was given to Communists by Lenin himself. He taught us "to apply the general and basic principles of communism to the *specific relations* between classes and parties, to the *specific features* in the objective development towards communism, which are different in each country and which we must be able to discover, study and predict." (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p. 89).

The historical truth of Leninism, its enduring universal significance, lies in the fact that it expresses the fundamental needs of our epoch.

"Today," we read in the Address, "we have every justification for saying about Lenin's teaching what he himself said about Marxism: it is omnipotent, because it is true."

For the peoples of the socialist countries, for the Communist parties exercising state power, loyalty to Leninism opens new vistas for using to the full the tremendous reserves contained in the new system. Pioneering the road to a radiant future for mankind, the Marxist-Leninist parties of the socialist countries, guided by the wise counsel contained in Lenin's teaching, are further developing and perfecting the social relations, forms of political, economic and cultural life of their peoples, are promoting all-round ties, fraternal solidarity and mutual aid between the socialist countries.

Leninism serves the Communists, the peoples of the socialist countries as a reliable compass in their advance towards the heights of human progress. The difficulties and differences existing at present in the socialist community are transient. They will inevitably be surmounted because of the identity of their socio-political system, of the fundamental interests and aims of the countries constituting the socialist world community.

The working-class movement in the capi-

talist countries, which has accumulated a tremendous revolutionary potential and which is entering a new phase of social battles, finds in Leninism, in the creative, scientific elaboration of its ideas by the Communist Parties, the answers to the most vital problems. Guided by Leninism, the international proletariat links the struggle against monopoly capital and for its basic interests and social rights, with the struggle for peace and against the aggressive policy of the ruling imperialist circles, with the struggle for democracy and socialism. All the other social sections who feel the oppression of the monopolies—the bulk of the peasantry, the urban middle strata, the intellectuals and the youth—are rallying ever more closely around the working class. A broad anti-monopoly front capable of destroying the power of the exploiters and opening the way to socialism, is taking shape. The present scope of the class battles in the capitalist countries fully corroborates the Leninist idea that the mass strike movement is a powerful means for awakening, enlightening and organizing the masses, for inspiring in them complete confidence in the leading role of the revolutionary proletariat.

The great attention Lenin paid to the national liberation of the peoples oppressed by colonialism is well known. Leninism has contributed tremendously to the success of the national liberation revolutions in the past few decades. In present conditions the national liberation movement is one of the most important fronts in the worldwide struggle against imperialism. The social progress of the peoples who have cast off the colonial yoke and the extent to which world socialism is able to consolidate its positions will depend in large measure on the road these peoples will take—the socialist or capitalist.

Today Lenin's teaching shows the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America the most effective way of achieving complete liberation and consolidating national independence. Lenin's idea regarding the non-capitalist way is particularly valid for the countries that have recently won political independence. In his report to the Second Congress of the Communist International, he said: "... are we to consider as correct the assertion that the capitalist stage of economic development is inevitable for backward nations now on the road to emancipation and among whom a certain advance towards progress is to be seen since the war? We replied in the negative."



He went on to say that with the aid of the proletariat of the advanced countries, backward countries can advance towards communism "without having to pass through the capitalist stage." (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p. 244). The historical experience of the Mongolian people and of certain other peoples has fully borne out the truth of Lenin's brilliant foresight. The Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties therefore had all grounds for arriving at the conclusion that the non-capitalist path "opens up the possibility of overcoming the backwardness inherited from the colonial past and creates conditions for transition to socialist development."

#### IV.

Vladimir Ilyich Lenin's whole life and activity are a model of true internationalism, of unceasing endeavor to achieve unity of will and action by Communists against the common foe and for common aims. Carrying forward Marx's idea about the community of vital interests of the working class of all countries and continents, Lenin wrote: "Complete victory over capitalism cannot be won unless the proletariat and, following it, the mass of working people in all countries and nations throughout the world voluntarily strive for alliance and unity." (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 31, p. 151).

Lenin's behest to Communists to constantly promote international solidarity of the working class, unity of the international Communist movement has acquired particular significance in our day. That is why the Communist and Workers' parties, true to Lenin's teaching, stressed at the Moscow Meeting that at the present time "the most important prerequisite for increasing the Communist and Workers' parties contribution to the solution of the problems facing the peoples is to raise the unity of the Communist movement to a higher level in conformity with present-day requirements. This demands determined and persistent effort by all the Parties."

Lenin saw Communist unity as unity of like-minded persons who firmly uphold Marxism and proletarian internationalism. He was therefore implacable to any manifestation of opportunism in the Communist movement. He repeatedly stressed that the struggle against imperialism is a hollow and false phrase unless it is indissolubly linked with the struggle against opportunism. The historical experience of the class struggle fully bears out the truth of Lenin's

profound perspicacity. Little wonder, therefore, that the forces of international reaction are pinning their hopes on all kinds of revisionists and disrupters in the working-class movement, for they understand that Right and "Left" opportunism, closely interlinking with nationalism, would inevitably vitiate the revolutionary qualities of the Communists, would lead to their degeneration.

Steadfastly following Lenin's behest, and firmly upholding the solidarity of our movement on a principled basis, Marxist-Leninists have always resolutely opposed those who by their subversive, divisive actions have prejudiced and continue to prejudice the unity of Communist ranks on a national and international scale, who hamper the unification of all anti-imperialist forces. That is why our Party, like many other parties, has emphatically rejected the attempts by the Mao Tse-tung group to substitute the "thought of Mao" for Leninism, and why it has denounced the anti-Marxist, anti-socialist platform and divisive, adventurist policy of this group.

#### V.

Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, the great continuer of the teaching and revolutionary work of Marx and Engels, the recognized leader of the international working class, was the great friend and teacher of the Mongolian people. It is therefore only natural that our people associate their freedom and independence, their successes and victories in building the new life with the name of the immortal Lenin, with his all-conquering teaching, with the glorious deeds of the great Communist Party of the Soviet Union, founded and reared by him.

Preparations for the historic jubilee, the centenary of Lenin's birth, have enhanced the awareness of our Party members and of the working people of socialist Mongolia of the grandeur of the ideas and revolutionary achievements of the leader of the world proletariat. The Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party considers it its sacred duty always to adhere to Lenin's teaching, resolutely to defend the purity of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, to be as implacable as Lenin was to all manifestations of opportunism, to fight on two fronts: against "Left" as well as Right revisionism. In preparation for the Lenin centenary our Party is reinforcing its guiding role in socialist construction, is stepping up its ideological, political and organizing



work among the masses, is strengthening the ties of Mongolian-Soviet friendship which has stood the test of time, of friendship and cooperation with the peoples of the other socialist states and fraternal solidarity with the Communists and working people of all countries.

Lenin's ever-living teaching has become in our epoch a source of strength and

inspiration to hundreds of millions of people of labor throughout the world in their fight for peace, freedom, socialism and communism. There is no doubt that the Address "Centenary of the Birth of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin" will contribute to still closer unity of the great army of fighters for a happy future for mankind under the invincible banner of Marxism-Leninism.

---

## ***Vietnam's just cause will triumph***

KHALED BAGDASH

Many fine pages have been written into the history of the international revolutionary movement since the Great October Socialist Revolution, the Soviet people's victory in the Great Patriotic War against Nazi Germany and the people's revolution in China. Now the courageous Vietnamese are writing one of the most brilliant pages. Their heroic effort was lauded at the Moscow Meeting of 75 Communist and Workers' Parties as a determining factor in the popular movement against imperialism.

For the Vietnamese people have convincingly demonstrated that, for all its exertions imperialism, and U.S. imperialism, its striking force, cannot reverse the world balance of forces in its favor. That is a very important factor.

Their victorious fight against the U.S. aggressors furthers the cause of progressive mankind. First, the Vietnamese have exploded the reactionary propaganda myth that it is useless to oppose the mammoth military force the USA has at its disposal; they have disproved the assertions of all those who had doubted that the Vietnamese people could resist and strike back at the USA in South Vietnam. Second, they have proved, in practice, the Marxist-Leninist proposition that the inevitable course of

history is towards a victory for national independence, democracy and socialism.

The development of the Vietnam situation clearly shows that imperialist aggression, no matter how vicious, is bound to fail, even when backed up by vast material and technical resources. But only given these two conditions: first, the people's solid determination to fight under a leadership enjoying their confidence, like the Vietnam Working People's Party in the North, and the National Liberation Front in the South. Second, the international solidarity and support of the Communist, working-class and national liberation movement, above all sincere and close friendship with the Soviet Union, and its all-round political, military and economic assistance. Given this, the imperialist attacks are bound to break against the granite-like determination of the people, and the plans of criminal aggression will end in total failure. That explains why the USA has been forced to call an unconditional halt to the bombing of North Vietnam and to agree to negotiate with the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam for a peaceful settlement.

The Document of the Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties has drawn



this important conclusion about the present stage in the development of human society: "The war in Vietnam is the most convincing proof of the contradiction between imperialism's aggressive plans and its ability to put these plans into effect. In Vietnam, U.S. imperialism, the most powerful of the imperialist partners, is suffering defeat, and this is of historic significance. The armed intervention in Vietnam holds a special place in the military and political designs of U.S. imperialism. The aggressor planned to destroy an outpost of socialism in Asia, block the way for the peoples of Southeast Asia to freedom and progress, strike a blow at the national liberation movement, and test the strength of the proletarian solidarity of the socialist countries and the working people of the whole world."

The Vietnamese people's fight and victories are of the utmost importance to the development of the world situation and the great fight for freedom and independence, against imperialism. That is why the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties proclaimed all-round support for the Vietnamese a priority aim of united action by Communists and all other anti-imperialists. It is no exaggeration to say that resolute support of Vietnam has become a vital problem for the liberation movement in every part of the globe, whatever its character, be it working-class or national liberation. Final victory for the Vietnamese patriots, and a forced U.S. pull-out of all interventionist and aggressive troops from Vietnamese territory is of *fundamental importance* in consolidating the positions of all peoples, without exception, in their fight against imperialist violence and lawlessness.

Support for the Vietnamese people's final victory in their intrepid struggle will go a long way towards solving the main problem uppermost in the minds of most men (all men, in fact, except for the handful who side with imperialism)—safeguarding peace and preventing another world war, which is bound to be thermonuclear and a holocaust. That is why, the Meeting's Appeal "Independence, Freedom and Peace for Vietnam!" is quite right in saying: "By defending their homeland, the Vietnamese people simultaneously fulfil their internationalist duty and serve the noble cause of world peace." This is now accepted not only by forward-looking workers and peasants, not only by society's vanguard forces, but also by the masses, even by large groups that have no ideological links with social-

ism. Regardless of their social status, political orientation and convictions, peace fighters the world over are at one in demanding that U.S. imperialism stop its war in Vietnam. This movement is spreading in the U.S. itself despite all the misleading imperialist propaganda techniques.

The Vietnamese people's successes, the result of heroism and courage, experienced leadership, and the assistance of the socialist countries, the Soviet Union above all, also contribute to the ideological strengthening of the whole revolutionary movement. These successes expose the political insolvency of those who have tried to spread doubt about the effectiveness of Soviet assistance, and slander the Soviet people and their splendid Party, the party of Lenin, by twisting the facts about the war in Vietnam and presenting a distorted picture of the situation. And in casting doubt on the strength of the Vietnamese people, who rely on Soviet assistance, they had a very definite purpose: to plunge mankind into a devastating world nuclear war to achieve their selfish, great-power aims. These men alleged that Soviet material and political support of, and international solidarity with, the Vietnamese people were inadequate, ineffective and useless. However, the Vietnamese people and their Working People's Party, guided by the wise and experienced leader, Comrade Ho Chi Minh, debunked this and showed the whole world what a small but heroic and fully determined people can do in standing up **for its independence and sacred soil.**

Vietnam has also debunked the reformist and the Right-wing revisionist "theories" that world peace may be jeopardized by **intensifying the fight against imperialism** in any part of the globe, and passing, wherever necessary and possible, to the higher stage of armed struggle. These objections were met by the Meeting when it said that "every people has the inalienable right to take up arms in defense against encroachments by imperialist aggressors and to avail itself of the help of other peoples in its just cause. This is an integral part of the general anti-imperialist struggle of the peoples."

The Syrian people, who together with other fraternal Arab peoples, are carrying on a fierce fight against Israeli aggression, which has U.S., West German and British imperialist support, highly appreciate Vietnam's courageous struggle. In Syria we have had a broad campaign of solidarity with Vietnam in which Communists, the



Left Baathists, and all other progressive forces took part despite their political differences. The progressive national regime in Syria has established diplomatic relations with the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, and has recognized the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam. Syria was one of the first to extend recognition to the Provisional Revolutionary Government of the Republic of South Vietnam.

Vietnam's example is an inspiration to the Syrian and all the other Arab peoples. It fortifies their confidence that they will eliminate the consequences of Israel's imperialist aggression and liberate the Arab Zionist-invaded territories.

The Syrian Communist Party has always

worked for broader, more diversified and closer solidarity with the heroic Vietnamese. The special resolution of the Third Congress of the SCP, held in Damascus early last June, urging greater solidarity with the courageous Vietnamese people, has evoked a wide response among workers, peasants, women, students, young people, and all progressive national elements.

True patriots in Syria and other fraternal Arab countries regard the Vietnamese fight against the criminal U.S. aggression as their own. They are sure that the Vietnamese will score a decisive and crushing victory over the imperialist aggressors.



# ***Outstanding event in the world communist movement***

"How do you assess the importance of the Meeting for the communist movement and for your own Party?"

**World Marxist Review** correspondents put the question to several heads and members of delegations at the recent International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow. Their answers are given on this and the following pages.

**LUIS CARLOS PRESTES**

**General Secretary, Central Committee,  
Brazilian Communist Party**

Our delegation is fully satisfied with the results of the Meeting. They are of enormous importance for the struggle of Brazil's Communists and patriotic and democratic forces against imperialist domination, and for social progress.

In my country there is a continued escalation of dictatorial rule, which began with the 1964 reactionary military coup that overthrew the government of Joao Goulart. With the growth of the forces opposing the dictatorship, and the rise of the popular struggle for freedom and national independence, the group of reactionary generals—the backbone of the dictatorship—has been resorting to ever more reactionary measures, increasing Brazil's subordination to the interests of the U.S. monopolies, and pushing her towards outright fascism.

The dictatorship's policy is to increase Brazil's dependence on U.S. imperialism. The plunder of the Brazilian economy by the U.S. monopolies has reached unprecedented proportions: in 1968, \$500 million, i.e., about 30 per cent of total export earnings, was taken out of the country in monopoly profits, interest on capital and repayment of external debts. Also this

fact: since 1963 real wages have been pressed down by more than 40 per cent.

Imperialism has used the most violent methods to suppress the revolutionary movement, and its vanguard, the working class. Its main goal is to prevent the maturing of objective and subjective conditions allowing the Brazilian people to follow the path blazed by the fraternal people of Cuba. But repression has proved anything but effective: the isolation of the dictatorship is growing, and a tide of hatred for the foreign oppressors is sweeping the country. What is more, imperialism has already lost its historical initiative and cannot win back its lost positions. For, as the Main Document "Tasks at the Present Stage of the Struggle Against Imperialism and United Action of the Communist and Workers' Parties and All Anti-Imperialist Forces" adopted by the International Meeting in Moscow declares, the main direction in mankind's development is now determined by these three great forces: the world socialist system, the international working-class and the national liberation movement.

All over the world imperialist domination is nearing its end. And the higher the



unity of the world's revolutionary forces, the sooner will imperialism's desperate effort to hang on collapse. To strengthen the unity and cohesion of the international Communist movement and all other anti-imperialist forces was the high and lofty aim of the International Meeting. The Document formulating the immediate tasks of the anti-imperialist struggle was framed in free, democratic and fraternal discussion. In such a broad discussion, especially in analyzing the present situation, which brought up many theoretical problems, there naturally arose some differences. They had appeared in the Communist movement even before the Meeting, but there is ample evidence that the Consultative Meeting at Budapest, the preparatory work and the Moscow Meeting itself, have resulted in a much closer identity of views.

That is why agreement was reached on the Document, which contains a scientific analysis of pressing international problems and offers solutions in the interests of the proletariat and all peoples.

Some Parties may have signed the Document with some reservations, but the unanimity on important documents like the one expressing solidarity with the heroic Vietnamese people fighting the U.S. aggressors, the Appeal in Defense of Peace, and the statement on the Lenin centenary is a reflection of the high spirit of unity at the Meeting.

Its results are a decisive contribution to greater joint action by Communists all over the world, to the struggle for peace, progress, democracy and socialism. This is a positive step of tremendous importance towards further cohesion and unity of the international Communist movement. It will considerably enhance the strength and prestige of all Communist and Workers' Parties.

With the political platform approved by the Meeting as a basis, the international Communist movement will find it easier to fulfil the historic task of bringing all the other progressive forces of the world into a joint struggle against imperialism, and in defense of world peace. Imperialism will find it more difficult to continue its crimes against the heroic Vietnamese people; the armed forces of the United States and its satellites will have to withdraw from Vietnam. This will strengthen the positions of all the peoples which like the Brazilian people, labor under imperialism and fight against the crimes and lawlessness of its agents.

The Document gives due attention to the Latin American people's struggle against imperialism, and for freedom, national liberation and social progress. It notes their intensified resistance to U.S. imperialism and its war plans through workers' strikes, peasant movements and diverse actions by students and other forces. It notes, also, that in some countries the revolutionary forces are going over to armed struggle against the domination of imperialist oligarchies.

We voice full agreement with the Meeting's conclusions. They will greatly help towards united action by Latin America's Communists and other anti-imperialist forces fighting U.S. imperialist penetration. In Latin America we are fighting one and the same enemy. All our countries are now going through the same stage of the revolution, which is a national-democratic revolution. At times this creates the erroneous impression of a homogeneous Latin America, with the democratic and revolutionary movement on the same level in all its countries. The Meeting did not make that mistake. Its Document recognizes the complexity of the situation in different Latin American countries and also the fact that the concrete situation in each country is highly fluid. It also notes that though our peoples are fighting a common enemy, there are growing distinctions from country to country as the revolutionary process unfolds. And this difference in level and phase of economic and social development determines the different forms of struggle the democratic and revolutionary forces employ in each concrete country and at each concrete moment.

That is why it would be futile to try to work out a single political line and uniform tactics for the revolutionary movement in all our countries. What we need is unity of all our peoples in the fight against the common foe, and this will intensify the struggle. But the form of such unity should be based on complete autonomy for each national detachment in working out tactics adapted to concrete conditions in each country, but also on mutual support, active solidarity and constant exchange of experience.

Such is the spirit of the Document approved at the International Meeting in Moscow. It gives us a new and powerful political and ideological weapon. It will be crucial in achieving greater unity of



Latin American Communists; it will help them work more effectively for united action by all the anti-imperialist and progressive forces and deal fresh and more

powerful blows at our enemy—imperialism—and hasten the advance to national independence, progress, democracy and socialism.

## MICHAEL O'RIORDAN

### General Secretary, Irish Workers' Party

The Communist movement is indeed a world movement. There is no other political force like it. Each Communist and Workers' Party sees the situation in which it functions as a sector of the international front in the worldwide struggle between socialism and imperialism. There is not, and cannot be, separate and isolated struggles in this global fight. Of course, each Party works in very different situations, under varying conditions, but all this is superseded by the common principle of solidarity and internationalism which was the basic creed laid down by Marx and Engels when they founded the First International. The attendance of 75 Parties from all parts of the world at the Conference underlines the character of our movement. The Conference in this way gave even fresh elan to that cardinal principle of "Workers of All Countries, Unite!"

All stressed the spirit of unity that permeated the meeting. Above all I was impressed by the opportunities that existed for free debate and the complete democratic procedures in which *all* parties whether big or small had the opportunity to express their viewpoints regardless of the fact that some of them had state power, others were functioning under rigorous illegal conditions, and more of them, as yet, exist as small minority organizations in some countries.

In no other movement or organization of an international character would you find such real genuine democratic and fraternal conditions for debate. Consequently, differences of opinion were only on some limited questions—there was a powerful unity and agreement on the objective of the Conference: The tasks of the struggle against imperialism and the unity of action of not only the Communist parties, but of all anti-imperialist forces.

What a contrast with the aim, purpose and proceedings of the Socialist International where the Wilsons, Willy Brandts and others gathered in Britain to, coincidentally, hold their meeting.

The 1969 International Meeting of Com-

munist and Workers' Parties marks a new and positive stage in the international working-class movement. It will affect events on a national and international scale in our common fight against imperialism in the 'seventies' that we cannot, even yet, visualize in their full immensity.

It is not without significance that this new, mature and purposeful unity took place not only on the eve of the Lenin Centenary, but that it also occurred in the halls of the Kremlin where lived and worked the greatest internationalist revolutionary of all times, V. I. Lenin.

My appraisal of the importance of the Conference for the Irish people's struggles?

Well, first, I would like to refer to the Irish participation, through the delegation of the Irish Workers' Party, as the most natural and logical thing in the world.

The Irish people have a long and bitter experience of imperialism, and our Party and we, therefore, welcomed the holding of the Conference with its objective of united struggle against imperialism.

The Irish working class and national revolutionary forces were linked with the work of the First International, and we fully appreciate the importance of international unity and solidarity, since among the first recipients of international help was the Irish revolutionary movement when Marx and Engels organized the campaign of the International Working Men's Association for the release of the "Fenian" prisoners after the Irish rebellion of 1867. So, we attended the 1969 Conference in the best internationalist traditions of our Irish forebears.

In the contemporary, as distinct from the historic struggle, we were particularly impressed by the analysis of developments in the world national liberation struggles. Let me quote the relevant part of the Document of the Conference:

"Social differentiation is developing in the newly independent countries. There is a sharpening conflict between the working class, the peasantry and other democratic forces, including patriotic-minded sections



of the petty bourgeoisie, on the one hand, and, on the other, imperialism and the forces of domestic reaction, the elements of the national bourgeoisie which are increasingly accepting a deal with imperialism."

This is absolutely correct. We know it from bitter experience. Readers, no doubt, are aware that we were the British imperialists' first colony. After generations of bitter and bloody struggle a degree of political independence was wrested from the imperialists, who, however, imposed Partition on our small island, thereby creating the first British neo-colony, the Republic of Ireland, and a semi-colony, the state of Northern Ireland. In the major state—the Republic of Ireland—in which our Irish Workers' Party functions, the bourgeois Fianna Fail Government has abandoned the struggle for an independent and united Ireland and is encouraging, in addition to the British, the penetration of other foreign monopolies such as the U.S., West German, Japanese and others; thus undermining the degree of political and economic independence that has been won.

I have referred to the fact that our participation in the International Meeting was in the best traditions of the previous fighters for Irish freedom. The Irish delegation also felt during the Conference the close link that existed between the work of the Meeting and the name of our own James Connolly.

Connolly was one of the very few Socialist leaders in the West who opposed, in the 1914-18 imperialist war, the betrayal by the social-chauvinist leaders of the Second International of the working class of their own and of other countries. For his part in the leadership of the anti-imperialist Irish Revolt of 1916 the British imperialists, with the connivance of elements of the Irish bourgeoisie, callously murdered him. In his application of Marxism to the interpretation of the centuries-long Irish national liberation struggle, he showed that the working class were "the only incorruptible inheritors of the fight for freedom in Ireland."

In the case of our country, both Connolly's conclusions and the analysis in the Document of the 1969 Conference, which I have quoted, have been proved true. Since his death in 1916, there have been two great "sell-outs" by "elements of the national bourgeoisie" in Ireland. The first was their help in the imposition of the British imperialist so-called "solution" of

the Irish question in the form of the partitioning Anglo-Irish Treaty of 1921; and 45 years later the inherent characteristic of the native propertied class was again demonstrated even by that section who were radical enough then to oppose the 1921 Treaty by the force of arms, but who in 1966—the 50th anniversary of the Revolt of 1916—capitulated to imperialism by signing the Anglo-Irish Free Trade Treaty which opens up completely our economy to the British monopolies and prepares for a total submerging of Ireland in the European Common Market.

Our people are fighting back against this surrender. They are countering both the imperialist strategy of "divide and rule" and the class offensive of the native bourgeoisie by perfecting new forms of united struggle. Alongside the mass fight for civil rights that is at present taking place in Northern Ireland, there is a parallel struggle in the Republic of Ireland against the Fianna Fail bourgeois government's attempt, alongside its national sell-out, to impose curtailment of democratic rights and anti-trade union legislation.

There is the strengthening of the Irish Congress of Trade Unions which acts not only as a single trade union center for one part, but for the Irish working class of the two states.

The Republic of Ireland heads the "European League" for mandays lost because of strike action. Militant solidarity actions have forced the triumphant release of imprisoned strikers. A firm class reaction has defeated attempts by U.S. monopoly firms to deny recognition to any form of trade union organization in their Irish subsidiaries.

In the countryside, the small farmers and landless men are fighting against the sell-out of Irish land to wealthy foreigners. They have organized themselves into "Land Leagues," the form of organization which so effectively fought British landlordism in the last century. On the very eve of the International Conference there were militant actions against West Germans (many of them former Nazis) who, with the permission of the Fianna Fail Government, have "grabbed," by means of their cheque-books, the land so badly needed by the small farmers and landless men. Their agitation has been sufficiently sharp to evoke an alarmed reaction in the Bonn Parliament.

The young married couples denied hous-



ing accommodation are also in a militant mood. They are "taking over" empty houses and at the same time linking their social struggle to that of one of opposition to the Government's involvement with the foreign property speculators who buy up sites, demolish habitable houses and build highly profit-making office blocks for the penetrating monopolies.

The small shopkeepers are actively resisting the continuing spread of the foreign-monopoly distributive supermarkets.

In our State Television Station, outstanding personalities have recently resigned in protest against the corrupt commercialization and cosmopolitanism which accompanies the national sell-out.

Irish exporters' associations have called

for trade and diplomatic relations (which are at present non-existent) with the socialist countries in order to offset some of the economic consequences of our heavy and increasing dependence on the British market.

The future of our people's struggle for complete national independence and for socialism, which will alone guarantee this freedom, depends on the leading role of the working class.

Thus, in my opinion, the outcome of the Moscow 1969 Conference will be a historic one. It was an event that will have profound effects not only on the Parties in each country, including our own Irish Workers' Party, but on the organizations of the people the world over.

## EZEKIAS PAPAIONNOU

### General Secretary, Progressive Party of the Working People of Cyprus

The Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties and the documents it adopted have an invaluable part to play in the anti-imperialist struggle of all the peoples for independence, democracy, peace and socialism. Both the Main Document and the other statements are permeated with the spirit of militant international solidarity and cooperation in the battle for a better future for all peoples.

Our Meeting proved worthy of the precepts of the great Lenin and lived up to the pressing demands of the present stage of the revolutionary struggle. It was a convincing demonstration of the growing unity of the Communist and Workers' Parties, and evidence of greater activity by all the anti-imperialist forces fighting for peace and socialism the world over. In paying tribute to V. I. Lenin, the centenary of whose birth honest men everywhere will be observing within a few months from now, Communists firmly declared their resolve to continue steadfastly to follow his all-triumphant doctrine, and relentlessly to fight all distortions of it, whether from the "Left" or from the Right.

For the Cypriot people, who fought for decades to escape from the imperialist yoke, the Moscow Meeting and its documents are of especial importance. It has been correctly pointed out at the Meeting that the continuing tension in Cyprus is created by the Anglo-American imperialists who want to use the situation to carry

out their plans of aggrandizement against my people.

Today Cyprus is a U.S. and British imperialist military strongpoint in the Eastern Mediterranean and the Middle East. Despite the proclamation of the Republic in 1960 and the nominal abolition of the British colonial regime, the country's independence continues to be heavily curtailed.

All these years, the U.S. and British imperialists have persisted in their attempts to turn Cyprus into a strong NATO military base, crush the liberation movement and completely to enslave the Cypriot people. In NATO's interests, the imperialists have been trying to divide the island between Greece and Turkey by exploiting differences between the Greek and Turkish Cypriots—differences which imperialism has itself produced.

Two factors played a crucial part in frustrating these criminal imperialist plans: the Cypriot people's resolute resistance, and the assistance and support of the socialist countries, the Soviet Union above all. However, the U.S. and British imperialists will not leave the Cypriot people in peace, even now, when talks are in progress between the two communities for a peaceful settlement of all outstanding issues in the interests of all our people.

We are a small people, and cannot, by our own strength, resist the criminal im-



perialist plans. But in a common front with all the other peoples, we can and will fight with success. Through joint action within the framework of a united front of anti-imperialist struggle, the socialist countries, the working class of the developed capitalist countries and the national liberation movement are capable of helping any people break free of the fetters of imperialism and colonialism, rid the planet of enslavement and war, and ultimately drive imperialism off the stage of history.

That is why the solidarity and support shown the Cypriots by the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties is of such great importance for our people. The fraternal support of the world's Communists is an inspiration to ours, as to all other peoples, fighting for their national liberation, urging them to fight even more resolutely for independence and libe-

ration from every form of imperialist economic and political domination, the dismantling of military bases, and for full sovereignty.

That is why our Party welcomes the Meeting's profound and comprehensive analysis of the international situation, the tasks at the present stage in the anti-imperialist struggle and the problems of united action by Communist and Workers' Parties and all anti-imperialist forces.

That is why the Progressive Party of the Working People of Cyprus welcomed with such enthusiasm the convocation of the Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, actively shared in its work, and will do everything to consolidate the unity and cohesion of the international Communist movement, forge the militant cohesion of the world anti-imperialist forces, and strengthen the solidarity of peoples.

## DOMINIQUE URBANY

### Chairman, Communist Party of Luxembourg

The fact that the whole Luxembourg press, including the Christian-Social Party organ *Luxemburger Wort* gave much attention to our International Meeting, emphasizes the importance of this forum for our country, too. Its proceedings were banner-headlined in papers of every trend. Of course, their main concern was to detect differences between the Communist parties and inflate them to incredible proportions. Nor was there any lack of distortion of the facts, and of all manner of prediction about a "split" in the Communist ranks. Nevertheless, the bourgeois and Right-wing Socialist hacks could not hide from public opinion their fear of the consolidating unity and cohesion of the international Communist movement.

The results of the Meeting are a devastating blow at all the expectations and hopes of reaction. The lying press was denied the satisfaction of producing a bombshell. The work of the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow was a complete success, an important stage in strengthening the unity of the world Communist movement.

All the Communist parties, our own included, are offsprings of the Great October Socialist Revolution. They grew and matured, overcoming some "infantile disorders." But they maintained a firm Marxist-Leninist stand by following the

great Lenin's behests. And though the situation has changed markedly since then—development in various countries has its specifics, and there is exceptional diversity in the battlegrounds on which Communists have to fight exploitation, reaction and imperialism—the world Communist movement is a well-knit family of Communist Parties, cemented by common goals and principles, and acting in concert against imperialism, mankind's arch-enemy.

In this family, as in any family, there is now and again a difference of opinion. But this has no bearing on the main questions and is smoothed out through negotiations and the unceasing worldwide struggle against the common enemy. Marxism-Leninism, our loyalty to this immortal doctrine, is the basis on which these difficulties are overcome. The spirit of Marxism-Leninism permeates all the documents, first line to last, adopted by the International Meeting: the Appeal in Defense of Peace, the appeal "Independence, Freedom and Peace for Vietnam," the Address on the Centenary of the Birth of V. I. Lenin, and finally, the Document "Tasks at the Present Stage of the Struggle Against Imperialism and United Action of the Communist and Workers' Parties and All Anti-Imperialist Forces."

We also have to deal with Maoism. Mao has managed to divert the CPC onto an



adventurist path, to saddle it with his chauvinistic, great-Han policy, which runs counter to all the principles of Marxism-Leninism. He has started a campaign of slander against the Soviet Union, the CPSU and the other Communist parties. The Mao clique's provocative policy only eggs on the imperialists to fresh aggressive acts. At this Meeting, representatives of the Communist parties in no uncertain terms condemned the policy of the Mao adventurists, and voiced their solidarity with the Soviet Union. Mao and his clique do not represent the Chinese people's interests. Their policy is contrary to the march of history and the Chinese people's vital interests. That is why it is doomed to failure. The Maoists cannot prevent the further cohesion and strengthening of the world Communist movement and victory over imperialism. The success of our International Meeting is not only a blow at the plans of the imperialists and their supporters, but also a stern rebuff to the Maoist splitters.

The imperialists have latterly intensified their subversive efforts to sow discord and uncertainty in the Communist parties, undermine their cooperation and international solidarity and soften them up from inside. They contrast the young Marx to the mature Marx, and Marx to Lenin. With energy worthy of better application they try to "revise" "obsolete" Marxism-Leninism, spreading a "new," more "humane" and "democratic" socialism. And all in an attempt to fan nationalistic passions within the Communist and Workers' Parties, and speculate on Right-wing opportunist deviations and Left-wing extremist adventurism.

Now as always, the main imperialist blow is directed at the Soviet Union and the CPSU. And there is the old cry about the Communist parties and socialist countries being subservient to the CPSU and Moscow.

The International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties and its documents

## MACIEL CAMPOS

Member of the Political Commission and Secretariat,  
Central Committee, Paraguayan Communist Party

Our Party's delegation believes that our Meeting's formulation of the tasks at the present stage of the anti-imperialist strug-

gle fully meet the requirements of the revolutionary movement and the present international relation of class forces.

create good conditions for successfully rebuffing this imperialist ideological offensive.

The Communist parties decide for themselves on all aspects of their policy and activity. They are responsible to their own peoples. But they are also responsible to the international working-class movement.

That is why the Communist parties are united in one worldwide working-class front. They are fully aware that joint struggle against imperialism, closer international links, proletarian solidarity and our movement's unity, are the necessary conditions for their successful struggle in their respective countries and on an international scale.

In its activity, our Party links its national tasks with its internationalist duty. This was most strikingly expressed in the complete and unconditional backing it gave to the steps taken by the five socialist countries to extend assistance to the CPC and Czechoslovakia. That is one of the reasons for the CPL's success at the elections last November and December.

Our Meeting has done much to strengthen the solidarity and fraternal alliance of the Communist and Workers' Parties with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, which has vast experience in struggle, has achieved the most success in building socialism and communism, and has always been unswervingly loyal to Marxism-Leninism—solidarity with the Party in which we all have complete trust. The Soviet Union is a solid bastion of socialism, a reliable bulwark in the fight for peace, democracy, national liberation and socialism. This was the keynote of the speeches at the Meeting, and it shows that this historical Communist forum was a success and that it has upset many an imperialist hope.

The success of the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties is a source on which the Communists of Luxembourg draw for fresh strength in the struggle against reaction and monopoly capital.



Attended by 75 fraternal parties, that is, the vast majority of the detachments of the world Communist movement, the Meeting was an outstanding success for the historical tendency towards unity of all Marxist-Leninist forces. It was an important stage on the road to a higher form of unity of Communist and Workers' Parties and all the anti-imperialist forces fighting for peace, democracy, national liberation and socialism.

On the other hand, the Meeting was a major defeat for the forces of imperialism, reaction and war, for Right-wing and "Left-wing" revisionism, and nationalistic tendencies of every variety. And it was a strategic defeat, for the Meeting and the documents it adopted give the Marxist-Leninist parties optimal conditions for performing their vanguard mission in the world revolutionary anti-imperialist movement.

The keynote in the discussion of the fundamental questions of the struggle against imperialism, and for peace and socialism was unity and solidarity. This is cogent evidence that, despite temporary disagreements on a number of issues, Communists will not allow any scattering of their forces, or any relaxation of their united action in the struggle against their common class adversary. In this context, our Party attaches especial importance to the stress the documents of the Meeting lay on principled and consistent struggle against opportunist deviations and bourgeois-brand national narrow-mindedness, against dogmatism and sectarianism, against anti-Sovietism and all other manifestations of anti-communism. We are deeply convinced that, in following this path, we shall firmly unite the movement and overcome the difficulties still facing it.

Our Party fully agrees with the analysis and the assessment of the world situation given by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev in his splendid speech at the Meeting. His speech was a great ideological and political contribution to the work of the Meeting. It is a mature Marxist-Leninist synthesis of the vast experience and wisdom which the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has stored up in the struggles against imperialism, in the course of socialist construction, in relations with other socialist countries and Communist parties, with the national liberation movement, and in the struggle for peace.

Our Party delegation signed the Main Document with great satisfaction, regarding it as a policy-making document not only for the Paraguayan Communist Party, but for the whole world Communist movement, and also for all the forces fighting imperialism.

We gave full backing to the Appeal for Independence, Freedom and Peace for Vietnam, a very important document which, we feel, will help to join the efforts of the peoples of the world in a powerful tide of active solidarity with the heroic people of Vietnam in their fight against the criminal aggressive machine of U.S. imperialism.

The Meeting was held shortly before a great anniversary of this epoch—the centenary of the birth of V. I. Lenin, whose undying genius continues to this very day to illumine all the peoples' path of struggle for social and national liberation. That is why we enthusiastically welcomed the Address on the centenary of the leader of the world's proletariat and founder of the modern Communist movement.

Our Party attaches great importance to the Appeal in Defense of Peace. Its proposition that world war is no longer fatally inevitable opens up effective possibilities for steadily intensifying the popular struggle for peace. The Appeal rightly emphasizes that this has become a reality thanks to the consistent peace-loving policy of the Soviet Union and other socialist states, the mounting struggle of the working people in the capitalist countries, the development of the national liberation movement, and the vigorous action of broad sections of world democratic opinion.

All the documents adopted by the Meeting fully meet the basic interests and demands of the struggle of Paraguay's working class and people for an end to the military, anti-national, dictatorial regime. We feel sure that the Meeting and its results will consolidate our Party's ideological and political unity, and help it fulfil its national tasks. At the same time, the Meeting documents will make for closer harmony of our national tasks and the common struggle of all the Communist and Workers' Parties and all the world's anti-imperialist, democratic and peace-loving forces. Now as always, our Party is invariably guided by Lenin's idea that only true internationalists can be true revolutionaries and Marxists.



## HENRY WINSTON

### National Chairman, CP USA

The gathering in Moscow of the 75 Communist and Workers' Parties was a great historical event. History was made and our Party was part of that history. Highly significant for us was the fact that this event was characterized, from beginning to end, by a high degree of proletarian internationalism.

The Conference was especially noteworthy for our Party, which works and fights in the heartland of U.S. imperialism under conditions of partial legality, semi-legality and complete illegality. Nonetheless, it strives to defend the fundamental interests of the working class and the Negro people, at the same time working for the broadest front of struggle to stop the genocidal war against the people of Vietnam, and against the huge armament burden imposed on the people. The armament drive in the USA threatens world humanity with a thermonuclear war. What became clear from the speeches of delegate after delegate was that the danger of a third world war emanates from the United States.

For 16-17 years, McCarthyism succeeded in isolating our Party from its class brothers in other lands, but the struggle of the democratic forces in our country, supported by all fighters for peace and democracy throughout the world, helped break the grip of McCarthyism to the point where our Party was able to re-establish connections with the parties of the Soviet Union and of all socialist countries, with fraternal parties in capitalist countries, Asia, Africa and Latin America. Ours is a mighty movement uniting the three main forces of social progress. Such unity provides the guarantee of victory in the struggle against imperialism.

The heightened unity of the world Communist movement is the key needed to open the door to the development of the widest unity of all popular and anti-imperialist forces throughout the world.

The delegation from the Communist Party of the USA clearly realizes that proletarian internationalism does not contradict the struggle for the national interests of the people of any country. Quite the contrary, proletarian internationalism, as understood and fought for by Marxist-Leninists, is a necessary form in which the true national interests of peoples can be defended and advanced.

The Conference placed to the fore the need to unite the hundreds of millions in the struggle for an end to the war in Vietnam and the immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops. More, the Conference gave full support to the NLF initiative in forming a provisional government in South Vietnam. These actions will meet with the widest response from the people in the USA, for they dovetail with a majority movement—for the first time in our history the majority have opposed the foreign policy of the government as it relates to Vietnam. It is correctly argued that since U.S. imperialism unilaterally went into Vietnam, where it is waging a genocidal war, it can unilaterally get out of Vietnam now. This would be in the best national interest of the people of the USA.

Here we find that proletarian internationalism corresponds with the national interest, with the interests of the working class, Negro people, students, etc.

This conference laid great stress on the fight against armaments. This corresponds to one of the major battles of the people of the USA today. The armament program now amounts to \$100 billion a year. This means that the government takes 40 cents out of every dollar the worker earns and uses the money to prepare a third world war. This means not only taxation and higher prices for the workers at home, but also the building of a huge military machine to support military bases around the world, and the use of imperialist forces to support existing reactionary regimes and to promote such regimes all around the world.

This coming together of the parties will strengthen the fight against imperialism everywhere, but it will also make a distinct contribution to the struggle of our people against the pivot of world imperialism, U.S. imperialism, and this contribution is in the national interest of the people of the USA.

The Conference was especially outstanding in that it singled out the two main weapons of U.S. imperialism in its drive for world domination—anti-Sovietism and racism.

The ruling circles of the USA lay great stress on the use of the ideological weapon. Numerous institutions exist in the USA to study how, by using the quarter lie, the half lie, the whole lie, to discredit the role of the Soviet Union as it develops



and builds toward communism. They do not want the masses to see and understand developments in the USSR. They wish to minimize the aid given by the Soviet Union to peoples struggling for national liberation, lest neo-colonialism itself becomes exposed. This foreign-policy attack on the Soviet Union is attended by the attack on the U.S. working class. The Conference's new emphasis on the role of the working class in the anti-imperialist struggle is still another of its contributions.

In calling for a struggle against anti-Sovietism, the Conference performed an historic act, an act which expresses socialist humanism, the aim of which is to stay the hand of the thermonuclear war-makers, prevent them from destroying countries, even continents.

The Conference also called for a worldwide struggle against racism. For Communists in the USA, for all progressives, this will be a rallying call for action, which for us in the USA means putting an end to every form of racial discrimination — in housing, on the job, education, the electoral structure, etc. The bestial police attacks on Negro ghettos, the barriers Puerto Rican and Mexican-American youth have to face are well known. The demand for an end to second-class citizenship of the Negro people is the touchstone in the strug-

gle for equality and democracy in the USA today.

U.S. imperialism is using new methods in an attempt to spread racism from its own borders into the world. The racism of U.S. imperialism merges with that of other imperialist powers. Thus, when the Conference of 75 Communist and Workers' Parties elevates this question to such a high plane, it calls for a struggle against worldwide imperialism in general, but especially against U.S. imperialism. The national interests of the people of the USA are well served by this act of proletarian internationalism.

It should be obvious that the true national interest has nothing in common with bourgeois nationalism. The national interest of our people requires a merciless struggle against bourgeois nationalism and chauvinism.

The decisions of the Conference have a special relevance to the many complex problems faced by our Party in the USA. Our Party contributed to the formulation of this collective document. We affixed our signature to it and will widely popularize it in the USA, and draw conclusions from it for the working class, Negro people, students, democracy, national liberation and socialism.

## RODNEY ARISMENDI

First Secretary, Central Committee,  
Communist Party of Uruguay

The Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties was indisputable evidence of our movement's strength and unity. The fact that it was attended by delegations of 75 parties, with the glorious Communist Party of Cuba among them, is noteworthy not only from the standpoint of Latin American Communists. The friendly messages received from the heroic Party of Vietnam and from comrades in Laos, the fraternal greetings from President Nasser and other prominent world leaders, and the 14,000 messages of greetings from the people of the Soviet Union and various organizations in other countries, are proof of its historic significance, further enhanced by the documents the Meeting approved. Since the 1957 Declaration and the 1960 Statement they are the first documents of this nature.

The imperialists hoped for a more mod-

est attendance at the Meeting, that old divergences and differences would widen and new ones would arise, that anti-Soviet tendencies would be more pronounced. These hopes did not materialize. Moreover, despite some differences, which nobody attempted to conceal, the Meeting impressively reaffirmed the existence of a united will and support for the Soviet Union and the CPSU. Their historic role, expressed in the triumph of the October Revolution, the building of socialism and communism, the victory over nazism, the decisive contribution towards the formation of the socialist world system and the assistance to Vietnam, Cuba and other countries and peoples fighting for freedom and socialism, has made the land of Lenin the bulwark of the world revolution.

The Chinese leaders' divisive and anti-Soviet policy, which has inflicted great



harm on our movement, was broadly condemned at the Meeting. At the same time it wisely avoided hasty denunciations and the inclusion of such denunciations into its decisions.

In our view, the Main Document, along with the Appeal for Independence, Freedom and Peace for Vietnam, the Address on the Lenin Centenary and the Appeal in Defense of Peace, are important both from the theoretical and political angles and represent a significant step towards the unity of the Communist movement. We spoke of this at the Meeting. The Document presents an integrated system of correct definitions of a general nature and provides a platform for united action against imperialism based on a series of democratic demands. In particular, it stressed the vital task of promoting solidarity with Vietnam. Latin Americans appreciate its emphasis on solidarity with the Cuban revolution and the historic significance of that revolution for the revolutionary process in our continent. Yes, we should have preferred a more programmatic Document containing more theoretical and political definitions. In this sense we feel that the present Document reflects certain compromises, that in it we have achieved an identity of various points of view on a principled foundation, with due regard for the present real situation in our movement. However, we believe it ushers in a transition to higher forms of unity, which would assure unity of thought and action, and a dialectical combination of general international theoretical and strategic concepts with the entire diversity of each Party's activities within its national boundaries.

We feel that the Document gives a correct assessment of the present world situation, with all the new and broad possibilities for the further development and triumph of the revolutionary movement in all its forms. It dismisses all illusions about a more or less idyllic peaceful coexistence, a straight and usually peaceful advance, and quantitative and automatic evolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism. In this sense we feel it is correct to sound the warning that imperialism, U.S. imperialism above all, is growing increasingly more aggressive. This does not imply a gloomy assessment of the world balance of power: it remains in favor of the progressive, socialist forces. But we must recall the Marxist axiom that no ruling class quits the scene peacefully and of its own accord. Thus, while rejecting idyllic and

"triumphalist" concepts of all kinds, the Document underscores the growing possibilities for securing world peace in bitter struggle against imperialism and rebuffing aggression against any people. It stresses the increased possibilities for new victories in the national liberation struggle, in the advance towards socialism of the newly liberated nations, and in the struggle for our parties' ultimate aim, socialist revolution, in more countries.

Another point. The Document's value lies not only in its contents, but also in the way it was drawn up. It is an example of collective work over many months of free and democratic discussion and patient quests for agreement on a principled foundation, of quest for ways of removing misunderstanding and contradictions. Consistent recourse to such methods in future is bound to facilitate the attainment of the higher forms of unity we desire.

Naturally, neither we nor anybody else think of a leading Party or of an international leading center in the narrow and schematic sense. But ideological disunity is not something we can be happy about. It is true that diversity of views has an objective foundation in the breadth and diversity of the world revolutionary process. However, we feel this does not mean automatically granting the "right of Marxist-Leninist citizenship" to views—some may already have become orientations—which are negative and obviously alien to scientific communism. Nor does it mean granting such rights to revisionist concepts, which are usually of a Rightist nature and manifest themselves in some sections of our movement. We do not for a moment believe that these problems can be resolved by a hasty sticking on of labels and tags. The way to a solution is through open and fraternal discussion, criticism and self-criticism. This does not presuppose interference in the internal affairs of other parties, but renunciation of the trend towards isolation within national boundaries, a trend that rules out the possibility of real unity. On the whole, we consider that the general trend of our policy should be to strengthen internationalist positions, which form the substance of our world outlook. This should not be taken to mean drab unification of national features.

To sum up. As we have said, the Meeting was a historic step towards unity, which is possible "provided a dynamic struggle is waged for it, provided we mould it day by



day and refrain from turning every divergence into an insult, oppose all centrifugal trends leading to confusion, combat all glorification of isolation, which identifies a Party's independence with aloofness, confuses creative Marxism with a departure from the CPSU and the socialist sys-

tem, provided we combat the metaphysical counterposing of the national obligations of each Party to its internationalist duties and, lastly, provide the conditions for a creative, fraternally critical and self-critical dialogue between as many of them as possible."

## LEON FEIX

### Member of the Central Committee, French Communist Party

We think that the Moscow Meeting was a major success for the international Communist movement. For several years, the French Communist Party had been urging its convocation and took an active part in preparing it.

We are satisfied with the form of the Meeting, which made possible a free juxtaposition of standpoints, with strict observance of the principle that each Party has equal rights and with the analysis of the international situation and the definition of our common goals with which it ended.

The different conditions in which the Communist parties operate explains why they may view one and the same phenomenon from different angles. The joint study of the international situation on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, as a method for analysis and a method for action, enables us to arrive at a common standpoint and makes our actions more effective.

The holding of a Meeting like the Moscow one, with a circumscribed and precisely specified agenda which does not touch upon the specific features of the situation each Party has to reckon with, brings out the full value of the factors that unite and make for cohesion.

In the great anti-imperialist movement, which marks our epoch, the Communist parties, parties of the working class, have a decisive part to play in mobilizing and orienting the masses. The greater their principle-based unity, the more concerted will be their action, the greater will be the strength of the international Communist movement as the main dynamic, power and stimulating factor in the struggle against imperialism, for the socialist future of mankind; the greater will be its role of essential element in the development of the whole revolutionary movement.

It is on the strength of these considerations that the French Communist Party considered it its duty to take a most active

part in preparing and holding the Meeting.

As for the Document, which the Meeting adopted, our Party has no doubt at all in regarding it as a valuable weapon in its struggle for peace, democracy and socialism.

Its analytical conclusions and ideas, and the goals it sets, accord with the theses and aims formulated at our own congresses.

This applies, for instance, to the analysis of the class struggle in the citadels of capitalism.

The main idea that has always inspired French Communist Party policy is unity of the working class, cooperation with the Socialists for a regime of developed democracy today, and for a socialist society tomorrow; cooperation with other democratic parties and organizations who want social renewal, provided the Socialist and other parties abandon their policy of class collaboration.

In the complex and crucial battle for working-class unity in France, our Party displays the greatest vigilance in respect of Right and "Left" opportunism, which persistently seeks to distort our doctrine and our activity.

The FCP's principled stand during the last presidential elections did a great deal to discredit the Social-Democratic leaders' policy of alliance with a section of reaction.

"The purpose of a united front, the purpose of an alliance of workers' and democratic forces is not to have the working class taken in tow by the bourgeoisie, for the sake of an unprincipled alliance," Waldeck Rochet said at the Meeting, "but to draw ever greater masses of people into action against the monopolies and their regime, into the fight for a new democracy and for socialism."

On the international plane, we shall



continue our constant and resolute efforts for unity of the international Communist

movement, a necessary foundation for a broad anti-imperialist front.

## LUIS CORVALAN

### General Secretary, Communist Party of Chile

The Moscow Meeting strengthened the unity of the Communist movement, upsetting all the capitalist press forecasts to the contrary. The Communist movement enhances its cohesion in the common struggle against imperialism and on the basis of assessment of the present epoch arrived at through collective analyses of the pressing problems of modern times in the light of Marxist-Leninist theory.

At the Meeting the Communist and Workers' Parties arrived at the unanimous conclusion that the utmost class solidarity, taking all-conquering proletarian internationalism as the point of departure, are essential for attainment of the aims of the common struggle.

The Communist parties are aware that objectively the world balance of forces has swung in favor of socialism. Thus, the struggle of each people and the united action of all anti-imperialist forces, above all of the Communist parties, make it possible to repel imperialist aggression, force the invader to withdraw his troops from Vietnam, prevent a third world war and open the road to fresh victories throughout the world. Such is the first conclusion we can draw from the results of the Moscow Meeting.

We have conclusive proof of the revolutionary enthusiasm and the increased faith in the struggle of the peoples, factors that have led to closer communist unity. The Communists of the whole world did not confine themselves to the formal signing of statements: in the immediate future the common struggle against imperialism will rise to a higher level.

The Communist movement has demonstrated its maturity. All parties, big and small, both those which have considerable experience and those recently formed, contributed to the discussion and helped to raise its theoretical level, stating their point of view freely and with a high sense of responsibility. The history of the revolutionary movement does not know of a meeting so carefully prepared in a series of consultations held in such a democratic spirit. The parties attending the Meeting were equal, and they had equal opportu-

ities to state their views and bring them to the notice of journalists of the whole world.

There was complete unanimity on the scientific analysis of the basic problems of our epoch, for example, the definition of the main contradictions and of the motive forces of the anti-imperialist struggle. At the same time, the participating parties devoted much attention to many new processes in the life of modern society resulting from the global influence of socialism, the struggle of the Communist parties, the scientific and technological revolution, and the widespread protest against the genocide in Vietnam, the persecution of Negroes, and the other crimes of imperialism.

Close attention was also given to an analysis of the actions of large segments of young people.

During the preparations and at the Meeting itself, there was no question of ostracizing any Party. Moreover, the Document clearly states that the participants are determined to advance the common struggle against imperialism side by side with the Communist and Workers' Parties, which, for one reason or another, did not attend the Meeting. At the same time, representatives of many parties sharply criticized the policy of the Chinese Communist Party leadership, in particular its aggressive attitude to the Soviet Union. Although some delegates maintained that such criticism was not conducive to unity—a view we do not share—nobody defended or justified this policy. On the contrary, there was a unanimous call for an appreciative assessment of the role of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party created by Lenin, of the historic responsibility borne by the first socialist state by virtue of its economic and military might and its political influence and prestige.

Indeed, representatives of a number of parties stated various opinions on some questions of the present international situation and the tasks of the Communist movement. This is quite natural in view of the scope of the Communist movement and the participation of new strata and social groups in the revolutionary struggle. Com-



plete unity of the Communist movement can only be the result of a definite process, of which the Moscow Meeting is a significant step forward. In the opinion of the Meeting's participants this purpose will be served by joint actions, contacts and discussion of specific problems and theoretical tasks, and also by time itself and by the maturity and experience of all parties and of each Party.

During the twelve days' proceedings in the Kremlin's St. George's Hall, those who had the honor to attend the Meeting had a sharply focussed picture of all that was taking place in the world. The speeches of the representatives of the 75 parties gave us

a broad panorama of the struggle waged by the peoples of the five continents, represented by the principal personages of this struggle—leaders of the Communist movement—men boundlessly devoted to the revolution, men who have gone through jail and torture and made sacrifices on the altar of the heroic struggle, which has already changed life in part of our planet and is being waged to change it throughout the world.

In the future, when the Communist movement meets new trials, it will be more powerful and well prepared to discharge its great duty, that of presenting a united front to imperialism.

## JOHN MARKS

### Chairman, South African Communist Party

The South African Communist Party estimates the Conference of Communist and Workers' Parties as an event of the most far-reaching historical significance.

It was high time, indeed, that such a conference was held.

The forces of international imperialism, organized and spearheaded by the United States, have evolved a global strategy of aggression and counter-revolution. They aim, utilizing reactionary and oppressive forces everywhere, to set back the clock of history. They aim to halt the onward march of the working people towards freedom from poverty, exploitation, backwardness and the fear of war. They seek to rob the masses of the hard-won political and social gains they have made through generations of struggle, and to isolate, subvert, divide and ultimately destroy the highest achievement of the working class — the socialist community and its citadel, the Soviet Union.

It cannot be denied that in certain areas they have achieved some temporary successes in their sinister goals. In every continent they have managed to engineer reactionary coups, as in Indonesia, Greece, Ghana, Mali. The Israeli Zionists, the main standard-bearers of imperialism in the Middle East have overrun and occupied Arab lands and expelled many of their inhabitants.

In practice, valuable assistance has been rendered to the imperialists by the Mao Tse-tung faction in China. They have conducted extensive splitting and disruptive maneuvers in the anti-imperialist move-

ment, and have now gone so far as to stage border provocations against the Soviet Union.

Disunity among the revolutionary anti-imperialist forces facilitates and makes possible these and other reverses suffered by the working-class and national liberation movement.

A prime essential for the rallying of all anti-imperialist forces is the consolidation and agreement—at least on the immediate objectives of the common struggle—of the world Communist movement, vanguard of the world revolution. The fact that the 1969 Moscow Conference brought together nearly all the main contingents of the international Communist movement was in itself of great significance, confounding the bourgeois commentators who had hoped and freely predicted that differences within the movement would bring about the failure of the conference. Even more important were the outstanding documents produced by the conference, which demonstrated that the area of agreement between the Parties is far greater than certain differences, which will be discussed and resolved.

The Document of the conference on the unity of Communists and all anti-imperialists is an outstanding Marxist-Leninist appraisal of the chief features in the present fight against imperialism. It will certainly rally and stimulate not only the Communists but all those forces genuinely interested in the fight against imperialism, for peace, national freedom, democracy and socialism.



Of exceptional interest and value, too, is the fine Address adopted by the Conference concerning next year's worldwide celebrations of the birth of the great leader and teacher, founder of the Soviet state and revolutionary fighter for the liberation of all oppressed peoples, V. I. Lenin.

The South African Communist Party will do its utmost to carry forward the inspiration of this great conference, and to rally and organize the people of our country for victory in the national democratic revolution, our main contribution to the common struggle of mankind against imperialism.

---



## ***To overthrow the dictatorship of the monopolies***

13th Congress of the Communist Party of Argentina

ORESTES GHIOLDI

Our Party's 13th Congress held clandestinely in Cordoba at the end of March, was an important landmark in Argentine political life.

Its keynote was "For a national democratic front to overthrow the dictatorship of the monopolies".

The Party Chairman Victorio Codovilla (now undergoing medical treatment in Moscow), L. I. Brezhnev, Ho Chi Minh, Nguyen Huu Tho, Fidel Castro, Gus Hall and Luiz Carlos Prestes were elected honorary members of the Congress presidium. Messages of greetings were received from Communist and Workers' parties in all continents. There was a particularly cordial response to the message from the CPSU and the Working People's Party of Vietnam. The political report, "The Communists and the Monopoly Dictatorship," was delivered by Comrade Geronimo Arnedo Alvarez, General Secretary of the CC, and has since been put out by Anteo Publishers in Buenos Aires.

The distinguishing features of the Congress were the militant nature and high ideological and political level of the speeches, keen interest in ideological issues, unity around the CC and its political and tactical line, and a deep understanding of vital, national and regional problems. Also noteworthy was the spirit of self-criticism. For the discussion was not centered on achievements—there was much criticism of shortcomings and weak spots, particularly in

Party work at large industrial enterprises, among the peasants, in recruiting new members, ideological work and organizing the circulation of Party literature.

Characteristic of all the proceedings was a lofty spirit of proletarian internationalism, profound affection for the Soviet Union and the world socialist camp, a clear-cut stand on the events in Czechoslovakia, and sharp condemnation of the Mao Tse-tung group's provocations on the Soviet-Chinese frontier. Special emphasis was laid on the need for greater solidarity with Vietnam, and in Latin America, with the socialist republic of Cuba and with the Peruvian people's anti-imperialist struggle.

Delegates made a thoroughgoing analysis of the economic, social and political situation in Argentina. They exposed the reactionary, anti-popular and anti-national policy of the Ongania dictatorship, spoke of the scale of denationalization, i.e., the systematic transfer of national wealth to foreign, chiefly U.S. and West German, monopolies, which was rapidly bringing industry, banking and trade under their control. As a result, they pointed out, Argentina's economy was growing increasingly dependent on international imperialism, and in the diplomatic and military spheres the Ongania government has become more dependent on U.S. foreign policy.

Hard facts were cited to show that land has been concentrated in the hands of the landowning oligarchy and of national and



foreign, mainly U.S., joint-stock companies. The Ongania government was justly characterized as a regime of the monopolies, the big capitalists and the latifundists.

In some provinces, chiefly in the north and southeast of the country, the consequences of Ongania's policy have been little short of tragic: the sugar industry has declined, factories have been closed and a crisis has hit the production of cotton, tobacco, tea and other industrial crops. Unemployment is growing throughout the country, the cost of living is rising, railways are being dismantled, the tradition of free and secular education is being ignored, and the health services have deteriorated markedly. All this is accompanied by the reactionary offensive, of which the anti-Communist law is the symbol and weapon and all manifestations of democracy the target. More than 8,000 were imprisoned between the June 28, 1966 coup and March 1969; over 400 cases were tried by the dictatorship's tribunals on the basis of the anti-Communist and other reactionary laws.

Delegates spoke of the needs and anguish of the people, of the industrial and agricultural proletariat, who make up the overwhelming majority of Argentina's working population.

Developments over the past few years have fully borne out the Party's assessment of the situation the day after the coup. Its statement, which did much to unite the anti-dictatorship forces, described the new government as a corporate-fascist type regime serving the monopolies, and exposed the wait-and-see attitude of the Right-wing trade union leaders, Peronists and non-Peronists. It warned the people against the demagoguery of the men behind the coup and called for energetic mass struggle and united action by all democratic and progressive forces to prevent the dictatorship from gaining strength and imposing a corporate system. It said that conditions had to be created for overthrowing the dictatorship. Our Party declared emphatically that the reactionary pro-imperialist coup had been made possible because of the weakness, wavering and capitulation of the deposed government of the Civil Radical Alliance of the People (which speaks for the bourgeoisie and the middle strata). The men who engineered the coup were not out to abolish "formal democracy," as they demagogically claimed, but to abolish basic democratic freedoms and set up a corporate regime of

the Spanish falangist type.

In addition to examining the socio-economic and political situation in the country the results of the corporate government's reign of more than two years, the Congress analyzed the struggle of the working class and other sections of the people for their immediate demands, against the dictatorship, and the part the Communists play in that struggle. Speakers noted with satisfaction that Communists shared in every action, past or present, big or small, in even the most remote parts of the country. The Party had not been isolated from the masses despite the political and repressive measures taken against it.

For the masses these years have been a stern school of struggle, and the Congress made a special point of summing up the experience of that struggle. There had been major strikes, some nationwide. These were militant actions in spite of the treachery of the Right-wing collaborationist union leaders, particularly the Peronists. In many cases there were long sit-ins, street demonstrations and sharp clashes with the police. The position remains particularly tense in Tucuman Province and in the north of Sante Fe Province, where massive demonstrations, marches to provincial capitals and militant action against the special police continue. Furthermore, there have been large-scale student actions against raids on the universities and against the reactionary curricula revision. The main thrust of the peasant movement is against the government's policy of driving them off the land and encouraging its concentration in the hands of a small group. In many regions the middle strata continue their opposition to the increasingly heavy taxation and other government measures benefiting the monopolies and the latifundists.

The struggle for the release of political prisoners has been successful in many instances. Noteworthy in this respect is the case of the 42 Communists accused of taking part in a conference held in preparation of the Party Congress near Mar del Plata. Under pressure from democratic public opinion the reactionary court of appeal had to release them from police custody.

Delegates noted that the shift to the Left, to which the CPA has drawn attention in the past few years, is to be observed not only among the working class, but also among peasants, students, the liberal professions, intellectuals and the



middle sections of the population. It manifests itself in the differentiation between the Right and Left wings within the political parties and also between the reactionary and patriotic elements in the armed forces.

The leftward swing can be traced even to the clergy. The reactionary top hierarchy is finding itself isolated from the Catholic masses, who are grouping around progressive parties and, along with the Communists and other patriotic and democratic forces, taking part in the popular movements in defense of democratic freedoms, the right to work, national independence and peace.

From its analysis of the popular struggle the 13th Congress drew these conclusions:

—The shift to the Left of the masses influenced by Peronism and other orientations is, despite all the waverings of these masses, an irreversible process and a principal if not the main, phenomenon in the socio-political life of Argentina. Its underlying factor is that the masses and their political and trade union organizations are increasingly combining the struggle for immediate economic demands with the struggle for political demands, for the overthrow of the dictatorship and its replacement by a genuinely democratic government. The actions of workers, peasants, students and the people as a whole in support of their immediate socio-economic, political and cultural demands, for democratic freedoms, against foreign monopolies and for freedom and national independence merge in a single stream.

—Anti-imperialist sentiments are growing and developing into a national anti-imperialist consciousness. The main contradiction in our country is between the whole people, on the one hand, and international imperialism, above all U.S. imperialism and its menials within the country, on the other.

The vast majority of the Argentine population is opposed to the reactionary, corporate-fascist dictatorship. It has been able to implement its plans only because the anti-dictatorship forces are disunited. The main task set by the Congress, therefore, is to launch a drive for united action and for a coordinating center of all anti-dictatorship forces in order to turn opposition to the regime into an organized struggle to depose the dictatorship and replace it by a really democratic government.

Delegates pointed out that the masses

were fighting to change the alignment of forces in the various organizations, particularly the trade unions, and devise new organizational forms which would facilitate unity and ensure the success of the struggle.

This has led to important victories in the election of factory commissions, when single lists of candidates were put forward.

The significance of these victories becomes all the more apparent when it is borne in mind that management, the Ministry of Labor and the union bosses (Peronists or Right-wing "independents") work in concert to expel from the factories, especially the big ones, Communists and other trade unionists committed to the class struggle and trade union democracy and independence from management and the government.

This process is seen also in the successes of the united working-class forces in regional executive bodies of the General Confederation of Labor and in numerous union branches.

It has also become part of the peasant movement. In defiance of the dictatorship, a new peasant organization with a progressive program has been set up. Today it has more than 50,000 members, mostly in such branches as viticulture, sugar-cane, potatoes, tobacco, cotton and tea. The commission working for democratization of the Agrarian Federation of Argentina, an organization directed by well-to-do peasants, is likewise gaining strength.

There is also this noteworthy development: despite the systematic repression (police raids, the razing of settlements, forced resettlement and so on), the movement of slum dwellers, among whom our Party's influence is growing, is gathering momentum, and Party branches in urban areas are becoming stronger.

Notwithstanding the dictatorship, the past two years—and this was noted at the Congress—have witnessed a strengthening of traditional mass movements such as the peace movement, the Argentine Women's League and the Argentine League for the Rights of Man. The Women's League, for example, is going through a veritable upsurge and the Rights of Man League has held a broad national civil rights forum. A solidarity with Vietnam movement has been started jointly by our peace fighters and Vietnam relief groups. It has launched a campaign in support of the Vietnamese people, whose heroic struggle for freedom and independence is an invaluable contri-



bution to the freedom and independence fight of all peoples oppressed by imperialism.

Movements in defense of local economic interests have sprung up in various parts of Argentina and are advancing anti-monopoly demands. Another new development is the movement in defense of secular, free and compulsory education.

An important movement in which different socio-political strata, both civilian and military, take part has arisen in response to the regime's denationalization measures. It is called *Modepana*, an abbreviation of Movement in Defense of National Wealth.

It need hardly be said that Communists participate in all these movements. The 13th Congress probingly examined their work in order to rectify errors, remove shortcomings, help to activate Communists still further and ensure many-sided cooperation between Communists, Peronists, Radicals, Socialists, Catholics, civilians and military personnel.

The Congress devoted serious attention to a new form of organizing the masses, namely, the coordinating commissions in trade unions, factories, political parties and various local or district popular organizations grouped round a program in defense of the people's national demands and for open struggle against the corporate-fascist dictatorship. In some provinces (Tucuman and, particularly, in the north of Santa Fe) these commissions initiated and directed important movements and popular actions—in some cases they even forced the resignation of government officials. The government retaliated by dispatching a large punitive force to these areas and for a time prevented large-scale demonstrations—and this in areas where unemployment and starvation are a very real menace. But the authorities are powerless to crush these movements.

The Congress attached much importance to extending and strengthening these coordinating commissions in anticipation of an intensified class struggle and popular action throughout the country. The clashes between the people and the Right-wing leaders will inevitably grow more acute.

That the actions of the people and of the workers have not attained a higher level is due to the treachery of the Right-wing leaders, chiefly Peronites. From his exile in Madrid Peron maintains contact with Ongania's emissaries with a view to striking a political bargain. To neutralize the

pernicious actions of leaders of this type, we must change the relationship of forces in the mass movement, particularly in the trade unions in favor of the supporters of the class struggle, democrats and all those opposed to the dictatorship. To this end consolidation of the united front must be facilitated from below. Thanks to the growing unity of action from below favorable conditions are arising for setting up a national coordinating center of all anti-dictatorship forces. Moreover, the Communist Party must be strengthened both organizationally and politically.

The dictatorship's monopoly-oriented policy has aggravated political and social instability and opened the way to economic chaos. There has been an exacerbation of the crisis of the country's socio-economic structure.

After analyzing this crisis the Congress came to the conclusion that it is entering a new stage.

Comrade Arnedo Alvarez pointed to a number of cracks in the edifice of the dictatorship. Aware of this, the landowning oligarchy, the big capitalists and the imperialists, though they continue to back the Ongania government and utilize it in their own interests, are preparing a replacement for it. Their back-stage machinations are meant to impress on the people that a new government will mean a "new deal." Meanwhile, Ongania is angling for popular support by negotiating with Peron. This attempt is doomed to failure because far from ceasing, the monopoly offensive on the people's living standards and working conditions is being stepped up.

As the CC CPA noted in its pre-Congress political theses, "everything is pointing to the fact that in the life of the country a new stage is beginning in which further changes of both a democratic and a reactionary nature could take place. The requisites are on hand for these changes to be solely of a democratic and anti-imperialist nature. This will depend chiefly on how the proletariat strengthens the united workers' center, which is independent of the employers and the government, on how it enhances its alliance with the peasant masses and rallies around itself all democratic and patriotic forces. They are preponderant in the country, but their disunity may nonetheless temporarily facilitate the enforcement of reactionary decisions. The Communist Party therefore declares that the urgent and immediate task before the



country is to set up a coordinating center of all anti-dictatorship forces in order to overthrow the present government and pave the way for a government of a new type, a truly democratic, popular and national government such as the people ardently desire."

The democratic forces and reserves are strong enough to put an end to the sombre present and prevent a return to the abhorrent past. This can be achieved provided all these forces unite in a democratic front of resistance to the dictatorship of the monopolies, which would signify the beginning of a new phase in the country's history. In order to help create this coordinating center, the CPA has submitted a minimum program to all democratic and anti-imperialist forces.

Pinpointing concrete problems of achieving united action by the democratic and anti-imperialist forces, the Congress drew the conclusion that "a great battle" is in progress "against imperialism, for complete national independence, for genuine democracy and a new type of government, for social progress and peace. But the progressive trends have yet to achieve the necessary depth and scale; they do not as yet represent a firm front and do not have a single coordinating center. However, it may be said that tangible successes have been scored in the coordinating activity of the progressive forces; there are prospects and trends favorable for united action."

The Congress pointed out that to facilitate the unity of the forces of change, the actions of the workers, peasants and other sections of the people in support of immediate economic, social, political and cultural demands have to be directed into a common channel of struggle to topple the regime and form a provisional government representing a broad democratic coalition. The CPA has put forward a minimum program as the basis of the fight for such a government. Furthermore, the Communists call for a constituent assembly, elected by proportional representation, that would put the socio-economic and political future of the nation into the hands of the people.

The 13th Congress introduced amendments into the Party Program adopted at the preceding Congress. As Comrade Hector Agosti, the reporter on this item of the agenda, pointed out, "the draft amendments do not add up to a new program. Basically, the Program adopted by the 12th Congress remains in force. The amendments are needed in order to give certain provi-

sions more precise formulation, bring them up to date, draw greater attention to an analysis of society's social structure and the crisis of this structure, specify in more detail the features of the revolution in Argentina and its probable mechanisms, and improve the wording of our concrete proposals for solution of numerous difficult problems facing our country.

"This program is founded on the assessments made in 1928 at the Party's 8th Congress, which had pointed to the anti-feudal and anti-imperialist nature of the Argentine revolution. This must be recalled today, when so many theoreticians of nationalism usually pose as discoverers of imperialism in our country. Consequently, the program submitted for the approval of the 13th Congress must be one which will be carried out by the new type of state." Its implementation will open the road to the socialist transformation of Argentine society.

Comrade Arnedo Alvarez reviewed the question of our road to power. Recalling the stand adopted on this issue by the preceding Congress, a stand to which we adhere to this day, he said:

"Marxism recognizes the most diverse forms of struggle and, at the same time, opposes all kinds of doctrinaire recipes which some want to impose and absolutely regardless of place and time. The correct answer is ability to apply one or another form of struggle; that is the orientation which must guide our Party and youth organizations.

"On this point we must underscore the instructions of the preceding Congress on the concrete steps that should be taken and on the need to be on guard, so as not to be caught unawares by abrupt changes of the situation.

"Today we are going through a period of struggle for fundamental solutions to national problems. Reaction will not scruple to use any means to hinder the growth of the patriotic and anti-imperialist forces. Our line—never to be caught unawares—must be a concrete orientation directive. We should not wait for reaction to force abrupt changes; we must anticipate them and take action now."

Comrade Arnedo Alvarez spoke of the attitude of the most reactionary section of the military, which, taking its cue from the Pentagon, develops theories about an "internal front" and the "counter-reactionary struggle," and also on the conformable use of the armed forces. Furthermore, he



pointed out that this policy of national betrayal evokes the mistrust and resistance of patriotic and anti-imperialist circles in the Argentine armed forces. At crucial moments these elements may side with the people. "We must help this process to mature. The main thing is to establish a close bond between the aspirations of these elements and the common interests of the liberation movement."

He reminded the delegates that Lenin always focussed attention on the task of winning the masses for revolutionary struggle, and pointed out that revolution cannot result from the actions of groups of heroes and conspirators. Nothing can be more dangerous than attempts to "prod" revolution. A sectarian position will only isolate the Party from the masses. The Party's great strength lies in the fact that, even under the most difficult conditions, it has been able to preserve close links with the masses and work to guide, organize and direct them.

"We," Comrade Alvarez continued, "must repeat that true to Marxism-Leninism our Party does not reject either path of revolution, the non-violent or violent path, and that it is preparing for both. In accordance with the Leninist theory of revolution, a theory that has been repeatedly tested in practice, the Communist Party understands that there are objective and subjective conditions which determine the choice of one or the other path in each given country and at a definite time. It understands that in face of an abrupt turn in the situation a fundamental change may occur requiring one or the other means of accomplishing the revolution. Therefore, the Party must be prepared to adopt a decision at each concrete historical moment . . . Lenin teaches us that a revolution is not determined only by the will of people or simply by slogans far removed from specific reality. Even when the objective and subjective conditions are on hand a revolution is the result of major actions by the workers and the entire people, of actions in which only the masses can determine the course of events. For that reason Lenin justifiably warned us that lack of faith in this painstaking, difficult and arduous work can result in people panicking and looking for an 'easy' way out. Our Party and its members neither panic nor look for an 'easy' way. We are fighting for the revolution in our country in a Leninist manner, i.e., scientifically, passionately and consistently."

Considering that the national tasks of the Argentine working class and people merge with international tasks, much of Comrade Alvarez' report and of the debate was devoted to the international situation and the tasks of the international Communist and working-class movement. The Congress's point of departure in creatively approaching these problems was the analysis of the 1960 Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, enriched by decisions of the world's Marxist-Leninist parties and by their bilateral and multilateral agreements.

Delegates pointed out that we are witnessing a sharp worsening of the international situation caused by U.S. imperialism's attempts to swing the world balance of strength in its favor by an unbridled arms race, by aggressive military blocs, "local" or "limited" wars and anti-socialist intrigues. Imperialism does not reconcile itself to the fact that the world socialist camp led by the Soviet Union is the decisive force directing the course of history.

Pressing problems of international politics were scrutinized against this background: the war in Vietnam, the conflict in the Middle East, West German imperialism, the national liberation movement in Africa, Asia and Latin America, the situation in Czechoslovakia, the provocations of the Mao group on the Soviet frontier, and so on.

The 13th Congress of the CPA expressed its solidarity with the foreign policy of the USSR and the glorious CPSU and emphasized the need for greater support for the Vietnamese people, the heroic socialist Republic of Cuba and the anti-imperialist struggle for the fraternal people of Peru. Our Party, it stressed, has always been firmly in favor of an International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties.

The Congress closely examined the question of major anti-imperialist actions in Latin America and came to the conclusion that "the time is becoming increasingly favorable for a continental meeting of representatives of anti-imperialist trends to coordinate their efforts for more effective united action in the fight for the common aims of the anti-imperialist movement in Latin America."

In opposition to the chauvinism encouraged by world reaction, the Congress raised on high the banner of proletarian internationalism.

With the ideological struggle becoming extremely acute, both nationally and inter-



nationally, the Congress devoted special attention to ideological problems. This, too, was necessary because it is dangerous to underrate the influence of bourgeois ideology, especially since the middle strata are joining the revolutionary movement. And though this is a sign that the revolution is maturing, these strata are joining the struggle without shedding their non-proletarian concepts, and the enemy adroitly exploits their ideological immaturity. Our task is to rally these non-proletarian strata around the proletariat for joint action. But this cannot be achieved without combating the ideology of imperialism and of "Left" and Right opportunism, which inject ideological confusion, dissension and organizational disunity.

The Congress resolution on the celebration of the Lenin centenary in Argentina urges improving the Party's ideological work, wider dissemination of Marxism-Leninism and criticism of bourgeois and petty-bourgeois theories, whose purpose is to paralyze or confuse the working class and other sections of the people.

The slogans at the 13th Congress included: "Lenin. 1870-1970. Leader and teacher of the international proletariat. Leninism is the Marxism of our epoch." This slogan stigmatizes those who on the Right or "Left" refuse to recognize that Leninism is the Marxism of the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolution, of the epoch of mankind's transition from capitalism to socialism and the building of communism.

The Congress called for exposure of those who, instead of developing Marxism on its own basis, regard theoretical work merely as efforts at revising the fundamental provisions of Marxism, provisions which are attacked both from the Right and the "Left." Revisionists of every hue reject or distort the Leninist theory of the development of the modern revolution. They reject or belittle the role of the working class. They undermine proletarian internationalism. They incline towards bourgeois nationalism. They seek to conceal or reject the tremendous historical role of the Soviet Union and the world socialist camp. They want to limit Leninism to Russian experience, denying that it is the Marxism of our epoch. And, primarily, they attack the Leninist concept of the new-type party, which consistently champions the proletarian point of view.

The Congress called for an unflagging

struggle against the bourgeois-nationalistic influence of Peronism among the Argentine working class, with its preachment of class harmony and its attempts to adapt the policy of the proletariat to that of the bourgeoisie. In countries where the peoples are fighting to win or consolidate political and economic independence, patriotism is a great motive force. It is the duty of Marxist-Leninists to make sure that genuine patriotic feelings are not used to infect the working class with the poison of bourgeois-nationalistic ideology.

The results of our work show that the CPA has sunk deep roots in the working class and among other sections of the people. It has organizations at enterprises in the oil fields of Salta, Mendoza, Comodoro Rivadavia, Neuquen and Santa Cruz provinces, at the sugar refineries in Salta, Jujuy and Tucuman provinces and in the north of Santa Fe Province, at the Aguilar mines in Jujuy province, among blast-furnace workers in Zapala, at the timber-felling sites in Chaco and Misiones provinces, among tobacco mill workers in Corrientes Province, among grape-growers in Mendoza and San Juan provinces, among the workers at the fruit plantations in the Rio Negro valley, at large factories in Buenos Aires and its industrial belt, in Rosario and its district, in Cordoba and in many humid pampas rural districts, among rural workers in various parts of the country, at secondary schools and institutions of higher learning, and so forth. In spite of this, the Communist Party's organizational work still lags behind its growing mass influence. It is, therefore, important to raise organizational work to a proper level. To make the Party a mass organization, it is vital to attract thousands of new members. This will enable it to play its guiding, organizational and leading role in the struggle of the masses for their immediate demands, against the rule of the monopolies, and for a truly democratic, popular and national government. One of the Congress slogans was: "Each factory is a fortress of the Party. Make the Lenin centenary a grand recruiting effort!" And the Congress decided to start a Lenin centenary membership drive to last until April 22, 1970.

Besides recruiting new members and training cadres for leading positions, the Congress pointed out that more young people must be attracted to the Party and the Communist Youth Federation, not only among the workers, particularly at large



enterprises, but also from among young peasants and students.

The youth question was accorded a special place in the work of the Congress. Delegates noted that, in the main, it was correct to raise the important question of devoting more attention to the problems of young workers and students and strengthening our Youth Federation. The latter's representatives spoke of the need to improve education of their members in a spirit of devotion to the Party and fidelity to its political and tactical line and to Marxism-Leninism.

Prior to the Congress, more than 3,000 meetings attended by nearly 20,000 people were held by Party branches. Roughly 3,000 delegates took part in district, local and zonal conferences. There were 785 delegates at the 21 provincial conferences and 116 delegates (more than 150, counting the Party officials) at the 13th Congress. Some delegates elected by province conferences were unable to attend for security reasons.

The preparations were based on the Central Committee theses and of proposed amendments to the Program and Rules. These were put out in 45,000 copies and distributed among Party members (35,000 copies), supporters and allies.

There was a broad pre-Congress discussion, and all the difficulties notwithstanding, it was held in a spirit of Party democracy at all levels.

The discussion substantially helped towards more political awareness and a higher standard of organizational work. During the preparations for the Congress some

1,100 new members were elected to the leadership of Party branches in the federal capital and the district of Buenos Aires. About 150 new leading officials were elected to provincial committees, and the Congress elected 21 new members and alternate members to the Central Committee.

The social composition of the Congress was: 72 workers, 4 peasants, 10 persons of the liberal professions, 6 teachers, 2 housewives, 1 student and 5 writers and journalists.

Altogether, including the reporters, there were 83 speakers. Six commissions functioned while the Congress was in session.

The drafts of the theses, Program and Rules were approved at 21 provincial conferences and at the Congress. Altogether 253 amendments were suggested to the draft theses. Of these the Congress adopted 76. Forty-five amendments were included in the draft Program and 30 in the draft Rules.

The Congress endorsed the CC report delivered by Comrade Arnedo Alvarez, and adopted a number of statements, messages of greetings, and resolutions: on ideological activity, Party building, the celebration of the Lenin centenary, and closer solidarity with the heroic Vietnamese people, Cuba and the Peruvian people. In a special resolution the Congress wholeheartedly supported the holding of the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties and expressed the CPA's readiness to help achieve still greater unity of the Communist and working-class movement on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism.



# ***Urgent tasks of mass party building***

ALBERTO SUAREZ

A conference of the Communist Party of Uruguay on organizational matters, held early this year, summed up the experience of the last few years, projected the main lines of Party work, and outlined a Party building plan for the period up to 1970, which is highlighted by two anniversaries: Lenin's centenary, and the 50th anniversary of the Communist Party of Uruguay (September 21, 1970).

The conference, attended by Communists from every part of the country, including delegates from large enterprises, opened a new stage in the drive to turn the Party into a large, mass organization with a fund of experienced cadres.

A number of Party building plans put into effect since the 16th Congress in 1955 have been a marked success: in the 14 years, the number of Communists has increased almost tenfold. In numbers and level of organization it has undoubtedly become a major party of Uruguay's Left-wing forces.

During the nine months between June 1968 and March 1969, the proletariat and all the people of Uruguay lived in the shadow of the "security measures" the ruling classes used to curtail the freedoms, and if the working class and the popular movement did succeed in those conditions in campaigning for and securing the repeal of those measures and in restoring the freedoms, it was not only because they used the right tactics, but also because the strength, organization and potential of the CPU enabled it to give a lead to the movement and act as a real and magnetic national force expressive of the vital interests of the masses in town and country.

\* \* \*

The new stage in the Party building drive coincides with a period of intense political struggle and mounting political instability.

Today, as in the nine-month emergency, we are faced with something greater than a battle on the trade union front. This is a period of acute class and mass struggle, which has its origins in the past decade. The working class, the masses, the people as a whole, have entered the stage as the protagonist.

Some groups and individuals fail to see this profound aggravation of the class struggle, and ascribe the emergency and reactionary socio-economic measures to the mediocrity of the president, a man who came to power by a chance of circumstance. This is not true, though his mediocrity does add some picturesque brushstrokes to Uruguay's political scene. The facts of the case are that the oligarchy is working on a far-reaching plan to achieve the aims pursued by the ruling classes over the last decade, resorting now to blandishments, now to repressions. That is no isolated fact: as in the rest of Latin America, where the peoples are rising to fight for liberation and which is wracked by class struggles, there is U.S. pressure to tighten up the regime in Uruguay.

The aims behind this are to redistribute the national income, wipe out the people's gains and prevent the growth of political awareness and the revolutionary movement. For this end the oligarchy has been trying to crush the powerful working-class and democratic movement, isolate the Left wing of the masses and, if need be, revoke the freedoms and even suspend the Constitution.

It is impossible to understand the meaning of the 1968 battle unless we take note of the sharp and deep-seated changes in the country. Some now say that the old idyllic Uruguay is fast disappearing, the Uruguay depicted by those who purvey the national reformist ideology, the Uruguay which allegedly has no use either for revolution or the class struggle, or, consequent-



ly, for a revolutionary working-class Party, because it was allegedly destined to be ruled by the bourgeoisie and guided by social paternalism. That myth has indeed been shattered. Anyone who fails to see this will not understand the tactics of 1968.

A new Uruguay is rising. But what will it look like? Will it be cast in the mould envisaged by the International Monetary Fund, or the one demanded by the masses, i.e., of a country advancing to economic and social progress, more democracy, national sovereignty, and a radical structural change? Which way will the Republic take? Will the latifundia remain or will a genuine land reform be carried out, changing the face of the country? Will the banks be handed over to foreigners or will they be nationalized, with the vast resources used for progress? Will policy be designed to make the people pay for the cost of the crisis or to penalize those guilty of the crisis and batten on it, i.e., the land-owning oligarchy, the big bankers and the capitalists?

Those were the implications that shaped the tactics of the revolutionary movement in that period—not new tactics, but a development to suit the new reality of the tactics worked out by our Party in the past decade.

In June 1968 we had to decide whether we were dealing with but one serious, even if partial, measure aimed against the working-class movement, or a great battle between democracy and reaction, between freedom and despotism, as the Communist Party, echoing the words of the national hero Artigas inscribed on the pediment of our university, had declared.

The intense nine-months struggle made it quite clear that the tactics of the working-class and popular movement was correct, because it was based on two elements: the spirit of fighting and resisting government policy, and the broad approach which made it possible to rally the majority of the population against that policy. In those months we saw examples of staunch, frequently heroic, resistance, notably by the working class, the students and all the other sections of the people, which explains the fact first, that reaction failed to saddle the country with a "gorilla" regime, and second, that it failed to crush the National Working People's Convention and the popular movement, and isolate the Left-wing forces. On the contrary, the National Workers' Convention gained in stature as the vanguard of the democratic movement,

while the Communist Party and Left-wing forces consolidated their ties with the people.

The struggle in that period is unmatched in depth and scope by anything in the history of Uruguay. The proletariat and the people combined the most diverse means to withstand the government and its savage repressions, and set up a broad front that isolated the government and forced it to lift the "security measures." The working class held seven or eight general strikes, including the one on July 3, 1968, which completely paralyzed the country. Strikes also hit all private industrial enterprises, banks, etc., complemented by mammoth demonstrations. That was the practice in the long weeks of struggle, and this despite the complete denial of freedoms for the working-class and democratic movement, and despite the fact that wartime regulations were enforced for the main groups of workers in the big enterprises, including industrial plants, the oil refinery, city transport in the capital, the telephone and telegraph, and employees of the national bank. Thousands of workers and students were arrested, and many drafted into the army, while hundreds of trade union leaders were dismissed or prevented from exercising their functions.

The thing to note about this struggle was the united action by unionized labor and the students of universities and secondary technical schools. The strikes and demonstrations against the government and the punitive forces embodied the "Workers and Students, Forward Together!" slogan. The high tide came when the government closed the university, which was ringed by troops for several weeks. The Minister of the Interior, who masterminded the repressions told Senate that in the first few weeks of the resistance movement against the "security measures" there had been 130 clashes between workers and students and the punitive forces. He dramatized the fact that the government was having it worse than other Latin American and European governments, because the working class and the student body had stood united and taken planned or joint action.

Clearly, the working class and the democratic movement could not have put up a fight without the vanguard Party, which, by virtue of its numerical strength and organization, played an important role in those nine turbulent months. The events vindicated the Communists, who had insisted at their 16th Congress that the main



problem was to build a mass revolutionary party. There was also a parallel process of deepening crisis and a decline of the traditional parties, which proved incapable of leading the country and had, in fact, brought it to a critical juncture.

We shall continue to develop our tactics. A "gorilla" regime is no more fatally inevitable than that the oligarchy should destroy the freedoms and the people's social and economic gains. True, the working people cannot expect a windfall: victory will depend on our ability to unite the country and the working class, and to rally the working class and the rest of the working people round the program we put forward a few years ago.

\* \* \*

The current inflation and other hardships are the product of Uruguay's economic reality, its dependence on imperialism, the latifundia system, and plunder of our resources by the people's enemies. That is why our struggle must be closely tied in with the program and its main element—the demand for freedom and other popular demands. In a sense, we are in the same situation as before the "security measures"—the country is still faced with the same basic choice: the policy of the International Monetary Fund or a policy in the national interest.

I have dealt with the question of a broad political campaign to secure the success of the progressive alternative. But what kind of party does that take, what kind of party is needed to forge a patriotic front in opposition to the government's policy? What kind of party do we need to have now that the traditional parties have proved to be unequal to the task?

Do we not ultimately have a major political indicator of a swing to the Left—even if it is still a limited one—in the fact that over the past few months the Party has grown, the inflow of new members being faster than before? The quality of the mass movement will depend mainly on the impetus it gets from our Party, and this will in turn depend on the Party's numerical strength and organization. The conference indicated that we are on the threshold of another political campaign. It is incumbent on us, therefore, to follow the slogan, "The Party Must Be in the Vanguard of the Struggle for Freedom and the Solution of Problems!"

If the Party is to be a force capable of

upsetting the plans of reaction we must secure its growth, for the conclusion drawn by the 16th Congress that the cardinal problem of the revolution is to create a big Communist Party holds good.

Lenin said: "Give us an organization of revolutionaries and we shall revolutionize Russia!" We can paraphrase it thus: once we have an organization of revolutionaries, a large Communist Party, we shall build a new Uruguay, a country meeting the demands of the masses. There was good ground for the talk at the conference about our going through the "heyday" of preparation for imminent battles. Preparing the Party to unite the working class and the people means to avoid underestimating the Party's role. If our Party's ranks have grown in the past 14 years, it is because we have always emphasized the need for a revolutionary vanguard, and have consistently planned and secured this vanguard's organizational and numerical growth.

As for the Party's composition, the conference underlined the need to draw strength from the working class. What we need is a powerful party, much stronger than today, in the industrial workers' areas. That is a matter of principle, and has been fully borne out by the experience of 1968. The working class has been so militant and has fought for so long, its struggle unmatched in Uruguay's history either in scope or intensity, not only because the trade union movement was united, but also because the main industrial enterprises had Party organizations to provide leadership.

Last year's battles have shown how important it is to have a working-class Party closely linked with the working masses at each large industrial enterprise. But this would be a half-truth and dangerously complacent if we did not add that many of our Party organizations are still small. The percentage of Communists is high in some places, but not everywhere. At some enterprises, Communists constitute but one, two or three per cent of the workers, in which cases our influence extends only to the most advanced workers, but does not always get to the bulk of the working people. Our blows at the enemy could be harder if we acted not only among these advanced workers, but among all the working people at the enterprises.

It is impossible to deprive the movement of its leadership—to decapitate it—when it rests on strong Communist organizations working in the midst of the working people. The fact is, however, that there is still a



disproportion between the mass numbers we lead and the numerical strength of the Party, especially in some groups of the working class. This may not be too harmful when the class struggle is not acute; but the size of the Party and the proportion between the scope of the movement and the Party's numerical strength become the crucial factor as the struggle intensifies and the enemy resorts to repressions and tries to destroy the movement's vanguard. We may add that it is no longer possible in Uruguay to lead the movement only from the top. With an "explosion" possible at any moment, guiding the working people and leading them to victory means having a mass Party.

This brings us to the goals we have set:

1) To ensure the presence everywhere of the working-class Party, a party with strong ties and support wherever the main class forces are concentrated;

2) To have a Party with influence throughout the country, which means increasing the number of our organizations in the provinces and rural localities;

3) Considerably to enhance the Party's influence in the middle sections of the population, a goal whose importance is indicated by the role the middle sections have played in the recent period by participating in the struggle against the government, and in defense of the university and civic liberties. This category includes the intelligentsia, which acted with such vigor;

4) To work—as a main line of Party activity—among women in the working class and the working population as a whole. In this respect, 1968 was a year of women's struggle for freedom, against the government. Women were responsible for some of the splendid actions that rocked the country. There is a marked upswing in the women's mass movement and also a growth in the number of women Communists;

5) To create, alongside a mass Party, a mass Communist Youth League. The 19th Congress of the Communist Party in August 1966 noted: young people must join in the campaign for their demands, for independence, national sovereignty and freedom. Young workers and students are taking an active part in the actions across the country. The Communist Youth League is their fighting vanguard. Liber Arce, Susana Pintos and Hugo de los Santos are symbols of the youth struggle.

It is high time to define the tendencies in the Party's development and organiza-

tion. The conference adopted the following decisions:

1. The Party should not grow haphazardly, but where the need is greatest: in the major industrial centers, in the interior, among the middle sections of the population, among the young people and women.

2. It is essential to make up the lag in work among sections of the working class outside the class union movement, and where the Party has no organizations of its own and is still inactive.

3. The Party's work in the interior must be improved.

4. The thousands of Communists who have joined the Party in the past few years must be drawn into active work, especially in the primary organizations.

5. Communists in the mass movement must be organized.

6. A truly broad cadres policy must be initiated.

7. The Communist Youth League must be developed.

8. The Central Committee apparatus and the middle-echelon leadership in the capital and the provinces must be enlarged and improved.

\* \* \*

At the present stage we must go out and meet the broad masses, so as to crystallize the experience in Party building and recruiting of new members, making the most of the experience of the branches. Preparations for the conference gave rise to doubts, and we need the right approach if they are to be dispelled. Should we, for instance, go on recruiting new members to the Party or first consolidate our gains? This is an alternative, because two different things are involved: it is one thing to recruit new members to the Party, and quite another, to educate them. This lack of clarity can be resolved with relative ease through a discussion in the Party.

Another doubt causes much concern. It is this: the Party is very big, its numbers have multiplied several-fold; is there any danger that this mass of new members may impair the Party's fighting efficiency and ideological unity? We feel there is no cause for anxiety on this score. The main thing to bear in mind is the need for a mass Party to win the political battle. In other words, the problem of numbers is not purely organizational; it is also a definitive political factor in solving the country's economic and social problems. Of course, there may



be an element of risk, but the Party's ideological unity is stable, and has been tested, and consolidated, especially in the past 14 years, in the face of countless difficulties. We also have a full consensus on political matters on the evidence of the last nine months, in the course of which the most diverse tactical methods were used, with the Party always acting as a body. We have a sound organization, the result of long years of effort. That is why we hold that no danger exists for the Party's fighting efficiency.

In this context, some of the propositions Lenin put forward during a special period in the Bolshevik Party's activity are highly relevant. Some civic freedoms, albeit abbreviated, had been won in a matter of weeks after the October 1905 crisis, in the course of the first Russian revolution. It was in these short-lived conditions of freedom that Lenin formulated the slogan on reorganizing the Party and calling a congress to pave the way for a mass party.

In his article, "The Reorganization of the Party," Lenin posed two problems, one of which I have already mentioned: is there any danger in opening up the Party to the inexperienced masses. And he wrote: "The conditions in which our Party is functioning are changing radically. Freedom of assembly, of association and of the press has been captured. Of course, these rights are extremely precarious, and it would be folly, if not a crime, to pin our faith to the present liberties. The decisive struggle is yet to come, and preparations for this struggle must take first place. The secret apparatus of the Party must be maintained. But at the same time it is absolutely necessary to make the widest possible use of the present relatively wider scope for our activity. In addition to the secret apparatus, it is absolutely necessary to create many new legal and semi-legal Party organizations (and organizations associated with the Party). Unless we do this, it is unthinkable that we can adapt our activity to the new conditions or cope with the new problems" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 10, p. 29).

Lenin went on: "Look at this question from another angle — from the point of view of the substance of the matter, not of its form. Is Social-Democracy endangered by the realization of the plan we propose?"

"Danger may be said to lie in a sudden influx of large numbers of non-Social-Democrats into the Party. If that occurred, the Party would be dissolved among the masses, it would cease to be the conscious

vanguard of its class, its role would be reduced to that of a tail. That would mean a very deplorable period indeed. And this danger could undoubtedly become a very serious one if we showed any inclination towards demagoguery, if we lacked party principles (program, tactical rules, organizational experience) entirely, or if those principles were feeble and shaky. But the fact is that no such 'ifs' exist . . .

"And now that the heroic proletariat has proved by deeds its readiness to fight, and its ability to fight consistently and in a body for clearly-understood aims, to fight in a purely Social-Democratic spirit, it would be simply ridiculous to doubt that the workers who belong to our Party, or who will join it tomorrow at the invitation of the Central Committee, will be Social-Democrats in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred. The working class is instinctively, spontaneously Social-Democratic and more than ten years of work put in by Social-Democracy has done a great deal to transform this spontaneity into consciousness" (*ibid.*, pp. 31-32).

From this it follows that in considering the need to reorganize the Party so as to involve in it great masses of people, Lenin reasoned along the following lines: Would this mass membership drive impair the Party's fighting efficiency and ideological unity? He said that the guarantee against this happening is that the Party has a program, a coherent tactical concept, and a well-knit organization. On the strength of this Lenin wrote: "Don't invent bugaboos," for the mass of workers likely to join the Party is instinctively and spontaneously Social-Democratic, because the Party's years of struggle have produced the basic elements of consciousness in that mass. Lenin did not shrug off the danger of there being some "elements of instability, vacillation, wavering," but said that "the steadfast of solid core" of Party members would cope with these elements (*ibid.*). In other words, to ward off the danger, the Party cadre must make an effort to overcome the "instability and vacillation," relying on the working people's instinctive acceptance of Party discipline and Party views.

In the same article Lenin emphasizes the importance of the Party's primary organizations for the mass of new members, and added: "We must immediately arouse the initiative of all Party functionaries and of all workers. . . . We must arrange at once, everywhere, lectures, talks, meetings, open-



air rallies . . ." (ibid., p. 34). The actual work of reorganizing the Party, as Lenin suggested, should be left for the broad masses. These ideas sparked the discussion at our conference.

We have ideological and political unity. We have a sound organization. What, in that case, can stop us? With full confidence in the working class, which has shown its mettle, we must call on the masses to join the Party, throwing open the door to thousands of working people. This requires an extensive ideological campaign in the press, including shop-floor newspapers, speeches and radio broadcasts, a campaign designed to draw the masses into the Party. On the occasion of the Lenin centenary we should disseminate the Party's program materials as a means of educating the people and extending the Party's ideological influence.

While implementing the new plan we shall continue to use the traditional methods that have proved to be effective, such as painstaking coordination of mass work with the Party's overall activity, Communist activity in parliament, and the work of the Party press, rank-and-file Communists, Party organizers and Party organizations. At the same time, we shall hold workers' meetings to start a frank dialogue with tens of thousands of men and women from the people. We need this to give them an understanding of our aims and involve them in Party activity.

As I have said, we need a mass Party and one that is well organized. At crucial junctures only those who are well organized can fight effectively—and we have just had proof of this. Those who are not organized cannot deploy their forces against the class enemy and its government. The Party is an association organized from top to bottom and consisting of men prepared consciously and systematically to work for the people's liberation. It is united by its ideological, tactical and organizational principles.

What are the difficulties and shortcomings facing us? First, sectarianism and underestimation of the new forces joining our ranks. Second, lack of a perspective as regards the Party's role in the life of the country. When the Party is not regarded as the force that determines events, that means the energy is lacking to turn all Party members into conscious revolutionaries. Third, clinging to a reality that is no longer there, to obsolete forms of work, to concepts characteristic of a small Party. Fourth, lack of facilities for working in the

new way (I have in mind the "narrowness" of the middle echelon apparatus—departmental committees and urban block committees; the lower echelon apparatus is very small), and of other necessary facilities, such as transport, premises for meetings and work outside the Party. We need more branch newspapers, which also help to educate members. Sometimes, lower echelon organizations do not even have the elementary propaganda facilities which, apart from their purely specific functions, also help to unite men for action and to educate them.

The directives of the 19th Congress of the CPU clearly point to the need for a Party that has cadres and is a mass party. The Congress pointed out the need to enhance the political awareness of all Communists, to consolidate the middle-echelon leadership, get all Party members into workers' associations, and strengthen the primary organizations, attaching special importance to the election of the first secretary, the secretary for organization and the secretariat in all Party organizations. In other words, the membership must be made to join in the organizational work so as to impel them to act, instead of just working with the cadres. Much needs to be done to draw all Communists into the day-to-day activities. It pays to get people with little political experience to take part in the mass movement, the trade union local, or the Left Front of Liberation committee at the factory or urban block, which will give the Communists the political experience they lack. This is not to say that such people are simply sent to work in the trade union movement or the Left Front of Liberation. The Party decides on their duties and helps to organize their work in this or that mass organization.

The conference dealt especially with the Party's work in the provinces, which were broadly represented. This is a sign that there, too, the Party's ranks are growing, that the Communists are more active ideologically and politically, and that they have been gaining experience. There is no distinct political line for Party organizations in the departments as opposed to that for Party organizations in the capital, but we realize that more assistance is needed where organizational work in the Party and in the masses lags behind as compared with Montevideo. We have set ourselves the task of establishing everywhere and consolidating a nucleus of leaders to shoulder the responsibility for Party activity. For the provinces this means increasing



the number of Communists and renewing the composition in the Party organization. As in the capital, so in the provinces, the Party must rely on the forces that have shown their mettle in the recent battles.

Party work in the provinces has undoubtedly advanced, as the political struggle in 1968 and the growth of Communist ranks show, but Party organizations in the outlying areas need more help. We shall concentrate our efforts on places like Canelones, Litoral and Tacuarembó. Canelones is the most populous department, with 250,000 inhabitants. With the population of Montevideo included, the bulk of Uruguay's population lives there. Moreover, all the elements of capitalism in its towns and countryside are in the process of development. Litoral is where the working class and the most advanced sections of the peasantry are concentrated. Conditions have already been created in Tacuarembó for the Party to advance, thereby exerting an influence on the northeastern part of the country.

\* \* \*

The conference pointed out that attainment of the projected goals presupposes a large organizational Party apparatus, an organizational effort on a wide front, and committees on organizational matters. Unless we have this, we cannot expect to build the kind of Party we want. The important role to be played by this organizational apparatus and the corresponding department of the Central Committee should be borne in mind. The conference has shown that the Party already has a large group of organizers, but this is far from enough to cope with the plans we have outlined for the two years. A larger mass Party must have an adequate organizing apparatus, and thousands must be drawn into this work: secretaries for organizational matters in the lower echelon bodies, a great number of organizational committees in the sections and departments, a committee for organizational matters in Montevideo and an organizational department under the Central Committee.

The conference examined a draft plan to be put through at the height of some big political campaign and in the struggle for a positive program, helping the working class and the whole people to see the road ahead. The main idea behind the plan is to set the whole Party to work for a higher level of organization, and to develop the

Party's organizational forms and the mass movement. All this is being done to prepare the movement for fresh battles, to go forward to meet the masses and unite them in the Party, thereby further consolidating the Party's positions in the major working-class centers.

As for the membership drive, we have set the following targets: 20,000 new Party members throughout the country; another 20,000 — yielding a total of 40,000 — new members for the Communist Youth League. This is surely a high proportion of revolutionaries for our population.

Consequently, the membership drive will be put into much higher gear. In 1968, 500 persons joined the Party in the capital every month. Under the new plan, the figure is to be 650, with 213 for the provinces. In the latter case, this means doubling the membership. Let me add that the new plan stresses the importance of the Party's composition. That is why the Montevideo figures may not seem to be high enough, but for us quality matters most, and we are obliged to persevere in our effort to recruit new members.

Although the Party has started doing so, we must still improve our work at enterprises where we do not lead the unions and have yet to set up Party organizations. The Party must do much more at all Montevideo factories employing over 400 workers.

As for the branches, the plan provides for an increase in their number to 500 by 1970, with two-thirds of them in industry. In the provinces, we intend to increase the number of branches to 200, concentrating on the over 400-worker plants. We must frame a policy for the main areas of industrial concentration in each zone and region.

The plan provides for doubling the Party cadre.

The call to secure 100 per cent payment of membership dues in 1970 holds good. We have had some success in the capital and many organizations have already reached the target, which cannot be said for the Party as a whole. Steps should be taken to remedy the situation by 1970.

The circulation of the Party newspaper is also of primary importance. By 1970 we should have 30,000 copies weekly going out to Party branches in the capital, and 40,000 copies for the whole country. It has been decided to make allocations for the zones, enlisting sizable numbers of members and helping the zonal leadership organize regu-



lar week-end sales drives to be led by Party leaders and not just some functionaries. In the propaganda field, we have decided to increase the number of newspapers put out by lower echelon Party organizations. We have drawn up a list of these publications, and defined their character and the type of assistance they are to receive.

By 1970 we plan to issue the journal *Estudios* in a printing of 10,000 copies and make a special effort to put it into the hands of Party members, workers and the masses.

On educational work, the Montevideo Departmental Committee is to work out its

own plan, while the Executive Committee is to examine other measures arising from work in the provinces.

Our task today is to unite the country in frustrating the schemes of our enemies. We cannot anticipate the nature of the struggle, but one thing is certain: our whole effort will be filled with resolve to unite the people and set up a mass Party for that purpose. Our ideas are gaining ground among the people, and we are sure to have such a Party. In that sense, the conference is bound to exert an influence not only on the future of the Party but also of the country.

## ***Hungary: strengthening the leading role of the party***

MATYAS TOTH

Strengthening the leading role of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, (HSWP), its Ninth Congress pointed out, was a major task, the key to our continued advance. The Party must exercise its leading role at every stage of socialist construction, and the present stage requires more active and united effort by all the organs of the dictatorship of the proletariat and all sections of society. The economic management reform calls for a bigger share by Party members in directing the country's economic life. Another reason why the question figured prominently at the Ninth Congress is that other Communist Parties interpret and carry out the Party's leading role differently.

Needless to say, the leading role of the Party implies a principled Marxist-Leninist policy that takes into account both our ultimate aims and the immediate interests of the people, primarily the working class. This is a pre-condition for winning mass support.

The Congress decision affects every aspect of Party life, and its fulfilment is closely linked with increased Party activ-

ity. All its work, ideological, political, organizational and educational, must be keyed to this aim of strengthening the Party's leading role.

Some aspects of our experience in this field are discussed in this article.

### **I.**

The work of the Party and its leading role are inseparable from the social strata and classes from which it draws its members. The quality and the number of people who join the Party is largely determined by its policy and aims and the work of the local organizations and members.

### **PARTY MEMBERSHIP**

On January 1, 1969, membership exceeded 600,000. Compared with the world membership of the Communist and Workers' parties, nearly 50 million, this is a small figure, only 1.2 per cent. But compared with the size and population of Hungary, the figure is much more impressive, 12.8 per cent of the gainfully employed



population. Membership growth has been even and, we think, in line with the growth of the Party's influence. In the two years since the Ninth Congress it increased seven per cent, with a similar growth rate, 3.5 per cent a year, in the years between the Eighth and Ninth Congresses.

The branches are guided by the Ninth Congress recommendation not to strive for excessive growth. That is based on the experience, over a long period, of our own and the fraternal parties. There was a time (after the merger of the Communist and Social-Democrat parties in 1948) when membership reached 1,200,000. In 1956, on the eve of the counter-revolution, the Hungarian Party of Labor had nearly 900,000 members. Experience shows that *the Party's strength and its leading role cannot be measured solely by the size of its membership.*

The Party enjoys much greater influence and is in no way weaker organizationally than before the counter-revolution, though its numbers are fewer than in 1956. That is partly due to the mistakes of the past, but also, apparently, to the fact that careerists and unsteady people had found their way into its ranks. The result was an inflated party in which many did not stand the crucial test: a considerable number left the Party or turned against it when things became difficult.

We do not have fixed membership goals and we believe it would be wrong to have them. The Party's growth depends, on the one hand, on the popularity of its policy, on the way it is accepted and implemented in the branches, and, on the other, on the observance of the Leninist organizational principles and membership requirements. This is convincingly demonstrated by the growth of the Party since the liberation.

Our Party was active in the closing years of the war despite continued harassment and persecution. After the liberation its policy won the immediate approval of the workers and poorer peasants, who had suffered both from cruel exploitation and the hardships imposed by the war. The Party was joined by veteran militants who had been active in the Resistance, former Left Social-Democrats and people of no previous party affiliation. Most of the new recruits were workers, farm laborers and peasants; by the end of 1945 we already had 500,000 members.

This was a time of struggle for power and the size of political organizations was, naturally, an important factor. According-

ly, we strove to recruit more members and lowered the demands made on applicants. But this also brought into our ranks people with whom we later had to part company.

At times the Party grew relatively fast despite more stringent membership requirements. By June 1957, after the defeat of the counter-revolution, about 300,000 former members of the Party of Labor and 50,000 new members joined the reorganized party. We recruited another 92,000 between June 1957 and the Seventh Party Congress (November 1959). The figures are evidence of the Party's successful fight on two fronts to consolidate the situation after the abortive counter-revolution.

### **ABOLITION OF PROBATIONARY MEMBERSHIP**

In 1966, in preparation for the Ninth Party Congress, we circulated to all branches a draft of the amended Rules envisaging abolition of the probationary period, the so-called candidate-member status. Many were alarmed: would this not open the Party to immature elements? Developments over the past two years, however, have dispelled these apprehensions. Repeal of the probationary period was not motivated by a desire to increase membership. The decision was made after careful consideration: about a quarter of a century had elapsed since liberation; Party branches have ample opportunity to study applicants, assess their work, public activity, and so on. There was also this consideration: Communists in the mass organizations would now feel a greater responsibility for helping non-Party people towards admittance to the Party, and the mass organizations would become real schools of communism.

And the results have been good in every respect. Of the 38,000 candidate members at the time of the Ninth Party Congress, more than 35,000 were accorded full-member status and about 2,500 were denied it. Abolition of the probationary period put an end to the division into full-fledged and fledgling members. Experience has shown that this has stimulated work among non-Party people. Last year, for instance, the Youth League organizations recommended some 7,500 for Party membership, or 65.8 per cent of all new recruits under 26. But the rate of growth (41,000 new members in the past two years) remains unchanged, which means that the Congress decisions are adhered to and that



each application is carefully examined — branches are more exacting in handling applications.

On the whole, repeal of the probationary period has not resulted in excessive growth of membership. In examining membership applications the branches are guided by the principle that it is better to have more non-Party people whom we can accept into our ranks than more Party members whom we would like to see outside our ranks.

### MEMBERSHIP COMPOSITION

The Ninth Congress did away with the division of Party members according to social origin, and now we have only three groups: "manual workers," "non-manual workers," and "others." This, while it makes it difficult to draw comparisons with earlier years, provides a fairly accurate picture of the present membership.

There has been no material change since the Ninth Congress. At the end of 1968, manual workers accounted for 42.7 per cent, non-manual workers for 38.1 per cent and "others" (servicemen, pensioners, students, housewives, etc.) for 19.2 per cent.

Can we pursue working-class aims without a majority of workers in the Party? some ask. The answer is that our's *has always been a working-class party, not because it was supposedly made up exclusively of workers, but because its ideals, policy and practical activity accord with the interests and ultimate aims of the working class.*

This, certainly, should not make us relax our efforts to recruit more workers. What is the explanation for the present ratio of manual and non-manual workers? Can it be that too few workers are joining the Party? That is not the case. Nearly half of all new members admitted since the Congress are manual workers. And yet the proportion has not considerably increased for a number of reasons, of which I shall mention the following.

There is a growing proportion of pensioners, 9.3 per cent at the time of the Ninth Congress and 10.6 per cent at the beginning of 1969, mostly former workers. This has lowered the proportion of manual workers.

It should be borne in mind, moreover, that technological advance has generated a process of re-stratification. The working class is no longer confined to manual workers; in every factory growing numbers are now performing non-manual operations, and are classified as non-manual, though

their outlook and attitudes do not conflict with those of the working class.

This process has been more rapid in the Party than in society generally. For the Party admits the more advanced workers, men and women who devote much time to study, with the result that many of them sooner or later shift to non-manual jobs.

Besides, several thousand Communists holding responsible positions are ex-workers or farmers. And while their functions are in the interests of the working class, they themselves cannot be classed as manual workers.

Lastly, an increase in the proportion of workers is retarded by the fact that most of those who resign or are expelled belong to the manual-worker group (60.4 per cent in 1967-68). This means that branches must show much more concern for work among members of this group, pay more attention to their conditions, more carefully study and train new recruits and be more strict in dealing with applications. The influence of the Party's policy and of its measures can be judged by the social strata that provide most of the new recruits. And most of these have always come from the working class, men and women who not only accept Party policy and decisions, but more than any other section of society share the Party's ultimate goal, the building of socialism and communism.

Each new phase in socialist construction poses new problems requiring specific solutions and measures. Some join the Party because they are attracted by these measures, not because they accept Party policy as a whole. Of course, personal advantage plays a part too. We must be on the lookout for that, for we cannot afford to dilute the Party by admitting such people. Many white-collar workers in the economic and administrative apparatus applied for membership when we were introducing our economic reform. (For many years now the number of professionals applying for membership has exceeded their share in the population. This tendency has to be held

On the other hand, there are periods when the Party deliberately encourages applications from one or another group. This was so during the socialist reorganization of agriculture, when we waived the probationary period for cooperative farmers, enabling us to start Party organizations on practically every cooperative farm. As a general rule, however, we strive to recruit the very best people.

The majority of Party members (60 per



cent at the beginning of the year) are engaged in industry, construction, transport and agriculture, or what is usually referred to as the productive sphere. The core of the Party is made up of organizations in big industry, a feature we must retain. Communists make up 12.8 per cent of the gainfully employed population, but the percentage is much higher in the main industrial enterprises, as will be seen from the following table:

|                                |      |
|--------------------------------|------|
| Osepel Engineering Combine     | 18.8 |
| Ganz-MAVAG                     | 17.1 |
| Lenin Steel Plant              | 20.9 |
| Salgotarjan Coal Mines         | 27.3 |
| Ozd Steel Plant                | 22.0 |
| Diosgyor Engineering Works     | 25.9 |
| Hungarian Shipbuilding Combine | 17.8 |
| Borsod Coal Mines              | 18.9 |
| Tatabanya Coal Mines           | 15.6 |
| Danube Steel Combine           | 13.9 |

These enterprises employ 160,000, or 11.7 per cent of total employment in state industry.

The bulk of the new members come from big industrial plants.

The position on the cooperative farms is unsatisfactory — Communists make up only 5.4 per cent. This, apparently, is attributable to the rising average age of cooperative farmers and to the exodus from rural areas in the past. Though it would be unrealistic to expect a radical change in the near future, the position is gradually improving. The number of well-managed, economically sound farms is increasing, with the result that young people are going back. Applications have been coming in also from members of farm families. Last year, 80,000 joined the cooperatives. On the best farms there is a very real opportunity for strengthening Party organizations by bringing in new members.

The average age of Party members is 43-44 and is steadily rising, despite the fact that most of the new recruits are young people — over 84 per cent of those who joined since the Ninth Congress are under 40 and 35.1 per cent under 26. The rise in the average age is due mainly to the longer life-span since liberation. Besides, there is a sizeable number of veteran Communists who joined the Party in the twenties and thirties. Some 9,000 joined before the liberation and about 90,000 in 1945-46.

Women make up 23.4 per cent, and their share is growing. The same can be said of members with secondary and higher edu-

cation, who now account for approximately 29 per cent.

## II.

We are making a special effort to extend inner-Party democracy on the basis of democratic centralism, which we regard as an integral and inviolable principle. Elections to Party committees were put on a more democratic basis even before the Ninth Congress.

The development of Party democracy, strict observance of the rights of members and of the conditions for their effective implementation—all are part and parcel of the life of each organization. The greater democracy in the Party, discussion of major issues at meetings and special attention to the views of the members help to impart a constructive business-like character to concrete measures in pursuance of the Party's overall policy, which has the support of the people. It is rare indeed for branch meetings to be postponed for lack of interest among members or poor attendance. And even rarer in the case of Party election meetings: last year, for example, attendance stood at 85 per cent, and 100 per cent in many branches.

Discussion is always democratic, with every member free to state his views. At last year's election meetings (there were about 140,000) nearly 25 per cent of the membership took part in the debate. And the character of the debate differed greatly from that of a few years ago, when there was still a wide margin of difference on our policy of alliances, the abolition of social-origin preferences in admission to universities, cadre policy, the Party's leading role. At that time many were still confused on some of these questions.

Patient explanation and experience have helped the vast majority to form a clear understanding of these issues, and they did not come up for discussion at last year's election meetings. The membership fully approves the Party's policy and practical measures on these matters.

The election meetings have shown full approval of, and support for, the Central Committee's home policy, its efforts to strengthen the international Communist and workers' movement, and its fight on two fronts, against revisionism and dogmatism. The membership has resolutely rebuffed sporadic manifestations of both these deviations. The discussion at election meetings centered on home-policy issues and the practical work of Party organizations, par-



ticularly their approach to economic problems and ways and means of stimulating membership activity. Many pointed to the potentialities for raising living standards, the need for closer ties between leadership and rank and file, more attention to the youth, etc.

It will probably not be easy to keep membership activity at the high level demonstrated at the election meetings. But we must work towards that goal, and the Party organizations are making it a point to revert to the questions discussed at these meetings and keep the branches informed of what is being done and what is being planned.

The new election procedure, with its broader opportunities for influencing policy, has done much to stimulate inner-Party democracy. Last year elections of Party committees were, for the second time, conducted in two stages. At the end of August and early in September branch meetings appointed nominating and teller commissions and elected the chairman of the election meeting to be held a month later.

This was favorably received by the members. Prior appointment of nominating commissions was especially welcome because it assured a large measure of democracy. The nominating commission has a month in which to interview each member, get his views on the branch's political and organizational work and the composition of its new leadership. The commissions were instructed to interview each member and take into account every suggestion relevant to the election of the branch bureau.

The value of this new procedure was fully demonstrated in the 1966 and 1968 elections. The commissions talked with every Communist (though this could not be done in the bigger branches) and consulted higher Party committees. After this careful preparation the commissions submitted their candidatures, and after long discussion most of the nominees — 96-97 per cent, in fact — were elected. Among other things, this made for a more constant composition of the leading committees.

The work of these commissions was valuable for another reason — it enabled the members fully to state their views on the problems of their branch and in this way more precisely to formulate its tasks.

The new procedure was introduced for several important reasons. First, since the commissions and the chairman of the election meeting are elected a month ahead,

they are able more closely to review the work of the branch. Second, the new procedure accords with the widespread demand that future bureau members be properly prepared for their job.

Still another step towards greater democracy is direct election, by secret ballot, of branch secretaries. The secret ballot, which is used in elections at all Party levels, precludes the element, even if subconscious, of inhibition and allows unhindered choice of candidates. Up to 1966, branch secretaries were elected by the bureau by open vote, so that the membership could not directly influence the choice of secretary. There was also the objection that branch secretaries were often recommended by higher Party bodies. Of course, that objection cannot be accepted as a *general rule*, but the old system left plenty of room for criticism, since the bureau was usually guided by the opinion or recommendation of the higher committees.

Under the new procedure, the secretary must obtain at least 50 per cent of the votes in a secret ballot, and only after that are the other members of the bureau elected. This has been welcomed by all branches, for even though all bureau members have equal rights and an equal vote, it is the branch secretary who exercises day-to-day direction and is expected to show initiative and take a definite stand on all questions. That is how Party members see it, and that is why they readily accepted the new procedure.

The importance they attach to the functions of secretary was clearly demonstrated at election meetings. For instance, in 1966, 70 per cent of the election debate was spent on discussing nominees for the secretaryship, and only 30 per cent on nominations for the bureau. In 1968 the figures were more even, but still more time was devoted to choosing the branch secretary than bureau members.

Members can nominate any number of candidates in addition to those named by the commission, which gives the meeting a wider choice. There is no limit to the number of members of any Party committee, but the Central Committee urges election of experienced comrades capable of carrying out Party policy and popular in the community.

Experience since the elections has fully confirmed the efficacy of the new method. Most secretaries and bureau members elected in 1968 possess the knowledge and



ability needed to carry out Party policy. The number of bureau members with secondary and higher education is up 6.2 per cent, and 45 per cent have had political training. The number of women bureau members has risen from 18.6 to 20 per cent. About two-thirds of bureau members are serving a second or third term, so that the change in composition has been slight.

A controversial question that cropped up after the elections is the slight decline, about two per cent, in the number of manual workers on Party bureaus (their share now is 29.6 per cent). This should be seen in context of the process of restratification mentioned earlier. But there is also another factor: the secretary and

bureau members are regarded as partners of the administrative-economic leadership, and the demands made on them are therefore more exacting. Party committees are now analyzing the factors behind this decline in the share of manual workers on Party bureaus.

On the whole, we assess the 1968 elections favorably. The discussion at election meetings has helped towards the uniform conception of Party policy and work, towards greater democracy and initiative. The new composition of the Party committees and what they have already accomplished is evidence that the Party organizations are successfully coping with the tasks set by the Ninth Congress.

---



# ***The international and national in communist policy***

**JULIUSZ WACLAWEK**

The problem of combining the international and national in Communist Party policy is acquiring increasing importance in the class struggle between socialism and capitalism. The reasons are several: socialist revolution has triumphed in many European and Asian countries; a socialist state has emerged in Latin America; relations between socialist countries have added a new dimension to international relations; there is a rising tide of the labor movement in developed capitalist countries, and an unparalleled ascendancy of the national liberation movement with the resultant collapse of imperialism's colonial empire and the emergence of a large number of new states. It is only natural, therefore, that this aspect of the struggle between socialism and imperialism should have figured so prominently at the recent International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties.

These parties operate in countries widely differing in size, economic development, and socio-political structure. This adds to the complexity of the problem. There is also this complicating factor: imperialist propaganda inflation of nationalistic sentiments meets with a definite response, primarily from the petty bourgeois element, and also among certain intellectual and even working-class groups. There are also the stepped-up Right and "Left" revisionist attacks on the principles of proletarian internationalism, and differing interpretations and assessments of such concepts as internationalism, nationalism, patriotism, the right of nations to self-determination, sovereignty, etc. Yet, Marxist-Leninist theory gives definite and pre-

cise interpretations based on the principles of the proletariat's class struggle with the bourgeoisie.

## **THE NEED TO COMBINE INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL TASKS**

The central problem of Marxism, of course, relates to the workers' class struggle in alliance with other progressive sections of the people to overthrow the exploiting classes and to establish proletarian dictatorship. And it is from this standpoint that Marxism regards all questions, including the national question. In fact, priority of the workers' class interests over narrow national interests is a fundamental principle of Marxism-Leninism. And from it follows the idea of the unity of the workers of all countries and nationalities in fighting their common foe, capitalism. Indeed, the communist movement was born with the slogan "Workers of All Countries, Unite!" This priority of joint struggle is the chief principle of proletarian internationalism and of international unity of the working class and solidarity of all the working people in the battle against exploitation, social and national oppression.

The main trait of the Communists, Marx and Engels wrote in the *Communist Manifesto*, is that they "are distinguished from the other working-class parties by this only: 1. In the national struggles of the proletarians of the different countries, they point out and bring to the front the common interests of the entire proletariat independently of all nationalities. 2. In the



various stages of development which the struggle of the working class against the bourgeoisie has to pass through, they always and everywhere represent the interests of the movement as a whole."

The Manifesto also emphasizes that in *substance*, the proletarian struggle is international, though in *form*, "the struggle of the proletariat with the bourgeoisie is at first a national struggle. The proletariat of each country must, of course, first of all settle matters with its own bourgeoisie."

In developing Marxism in the period of monopoly-capital domination, Lenin concluded that "socialism cannot be victorious in *all* countries simultaneously. It will triumph first in one or several countries, while the rest will for some time remain bourgeois or pre-bourgeois." The history of this century, and the more than half-century of experience of socialist revolution, fully corroborate that idea. If the struggle for socialism is waged within separate, politically, economically and nationally insulated countries, if socialism triumphs first in a single uni-national or multi-national state with all its distinctive specifications, that would oblige the world communist movement to combine the proletariat's international with national tasks, i.e., the fight for socialist victory in the given country with the fight for socialism throughout the world. The Communist Parties are above all guided by the proletariat's common international tasks, which does not mean that they should ignore concrete, national specifics of their own country. This is an axiomatic condition of success.

But neither should it be interpreted to mean that we can allow appeals for supra-class national unity: that is, unity between exploiters and exploited, which contradicts the class and international interests of the proletariat and the working people's struggle for social emancipation. Marx and Lenin always denounced such appeals as petty-bourgeois or bourgeois. Lenin said: "We had to disperse the petty-bourgeois illusion that the people are an integral whole and that the popular will can be expressed other than in class struggle" (*Coll. Works*, Vol. 28, p. 207). Substituting the class principle of internationalism by the principle of national unity and supra-class national interests—whatever the arguments adduced in justification—is, objectively, a betrayal of the working class of one's own country and of the entire international proletariat. Only in the coun-

tries of victorious socialism can the interests of the ruling class—for the first time in history—be justifiably equated with the general national interest, for in this case the ruling class is the working class, acting in close alliance with all other sections of the working people. And the record of these countries will show that such identity of national and working people's interests does exist. It can be seen in the economic, social, cultural and political achievements, in which the aims of the working people find their realization. But even here any disregard of the fact that socialist society, and the Communist Party that directs it, must above all consider the interests of the working class as the most consistent class in the struggle to develop socialism—any disregard of the working class's international interests and obligations—can, and does, lead to grave errors, even setbacks.

#### INTERNATIONALISM AND THE NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENT

Solution of the national problem in one or another country depends on the strength and scope of its workers' struggle, on the results of the international class struggle, on socialism's struggle against capitalism. That is why Lenin, in championing the rights of nations to self-determination and equality, at the same time exposed the Social-Democrat and petty-bourgeois views on the national question, notably the contention that it is wholly unrelated to the class struggle between socialism and capitalism. On this point he was precise and blunt: "Demands of democracy, including self-determination, are not an absolute, but only a *small* part of the general-democratic (now: general-socialist) world movement" (Vol. 22, p. 341).

For Marxism-Leninism the national question and the problems of the national liberation movement are a composite part of the much wider problem of socialist revolution, worldwide socialist victory, and abolition of classes.

Recent years have seen attempts to separate the national liberation movement from the international revolutionary movement, of which the socialist world system is the vanguard. Petty-bourgeois opportunists have no scruples in classifying the European socialist countries, and particularly the Soviet Union, as exploitive, even imperialist, states. The lack of any supporting arguments does not deter them



from inciting nationalist prejudices among the population of ex-colonial and dependent countries of Asia and Africa, and also of Latin America, or from sowing enmity for the Soviet Union and the European socialist countries. And it is no accident that bourgeois nationalism more and more frequently degenerates into anti-Sovietism.

International opportunism supports all manner of centrifugal separatist tendencies in Third World countries, thereby effectively assisting imperialism's neo-colonialist policy. Moreover, this is often done on the plea of supporting the right to self-determination, though every Marxist-Leninist knows that self-determination does not clash with the anti-imperialist struggle which alone can assure genuine national independence.

The communist movement is in duty bound to support all progressive, anti-imperialist forces fighting for national liberation. And the increasing political, material and military assistance the Communist Parties of the socialist countries are giving these forces is a very tangible manifestation of proletarian internationalism. Every passing year brings fresh confirmation of what Lenin said of the leading role of the socialist states in solving the national and colonial questions. Addressing the Second Congress of the Communist International, he said that "in the present world situation following the imperialist war, reciprocal relations between peoples and the world political system as a whole are determined by the struggle waged by a small group of imperialist nations against the Soviet movement and the Soviet states headed by Soviet Russia. Unless we bear that in mind, we shall not be able to pose a single national or colonial problem correctly, even if it concerns a most outlying part of the world. The Communist parties, in civilized and backward countries alike, can pose and solve political problems correctly only if they make this postulate their starting-point" (Vol. 31, p. 241).

This was valid at a time when the Soviet Union stood alone, it is a hundred times more valid today, when socialism has become a world system.

### **PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE AND THE SOCIALISM-CAPITALISM STRUGGLE**

Some maintain that the communist concept of peaceful coexistence, by allegedly playing down the revolutionary perspective in capitalist countries, undermines

the supreme principle of class struggle.

In its present form, peaceful coexistence of socialist and capitalist countries is the logical sequence to the humanistic foundations of Marxism-Leninism. And it has a very special topicality today, when the appearance of thermonuclear weapons has wrought a veritable revolution in warfare. The Communists reject the Leftist dogmatic contention that socialist victory in the capitalist countries is necessarily linked to world war. Peaceful coexistence is designed to spare mankind the horrors and devastations of a world thermonuclear war.

However, there is also a tendency to interpret peaceful coexistence in a much broader way, in fact as the renunciation of ideological, political and economic struggle between the two systems, between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. That is wrong. And not only because it runs counter to the basic tenets of our ideology, but primarily because this struggle is an objective fact, and not the result of our subjective wishes. The Polish United Workers' Party categorically rejects such an understanding of peaceful coexistence. Its First Secretary, Wladislaw Gomulka, told the Fifth Party Congress: "Nobody should confuse our policy of peaceful coexistence with our determined will to prevent this idea from being abused and exploited for the achievement of aims which were previously to have been achieved by cold war or armed intervention . . . Peaceful coexistence is a political conception designed to ease international tensions, build a system of collective security, bar the way to war, prevent a nuclear catastrophe. The coexistence of states with different social systems does not change the nature of socialism and capitalism even to the smallest degree."

In its Marxist-Leninist understanding, peaceful coexistence does not militate against the perspective of working-class struggle in the capitalist countries. In fact, experience over recent years has convincingly proved that the socialist countries' efforts for an international detente create favorable conditions not only for continued development of the socialist system, but also for normal social development which, in state-monopoly societies, is bound to take the form of mounting class struggle by the proletariat and the broad mass of the working people against monopoly oppression, for more democratic freedoms, for a socialist path.



That gives the lie to the allegation that Communists need a world war to overthrow capitalism, and to the equally false assertion that enduring peace vitiates the prospect of inevitable worldwide socialist victory.

The struggle to prevent war, for lasting world peace and disarmament, is an obligatory component part of all revolutionary activity. It is not the socialist countries nor the Communists, but the imperialists (especially of the U.S. and the FRG) who need more international tension in order to exploit the fictitious "communist aggression" menace to replace proletarian internationalism by chauvinism and anti-communist and anti-Soviet hysteria in people's minds.

This relation between the interests of peace and the interests of the revolution fully accord with Marxism-Leninism, which has always maintained that revolution cannot be "exported."

Revolution has always been the result of internal class contradictions. The first and second world wars merely accelerated the development of revolutionary situations where the conditions for that were ripe. These wars were not the basic cause of revolution and, considering the present level of weaponry, there is absolutely no ground for the belief that a world war would bring on a revolutionary situation. Hence, there is absolutely no evidence to support the "ultra-Left" adventurist theories of a third world war accelerating the overthrow of capitalism. But there is ample evidence that the struggle for enduring world peace is a component of the revolutionary struggle between socialism and capitalism.

In opposing the export of revolution, the communist movement and the socialist countries are equally opposed to imperialist export of counter-revolution. This means that peaceful coexistence is a condition for successful internationalist assistance to the revolutionary progressive forces in countries fighting for social and national liberation.

Postwar history furnishes any number of examples of preventing the imperialists from starting local wars, exporting counter-revolution and suppressing the fight for social progress and national liberation. In every case this was due to the firm stand taken by the socialist countries and the democratic and peace-loving forces the world over.

## CONTROVERSY OVER INTERNATIONALISM

It is by no means fortuitous that the Communists speak of *proletarian* internationalism. Is there any other kind? When capitalists of several countries unite to defend their interests and arrest, or at least impede the development of the socialist countries, or suppress the workers' and mass liberation movements, this, too is "internationalism," but the very opposite, both in character and aims, to proletarian internationalism.

The internationalism of the proletariat follows from its condition of exploited class deprived of the means of production, and from its ultimate aim—expropriation of the expropriators and the conversion, throughout the world, of the means of production from private to public ownership. Proletarian internationalism is, therefore, fully consistent. The very opposite is true of bourgeois "internationalism": it is inconsistent and antagonistic by its very nature; it is a potential source of war and national betrayal. Agreements between national or regional capitalist groups are always of a temporary nature. Dictated by specific situations, they are violated as soon as the strength-ratio of the participating groups changes.

We must, of course, take into account the fact that the increasing strength of socialism, coupled with fear of inevitable collapse, compels state-monopoly capital to operate in closer concert. Notwithstanding all contradictions, most capitalist governments are at one in, say, refusing to recognize the German Democratic Republic, or in their attitude towards Vietnam. All this necessitates stronger unity of the anti-imperialist forces.

There is also the *petty-bourgeois* understanding of internationalism, which rejects all its social and class implications and accepts only equality of nations. Of course, equality and the right to national self-determination are part of proletarian internationalism, but they cannot be held up in contrast to its overall class content. Lenin exposed this petty-bourgeois distortion when he wrote:

"Petty-bourgeois nationalism proclaims as internationalism the mere recognition of the equality of nations, and nothing more. Quite apart from the fact that this recognition is purely verbal, petty-bourgeois nationalism preserves national self-interest intact, whereas proletarian international-



ism demands, first, that the interests of the proletarian struggle in any one country should be subordinated to the interests of that struggle on a world-wide scale, and, second, that a nation which is achieving victory over the bourgeoisie should be able and willing to make the greatest national sacrifices for the overthrow of international capital" (Vol. 31, p. 148).

The history of the international workers' movement shows that both Marx and Lenin were irreconcilable in opposing attempts to place national separatism above the common international interests of the workers' movement. And history has fully corroborated Lenin's stand in this struggle, from internationalist positions, against the Second International Social-Democrat parties which supported their bourgeois governments during the first world imperialist war. Lenin strongly warned against verbal acceptance of internationalism, demanding that the sincerity of each party be tested by measuring word against deed.

The situation prevailing in the international working-class movement and the socialist countries requires that national specifics be taken fully into account. Yet the main danger is a tendency to under-rate the international aspects, to recognize internationalism in word and drift to nationalism and separatism in deed.

The principle of considering national specifics, the differences in national conditions and the ways of fighting capitalism and building socialism, has been universally recognized for years. In his report to the Fifth Congress of our Party, Wladyslaw Gomulka said: "The ways to socialism not only may, but are bound to, differ . . . The ways charted by one Party or, to be exact, for one of the countries building socialism cannot be imposed on other countries and Parties. But they can and must be a source of experience for each Party fighting for power or building the new society. Ignoring or scorning this experience is bound to damage the individual Parties, the whole working-class movement and the worldwide struggle for socialism."

The main danger is not in ignoring the principle of different ways but in invoking this principle to ignore the historical experience and common laws of fighting capitalism and building the new, socialist society.

What is doubly dangerous now for the socialist states is to underestimate the importance of unity, for their unity is of

cardinal significance for the future of the world.

The boundaries of socialism, like its ideas, do not coincide with the boundaries of the socialist states, because socialist ideas embrace the whole world. However, just as obviously, the borders of the socialist states are important, because they circumscribe the historical gains of the workers of the world and are for the international working-class and anti-imperialist movement the earnest of fresh victories.

Any attempts at resolving the problems of the revolutionary struggle and building socialism in isolation from the action of the international working class, attempts at going it alone, abound in dangers. The central problems of the world today—the problems of war and peace, of the class and national liberation struggle against imperialism, of utilizing the great achievements of the scientific and technological revolution for man's progress, and the like—cannot be solved in isolation from the struggle between the socialist and capitalist systems. That is the underlying content of proletarian internationalism today implying not only aid and support by socialist states to the Communist Parties and all anti-imperialist forces in the capitalist world, but also aid and support by the Communist Parties and progressives of the world to the countries of the socialist camp.

"The attitude to the principles of internationalism," Comrade Gomulka said at the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow last June, "is today the main criterion of the political line of each Communist Party and the worldwide working-class movement."

Socialism is internationalist in essence. The common struggle fought by the workers of the world imposes on each Communist Party a dual responsibility: to the working class of its own country and to the world Communist movement—responsibility for safeguarding the socialist camp, the common gain, responsibility for the revolutionary and social progress of the workers of its country, for success in combating the international and national forces of reaction and counter-revolution. "Each Communist Party," Gomulka said at the International Meeting, "charts its own political line on the basis of concrete appraisals of activity in its own country, on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism, on the basis of the experience of all our movement, of which it is an inte-



gral part. Each Party bears a historical responsibility for its policy both to its own people and to the international working class."

These dual responsibilities and dual obligations of each Party, far from being mutually exclusive, are actually mutually conditioned. The revolutionary workers' movement is victorious precisely because it expresses and defends the interests of the main classes of its own people and other peoples, that is, the working class and all working people. Although national in form, the struggle of the Communists is inevitably internationalist in content, reflecting the basic conflict of our epoch, that between socialism and capitalism.

### **SOCIALISM AND THE NATIONAL QUESTION**

Two opposite trends prevail in the modern world. This may seem paradoxical at first glance, for, on the one hand, there is a distinct striving for closer cooperation among nations and, on the other, a distinct inflation of the national factors. Lenin saw this in his day and wrote: "Developing capitalism knows two historical tendencies in the national question. The first is the awakening of national life and national movements, the struggle against all national oppression, and the creation of national states. The second is the development and growing frequency of international barriers, the creation of the international unity of capital, of economic life in general, of politics, science, etc.

"Both tendencies are a universal law of capitalism. The former predominates in the beginning of its development, the latter characterizes a mature capitalism that is moving towards its transformation into socialist society. The Marxists' national program takes both tendencies into account, and advocates, firstly, the equality of nations and languages and the impermissibility of all *privileges* in this respect (and also the right of nations to self-determination . . . ); secondly, the principle of internationalism and uncompromising struggle against contamination of the proletariat with bourgeois nationalism, even of the most refined kind" (Vol. 20, p. 27). This second, integrating tendency breaking down the national barriers and eliminating national exclusiveness, Lenin held, is a powerful factor converting capitalism into socialism.

How do these two tendencies materialize in the conditions of modern capitalism and

socialism? Particularly, how is the question of the equality of nations and their right to self-determination conceived in either system?

In seeking the answer we should deal less with the formal principle and analyze the concrete historical situation, particularly in the economic context. If we look at these problems from that angle we shall discover that both tendencies have become unusually strong, although modified by the struggle of the different social systems. The tendency to integrate is impelled by the colossal acceleration of the growth of the productive forces after the Second World War, especially of industry (world industrial output doubles each ten or eleven years) and the priority growth of foreign trade, expansion of scientific and technical cooperation, and the like.

At the same time, with the colonial system falling apart, more than 70 new countries have come into being, eager to end their state of dependence and backwardness. Yet even in the developed capitalist countries and their regional economic associations (the Common Market, etc.) we observe strong disintegrational trends alongside the integrational. That is inevitable. Under capitalism (ruled by the law of the power of capital and the law of distributing benefits in accordance with the magnitude of the national capital) there can be no question of any equality of nations. This is borne out by the widening economic gulf between the developing countries of the Third World and the imperialist states.

The national question arises anew even in those capitalist countries where, it seemed, the matter had long been settled, specifically in the West European states, where U.S. corporation investments have grown considerably in the postwar, now totalling about \$18,000 million. And it might be added that U.S. property in Western Europe is largely financed out of the national capital of the countries concerned.

Comrade Gomulka pointed out in his summing up at the Fifth Congress of the PUWP that U.S. capital stimulates integration in Western Europe not merely by obtaining profits through investments in the decisive economic spheres, but also by building up a "general anti-communist front and putting an economic foundation under the aggressive Atlantic pact. For these reasons, strategy, particularly that of the USA and FRG, is aimed at disintegrating the socialist countries."



In socialist conditions the trends in the national question discovered by Lenin do not contradict each other. On the contrary, socialism paves the way to combining the growth of each of the socialist nations with their convergence and cooperation. This is made possible by the fact that by eliminating the power of capital socialism provides a tangible foundation for uniting nations on the basis of mutual confidence and fraternal cooperation.

It is common knowledge, for example, that the economic growth rates of the CMEA countries are far higher than they were under capitalism and higher than in present-day Western Europe. It is common knowledge, too, that socialist countries of a somewhat lower economic level show a distinct tendency to develop at a still higher rate. The socialist system has given impetus to a smoothly working mechanism of gradually eliminating the essential disparities in levels of economic development. That alone reveals the absurdity of the various capitalist propaganda claims that the Soviet Union is extracting unilateral advantages from the cooperation of the socialist countries. One need only look at the list of commodities exchanged by the USSR and other CMEA countries to see that 70 per cent of the Soviet import machines and equipment comes from the latter, while the industry of the latter gets the bulk of its raw materials (ore, oil, coal, fertilizer, cotton) from the Soviet Union. Yet we know that investing in the extractive industries is less effective than in the manufacturing industries and that it is far more profitable to exchange machines for raw materials at world prices than raw materials for machines.

Without Soviet raw materials and the Soviet market for machines and other industrial commodities, the European socialist states could not have conceivably attained their present economic level and would not have good prospects for the future.

Economic cooperation among socialist countries is based on the principles of equality and mutual aid. In CMEA, all member countries, regardless of size and economic level, possess equal rights.\* Their speedier economic growth hinges on greater cooperation and deeper-going economic integration processes, which is in their

\*In the Council of the European Economic Community representatives of the FRG, France and Italy each have four votes, those of Belgium and the Netherlands two votes and Luxembourg one vote.

common interest and the interest of each country.

The experience of the socialist countries shows that their economic growth and cooperation do not conflict with patriotic sentiment. On the contrary, it buoys up patriotism. In capitalist Poland, for example, the propertied classes called on the working people year after year to tighten their belts, to abandon the struggle for their interests, for social emancipation, pleading the case of so-called national interests to cover up their egoistic aims. Under socialism, for the first time, the class interest of the people became the dominant interest of the nation as a whole. History in general and that of Poland in particular shows, as aptly put by Comrade Zenon Kliszko, Member of the Political Bureau and Secretary of the CC PUWP, that "only those classes that represented progress in any specific stage of development were the true agents of patriotic thought, the makers of the patriotic ideology in each nation. And this because their social interests did not conflict with those of the nation. On the contrary, they were as a rule identical."

### **SOCIALIST SOVEREIGNTY**

Before a Communist Party can properly appreciate the genuine interest of the nation it must succeed in elevating the class interests of the workers and all working people to the level of general national interests. The patriotism so conceived is intimately linked with internationalism, with closer bonds among the socialist countries, stronger fraternal ties with the Communist Parties of the world, with all social and democratic forces.

Hence the duty of Communists to influence the people's aspirations that they should become socialist in character.

Safeguarding and developing the achievements of socialism and consolidating the power of the working class in one country is conditional as a task on consolidating socialism's positions on the international scale. That is what Lenin had in mind when he wrote of "the task of converting the dictatorship of the proletariat from a national dictatorship (i.e., existing in a single country and incapable of determining world politics) into an international one (i.e., a dictatorship of the proletariat involving at least several advanced countries, and capable of exercising a decisive influence upon world politics as a whole)" (Vol. 31, p. 148).



It is this "international dictatorship of the proletariat," that is, close unity of the countries of the socialist camp, which enables them to influence world politics, ensuring socialism and national sovereignty for each and, at the same time ensuring the leading role of the working class and its Party in all spheres of life. This applies to every socialist country, because each can follow its policy, as Comrade Gomulka put it, in the context of the protective unity of the Warsaw Treaty countries. Seen from that angle, the sovereignty of each socialist country is conditioned by the international interests of socialism, with which the sovereignty of each must combine.

Unless this unity, that is, primarily the unity of the Communist Parties and states of the socialist camp bearing a special responsibility, is buttressed, it is impossible to assure the defense of socialism either on a world scale or in each socialist country individually. That is due to the existence of the aggressive Atlantic pact and to no less a degree to the policy of the FRG, one of the pact's members, which openly challenges the western borders of the socialist community. That the bourgeoisie of a number of countries is patronized by the United States, the world gendarme who maintains more than two million soldiers and other military personnel in 132 points of the world, is a graphic illustration of this.

Cementing the unity of the socialist countries is necessary, too, in order to secure closer mutually advantageous economic cooperation, without which none of them could maintain the present high rate of economic growth and safeguard its independence from imperialism.

Lastly, cementing the unity and securing the cohesion of the forces of the socialist community is a guarantee of the maximum effectiveness of socialist construction in each country, and, moreover, also serves as a stimulant for the socialist, progressive and national liberation movements in all countries, as a source of aid and guarantee of world peace.

In a class society the principle of sovereignty is of a class character. In socialist conditions sovereignty is a component of proletarian internationalism and means that the Party and government of each socialist country bear responsibility to their own working class, their own people, that they chart their own home and foreign policy independently to suit the specific

conditions and experience of their country, as well as the interests of the socialist camp as a whole and, furthermore, the interests of the world Communist movement.

What is determinative in the question of the sovereignty of a socialist state is that this sovereignty should be socialist in character. This implies that its interests and aspirations should not be defined in the narrow national sense in contradistinction to the interests, aspirations and aims of socialism on a world scale. On no account is it the product of anyone's subjective wish; it is an objective requirement. "The struggle of each Party," Comrade Gomulka told the Fifth Congress of the PUWP, "is conditioned not only by the internal correlation of the social and political forces, but also by the correlation of forces in the world arena, by the struggle of the two systems, by the multilateral process of rivalry and struggle between socialism and capitalism on a world scale, penetrating all spheres of the life of mankind."

The conception of proletarian internationalism and the sovereignty of the socialist state gives rise not only to the principle of active support for socialist and anti-imperialist movements throughout the world, but also to the duty to counteract the counter-revolutionary endeavors of the reactionary imperialist forces.

This is clear to anyone who understands the principles of proletarian internationalism, anyone reluctant to emulate Sisyphus and by oversight undo what was achieved in bitter struggle and hard work by many generations of proletarians and revolutionaries, anyone determined to prevent any change in the class character of the workers' power.

"History," Zenon Kliszko said, "provides many examples of how the gains of one generation won at the price of tremendous sacrifices were squandered by the succeeding generations. That sort of thing happened in many different historical and social situations."

We should never forget that the imperialist policy of pressures, coups and interventions is a hard reality; and we should remember, too, that socialist society is by no means a classless society, that the traditions, morals and psychology of the exploiting classes, particularly the petty-bourgeois nationalist outlook, are still extant in it and that anti-socialist elements and eclectic forces are still extant which display a revisionist attitude to Marxism and an attitude of forbearance and sym-



pathy for the capitalist ideology. Neither must we forget that the class struggle, especially on the ideological plane, continues in the countries building socialism (though in different forms), that this struggle is being encouraged by foreign (chiefly U.S. and West German) centers of imperialist propaganda. That is where bourgeois nationalism merges with undisguised anti-communism and anti-Sovietism.

The struggle of the two antagonistic forces, of socialism and capitalism, of the capitalist and Marxist ideologies, must necessarily breed intermediary forces and attitudes. Petty bourgeois striving to "obscure" the class struggle between nationalism and socialism or trying to "rise" above it, is just that kind of intermediary force, a tool of obviously reactionary forces. Those are the social sources of the views which weigh the national interest of the working class against its international interest and reduce the concept of proletarian internationalism to the slogan of a narrowly-conceived self-determination and sovereignty. Lenin pointed out that there is not one democratic demand "which could not serve and has not served, under certain circumstances, as an instrument in the hands of the bourgeoisie for deceiving the workers" (Vol. 22, p. 149). And, he added, the demand for self-determination is not an exception in this respect.

It is international imperialism that has the biggest stake in changing the existing system in the socialist countries, just as West German imperialism, which speaks openly of its territorial claims, has the biggest stake in changing their borders. These are the forces that try to awaken and fan prejudice, to re-animate the survivals of nationalism in the socialist countries, taking cover behind claims of a spurious threat to their sovereignty, right of self-determination, etc. In so doing, they are least concerned about either sovereignty or self-determination, because the working class and people of the People's Democracies self-determined themselves when performing the socialist revolution and casting

off the yoke of capitalism and dependence on foreign monopolies. The imperialists have a stake in splitting the community of socialist countries, in prying them away one by one from that community and putting them under their own influence.

The variety of national forms of socialism, the variety of political solutions, the difference in approaches to the various problems—all this is long a fact, an objectively existing fact, enriching socialism. Slogans of "national socialism" or "national communism" are both theoretically and politically untenable and count on credulity and elementary ignorance of scientific socialism. The ways to socialism are many. And there will be more. But in essence, there is only one socialism. The diverse forms of the socialist system have the common denominator of working-class power under the guidance of the Marxist-Leninist political vanguard and of planned management of the publicly-owned means of production.

\* \* \*

The Polish United Workers' Party has gone through many trials and accumulated much experience. All this experience shows that its links with the Communist and Workers' Parties of the world, with all revolutionary forces of our time in the struggle against imperialism for peace, progress and socialism, that alliance with the Soviet Union and the consolidation of the socialist community is, as Kliszko pointed out, "a question of its whole future, a guarantee of its present and just territorial integrity, security and peaceful development."

Poland is an exponent of many specific forms of socialist construction, many specific ways of resolving economic, social and political problems. All of them are designed to consolidate socialism, the building of which, far from excluding, presupposes stronger internationalist bonds linking our country with the community of socialist countries and with the world Communist and working-class movement.



# ***The French presidential elections: some conclusions***

PIERRE HENTGES

General de Gaulle's defeat in the April 27 referendum came as a critical turning point in the personal power regime, under which France had been living since 1958. It bared the grave contradictions of the regime and the capitalist system generally. It was the first plebiscite since the time of Napoleon III, in which its organizer himself felt obliged to admit that his "historic mission has become impossible and is, consequently, over."

For 11 years de Gaulle kept harping on his omnipotence. "It goes without saying, and it is true, that the indivisible authority of the state is fully vested in the president by the people electing him, and that there is no other authority, whether ministerial, civil, military or judicial which they could vest in anyone else," he declared on one occasion.

And his practices fully conformed to theory. Let us recall that in 1962 a government which had repeatedly won majorities in the National Assembly—the Debré government—disappeared without any explanations, simply because it no longer suited the president of the Republic. Let us recall that that same year the government of Georges Pompidou stayed in office although it had a minority in Parliament. Michel Debré said: "For a long time, Parliament was regarded as the vehicle of national sovereignty. This is no longer an accepted idea today."

The following figures tell the story of Gaullism's decline from 1958 to 1969. In the 1958 referendum, soon after his installation, de Gaulle obtained 79.25 per cent of the poll. In the 1962 referendum he lost

five million votes and got 61.75 per cent. On April 27, 1969, he lost another 2.2 million: the vote was 12,007,102 "non" to 10,901,753 "oui," or 47.58 per cent of the ballot (37.09 per cent of the registered voters).

This defeat was the result of 11 years of authoritarian rule directly expressive of the will of Big Business, with which it was closely allied. Let us also recall that in 1958, the Communist Party was the only one opposing the regime. It argued that the interests of the forces that had ensured de Gaulle's massive success were anything but identical. It said that the contradictions would ultimately make themselves felt in a most acute form, and that the personal power, openly expressive of capitalist monopoly domination, would always trample the interests of the non-monopoly sections.

The more than seven-year-war in Algeria, which ended in 1962, and the harsh treatment meted out to the striking miners in 1963, dispelled the illusion about Gaullism and so-called French neo-capitalism. But all the difficulties which brought on the May-June 1968 crisis, and led to de Gaulle's resignation a year later—massive unemployment; rejection of the working people's demands; social security curtailment; the shortage of public facilities (housing, schools, hospitals); the monetary upheavals of 1968; the tax burden and the inflation, which hit every section of the population outside the financial oligarchy and the big monopolies—in short, all the evil arising from the disastrous combined activity of the monopolies and the capital-



ist state shows the true meaning of the struggle against Gaullism both before and after April 27.

The 1969 election struggle should be seen in the context of the battles the French people have fought since 1958: from the general strikes against the 1961 military coup in Algeria to the miners' strike of 1963; from the powerful workers' movement in 1966 and 1967 to this year's resistance to de Gaulle's overlordship. The record has been one of ceaseless movement and struggle, with the highest phase reached in the May-June 1968 strikes and demonstrations.

The strikes broke out when the economic situation became markedly worse, with inflation, rising prices and mounting mass unemployment. The strikes, Benoit Fraillon, President of the CGT (General Confederation of Labor) said, were "the first major clash of the period of accelerated capitalist concentration, the first major clash between the working masses and the monopoly power beset by contradictions it cannot solve." The strikes also revealed the accumulated discontent of ten years of Gaullism. They dealt a blow which rocked the regime and hastened the people's disenchantment with it. They largely explain de Gaulle's defeat on April 27, and have already left his successor in a weaker position than his own had been for a long time.

\* \* \*

How will Gaullism fare after the General's departure? Are we to believe André Malraux, de Gaulle's minister for 11 years, that "no future Gaullism will be able to maintain France by relying on the *non* that ousted de Gaulle"? Another and even more important question, which makes all others superfluous, is: will all the French parties of the Left who styled themselves anti-Gaullist be able to unite to prevent modified Gaullism from pursuing its Big Business policy under the new leader?

The Communists have done everything to realize this unity.

Since the night of the referendum, the Communist Party solemnly declared, through its Political Bureau, "its will to do everything to contribute to the unity of the Left parties and the major trade union organizations on a clear-cut commonly worked out program, and promote conclusion of such an alliance without any compromise with the Right."

In repeated appeals to the Socialist

Party, it proposed designating a candidate to bring together the workers and democratic forces on the basis of a clear alternative.

However, the Socialist Party Congress on May 4 reaffirmed its refusal to work out a common program, and nominated its own candidate without any coordination with the other Left parties.

The Socialist leaders wanted to prevent the popular opposition from reaching its objectives, and hamper the movement which manifested itself during the referendum. To do that, they came up with their "centrist" operation. There were three points which made them think that it would work:

1. They thought that, as compared with the General, the Gaullist candidate would lose a great number of votes in the June 1 elections. Former Minister Jules Moch made this quite clear in the *Revue socialiste*: "The ex-President was the embodiment of a historical period of French consciousness. That cannot be said of the man who succeeds him. Another cause of the expected retreat is that M. Pompidou takes over the baton of Gaullism when the latter is in regress . . . The slide of April is bound to continue, and the Gaullist candidate will be the victim." This confidence, based on purely "electoral" considerations, failed to take account of working-class unity or of the future of democracy and socialism in France, and made the Socialist leaders deaf to the appeals of the Communists, who maintained that only a common program would create the *best conditions* for winning a majority.

2. The Socialist leaders also felt that anti-Sovietism would provide them with a weapon against the Gaullists as well as against the Communists — it would help them weaken the latter without strengthening the former. Moch accused both of a foreign policy conspiracy. Of de Gaulle he said: "You can't keep saying: 'It's me or chaos' (meaning Communism.—P.H.) while aligning yourself with the USSR in your policy in the United Nations, on the Middle East and in Vietnam. The public will end up with a dual impression: Communism is being relied upon in one instance and presented as a bogey in another."

3. The Socialist leaders felt sure that the Communist Party would not venture to put up its own candidate, and if we are to believe the weekly *l'Express*, which campaigned for Gaston Defferre, the Communist leadership lived in fear of failing to



solve its own problem, namely: "How to avoid having to count the Communist votes on the night of June 1?" (*l'Express*, May 19-25, 1969).

These speculations were based on the assumption that the working class would be only ancillary in the bourgeoisie's electoral game. Consequently, the primary task was to get ahead of the Communist candidate. Beating the Communist and getting more votes than he does, they said, will transform the relation with the Communist Party. All the non-Communists who want to see unity triumph should act accordingly in the election, and prevent the Communist Party's man polling the biggest Left vote. And the figures should make the Communist leaders have second thoughts.

But it was the Socialist leaders who had to do the head scratching. And if they reflected on the disastrous May 4 decision, they would have to recall another highly premonitory question posed by the Socialist journal *Nord-Matin*, which wrote during the 1965 electoral campaign:

"What is centralism's political hope if not a formal and flat rejection of any hope for working-class unity?"

The centrist operation goes back to 1963, when *l'Express* gave a portrait of Mr. X, the man with all the qualities to succeed de Gaulle. Gaston Defferre soon emerged from this robot portrait, like a butterfly from its cocoon, to offer the "grand federation" ranging from the Socialist to the MRP.

"Voting right in the first round is voting for Defferre," *l'Express* would say on the eve of the first ballot in 1969, leaving open the question as to who—Defferre or Poher, the Senate President, with his political origins in the MRP—would carry the centrist colors during the second ballot, and would declare that on June 1 "the grand federation urged by Defferre will be constituted in the ballot box."

In his *Revue socialiste* article, Moch already dreamed of bringing into the alliance such men as "Pleven, Sudreau, Lecanuet or Alain Poher, whose standing is too high for them to be seduced by Pompidou."

We shall return to Poher, but it has to be said that René Pleven, one-time Director-General of the European branch of the American Automatic Telephone Company, Defense Minister during the Vietnam war, and a member of the Chaban-Delmas government since June 22, 1969—despite his "non" on April 27—is a fitting representative of the alliances the Socialists had in

mind. Much the same applies to Lecanuet, the most pro-American candidate during the 1965 election, or, say, to Sudreau, one-time Gaullist minister.

On the one hand, the speculations of the Socialist Party leaders over various alliances with the most reactionary bourgeois politicians were in every instance another attempt to help the bourgeoisie escape from its critical situation. On the other, the fact that in his election campaign Gaston Defferre associated himself with the one-time Prime Minister Pierre Mendès-France, whom he designated as the head of his future government, should be viewed in the light of the attitudes of a whole group of politicians during the May-June 1968 crisis, for these are two closely interconnected aspects of one and the same battle.

On May 28, 1968, François Mitterand, then president of the Federation of the Left, without duly informing the Communist Party, made public a plan for a "provisional government." Mendès-France was to be its head under the tutelage of François Mitterand, who was hoping to become President of the Republic. At his press conference on June 17, 1968, the Socialist leader Guy Mollet declared that "the idea of a 'Provisional Government' was supported by men as far apart politically as Mendès-France, Pinay, Lecanuet and Abelin."

The Communist Party's answer to these adventurous combinations was to set out its clear-cut position. Based on concern for the working class and democracy, it was fully in line with the consistent policy that determined its recent successes and strength, which even its adversaries admit.

On May 27, 1968, the Political Bureau issued its Appeal which deserves special mention. The existence of a "common program," it said, "would ensure victory for the workers and the democratic forces," adding: "We shall not allow the working class to be duped and cheated . . . We shall not condone any move to replace the Gaullist power by a government that rejects the working people's demands on the plea that they are outdated, denies the working class and is party a say in running the country, and tries to discredit the very idea of true democracy and socialism, paving the way for a regime dominated by anti-communism and subservient to U.S. policy."

The defeat of the Socialist candidate Defferre in the first round on June 1, 1969



is primarily due to the Socialist leaders having ignored these warnings. It was surely a disappointment for the working people to see some Socialist federations backing Poher in the first round, or declaring that Defferre should withdraw in his favor in the second, though Poher was supported by the old bosses of the fascist OAS, men like Georges Bidault and Jacques Soustelle, or Pétain's information minister Tixier Vignancour.

All these plans failed, as will be seen from the June 1 returns:

|          | Votes polled | Per cent of the poll |
|----------|--------------|----------------------|
| Pompidou | 10,051,816   | 44.46                |
| Poher    | 5,268,651    | 23.30                |
| Duclos   | 4,808,285    | 21.27                |
| Defferre | 1,133,222    | 5.01                 |
| Rocard   | 816,471      | 3.61                 |
| Ducatel  | 286,447      | 1.26                 |
| Krivine  | 239,106      | 1.05                 |

This is a harsh verdict for the Socialist Party: five per cent of the poll, only a quarter of the Communist vote. In the departments where the Socialist Party normally had the highest poll, like Nord or Pas-de-Calais, Defferre lost two-thirds and in some places three-quarters of the Socialist vote as compared with the first round in the 1968 Parliamentary elections. In Marseilles, where Defferre is Mayor, he got only 10.9 per cent. In Grenoble, where Mendès-France won his seat in 1967, the Socialist vote dropped from 27 per cent in 1968 to seven per cent on June 1.

The United Socialist Party, which in 1968 took part in the Leftist manifestations hostile to the Communist Party and the CGT (at the Charléty Stadium in Paris on May 27, for instance), and some of whose leaders declared that "anything is possible," or that "for those who will be forging the country's future . . . the regime is becoming a thing of the past"—this party also suffered a defeat, its vote declining from 3.94 per cent on June 23, 1968 to 3.66 per cent.

The Trotskyite Krivine enjoyed the patronage of Jean-Paul Sartre, who tried to spread the idea that in the May-June 1968 strikes, "the sons of the bourgeoisie made the CGT tag along." The fact is that the CGT played the main role in organizing and spreading the movement. On May 15, it proclaimed: "The action must be raised to the highest level . . . In response to your trade unions, act without delay," ad-

ding: "The replacement of the present power by a popular government, the changes for which we are fighting, depend on alliance and united action by all the victims of the present policy."

The first round of the presidential election was a reply to those who marched past the *l'Humanité* building shouting anti-communist slogans. Krivine got just over one per cent of the vote, which placed him below even the "joke" candidate, Ducatel. In other words, the vote highlighted the defeat of the anti-unitary forces, which had claimed to be the only socialist force capable of providing an alternative to doomed capitalism.

Jacques Duclos' high poll came as a great surprise to the Communist Party's opponents. his candidature had been approved by the Party's Central Committee on May 5, and presented by Waldeck Rochet in these words:

"Our Communist Party has done its best for agreement on a single Left candidate. It is not our fault that there is no such agreement.

"In these conditions, the Political Bureau proposes to the Central Committee that our Party enter the struggle under its own banner.

"The men and women of our country know Jacques Duclos as an outstanding working-class fighter, as one of those who, together with Maurice Thorez, founded our Party. His integrity, his experience, his dedication to the cause of the working people and the exploited is well known to everyone, friend and foe alike.

"... We shall show that the higher the vote for the Communist candidate, the more favorable will be the conditions for unity of the workers and the democratic forces, and the nearer the hour for the deep-going change desired by the working class, workers by hand and by brain, and by the largest section of the middle strata."

The Party's election program followed its 1968 Manifesto "For Advanced Democracy, for a Socialist France."

The French Communists are working for a "truly democratic and progressive regime" which would "extend the political rights of the masses and assure them a real say in running the country."

Waldeck Rochet also said: "There can be no real democratic progress without extensive measures to democratize our economic and social life.

"That is why we demand:

"nationalization of key sectors of the



economy and democratic management of nationalized enterprises;

"implementation of an economic and social development plan with the participation of and control by the working people and their organizations;

"fiscal reform that would strike at the big capitalist companies and the great fortunes, while reducing the tax burden on small and middle incomes."

The Communist Party also explained that it would continue to insist on an independent French policy, against participation in the Atlantic Alliance, against integration with the Little Europe of the trusts, as represented by the European Economic Community, and against alliance with the West German militarists. It would work towards France making an active contribution to the policy of peaceful coexistence, European security, cooperation with the socialist countries, and the struggle against imperialism.

Certain circumstances, it seemed, would create insurmountable obstacles to Duclos' campaign.

On the one hand, there was de Gaulle's electoral law, under which only two candidates with the greatest number of votes in the first round went on to the second round.

On the other hand, the activity of the Center, it seemed, ruled out any Communist role in the second round.

Let us also emphasize that a Party like the Communist Party usually has greater opportunities of influencing district or municipal elections, when the voters can assess the effectiveness of their votes directly and to some extent more concretely.

But our Party immediately turned the election campaign into a major battle for unity, which was not connected with any short-range electoral considerations.

Jacques Duclos began every speech by declaring that he would have preferred "to take part in the presidential election by supporting a common candidate of the Left."

The fact that the Party was forced to put up its own candidate enabled it to make unprecedentedly wide use of the propaganda media at its disposal. Apart from the numerous meetings organized by the Party, the state television and sound radio, and also provincial television and sound radio, carried Communist ideas into every home. As Jacques Duclos put it, the French had never had such an opportunity to understand "whence the Communists have

come, what they are, and where they are going." The attractive aspect of the campaign, the interest, in a sense a sporting one, which led to exchanges of opinion and re-evaluation of the chances of the candidates, prompted people to contrast the ideas, activity and human qualities of Communists to those of the other candidates. There was no longer any question of blotting out Jacques Duclos by a conspiracy of silence, nor any room for lies and slander against the Party and its candidate, whose voice and message became known to all. This time we can believe the papers that Duclos' was the best campaign. With the approach of the first round, his candidature gained in weight, and everyone felt that the Communists would at least maintain their electoral position, and that a vote for Duclos was the only chance of carrying a Left candidate into the second round.

And a glance at the figures will show that it needed only a little to make that a reality.

Being about two percent behind Poher, (21.52 against 23.42—with the overall result showing a gap of only 2.03 per cent), Duclos would definitely have been second but for the splitting or subverting candidatures of the USP's Rocard and the Trotskyite Krivine.

Leading in all the major working-class areas, and with their positions fortified in the industrial centers of the Nord, Pas-de-Calais, Haute-Garonne, Bouches-du-Rhone with Marseilles, the Communists won 350,000 votes more than in the first-round National Assembly elections of June 1968.

The day after June 1, it became perfectly clear that the majority of the French working class refused to be taken in tow, that it had joined in the political battle, and had no intention of remaining on the side-lines. As for the Communist Party, it proved that it is the most organized force of the Left, a great party of socialism.

This success dashed the plans of imperialism, Gaullism and other reactionary forces to integrate the working class with the capitalist system.

The theoretical implications of all this are self-evident: one of the main contentions of that latter-day "interpreter" of Marxism, Herbert Marcuse, is that in the period of its maturity, capitalism shows evidence of a long-term tendency for class collaboration rather than for the class struggle, and that the working class dream is to defend its true interests within capi-



talism and not against capitalism (Herbert Marcuse. *Soviet Marxism, A Critical Analysis*, New York, 1958).

The Gaullist electoral law, under which only two candidates go on to the second round, also calls for some comment.

It is a strange kind of democracy that denies the vote to 21.52 per cent of the French electorate,\* that is, the most class-conscious section of the working class. Under this system, the voter is invited to choose between men the electorate had just rejected. That is why the Communist Party recommended abstention in the second round.

But here again, the facts show the limits of bourgeois democracy. The right to abstain flows theoretically from the right to vote and it may appear *a priori* that every voter wishing to exercise this right can do so. The fact is, however, that before the second round *l'Humanité* received many letters from voters saying that to find out who had followed the Communist Party's recommendation to abstain, all one had to do was to compare the electoral rolls for the first and second rounds.

A reader from the Oise wrote: "In the very small communes, where everyone knows each other, the voting Communist cannot abstain, for his very livelihood depends on the local landowner or on one employer."

These facts show how basically rotten even such a democratic gain as the franchise can be where the bourgeoisie, in possession of the means of production, controls the working people's "livelihood."

In such cases, the Communist Party advised its voters to drop blank or invalid ballot papers, even though this makes it less possible to mobilize the masses than the call to abstain, which, as the Party urged, ultimately played an important role in the second round.

Is the call to abstain a novel attitude for the Communists to take? In a sense it is, because once the Party found itself without a candidate it had to continue the electoral fight with the means remaining at its disposal, and this accorded with the democratic aspirations of the masses.

In these conditions, abstention still meant participation. It meant confirming the Communist Party's prestige won in the first round, and preventing the successful candidate from winning a majority

of the registered voters or a majority of those taking part in the first round. And the results bore out our expectations—the successful candidate had to reckon with the strength of the opposition tide. By contrast, a vote for either of the two competing candidates would have meant allowing the parties against whom we are fighting to dupe us, and allowing the Gaullists and Centrists to break down the democratic opposition to their political schemes. In fact, it would have been impossible to make a choice between Pompidou and Poher: in the very first round Jacques Duclos proved that Poher and Pompidou were virtually one and the same thing.

Already on June 2, Waldeck Rochet set out the Party's stand: "If Pompidou is elected, he is sure to continue the policy he pursued for six years (from 1962 to 1968. —P.H.) as Prime Minister in de Gaulle's government, a policy sacrificing the interests of the masses to the privileges of the capitalist monopolies.

"A representative of the great banks, he strives to perpetuate authoritarian rule. That is why working people and democrats cannot vote for the reactionary Pompidou. Our Communist Party has never ceased and will never cease fighting this confidential agent of Big Business.

"The other reactionary candidate still in the running is Poher. If elected, he is sure to continue the policy that is to the advantage of Big Business and to the disadvantage of the working people.

"Poher is, in fact, an MRP politician associated with various measures of the reactionary so-called third-force governments of the Fourth Republic that paved Gaullism's way to power.

"Together with the reactionary Fourth Republic politicians he approved, from 1958 on, de Gaulle's anti-social measures, including the laws against secular education.

"He has the support of a reactionary bloc made up of avowed enemies of the working class and democracy. Like Pompidou, Poher was supported by certain circles of high finance . . .

"Following either of these servitors of capital would result in swift and bitter disappointment, and would help mislead the people."

After June 1, as though deliberately confirming the assessment of the Communist Party, French bourgeois politicians resorted to intrigue and alliance building,

\*We do not deal with the elections in the overseas departments and territories, where French imperialism still maintains its colonial domination.



which made it impossible to distinguish between Gaullists and Centrists.

Such Centrist leaders as Pleven and Duhamel, who said "No" at the referendum, such Independents as Giscard d'Estaing, who "did not accord their 'Yes'" to the General, went over to the Pompidou camp very much like the Socialist Elie Rouby, President of the General Council of Corrèze. The Gaullist candidate accepted also the support of Tixier-Vignancour, who was Information Minister in the Pétain government.

However, Poher retained the support of persons close to Lecanuet, of such "democrats" as ex-premier Georges Bidault and the former Gaullist minister Jacques Soustelle.

The two camps were, in fact, so closely intertwined, that after the first round there were Centrist demands for Poher to stand down. The pressure of the Center on Pompidou had "no other honorable purpose than finally to give Gaullism a human countenance" (Etienne Borne, "La Croix," quoted by *Le Mond*, June 14, 1969).

Poher maintained his candidature, arguing that if he stood down Jacques Duclos, being a candidate, would again be entitled to a two-hour TV and radio speech. That is truly the ultimate in democracy!

All this maneuvering was against the background of a sharp class struggle, which brought to light far-reaching contradictions between the democratic and anti-democratic trends in bourgeois society. "Capitalism in general, and imperialism in particular," Lenin point out, "turn democracy into an illusion—though at the same time capitalism engenders democratic aspirations in the masses, creates democratic institutions, aggravates the antagonism between imperialism's denial of democracy and the mass striving for democracy" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 25).

The second round strikingly demonstrated some distinctive features of French capitalism. The French bourgeoisie managed to compel the electors to choose between two clans of one and the same reaction, clans which quarrelled over power and went through the motions of struggle only to make peace on the very next day. However, the voting of June 15 gave fresh proof of the disintegration of Gaullism.

Let us again cite the figures, which speak for themselves:

Georges Pompidou received 11,064,371 votes or 58.21 per cent of the ballots cast,

or the votes of 37.5 per cent of the registered electorate.

Alain Poher — 7,943,118 votes, i.e., 41.78 per cent of the ballots cast, or the votes of 29.92 per cent of the registered electorate.

A comparison of these figures with the results of the 1965 presidential elections shows a considerable growth of abstentions (to which must be added those who turned in blank or invalid ballot papers).

Second round of the 1965 elections: abstentions—blank or invalid ballot papers: 5,199,270, i.e., 17.98 per cent of the registered voters.

The respective figures for the 1969 second round are: 10,492,845, or 35.5 per cent.

The percentage of registered votes cast for Pompidou (37.16 per cent) was smaller not only than the share of votes received by General de Gaulle in the 1965 second round, but also than the share of the Left candidate, François Mitterand, (37.39). This confirms that, following de Gaulle's defeat on April 27, the candidate uniting all the working-class and other democratic forces in a single alliance could have been successful in the presidential elections.

\* \* \*

Following the massive strikes of 1968, the political campaign of the French Communist Party during the referendum, and then in the 1969 presidential elections, aggravated the instability and contradictions of French capitalism. And this, moreover, in an international situation the Document of the Moscow Meeting characterizes in the following words: "Imperialism is powerless to regain the historical initiative."

As we have pointed out, the government formed after June 15 is an alloy, or coalition, of all reactionary trends. In it are men who had frequently been ministers before or after the military conspiracy that brought General de Gaulle to power in 1958. Its very composition shows that it is no better prepared to resolve the problems confronting the French bourgeoisie than Gaullism was in 1958-69.

The message of President Georges Pompidou, read in the National Assembly, sounded like a manifesto of decline:

"Our civilization is experiencing a spiritual crisis. The economic upheavals, accelerated scientific and technological progress, the undermining of faith and of traditional foundations and the decline of morals have drawn society into a mad race



for material progress, which knows no boundaries, but which evidently develops demands faster than the means of satisfying them, and knows no answer to the deep aspirations of disoriented mankind."

Georges Pompidou urges measures to boost state-monopoly capitalism. He wants priority treatment for enterprises and industries poorly prepared for international competition. "Dynamic and modern enterprises," he said, "must be accorded as much freedom as possible. This presupposes not only the rendering of necessary and versatile assistance but also constant efforts by the enterprises themselves to renew their management and methods, which sometimes presupposes merger or concentration" ("Le Figaro," June 12, 1969).

The possibilities of French capitalism are steadily dwindling. No wonder that, in speaking of the economic situation, Prime Minister Chaban-Delmas assessed it as being "under the influence of international conditions, with all their serious upheavals." Giscard d'Estaing, Minister of Economy and Finances, declared that the economic policy France should pursue will be hamstrung by "currency instability and the threat of underemployment," adding that "the success or failure of our aims (plans — P.H.) depends on the market, which does not submit to the will of the government."

The new government has taken office at a time when all the trade union organizations are preparing to put forward major economic and social demands. For its part the CGT considers that "all the problems which have not been resolved prior to the referendum and the presidential elections remain" and that "they are numerous."

As regards the universities, the extended Gaullist majority will try to cut down as far as possible on the concessions made under pressure of the 1968 events. Before his election, Georges Pompidou, who was Prime Minister until the explosion of May 1968, said he would like to see a slowing down of expenditures on public education.

In foreign policy the new government has no intention of changing the basic line of French diplomacy as pursued by General de Gaulle. This concerns both its positive and negative aspects (the treaty with the FRG, refusal to recognize the German Democratic Republic). Prime Minister Chaban-Delmas has declared: "We shall maintain and consolidate the policy of co-operation with the Eastern countries, and

chiefly with the Soviet Union, a policy which is beginning to bear fruit economically but which, in our view, also contains a political dimension." The French working people and democrats do not separate these positive aspects of French policy either from the influence of the increased economic, political and military might of the Soviet Union and the peaceful foreign policy of the USSR and other socialist countries, or from the scope of the peace movement in France itself. One of the factors to which the French Communist Party owes its enhanced prestige as the country's basic Left force is the struggle against the war in Vietnam.

The French Communist Party is continuing on all fronts the struggle it launched against the regime of personal power, and it will carry on this struggle against the present government, which, though it has somewhat changed its image and methods, remains a weapon of big monopoly capital.

The struggle for unity must be continued. The recent elections opened the people's eyes to the divisive policy of the Socialist leaders and its pernicious consequences. They underscored the harm that could be caused to the working class by organizations like the USP, which does not have mass support and is subjected, like the small Leftist groups, to all varieties of Right and "Left" opportunism. Parallel with denouncing the splitters, the task of the Communist Party is to organize the masses that are still looking for the true path and draw them into the struggle. But, whatever the circumstances, the struggle for unity is a complex affair.

The Communist Party, the party of the working class, must reckon with the special, diverse and frequently contradictory interests of the middle strata, interests that have been infringed upon by monopoly capital. The parties and associations supported by these middle strata or by less politically conscious elements of the working class inevitably reflect their illusions, apprehensions and prejudices. That explains why they do not always and everywhere pursue a consistent policy. The French Communist Party will make every effort to be a uniting factor for everyone. The Party, its deputies and its functionaries will continue to champion the interests of the working class and all non-monopoly strata. It knows that the struggle for democracy and socialism is not confined to social, primarily working-class demands, although such demands are in-



trinsic to this struggle. A united working-class front would find embodiment in a general trade union front, which the CGT is tirelessly working to achieve. Unity of all the social strata oppressed by big capital is the only bright prospect leading to victory over the big monopoly bourgeoisie and its parties, to France's passage through the necessary stage of advanced democracy to socialism.

As Comrade Gaston Plissonnier noted in

his report to the Central Committee plenum of June 27, the "presidential elections are only a stage of the struggle . . . Pompidou called for 'national reconciliation' . . . He lauded class cooperation. However, his policy, which serves the interests of the privileged minority to the detriment of the huge majority of Frenchmen, will inevitably lead to an intensification of the class struggle. The conditions are emerging for broad anti-monopoly unity."

## ***Is the Bundeswehr really a "paper army"?***

Western papers are spreading the notion that for political and technical reasons the Bundeswehr is gradually becoming a "paper army." The following letter from the German Federal Republic deals with one such report in the French journal, *L'Express*.

Jean-Claude Halle's article, Bundeswehr 1969, in the April issue of *L'Express* (No. 926) is a graphic example of deliberate distortion. "The new German army," we read, "theoretically Western Europe's strongest (455,000 men, 12 divisions), is an army only on paper." Halle holds that the Bundeswehr of 1969 is "incapable of conducting war," unskilled in elementary maneuvers and still —13 years after its inception—looking for a proper image.

The *L'Express* article is slanted to twist the actual picture and to minimize the danger of West German imperialism and militarism. Before the first and second world wars, too, writers of Halle's type dissected weaknesses in the German militarist machine, "proving" that it was below standard. Yet in just the 20th century it was the German imperialists who precipitated two devastating wars. The result: 70 million dead and incalculable destruction. This is therefore a time to be vigilant and to exhort others to vigilance.

Take some facts which the *L'Express* writer overlooks. At the end of 1968, the Bundeswehr had 451,000 men and officers, but including the 1,200,000 Bundeswehr-trained reservists the grand total was 1,650,000 (against 950,000 in France and

600,000 in Britain). The Bundeswehr has 3,000 sophisticated tanks, 1,000 Starfighter-type aircraft and powerful U.S.-made tactical nuclear-delivery devices.

Over 7,000 U.S. nuclear warheads are stored in the Federal Republic, with some in Bundeswehr depots. Although formal control is in U.S. hands, "participation of the German Federal Republic in nuclear planning," as noted by the Bundeswehr Inspector-General, "and in permitting the use of nuclear arms is guaranteed by Bonn's participation in the nuclear planning group" (*Wehrkunde*, 1969, No. 4, p. 173).

Between 1950 and 1968, the Finance Ministry revealed, DM260,000 million was spent on building and expanding the Bundeswehr, whereas Hitler spent but RM90,000 million until 1939 to build up his Wehrmacht. Besides, the Federal Government plans to spend DM103,000 million more on arms between 1969 and 1973 under just the intermediate financial plan. The only possible conclusion is that the Bundeswehr is the best equipped and most combat-ready army in Western Europe today.

The *L'Express* writer says nothing of the aims for which the Bundeswehr is being armed. Yet to gauge the danger presented by the Bundeswehr you need the answer



to the following question: whose instrument is it and what aims are envisaged by those who give it arms?

The Federal Republic is ruled by big capital. Dominant there are the social forces that precipitated the first world war, put fascism in power and started the second world war. The Federal Government is headed by a man who was a member of the Nazi party from 1933 to 1945 and served Hitler in a top Foreign Ministry position. As in the time of Kaiser Wilhelm and Hitler, the army is intended to assure the dominance of big capital. The Bundeswehr is therefore a potential instrument for suppressing the people: the "emergency laws" passed by the West German parliament last year with assenting votes from SDP as well as CDU/CSU deputies, provide for Bundeswehr intervention in the event of an "emergency situation arising in the country."

In the context of foreign policy Bonn is bent on revising the outcome of the Second World War and regaining the former sphere of operations of the German imperialists. The FRG is the only European state refusing to recognize the existing frontiers.

At a CSU convention in Munich on July 13, 1968, Federal Chancellor Kiesinger said: "Recognition of the existence of two sovereign German states, the Oder-Neisse border, the unlawfulness of the Munich agreement from the beginning—nothing can induce me to sign such terms of surrender . . . This applies to the whole government and its partners in the coalition."

Earlier, CSU Deputy Majonica observed frankly that changing the balance of power would involve armed force: "Reunification means changing radically the postwar balance of power . . . But rarely were the results of a war rectified later by peaceful means" (*Politisch-Soziale-Korrespondenz*, No. 1, 1966). It is in pursuance of this policy that the Bundeswehr is being built up and that the Federal Government clamors for atomic weapons. The CDU program contains the demand for a European nuclear force put forward by Bonn's "Strongman" Strauss. Meanwhile, the Federal Government refuses to sign the nuclear non-proliferation treaty.

Is Jean-Claude Halle ignorant of these facts?

He quotes Hans-Georg von Studnitz, writer of the pamphlet, "Save the Bundeswehr," to give credence to the contention that the Bundeswehr is moulded in too mild

a spirit, that its soldiers are overly pampered and that the world has nothing to fear from the German army. Publicist von Studnitz, son of a Kaiser's Guards officer and associate of the Foreign Ministry's Press Department in Berlin from 1940 until the end of the war (he was then a subordinate of the present Federal Chancellor), holds that the idea of a soldier being a "citizen in uniform" robs the army of its combatibility.

Bundeswehr General Grashei says in so many words that he always regarded the image of a "citizen in uniform" as merely a means to break resistance to remilitarization. He holds that the Bundeswehr should be converted into a factor of order, and thereby earned the approval of Strauss, who wrote in *Deutschlandmagazin*: "The Bundeswehr . . . is no training ground of democracy." General Grashei's ideas are shared by Chancellor Kiesinger who, speaking to the Servicemen's Union, said in the true Kaiser Wilhelm and Hitler spirit that the Bundeswehr should be a "a big school of the nation." It remains to recall that the teachers in that "school" are the same men who had once trained the youth, turning it into an obedient executor of the imperialist's nefarious designs. The top posts in the Bundeswehr are held by 189 former Nazi officers, with 160 in Bonn-based headquarters, 17 in the so-called Defense Ministry and 12 in the NATO Supreme Command.

The *L'Express* writer will hardly deny the fact that a large percentage of the Bundeswehr's professional soldiers are members or followers of the avowedly neo-Nazi NDP. Yet he should not be surprised, because in the final analysis the foreign, home and military policy of the NDP coincides with the ideas purveyed by the CDU/CSU, the main party of West German big capital. Captain Ross of the Bundeswehr reserve, now an NDP deputy in the Bavarian Landtag, said: "The five-year civic schooling of the Bundeswehr prepared me for joining the NDP. By virtue of this the NDP program is literally created for me."

Any attempt at aggression by the revanchists is doomed to failure. However, an instrument of West Germany big capital, the Bundeswehr could cause unprecedented disaster in Europe and inflict incalculable suffering on mankind. Imperialism remains a constant menace to peace and social progress. Millions of people must be shown the implications for mankind of imperialist policy. European peace



demands that the revanchist forces in the GFR be curbed. That is why those who, like the *L'Express* writers, distort the truth about the Bundeswehr and thereby

grind the axe of the German militarists, should be exposed.

*Duesseldorf*

*Jupp ANGENFORT*



## ***Peace fighters meet in Berlin***

In the first half of this century piratical German imperialism had its general staff in Berlin, and the criminal decisions taken there cost the peoples of Europe and other continents millions of lives, vast destruction and terrible losses. The order setting off the Second World War was also issued in Berlin 30 years ago.

It is significant and symbolic that Berlin, the capital of the German Democratic Republic, was recently the venue of two major forums of fighters against imperialist aggression and war—the World Peace Assembly (June 21-24) and the World Peace Council session (June 25-26) to mark the 20th anniversary of the peace movement.

Both were warmly welcomed by Walter Ulbricht, who spoke on behalf of the GDR State Council and Government and the population of the world's first peaceable German state. His message to the World Peace Assembly said in part: "Our people have destroyed imperialism on their territory root and branch. All that remained of the great-power imperialist policy of war here in Berlin, our capital, was the ruins of the Kaiser's palace, Hindenburg's palace and Hitler's Reichschancellory. Our working people have swept away these ruins together with the rest of the nazi-imperialist rubble." His message set out an action program for the GDR government and people in defense of peace and the security of nations, which is also very important for Europe in view of the aggressive and revenge-seeking plans of West German imperialism.

Those who were at the forum saw for themselves how much headway the people of the GDR have made in developing their socialist economy, science and culture, and how genuinely democratic is the social system of their Republic, which is marking its 20th anniversary. The GDR government and mass organizations did everything to make the two forums a success.

An outstanding feature of the *World Peace Assembly* was its highly representa-

tive character: it was attended by over 1,100 delegates, among them many peace fighters prominent both at home and abroad, from 56 international and 320 national organizations in 101 countries. They condemned the imperialist policy of militarism, aggression and war, colonialism and neo-colonialism, racialism and fascism. Men and women of different professions, outlooks and religious convictions, they were inspired by sincere concern for the future of mankind, and united by a passionate desire to discuss the most burning issues of our day and find the most effective ways of ensuring peace and security for all nations.

The Peace Assembly set up five working committees: Vietnam; the Middle East, colonialism, neo-colonialism and national independence; European security; and disarmament. In view of the complexity of these issues and the large number of speakers, four of the five committees set up subcommittees to go into specific questions in greater detail. In addition, nine big specialized working groups met during the Assembly. Trade unionists, peasants, students, women, clergymen, MPs, lawyers, teachers, educationalists, artists and scientists joined in heated debate of specific problems and delivered general reports setting out constructive proposals for intensifying the activity and cohesion of organizations working for peace and friendship.

The five main committees worked at a high pitch. Thus, there were over 100 speakers in the European Security Committee and its subcommittees and over 60 in the Middle East Committee. Free democratic discussion and exchange of experience in the struggle testified to unity on fundamental issues, with fresh moves in defense of peace in various countries and zones worked out and approved.

Specific measures to put the world peace movement into higher gear were elaborated in all the committees and subcommittees. The Action Subcommittee, set up by the Vietnam Committee, proposed he follow-



ing urgent international mass action:

"1) A two-month special international campaign in July and August starting on July 4, U.S. Independence Day, each movement to decide on its own time-table and form of action.

"2) Mass Action Day on June 20, the day of the signing of the Geneva Agreements, in support of the Provisional Revolutionary Government and for the complete and unconditional withdrawal of U.S. and satellite troops.

"3) July 4—action on U.S. Independence Day.

"4) August 6—action on Hiroshima Day.

"5) Campaign of protest letters and telegrams sent from all parts of the world to President Nixon at his summer residence (Summer White House, San Clemente, California).

"6) The fullest possible boycott of all U.S. goods.

"7) Demonstrations in front of U.S. embassies and consulates, wherever possible.

"8) Intensive campaign to expose U.S. hypocrisy in using the Paris talks to drag out a settlement while escalating the war in Vietnam.

"9) Broad campaign to explain and spread the 10-point program of the National Liberation Front.

"10) International petition in support of the 10-point program of the National Liberation Front.

"11) International conferences to increase pressure on the U.S. government and express solidarity with the peace forces in the USA.

"12) Worldwide protest against suppression of active opponents of the war in Vietnam.

"13) Mass action, the date to be determined, for dismantling the Okinawa military base and stopping the USA from using the island as a springboard for military operations against Vietnam."

The Assembly, meeting in plenary session, wholeheartedly approved these and other proposals of the Vietnam Committee.

The Middle East Committee unanimously demanded the unconditional and immediate withdrawal of Israeli troops from the occupied Arab territories and restoration of the Palestinian people's right to return to their homeland. Most speakers insisted on the implementation of the UN Security Council Resolution of November 22, 1967, which is being sabotaged by Israeli ruling circles. The Committee's report said that many speakers had proposed mass action to expose the imperialist powers' role in organ-

izing and supporting Israel's aggression and to unmask the lying Zionist propaganda. It was proposed, in particular, that this November should be a month of solidarity of all progressive forces with the Arab peoples. The Committee stated that the Israeli occupation was also encountering growing opposition among Jews in all countries, including the USA.

The Colonialism, Neo-colonialism and National Independence Committee came to the conclusion that while modern imperialism had grown weaker it was still piratical. The imperialist states were trying to preserve their system of exploitation and suppression of peoples by using the new tactics and methods of neo-colonialism. The Committee made the point that the socialist countries' assistance was crucial to the peoples' fight for national independence. The delegates sharply condemned the neo-colonialism of the USA, FRG, Portugal and other imperialist states, and proposed a series of specific measures against imperialism, a study of all aspects of neo-colonialism on an international scale, and an international forum on this issue. The main document drawn up by the Congress against neo-colonialism would be made available to the UN and the governments of the world.

The proposals of the European Security Committee are of great importance for European and world peace. On the strength of an analysis of the present situation in Europe, the more than 200 members on the Committee stated that U.S. imperialist policy and its growing ties and interaction with the aggressive forces in the FRG had intensified the threat of another war in Europe which could involve the use of thermonuclear weapons. Vigorously supporting the establishment of an effective European security system, the Committee stressed that this could be achieved only if all states recognized the territorial *status quo* in Europe.

The Committee summed this up as follows:

"1. Strict observance of the principles of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems.

"2. Recognition of the existing frontiers, notably that along the Oder-Neisse and that between the two German states.

"3. Recognition of the GDR as a sovereign and equal state and repudiation of the Hallstein Doctrine by the FRG government.

"4. Declaration of the Munich agreement as being invalid from the outset.



"5. Respect for the independence, sovereignty and equality of all states and observance of the principle of non-interference.

"6. Repudiation of force in settling disputes between states."

Delegates from all countries demanded that the FRG government should immediately sign the non-proliferation treaty, condemned the growth of militarism, the preservation of the relics of fascism and the growth of neo-nazi and revanchist forces in West Germany. The interests of European security demand consistent fulfilment by the FRG of the Potsdam Agreement, which provides for the uprooting of nazism and militarism.

Speakers on European security supported all proposals and action to redouble efforts to establish a sound system of peace in Europe. They welcomed the proposal of a number of organizations to hold a European public conference on "European Security and Cooperation" in Vienna next October.

The Disarmament Committee worked out important measures to intensify the struggle against militarism and the threat of war. Noting that U.S. ruling circles were responsible for the arms race and the spread of atomic weapons in various parts of the world, the Committee demanded special measures to ban atomic weapons, and reduce or destroy their stockpiles and means of delivery. It called upon all governments and peace fighters to work for a ban on underground nuclear tests, and urged all states, the FRG, Israel and the South African Republic in particular, to sign the non-proliferation treaty and secure its complete and effective fulfilment.

The Committee gave much attention to the pressing need to ban biological and chemical weapons. It unanimously condemned the USA for using chemical weapons in the war against the Vietnamese people, and appealed to all scientists to denounce the development and stockpiling of biological and chemical weapons, not to take part in designing them and to warn the world about any secret research and projects in this field. In view of the ever greater danger of war coming from the imperialist states, the Committee demanded that the UN and the 18-nation Disarmament Committee should intensify their activity and adopt at the earliest date practical measures to secure partial disarmament, and to ban all types of mass annihilation weapons.

The reports of all the five Committees were approved unanimously at the final

plenary sitting of the Peace Assembly.\* It also adopted an appeal to all nations, all men of goodwill to fight against aggression and oppression. "We are united," it said, "by the firm belief that lasting peace is possible and can become a reality. We have gathered together, because there is an imperative need for joint action. We are convinced that this can be done. Guided by humanitarian feelings and a sense of responsibility to mankind we declare our resolve to do everything for unity." The Assembly also adopted a resolution on Vietnam envisaging a broad campaign for moral, political and material support for the Vietnamese people.

The Anniversary Session of the World Peace Council (WPC) was opened by coordinating President Isabella Blume (Belgium).

General Secretary of the WPC Romesh Chandra in his report spoke at length about the Council's 20 years, its plans for the future and the organizational measures to extend its work. Many speakers gave a high appreciation of the noble activity of the WPC and its General Secretary.

The session adopted important decisions to enlarge the Council, and elected a new Presidium and Secretariat. Henceforth, 460 representatives of international and national peace organizations will be its permanent members. Fifty prominent persons were elected to its Presidium, and a decision was taken to invite a consultative group of Council members to attend the sittings of the Presidium. The new Presidium unanimously re-elected Romesh Chandra as General Secretary of the WPC. John Bernal, Lezaro Cardenas, Pablo Picasso and Krishna Menon, all of whom have rendered great service to the cause of peace, were elected honorary presidents of the Council.

At the closing session, the delegates enthusiastically approved a WPC Declaration reaffirming the basic principles of the world peace movement. It forcefully emphasized the urgent need for cooperation and unity of action of all organizations, movements and groups working for lasting peace and the friendship of peoples.

The World Peace Assembly and the World Peace Council session were held directly after the Moscow Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, whose Documents made a deep impression on all those who took part. Peace fighters from many countries believe these documents will be

\*The texts were published in *Neues Deutschland*, organ of the SUPG on June 25, 1969.



of inestimable value to them in the fight for peace. For their part, the World Peace Assembly and the WPC session have made it

quite clear that the unity of all progressive peace-loving forces is a dictate of our time.  
Y. Kh.

---



# ***Changes in the structure of the working class in the FRG***

WILLI GARNIS

The changed structure of the working class has a direct bearing on Marxist political practice in the Federal Republic of Germany. As the most consistent and advanced section of the working class, we must pinpoint and reflect in theory the changes brought on by the growth of the productive forces. We must analyze the attendant social dynamics and its impact on political strategy, and orientate ourselves on those groups of workers most closely associated with modern production. Past experience shows that proletarian consciousness does not take hold automatically among new groups and strata of workers, that this is a historical process hitched to social and political practice, and that in awakening their class consciousness, the Communist movement must always bear in mind and consider their specific interests.

The theoretical aspect of this problem has aroused keen interest among Marxists. In May 1968, we held an international conference, "Classes and the Class Struggle of Today," under the auspices of *Marxistische Blaetter*, our Frankfurt-on-Main publication, with many contributions later published under separate cover.

These studies proceed from the basic criterion that the status of hired worker is the decisive identification with the working class, going on to explore the inner structure, the peculiarities of the various strata of workers.

The rapid post-war growth of the working class is reflected in official statistics: the proportion of hired labor to total work-

ing population went up from 71.6 per cent in 1950 to 80.8 per cent in 1966, wage-earners being classed in three categories—workers, white-collar workers and civil servants. The latter are a group subject to rigid regulations, restricted in movement, in political activity and in changing jobs, but enjoying certain social privileges, such as better pensions and job security, longer vacations, etc. The white-collar workers, too, have advantages over factory labor as regards rights and privileges. In addition to these categories, special literature has introduced a new concept, that of "academic," the hired worker with a higher education. And all these distinctions, we may sum up, are rooted in history.

In the FRG, the working class is growing rapidly, and for four main reasons:

1) The ruin of farmers and the urban middle strata. From 1950 to 1966 the number of independent farmers and their helpers (members of their family) shrank by more than 1.5 million, and that of independent operators in industry and the crafts by 131,000. In trade, transport and the services, meanwhile, independent operators increased in number by nearly 500,000, the overall reduction of the group thus amounting to approximately 1,140,000.

2) The influx of resettlers before August 13, 1961, including large numbers of factory and office workers from the GDR.

3) The greater number of women in the labor market. From 1951 to 1966 their ranks swelled by 2,424,000, climbing to a total of 7,074,000. The accretion in 15 years thus was 49 per cent, with the res-



pective increase of male wage-earners being 31.6 per cent.

4) The inflow of foreign workers, whose number was 1,314,000 as of June 30, 1966.

### POSTWAR STRUCTURAL CHANGES

Not only did the working class grow numerically. Its structure, too, changed substantially in the postwar.

1) Intensive concentration and centralization of capital and production impelled greater concentration of factory and white-collar workers in bigger enterprises. In 1951, for example, 23.8 per cent of the industrial labor force was still employed in enterprises with 10 to 99 employees, shrinking to 17.5 per cent in 1961, while employment in enterprises with over 1,000 employees increased from 33.6 to 40.9 per cent of the total labor force. And the degree of concentration in concerns or groups of concerns employing more than 100,000 is shown in Table 1.

**Table 1**

|                   | Employees<br>(in thousands) |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| IG-Farben group   | 337                         |
| Siemens           | 260                         |
| Flick             | 180                         |
| Thyssen           | 160                         |
| AEG               | 150                         |
| Krupp             | 125                         |
| Volkswagenwerk AG | 122                         |
| Haniel-DEAG group | 115                         |
| VEBA group        | 100                         |

However, the capitalist state is the biggest employer of all, with 4,000,000 (about 20 per cent of the labor force) employed in state-operated enterprises, services, utilities and government offices.

2) Changes in the economic structure under the impact of the scientific and technological revolution have caused a redistribution of factory and office workers in the various sectors of industry (see Table 2).

**Table 2\***

**Distribution by Economic Sectors**  
(in thousands and % of total)

|                          | 1950  | %    | 1960   | %    | 1966   | %    |
|--------------------------|-------|------|--------|------|--------|------|
| agriculture and forestry | 999   | 7.1  | 533    | 2.7  | 360    | 1.6  |
| industry and crafts      | 7,632 | 54.7 | 11,164 | 55.7 | 12,777 | 55.7 |
| trade and transport      | 2,075 | 14.9 | 3,467  | 17.3 | 3,781  | 17.3 |
| services                 | 3,257 | 23.3 | 4,869  | 24.3 | 5,552  | 25.4 |

\*1950—FRG only; later, FRG plus West Berlin (incl. servicemen)\*\*

Source: *Statistisches Jahrbuch fuer die Bundesrepublik Deutschlands*, Stuttgart-Mainz, 1967, S. 139.

\*\*In the absence of other sources, we used the Statistical Annual of the FRG, although West Berlin is a distinct political unit and not a part of the FRG.

While the percentage of wage-earners in agriculture and forestry dropped and that in industry and the crafts, trade and transport struck a balance, the service sphere expanded rapidly, with employment in government offices and social insurance growing at the fastest rate (labor in the services as a whole by about 14 per cent, and in government offices and social insurance at 26 per cent between 1960 and 1966).

With general employment in industry stagnant (an accretion of but 0.8 per cent between 1961 and 1966), employment in branches hit by the structural crisis shrank more visibly, and most of all in mining, where employment in iron ore dropped 64.6 per cent, coal 24.8 per cent, potas-

sium and salt 14.3 per cent, and in the rest of the industry 22.2 per cent.

Industries associated with technological progress, on the other hand, showed a considerable growth of employment. Synthetic materials, for one, increased employment by 36 per cent, automobiles 25.6, rubber and asbestos 10.8, chemicals 9.2, electrical engineering 6.5 and general engineering 6.3.

3.) Structural changes affected the numerical relation of blue- to white-collar workers. The percentage of the former has long been going down in relative, and of late also in physical, terms, whereas the percentage of white collars is steadily on the increase (see Table 3)



**Table 3**  
**Dynamics in the Relation of Categories of Workers (%%)**

|                   | Blue-collar workers | White-collar workers | Civil servants |
|-------------------|---------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| May 17, 1939*)    | 69.4                | 18.6                 | 12             |
| Sept. 13, 1950**) | 71.3                | 23.4                 | 5.3            |
| October 1957***)  | 67.7                | 26.3                 | 6              |
| April 1963***)    | 62.6                | 31.3                 | 6.1            |
| April 1966***)    | 60.1                | 33.6                 | 6.3            |

\*German Reich;

\*\*FRG;

\*\*\*FRG and West Berlin.

Source: Based on *Statistisches Jahrbuch*, 1967, S. 137.

This trend in the blue- to white-collar ratio is certain to continue. The case of the United States proves this. There, the number of white-collar workers equalled that of blue-collar workers back in 1955, surpassing the latter by 21 per cent in 1965, with a more than 40 per cent edge predicted in 1975.

This rapid growth is partly due to the growth of services, but more white-collar workers are also employed in other spheres, not least in industry. Industries

most closely associated with technological progress head the list in this respect (see Table 4).

**Table 4**  
**Blue- and White-Collar Workers in Key Industries in 1961-1966 (%%)**

|                        | Employment growth | Increase in factory workers | Increase in white-collar workers |
|------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| synthetic materials    | +36               | +31.4                       | +55.4                            |
| automobiles            | +25.6             | +22.2                       | +42.4                            |
| rubber and asbestos    | +10.8             | + 8                         | +23                              |
| chemicals              | + 9.2             | + 3.4                       | +21.6                            |
| electrical engineering | + 6.5             | + 0.6                       | +29.9                            |
| general engineering    | + 6.3             | + 0.3                       | +24.6                            |
| industry, total        | + 0.8             | — 3.3                       | +17.7                            |

4) Scientific and technological progress has also wrought changes in the structure of the industrial working class.

**Table 5**  
**Structure of Industrial Working Class (%%)**

|                                 | 1951 | 1957 | 1960 | 1964 | 1966 |
|---------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| group I (skilled workers)       | 47.6 | 44.8 | 40.6 | 42.5 | 43.4 |
| group II (semi-skilled workers) | 28   | 32.4 | 36.4 | 36.5 | 36.8 |
| group III (unskilled workers)   | 24.4 | 22.8 | 23   | 21   | 19.8 |
|                                 | 100  | 100  | 100  | 100  | 100  |

Source: Deutsches Wirtschaftsinstitut (*DWI-Berichte*), No. 1, 1968, S. 18.

Table 5 reveals two distinct periods of structural flux, of which the first covers 1951-1960.

In the first period technological development was chiefly centered on continued mechanization and simple semi-automats, the technical advances pressing down the number of skilled and unskilled workers and pushing up the semi-skilled force. In the latter period, on the other hand, with unskilled labor still dropping and the number of semi-skilled continuing to rise (though more slowly), skilled labor was back on the upgrade, reflecting a fresh technological advance. Though semi-automats were still being introduced at the previous rate for partial processes, broader use was made of automated systems for whole sectors of production, requiring a new type of semi-skilled operator as proficient as the traditional skilled worker, though the criteria of proficiency differed. Operators running automated systems

manage without any special training, specific knowledge and know-how. What they need in their work is a sound general education.

The spread of comprehensive automated systems is reducing the number of workers directly employed in production. Meanwhile a relatively larger number of skilled workers is needed for maintenance, because smooth operation of expensive equipment and duration of repairs when necessary depend largely on the precision and quality of their performance. So the introduction of new technology puts a higher demand on skilled workers as well, and they, too, must now possess technical knowledge and the essential skills, improving themselves continuously to the grade of technicians.

The proficiency required in the opera-



tion and maintenance of comprehensive automated systems is now of so high a degree that more technicians and engineers are employed alongside highly-skilled workers.

5) Substantial structural changes are also observed in the white-collar bracket as a result of the increasing part of the state and of scientific and technological progress. The growing number of civil servants and of teaching and research personnel in education and public health is indicative of the greater role played in society by the state, with employment in the other services also rising.

At present, the number of technical workers participating directly in production and producing value and surplus value, is increasing. In steel and steel-rolling, for example, many of the operators of automated systems are technicians and engineers, and, regardless of whether they operate these systems or belong to the maintenance staff, they are deeply involved in the process of production, so deeply in fact that it could not go on without them. This applies equally to technical and research personnel in electrical engineering, chemicals and some other industries.

The scientific and technological revolution has added greatly to the importance of research and designing. Research and designing sectors in modern industry are large centers employing thousands of engineers, technicians and scientists. Farbenfabriken Bayer (Leverkusen), Farbwerke Hoechst and BASF (Ludwigshafen), which are successors to IG-Farben, employ 26,000 specialists in research and designing. And out of the 40,000 employed in the FRG in making aircraft and rocket bodies and engines, 8,000 are engaged directly in research and designing. This employment bracket is now an essential part of production, performing functions comparable to those of the working class.

Further mechanization of production control and of commerce is another area in which the number of technical workers performing the classical commercial operations is increasing.

The continuous growth in the number of technical workers, primarily technicians and engineers, provides evidence of the difference of growth rates in this group and of the blue and white-collars and civil servants combined (see Table 6).

**Table 6**

|                           | Blue and white collars and civil servants |       | Engineers, technicians, and related occupations* |      |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------------------------|------|
|                           | thous.                                    | %/o   | thous.                                           | %/o  |
| June 30, 1951**)          | 16,046                                    | 100   | 251                                              | 1.56 |
| October 1957***)          | 19,792                                    | 100   | 431                                              | 2.18 |
| June 30, 1961***)         | 20,632                                    | 100   | 635                                              | 3.08 |
| Changes from 1951 to 1961 | +4,586                                    | +28.6 | +384                                             | +153 |

\*excluding laboratory assistants, draughtsmen, and ordinary technical workers, and servicemen.

\*\*FRG

\*\*\*FRG and West Berlin.

Source: Based on *Statistisches Jahrbuch*, 1953, S. 128; 1961, S. 146; 1966 S. 153; 1967, S. 138.

The rise of the percentage of technical workers is most rapid in the big concerns in sophisticated industries. Due to scientific and technological progress, which entails a high standard of proficiency, specialists with a higher education are also steadily gaining ground in this group. In electrical engineering, for example, their percentage among technical workers increased from 6 in 1950 to 17 in 1966.

The above changes in the structure of the working class are a reflection of the fundamental postwar processes under way in West Germany and, above all, of the scientific and technological revolution, which is turning science into a direct productive force. Research and rationalization have begun to play a bigger part, and education is the decisive factor in further economic growth.

The second fundamental process completed in postwar West Germany and intimately related to the technological revolution is the transition to state-monopoly capitalism. In face of sharper internal and external contradictions, monopoly power has fused with the power of the capitalist state, this fusion crystallizing into an all-embracing system. And one of the most salient results is the centralization of management and concentration of production. State-monopoly capitalism spurred militarism and gave impetus to the expansion of the apparatus of coercion and oppression, an aspect particularly prominent in the Federal Republic by reason of the extreme aggressiveness of West German imperialism and its basic orientation on fighting socialism on German soil.



## CONVERGENCE OF THE STATUS OF WORKERS AND EMPLOYEES

While pressing down the percentage of industrial workers and boosting that of employees, the technical revolution and growth of state-monopoly capitalism tend to bring closer the conditions of life and work of these two working-class groups.

The white-collar workers' economic advantages and the privileges they are assured by the labor code, like their special place in the production hierarchy, are the product of a distinct historical phase in capitalism. In the early period of capitalism commercial and technical functions, the proliferation of which led later to the emergence of specific occupations, were concentrated in the employer. As capitalist accumulation continued, extending the scale of production and circulation, and as the social division of labor spread, the employer turned over some of his functions to employees. As a result, the bulk of employees, at first a numerically small group, was closely associated with the capitalists, and even in origin consisted mainly of members of capitalist families, ruined capitalists, craftsmen, traders and their children. At that time, they had a considerable influence on production, were vested with relatively broad decision-making powers and looked upon as "owners' deputies." Though no longer belonging to the capitalist class, they were regarded as its appendage. And to strengthen the existing bond, they were given economic advantages and a special status in the labor code.

Yet their status has changed radically.

1) As recently as 1910 more than half the male employees (52.6 per cent) came from families of independent operators and the liberal professions. In 1958, this applied to no more than 25 per cent, while 73.6 per cent were children of white-collar and factory workers, and civil servants.

2) From an inconsiderable social stratum linked with the capitalists and exercising a strong influence on production, salaried employees have, with some exceptions, developed into a large group belonging to the working class with no decisive influence on the affairs of the enterprise. Speaking at an international seminar "Computers and Employees," held by the Union of Metalworkers in 1968, Heinz Duerrbeck, board member of the union said: "In that part of the former German Reich that now constitutes the Federal Republic, the percentage of employees in the

hired labor force has increased from five to 34 per cent in the past 80 years. The five per cent were once an insignificant minority with a significant influence in their enterprises, while at present employees, who comprise 34 per cent or more than one-third of all hired labor, have hardly any influence on production."

The so-called middle-echelon managerial personnel is in a contradictory position: it consists of employees taking orders from capitalists, on the one hand, and, to some, though relatively small extent, performs the function of capitalists and is afforded various advantages, on the other. Increasingly, technological progress expels these people from positions of leadership. The prerogative of decision-making is concentrated more and more in a small group of capitalists and managers, with computers playing a prominent part.

Dr. Fuhrmann observes in his contribution to the same seminar that "introduction of computers at the middle managerial level is changing the old system of organizational relationships in industry. The work of departments and groups is oriented by the computing center. Instructions are often senseless, because computers set the schedule and rate of production . . . A supervisor, who does nothing but control and supervise work, becomes a luxury."

3) If for a part of the employees the chance of promotion was once a privilege that distinguished them from workers, technical progress has changed all that. Sociologists Urs Jaeggi and Herbert Weidemann observe in their book, *Employees in the Industrial Society*, that "the upper stratum is inclined to fence itself off and enlist replacements out of its own ranks."

True, a large section of employees has not yet realized the changes in their status. An investigation showed that about 30 per cent think they hold positions of leadership, although this is true of only five per cent of their number.

4) The economic and legal status of workers and employees has partly converged, and this despite Bonn's retaining the artificial barriers in the labor code. And the legislative privileges of employees are not the least of the reasons for the parochial mentality of many employees, hindering them from understanding that their basic economic, political and social interests coincide with those of the workers and that, hence, they must act in concert.

The convergence of the economic and



legal status of workers and employees is a two-sided process: thanks to the unions, the postwar workers' standard of living has improved, while that of employees has improved much less, and the gap between them has shrunk.

In January 1968, for example, the workers' average weekly pay was DM207, i.e., approximately DM900 monthly (before deductions). The employee in industry and commerce, meanwhile, earned an average DM1,005 monthly (before deductions). The difference, therefore, amounted to some 10 per cent, and considering that employees' average wage statistics cover the high-salaried upper-echelon administrators, the difference between most employees' salaries and workers' wages is hardly significant. True, it should be remembered that employees with a higher education earn more than workers, but there are also employees whose salaries are well below workers' wages.

5) The convergence of working conditions is another significant factor. As noted earlier, more and more technical workers are employed directly in production. They operate and maintain machines and mechanisms, and their working conditions are identical to those of skilled workers, entailing the same degree of strain.

Engineers and technicians employed in designing and rationalization, as well as a large section of researchers in laboratories and research institutions, work in conditions similar to those of industrial workers. To begin with, they handle partial operations only, as small wheels of the creative group with no overall grasp of the process.

Due to technological progress, a section of employees performs chiefly mechanical and manual work. This pushes up the norms expected of them. The system of paying for their work is altered. Piece rates appear, as a result of which white-collar workers labor under strains equal to those of the blue collars, who work on similar rates in material production.

6) Technological progress creates the same sense of insecurity in offices and laboratories as in factory shops. Dr. Fuhrmann notes, for one, that "until now it was thought automation in commercial and technical offices affected the interests of those persons who performed technical and mechanical operations involving manual skills, jeopardizing only the lower-level employees. But investigations at enterprises revealed no facts to confirm this opinion. Rationalization produces redun-

dancies in all functional groups . . . For example, due to the incorporation of sectors and departments, the functions of the so-called middle-level managerial staff, as well as its status, are just as vulnerable to the consequences of rationalization as are those of the manual staff."

Technological progress jeopardizes the jobs even of persons with a higher education.

Not only the objective status of the workers as the exploited class and their direct confrontation with capital, but also the concentration of workers in big enterprises, constitutes the basic and most important pre-condition for moulding the consciousness and militancy of industrial workers. That is what makes workers realize their similar collective status, forging close links and producing stable organizations. Class conflicts grew sharper in direct proportion to the added resistance of the workers. In the past, some of these factors did not apply to employees, which was an objective obstacle to the growth of their class consciousness. Now the situation is different: larger groups are becoming class conscious.

Analyzing the effects of automation on employees, we should bear in mind that in the FRG the process is of recent vintage. In 1959 West Germany had but 94 electronic computers, in 1967 their number grew to 2,963, and the estimate for 1975 is 11,550. As a result, the convergence of workers and employees will unquestionably be more rapid in coming years.

### **INCREASING IMPORTANCE OF THE NEW STRATA OF THE WORKING CLASS**

The structural changes in the working class lay increasing weight on employees. However, this gives no reason to conclude that the part played by the industrial workers in the class struggle will thereby diminish. Despite their reduction in numbers, industrial workers are the decisive force of the working class. This they owe to their place in production, their high degree of organization and their greater activity in economic, social and political class conflicts as compared with the other detachments. And those skilled workers who control the panels of automated production lines, or are employed in maintenance, stationed at the nerve centers of modern production, are increasingly important. Present-day capitalist production cannot go on without them. That is why in highly-automated enterprises the handful of skilled



workers can compel employers to meet demands by striking.

The importance of employees is also steadily increasing. This applies mostly to technicians and engineers directly employed in material production. By virtue of their objective position this section of employees is quickly acquiring the same significance as the category of highly-skilled workers. Last but not least, the further growth of the social character of capitalist production and management attaches added importance to employees engaged in planning and in government bodies for economic regulation. Their functions have become essential for the smooth operation of the economy.

The new strata of the industrial proletariat and employees created by technological progress are sure to become the main force of the working class. That is why the results of working-class actions and the prospect of the fight for basic democratic and socialist reconstruction depend increasingly on the level of their consciousness and activity.

The objective conditions in which these new strata operate, compel us to search for new approaches in moulding their class consciousness and directing their activities. The ruling circles strive to associate these important groups of wage-earners with

capital, making considerable concessions to them and raising their standard of living. The fight for higher wages, therefore, will not be as important for them as for other sections of the working class. Yet wage policy, too, will, as before, unquestionably be a strong factor for their participation in class actions. The fight for job security, against the continuous threat to jobs due to the way technological progress is exploited by capitalists, will become more and more important, the struggle for a progressive policy in education will play a big part.

Finally, actions for effective workers' participation in management at all levels may be decisive for drawing new sections of the working class into the class struggle.

Opinion polls show that status in the system of an enterprise and opportunities to influence the aims of production and exercise control are factors gaining increasing importance among various brackets of skilled workers and employees.

It is up to the Communists, therefore, to pinpoint and accentuate those elements in the fight for democratic reforms restricting the power of state-monopoly capitalism and extending the democratic rights of working people.

## ***Portrait of an anti-communist***

That criminal elements and corrupt politicians make up a goodly portion of the anti-communist fraternity is nothing new. But the trial in Austria earlier this year, of one of these types is still very much in the news because it goes far beyond the customary practices of the "free world."

The man in the dock, Franz Olah, ex-president of the Austrian trade unions, ex-Minister of the Interior, and for years a high-ranking official of the Socialist Party, faced a charge of "misappropriation of trade-union funds" and was sentenced to one year in prison. But the verdict was so couched as to provide Olah with free publicity which he used to boost his candidature in the Vienna municipal elections.

Elected, he blandly declared that had it not been for the trial—which condemned him as a criminal—he wouldn't have won! But, then, in the capitalist world crime and anti-communism go together; more, they can help towards a political career.

### **RISE AND FALL**

And Olah's career was really meteoric. It began in 1945, when he became secretary of the Builders and Wood-Workers' Union. Three years later he was a Socialist member of the National Council, then president of his union, member of the Socialist inner leadership, vice-president and president of the Austrian Trade-Union Federation. The



apex came with his appointment as Minister of the Interior in the coalition government.

Then came the fall. In 1964 he was dismissed from his post and expelled from the Socialist Party for fraudulent manipulation of trade union funds. That, in fact, was the charge against him in the recent court case. Among other things, the court established that Olah had used union money to buy influence in the press and even in the nationalist Freedom Party. "The accused," the prosecutor declared, "abused his political position and authority."

Olah, it should be pointed out, was the chief exponent of anti-communism in the Socialist Party, and the roots of his anti-communism emerged at the trial from his own testimony — his contacts could be traced to Right-wing U.S. union leaders and to the U.S. secret service.

#### WHO "MADE" OLAH?

This is a portrait of Franz Olah according to documentary evidence and his court testimony.

In 1947, he told the court, the then president of the Trade Union Federation, Boem, made the following arrangement with the U.S. High Commissioner: in the event of a "break-down in the central union leadership" (meaning, in fact a breakdown of the still weak bourgeois machinery of government), Olah would address the workers, on behalf of the Trade Union Federation, through the U.S. Army radio station.

And Olah was told "not to be alarmed" in the event of his arrest by the U.S. military authorities. That would be done for his "own safety . . ." One wonders whether some U.S. sergeant provided the text of the speech Olah was to deliver "on behalf of the Trade Union Federation." At any rate, he was in close contact with various U.S. organizations. Towards the end of 1948 he went to the States to attend an AFL convention, and returned with a "promise of continued and increasing aid to the Austrian trade unions." This was at a time when the U.S. Right-wing union leaders were working to split the World Federation of Trade Unions. The *Wiener Kurier*, then published by the U.S. occupation authorities, reported (October 29, 1948) that Olah had declared for the establishment of a new international trade union organization, in other words for a split.

Capitalist consolidation in 1948-51 sharply worsened the workers' conditions. The workers retaliated by a spontaneous gener-

al strike in October 1950. The Socialist leaders, who clung to their coalition with the Peoples Party, opposed the strike, but were powerless to prevent its spread. They fell back on the usual anti-communist slander, alleging that the Communists had started the strike as a prelude to a coup d'etat. "Mobile squads" and gangs of thugs were organized, and after a long and bitter struggle the strike ended in defeat. Olah, one of the organizers of the strike-breaker gangs, was held up as the "hero" who had averted a Communist coup.

After the strike, he told the court, the Americans had instructed him to build up an illegal armed organization. He was given the money — millions of schillings — with which to buy transport, weapons, radio transmitters, and so on. The armed groups trained in the guise of sports and other organizations. Arms caches were set up in trade union halls, for instance in Wiener-Neustadt and St. Poelten. In Vienna, the municipality gave one of its employees a six-months leave of absence so that he could act as Olah's gunsmith.

This flagrant violation of the laws was committed with the knowledge of the authorities. And not all of it was secret—an "industrial accident" in Trofaiach (Styria) led to the arrest of several members of Olah's clandestine organization and confiscation of their radio transmitters. At Olah's request the Socialist Minister of the Interior, Helmer, released the men and returned the transmitters.

With the signing of the State Treaty in 1955, American and other foreign troops left Austria and the country was committed to permanent neutrality. But Olah's American-financed organization continued to function right up to 1963-64 and played a definite part in the U.S. provocation against the 1959 World Youth Festival in Vienna.

Meanwhile Olah was continuing his climb to power—he was now president of the Trade Union Federation and soon he would be Minister of the Interior. For him things began to go awry when, with the easing of international and internal tensions, anti-communism was losing its effect.

#### CROOK, BUT A FAITHFUL ONE

Olah was determined to keep anti-communism alive. In 1959 he took part, together with other Socialist Party officials, in negotiations with the Freedom Party, to which the Socialists promised generous political and financial support. The idea was to form a two-party government with



Olah as Federal Chancellor. Olah used trade union money to finance the anti-communist rag *Kronen Zeitung*, which combined eulogy of Olah with unscrupulous slander of every Socialist leader opposed to cooperation with the reactionary Freedom Party.

At one time it seemed that this plan for a "mini-coalition" of the Socialist and Freedom parties would be put through but, meeting with resolute opposition from the Socialist rank and file and many party officials, it had to be abandoned. The sole result was Olah's expulsion from the Socialist Party.

But he was still useful to the bourgeoisie. The difficulties he created for the Socialists in 1965-66 by his fraudulent financial dealings were adroitly exploited by the People's Party, which speaks for the big bourgeoisie. It insisted on a general election which, it rightly hoped, would enable it to form a one-party government. In this critical situation the Communists decided to support the Socialists in all constituencies except one, despite their criticism of Socialist policy. The Communists hoped that this would bar the way of the People's Party to power. But Olah announced his own candidature and this siphoned away Socialist votes.

The People's Party won the election and formed its own government. Olah, though not elected to parliament, still presented a serious threat to the Socialists. The new party leaders headed by Dr. Kreisky, who for long had supported Olah, being largely in agreement with his anti-communist policy, could not make up their minds to break with him. They went no further than condemning his shady financial operations and instituted proceedings against him. But they were very careful to prevent any political issues cropping up at the trial. And it was this that played into the hands of the People's Party: it used Olah's embezzlement of millions of trade union money to exploit rank-and-file indignation and to work up anti-union sentiment.

Olah's tactics in court was characteristic. He made great play of his contacts with the Americans and of his anti-communism—he knew that in a capitalist country this could be used to maximum effect. He was right: in condemning him of fraud, the court took into account his services in "preserving democracy" and "promoting social peace in Austria" as mitigating circumstances. But it could not prevent exposure of the U.S. trade union bosses' anti-communist activities and the purpose behind their con-

tacts with European trade unions. In short, the trial was a clear demonstration of the fusion of anti-communism and crime.

Of course, for the U.S. secret service Olah and his organization were no more than cogs in a far-flung subversion machine. Olah had other sources besides appropriated union funds, but they were not revealed at the trial. However, all the exposures of the techniques of the U.S. secret service, its financial support for trade union, student, youth and intellectual organizations, its attempts to install "suitable" men in top positions in these organizations, its method of controlling them, were fully confirmed in the course of the proceedings. There was no doubt about the sources of the money Olah had used for his operations. Writing in the *Saturday Evening Post* in March 1967, the man responsible for U.S. secret service contacts with international organizations in 1951-54, Thomas W. Bradens, said that the U.S. secret service sent huge sums, via the U.S. trade unions, to support anti-communist and pro-American forces in Europe.

Olah was tried only on charges of financial machinations. Yet in recent years several illegal organizations sponsored by the U.S. secret service, apparently as part of Olah-type "special operations," have been instrumental in overthrowing bourgeois-democratic regimes and installing military dictatorships in some countries, including Greece. Similar attempts were made in Italy.

Olah was found guilty of causing material damage to the Austrian Trade Union Federation. The court did not go into his activities in organizing a civil-war army, or his actions against Austrian state security, both financed from U.S. sources. The idea, of course, was to keep Olah in the public eye as a "hero" of the fight against communism. The prosecutor and the government rejected the charge made by Communist leaders that Olah had flagrantly violated the law on state security. No one, therefore, should be surprised that this faithful servant of American masters is still very much in circulation. At a press conference immediately after the trial he announced that he would intensify his political activity. He was elected to the Vienna city parliament after a rabid anti-communist campaign. Most of the votes came from the middle class, but some also from Socialists. Now Olah enjoys parliamentary immunity and no doubt will use it to further his political career. *Hans KALT*



# ***Apostle of the "third way"***

Critical remarks about the theories of Herbert Marcuse

ROBERT STEIGERWALD

Although the works of the social critic Herbert Marcuse spread over two or three decades have made a mark internationally, we Marxists began to look into them only in the mid-sixties. Why this new-found interest, and why the awakening to Marcuse of so many in the capitalist countries? What section of society do these admirers of his critical theories represent?

## **THE STUDENT "MUTINY" AND MARCUSE**

The growth of science into an immediate productive force is changing the role, training standards, work and life of the intelligentsia, especially of that increasing part of it associated with production. Growing too is the role of people directly employed in the sphere of production. But like the workers at the bench the intellectuals in the capitalist countries are denied effective participation in handling basic issues in education, occupational training and working and living conditions. In the conditions created by the technological revolution and the competition of the two differing social systems, the student ranks are swelling rapidly, with the conditions in educational institutions hopelessly out of harmony with this numerical growth. The educational system in most advanced capitalist countries is obviously much behind the times. This and the growing dissatisfaction with the conditions of life in state-monopoly society redoubles the student discontent. Students are deeply conscious

of the gulf between the humanistic perorations of the champions of capitalist reality and its reactionary substance. The result is a student movement of motley composition, of varying views and varying maturity.

The student world is now politically engaged, with part of the students fighting a "war" on two fronts — against state-monopoly capitalism and the real socialism.

In objective terms this "mutiny" can be described as petty-bourgeois. Its exponents stand for freedom both in relation to state-monopoly institutionalism and to proletarian socialist organization and discipline. They tend to worship spontaneous motion and "direct" action, and pick up the motley arguments against "the apparatus," "bureaucracy" and "party." They are critical of the proletarian state and the leading role of the Communist Party, and of the rejection of export of revolution. Eagerly, they seize on ideas implying that the workers in the imperialist metropolitan countries have become integrated in the system thanks to the industrialization, to the "affluence," the "welfare state" and its ideological manipulations, and that the proletariat is no longer the "addressee" of revolution. They contend that imperialism and the real socialism are converging, and that now the young intellectuals and the peasant masses of the Third World are the supreme revolutionary force, because they are not yet integrated in the status quo.



In many of these matters, and principally concerning the political power of the working class and its allies, their views coincide with those of the revisionists. Their concept of socialism is substantially anarchistic. And their avowed intention of building a socialism without working-class power denudes the objectively bourgeois nature of their new "third way," posited somewhere in between imperialism and socialism. The students' indisputable sympathies for socialism are, in the main, ethically motivated, their program is almost entirely bereft of any serious insight into the objective conditions, while saturated with impatience, voluntarism and subjectivism.

These features of the student "mutiny" are in evidence in the works of Herbert Marcuse.\*

The main lines in Marcuse's concepts took shape long before, and independent of, the modern student movement. The "rebellious" students found in his theories formalization of their own protest, and the movement of part of the students was the social medium in which Marcuse's views won a following.

True, many ideas propounded by the student "mutiny" also appear in the works of other theories — Adorno, Habermas, Sartre, in the journal *Praxis* (Zagreb), and in declarations emanating from Peking.

### THE THREE PERIODS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF MARCUSE'S PHILOSOPHICAL VIEWS

Herbert Marcuse's theoretical activity falls into at least three periods.

In the first (1928-1932) we find him an exponent of Heidegger's existentialism. Under the influence of writers who questioned dialectical materialism and interpreted historical materialism in subjectivist terms, he strove to "fuse" existentialism, dialectics and historical materialism, depicting man as an ultimately isolated individual, whose essence he reduced to consciousness, to spiritual activity. And politics, he said, was ultimately conditioned by consciousness. If the consciousness was revolutionary, then revolution was possible at any time, because in nature capitalism amounted to a revolutionary situation. Any action

\*Born in Berlin in 1898, Marcuse studied philosophy and hoped to become a university professor. When the Nazis came to power he emigrated to the United States, was a department head in the Office of Strategic Services during the Second World War and later head of a section of the State Department. In 1954 he became professor.

merited support, Marcuse maintained, if it was aimed against the status quo. Supporting reforms, whatever these were, was wrong, because reform buttressed the dominant system. The only right thing, he averred, was "catastrophical" revolution.

It should be borne in mind that Marcuse expressed these views at the time of the world economic crisis, when the threat of fascism was growing and the Weimar Republic was tottering to its death. In those days the Nazis, too, were against the "system" — not that of monopoly capitalism, of course, but of bourgeois democracy — and it was even objectively necessary to defend the bourgeois republic from the Rightist assault.

This early phase of Marcuse's career was crowned by his major and still influential commentary on Marx's then just published (1932) "Economic-Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844," in which Marcuse portrayed the young Marx as the champion of man in the spirit of petty-bourgeois individualism. He anthropologized Marx's historical materialism and "refunctioned" it into a theory of individualistic activism.

Marcuse's second phase (1933-1941) was colored by the triumph of fascism in Germany. He turned his back on Heidegger and, influenced by Horkheimer's and Adorno's Left-Hegelian "Frankfurt school," shot through with Marxist elements, determined his position vis-à-vis the classical humanist legacy of the bourgeoisie. He reevaluated Hegel and defined his attitude to Marxism, depicting it, in the main, as the successor to the classical bourgeois rationalism, above all that of Hegel. In so doing, he referred Marx to Hegel *philosophically*, denying him the authorship of a qualitatively distinct philosophy, while elevating Hegel to Marx's level by exaggerating the worth of his social theory. In the same breath, Marcuse showered criticism on the real socialism, the political power of the working class, for its failure to provide "direct" democracy for the people.

The third phase (from 1945 on) began against the backdrop of the cold war. Marcuse shed his earlier Left-Hegelianism garished with elements of Marxism, proclaimed the intrinsic ineptitude of the social theories of Hegel and Marx (see principally the Afterword to the second U.S. edition of his "Reason and Revolution"), and blamed this on their ostensible failure to resolve the problem of domination and freedom. He set forth a "new" theory to that effect, proceeding to elaborate it at length



in "The Structure of Instinct and Society." The rationale of that theory builds upon the Freudian psychological origin of domination. Our culture, Marcuse maintained, evolved as a product of the repression of instinct in a dominated environment. He "explained" domination, unfreedom and culture in biogenico-instinctive terms, describing Marx's theory of classes and class stratification as insufficiently "profound" to explain domination and freedom. As he saw it, the basic social conflicts could not be resolved by any socialist revolutionizing of the relations of production, but solely by a radical change in the existing "structure of instincts," for which, he averred, the necessary material instruments were now at hand. The productive forces accumulated through the "repression of instincts" made repression all but unnecessary.

Marcuse's biological theory of society is based on "if-then" premises, which he deliberately leaves open to question, "forgetting" in later discourses that his "ifs" are unconfirmed.

Historically all forms of association among humans, including sexual, are determined and conditioned by the degree of domination man exercises over the powers of nature, by the need to organize the struggle for existence.

Yet no evidence of repressive forms as conceived by Freud and Marcuse is available in the time preceding the emergence of classes and the class struggle, while the matriarchal organization, of which every evidence exists at a definite stage in primeval society, contradicts the Freud-Marcuse legend, of which the right of the forefather is the focal point. This means that the Freud-Marcuse socio-biological theory lacks a factual basis. For which reason it is doubly fallacious to apply it to *all* past history.

Marxism has shown how in society, keeping pace with the growth of the productive forces, there evolve the relationships of exploitation and private ownership of means of production, how society breaks up into classes and how class struggle begins and the state comes into being. If a primeval horde has really existed, as Freud and Marcuse would have us believe, then the latter should provide a creditable answer to the following: how could the horde produce a primeval society of people free from exploitation and domination in the conditions of the need which primitive people experienced in all things? For if it were

true, the potential of the biological "craving for domination" could hardly have been much pronounced. And if not pronounced it could not have been a factor of social regulation. In sum, the Freud-Marcuse biological theory on society is unconfirmed historically, nor is it devoid of inner logical weaknesses.

It is not surprising, therefore, that after laying down his mystifications about society and its history, Marcuse says nothing as to how, and with the help of what forces, his suggested structural reconstruction of instincts can be brought about.

Marcuse invokes his new "critical" theory to smite what he terms "Soviet Marxism" in his "The Teaching of Soviet Marxism on Society," in which he is more "radical" than Lenin in his view of opportunism. As he sees it, opportunism originates from the built-in capacity of imperialism to "integrate" the working class of the metropolitan countries. The support by leaders of Western Social Democracy of the imperialist governments during the First World War, he holds, was no betrayal on their part but the result of the then already far advanced integration of the working class into the system. It is this integration, coupled with the later "reformist policy" of the Western Communists, that Marcuse blames for the October Revolution being isolated. As a result, he avers, the building of socialism in the isolated, still backward Soviet Union entailed with regard to the masses a policy of repressing instincts, producing a "repressing power."

The policy of coexistence was inescapable in the foreign policy area. Yet coexistence "stabilized" capitalism, while "deforming" socialism, giving impulse to a convergence of the two systems.

The above was written in the early fifties during the Korean war, at the height of the cold war, the height of the U.S. policy of atomic blackmail from "positions of strength." All things considered, this yields a clear enough idea of Marcuse's objective role.

Last but not least, as the "crowning piece" of his new "critical theory," Marcuse advanced the following theses (see his "One-Dimensional Man"): domination lays bare the inhuman treatment of man by himself. That, too, lies at the root of man's incorrect relation to the nature outside him. He sees nature as something to be conquered, and the result of this incorrect attitude "adopted" still in the days of Ancient Greece (the influence of Heideg-



ger and Sartre is more than obvious at this point) is the "repressive form" of harnessing nature, the repressive use of technology and industry.

Dependence and manipulation, Marcuse writes, stem from man's incorrect relationship to nature, from his incorrect application of technology and of the logical thought shaped by technology. (Here Marcuse continues the irrationalist trend of German bourgeois sociology in relation to culture). For this thought and this technology, he goes on, have but one "dimension," the existing one. The second dimension, that is the future and the way to that future (red revolution), escapes the field of vision, the thought and action of the "one-dimensional" man, the man moulded in "one dimension." Consequently, in the industrially advanced countries man is at the mercy of the technological mechanism which has created the "industrial society" patterning our thinking and actions in "one dimension."

For Marcuse the technological potential of industrial society impedes our release from "one-dimensionality," unless we manage to create a new type of science, technology and instinct structure. And the social agents of such a revolution, Marcuse deduces, are found solely among the non-integrated elements of society — the students, that is, people living on the margin of society, and the mass of people in the Third World. As Marcuse sees it, the critical theory cannot close the gulf between itself and practice, and he offers "refusal" to participate in the "play" of systems as a method of struggle.

### IS THE WORKING CLASS REALLY INTEGRATING?

How lightly Marcuse borrows stereotypes from the apologists of imperialism and the right-wing Social-Democrats is evident from his reasoning. The welfare state, he avers, absorbs the revolutionary potential of the proletariat. He overlooks the fact that a sizeable section of the population in the capitalist "metropolitan countries" lives in poverty, and he ignores the specifically "sophisticated" forms of impoverishment bred by imperialist wars causing wholesale extermination of people.

To be sure, neither the "traditional" nor the "sophisticated" forms of poverty lead automatically to revolutionary consciousness. This, by the way, applies equally to workers in imperialist countries and the

masses of the Third World oppressed by old and new colonialisms. Nor can spontaneous rebellion impel social progress for either.

Marcuse's postulate that revolutionary consciousness is absorbed by satisfaction of needs, presupposes a direct link between consciousness and impoverishment. This is wrong for more than one reason. To begin with, it confuses the "positivist" apprehension of poverty by people languishing in poverty with theoretical knowledge of the fundamental reasons for their condition. This confusion leads Marcuse to the vulgar materialist concept of the relation of being to consciousness, linking revolutionary consciousness and revolutionary potential with the sphere of consumption and distribution, yet, at once, divorcing the problem of revolution from the sphere of production. This simplistic view of the sources of the revolutionary potential ignores the objective basis on which revolutionary consciousness germinates—the unresolvable imperialist conditions, barbarism, crises and war.

In sum, this proposition, a typically bourgeois one, is blind to the fact that the impulses for the inception of revolutionary consciousness, mediated by the above-mentioned contradictions or bred by them, may be extremely varied. These impulses may emanate from material poverty, deprivation of democratic or national rights, wars, the lamentable state of education or, briefly, all the principal areas in social life, but will exercise no effect unless an organized force, shaping the consciousness, develops them into facts of consciousness, thereby advancing political growth. The role of the working class, which Marcuse contests, stems from the qualitative and quantitative characteristics of its existence: the working class, the chief producer of material wealth and directly linked with the most sophisticated forms of production, is the bearer of the negation of the attributes of capitalist society and, furthermore, embodies even at this stage the features of the future socialist society. The contours of that society are visible to social thought which develops from the standpoint of the working class. And the critical intellectuals of the opposition cannot participate in guiding the revolutionary process until they line up with the working class, merge with its movement and espouse its interests.

Does not the new surge of the workers' movement in the Western countries, which, as strike statistics indicate, began early in the sixties (whereas the student unrest



began later) refute the hasty conclusions about integration? Both are expressive of the socially disintegrating influence of the technological revolution propelled in the interests of the capitalist class. The growing role of Marxism in the ideological struggle in the capitalist metropolitan countries also refutes the idea of integration. Yet Marcuse's theory draws no distinction between the changing level of the workers' consciousness, on the one hand, and the objective situation and historical role of the working class, on the other.

The idea of integration stems from an abstract and romantic concept of revolution and revolutionary struggle. In comparison, the Communist and working-class movement in Western Europe may, indeed, appear reformist. But the abstract romantic concept overlooks the real problems of revolutionary and socialist policy in the conditions of state-monopoly capitalism.

As for the revolutionary potent forces in the imperialist countries singled out by Marcuse (the students and the social outsiders), it should be said that they do not constitute a socially homogeneous stratum. The vast majority are not direct producers of material values. Though, admittedly, they can be revolutionary, even their most virulent "resistance" is no threat to the imperialist system, unless linked with the mass movement of the workers.

The peasants of the Third World, also referred to by Marcuse, are different. They are a class immediately involved in production and represent the vast majority in the Third World. The more closely the peasant movement adheres to the anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist way, the more progressive it is. Growth of the working class in the Third World and fusion of the peasant and workers' movements, can pave the way to socialism.

What about Marcuse's grand "resistance"? In the class struggle resistance has long been prominent. A workers' strike is a form of resistance as much as an anarchist strike or blockade of the factory-gate. Resistance, therefore, should be anatomized in the specific historical and social context. That of workers may strike at the heart of the exploitative mechanism, but to be effective it must be "complemented" by seizure of power which, no matter what Marcuse may say to the contrary, is by no means purely "negative" in character. It should be borne in mind, too, that opposition to the existing system does not take the form of large-scale resistance in the

beginning, but is often fairly small-scale and concrete, which brings us to the core of the concrete policy pursued by the Communist and workers' movement in organizing the "resistance" of the vast majority of toilers to the policy of the capitalist exploiters.

### **"RADICALIZATION" OF MATERIALIST DIALECTICS**

Like Sartre, Marcuse allows that at the beginnings of history man had freedom to choose the mode of his technical relationship with nature. To use Marcuse's expression, then the subject was autonomous, whereas now that subject is in a really diabolical way mechanically determined from outside.

Marcuse's concept of freedom of choice is subjectivist and overlooks the fact that although people are the makers of their own history, they labor in conditions created by laws operating independently of their will and consciousness. To accept the thesis of an indeterminative free choice is to accept irrationalism. The scientific concept of freedom presumes not only freedom of choice but also ability to act in pursuance of that choice. Would this be possible in a world of chaos? No conscious choice is possible, nor freely chosen aims attainable, in an indeterminative world. Freedom and objective determinism are intimately linked.

Take a closer look at the concept of "one-dimensionality." It presumes the existence of a second dimension, creating the basis for comparison. Yet how could a purely one-dimensionally moulded man apprehend the second dimension if the embryo of that second dimension did not exist in the first? We thus arrive at the critical point in Marcuse's theory. For a better view, turn to his report to the International Hegelian Congress in Prague in 1966.

It is difficult, he said, to understand modern capitalism by means of Marxist concepts, because these admit of a flowering of the capitalist system (A) and at once refer to the latter's negation, to its crisis (non-A), thereby showing indifference to the nature of capitalism. As Marcuse sees it, the source of this lies in Marx's dialectics originating from Hegel's. According to Marx negativeness erupts from within the capitalist system. However, Marcuse says, no such negativeness is in evidence in late capitalism and, consequently, the problem of negation needs to



be reviewed. Materialist dialectics, he declares, will continue to be enthralled by idealistic reason, by positiveness, so long as it does not destroy the concept of progress according to which the fruits of the future are rooted in the present, so long as Marx's dialectics does not "radicalize" the concept of transition to a new social level, that is, so long as it does not incorporate in theory the break with the past and the present, a qualitative change in the direction of progress.\*

He, Marcuse, wishes to assist this radicalization by reviewing the two focal concepts of dialectics—that of negation and of totality.

Hegel and Marx held that the negative forces originate inside the system, Marcuse notes, that these negative forces put the system in question and abolish it through gradual advancement.

Yet he, Marcuse, doubts if negative forces necessarily originate inside the system. That, he says, is something that concerns historical materialism as a whole in its relation to idealistic dialectics. Dialectical materialism, he holds, reduces its own materialistic base by not assessing deeply enough the influence of social institutions on the being and consciousness of people, by belittling the role of violence and underestimating that of the forcibly merged science and technology in forming and determining requirements and their satisfaction. He maintains, in other words, that Marxist materialism underestimates the forces of integration active in the latter stage of capitalism.

As a result, he says, the thesis that negativeness is immanent in the system is disputable. As a consequence, political practice must be delivered from this scheme and inner factors again linked with the outer.

Here Marcuse interprets the category of totality. Can a concrete whole be removed from without? In that case, each societal whole, he says, must itself be part of a larger totality within which it is able to experience influence from outside. The larger totality, he adds, must be historically concrete, e.g., global capitalism in relation to national capitalism.

As Marcuse sees it, a new theory of dialectics is required to explain the mechanism of the relation of totalities, and he goes on to offer the general propositions of such a theory. The outer, he writes, must not be

conceived mechanically in a spatial sense, but as a qualitative differentiation that, far from being restricted by contradictions existing in the antagonistic part of the whole, as, for example, the contradiction between capitalism and labor, must overcome these contradictions.

What he means by outer is something qualitatively outside the existing system, something that does not develop within that system. The outer also includes qualitative differentiation with regard to the concept and satisfaction of new needs suffocated in antagonistic society, which Marcuse lists as solidarity instead of competition, sensuousness instead of repression, disappearance of cruelty, vulgarity and its language, and peace as an enduring state.

As late capitalism integrates its negation, the latter's force must grow outside of this totality. Nowadays, Marcuse writes, the force of negation is not concentrated in any single class, being now a chaotic, anarchistic opposition, a political and moral, rational and instinctive denial of participation in the status quo and a repugnance of prosperity, a desire to protest. This opposition, weak and unorganized, is at least in irreconcilable conflict with all things.

What is the essence of this "new" concept of dialectics?

To begin with, it is a distorted interpretation of the dialectics of Hegel, let alone that of Marx. For Marx the A and non-A in a given totality were not equivalent, as say in the capitalist social system prosperity and crisis, or the capitalist and the working class: it is quite untrue that for him these poles balance each other like, say, action and counter-action in classical mechanics. In his "Holy Family" Marx wrote that in capitalism the two poles, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, had non-equivalent valencies. The bourgeoisie, he pointed out, was the conservative class, while the working class was revolutionary. Marx substantiated this conclusively. He observed that no factory chimney belched smoke without workers, showing that the capitalist class could not survive without the working class, while the latter could get along splendidly without capitalists.

Only by simplifying Marx's theory could one deduce that in Marxian dialectics the positive and negative processes are viewed as equivalent. If they were, Marxism would not be the theory of the rock-bottom historical trend leading to the abolition of capitalism. It would then me-

\*See H. Marcuse, *Ideen zu einer kritischen Theorie der Gesellschaft*. Frankfurt-am-Main 1969. Quotations further are also from this volume.



rely be a positivist reflection of one of the aspects in the condition of capitalism, and would not explain the causes and trends in capitalism's concrete processes. This is borne out by the readiness with which monopoly capitalism integrates the theory and practice of Marcuse (even partially financing the elaboration and dissemination of his theories), while refusing to integrate with and nursing the intention of destroying Marxism-Leninism and the Communist movement.

### THE IDEOLOGUE OF A "THIRD" WAY

Marcuse's critical theory does not stand up to the test either in factual content or in methodological and theoretical terms. Yet it is spoken of so widely. Why?

Compare, from the ideological standpoint, the present-day student "mutinies" and the views of Marcuse. You will discover that they coincide. Since his version of the ideas propelling the student opposition are more effective than those of Sartre, Adorno, Habermas and others, there must be reasons, reasons worth looking into.

For one thing, the student "mutiny" was most virulent at first in the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany. Those are the two countries in which Marcuse works. His theory eclectically combines all the main ideas of the left-bourgeois version of the "third" way formulated in recent decades. And precisely in the United States and the Federal Republic was this left-bourgeois variant bound to win support, because there was no Social-Democratic variant of a "third" way, or because the Social-Democratic leadership had been earlier and "more consistently" integrated in the state-monopoly system. Hence, the student "mutiny" could not identify itself with Social Democracy and adopted the "third" way of the left petty bourgeoisie.

For another thing, the influence of the Marxist-Leninist ideology on the working-class movement in those countries is relatively weak, with the result that the opposition-minded students lack a strong center for crystallizing their opposition. Nor should we forget that unlike Adorno, Horkheimer and Habermas, Marcuse has almost always been with the opposition, almost always politically active, a protester against the oppression of colored people, and against the aggression in Vietnam.

Furthermore, the reasons for Marcuse's

popularity among the intelligentsia are rooted in the unique combination of strong and weak points in his theory. He provides a striking picture of, and closely analyzes, the important deep-going dehumanizing processes in the capitalist society. Yet he sticks to "rules" of anti-communism and as a result, lands among the champions of the capitalist status quo. He is right in saying that we are still living in a class society and revolution is necessary. But he fails to understand the dialectics of the class struggle and revolution, the concrete ways, forms and methods of the class struggle in present-day conditions. On the contrary, he substitutes "grand resistance" for the class struggle, and Utopia and appeals to ethics for revolutionary science. He rejects the working class as the force capable of opposing modern capitalism and ascribes this role to the students and "middle-class" intelligentsia, on the one hand, and the oppressed ghettos and "under-privileged," the Negroes and the white outsiders, on the other. He hails the mutinous spirit of these groups, yet admits that they cannot be the historical agents of radical change. He dreams of socialism, but declares publicly that in the modern world he sees no real force capable of carrying through socialist reconstruction.

In sum, his criticism of capitalism, which ignores the historical role of the working class and accepts the myth of the affluent society, his abstract romantic conception of revolution and disbelief in the possibility of socialist reconstruction in modern conditions, his ethical justification of socialism and denunciation of the real socialism—all this makes Marcuse's theories anything but Marxist. They are useful to the bourgeoisie, and the bourgeoisie is not slow to use them for its ends.

The contradictions in Marcuse's views explain his influence on those intellectuals who are half-way between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat in their opposition to imperialism. And so long as they continue to think and act in terms of these contradictions, they are not entirely lost to the bourgeoisie. It is not accidental that they extol Marcuse as the present-day Marxist.

Political alliance and joint action with all forces in capitalist society striving for effective democratic change and opposing state-monopoly capitalism, monopoly oppression and monopoly influence, growing bureaucracy, etc., is something to be welcomed. As a pre-condition, however, we need clarity in the matter of theoretical



differences. Political maneuverability is impossible without the fullest fidelity to principle. We cannot abandon theoretical discussion whether or not the alliance exists. Discussion is necessary to help the exponents of the "third way" theory overcome the bourgeois way of thinking, for it stands in the way of effective political activity

and, moreover, leads a considerable section of the youth, of the left intellectual opposition, along the wrong way.

The mentor of the young intelligentsia, the man influencing large sections of it, should be asked: whom is he moulding, with whom does he side and whom does he serve?

---



## ***Freedom under the jackboot***

### **Letter from Mexico**

We want to draw the attention of world public opinion to the situation in Mexico today, whose government loudly professes allegiance to the "promotion of democracy," and even calls itself "revolutionary." Brutal repressions continue against Communists, against progressives who are in opposition to the policy of the authorities, the guardians of the interests of the big bourgeoisie.

The country's prisons are filled with political prisoners—the figure was some 250 in July. Among them are Central Committee members of the Communist Party, Fernando Cortez, Presidium members of the Party, Valentin Campa, Gerardo Unzueta and Ramon Danzas Palomino, who is also General Secretary of the Independent Peasant Center; National Executive Committee members of the Communist Youth of Mexico, Ruben Valdespin, Arturo Sama, Feliz Goded, Pedro Castillo, Aguilar Talamantes and Arturo Martinez. The latter two are President and General Secretary respectively of the National Center of Democratic Students.

The prisoners' list also includes several trade union leaders, among them Mario Hernandez, member of the National Council of Railway Workers, and Demetrio Vallejo who was General Secretary of the railway workers' union before his imprisonment 10 years ago. He was sentenced to 16 years' imprisonment for his participation in the big railway workers' actions of 1958-59.

The police terror has not spared the country's progressive intellectuals either. Languishing in prison are Eli de Gortari, philosopher and former Rector of the University of San Nicolas Hidalgo and faculty member of the National Autonomous Uni-

versity of Mexico; Heberto Castillo, professor at the same university; Fausto Trejo, professor at the National Polytechnical Institute; the novelist Jose Revueltas; the journalist Victor Rico Galan, the trade union lawyers Armando Castillejos and his wife, not to mention many, many other representatives of science, art and literature.

Among the political prisoners are also many students, railway and oil workers, office employees and peasants. In the second half of May alone 40 peasants and students were arrested in the town of Durango on charges of disturbing the peace.

The persecution of Communists and other democrats was intensified following the stormy student actions in the second half of 1968, which were widely supported by the working people. Most of those arrested and imprisoned were either the leaders or active supporters of these actions.

Voicing the demands of the majority of the population, the student youth have risen up against the encroachments by the government of the big bourgeoisie on the democratic rights of the people. They are demanding the release of all political prisoners, annulment of the draconic "Crimes Against Public Order" law under which people can be sentenced from two to 12 years' imprisonment, the removal from his post of the police chief of Mexico City responsible for the mass repressions, and punishment of other officials involved in the savage reprisals against those who openly express their dissatisfaction with the reactionary actions of the authorities. Reprisals have become a common feature in our towns and villages. To cite one example. Last January 10,000 peasants assembled in the town of Merida (State of Yucatan) to ask the government to extend



them credit to the sum of 200 pesos per family. The authorities refused to fully satisfy the just demand of the peasants, many of whom were literally starving to death. When they expressed their dissatisfaction and persisted in their demand troops were sent against them.

Needless to say the Communists, the consistent champions of the people's rights, are singled out for the most savage persecution. It has come to our knowledge that the government intends to make further arrests among our comrades and has already issued warrants to this end. In an

attempt to somehow justify these repression in the eyes of the public the authorities claim that the Party is conducting "counter-revolutionary" and "anti-popular" activity.

In these difficult conditions the Communists of Mexico particularly stand in need of international solidarity which would greatly sustain them in their fight against the onslaught of reaction, and for the democratic rights of the Mexican people and the release of all political prisoners.

R. GARCIA

## ***Foul murder***

In broad daylight, in a street in Baghdad, fire was opened at Sattar Khedair, a member of the Iraqi Communist Party Central Committee. Hit by five bullets, he was taken to hospital, where he died of his wounds.

A member of the Communist Party since his early youth, he had actively fought against imperialism, reaction and Zionism, and for the people and the working class. In 1954, under the pro-imperialist monarchist regime, he was arrested for his patriotic activities. After his release he continued his activity as one of the Party's leading cadres. He held different Party posts and in 1964 became a CC member.

This Communist fighter has been assassinated at a time when the Communist Party, though still illegal, is increasing its activity and when there is ever greater hope of unity of the patriotic and progressive forces, something imperialism and reaction fear most of all.

That is why they keep committing the

most savage crimes so as to stoke up the atmosphere of terror and mistrust.

Instead of taking steps to find the assassin, the security police pretended that Comrade Sattar was under arrest and even searched his home.

This is not the first such outrage under the present regime, whose leaders have repeatedly proclaimed their desire to cooperate with the Communist Party and take steps against imperialism and reaction. It has aroused great indignation among various national circles and has caused great discontent among the masses.

Such foul crimes are part and parcel of the anti-Communist activity which is practiced by certain forces in Iraq and which is essentially designed to help imperialism, reaction and Zionism. But this will not check the Communists' resolve to continue the fight for freedom. Sooner or later, the people will bring the assassins to account.

R. A.



## ***Monograph on history of the Comintern***

A new scholarly work on the history of the Communist International,\* prepared by the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the CPSU Central Committee, has recently been put out by the Politizdat in Moscow. The monograph, which reviews the basic aspects of the Third International's activity and its most important decisions, was compiled with the participation and help of leading figures of the Comintern: Walter Ulbricht, Dolores Ibarruri, Jacques Duclos, Tim Buck, Khaled Bagdash, Victorio Codovilla, Georges Cogniot, Inkeri Lehtinen, Boris Ponomarev, Palme Dutt, Dezso Nemes, Friedl Fuernberg, Emilio Sereni, Ruben Avramov, Andrew Rothstein. The book contains much new, hitherto unpublished documentary material.

Retracing the Comintern's history from the day of its establishment in March 1919 up to the day of its dissolution in June 1943, the authors begin their study with an analysis of the historical conditions that pointed to the need for such an international organization of Communists: the rising tide of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat when mankind began the transition from capitalism towards socialism, when the class struggle in most countries gained in intensity and when the need to overcome the disastrous consequences of the shameful betrayal by the leaders of the Second International was on the order of the day. Established on the initiative of Lenin and with his direct participation, the Communist International was the historical successor to the League of Communists and the First International, founded by Marx and Engels, the inheritor of the finest traditions of the Second International.

\*The Communist International. (A Historical Survey). Moscow, Politizdat. 1969. 600 pp.

The authors of the monograph show the role played by Lenin in framing the Comintern's ideological, theoretical and organizational principles, in helping the Third International to perform its vanguard role in the international revolutionary working-class movement. Lenin elaborated the underlying principles of the strategy and tactics of the world Communist movement, charting the revolutionary actions of the Communist parties on a national and international scale. The Comintern and its sections were ever in the mainstream of the crucial class battles of their time. It helped its national sections to master Leninism, creatively to apply, develop and enrich it collectively. Its Seventh Congress decisions, which profoundly influenced the subsequent activity of the Communist parties of the world, was an example of its creative approach to Leninism. This is clearly brought out in the monograph.

The Communist International was born in the struggle against opportunism which afflicted the parties of the Second International, against the opportunists in the working-class movement who, in Lenin's words, were "better defenders of the bourgeoisie than the bourgeoisie itself." Under the powerful impact of the October Revolution, the fight against opportunism led to the establishment in many countries of proletarian parties of the new type—Communist parties. However, they lacked the needed experience to counteract the opportunist trends that seeped in from the Right and from the "Left." Here again the Comintern rendered invaluable assistance to the young Communist parties. The authors of the monograph show how throughout its existence the Third International relentlessly waged the battle against opportunism in all its manifestations, first begun under the leadership of Lenin.



The monograph gives the reader a comprehensive picture of the Comintern's role in developing the principle of proletarian internationalism. The bourgeoisie has always violently attacked this principle and gone to all lengths to oppose it to the principles of independence, sovereignty and equality of the national contingents of the working-class and Communist movement. The Comintern greatly enriched the theoretical precepts regarding the dialectical interconnection between the national and the international in the policy of the Communist parties, between the patriotic and class element in the liberation struggle of the proletariat.

In our day the history of the Comintern has become the object of a sharp ideological struggle. The enemies of communism—

from the apologists of capitalism to the renegades of Marxism—try to distort and denigrate the activity of the Comintern and, at the same time, the basic principles of the international Communist movement, especially the principle of proletarian internationalism which unites the revolutionary forces of our time.

The appearance of this new scholarly study, showing the role and place of the Communist International in the history of the international revolutionary movement of the working class, the significance of its traditions for the contemporary world Communist movement, will undoubtedly help Communists and progressives effectively to combat the ideological offensive of imperialism.

V. S.

## ***Sudan: social change on the order of the day***

Sudan's progressive forces welcome the efforts of their foreign friends—journalists and publicists—to acquaint progressive world opinion with the revolutionary movement in the country particularly considering that, despite the momentous events taking place there, Sudan still remains isolated from the outside world to some extent, and that its communication media are still rather poor.

The book, *New Horizons in the Sudan*\* by the Soviet author Y. Gryadunov, is the first in many years that traces the development of the national democratic movement since 1956. It gives the reader a picture of the state of affairs in the country shortly before independence was proclaimed, in the immediate years after, then during the military dictatorship of 1958-1965, and of the events related to the revolution of October 21, 1964. The book closes with an account of the Fourth Congress of the Sudanese Communist Party, held in October 1967.

The author does not confine himself to a

chronological description of events, but examines them from the viewpoint of the development of the Sudanese revolution. This is apparent in the closing part of the book where he concludes that the chronic problems besetting the country could hardly be resolved in conditions of capitalist development, the path embarked upon by the "traditional" ruling classes; that the revolution of October 21 showed that the popular forces opt for the ideas of social change and are prepared to continue the fight for their realization. The events of May 25, 1969 confirmed that the analysis contained in the book, which appeared shortly before, was in tune with reality. On that day a group of patriotic officers and progressive personalities opened the way to the revolutionary movement to accomplish the tasks charted by the revolution of October 21, and proclaimed a development program along non-capitalist lines. The counter-revolutionary forces were ousted from power.

One of the basic problems dealt with in the book is that of Sudan's social structure and the transformation of the state machinery after the proclamation of indepen-

\*Y. S. Gryadunov. *New Horizons in the Sudan*. Internal Political Development During the Years of Independence (1956-1967). Moscow, "Nauka," 1969. 184 pp.



dence into an instrument serving the interests of the ruling classes. By his analysis of the military dictatorship's economic policy and of the revolution of October 21, the author helps the reader to better understand the nature of the processes underway in the Sudan.

Drawing on numerous sources and facts he shows, in particular, how the "traditional" classes emerged, in conditions of imperialist rule, from the upper crust of the "tribal administration," from the weak tribal chiefs and evolved into an economic and political force dominating the Sudanese countryside. The author shows how the stratum of private estate owners came into being and their organic connection with the leaders of religious sects, how the commercial bourgeoisie, closely linked with foreign capital, and the stratum of the capitalist bureaucracy arose and took shape. In their aggregate these exploiter elements became a conservative force which kept the country in a state of backwardness and regress.

The reader is thus given a clear picture of the class structure that existed at the time political independence was proclaimed, and which determined its development along the capitalist path and its dependence on imperialist states who used the state machinery and parliament to suit their ends. As a result, the working people were deprived of the fruits of political independence, of the gains they had won in the battle for this independence.

The author deals at length with the history of the country's working class and peasant movement, shows the complexity of the structure of the laboring classes, owing to the nature of production and geographical conditions. He describes the socio-political structure and production relations in the cotton-growing regions and particularly the relations between the government and the tenant cotton growers.

The book traces with scientific scrupulousness the development of the revolutionary movement and the founding of the Communist Party, the growth of the trade union and peasant movements under the leadership of the Communists, graphically shows how the popular movement in the country became widespread, reaching its present high level of development.

Highly interesting is the section dealing with the economic policy pursued by the military dictatorship installed in November 1958. The most characteristic feature of this policy was, to quote the book, that "on the one hand, the government of the mili-

tary dictatorship promoted, to the best of its ability, the development of national capital and, on the other, opened wide the door to the imperialist monopolies" (p. 68). The author draws on the official documents of the period revealing that the policy was one of giving every encouragement to private enterprise and foreign capital. Foreign investors were assured that they could take out their capital and profits in any currency they chose.

The book gives a concise outline of the 10-year plan of economic and social development (1961/62-1970/71) which was financed by international monopolies and neo-colonialist organization such as the International Bank of Reconstruction and Development, and others. The government's policy inclined to weaken the role of the state sector and to strengthen that of the private sector. This was particularly evident in industry where state investments were set at half that of private investments (25.3 million and 51 million Sudanese pounds correspondingly). State investments in agriculture were to be 90 million Sudanese pounds, the bulk of which sum was earmarked for land reclamation and irrigation. Private land and plantation owners were thus released from vast and burdensome outlays; private investments in this branch of the economy would be, at most, in the region of 30 million Sudanese pounds. Citing facts and figures, the book shows how foreign capital dominates most of Sudan's industry, with national capital acting merely as a junior partner.

One of the highlights of the book is its analysis of the national democratic movement after the revolution of October 21. A first-hand knowledge of Sudan's revolutionary movement during this period enabled the author to thoroughly assess the situation and draw the correct theoretical conclusions. He shows the popular struggle against the military dictatorship, how the general political strike which ended the dictatorial regime was prepared and carried out; how the first national government was formed, the policy of the Right forces to depose this government and to liquidate the revolutionary gains of the people; the weak sides of the revolutionary movement. The author notes in this connection that the political strike did not at the time receive the support it should have from the army. The latter confined its participation in the revolutionary movement to bringing pressure to bear on the military dictatorial clique to give up office.

The book gives a comprehensive picture



of the people's movement after the revolution of October 21 was defeated and of the events following the repressions against the Sudanese Communist Party. Here the author expresses the confidence, fully justified, that the popular movement will ultimately triumph.

In conclusion it should be said that *New Horizons in the Sudan* is written in a spirit of friendship and solidarity with the Sudanese revolutionary movement and with a deep understanding of its problems.

This is the first book to appear abroad

that deals with the period of Sudan's independence, from Marxist positions. It is to be hoped that it will be translated into Arabic. Sudanese revolutionaries will find in it expressions of profound international solidarity with their struggle. Our readers will learn with a deep sense of gratification that their friends are devoting much of their time and energy to studying the problems of Sudan and its revolutionary development.

Mohammed Ibrahim NOUGOUD

Khartoum

## ***New Canadian journal***

During the 48 years of its existence, the Communist Party of Canada has published several different political-theoretical journals, each of which corresponded to a particular period in the Party's history. Early this spring a new bi-monthly journal, *Communist Viewpoint*, made its appearance in Canada. Coming out on the eve of the Party's 20th convention, which set itself the goal of ideologically cleansing and organizationally consolidating the ranks of the Canadian Communists, the new journal will doubtless prove to be an indispensable weapon to that end.

In its first (March-April) number the editor of the new journal, Norman Freed, "by way of introduction" lists some of the goals which the new publication has set itself. It aims or hopes to:

—"utilize creatively the rich science of Marxism-Leninism to interpret Canadian reality and apply this science to the complex variety of developments."

—"provide the theoretical basis for the understanding of the policies advanced by the Communist Party to Canada's domestic and foreign affairs."

—"deal with the Communist Party's program, 'The Road to Socialism in Canada' . . . seek solutions, in theory and practice, to the relations between reforms and revolution—between the struggles for immediate demands and the achievement of socialism in Canada."

—"engage in dialogue and polemics with the socialist Left, with anti-Marxist and petty-bourgeois ideological trends at pre-

sent current in the radical and Left movement."

—"reflect the rich experiences from the various fronts of the class struggle and exchange the valuable information arising from the diversity of the movements."

—"introduce a feature in the journal where readers could submit questions on theory or practice to be answered through the pages of the journal."

Already in this first issue the journal goes well along toward fulfilling this ambitious plan. In its 64 pages are eight major articles covering a wide range of topics. All but one of the articles are very "Canadian" in character—written by Canadians and dealing with Canadian issues and problems. The one exception is a topic article, titled "Socialist Humanism," by the Soviet author G. Smirnov. Still another welcome feature is that three of the articles are of a polemical nature.

The opening article by the Canadian Party's General Secretary, William Kash-tan, discusses the then forthcoming 20th convention of the Party, its main problems and tasks and its relation to the Canadian and world scene (review and analysis of this convention by William Kashtan was published in the July issue of our journal).

One of the feature articles is "Polemic With Charles Taylor," in which the editor, Norman Freed, challenges the views of the national vice-president and a leading ideologist of the New Democratic Party, the party of Canadian Social-Democracy. Taylor, who is a political science professor at



a Canadian university, had outlined a series of "new courses for Canadian socialism" at a meeting of NDP members of parliament, wherein he explained why there was a change in socialist thinking in the West following World War II.

One of Taylor's main theses is that "contrary to the classical model of the capitalist enterprise, we now have a split between ownership and control so that the corporation was not run by capitalists but by managerial bureaucrats. These had no longer the direct interest in exploitation that the classical entrepreneur was supposed to have, for whom an increase in worker's wages meant a drop in income." Freed, pointing out that Taylor's view is "neither original nor profound," shows how both Marx and Engels had long ago predicted that capitalism would develop from an earlier condition of free competition to a stage of monopoly and state-monopoly capitalism. But, writes Freed, the disappearance of free competition and the subsequent economic intervention of the state does not mean the disappearance of capitalism. "The workers remain wage workers, capitalist exploitation is not abolished." The source of capitalist profits, he adds, is the same even when management functions are carried out by salaried employees. "The nature of the capitalist beast has not changed; if anything the beast has become more powerful, more greedy and more sovereign."

Taylor claims also that "the modern corporation had gone a long way towards solving the contradictions of traditional capitalism." But all evidence, Freed points out, indicates the continuous sharpening of contradictions. "If this is not the case, then what is the source of the growing, turbulent social conflicts? Mr. Taylor must be living on a different planet."

On the basis of this "new socialist thinking," Taylor sees the big line of division in Canadian society in the second half of the 20th century as not only or mainly between the majority of the population and a small group of privileged, "but much more between the majority who participate in the affluent society and the one-quarter of the population which is on or below the poverty line." And how does Taylor propose to solve the problem of poverty? Through "a relative de-emphasizing of growth of that sector of the economy dedicated to increasing the number or variety of consumer goods available to the affluent in order to put more of our resources into the kind of

policies which can come to grips with the problem of poverty." What Taylor is really proposing, writes Freed, is that the working people should accept a lower standard of living so that the problem of poverty could be solved. Freed then makes this important point: "Poverty is not any more the effect of individual misfortune, but the condition and the source of capitalist accumulation of wealth through the exploitation of labor." He concludes with this observation: "The goal of socialists is not to run capitalism more efficiently but to replace it with socialism."

In an article titled, "Class Consciousness—Vital Element for Social Advance," A. Dewhurst takes as his starting point the thesis that "for the working class to begin the process of raising itself to the position of the ruling class it must first begin to think and act for itself as a class." Then, turning to Canada, he puts forward this view: "Historically speaking, the Canadian working class has yet to reach this level of consciousness. Its battles with the Canadian ruling class—the monopoly capitalists—are mainly confined as yet to wresting concessions on wages, hours of work, living conditions and social reform."

Dewhurst reviews some of the struggles the Canadian working class has conducted in the recent period, particularly in the years 1965-68, and shows how these "assumed a marked militancy." But, he points out, there is also the fact that the strategy of state-monopoly capitalism has been to advance the ideological concept that labor and management are "partners" in a common enterprise and in this it has met with some success. "The force of illusions based on acceptance of the 'labor-capital partnership' idea," writes Dewhurst, "continues to chain Canadian workers to the capitalist system and its never-ending struggle between wages and profits." The author also shows the effect on the level of class consciousness of such factors as the great changes that have taken place in the structure and composition of the working class, as well as its rapid growth with the heavy influx of new wage workers, native-born and immigrant, over the past 20 years.

Canada's new prime minister, Pierre Trudeau, in a tape-recorded interview with the *New York Times* last November, expressed his views on a wide range of topics, including how Canada-United States relations should evolve now and in the future. Among other things, the prime minister said: "I think the problem of economic



domination is somewhat inevitable — not only of the U.S. over Canada but perhaps over countries of Europe as well . . . These are facts of life and they don't worry me. . . . I think even more important than the capital which comes in from the United States is the technology that comes with it . . . I am not an economic nationalist, and I believe that the whole device of nationalism is an impoverishing one — that you should use it sparingly in areas where you cannot defend yourself otherwise."

Bruce Magnuson, in an article titled, "A Reply to Pierre Elliott Trudeau", challenges these views. He denies Trudeau's claim that Canada would suffer a serious decline in its standard of living without direct foreign investment. He cites the following facts:

" . . . U.S. subsidiaries operating in Canada finance their expansion in the main from earnings made in Canada through the exploitation of Canadian workers and Canadian resources. Such plants, moreover, provide a relatively small proportion of employment in comparison to value of sales and profits made. The payments of interest and dividends is now in absolute terms exceeding \$1,500,000,000 per year, or more than \$3 million per day. When payments of royalties, management fees, and other emoluments are added, the *outgoing payments exceed by far the investments coming into the country*, if and when they do come in."

Magnuson reviews how the Canadian governments of the post-war period have practiced policies that have accommodated and facilitated the economic rape of Canada by the U.S. monopolies and charges that Trudeau, like his predecessors, is echoing the apologists of U.S. imperialism. He concludes: "Stern measures (are) required by the Canadian government to reverse the foreign economic domination that threatens our political independence. Without such measures all talk of the future for Canada and Canadians becomes meaningless rhetoric."

How is the unity of will and action of a Communist Party achieved? How is the membership of a Communist Party united in the fight for a given policy? These and similar questions are discussed in an article titled, "Unity of Purpose and Democratic Centralism," by Nelson Clarke. In this article the author examines the principle of democratic centralism and some of the concrete problems of its application experienced by the Communist Party of Canada.

This includes such problems as: how is the principle of democratic centralism expressed in the Party's constitution; how do individual Communists explain and win support for the policies of the Party among the people in the various organizations in which they work; how and to what extent does the Party check up on how this is being done; what is the relationship between the initiative and responsibility of the leadership and the initiative and responsibility of the members of the Party, as individuals and within their clubs.

An article on "Worker-Student Unity" by A. Stenberg examines some of the reasons for the changed character of the student movement today, as compared with earlier periods. The author emphasizes two of these: (1) "the changed and changing role of the educational system as a consequence of the scientific and technological revolution and the contradictions confronting state-monopoly capitalism in dealing with it" and (2) "the changes in the size and composition of the student population."

After examining some of the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois illusions that arise and develop among the students, the author says: "It is quite understandable that such illusions should exist—it would be surprising if they didn't. What is essential and decisive is the speed with which some students are overcoming these illusions, are developing accurate and deep-going analyses of society and their own situations. It must be noted that a small but growing number of students are coming to take essentially Marxist, revolutionary positions." He then adds: "It is not by accident that important forces in the leadership of the student movement have come to the conclusion that the future of the student movement lies in the development of close and permanent ties with the labor movement."

Still another polemical article is in the form of a "Letter to a Brother at University" by N. E. Story, in which the author declares that "ivory tower conditioning is the dominant and most insidious feature of university cultivation." He examines and exposes the misconceptions of bourgeois educational philosophy, which he says encompasses at least three basic pre-conceptions: elitism, logic of power, and metaphysics. Pre-conceptions, he argues, are the antithesis of the scientific method. There is a great need of overthrowing pre-conceptions hindering efforts to overthrow the system. He concludes with these words



of advice to his "brother" at the university: "The first and most difficult responsibility for a socialist-minded student at a bourgeois university is to resist the ivory-tower taint, to see it for what it is. The second responsibility is to soak up as much genuine knowledge as possible. A third, and for Canada newer, responsibility is to develop bridgeheads for open, progressive knowledge and activity."

The new journal has three very interesting regular departments, each of which serves a most useful purpose:

"Flashback," as its name implies, dips into the rich lode of materials published in former journals over the Party's 48-year history and reprints those having a fresh interest or a special bearing on the present-day scene. This first issue goes back to April 1949, and publishes in abridged form, an editorial written by the then General Secretary and present Chairman of the Party, Tim Buck, which reveals what Canadian Communists said about NATO when it was founded 20 years ago.

"Facts and Sources" gives two pages of statistics from various authentic sources on a wide range of topics: foreign investments, consumer credit, the press, agriculture, education, living costs, etc.

The "Self-Study Course" is a service to the reader: to help plan and organize his or her individual or group study. With this first issue the department begins a course in Political Economy. It lists several particular themes (for example, Commodity Production), breaks these down into three or four topics, lists the books wherein each of these topics is covered (including chapters and page numbers) and gives a number of control questions for them. Readers are invited to raise additional questions and problems with the editor.

The journal also carries the usual department, "Books Received," listing names of publishers and prices.

Well designed technically and neatly printed, the first issue of *Communist Viewpoint* makes a very favorable impression. It is obvious that in its preparation the editors applied all the rich experience accumulated in publishing the several journals in the Canadian Party's history. From this point of view other Parties should find in this journal many useful ideas as well as much valuable information on the problems and activities of the Canadian Communists.

John BOYD

## REPRINTS AVAILABLE FROM JUNE 1969 ISSUE OF WMR

### **Taking counsel with Lenin on the problems of our time**

by TIM BUCK

10 CENTS



### **SOME ROOTS OF OPPORTUNISM**

by LONGINO BECERRA

10 CENTS

ORDER FROM  
**PROGRESS BOOKS**

487 Adelaide St. West, Toronto 2B, Ont. Canada



Books listed here are in the language of the country of publication

MARX K. *Miseria della filosofia* (The Poverty of Philosophy). Rome, Editori Riuniti, 1969. 190 pp.

LENIN, V. I. *Dyrzhavata i revolyutsiyata* (The State and Revolution). Sofia, CCP, 1969. 135 pp.

LENIN, V. I. *Kakvo da se pravi?* (What Is to Be Done?). Sofia, BCP, 1969, 200 pp.

LENIN, V. I. *Shag vperyod, dva shaga nazad* (One Step Forward, Two Steps Back). Moscow, Politizdat, 1969. 231 pp.

LENIN, V. I. *O literature i iskusstve* (On Literature and Art). Moscow, Khudozhestvennaya Literatura, 1969, 822 pp.

LENIN, W. I. *Ueber Wissenschaften und Hochschulwesen* (On Science and Higher Education). Berlin, Dietz Verlag, 1969. 461 pp.

KOLLONTAI, A. M. *Vospominaniya ob Ilyiche* (Recollections about Lenin). Moscow, Politizdat, 1969. 15 pp.

*Metodicheskiye sovery po izucheniyu proizvedenii V. I. Lenina* (Advice on Methods for Studying Lenin's Works). Moscow, Mysl, 1969. 204 pp.

ALVAREZ, G. A. *Argentina frente a la dictadura de los monopolios* (Argentina Confronting the Monopoly Dictatorship). Buenos Aires, Editorial Anteo, 1969. 108 pp.

AGOSTI, H. P. *La revolucion que propiciamos* (The Revolution We Advocate). Buenos Aires, Editado por Nueva Era, 1969. 19 pp.

ALMASI, J. *Berlin—1918*. Budapest, Kossuth Konyvkiado, 217 pp.

BONTE, F. *Les antifascistes allemands dans la résistance française* (The German Anti-Fascists in the French Resistance). Paris, Editions Sociales, 1969. 392 pp.

DYOMUSHKINA, Y. V. *Venezuela posle vtoroi mirovoi voyny. 1945-1958*. (Venezuela after the Second World War. 1945-1958). Moscow, Nauka, 1969. 238 pp.

DOBRIYANOV, V. *Nishcheta na antiistorizma* (The Poverty of Anti-Historicism). Criticism of Karl Popper's Philosophical-Sociological Views. Sofia, BCP, 1969. 260 pp.

*Dyskusja o funkcjonowaniu gospodarki socjalistycznej* (Discussion of the Functioning of the Socialist Economy). Collection of articles. Warsaw, PWE, 1969. 445 pp.

"*Kapitalyt*" na K. Marks i nashata syvremennost (Marx's Capital and our Time). Sofia, Nauka i izkusstvo, 1969. 424 pp.

GHIOLDI, O. *Algunas cuestiones de la lucha ideologica* (Some Problems of the Ideological Struggle). Buenos Aires, Editorial Anteo, 1969. 31 pp.

KELIN, V. N. *Vneshnyaya politika i ideologiya* (Foreign Policy and Ideology). The role of ideology in imperialist foreign policy. Moscow, Mezhdunarodniye otnosheniya, 1969. 237 pp.

KORTUNOV, V. V. *Bitva idei* (The Battle of Ideas). The ideological struggle in the international arena. Moscow, Politizdat, 1969. 72 pp.

*Marx and India*. New Delhi, People's Publishing House, 1969. 27 pp.

MUENNICH, F. A. *Magyar Tanacsokztarsasagrol* (On the Hungarian Soviet Republic). Budapest, Kossuth Konyvkiado, 1969. 261 pp.

ROCQUES, M. *Y a-t-il une gauche aux Etats-Unis?* (Is There a Left in the United States?). Paris, Editions Sociales, 1969, 125 pp.



## 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,  
487 Adelaide St. West,  
Toronto 2B, Ontario,  
Canada

**FRENCH EDITIONS**  
(La Nouvelle Revue Internationale)  
Société d'Édition et  
d'Information 9, Boulevard des Italiens  
Paris (2e) France

Librairie Du Monde Entier,  
5, Place St-Jean,  
Bruxelles

Librairie Rousseau,  
36, rue J.-J. Rousseau,  
Geneve

**RUSSIAN EDITION**  
Stredisko pro rozširovani tisku,  
Praha 6, Thakurova 3  
Czechoslovakia

**BRAZILIAN EDITION**  
(in Portuguese)  
Rua da Assembléia, 34  
3.º andar, sala 304,  
Rio de Janeiro, Estado da Guanabara  
Brazil

**BULGARIAN EDITION**  
Raznoiznos,  
1, Rue Tzar Assen  
Sofia

**CEYLON EDITION**  
(In Sinhalese)  
91 Cotta Road  
Colombo, Ceylon

**CYPRUS EDITION**  
(in Greek)  
Laikon Praktorion,  
Tricoupi Street, 53 T. Nicosia

**CZECH EDITION**  
Artia, Praha 2,  
Nove Mesto, Ve smeckach 30

**DUTCH EDITION:**  
Progressief Algemeen Vertaalbureau,  
Chr. Snouck Hurgronjehof 22",  
Amsterdam W

**GERMAN EDITIONS**  
Deutscher Buch-Export und Import  
GmbH,  
Leipzig C I, Leninstrasse 16

"Globus" Vertrieb ausländischer  
Zeitschriften, Wien XX,  
Höchstädtplatz 3,  
Austria

Genossenschaft Literaturvertrieb  
Zürich, Zürich 4, Feldstrasse 46,  
Switzerland

**HUNGARIAN EDITION**  
Kossuth Kiado, Budapest, V,  
Arpad-U6

**ITALIAN EDITION**  
Libreria Rinascita, Via delle Botteghe  
Oscure 2, Roma

**JAPANESE EDITION**  
Nauka Ltd.,  
2, Kanda-Zinbocho  
2-chome, Chiyoda-Ku, Tokyo

**MONGOLIAN EDITION**  
Mongolgosknigotorg,  
ul. Lenina 41, Ulan-Bator

**POLISH EDITION:**  
P. K. W. Z. "RUCH", Warszawa,  
Wilcza 46

**RUMANIAN EDITION**  
Directia Difuzarii Presei,  
Palatul administrativ C.F.R.,  
Bd. Dinicu Golescu, Intrarea G.  
Bucuresti

**EDITIONS IN SPANISH**  
Agencia de Distribucion de Prensa  
Praha 6, Thakurova 3

Ediciones Paz y Socialismo,  
Apt. Nacional 1253,  
Bogota, Colombia

Ediciones Pueblos Unidos,  
Casilla Correo 589, Montevideo.  
Uruguay

Fondo de Cultura Popular  
Apdo. postal 2352  
Mexico 1, D.F.

Empresa Editora Austral  
San Francisco 36,  
Casilla 13201  
Santiago, Chile

Editorial "Anteo,"  
Entre Rios 1033,  
Buenos Aires,  
Argentina

**SWEDISH EDITION**  
Arbetarkultur, Kungsgt 84,  
Stockholm K, Sweden

**VIETNAMESE EDITION**  
So'o xuất nhập khẩu sách bao 32,  
Hải Ba trung, Hà-nôl



